Hon. David G. Estudillo 1 2 3 5 6 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 9 AT TACOMA 10 Civil Action No. 3:22-cv-05377-DGE MAUREEN MURPHY, 11 individually and on behalf of a class of similarly situated individuals; 12 JOHN HUDDLESTON, 13 individually and on behalf of a class of similarly situated individuals, Plaintiffs, 15 16 v. REPLY IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' 17 GINA RAIMONDO, MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION in her official capacity as Secretary of 18 Commerce; Noted on motion calendar: DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, August 26, 2022 19 a federal agency; 20 ROBERT SANTOS, in his official capacity as Director of the 21 Bureau of the Census; BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, 22 a federal agency, 23 Defendants. 24 24

26

27

28

Plaintiffs fully briefed their entitlement to class certification under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, ECF12, yet Defendants oppose class certification on ripeness grounds only, ECF23; see ECF22:12–16 (MSJ). As a preliminary matter, therefore, objections on other grounds are waived. Stichting Pensioenfonds ABP v. Countrywide Fin. Corp., 802 F. Supp. 2d 1125, 1132 (C.D. Cal. 2011) ("[I]n most circumstances, failure to respond in an opposition brief to an argument put forward in an opening brief constitutes waiver or abandonment in regard to the uncontested issue.") (citing Jenkins v. County of Riverside, 398 F.3d 1093, 1095 n.4 (9th Cir. 2005) (concluding that party abandoned an argument it could have made in opposition by not raising it in the response to the motion)). By failing to say that Plaintiffs do not meet the Rule 23 criteria for class certification, Defendants have waived those arguments.

Plaintiffs address Defendants' ripeness arguments in the cross-motion for summary judgment that is filed contemporaseously, with this really. Plaintiffs will not report these arguments began

Plaintiffs address Defendants' ripeness arguments in the cross-motion for summary judgment that is filed contemporaneously with this reply. Plaintiffs will not repeat those arguments here. Plaintiffs' claims are ripe.

The Court should grant Plaintiffs' motion for class certification, certify the class as defined, and appoint class counsel as requested in the motion.

Conclusion

Plaintiffs' claims are ripe for adjudication. Plaintiffs' class-certification motion should be granted.

DATED: August 26, 2022.

Reply ISO P. Mot. Class Cert. - 2

Case No. 3:22-cv-05377-DGE

1	Respectfully submitted:	
2	s/ Aditya Dynar	s/ Brian T. Hodges
3	ADITYA DYNAR DC Bar No. 1686163*	BRIAN T. HODGES WSBA No. 31976
4	Pacific Legal Foundation	Pacific Legal Foundation
	3100 Clarendon Blvd., Suite 610	255 South King Street, Suite 800
5	Arlington, VA 22201 Telephone: (202) 807-4472	Seattle, WA 98104 Telephone: (425) 576-0484
6	Email: ADynar@pacificlegal.org	Email: BHodges@pacificlegal.org
7	s/ Michael A. Poon	
8	MICHAEL A. POON	
0	Cal. Bar No. 320156*	
9	Pacific Legal Foundation	
10	555 Capitol Mall, Suite 1290 Sacramento, CA 95814	
	Telephone: (916) 419-7111	
11	Email: MPoon@pacificlegal.org	
12	* pro hac vice	
13	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
14		
15	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
16	I hereby certify that on this date, I filed a copy of the foregoing with the Clerk of this Court	
17	through the CM/ECF system, which will notify all counsel of record of this filing.	
18	DATED: August 26, 2022.	
		s/ Aditya Dynar
19		ADITYA DYNAR DC Bar No. 1686163
		Attorney for Plaintiffs
21		
22		
23		
24		
24		
26		
27		
28		