

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA  
CENTRAL DIVISION

|                                |   |                         |
|--------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| STUDENTS FOR LIFE ACTION,      | ) |                         |
|                                | ) | 3:23-CV-03010-RAL       |
| Plaintiff,                     | ) |                         |
|                                | ) |                         |
| vs.                            | ) |                         |
|                                | ) |                         |
| MARTY JACKLEY, IN HIS OFFICIAL | ) | STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED |
| CAPACITY AS ATTORNEY           | ) | MATERIAL FACTS          |
| GENERAL OF THE STATE OF        | ) |                         |
| SOUTH DAKOTA; AND MONAE        | ) |                         |
| JOHNSON, IN HER OFFICIAL       | ) |                         |
| CAPACITY AS SOUTH DAKOTA       | ) |                         |
| SECRETARY OF STATE,            | ) |                         |
|                                | ) |                         |
| Defendants.                    | ) |                         |
|                                | ) |                         |

COMES NOW, the above-named Defendants by and through their undersigned counsel, Grant M. Flynn, Assistant Attorney General, and hereby submit, pursuant to D.S.D. CIV LR 56.1, Local Rules of Practice of the United States District Court, this Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in support of their Motion for Summary Judgment.

1. Defendants submitted their First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents to Plaintiff on December 13, 2024. Exhibit 1.
2. Defendant provided written responses to Defendants First Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents on February 17, 2025. Exhibit 2.
3. Among Defendants' document requests, Defendants sought all text messages relating to ¶ 20 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, all mailers relating to ¶ 21 of Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, all mail solicitations used for fund raising, all internet and email solicitations used for fund raising, and all scripts used for telephone solicitations. Exhibit 1, ¶ 6, 7, 17, 18, 19.

4. Plaintiffs provided approximately three thousand pages of documents in response to Defendants' requests for production of documents.
5. Many of these documents represent similar communications sent to various individual voters in different geographic areas.
6. Plaintiffs provided text message and phone call scripts providing information to voters regarding a ballot measure as well as the pro-life voting history of individual South Dakota legislators. Exhibit 3.
7. These scripts do not "expressly advocate" for a particular candidate or ballot measure as defined in SDCL 12-27-1(9).
8. Plaintiffs also provided the verbiage of text messages sent to voters to inform them of the responsive of individual South Dakota legislators response to a pro-life pledge as well as their voting history on pro-life issues. Exhibit 4.
9. These messages do not "expressly advocate" for a particular candidate or ballot measure as defined in SDCL 12-27-1(9).
10. Plaintiffs disclosed examples of mailers sent to South Dakota voters informing them of the pro-life voting records of individual South Dakota legislators. Exhibit 5.
11. These mailers do not "expressly advocate" for a particular candidate or ballot measure as defined in SDCL 12-27-1(9).
12. Plaintiffs disclosed several communications soliciting donations as well as petition signatures. An example of one such communication is attached as Exhibit 6.
13. These solicitation messages do not "expressly advocate" for a particular candidate or ballot measure as defined in SDCL 12-27-1(9).
14. Plaintiffs shared newsletters they distributed. An example of one such newsletter is attached as Exhibit 7.
15. These newsletters do not "expressly advocate" for a particular candidate or ballot measure as defined in SDCL 12-27-1(9).
16. Plaintiffs disclosed emails they sent to inform voters. An example of one such email is attached as Exhibit 8.
17. These emails do not "expressly advocate" for a particular candidate or ballot measure as defined in SDCL 12-27-1(9).

18. Plaintiffs disclosed one pamphlet that appears to “expressly advocate” for the defeat of South Dakota’s “Amendment G” in the 2024 election through the use of the phrase “Vote ‘No.’” Exhibit 9.
19. The pamphlet also provides additional information regarding the scope of the law and its potential effect on reproductive healthcare in South Dakota. *Id.*
20. This pamphlet could be considered “express advocacy” as that term is defined in SDCL 12-27-1(9).
21. This is the only such communication disclosed by Plaintiffs that appears to expressly advocate for the support or defeat of a particular candidate or ballot question.
22. Plaintiffs disavow any intent to engage in similar express advocacy in the future. Doc. 24, 59-63.

Dated this 2nd day of September, 2025.

/s/ Grant M. Flynn

Grant M. Flynn  
Assistant Attorney General  
1302 E. Hwy 14, Suite 1  
Pierre, SD 57501-8501  
Telephone: (605) 773-3215  
E-mail: atgservice@state.sd.us