

DISTRICT COURT, CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER, STATE OF COLORADO 1437 Bannock Street Denver, CO 80202	Δ COURT USE ONLY Δ
Petitioners: NORMA ANDERSON, MICHELLE PRIOLA, CLAUDINE CMARADA, KRISTA KAUFER, KATHI WRIGHT, and CHRISTOPHER CASTILIAN v. Respondents: JENA GRISWOLD, in her official capacity as Colorado Secretary of State, and DONALD J. TRUMP and Intervenors: COLORADO REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE and DONALD J. TRUMP	
ORDER RE: DONALD J. TRUMP'S MOTION TO DISMISS FILED SEPTEMBER 29, 2023	

This matter comes before the Court on Donald J. Trump's Motion to Dismiss, filed September 29, 2023. Having considered the parties' briefing, the relevant legal authorities cited, and being otherwise familiar with the record in this case, the Court FINDS and ORDERS as follows:

I. LEGAL STANDARD

A complaint must state a plausible claim for relief to survive a C.R.C.P. 12(b)(5) motion to dismiss. *Warne v. Hall*, 373 P.3d 588, 591 (Colo. 2016). However, motions to dismiss are disfavored, and may be granted only when, assuming all the allegations of the complaint are true, and drawing all reasonable inferences in favor of the plaintiff, the plaintiff would still not be entitled to any relief under any cognizable legal theory. *Colorado Ethics Watch v. Senate Majority Fund, LLC*, 269 P.3d 1248, 1253 (Colo. 2012); *Denver Post Corp. v. Ritter*, 255 P.3d 1083, 1089 (Colo. 2011). Although a complaint need not contain detailed factual allegations, a plaintiff must identify the grounds on which he is entitled to relief, and cannot simply provide “labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action.” *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). A complaint is insufficient if it provides only bald assertions without further factual enhancement. *Id.* at 557.

Whether a claim is stated must be determined solely from the complaint. *Dunlap v. Colorado Springs Cablevision, Inc.*, 829 P.2d 1286, 1290 (Colo. 1992). A court may consider only the facts alleged in the pleadings, as well as “documents attached as exhibits or incorporated by reference, and matters proper for judicial notice.” *Denver Post*, 255 P.3d at 1088.

II. ANALYSIS

In his Motion to Dismiss, Intervenor Trump makes the following arguments: (1) the question before the Court is a non-justiciable political question; (2) Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment is not self-executing; (3) Congress has preempted states from

judging presidential qualifications; (4) Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment does not apply to Intervenor Trump; (5) the Petition fails to state a claim that violence constituted an insurrection or President Trump engaged in an insurrection; and (6) the case should be moved to Washington, D.C. under Colorado’s *forum non conveniens* statute.

a. Non-Justiciable Political Question

“In general, the Judiciary has a responsibility to decide cases properly before it, even those it ‘would gladly avoid.’” *Zivotofsky ex rel. Zivotofsky v. Clinton*, 566 U.S. 189, 194 (2012) (quoting *Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U.S. 264, 404 (1821)). A case “involves a political question . . . where there is ‘a textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issue to a coordinate political department; or a lack of judicially discoverable and manageable standards for resolving it.’” *Nixon v. United States*, 506 U.S. 224, 228 (1993) (quoting *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 217 (1962)) In such a case, the United States Supreme Court has held that a court lacks the authority to decide the dispute before it. *Zivotofsky*, 566 U.S. at 195. This exception is narrow. *Id.* A court cannot avoid its responsibility to enforce a specific statutory right because the issues have political implications. *Id.* at 196.

In this case, Intervenor Trump argues that the U.S. Constitution reserves exclusively to the U.S. Congress the decision as to whether a candidate is unqualified under Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment.¹ He does not argue the second basis

¹ Intervenor Trump claims that Courts have dismissed “every Section Three challenge brought against President Trump—and every other federal candidate or officeholder—arising from the events of January 6, 2021.” Intervenor Trump, however, cites nary a case. Presumably, this is because those cases have been dismissed for lack of federal standing. In this case, C.R.S. § 1-1-113 clearly gives Petitioners standing.

under the political question doctrine—that a Court is incapable of resolving the question—nor could he. Instead, Intervenor Trump argues the U.S. Constitution reserves exclusively for the United States Congress the power under Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment to determine whether a party may take office. In doing so, Intervenor Trump relies on cases that address the question of whether various Presidential candidates (Barack Obama, John McCain, and Ted Cruz) were natural born citizens. He does not cite a case holding that the question before this Court (whether a candidate is barred under Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment) is barred under the political question doctrine.

i. Intervenor Trump’s Cases

Intervenor Trump cites the Third Circuit in *Berg v. Obama*, 586 F.3d 234, 238 (3d Cir. 2009) for the proposition that the question of whether Barack Obama was a natural born citizen was a non-justiciable political question outside the province of the judiciary. The Court in *Berg* makes no such holding. Instead, when describing the history of the case, the Third Circuit states, “[w]e also denied that motion, reiterating Berg’s apparent lack of standing and also stating that Berg’s lawsuit seemed to present a non-justiciable political question.” *Id.* This Court does not have this order in front of it, in which the Third Circuit apparently stated, “the lawsuit seemed to present a non-justiciable political question.” *Id.* However, even if it did, it appears that whatever the Third Circuit did say regarding the political question doctrine was *dicta*.

In addition to *Berg*, Intervenor Trump cites a series of trial court opinions, and one California appellate opinion, some published, some unpublished, that largely hold

or state in *dicta* that the plaintiffs' claims are likely also barred under the political question doctrine as a question committed to a coordinate political department. The Court addresses the cases Intervenor Trump cites below.

In *Robinson v. Bowen*, 567 F.Supp.2d 1144, 1145 (N.D. Cal. 2008), an elector pledged to a third-party candidate filed a motion for preliminary injunction seeking to remove John McCain from the ballot because he was allegedly not a natural born citizen. The Court denied the motion for preliminary injunction because the plaintiff was not likely to succeed on the merits. *Id.* at 1146. The Court then noted that Article II of the Constitution prescribes the number of presidential electors to which each state is entitled, and the Twelfth Amendment prescribes the manner in which the electors shall elect the President. *Id.* The Court examined 3 U.S.C. § 15 which directs that Congress “shall open, count, and record the electoral votes” and provides a mechanism for objections. *Id.* at 1147. Finally, it turned to the Twentieth Amendment which provides instructions on how to proceed if a president elect fails to qualify. *Id.* Having looked at these various constitutional provisions and statutes, the *Robinson* Court then concluded, without invoking the political question doctrine, that “[j]udicial review—if any—should occur only after the electoral and Congressional processes have run their course.” *Id.* The course it referred to was a 3 U.S.C. § 15 objection to a candidate and the Twentieth Amendment procedures addressing a failure to qualify. The idea, however, of Court intervention after “Congressional processes have run their course” is directly contrary to a holding that this is a political question—where there is no judicial review permitted.

In *Kerchner v. Obama*, 669 F.Supp.2d 477, 479-80 (D. N.J. 2009), two citizens brought actions against various government officials, including the U.S. Congress, alleging President Obama was not a natural born citizen and seeking to compel Congress to hold hearings, conduct investigations, and take certain actions following said investigations. The Court held the plaintiffs did not have Article III standing. *Id.* at 483. In a footnote, the Court noted that even if there was standing, the case likely fell into “the category of generalized grievances that are most appropriately handled by the legislative branch.” *Id.* at n. 5. It continued that “it appears that Plaintiffs have raised claims that are likewise barred under the ‘political question doctrine’ as a question demonstrably committed to a coordinate political department,” citing to Article II, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution and the Twelfth Amendment, Section 3. *Id.*

Keyes v. Bowen, 117 Cal.Rptr.3d 207 (Cal. Ct. App. 2010) is the only appellate court opinion cited that has addressed the issue. There, the appellate court held the Secretary of State had no duty to investigate presidential eligibility and extensively cited *Robinson, supra*, for the proposition that “presidential qualification issues are best resolved in Congress.” *Keyes*, 117 Cal.Rptr.3d at 216.

Of the cases Intervenor Trump relies on, the Court in *Grinols v. Electoral Coll.*, No. 2:12-CV-02997-MCE-DAD, 2013 WL 2294885 (E.D. Cal. May 23, 2013) (unpublished), *aff’d*, 622 F.App’x 624 (9th Cir. 2015) had the most extensive analysis. First, it noted that the “natural born citizen” requirement does not designate which branch should address whether the candidate is qualified. *Id.* at *6. It further noted Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution establishes that the Electoral College elects the

President. *Id.* It then pointed out that “[t]he Twelfth Amendment empowers the President of the Senate to preside over the meeting between the House of Representatives and the Senate in which the President of the Senate counts the electoral votes.” *Id.* According to the Court, “[t]he Twentieth Amendment empowers Congress to create a procedure in the event that neither the President-elect nor Vice President-elect qualifies to serve as President of the United States [sic].” *Id.* Finally, the Court pointed out that “the Twenty-Fifth Amendment provides for removal of the President should he be unfit to serve.” *Id.* Based on those provisions, the Court held “the Constitution make[s] clear that the Constitution assigns to Congress, and not to federal courts, the responsibility of determining whether a person is qualified to serve as President of the United States.” *Id.*

In *Strunk v. New York State Bd. of Elections*, No. 6500/11, 2012 WL 1205117, at *12 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Apr. 11, 2012) (unreported disposition), *aff’d*, 5 N.Y.S.3d 483 (N.Y. App. Div. 2015) the Court held the framework for the Electoral College and its voting procedures for President and Vice President is found in Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution. More specifically, the Court noted that 3 U.S.C. § 15 dictates “the counting of electoral votes and the process for objecting” to votes. *Id.* According to the Court, “[n]o objections were made by members of the Senate and House of Representatives, which would have resolved these objections if made.” *Id.*

Finally, in *Taitz v. Democrat Party of Mississippi*, No. 3:12-CV-280-HTW-LRA, 2015 WL 11017373, at *16 (S.D. Miss. Mar. 31, 2015) (unpublished), the Court, relying on *Keyes* and *Grinols*, *supra*, held “this court can find no authority in the Constitution

which would permit it to determine that a sitting president is unqualified for office or a president-elect is unqualified to take office. These prerogatives are firmly committed to the legislative branch of our government.”

ii. Petitioners’ Cases

Petitioners primarily cite *Elliot v. Cruz*, 137 A.3d 646 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2016),² *aff’d*, 134 A.3d 51 (Pa. 2016), *cert. denied*, 580 U.S. 867 (2016). There, the Court reviewed Article II, Section 1 and the Twelfth Amendment of the United States Constitution which set forth the procedure by which a person is elected to the office of the President. *Id.* at 650. The Court in *Elliot* described Article II, Section 1 and the Twelfth Amendment as accomplishing the following:

1. vested in the legislatures of the several states, not Congress, the power to “appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled.”
2. commanded the electors, once selected, to meet in their respective states, and vote by ballot for two persons, and then to transmit their votes to the nation’s seat of government.
3. commanded, upon receipt, the President of the Senate open the ballots and count the votes in the presence of the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives.
4. provide that only in the case of a tie, or the absence of a majority, does the Constitution allow Congress to choose the President and Vice President.

Id. (quoting U.S. CONST. art. II, § 1, cl. 2).

After reviewing the various constitutional provisions that supposedly support the Court dismissing the case due to the political question doctrine, the Court in *Elliot* concluded that the Constitution does not vest the Electoral College with the power to

² The Pennsylvania Commonwealth Court is an appellate court that also has original jurisdiction to hear election cases.

determine eligibility of a presidential candidate. *Id.* at 650-51. The Court similarly concluded that Congress has no control over the process other than deciding the day on which electors “give their votes.” *Id.* at 651 (quoting U.S. CONST. amend. XII). The Court then compared the provisions regarding Presidential eligibility with those regarding the eligibility of Congress where the U.S. Constitution clearly vests in Congress the power to determine the eligibility of its own members. *Id.* The Court concluded that because the Constitution does not vest any entity of the federal government with the power to ensure that only persons who are constitutionally eligible become the President, that determination is reserved for the Courts. *Id.*

The only other case the Petitioners cite that squarely addresses this issue is *Williams v. Cruz*, OAL Dkt. No. STE 5016-16, pp. 4-5 (N.J. Off. of Admin. Law Apr. 12, 2016), a New Jersey administrative law decision where the judge examined the various Constitutional provisions and held:

While Congress is the Judge of the Elections, Returns, and Qualifications of its Own Members, including their citizenship . . . Congress is not afforded any similar role in connection with the issue of Presidential eligibility. There is no basis to conclude that the issue of eligibility of a person to serve as President has been textually committed to the Congress.

iii. Analysis

Intervenor Trump argues the weight of the law favors a holding that the political question doctrine precludes judicial review, and that Petitioner can only cite “two idiosyncratic state cases that never received appellate review.”³ The Petitioners, on the

³ The Pennsylvania Supreme Court affirmed the decision in *Elliot v. Cruz*, 137 A.3d 646 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2016).

other hand, argue nothing in the Constitution commits to Congress and the Electoral College the exclusive power to determine presidential qualifications and that Intervenor Trump's cases are distinguishable because in none of those cases did the plaintiffs bring pre-election suits in state court under a state law authorizing ballot access challenges.

The Court agrees with Intervenor Trump that the weight of cases have held that challenges to an individual's qualifications to be President are barred by the political question doctrine. The Court, however, agrees with Petitioners that most of the cases Intervenor Trump cites involved post-election attempts to remove former President Obama from office and that there is at least some distinction between ballot access cases and removing a sitting President. Further, most of the cases concluding that the political question doctrine applies did so with very little analysis of what the constitutional provisions they rely on provide. For that reason, the Court looks to the specific provisions to determine if they meet the "textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issue to a coordinate political department" standard. *Baker*, 369 U.S. at 217.

ARTICLE II OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION

U.S. CONST. art. II, § 1, cl. 2 provides:

Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector.

This clause vests the States authority to appoint electors. The Court cannot find anything in this clause supporting a holding that the Constitution directs Congress to

determine whether a candidate for President or a President-elect is constitutionally ineligible.

U.S. CONST. art. II, § 1, cl. 3 provides:

The electors shall meet in their respective States, and vote by ballot for two Persons, of whom one at least shall not be an Inhabitant of the same State with themselves. And they shall make a List of all the Persons voted for, and of the Number of Votes for each; which List they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the Seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall, in the Presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the Certificates, and the Votes shall then be counted. The Person having the greatest Number of Votes shall be the President, if such Number be a Majority of the whole Number of Electors appointed; and if there be more than one who have such Majority, and have an equal Number of Votes, then the House of Representatives shall immediately chuse by Ballot one of them for President; and if no Person have a Majority, then from the five highest on the List the said House shall in like Manner chuse the President. But in chusing the President, the Votes shall be taken by States, the Representation from each State having one Vote; A quorum for this Purpose shall consist of a Member or Members from two-thirds of the States, and a Majority of all the States shall be necessary to a Choice. In every Case, after the Choice of the President, the Person having the greatest Number of Votes of the Electors shall be the Vice President. But if there should remain two or more who have equal Votes, the Senate shall chuse from them by Ballot the Vice-President.

This clause directs that the Electors shall meet and certify a list of whom the Electors voted for and transmit it to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall the open the Certificates and count them. It also outlines what happens if there is a tie. The Court cannot find anything in this clause supporting a holding that the Constitution directs Congress to determine whether a candidate for President or a President-elect is constitutionally ineligible.

U.S. CONST. art. II, § 1, cl. 4 provides: “The Congress may determine the Time of chusing the Electors, and the Day on which they shall give their Votes; which Day shall be the same throughout the United States.”

This clause says that Congress sets the date that the Electors meet to certify their votes. The Court cannot find anything in this clause supporting a holding that the Constitution directs Congress to determine whether a candidate for President or a President-elect is constitutionally ineligible.

U.S. CONST. art. II, § 1, cl. 5 provides:

No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States, at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President; neither shall any Person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States.

While this clause sets out certain constitutional qualifications, it says nothing regarding what branch of the government shall determine if the candidate meets those eligibility qualifications.

U.S. CONST. art. II, § 1, cl. 6 provides:

In Case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the Same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

This clause addresses what happens when a President is removed and does not address who determines whether a candidate for President or President-elect meets eligibility qualifications.

THE TWELFTH AMENDMENT

The Electors shall meet in their respective states and vote by ballot for President and Vice-President, one of whom, at least, shall not be an inhabitant of the same state with themselves; they shall name in their ballots the person voted for as President, and in distinct ballots the person voted for as Vice-President, and they shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President, and of all persons voted for as Vice-President, and of the number of votes for each, which lists they shall sign and certify, and transmit sealed to the seat of the government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate;—The President of the Senate shall, in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives, open all the certificates and the votes shall then be counted;—The person having the greatest number of votes for President, shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed; and if no person have such majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by states, the representation from each state having one vote; a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the states, and a majority of all the states shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon them, before the fourth day of March next following, then the Vice-President shall act as President, as in case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President.—The person having the greatest number of votes as Vice-President, shall be the Vice-President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of Electors appointed, and if no person have a majority, then from the two highest numbers on the list, the Senate shall choose the Vice-President; a quorum for the purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. But no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President of the United States.

U.S. CONST. amend. XII.

The Twelfth Amendment modifies Article II, Section 1, Clause 3 and makes it clear that the President and Vice President are chosen separately but together. If there

is no majority or a tie for President, the House of Representatives chooses the President. In the interim, the newly elected Vice President will serve as President. While the Twelfth Amendment references the “constitutional disability of the President” and that “no person constitutionally ineligible to the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice-President,” the Court cannot find anything in this clause supporting a holding that the Constitution directs Congress to determine whether a candidate for president or a President-elect is constitutionally ineligible.

SECTION 3 OF THE TWENTIETH AMENDMENT

If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President elect shall have died, the Vice President elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice President elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President elect nor a Vice President elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

U.S. CONST. amend. XX, § 3.

This provision addresses what happens if the President-elect dies or fails to qualify. It also allows Congress to make law to provide for the case when neither the President-elect nor the Vice President-elect qualify. *Robinson*, 567 F.Supp.2d at 1147; *Keyes*, 117 Cal.Rptr.3d at 216; and *Grinols*, 2013 WL 2294885 at *6 cite the Twentieth Amendment for the proposition that it empowers Congress to create a procedure if neither the President-elect nor Vice President-elect qualifies to serve as President of the United States. *See Peace & Freedom Party v. Bowen*, 912 F.Supp.2d 905, 911 (E.D. Cal.

2012), *aff'd sub nom. Lindsay v. Bowen*, 750 F.3d 1061 (9th Cir. 2014) (“Section 3 [of the Twentieth Amendment] was intended to provide for a then-unprovided for contingency: the selection and succession of the presidency in the event that the president elect, vice president elect, or both could not assume office” (citing 75 Cong. Rec. 3831 (1932) (statement of Rep. Cable))). And Congress did just that when it passed the Presidential Succession Act of 1947, 3 U.S.C. § 19. What Congress has not done is provide for any process to determine whether a President qualifies and what entity is supposed to make that determination. Further, nothing in the text of the Amendment commits to Congress the exclusive authority to render judgment on a presidential candidate’s fitness to be placed on the ballot. *See Lindsay*, 750 F.3d at 1065 (“nothing in the Twentieth Amendment states or implies that Congress has the *exclusive* authority to pass on the eligibility of candidates for president” (emphasis in original)). However, unlike the other Constitutional provisions relied on by the decisions Intervenor Trump relies on, section 3 of the Twentieth Amendment does include the word “qualify” and suggests that someone or something has decided whether a President qualifies to be President. It is for this reason that the Court has asked the Parties to provide the Court with testimony regarding the historical meaning and interpretation of this Amendment, if such evidence exists.

3 U.S.C. § 15

Finally, the decisions Intervenor Trump cites rely heavily on 3 U.S.C. § 15 for the proposition that there is an objection process when the electoral college votes are counted and that it is during this process that the objections to the qualifications of a

President should be made. *Robinson*, 567 F.Supp.2d at 1147 (“It is clear that mechanisms exist under the Twelfth Amendment and 3 U.S.C. § 15 for any challenge to any candidate to be ventilated when electoral votes are counted, and that the Twentieth Amendment provides guidance regarding how to proceed if a president elect shall have failed to qualify”); *Keyes*, 117 Cal.Rptr.3d at 216 (quoting *Robinson, supra*); *Strunk*, 2012 WL 1205117 at *12 (“the counting of electoral votes and the process for objecting for the 2009 Presidential election is found in 3 USC § 15. . . . This required the meeting of the joint session of Congress to count the 2008 electoral votes. . . . No objections were made by members of the Senate and House of Representatives, which would have resolved these objections if made. This is the exclusive means to resolve objections to the electors' selection of a President or a Vice President”); *Taitz*, 2015 WL 11017373 at *13 (noting that the *Keyes* Court cited the Twelfth Amendment and 3 U.S.C. § 15 when it “stated that the Constitution and laws of the United States delegate to Congress the authority to raise and decide objections to a presidential nominee's candidacy”); *see also Oines v. Ritchie*, Dkt. No. A12-1765 (Minn. Oct. 18, 2012) (citing *Keyes* in support of the conclusion that 3 U.S.C. § 15 provides the avenue for challenging constitutional qualifications of presidential candidates).

Congress, however, amended 3 U.S.C. § 15 in 2022. As amended, 3 U.S.C. § 15(d)(2)(B)(ii) provides: “The only grounds for objections shall be as follows: (I) The electors of the State were not lawfully certified under a certificate of ascertainment of appointment of electors according to section 5(a)(1). (II) The vote of one or more electors has not been regularly given.”

As such, it appears that Congress has disavowed any ability it once had to consider objections other than the two listed above—including any regarding the constitutional qualifications of the President-elect.

SECTION 3 OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 3.

This provision clearly gives Congress the ability to remove a constitutional disability should a person be disqualified under Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment. However, it says nothing regarding what government body would adjudicate or determine such disability in the first instance.⁴ The Court notes, however, it would be strange for Congress to be the only entity that is empowered to determine the disability and then also the entity that is empowered to remove it.

⁴ Intervenor Trump argues that “Section Three itself contains an exclusive grant of jurisdiction to Congress.” The argument is that if this Court were to disqualify Intervenor Trump from being a candidate, it would strip Congress of the ability to remove the disability. The Court disagrees. If this Court were to disqualify Intervenor Trump, there would be nothing standing in the way of Congress immediately removing that disability. In fact, there is nothing standing in Congress’s way of removing the disability prior to Secretary Griswold or this Court determining whether Intervenor Trump is disqualified in the first instance.

The Court, having considered the above, declines to dismiss this case under the political question doctrine. A controversy involves a political question when, as is argued here, there is “a textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issue to a coordinate political department.” *Baker*, 369 U.S. at 217. As the foregoing demonstrates, there is no textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issue to a coordinate political department. The text is simply silent as to the specific issue, and arguments by inference, implication, or convention fail to demonstrate the kind of strong “textually demonstrable commitment” necessary for the Court to find the matter nonjusticiable. *See, e.g.*, U.S. CONST. art. I, § 5, cl. 1 (“Each House shall be the Judge of the Elections, Returns, and Qualifications of its own Members”); *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 548 (1969) (Art. I, § 5, cl. 1 is a “textually demonstrable commitment” to Congress to judge *only* the qualifications expressly set forth in art. I, § 2, cl. 2, and nothing more).

The Court will, however, revisit this ruling when it makes a final ruling following the hearing set to begin October 30, 2023 to the extent that there is any evidence or argument at trial that provides the Court with additional guidance on whether the issue of presidential eligibility has been delegated to the United States Congress. *Baker*, 369 U.S. at 198 (“In the instance of nonjusticiability, consideration of the cause is not wholly and immediately foreclosed; rather, the Court's inquiry necessarily proceeds to the point of deciding whether the duty asserted can be judicially identified and its breach judicially determined, and whether protection for the right asserted can be judicially molded.”)

b. Whether the Fourteenth Amendment Is Self-Executing

Citing a law review article authored by Joshua Blackman and Seth Barrett Tillman, Intervenor Trump argues “Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment is not self-executing and cannot be applied to support a cause of action seeking judicial relief absent Congressional enactment of a statute authorizing Plaintiffs to bring such a claim in court.” Intervenor Trump argues that the Blackman and Tillman law review article substantially refutes the law review article authored by William Baude and Michael Stokes Paulsen which the Petitioners cite in their Response causing the authors “to substantially modify their own analysis” and for a well-respected constitutional scholar, Steven Calabresi, to reverse his position on the matter. The Court has reviewed the modifications of the Baude and Paulsen law review article and the modifications do not in any way reverse their positions. Further, the retraction from Calabresi had nothing to do with whether Section Three was self-executing but was rather based on whether Section Three applies to Presidents. This leaves the Court with two law reviews that are over 100 pages each with contradictory conclusions.

Intervenor Trump argues there is “[a]mple precedent” supporting Blackman and Tillman’s conclusion that Section Three was not self-executing. But the only precedent cited is *In re Griffin*, 11 F.Cas. 7 (C.C. Va. 1869) written by Chief Justice Salmon Chase while riding circuit.

The Petitioners, on the other hand, argue that whether Section 3 is self-executing is irrelevant because Petitioners are proceeding under Colorado’s Election Code which provides it a cause of action. The Court agrees. To the extent that the Court ultimately

holds that C.R.S. § 1-4-1204 allows the Court to order Secretary Griswold to exclude a candidate under the Fourteenth Amendment, the Court holds that states can, and have, applied Section 3 pursuant to state statutes without federal enforcement legislation. *See, e.g., State v. Griffin*, No. D-101-CV-2022-00473, 2022 WL 4295619, at *16 (N.M. Dist. Ct. Sept. 6, 2022) (adjudicating Section 3 challenge under state *quo warranto* law); *Worthy v. Barrett*, 63 N.C. 199, 200-01 (1869) (adjudicating Section 3 challenge as *mandamus* action), *appeal dismissed sub nom. Worthy v. Comm’rs*, 76 U.S. 611 (1869); *In re Tate*, 63 N.C. 308, 309 (1869) (adjudicating Section 3 challenge as *mandamus* action); *State ex rel. Sandlin v. Watkins*, 21 La. Ann. 631, 632 (La. 1869) (adjudicating Section 3 challenge under state *quo warranto* law); *Rowan v. Greene*, Dkt. No. 2222582-OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-57- Beaudrot (Ga. Off. Admin. Hr’gs May 6, 2022) (state administrative Section 3 challenge).⁵

⁵ Intervenor Trump argues that none of the cited cases are relevant as such cases “relied upon state laws patterned after Section Three that applied to state officials.” Not so. In these cases, state law provided the procedural avenue for challenging a candidate’s fitness for office, but the substantive question remained qualification under the Fourteenth Amendment, not merely a state law patterned after Section Three. *See Griffin*, 2022 WL 4295619 at *16 (“The Court therefore concludes that . . . Mr. Griffin became disqualified under Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment”); *Worthy*, 63 N.C. at 200 (procedural statute in question “provides that no person prohibited from holding office by section 3 of the Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, known as Article XIV, shall qualify under this act or hold office in this State” (internal quotation omitted)); *Tate*, 63 N.C. at 309 (applying the rule in *Worthy* to bar County Attorneys from office, to wit: “We are of the opinion that he is disqualified from holding office under the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States”); *Sandlin*, 21 La. Ann. at 631-33 (in *quo warranto* proceeding brought under “the intrusion act (No. 156, acts of 1868),” qualification of candidate was assessed under both the “eligibility act, No. 39, of the acts of the State Legislature of 1868, and the third Section of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.” Supreme Court of Louisiana held that the eligibility act was not applicable to the proceeding, and that “[t]he inquiry in this case is, has the defendant, under the provisions of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and those of the act of Congress of twenty-fifth June, 1868 [re-admitting secessionist states to the Union, requiring compliance with Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment], the legal right to discharge the duties of the office of District Judge of the Eleventh Judicial District.”).

c. Whether Federal Preemption Applies

Intervenor Trump argues that federal law has preempted the States from governing ballot access for presidential candidates.

Under the field preemption doctrine, “the States are precluded from regulating conduct in a field that Congress, acting within its proper authority, has determined must be regulated by its exclusive governance.” *Arizona v. United States*, 567 U.S. 387, 399 (2012).

[Congressional] intent to displace state law altogether can be inferred from a framework of regulation “so pervasive . . . that Congress left no room for the States to supplement it” or where there is a “federal interest . . . so dominant that the federal system will be assumed to preclude enforcement of state laws on the same subject.”

Id. (quoting *Rice v. Santa Fe Elevator Corp.*, 331 U.S. 218, 230 (1947)). In support of this argument, Trump cites the Twelfth Amendment, the Twentieth Amendment, and 3 U.S.C. § 15 for the proposition that federal law occupies the field.

Based on the discussion above regarding the political question doctrine, it is unclear to the Court that there is any mechanism under federal law to determine whether a candidate for President or President-elect meets the eligibility requirements let alone a framework of regulation so pervasive that Congress left no room for the States to supplement it. The Court declines to dismiss this action based on the field preemption doctrine.

d. Whether Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment Applies to a President

This is an issue that will be addressed at the hearing set to begin October 30, 2023.

e. Whether President Trump Engaged in an Insurrection

This is an issue that will be addressed at the hearing set to begin October 30, 2023.

f. Forum Selection Clause

Lastly, Intervenor Trump seeks dismissal of the action based on the forum. Colorado law sets out five requirements which all must be met to dismiss on *forum non conveniens* grounds. Pursuant to C.R.S. § 13- 20-1004(1), they are:

1. “The claimant or claimants are not residents of the state of Colorado.” C.R.S. § 13-20-1004(1)(a). Here, all Petitioners are Colorado Residents.
2. “An alternative forum exists.” C.R.S. § 13-20-1004(1)(b). Intervenor Trump has not identified a viable alternative forum. The three forums he suggests are: (1) Congress—but as discussed above, there is no mechanism by which a Colorado elector can object to Intervenor Trump’s qualification to Congress; (2) Criminal Prosecution—Intervenor Trump provides no explanation about how the Petitioners can seek criminal prosecution against Intervenor Trump in Washington, D.C.; and (3) Federal Court in Washington, D.C. But, as Intervenor Trump acknowledges, the Petitioners do not have standing in Federal Court. No adequate alternative forum, therefore, has been identified.
3. “The injury or damage alleged to have been suffered occurred outside of the state of Colorado.” C.R.S. § 13-20-1004(1)(c). The alleged injury, in this case, is having an ineligible candidate on the ballot. That injury will occur in Colorado.

4. “A substantial portion of the witnesses and evidence is outside the state of Colorado.” C.R.S. § 13-20-1004(1)(d). Here, Intervenor Trump concludes this is the case but has not put forth any specific witness that he’d like to attend that is unavailable at trial.

5. “There is a significant possibility that Colorado law will not apply to some or all of the claims.” C.R.S. § 13-20-1004(1)(e). There is no doubt that Colorado election law will play a significant part in any decision this Court renders.

As Intervenor Trump acknowledges, except in the “most unusual circumstances,” a resident plaintiff’s choice of forum is honored. *McDonnell-Douglas Corp. v. Lohn*, 557 P.2d 373, 374 (Colo. 1976). In fact, Colorado courts have “extremely limited discretion under this doctrine to dismiss an action filed by a resident plaintiff.” *Cox v. Sage Hosp. Res., LLC*, 413 P.3d 302, 304 (Colo. App. 2017). Here, the Petitioners all reside in Colorado and have exercised their right to object to Intervenor Trump’s name being placed onto the ballot under C.R.S. § 1-1-113 and C.R.S. § 1-4-1204. While Trump argues that they are nominal plaintiffs, he fails to explain who the actual plaintiffs are in this matter.

In short, Intervenor Trump’s motion under the *forum non conveniens* statute fails because he has not articulated why this is a “most unusual circumstance,” nor has he offered an alternative forum or identified witnesses he cannot call because they won’t come to Colorado. Rather, it appears that he is simply objecting to the C.R.S. § 1-1-113 process.

III. CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, the Court DENIES Intervenor Trump's Motion to Dismiss, filed September 29, 2023.

DATED: October 25, 2023.

BY THE COURT:



Sarah B. Wallace
District Court Judge