

**BEFORE THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COLE COUNTY  
STATE OF MISSOURI**

RONALD CALZONE,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 15AC-CC00247
	)	
STATE OF MISSOURI et. al.,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	

**ANSWER**

Respondents, Chris Koster, Missouri Attorney General, Richard Fordyce, Director of Department of Agriculture, Kevin Keith, Director of Department of Transportation, Nia Ray, Director of Department of Revenue, Margie Vandeven, Commissioner of Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and Gail Vasterling, Director of the Department of Health and Senior Services, (“Respondents”), by and through undersigned counsel, Answer Petitioner’s Petition as follows:

1. Respondents admit Paragraph 1 in that it summarizes Petitioner’s Petition. However, Respondents deny any allegation with regard to the merits of the summary.

2. Admit.

3. Respondents lack sufficient information to admit or deny Paragraph 3; therefore, deny.

4. Deny.

5. Deny.

6. Deny.

Various claims relating to standing  
and how the Plaintiff is impacted.

7. Deny.

8. Deny.

9. Paragraph 9 merely lists a named Respondent; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

10. Paragraph 10 merely lists a named Respondent; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

11. Paragraph 11 merely lists a named Respondent; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

12. Paragraph 12 merely lists a named Respondent; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

13. Paragraph 13 merely lists a named Respondent; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

14. Paragraph 14 merely lists a named Respondent; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

15. Paragraph 15 merely lists a named Respondent; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

16. Paragraph 16 recites a Missouri statute; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

17. Admit.

18. Admit.

19. Paragraph 19 recites a provision of the Missouri Constitution; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

20. Paragraph 20 recites a provision of the Missouri Constitution; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

21. Paragraph 21 recites a provision of the Missouri Constitution; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

22. Admit.

23. Admit.

24. Admit.

25. Admit.

26. Admit.

27. Admit.

28. Admit.

29. Admit.

30. Respondents lack sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 30; therefore, deny.

31. Respondents lack sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 31; therefore, deny.

32. Respondents lack sufficient information to admit or deny the allegations in Paragraph 30; therefore, deny.

33. Admit.

34. Admit.

35. Admit.

36. Admit.

37. Deny.

37) The official fiscal note for the final version of SB 672 included forecasts of numerous expenditures by the state as well as local entities. See Exhibit L.

38. Respondents admit Paragraph 38 in that it summarizes Petitioner's relief sought. However, Respondents deny any allegation with regard to the merits of the summary.

39. Respondents restate their admissions and denials to Paragraphs 1-38.

40. Paragraph 40 restates and recites a provision of the Missouri Constitution; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

41. Paragraph 41 restates, recites, and calls for a legal conclusion with regards to a provision of the Missouri Constitution; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

42. Paragraph 42 states a legal conclusion; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

43. Deny.

43) The official title for the **introduced version** of SB 672 was dramatically different than the official title for the **finally passed version**

44. The documents speak for themselves, otherwise, deny.

45. Deny.

45) While the purpose of the introduced version of SB 672 was clear and concise and focused on one subject, the purpose of the finally agreed to and passed version might be best described as “catch all”, and some of what it “caught” is not even consistent with the unconstitutionally vague *new purpose* of “political subdivisions.”...

46. Respondents restate their admissions and denials to Paragraphs

1-45.

47. Deny.

47) The allegation that SB 672 violates the single subject requirement of Missouri Constitution Article III Section 23 is supported by the same set of facts that implicate that bill in Count 1 of this petition.

48. Paragraph 48 states many legal conclusions; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted. Any factual allegations which can be gleaned from Paragraph 48 are denied.

49. Paragraph 49 states many legal conclusions; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted. Any factual allegations which can be gleaned from Paragraph 49 are denied.

50. Respondents restate their admissions and denials to Paragraphs 1-49.

51. Paragraph 51 speculates the purpose of a provision of the Missouri Constitution; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted. Any factual allegations which can be gleaned from Paragraph 51 are denied.

52. Paragraph 52 speculates the purpose of a provision of the Missouri Constitution; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted. Any factual allegations which can be gleaned from Paragraph 52 are denied.

53. Paragraph 53 speculates the purpose of a provision of the Missouri Constitution; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted. Any factual allegations which can be gleaned from Paragraph 53 are denied.

54. Deny.

54) The radical change in the title of SB 672 and other bills does injury to the Plaintiff and other citizens who, then experience a diminished opportunity to influence the laws they must live under. Such disenfranchisement violates the provisions of Article III Sections 21 and 23, as well as Article I Section 14

55. Respondents restate their admissions and denials to Paragraphs 1-54.

56. Paragraph 56 restates a provision of the Missouri Constitution, therefore, no admission or denial is warranted.

57. Paragraph 57 speculates the purpose of a provision of the Missouri Constitution; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted. Any factual allegations which can be gleaned from Paragraph 57 are denied.

58. Deny.

59. Paragraph 59 speculates the purpose of a provision of the Missouri Constitution; therefore, no admission or denial is warranted. Any factual allegations which can be gleaned from Paragraph 59 are denied.

60. Deny.

60) The following is a list of provisions in SB 672 that violate Article III Section 40(30).

### **Affirmative Pleadings**

61. Petitioner lacks standing to challenge SB 672.

62. Should it be found that any provision of SB 672 is unconstitutional; the rest of the bill is severable pursuant to Section 1.140, RSMo.

WHEREFORE, Respondents respectfully request that the Court dismiss the entire petition in this case, issue a judgment finding that Petitioner lacks standing, issue a judgment finding that SB 672 is not unconstitutional, and for such other and further relief as is just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRIS KOSTER  
Attorney General

/s/ Curtis Schube  
Curtis Schube  
Assistant Attorney General  
Missouri Bar No. 63227

Supreme Court Building  
207 W. High St.  
P.O. Box 899  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
Telephone: 573-751-7728  
Facsimile: 573-751-5660  
Curtis.Schube@ago.mo.gov

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENTS

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served via electronic mail, on this 27th day of August, on the following:

**Ronald J. Calzone**, *pro se*  
33867 Highway E  
Dixon, MO 65459  
ron@mofirst.org

/s/ Curtis Schube  
Assistant Attorney General