

It is not even certain that this action should be considered the “first-filed” redistricting case for purposes of deciding questions of consolidation and transfer. This matter was initiated before the Legislature acted upon, and the Governor signed, redistricting legislation. The complaint even questioned whether the Legislature would adopt new lines at all. And, in a Joint Advisory on October 26, Plaintiffs announced that they “now intend to pursue similar claims in state court, the resolution of which may impact the issues before [this] Court.” (Dkt. 23, at 2). Both sides agreed that there is no need for this three-judge court to address, immediately, the requested relief, including an injunction or dismissal. (*Id.*).

There is no reasonable chance that anything decided in the instant matter will conflict with potential rulings in the other pending cases as to which the state requests consolidation into this case. Accordingly, the first motion to consolidate, (Dkt. 20), and the second motion to consolidate, (Dkt. 26), are **DENIED**. This ruling is without prejudice to any party, in this or any other of the pending three-judge redistricting cases, to seek or suggest consolidation, transfer, abatement, or other appropriate relief.

SIGNED on November 9, 2021 on behalf of the Three-Judge Panel.



ROBERT PITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE