		8/4/2021 4:52:15 PM Filing ID 13211649	
1	Alexander Kolodin (SBN 030826)	Thing 1D 13211049	
2	Christopher Viskovic (SBN 035860)		
3	KOLODIN LAW GROUP PLLC 3443 N. Central Ave. Ste 1009		
	Phoenix, AZ 85012		
4	Telephone: (602) 730-2985		
5	Facsimile: (602) 801-2539		
6	Email: Alexander.Kolodin@KolodinLaw.com		
7	CViskovic@KolodinLaw.com		
8	<u>Admin@KolodinLaw.com</u> (file copies)		
o 9	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
10	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA		
11	FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA		
12	DOUGLAS HESTED a tanahar in the		
13	DOUGLAS HESTER, a teacher in the Phoenix Union High School District;	Case no. CV2021-012160	
14	Plaintiff,		
15	V.		
16	PHOENIX UNION HIGH SCHOOL	FIRST AMENDED VERIFIED	
17	DISTRICT; LELA ALSTON, STANFORD	COMPLAINT FOR A SPECIAL ACTION	
18	PRESCOTT, NAKETA ROSS, STEPHANIE PARRA, LAURA PASTOR, STEVE	nemon	
	GALLARDO, and AARON MARQUEZ, in	(Order to Show Cause Requested)	
19	their official capacities as members of the Phoenix Union High School District	(Oral Argument Requested)	
20	Phoenix Union High School District Governing Board; CHAD GESTSON, in his	(oral inguinent requested)	
21	official capacity as Superintendent of the		
22	Phoenix Union High School District; DOES I- X;		
23	,		
	Defendants.		
24	Plaintiff, hereby submits this First Amended Verified Complaint pursuant to		
25	ARCP 15(a)(1). For his First Amended Verified Complaint against the Phoenix Union		
26	High School District, the members of its governing board, and its superintendent		
27	("Defendants"), Plaintiff alleges as follows:		
28	(Derendants), i famult aneges as fonows.		

1 PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE 1. Plaintiff Douglas Hester is a teacher in the Phoenix Union High School District. 2 3 2. The Phoenix Union High School District ("PUHSD") is a public body. 3. Defendants Alston, Prescott, Ross, Parra, Pastor, Gallardo, and Marquez are the 4 members of PUHSD's governing board. They are being sued in their official 5 capacity only. 6 7 4. Defendant Gestson is PUHSD's superintendent. He is being sued in his official 8 capacity only. 9 5. Does I-X are other persons who may be responsible, in whole or in part, for the acts and omissions complained of herein. 10 6. All or substantially all of the acts and occurrences giving rise to this Verified 11 Complaint occurred in Maricopa County, Arizona. 12 7. Pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-401(16) an action against public officers shall be brought 13 in the county in which the officer, or one of several officers holds office. 14 8. Plaintiffs may proceed by special action where there is no equally "plain, speedy 15 and adequate remedy" available. A.R.S. §§ 12-2001, 12-2021, Rules of Procedure 16 17 for Special Actions ("RPSA") 1. For the reasons set forth below, there is no equally plain, speedy, and adequate remedy available. 18 19 9. A special action may be instituted with or without an application for order to show 20 cause why the requested relief should not be granted. RPSA 4(c). Where a show-21 cause procedure is used, the court must set a speedy return. Id. Given the 22 imminent implementation of Defendants' unlawful policy, further discussed below, Plaintiffs seek an order to show cause. 23 24 10. A special action may be brought in the superior court for the county that is the principal place of business for the public officer or body being sued. RPSA 4(b). 25 26

27

28

- 2 -

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

11. This Court has jurisdiction to hear this matter and venue is proper pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 12-2001, 12-2021,¹ the Uniform Declaratory Judgments Act and other statutes governing the issuance of declaratory judgments, the Arizona Rules of Procedure for Special Actions ("ARPSA") 1-4, and other applicable law.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

12. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding allegations.

13. On June 30th, 2021, Governor Doug Ducey signed HB 2898 into law. Exhibit A.

14. Included within HB 2898 was a new statute, A.R.S. § 15-342.05.

15. A.R.S. § 15-342.05 provides as follows:

- a. "Notwithstanding any other law or order, a county, city, town, school district governing board or charter school governing body may not require the use of face coverings by students or staff during school hours and on school property."
- b. "A school district or charter school may not require a student or teacher to receive a vaccine for COVID-19 or to wear a face covering to participate in in-person instruction."
- 16. HB 2898 was an omnibus bill, the various portions of which have different effective dates.
- 17. Section 119(A) of the bill provides as follows: "Section 15-342.05, Arizona Revised Statutes, as added by this act, applies retroactively to from and after June 30, 2021. Exhibit A p 160.
- 18. On July 30, 2021, the PUHSD posted the following announcement on its website: Our current Board-adopted policies still require masks when indoors in the presence of others. However, this past month, we did align our masking practices district-wide with the current prohibition of mask mandates. Recently, we have heard from our staff, students, and families that they want us to realign our

 ¹ To the extent, if any, that Plaintiff is expressly required to so state, included in this action is a prayer for a writ of mandamus or its equivalent under the RPSA. The special action now encompasses applications for writs of mandamus. RPSA 1(a-b).

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

mitigation practices with the guidelines and recommendations of national and local health agencies.

In an effort to protect our staff, students, and community, PXU has a good faith belief that following guidance from the CDC and other health agencies regarding mitigation strategies is imperative. Therefore, Phoenix Union will begin the school year on August 2 enforcing our existing Board-adopted mask requirement of universal indoor masking only, regardless of vaccination status. This masking requirement is for all staff, students, and visitors. At the August 5 Board meeting, District leadership and Governing Board will discuss mitigation plans, including masking policies, and consider the temporary continuation of the mask requirement until the CDC (and/or other federal, state, and local health agencies) changes their masking guidelines.²

19. The same day, the Arizona Republic reported as follows:

"Phoenix Union High School District will require masks to be worn indoors when students head back to school next week — despite an Arizona law that bans mask mandates.

In a statement, Gov. Doug Ducey's office said Phoenix Union's policy is not allowed under Arizona law, calling the district's move 'unenforceable.'

At a news conference on Friday, Phoenix Union Superintendent Chad Gestson repeatedly declined to comment on whether the district was following state law. He said he has been in talks with his legal team about the mandate but reiterated that his job was about the health and safety of schools."³

20. Twelve News reported more fully on Governor Ducey's July 30th statement:

² https://www.pxu.org/Page/28142

^{28 &}lt;sup>3</sup> <u>https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/phoenix-education/2021/07/30/phoenix-union-high-school-district-require-masks-indoors/5431886001/</u>

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

"A spokesman for Gov. Doug Ducey, a fierce opponent of any COVID-related mandates, issued a statement that declared the district was breaking the law: 'Gov. Ducey believes the decision by Phoenix Union requiring masks has no teeth. It's not allowed under Arizona law. It's unenforceable. Arizona is not anti-mask, we're anti-mask mandate. As the governor has often said, mask usage is up to parents. School administrators should be doing everything they can to encourage eligible students and staff to get vaccinated, not break state law.' But Ducey didn't indicate that he would try to block the district's mandate."⁴ 21. Just three days prior, Governor Ducey had released a statement reading, in pertinent part: "Arizona does not allow mask mandates, vaccine mandates, vaccine passports or discrimination in schools based on who is or isn't vaccinated. We've passed all of this into law, and it will not change."⁵ 22. The mask mandate applies to students, faculty, and staff.⁶ 23. PUHSD's first day of school is August 2nd, 2021.⁷ 24. Accordingly, Plaintiff has no equally plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law. 25. On March 11, 2020, Governor Doug Ducey issued a Declaration of Public Health State of Emergency pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 26-303 and 36-787. 26. Accordingly, "coordination of all matters pertaining to COVID-19 are of statewide concern rather than local concern unless otherwise determined by the director of the Arizona Department of Health Services."8

 ⁴ <u>https://www.12news.com/article/news/health/coronavirus/phoenix-union-high-school-district-to-requires-masks-indoors-regardless-of-vaccination-status/75-442922ca-3e41-465a-9971-021d4158cffd
</u>

⁵ <u>https://azgovernor.gov/governor/news/2021/07/governor-ducey-statement-updated-cdc-guidance</u>

^{27 &}lt;sup>6</sup> <u>https://www.azfamily.com/news/continuing_coverage/coronavirus_coverage/facemask-mandate-phoenix-union-high-school/article_df19f11e-f154-11eb-ad7a-bbadde56d83d.html</u>

^{28 &}lt;sup>7</sup>/₈ https://www.pxu.org/calendar#calendar1/20210830/month

⁸ <u>https://azgovernor.gov/sites/default/files/eo_2021-09.pdf</u>

1	27. The Public Health Emergency remains in effect.	
2	CAUSE OF ACTION	
3	<u>(RPSA 3)</u>	
4	28. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the preceding allegations.	
5	29. Special action relief is available where a Plaintiff seeks relief against a public	
6	body, officer, or person. RPSA 1(a).	
7	30. Special actions are especially appropriate when they are brought regarding subject	
8	matter of statewide concern.	
9	31. Applications for writs of mandamus pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-2021 are	
10	appropriately brought as special actions. RPSA 1(a-b).	
11	32. RPSA 3(a) provides that the question of "[w]hether the defendant has failed to	
12	exercise discretion which he has a duty to exercise; or to perform a duty	
13	required by law as to which he has no discretion" may be raised by special	
14	action.	
15	33. A.R.S. Title 15, Chapter 3, Article 3 is entitled "Powers and Duties of School	
16	District Governing Boards[.]"	
17	34. Pursuant to that article, a school district's governing board has the duty to	
18	"Prescribe and enforce policies and procedures for the governance of the schools	
19	that are not inconsistent with law[.]" A.R.S. § 15-341(A)(1).	
20	35. The policies and procedures put in place by Defendants include an illegal mandate	
21	requiring students and staff to wear masks.	
22	36. Therefore, Defendants have failed to perform their duty to prescribe policies and	
23	procedures that are not inconsistent with law.	
24	37. RPSA 3(b) provides that the question of "[w]hether the defendant has	
25	proceeded or is threatening to proceed without or in excess of jurisdiction or	
26	legal authority" may be raised by special action.	
27	38. Defendants lack the legal authority to mandate that students and staff wear masks.	
28	39. Nonetheless, Defendants have imposed such a mandate.	

- 6 -

- 40. Further, Defendants are threatening not to promulgate lawful policies until the CDC changes its masking guidance or they feel it is otherwise safe to do so.
 41. For example, in an August 4th, 2021 interview with the Wall Street Journal, defendant Gestson said "We don't want a mask requirement forever either, and we'll make a decision to change that when it's safe to do so[.]"⁹
 42. Therefore, Defendants are threatening to proceed without or in excess of their jurisdiction or legal authority.
 43. Furthermore, CDC guidance as well as that of other authorities are highly variable, as is the state of the COVID pandemic generally. Thus, in the alternative, this case should be adjudicated as one that is capable of repetition but evading review.
 WHEREFORE Plaintiff prays:
 A. That this Court accept special action jurisdiction, issue an Order to Show Cause, and set a speedy return.
 - B. For a declaration that Defendants' mask mandate is contrary to law *or*, *alternatively* for a declaration that Defendants' mask mandate will be contrary to law as of September 29th, 2021.
 - C. For preliminary and permanent injunctive relief requiring Defendants to fulfill their legal duty to "Prescribe and enforce policies and procedures for the governance of the schools **that are not inconsistent with law**" by promulgating policies and procedures for the new school year, and for subsequent school years, that do not include the mask mandate. *Or*, *alternatively*, for preliminary and permanent injunctive relief requiring Defendants to, on or before September 29th, 2021, fulfill their legal duty to "Prescribe and enforce policies and procedures for the governance of the
- ⁹ <u>https://www.wsj.com/articles/some-arizona-schools-require-masks-flouting-covid-19-state-law-11628082000</u>

		schools that are not inconsistent with law" by promulgating and
,		maintaining policies and procedures that do not include the mask mandate.
	D.	For attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 12-2030, 12-348, 12-
-		349, common law doctrine, and other applicable law.
	E.	For such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.
,		
		Respectfully submitted this 4 th day of August, 2021
,		
)		By <u>/s/Alexander Kolodin</u>
		Alexander Kolodin
		Kolodin Law Group PLLC 3443 N. Central Ave. Ste 1009
		Phoenix, AZ 85012
		Attorneys for Plaintiff
,		
)		
)		
, ,		
5		
,		
		- 8 -

