

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

ASSOCIATION OF CONNECTICUT	:	CASE NO. 3:06-CV-01360 (SRU)
LOBBYISTS, LLC, ET AL.,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
JEFFREY GARFIELD, ET AL.,	:	FEBRUARY 16, 2007
	:	
Defendants.	:	

AMENDED ANSWER

Proposed Intervenor-Defendants, Audrey Blondin, Esq., Kim Hynes, Tom Sevigny, Connecticut Citizen Action Group and Common Cause Connecticut, hereby answer and assert their affirmative defenses to Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint dated January 16, 2007, as follows:

1. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 1 that this court has supplemental jurisdiction over state constitutional law claims. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants admit the remaining allegations of Paragraph 1.
2. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 2.
3. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 3.
4. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 4, and accordingly neither admit nor deny those allegations.
5. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 5, and accordingly neither admit nor deny those allegations.

6. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 6 that Defendant Richard Blumenthal is the Attorney General of the State of Connecticut and that this action is brought against him in his official capacity only. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 6.

7. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 7.

8. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants admit based on information and belief that Defendant Jeffrey B. Garfield is a resident of Connecticut. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants admit the remaining allegations of Paragraph 8.

9. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 9 that Plaintiffs have brought an action for a declaratory ruling under 28 U.S.C. § 2201 seeking a declaratory judgment. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants deny that Connecticut General Statute § 9-600 *et seq.* (formerly § 9-333 *et seq.*) violates the constitutional rights of Plaintiffs.¹

10. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 10 that Plaintiffs seek a permanent injunction barring Defendants from enforcing sanctions for violations of Connecticut General Statute § 9-600 *et seq.* (formerly § 9-333 *et seq.*) and § 1-97 and for relief in accordance with 42 U.S.C. § 1988 including the imposition of costs. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 10.

11. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 11, and accordingly neither admit nor deny those allegations.

¹ The Connecticut law was re-codified in January 2007 such that statutes formerly numbered § 9-333 *et seq.* are now numbered § 9-600 *et seq.* See State of Connecticut Elections Enforcement Commission, "Title 9 – 2006, New Chapters Parts and Sections, *available at* http://www.ct.gov/seec/lib/seec/t09_additions.pdf (effective Jan. 1, 2007).

12. Proposed Intervenors-Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 12, and accordingly neither admit nor deny those allegations.

13. Proposed Intervenors-Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 13.

14. In Paragraph 14, the Plaintiffs have either quoted or characterized the law that is at issue in this suit. The law speaks for itself and thus no response is required to these quotes or characterizations. To the extent this Paragraph makes any factual allegations, they are denied.

15. In Paragraph 15, the Plaintiffs have either quoted or characterized the law that is at issue in this suit. The law speaks for itself and thus no response is required to these quotes or characterizations. Proposed Intervenors-Defendants deny that Section 9-3333 exists in the Connecticut General Statutes.

16. Proposed Intervenors-Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 16, and accordingly neither admit nor deny those allegations.

17. Proposed Intervenors-Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 17 that the statutory provisions challenged prevent the Association of Connecticut Lobbyists LLC's members and their family members from engaging in the political process or limit their rights of free speech. Proposed Intervenors-Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations of Paragraph 17, and accordingly neither admit nor deny those allegations.

18. Proposed Intervenors-Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 18.

19. Proposed Intervenors-Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 19.

20. In Paragraph 20, the Plaintiffs have characterized the past, present and future law that is at issue in this suit. The law speaks for itself and thus no response is required to these characterizations. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 20 regarding Plaintiff Barry Williams and the members of the Association of Connecticut Lobbyists LLC, and accordingly neither admit nor deny those allegations. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 20.

21. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 21.

22. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 22.

23. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 23, and accordingly neither admit nor deny those allegations.

24. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 24, and accordingly neither admit nor deny those allegations.

25. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 25, and accordingly neither admit nor deny those allegations.

26. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 26.

27. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 27.

28. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 28.

29. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 29.

30. Proposed Intervenor-Defendants incorporate their answers to Paragraphs 1-29.

31. Proposed Intervenors-Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 31.
32. Proposed Intervenors-Defendants deny the allegations of Paragraph 32.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims for injunctive relief are barred because the public interest favors Defendants and Proposed Intervenors-Defendants.

Dated: February 16, 2007
Respectfully submitted,

/s/Ciara Torres-Spelliscy
Suzanne Novak
Ciara Torres-Spelliscy
BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE
AT NYU SCHOOL OF LAW
161 Avenue of the Americas, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10013
Phone: (212) 998-6730
Fax: (212) 995-4550
suzanne.novak@nyu.edu
ciara.torres-spelliscy@nyu.edu
Novak's Federal Bar # ct23016
Torres-Spelliscy's Federal Bar # phv01373

Ira M. Feinberg
Lawrence V. Brocchini
Benjamin F. Holt
Brian C. Lavin
Jeffrey D. Ratner
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.
875 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
Phone: (212) 918-3000
Fax: (212) 918-3100
IMFeinberg@hhlaw.com
LVBrocchini@hhlaw.com
BFHolt@hhlaw.com
BCLavin@hhlaw.com
Jdratner@hhlaw.com
Feinberg's Federal Bar # phv01662
Brocchini's Federal Bar # ct17938
Holt's Federal Bar # phv01665
Lavin's Federal Bar # phv01663
Ratner's Federal Bar # phv01664

J. Gerald Hebert
Paul S. Ryan
CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER
1640 Rhode Island Ave., NW, Suite 650
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 736-2200
jhebert@campaignlegalcenter.org
pryan@campaignlegalcenter.org
Hebert's Federal Bar # phv01375
Ryan's Federal Bar # phv01376

Donald J. Simon
SONOSKY, CHAMBERS, SACHSE,
ENDRESON & PERRY, LLP
Suite 600, 1425 K St. NW
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 682-0240
Facsimile: (202) 682-0249
dsimon@sonosky.com
Federal Bar # phv01374

Fred Wertheimer
DEMOCRACY 21
1875 I St. NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 429-2008
fwertheimer@democracy21.org
Federal Bar # phv01377

Stephen V. Manning
O'BRIEN, TANSKI & YOUNG, LLP
CityPlace II - 185 Asylum Street
Hartford, CT 06103-3402
Phone: (860) 525-2700
Fax: (860) 247-7861
svm@otylaw.com
Federal Bar # ct07224

Attorneys for Proposed Intervenors-Defendants

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that on February 16, 2007, a copy of the foregoing was filed electronically. Notice of this filing will be sent by e-mail to all parties by operation of the court's electronic filing system or by mail to anyone unable to accept electronic filing as indicated on the Notice of Electronic Filing. Parties may access this filing through the court's CM/ECF System.

/s/ Ciara Torres-Spelliscy

Ciara Torres-Spelliscy

BRENNAN CENTER FOR JUSTICE

AT NYU SCHOOL OF LAW