EXHIBIT E.1

BEFORE THE STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION Of the State of Addamas

<u>_</u> +

		1	the second state of the se	
C Man	Arkan	sas Din	Write in These Second	
CT Mg.	State Claims C	ommission	La realization of the second second	
D'Mar Share Chilling	State Claims	Female Silo	ningelylingelige and a stand and a stand and a stand a	
Steven Shulls	ARE	2018 Des File		1
ten.	AUG 2 V	1	anth): (Day) (Yan)	- j _
		Aminan of Chin	A strategy and a strategy of the second strat	1
State of Aritmens, Respondent		AND Red		
	RECE	IVED I	the second s	
		Law and the second seco		ألينست
	COMPLAT	NT		
Steven Shults			2 (1993) (19	
STLVIN SIVITS	- de statement Childrent, et O	DO W. Capi	tol, Ste 1400	Little
A0		(Since or 2.1 D	END.) (City)	Ony
AR -12001 501 375-25	Bol and Pulaski	Ale	(Gaines	former or
and a second sec	5a	(Lend)	intered Prop. for China)	
- III LEAHER SHRUL SK	2200 Little Porr PE-	2201 5137	16800 94300 /. 45	1 2
			(Far Na)	
the appropriate AR Dearch	ment of Correction	CR ASSALLS STREET	2. 5-10 40	
Month, day, your and place of included or any feet.	an a	and the second secon		
Restaurition:			an a	dination of the second
	Contraction of the second s			
<u>Claimant</u> se	eks attomays	kes and c	osts oursuant	
	Charles and the second s	er en	ala a seconda	
to Ark code P	na & 25-19-107	as the	Omunition Anch	
			O I	×1
in an Foia	Claim against	the Arcar	SAS DODATION	F.
		an a		
Of Corrections	There are Si	CXDIDits -	to this	
	Charles and the second s	an a		······································
Comovaint.	ander versten der eine eine eine eine eine eine eine ei	an a	<u>.</u>	re pri tri ni t
	and the second	xe Meri da gia da gia da gia da da gia da da da		
	an a	and the second secon	A CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER	and the second
and the second	and and a standard standards and a standard standard standard standard standard standard standard standard stan	-ari anterio de como	ilonijsko na presta posta na posta i staj presj	
and the second	an a	an katangana	ۥ ، ، ، ، ، ، ، ، ، ، ، ، ، ، ، ، ، ، ، 	
and and a second se The second se The second se	and the design of the second seco Second second second An existence of the second	and a state of the s The state of the state	<mark>ﻣﺎﻣﺎﻳﺪﻩ ﻣﺎﻣﺪﻩ ﻣﻪﻳﺪﻩ ﺑﻮﻳﺪﻩ ﻣﻪﻳﺪﻩ ﻳﻪﻳﺪﻩ ﻳﻪﻳﺪﻩ. ﻣﻪﻟﻪ ﻣﻪﻟﻪ ﻣﻪﻟﻪ ﻣﻪﻟﻪ ﻣﻪﻟﻪ ﻣﻪﻟﻪ ﻣﻪﻟﻪ ﻣﻪﻟﻪ</mark>	
ى دەرىپىدىنى بىرىپىيىسىدىنى بىرىپىيىنىڭ يەرىپىيىنىڭ بىرىپىدىنىڭ بىرىپىدىنىڭ بىرىپىيىكى بىرىپىيىكى بىرىپىيىسىدى سېچىنىيەر دەرىپىيى دىرىپىيىدىنىڭ بىرىپىيىكى ئىلىپىيىدىنىيە بىرىپىيى بىرىپىيى بىرىپىيى بىرىپىيى بىرىپىيىسىيى بىرىپىيى بىرىپىيى دىرىپىيى بىرىپىيى بىرىپىيى تەرىپىيە بىرىپىيە بىرىپىيى بىرىپىيى بىرىپىيى بىرىپىيى بىرىپىيىسىيى			ىلىمى ئىرىكى ئىرىمىيە مەيمە ئىلىمى ئىلىمىيە ئىلىرىكى مەلىكى ئىلىمىيەت مەيمە ئىلىمى ئىلىمىيە ئىلىمىيە ئىلىمىيە ئىلىمىيە ئىلىمىيە ئىل ئىلىمىيە ئىلىمىيە ئىل	مبد به زیاد . مدین <u>مرکزینه</u> مدینه میکنید
	میرون می از می بود. با با این می با این می بارد می بارد می بارد این این می بارد این این این می بارد می این می بارد این می بارد این می بارد این می بارد می بارد می بارد این می بارد این می بارد این می بارد این می بارد می بارد این می بارد این می بارد این می بارد می بارد این می بارد			
	ینی که بالا می از به این			
NO				
A A	A forest word conservation, same of the forest form of the start share	and a state of the		
NO				
	in in iteritant.	unite entre production of the second seco	anglang menangangangang sa	
		unite entre production of the second seco		
N.P. (dame) (Dis)	s for sidenal (Care) Ban das Salaring an characteristic discontinue (2) Mars may Michigan an energy and her sa	alaan ahaan aha	JO : An American	
	in in iteritant.	alaan ahaan aha	JO : If any distributions on (Participant) (Zip Confect	
N.P. (dame) (Dis)	s for sidenal (Care) Ban das Salaring an characteristic discontinue (2) Mars may Michigan an energy and her sa	alaan ahaan aha	JO : An American	
N.P. (dame) (Dis)	Standard (Carl) But the Diving a class marketing thereas (Base my Mittigenese, or corporation of (Ross 5 (E.F.D. & No.)	alaan ahaan aha	JO : If any distributions on (Participant) (Zip Confect	
	Standard (Carl) But the Diving a class marketing thereas (Base my Mittigenese, or corporation of (Ross 5 (E.F.D. & No.)	alaan ahaan aha	JO : If any distributions on (Participant) (Zip Confect	
N.O. (Advanta) (Charles) (Standard (Carl) But the Diving a class marketing thereas (Base my Mittigenese, or corporation of (Ross 5 (E.F.D. & No.)	alaan ahaan aha	JO : If any distributions on (Participant) (Zip Confect	
N.O. (Advanta) (Charles) (Standard (Carl) But the Diving a class marketing thereas (Base my Mittigenese, or corporation of (Ross 5 (E.F.D. & No.)	alaan ahaan aha	JO : If any distributions on (Participant) (Zip Confect	
	Standards Constants	alaan ahaan aha	JO : If any distributions on (Participant) (Zip Confect	
N.P. (Mark) (Mark) (Mark) (Mark) (Mark) and Aast 5 marputal flamm Plants marputal flamm<	Starilized Static Constraints and an and a static state of the second state of the se	alaan ahaan aha	JO : If any distributions on (Participant) (Zip Confect	
N.P. (Mark) (Diff. (Mark) (Diff. (Mark)) (Diff. (Mark)) (Diff. (Mark)) (Diff. (Mark)) (Diff. (Mark)) (Mark)	Standards Constants	alaan ahaan aha	JO : If any distributions on (Participant) (Zip Confect	
N.P. (Mark) (Mark) (Mark) (Mark) (Mark) and Aast 5 marputal flamm Plants marputal flamm<	Starilized Static Constraints and an and a static state of the second state of the se	Con	10 : Mar, Marine and M	
Planer Soy	Sorieland Statistic Series of the source of	Can	10 : Mar, Marine and M	
THE DIDEESIGNED series on onto the history and the control of the	Starilized Static Constraints and an and a static state of the second state of the se	Can	10 (Pres) (P	
THE DIDEESIGNED series on onto the history and the control of the	Sorieland Statistic Series of the source of	Can	10 : Mar. Marine (Price) (24) Octob) . Caracteria . Car	
THE DIDEESIGNED series on onto the history and the control of the	Sorieland Statistic Series of the source of	Can	10 (Pres) (P	
NO result (No (Model) (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ and datts margarithma margarithma (Model) (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ (Db)/ (Db)/ (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ (Db)/ (Db)/ (Db)/ (Sorieland Statistic Series of the source of	Can	10 : Mar, Marine and (Partie) (24) Outley (Partie) (24) Outley (Partie) (24) Outley (Partie) (20) (Partie)	VE Philipper
NO result (No (Model) (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ and datts margarithma margarithma (Model) (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ (Db)/ (Db)/ (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ (Db)/ (Db)/ (Db)/ (Sortional address of the second of the secon	Can	10 : Mar, Marine and (Partie) (24) Outley (Partie) (24) Outley (Partie) (24) Outley (Partie) (20) (Partie)	VE Philipper
NO result (No (Model) (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ and datts margarithma margarithma (Model) (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ (Db)/ (Db)/ (Db)/ (Model) (Db)/ (Db)/ (Db)/ (Db)/ (Sorridoned State of the same solution of the same (2) The same solution of the same solution (2) The same solution of the same solution of the same solution (2) The same solution of the same solution of the same solution (2) The same solution of the same	Can	10 : 17 av. 19 average (Prefe) (22 p. Code) (Prefe) (22 p. Code)	12 (None) (Xone) (2)
Charles Say and Annual States of and Annual States Annual States of Annual States of and Annual States of Annual State	Sortional address of the second of the secon	Can	10 : Mar, Marine and (Partie) (24) Outley (Partie) (24) Outley (Partie) (24) Outley (Partie) (20) (Partie)	VE Philipper

Arkansas State Claims Commission

AUG 2 0 2018

BEFORE THE STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

¥ .:

STEVEN SHULTS

RECEIVED CLAIMANT

RESPONDENT

٧.

STATE OF ARKANSAS

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

Claimant, Steven Shults, for his Statement of Claim, states:

 Claimant substantially prevailed in a Freedom of Information Act appeal against the Arkansas Department of Correction ("ADC") in Case No. 60CV-17-1419 in the Circuit Court of Pulaski County, Arkansas, Seventeenth Division.

2. The lower court found that Claimant had prevailed on his FOIA claim and that the State was not substantially justified, stating, "The ADC violated the AFOIA by its refusal to produce those documents. That refusal was not justified by the language of the MEA in any respect." See Exhibit 3.

3. ADC appealed the court's ruling to the Arkansas Supreme Court, which affirmed the lower court's principal ruling, and reversed/remanded on an ancillary issue. See Exhibit 4.

4. ADC did not appeal the lower court's ruling on "substantial justification" and the Arkansas Supreme Court affirmed that portion of the Court's ruling *sub silentio*.

5. On remand, the Circuit Court ordered limited redaction by agreement of the Parties and reaffirmed its determination that "Plaintiff has substantially prevailed in this matter." See Exhibit 5.

6. Claimant attaches the following Exhibits to the Complaint.

Exhibit 1: Statement of Claim

Exhibit 2: Complaint in Case No. 60CV-17-1419



Exhibit 3: March 31, 2017, Order in Case No. 60CV-17-1419

Exhibit 4: March 29, 2018, Opinion in Case No. CV-17-544

Exhibit 5: July 24, 2018, Order in Case No. 60CV-17-1419

14

Exhibit 6: Statement of Fees and Expenses Rendered by Williams & Anderson PLC

WHEREFORE, Claimant Steven Shults is entitled to attorneys' fees and expenses in the amount of \$33,578.00 pursuant to the Arkansas Freedom of Information Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 25-19-107.

Respectfully Submitted,

WILLIAMS & ANDERSON PLC 111 Center Street, Suite 2200 Little Rock, Arkansas 72201 Telephone: 501-372-0800 Facsimile: 501-372-6453

/s/ Alec Gaines

Philip E. Kaplan (AR68026) pkaplan@williamsanderson.com Heather G. Zachary (AR2004216) hzachary@williamsanderson.com Alec Gaines (AR2012277) againes@williamsanderson.com

Attorneys for Steven Shults

<i>.</i>			
	and the second s		
-			Arkansas
			State Claims Commiss
			JAN 0 5 2018 .
			JAN VO 2010 -
	Please Read Instructions on R	everse Side of Yellow copy	
	Please print in		RECEIVED
	BEFORE THE STATE CI Of the State o	LAIMS COMMISSION f Arkansas	
		De	Not Write in These Spaces
XMr. □ Mrs.		Constantiation of	180567
🗆 Ms.			
· Miss Steven	Shults	, Claimant	January 5, 2018 (Month) (Day) (Year)
			Claim \$15,000.00
YS.		FundA	
State of Arkansas, Responden	t		Other
ot of Corrections	5 COM	IPLAINT	
Store Shul	+5	ant, of 200 W Capito	Stelboo Little Rock
5-leven Shul (Name)	the above named Claim:	int, of post or R.	F(D. & No.) (City)
AR 72201 501	375 230 County of PUL	SKi represented by A	14 baines
(State) (Zip Code) (E	Deptime Phone No.)	00001 5012000	egal Counsel, if any, for Claim)
or III Conter >t. 15th	(2200 LittleBale AR	72% 723720 atc) (Zip Code) (Phone	800 5013726453, says No.) (Pax No.)
(second day)	Rept. of Correction	Amount soughts	15,000,00
State agency involved: /// 1%	A with Di	2017	
Month, day, year and place of inci Explanation: CIGIMG	ident or service: AUGUST 21,0 AT seeks a Horneys	fees and costs	our suger to Ark.
Explanation: <u>19189</u>	-19-107.7608 and 5	:x(6) exhibits.	to this Graplant
- 402 AAA - 2 63			E
As parts of this complaint, the claim	ant makes the statements, and answers the followin	g questions, as indicated: (1) Has claim l	been presented to any state department or officer there
NO: when?	; to whom?		been presented to any state department or efficient there (Department)
NO :when?) Min. 1999, Minist Annaly Marganian (1999) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997) (1997)	
NO: when?	forth (Day); to whom? (Day) (Year) : and that the following action was:	taken thereon:	(Department)
NO: when?	(Dav) (Year)	taken thereon:	(Department)
; when? (Yes or No)(N	forth (Day); to whom? (Day) (Year) : and that the following action was:	taken thereon:	(Department)
	(Street or R.F.D. &	taken thereon: or corporation an interest in this claim? No.) (City)	(Department)
	(Day) (Year) (Year) : and that the following action was was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. &	taken thereon: or corporation an interest in this claim? No.) (City)	(Department)
	(Day) (Year) (Year) : and that the following action was was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & was:	or corporation an interest in this claim? No.) (City)	(Department)
NO :: when? (N (Yes or No) :: when? (N and that \$ and that the nature thereof is as follo THE UNDERSIGNED st	(Day) (Year) (Year) : and that the following action was was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & was:	or corporation an interest in this claim? No.) (City)	(Department) ; if 50, state name and addre (State) (Zip Code)
NO :: when? (A (Yes or No) :: when? (A and that 5	(Day) (Year) (Year) (Year) (Year) (Year) : and that the following action was was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & ws: : and was acquire tates on oath that he or she is familiar with the	e taken thereon: or corporation an interest in this claim? No.) (City) ston e matters and things set forth in the	(Department) ; if so, state name and addre (State) (Zip Code) , in the following man above complatint, and that he or she verify belie WWW
NO :: when? (A (Yes or No) :: when? (A and that 5	(Day) (Year) (Year) (Year) (Year) (Year) : and that the following action was was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & ws: : and was acquire tates on oath that he or she is familiar with the	e taken thereon: or corporation an interest in this claim? No.) (City) ston e matters and things set forth in the	(Department)
NO :: when? (A (Yes or No) :: when? (A and that 5	(Day) (Year) (Year) (Year) (Year) was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & (Street or R.F.D. & and was acquire tates on oath that he or she is familiar with the ESC (épresentative Name)	r taken thereon: or corporation an interest in this claim? No.) (City) ston e matters and things set forth in the Addition (Signetus)	(Department) ; if so, state name and addre (State) (Zip Code) , in the following man above complatint, and that he or she verify belie WWW
NO :: when? (A (Yes or No) :: when? (A and that 5	(Day) (Year) (Year) : and that the following action was was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & : and was acquire : and was acquire tates on oath that he or she is familiar with the	r taken thereon: or corporation an interest in this claim? No.) (City) ston e matters and things set forth in the Addition (Signetus)	(Department) ; if so, state name and addre (State) (Zip Code) , in the following man above complatint, and that he or she verify belie WWW
NO :: when? (N (Yes or No) :: when? (N and that 5	(Day) (Year) (Year) (Year) was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & was: and was acquire tates on oath that he or she is familiar with the SWORN TO and subscribed	e taken thereon:	(Department)
NO :: when? (N (Yes or No) :: when? (N and that 5	(Day) (Year) (Year) (Year) was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & was: and was acquire tates on oath that he or she is familiar with the SWORN TO and subscribed	a taken thereon:	(Department) ND ; if so, state name and addre (State) (Zip Code) , in the following man above complaint, and that he or she verily bells more of Claimant/Representative) Le Rock APA (City) (State) 2018
NO :: when? (N (Yes or No) :: when? (N and that 5	(Day) (Year) (Year) (Year) was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & was: and was acquire tates on oath that he or she is familiar with the SWORN TO and subscribed	e taken thereon:	(Department)
NO :: when? (N (Yes or No) :: when? (N and that 5	(Day) (Year) (Year) (Year) was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & was: and was acquire tates on oath that he or she is familiar with the SWORN TO and subscribed	a taken thereon:	(Department) ND ; if so, state name and addre (State) (Zip Code)
NO :: when? (N (Yes or No) :: when? (N and that 5	(Day) (Year) (Year) (Year) was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & was: and was acquire tates on oath that he or she is familiar with the SWORN TO and subscribed	ataken thereon:	(Department) ND ; if so, state name and addre (State) (Zip Code) , in the following man above complaint, and that he or she verily bells more of Claimant/Representative) Le Rock APA (City) (State) 2018
NO when? (Name) and that 5 (Name) and that 5 (Name) and that the nature there of is as follo THE UNDERSIGNED as that they are true. (Print Claimant/R (Print Claimant/R (Print Claimant/R (Name) and that 5 (Name) and that 5 (Name) (Name) and that 5 (Name) and that 5 (Name) and that 5 (Name) and that 5 (Name) (Name) and that the nature there of is as follo (Name) (Name) and that the nature there of is as follo (Name) ((Day) (Year) (Year) (Year) (Year) (Year) was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & (Street or R.F.D. & and was acquire and was acquire (Street or she is familiar with the Effersentutive Name) SWORN TO and subscribed (Street of Street of Street) (Street o	ataken thereon: or corporation an interest in this claim? No.) (City) aton er matters and things set forth in the Gign aturn before me at day of Date es: MayCh	(Department) ; if so, state name and addre (State) (Zip Code) in the following man above complaint, and that he or she verily belie M re of Claimant/Representative)
NO :: when? (N (Yes or No) :: when? (N and that 5	(Day) (Year) (Year) (Year) was paid thereon: (2) Has any third person (Street or R.F.D. & was: and was acquire tates on oath that he or she is familiar with the SWORN TO and subscribed	ataken thereon:	(Department) ND; if so, state name and addr (State) (Zip Code) , in the following man above complaint, and that he or she verily bell MO re of Claimant/Representative) Le Bock AR (City) (State ACMAY 2015) (Month) (Year (Notary Public)

BEFORE THE STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

STEVEN SHULTS

v.

STATE OF ARKANSAS

STATEMENT OF CLAIM

Claimant, Steven Shults, for his Statement of Claim, states:

1. Claimant substantially prevailed in a Freedom of Information Act appeal against the Arkansas Department of Correction ("ADC") in Case No. 60CV-17-4931 in the Circuit Court of Pulaski County, Arkansas, Seventeenth Division.

2. The court held ADC's position was not substantially justified.

3. ADC appealed the court's ruling to the Arkansas Supreme Court, which affirmed the lower court's principal ruling, and reversed/remanded on an ancillary issue.

4. ADC did not appeal the lower court's ruling on "substantial justification" and the Arkansas Supreme Court affirmed that portion of the Court's ruling *sub silentio*.

5. Claimant does not seek attorneys' fees and costs related to the remand proceedings, as reflected on Exhibit 6.

6. Claimant attaches the following Exhibits to the Complaint.

Exhibit 1: Statement of Claim

Exhibit 2: Complaint in Case No. 60CV-17-4931

Exhibit 3: September 22, 2017, Order in Case No. 60CV-17-4931

Exhibit 4: November 2, 2017, Order in Case No. CV-17-788

Exhibit 5: November 13, 2017, Order in Case No. 60CV-17-4931

Exhibit 6: Statement of Fees and Expenses Rendered by Williams & Anderson PLC

JAN 0 5 2018 RECEIVED

Arkansas State Claims Commission

CLAIMANT

RESPONDENT

WHEREFORE, Claimant Steven Shults is entitled to attorneys' fees and expenses in the amount of \$15,000.00 pursuant to the Arkansas Freedom of Information Act, Ark. Code Ann. § 25-19-107.

Respectfully Submitted,

WILLIAMS & ANDERSON PLC 111 Center Street, Suite 2200 Little Rock, Arkansas 72201 Telephone: 501-372-0800 Facsimile: 501-372-6453

/s/ Alec Gaines Philip E. Kaplan (AR68026) pkaplan@williamsanderson.com Heather G. Zachary (AR2004216) hzachary@williamsanderson.com Alec Gaines (AR2012277) againes@williamsanderson.com

Attorneys for Steven Shults

BEFORE THE ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION

STEVEN SHULTS

CLAIMANT

V.

CLAIM NO. 180567 CLAIM NO. 190250

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

RESPONDENT

<u>ORDER</u>

Now before the Arkansas State Claims Commission (the "Claims Commission") are the claims of Steven Shults (the "Claimant") against the Arkansas Department of Correction (the "Respondent"). At the hearing held September 13, 2018, Claimant was represented by Alec Gaines and Heather Zachary. Thomas Burns appeared on behalf of Respondent.

Background of Claim No. 180567

1. Claimant submitted a request pursuant to the Arkansas Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") to Respondent in August 2017 asking for information relating to Respondent's supply of drugs intended for use in executions. Respondent revealed that it had acquired 40 vials of midazolam but refused to disclose the package inserts or labels (the "Requested Documents") because they could be used to identify the supplier.

2. Claimant filed suit against Respondent on September 7, 2017, in Pulaski County Circuit Court. This lawsuit was styled as *Steven Shults v. Arkansas Department of Correction; et al.*, Pulaski County Circuit Court Case No. 60CV-17-4931 (the "Midazolam Case").

3. Respondent moved to dismiss the Midazolam Case, arguing that the Method of Execution Act ("MEA") prohibits disclosure of the Requested Documents.

4. On September 22, 2017, the Pulaski County Circuit Court denied Respondent's motion to dismiss and ordered Respondent to produce unredacted versions of the Requested

Documents. As part of that order, the Pulaski County Circuit Court found that Respondent's "position [in refusing disclosure] was not substantially justified." The Pulaski County Circuit Court also found that Claimant "substantially prevailed" in the Midazolam Case.

5. Respondent appealed the Pulaski County Circuit Court's ruling that the confidentiality provisions of the MEA are not intended to protect the identity of the drug manufacturers. Alternatively, Respondent argued that the lot, batch, and control numbers could lead to the identification of the suppliers or sellers should be redacted. Respondent did not appeal the Pulaski County Circuit Court's explicit finding that its nondisclosure was "not substantially justified."

6. The Arkansas Supreme Court affirmed the circuit court's ruling that the drug manufacturers are not protected under the confidentiality provisions of the MEA. However, the Arkansas Supreme Court remanded the case back to the circuit court for a determination of exactly what information should be redacted on the Requested Documents.

7. On remand, the Pulaski County Circuit Court issued an order finding that Claimant is entitled to an unredacted copy of the package insert and a redacted copy of the label.

8. On January 5, 2018, the Claimant filed his claim for \$15,000.00 in attorney's fees and costs with the Claims Commission.

Background of Claim No. 190250

9. Claimant submitted FOIA requests to Respondent in February 2017 and March 2017 asking for information relating to Respondent's supply of drugs intended for use in executions. Respondent revealed that it had acquired 100 vials of potassium chloride but refused to disclose the package inserts or labels (again referred to as the "Requested Documents") because they could be used to identify the supplier.

10. Claimant filed suit against Respondent on March 23, 2017, in Pulaski County Circuit Court. This lawsuit was styled as *Steven Shults v. Arkansas Department of Correction; et al.*, Pulaski County Circuit Court Case No. 60CV-17-1419 (the "Potassium Chloride Case").

11. Respondent moved to dismiss the Potassium Chloride Case, arguing that the MEA prohibits disclosure of the Requested Documents.

12. On March 31, 2017, the Pulaski County Circuit Court ordered Respondent to produce unredacted versions of the Requested Documents. As part of that order, the Pulaski County Circuit Court found that Respondent's "refusal [to disclose the Requested Documents] was not justified by the language of the MEA in any respect." The Pulaski County Circuit Court also found that Claimant "substantially prevailed" in the Potassium Chloride Case.

13. Respondent appealed the Pulaski County Circuit Court's ruling that the confidentiality provisions of the MEA are not intended to protect the identity of the drug manufacturers. Alternatively, Respondent argued that the lot, batch, and control numbers could lead to the identification of the suppliers or sellers should be redacted. Respondent did not appeal the Pulaski County Circuit Court's explicit finding that its nondisclosure was "not justified . . . in any respect."

14. The Arkansas Supreme Court affirmed the circuit court's ruling that the drug manufacturers are not protected under the confidentiality provisions of the MEA. However, the Arkansas Supreme Court agreed with Respondent that redaction of lot, batch and control numbers was proper and remanded the case back to the circuit court for a determination of exactly what information must be redacted on the package inserts and labels.

15. On remand, the Pulaski County Circuit Court issued an order finding that Claimant is entitled to an unredacted copy of the package insert and a redacted copy of the label. The circuit court also found that Claimant "has substantially prevailed in this matter."

16. On August 20, 2018, the Claimant filed his claim for \$33,578.00 in attorney's fees and costs with the Claims Commission.

Findings of Fact

17. The Claims Commission finds that Claimant filed the Midazolam Case and the Potassium Chloride Case in Pulaski County Circuit Court against Respondent regarding Respondent's refusal to disclose the Requested Documents.

18. The Claims Commission finds that in both the Midazolam Case and the Potassium Chloride Case, the Pulaski County Circuit Court ordered Respondent to disclose the Requested Documents.

19. The Claims Commission finds that in both the Midazolam Case and the Potassium Chloride Case, the Pulaski County Circuit Court held that Claimant was the substantially prevailing party.

20. The Claims Commission finds that in both the Midazolam Case and the Potassium Chloride Case, the Pulaski County Circuit Court held that Respondent's refusal to disclose the Requested Documents was not justified.

21. The Claims Commission finds that in both the Midazolam Case and the Potassium Chloride Case, Respondent appealed the circuit court's rulings to the Arkansas Supreme Court. Specifically, in both cases, Respondent appealed the rulings that the Requested Documents were subject to disclosure under the MEA.

22. The Claims Commission finds that in both the Midazolam Case and the Potassium Chloride Case, Respondent did not appeal the rulings of the Pulaski County Circuit Court that Claimant was the substantially prevailing party.

23. The Claims Commission finds that in both the Midazolam Case and the Potassium Chloride Case, Respondent did not appeal the rulings of the Pulaski County Circuit Court that its position in refusing disclosure was not justified.

24. The Claims Commission finds that in both the Midazolam Case and the Potassium Chloride Case, Respondent offered redaction as an alternative argument in the event that the circuit court's rulings as to disclosure were affirmed.

25. The Claims Commission finds that in both the Midazolam Case and the Potassium Chloride Case, the Arkansas Supreme Court disagreed with Respondent that the confidentiality provisions of the MEA prohibit disclosure of the Requested Documents.

26. The Claims Commission finds that in both the Midazolam Case and the Potassium Chloride Case, the Arkansas Supreme Court remanded the cases back to the circuit court to determine whether redactions of lot, batch, and control numbers were necessary.

27. The Claims Commission finds that in both the Midazolam Case and the Potassium Chloride Case, the circuit court, on remand, ordered the redaction of lot, batch, and control numbers.

28. The Claims Commission finds that in the Potassium Chloride Case, on remand, the circuit court made another specific ruling in its order that the Claimant substantially prevailed.

29. The Claims Commission finds that the Midazolam Case and Potassium Chloride Case are essentially identical except as to the specific type of drug.

30. The Claims Commission finds that in both the Midazolam Case and the Potassium Chloride Case, the circuit court did not make specific rulings in <u>any</u> order that Respondent was substantially justified in failing to disclose the Requested Documents.

31. The Claims Commission finds that Claimant filed a claim related to its attorney's fees and costs incurred in the Midazolam Case on January 5, 2018.

32. The Claims Commission finds that Claimant filed a claim related to its attorney's fees and costs incurred in the Potassium Chloride Case on August 20, 2018.

33. The Claims Commission finds that, at hearing, Respondent did not object to the reasonableness of Claimants' attorney's fees and costs in either the Midazolam Case or the Potassium Chloride Case. Respondent did, however, argue that Claimant has not been damaged by the prosecution of the Midazolam Case or the Potassium Chloride Case because Claimant had a contingent fee agreement with his attorneys.

Conclusions of Law

34. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-204(d) gives the Claims Commission jurisdiction to consider claims for reasonable attorney's fees and litigation expenses pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. § 25-19-107.

35. Pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. § 25-19-107(d)(1), a defendant may be liable for "reasonable attorney's fees and other litigation expenses reasonably incurred by a plaintiff who has substantially prevailed unless the court finds that the position of the defendant was substantially justified."

36. The Claims Commission finds that Ark. Code Ann. 25-19-107(d)(1) must be read in conjunction with Ark. Code Ann. § 25-19-107(e)(2), which clarifies that where a plaintiff substantially prevails in a FOIA action against "the State of Arkansas or a department, agency, or

institution of the state," the claim for attorney's fees and other litigation expenses must be filed with the Claims Commission.

37. The Claims Commission finds that, where "the State of Arkansas or a department, agency, or institution of the state" (collectively referred to herein as the "State") is ordered to disclose documents or information by the courts, it is incumbent upon the State to seek a ruling from the court as to whether the State was "substantially justified" in refusing disclosure pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. § 25-19-107(d)(1).

38. Likewise, where a plaintiff prevails in a FOIA lawsuit against the State, unless the court rules that the State must disclose <u>all</u> documents or information sought by the plaintiff (thereby eliminating the question of whether the plaintiff "substantially prevailed"), the plaintiff should obtain a ruling by the court that it "substantially prevailed" pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. § 25-19-107(d)(1) in order to preserve its claim for attorney's fees.

39. To hold otherwise would require the Claims Commission to engage in the ultimate exercise in inefficiency, which would be to essentially re-hear the FOIA lawsuit.

40. The Claims Commission is unpersuaded by Respondent's argument that it was substantially justified in failing to disclose the Requested Documents because certain information was eventually redacted from the labels. The Claims Commission will not infer this language from the rulings of the Arkansas Supreme Court or the remand orders of the Pulaski County Circuit Court, especially where Respondent failed to appeal the findings of the Pulaski County Circuit Court in both cases that its refusal to disclose the Requested Documents was not justified and that Claimant was found to be the substantially prevailing party. Given that Respondent did not appeal these rulings, it would be improper—and inconsistent with the unappealed findings in the

Midazolam Case and Potassium Chloride Case—for the Claims Commission to now hold that Respondent was substantially justified in refusing disclosure.

41. As such, pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. §§ 19-10-204(d) and 25-19-107, the Claims Commission finds that Claimant is entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs related to the Midazolam Case and Potassium Chloride Case.

42. Given that Respondent did not object to the reasonableness of attorney's fees and costs incurred by Claimant in either case, the only remaining question is whether the contingent fee agreement that Claimant had with his attorneys is relevant. The Claims Commission finds that there is nothing in Ark. Code Ann. §§ 19-10-204(d) or 25-19-107 to suggest that attorney's fees and costs incurred by virtue of a contingent fee agreement are not recoverable.

43. The Claims Commission finds that Claimant is entitled to an AWARD of \$15,000.00 in attorney's fees and costs in the Midazolam Case and \$33,578.00 in attorney's fees and costs in the Potassium Chloride Case.

44. Pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-215(b), the Potassium Chloride Case will be referred to the General Assembly for review, approval, and placement on an appropriations bill.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION Dexter Booth

Servy C. Kinslow

ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION Henry Kinslow, Co-Chair

ill Lancoster

ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION Bill Lancaster

DATE: October 18, 2018

Notice(s) which may apply to your claim

- (1) A party has forty (40) days from the date of this Order to file a Motion for Reconsideration or a Notice of Appeal with the Claims Commission. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-211(b). If a Motion for Reconsideration is denied, that party then has twenty (20) days from the date of the denial of the Motion for Reconsideration to file a Notice of Appeal with the Claims Commission. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-211(b)(3). A decision of the Claims Commission may only be appealed to the General Assembly. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-211(a).
- (2) If a Claimant is awarded less than \$15,000.00 by the Claims Commission at hearing, that claim is held forty (40) days from the date of disposition before payment will be processed. See Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-211(b). Note: This does not apply to agency admissions of liability and negotiated settlement agreements.
- (3) Awards or negotiated settlement agreements of \$15,000.00 or more are referred to the General Assembly for approval and authorization to pay. Ark. Code Ann. § 19-10-215(b).

BEFORE THE ARKANSAS STATE CLAIMS COMMISSION

STEVEN SHULTS

V

CLAIMANT

CLAIM NO. 180567 CLAIM NO. 190250

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION

RESPONDENT

NOTICE OF APPEAL AND DESIGNATION OF THE RECORD

Comes now Respondent, Arkansas Department of Correction (ADC), and hereby gives notice of appeal from all orders, judgments, and findings of the Commission in the abovereferenced case. Specifically, ADC appeals the October 18, 2018, Order granting the award of attorney's fees, and all other decisions of the Claims Commission adverse to the ADC in the abovestyled cause.

The ADC designates the entire record and all proceedings: including, but not limited to, any pretrial proceedings, exhibits, evidence and documents introduced into evidence or offered into evidence at all hearings to be contained in the record on appeal. The transcript shall be forwarded by the Commission to the Joint Budget Committee.

Respectfully submitted, Department of Correction Office of Chief Counsel

Thomas Burns (02006) General Counsel Post Office Box 8707 Pine Bluff, AR 71611 (870) 267-6845 Office (870) 267-6373 Facsimile thomas.burns@arkansas.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of this pleading has been served this 24th day of October, 2018, on the Claimant by placing a copy of the same in the U. S. Mail, regular postage to:

Alec Gaines againes@williamsanderson.com

Thomas Burns