

setting an expedited schedule for the filing, briefing, and hearing of summary judgment motions. (Order, p.2 (Nov. 1, 2019)).

In its order granting Plaintiffs' preliminary injunction motion, the Court stated that it did not "presume, at this early stage of this litigation, to have any authority to compel the General Assembly to commence a process of enacting new Congressional districts," but expressed concerns about potential disruptions to the 2020 elections process and noted that "these disruptions to the election process *need not occur, nor may an expedited schedule for summary judgment or trial even be needed*, should the General Assembly, on its own initiative, act immediately and with all due haste to enact new congressional districts." (*Id.* at p. 17) (emphasis added).

As intimated by the Court in its November 1, 2019 order, the General Assembly, on its own initiative, enacted a new congressional plan on November 15, 2019 fully replacing the enjoined 2016 congressional plan.

ARGUMENT

In light of the enactment of new congressional districts on November 15, 2019, this Court should now hold true to its statements that in such an event, "disruptions to the election process need not occur, nor may an expedited schedule for summary judgment or trial even be needed." There are at least two good reasons for doing so: avoiding unnecessary disruption to the election cycle and the interests of judicial economy and efficiency.

First, now that a new map has been duly enacted by the legislature, the Court should take all steps necessary to avoid undue disruption to the election cycle. When courts award or withhold immediate relief in an apportionment or redistricting case, a court "should consider the proximity of a forthcoming election and the mechanics and complexities of state elections laws, and should act and rely upon general equitable principles." *Pender County v. Bartlett*, 361 N.C. 491, 510, 649

S.E.2d 364, 376 (2007) quoting *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 585 (1964). Further, a court can “endeavor to avoid a disruption of the election process which might result from requiring precipitate changes” that could unduly burden the State. *Id.* Here, the legally mandated filing period for congressional offices begins December 2, 2019. If this Court promptly enters an order dismissing this action as moot, elections officials, candidates, and the general public can be prepared for the filing period without disruption or delay. Under the scheduling order currently in place, the Court will not even hear dispositive motions until December 2, 2019, the first day of the lawful filing period. In that event, the filing period and the election cycle will be inevitably delayed along with the confusion and disruption that attend such circumstances. The Court should instead avoid any disruption of the election process by ordering an expedited briefing schedule and expediting resolution of the summary judgment motion.

Second, there is no reason for the Court to consider any motions related to the 2016 congressional plan—the plan challenged by Plaintiffs in this action—as that plan has been erased by the legislature and any challenge to it is obviously moot. Thus, there is no reason for the Court to continue to adhere to a schedule in which summary judgment responses regarding the 2016 plan are filed and heard on the prior case management schedule as all such activity is legally meaningless and will only waste judicial resources. In light of the enactment of the new congressional plan, the Court should instead devote its time and resources to recognizing the mootness of the prior claims and providing certainty and stability to the 2020 election cycle.

Accordingly, Legislative Defendants’ propose the following timetable for briefing and ruling upon their Motion for Summary Judgment based on mootness:

November 20, 2019: Plaintiffs file any Response to Legislative Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment Based on Mootness

November 22, 2019: Hearing on Legislative Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment

Based on Mootness

Any hearing on the motion could be conducted telephonically to facilitate participation by the Court and the parties. A hearing on or before November 22, 2019 would allow the Court sufficient time to rule on the matter and allow the normal election cycle to go forward without delay. In light of the General Assembly's voluntary recognition of this Court's advice in enacting a new plan, it would also obviate the need for any further briefing, argument, or hearings on the 2016 congressional plan. The Court should therefore act without delay to determine the mootness of this action and provide stability and certainty to the citizens of North Carolina.

CONCLUSION

Legislative Defendants respectfully request that the Court expedite Plaintiffs' response to Legislative Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment and expedite its resolution of this case as described above. A proposed order is attached hereto.

Respectfully submitted, this the 15th day of November, 2019.

OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH,
SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.



Phillip J. Strach
N.C. State Bar No. 29456
Thomas A. Farr
N.C. State Bar No. 10871
Michael McKnight
N.C. State Bar No. 36932
phil.strach@ogletreedeakins.com
tom.farr@ogletreedeakins.com
michael.mcknight@ogletreedeakins.com
4208 Six Forks Road, Suite 1100
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609
Telephone: (919) 787-9700
Facsimile: (919) 783-9412
Counsel for the Legislative Defendants

BAKER & HOSTETLER, LLP

E. Mark Braden*

(DC Bar #419915)

Richard B. Raile*

(VA Bar # 84340)

Trevor M. Stanley*

(VA Bar # 77351)

Katherine McKnight*

(DC Bar # 99456)

Washington Square, Suite 1100

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20036-5403

Telephone: (202) 861-1500

Facsimile: (202) 861-1783

Counsel for Legislative Defendants

**admitted pro hac vice*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

It is hereby certified that the foregoing document was served upon the parties via electronic mail:

Paul Cox
Stephanie Brennan
North Carolina Department of Justice
114 W. Edenton St
Raleigh, NC 27603
(919) 716-6932
pcox@ncdoj.gov

Counsel for the State Board of Elections

John Branch, III
Nate Pencook
Andrew Brown
Shanahan Law Group
128 E. Hargett St. Suite 300
Raleigh NC 27601
jbranch@shanahanlawgroup.com

Chris Winkelman
Jason Torchinsky
45 North Hill Drive, Suite 100
Warrenton, VA 20186.
cwinkelman@hjtvt.law

Counsel for Intervenor Defendants

R. Stanton Jones
David P. Gersch
Elisabeth S. Theodore
Daniel F. Jacobson
601 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20001-3761
(202) 942-5000
Stanton.jones@arnoldporter.com


Marc Elias
Aria C. Branch
700 13th Street NW
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 654-6200
melias@perkinscoie.com

Abha Khanna
1201 Third Avenue
Suite 4900
Seattle, WA 98101-3099
(206) 359-8000
akhanna@perkinscoie.com

Burton Craige
Narendra K. Ghosh
Paul E. Smith
100 Europa Dr., Suite 420
Chapel Hill, NC 27517
(919) 942-5200
bcraige@pathlaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs

This the 15th day of November, 2019

By: 
Alyssa M. Riggins (N.C. Bar No. 52366)