

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA  
SHREVEPORT DIVISION

DAVID B. MEANS, ET AL.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:23-cv-00669

VERSUS

JUDGE JERRY EDWARDS, JR.

DESOTO PARISH, ET AL.

MAGISTRATE JUDGE HORNSBY

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO STAY**

NOW INTO COURT, through undersigned counsel, come Plaintiffs, who file this Motion to Stay ("**Motion**") and seek entry of enter an order from this Court staying this matter pending the United States Supreme Court's Decision in *Louisiana v. Callais*, Nos. 24-109 & 24-110, slip op. at 1 (U.S. June 27, 2025), [https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/24-109\\_153m.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/24-109_153m.pdf).

This relief is requested because the *Callais* decision will materially alter the legal framework governing this litigation. As such, a short stay will prevent unnecessary additional litigation once the decision is issued.

WHEREFORE, for the reasons set forth in the accompanying memorandum, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court grant this Motion.

Dated: September 15, 2025

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

/s/ Dallin B. Holt

Dallin B. Holt \* (DC Bar #1722555)

HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN TORCHINSKY

& JOSEFIK, PLLC

2555 E. Camelback Road, Suite 700

Phoenix, Arizona 85016

Telephone: (602) 388-1262

Facsimile: (540) 341-8809

Email: [dholt@HoltzmanVogel.com](mailto:dholt@HoltzmanVogel.com)

Jason B. Torchinsky\* (VA Bar # 47481)  
HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN TORCHINSKY  
& JOSEFIK, PLLC  
2300 N. St. NW, Ste. 643A  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Telephone: (202) 737-8808  
Email: [jtorchinsky@HoltzmanVogel.com](mailto:jtorchinsky@HoltzmanVogel.com)

Reid A. Jones (#34611)  
WIENER, WEISS & MADISON APC  
330 Marshall Street, Suite 1000  
Shreveport, Louisiana 71101  
Telephone: (318) 226-9100  
Facsimile: (318) 424-5128  
Email: [rjones@wwmlaw.com](mailto:rjones@wwmlaw.com)

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*  
*\*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this day I electronically served the foregoing document upon all counsel of record via the Courts CM/ECF filing system.

DATED this 15<sup>th</sup> day of September 2025.

/s/ Dallin B. Holt  
Dallin B. Holt

### **CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE**

I certify that, prior to filing this motion, I contacted counsel for Defendants regarding the relief requested in this Motion. Counsel for Defendants indicated that they oppose this Motion.

DATED this 15<sup>th</sup> day of September 2025.

/s/ Dallin B. Holt  
Dallin B. Holt

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA  
SHREVEPORT DIVISION**

**DAVID B. MEANS, ET AL.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:23-cv-00669**

**VERSUS**

**JUDGE JERRY EDWARDS, JR.**

**DESOTO PARISH, ET AL.**

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE HORNSBY**

**MEMORANDUM IN PLAINTIFFS' SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO STAY**

NOW INTO COURT, through undersigned counsel, come Plaintiffs, who respectfully submit this memorandum in support of their Motion to Stay for the reasons more fully expressed below.

**I. Facts and Background.**

This case arises from the redistricting maps drawn by the DeSoto Parish Police Jury. In late 2022 and early 2023, the Police Jury enacted a new parish map in which race predominated as the driving factor. At multiple public meetings, Jury members used explicit racial language in explaining their goals and then acted consistently with those statements in adopting the current redistricting map. The Jury's map was not in harmony with the new demographic realities that included substantial population growth in the majority-White northern portion of the parish and a decline in majority-Black Mansfield. In enacting this new map, the Jury acted against the advice of its own Parish counsel, who repeatedly warned them in public sessions that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 does not permit line-drawing based on race, absent proof of an actual violation, as opposed to mere allegations.

Plaintiffs filed suit on May 18, 2023, and filed a motion for preliminary injunction and proposed order the next day. ECF Nos. 1-2. An Amended Complaint and Motion were later filed on May 25, 2023. ECF Nos. 8-9. This Court held a two-day evidentiary hearing on July 11 and 12,

2023. ECF Nos. 57-58. While the Court ultimately denied the preliminary relief, it expressly found “substantial evidence that the enacted Police Jury districting map is constitutionally infirm in that race unlawfully predominated as a consideration in drawing the enacted DeSoto Parish Police Jury Map in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.” The Court also observed that the Police Jury received what it described as “constitutionally suspect” legal advice from its districting advisor, Mr. Hefner.

After the preliminary injunction hearing, the parties pursued settlement negotiations, but those efforts were not fruitful. ECF Nos. 76-83. The case then returned to a litigation track, and, on November 26, 2024, this Court issued an Amended Scheduling Order. ECF Nos. 84, 87. Relevant to this Motion, the scheduling order set trial for February 9, 2026, the Pretrial Conference for January 21, 2026, and Dispositive Motions for September 23, 2025. ECF No. 87.

At the same time, another Louisiana redistricting dispute has advanced to the United States Supreme Court. *Louisiana v. Callais*, Nos. 24-109 & 24-110, slip op. at 1 (U.S. June 27, 2025), [https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/24-109\\_153m.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/24-109_153m.pdf). That case concerns the congressional map adopted in Louisiana after the 2020 census. *Id.* at 1-2. Shortly after the 2022 map was adopted, Black voters and organizations challenged the map under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act on the ground that the map diluted Black voting strength. *Id.* at 2-3.

The district court and the Fifth Circuit concluded that the map likely violated Section 2, and in 2024 the legislature enacted a remedial plan, Senate Bill 8, creating a second majority-Black congressional district between Shreveport and Baton Rouge. *Id.* at 3-4. A group of White voters then challenged the remedial plan in the Western District of Louisiana, asserting that the new district was an unconstitutional racial gerrymander. *Id.* at 4. A three-judge panel agreed and struck

down the plan. *Id.* at 4-5. Both the State and the Black plaintiffs who had prevailed in the earlier Section 2 litigation appealed. *Id.* at 5.

The Supreme Court accepted jurisdiction of this case and heard argument in March 2025, and on June 27, 2025, ordered reargument and supplemental briefing on whether the intentional creation of a second majority-Black district violates the Fourteenth or Fifteenth Amendment. *Id.* at 1, 6. The Supreme Court’s resolution of *Callais* will directly affect this case because it will mandate how legislatures must balance constitutional limits with Voting Rights Act requirements and how much discretion remains to weigh other traditional or political factors. *Id.* at 6-7.

## **II. Argument**

Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court modify its November 26, 2024 scheduling order to stay the dispositive motions deadline, the pretrial conference and evidentiary hearing until the U.S. Supreme Court issues its decision in *Callais*, which will materially alter the legal framework governing this litigation.

Scheduling orders may be modified for good cause shown under F.R.C.P. 16(b)(4). There are four relevant factors for determining whether good cause exists: (1) the explanation for the failure to timely [comply with the scheduling order]; (2) the importance of the [modification]; (3) potential prejudice in allowing the [modification]; and (4) the availability of a continuance to cure such prejudice.” *Springboards To Educ., Inc. v. Houston Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 912 F.3d 805, 819 (5th Cir. 2019), *as revised* (Jan. 29, 2019), *as revised* (Feb. 14, 2019). Petitioner satisfies all four factors.

As to factor one, the United States Supreme Court’s decision in *Callais* will clarify how courts should evaluate the redistricting map before this Court. As such, it is prudent to defer litigation until the Court issues its decision.

The second factor, the importance of the modification, is plainly satisfied. Making a decision on a redistricting map based on the process and understanding of redistricting jurisprudence that produced the contested map would be an exercise in futility. If this Court issues a decision here without the Court's *Callais* decision, it is highly likely that a renewed round of lawsuits challenging this map under the new guidance will follow, from whichever side the decision favors. As such, delaying this action not only helps ensure the remedy in this case will comply with current and very near future law, but it will also better serve judicial economy than engaging in another round of avoidable litigation.

The third factor, the potential for prejudice if the modification is allowed, is also satisfied. A continuance to consider the U.S. Supreme Court's latest insights on the murky waters of redistricting jurisprudence is a minimal delay considering that this slight delay can save this Court from hearing an entirely new case based upon the *Callais* decision. Taking additional time at the district court level will help ensure a proper outcome.

Finally, the fourth factor, the availability of a continuance to cure such prejudice, is clearly met. By staying this action, this Court can help avoid wasting the Court's, Plaintiffs', and Defendant's time and resources on yet another round of multi-year redistricting litigation.

### **III. Conclusion**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court stay this matter until the United States Supreme Court issues its decision in the *Callais* case.

Dated: September 15, 2025

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

/s/ Dallin B. Holt

Dallin B. Holt \* (DC Bar #1722555)  
HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN TORCHINSKY  
& JOSEFIAK, PLLC  
2555 E. Camelback Road, Suite 700  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016  
Telephone: (602) 388-1262  
Facsimile: (540) 341-8809  
Email: [dholt@HoltzmanVogel.com](mailto:dholt@HoltzmanVogel.com)

Jason B. Torchinsky\* (VA Bar # 47481)  
HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN TORCHINSKY  
& JOSEFIAK, PLLC  
2300 N. St. NW, Ste. 643A  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Telephone: (202) 737-8808  
Email: [jtorchinsky@HoltzmanVogel.com](mailto:jtorchinsky@HoltzmanVogel.com)

Reid A. Jones (#34611)  
WIENER, WEISS & MADISON APC  
330 Marshall Street, Suite 1000  
Shreveport, Louisiana 71101  
Telephone: (318) 226-9100  
Facsimile: (318) 424-5128  
Email: [rjones@wwmlaw.com](mailto:rjones@wwmlaw.com)

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*  
*\*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

**CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this day I electronically served the foregoing document upon all counsel of record via the Court's CM/ECF filing system.

DATED this 15<sup>th</sup> day of September 2025.

/s/ Dallin B. Holt

Dallin B. Holt

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA  
SHREVEPORT DIVISION**

**DAVID B. MEANS, ET AL.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:23-cv-00669**

**VERSUS**

**JUDGE JERRY EDWARDS, JR.**

**DESOTO PARISH, ET AL.**

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE HORNSBY**

**[PROPOSED] ORDER**

Considering the Motion to Stay (“Motion”) filed by Plaintiffs, David B. Means, Ryan Dupree, Robert G. Burford, Robert Gross, Mary L. Salley, Martha Trisler, John F. Pearce, Joe Cobb, Jack L. Buford, Jack E. Barron, W. Bruce Garlington, Donald Barber, Billy Dwayne Brumley, and Sherry Brumley (collectively “Plaintiffs”);

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiffs’ Motion is GRANTED. This case shall be stayed until the United States Supreme Court issues its decision in *Louisiana v. Callais*.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all pending deadlines are stayed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs shall file a notice with this Court of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Louisiana v. Callais* within 10 days of its issuance.

THUS DONE AND SIGNED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2025, in Shreveport, Louisiana.

---

JUDGE JERRY EDWARDS, JR.  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA  
SHREVEPORT DIVISION**

**DAVID B. MEANS, ET AL.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:23-cv-00669**

**VERSUS**

**JUDGE JERRY EDWARDS, JR.**

**DESOTO PARISH, ET AL.**

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE HORNSBY**

**MEMORANDUM IN PLAINTIFFS' SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO STAY**

NOW INTO COURT, through undersigned counsel, come Plaintiffs, who respectfully submit this memorandum in support of their Motion to Stay for the reasons more fully expressed below.

**I. Facts and Background.**

This case arises from the redistricting maps drawn by the DeSoto Parish Police Jury. In late 2022 and early 2023, the Police Jury enacted a new parish map in which race predominated as the driving factor. At multiple public meetings, Jury members used explicit racial language in explaining their goals and then acted consistently with those statements in adopting the current redistricting map. The Jury's map was not in harmony with the new demographic realities that included substantial population growth in the majority-White northern portion of the parish and a decline in majority-Black Mansfield. In enacting this new map, the Jury acted against the advice of its own Parish counsel, who repeatedly warned them in public sessions that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 does not permit line-drawing based on race, absent proof of an actual violation, as opposed to mere allegations.

Plaintiffs filed suit on May 18, 2023, and filed a motion for preliminary injunction and proposed order the next day. ECF Nos. 1-2. An Amended Complaint and Motion were later filed on May 25, 2023. ECF Nos. 8-9. This Court held a two-day evidentiary hearing on July 11 and 12,

2023. ECF Nos. 57-58. While the Court ultimately denied the preliminary relief, it expressly found “substantial evidence that the enacted Police Jury districting map is constitutionally infirm in that race unlawfully predominated as a consideration in drawing the enacted DeSoto Parish Police Jury Map in violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.” The Court also observed that the Police Jury received what it described as “constitutionally suspect” legal advice from its districting advisor, Mr. Hefner.

After the preliminary injunction hearing, the parties pursued settlement negotiations, but those efforts were not fruitful. ECF Nos. 76-83. The case then returned to a litigation track, and, on November 26, 2024, this Court issued an Amended Scheduling Order. ECF Nos. 84, 87. Relevant to this Motion, the scheduling order set trial for February 9, 2026, the Pretrial Conference for January 21, 2026, and Dispositive Motions for September 23, 2025. ECF No. 87.

At the same time, another Louisiana redistricting dispute has advanced to the United States Supreme Court. *Louisiana v. Callais*, Nos. 24-109 & 24-110, slip op. at 1 (U.S. June 27, 2025), [https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/24-109\\_153m.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/24pdf/24-109_153m.pdf). That case concerns the congressional map adopted in Louisiana after the 2020 census. *Id.* at 1-2. Shortly after the 2022 map was adopted, Black voters and organizations challenged the map under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act on the ground that the map diluted Black voting strength. *Id.* at 2-3.

The district court and the Fifth Circuit concluded that the map likely violated Section 2, and in 2024 the legislature enacted a remedial plan, Senate Bill 8, creating a second majority-Black congressional district between Shreveport and Baton Rouge. *Id.* at 3-4. A group of White voters then challenged the remedial plan in the Western District of Louisiana, asserting that the new district was an unconstitutional racial gerrymander. *Id.* at 4. A three-judge panel agreed and struck

down the plan. *Id.* at 4-5. Both the State and the Black plaintiffs who had prevailed in the earlier Section 2 litigation appealed. *Id.* at 5.

The Supreme Court accepted jurisdiction of this case and heard argument in March 2025, and on June 27, 2025, ordered reargument and supplemental briefing on whether the intentional creation of a second majority-Black district violates the Fourteenth or Fifteenth Amendment. *Id.* at 1, 6. The Supreme Court’s resolution of *Callais* will directly affect this case because it will mandate how legislatures must balance constitutional limits with Voting Rights Act requirements and how much discretion remains to weigh other traditional or political factors. *Id.* at 6-7.

## **II. Argument**

Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court modify its November 26, 2024 scheduling order to stay the dispositive motions deadline, the pretrial conference and evidentiary hearing until the U.S. Supreme Court issues its decision in *Callais*, which will materially alter the legal framework governing this litigation.

Scheduling orders may be modified for good cause shown under F.R.C.P. 16(b)(4). There are four relevant factors for determining whether good cause exists: (1) the explanation for the failure to timely [comply with the scheduling order]; (2) the importance of the [modification]; (3) potential prejudice in allowing the [modification]; and (4) the availability of a continuance to cure such prejudice.” *Springboards To Educ., Inc. v. Houston Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 912 F.3d 805, 819 (5th Cir. 2019), *as revised* (Jan. 29, 2019), *as revised* (Feb. 14, 2019). Petitioner satisfies all four factors.

As to factor one, the United States Supreme Court’s decision in *Callais* will clarify how courts should evaluate the redistricting map before this Court. As such, it is prudent to defer litigation until the Court issues its decision.

The second factor, the importance of the modification, is plainly satisfied. Making a decision on a redistricting map based on the process and understanding of redistricting jurisprudence that produced the contested map would be an exercise in futility. If this Court issues a decision here without the Court's *Callais* decision, it is highly likely that a renewed round of lawsuits challenging this map under the new guidance will follow, from whichever side the decision favors. As such, delaying this action not only helps ensure the remedy in this case will comply with current and very near future law, but it will also better serve judicial economy than engaging in another round of avoidable litigation.

The third factor, the potential for prejudice if the modification is allowed, is also satisfied. A continuance to consider the U.S. Supreme Court's latest insights on the murky waters of redistricting jurisprudence is a minimal delay considering that this slight delay can save this Court from hearing an entirely new case based upon the *Callais* decision. Taking additional time at the district court level will help ensure a proper outcome.

Finally, the fourth factor, the availability of a continuance to cure such prejudice, is clearly met. By staying this action, this Court can help avoid wasting the Court's, Plaintiffs', and Defendant's time and resources on yet another round of multi-year redistricting litigation.

### **III. Conclusion**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court stay this matter until the United States Supreme Court issues its decision in the *Callais* case.

Dated: September 15, 2025

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

/s/ Dallin B. Holt

Dallin B. Holt \* (DC Bar #1722555)  
HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN TORCHINSKY  
& JOSEFIAK, PLLC  
2555 E. Camelback Road, Suite 700  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016  
Telephone: (602) 388-1262  
Facsimile: (540) 341-8809  
Email: [dholt@HoltzmanVogel.com](mailto:dholt@HoltzmanVogel.com)

Jason B. Torchinsky\* (VA Bar # 47481)  
HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN TORCHINSKY  
& JOSEFIAK, PLLC  
2300 N. St. NW, Ste. 643A  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Telephone: (202) 737-8808  
Email: [jtorchinsky@HoltzmanVogel.com](mailto:jtorchinsky@HoltzmanVogel.com)

Reid A. Jones (#34611)  
WIENER, WEISS & MADISON APC  
330 Marshall Street, Suite 1000  
Shreveport, Louisiana 71101  
Telephone: (318) 226-9100  
Facsimile: (318) 424-5128  
Email: [rjones@wwmlaw.com](mailto:rjones@wwmlaw.com)

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*  
*\*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

**CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this day I electronically served the foregoing document upon all counsel of record via the Court's CM/ECF filing system.

DATED this 15<sup>th</sup> day of September 2025.

/s/ Dallin B. Holt

Dallin B. Holt

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA  
SHREVEPORT DIVISION**

**DAVID B. MEANS, ET AL.**

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:23-cv-00669**

**VERSUS**

**JUDGE JERRY EDWARDS, JR.**

**DESOTO PARISH, ET AL.**

**MAGISTRATE JUDGE HORNSBY**

**[PROPOSED] ORDER**

Considering the Motion to Stay (“Motion”) filed by Plaintiffs, David B. Means, Ryan Dupree, Robert G. Burford, Robert Gross, Mary L. Salley, Martha Trisler, John F. Pearce, Joe Cobb, Jack L. Buford, Jack E. Barron, W. Bruce Garlington, Donald Barber, Billy Dwayne Brumley, and Sherry Brumley (collectively “Plaintiffs”);

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiffs’ Motion is GRANTED. This case shall be stayed until the United States Supreme Court issues its decision in *Louisiana v. Callais*.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all pending deadlines are stayed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs shall file a notice with this Court of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Louisiana v. Callais* within 10 days of its issuance.

THUS DONE AND SIGNED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2025, in Shreveport, Louisiana.

---

JUDGE JERRY EDWARDS, JR.  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA