



Edward D. Greim
Phone: 816.256.4144
edgreim@gravesgarrett.com

October 15, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk of the Court
U.S. Court of Appeals
For the Fifth Circuit
600 S. Maestri Place
Suite 115
New Orleans, Louisiana 70130

RE: Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(j) Letter from Appellees in *Callais v. Landry*, No. 24-30177 (5th Cir.) Notifying Clerk of the Court of U.S. Supreme Court’s Dismissal of *Galmon v. Callais*, No. 24-111 (U.S.) for Lack of Jurisdiction

Dear Mr. Cayce:

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(j), Appellees in *Callais v. Landry*, No. 24-30177 (5th Cir.) write to provide the Court with supplemental authority. Specifically, Appellees attach the October 15, 2024, Order List from the U.S. Supreme Court specifying that *Galmon v. Callais*, No. 24-111 (U.S.), an appeal by Appellants to the U.S. Supreme Court of the same Intervention Orders in *Callais v. Landry*, No. 3-24-CV-122 (W.D. La.), currently pending before this Court, was “dismissed for want of jurisdiction.” The Supreme Court’s dismissal of Appellants’ appeal suggests that this Court should also dismiss the present appeal of the Intervention Orders for want of jurisdiction, or, alternatively affirm the district court.



Appellees also write to call *St. Cyr v. Hays*, 513 U.S. 1054 (1994) (Mem) to the Court’s attention. The Brief of Plaintiffs-Appellees, filed June 17, 2024, stated that proposed intervenors in *Hays v. Louisiana*, 18 F.3d 1319 (5th Cir. 1994) “also filed a direct appeal [to the U.S. Supreme Court of their intervention orders], but the Supreme Court deferred any probable jurisdiction finding and instead remanded the order to the district court to cure procedural defects. *St. Cyr v. Hays*, 513 U.S. 1053 (1994) (Mem).” **Red Brief at 35.** This sentence should instead state that proposed intervenors “also filed a direct appeal, but the Supreme Court summarily affirmed the district court in a memorandum order without further analysis. *St. Cyr v. Hays*, 513 U.S. 1054 (1994) (Mem).” Plaintiffs-Appellees request the Court to ignore any other suggestion in their Brief that the Supreme Court did not exercise jurisdiction in *Hays* in light of *St. Cyr v. Hays*, 513 U.S. 1054 (1994) (Mem). However, in light of the Supreme Court’s recent dismissal for lack of jurisdiction in *Galmon v. Callais*, No. 24-111 (U.S.), *St. Cyr v. Hays*, 513 U.S. 1054 (1994) (Mem) does not impact this Court’s jurisdiction over this present appeal.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Edward D. Greim', is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Edward D. Greim



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Edward D. Greim, certify that on October 15th, 2024, a copy of the foregoing, was filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which sent notification to all parties through their counsel of record.

/s/ Edward D. Greim
Edward D. Greim
Attorney for Plaintiffs-Appellees

(ORDER LIST: 604 U.S.)

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 15, 2024

APPEAL -- SUMMARY DISPOSITION

24-111 GALMON, EDWARD, ET AL. V. CALLAIS, PHILLIP, ET AL.

The appeal is dismissed for want of jurisdiction.

CERTIORARI -- SUMMARY DISPOSITIONS

23-1155 VILLARREAL, PRISCILLA V. ALANIZ, ISIDRO R., ET AL.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit for further consideration in light of *Gonzalez v. Trevino*, 602 U. S. ____ (2024) (*per curiam*).

23-7841 SCHOROVSKY, RICHARD V. UNITED STATES

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the petition for a writ of certiorari are granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit for further consideration in light of *Erlinger v. United States*, 602 U. S. ____ (2024).

24-93 PARIS, COMM'R, PA STATE POLICE V. LARA, MADISON M., ET AL.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit for further consideration in light of *United States v. Rahimi*, 602 U. S. ____ (2024).

115 S.Ct. 687, 130 L.Ed.2d 595, 63 USLW 3500, 63 USLW 3507

115 S.Ct. 687
Supreme Court of the United States

Bernadine ST. CYR, et al., appellants,
v.
Ray HAYS, et al.

No. 94-753.
|
Dec. 12, 1994.

Synopsis

Former decision, 512 U.S. 1230, 114 S.Ct. 2731; 512 U.S. 1273, 115 S.Ct. 31.

Case below, *Hays v. State*, 862 F.Supp. 119; 5 Cir., 18 F.3d 1319.

Opinion

The judgment is affirmed.

All Citations

513 U.S. 1054, 115 S.Ct. 687 (Mem), 130 L.Ed.2d 595, 63 USLW 3500, 63 USLW 3507

End of Document

© 2024 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.