

James C. Phillips (17302)  
Tyler B. Lindley (18635)  
SCHAERR | JAFFE LLP  
299 S. Main Street, Suite 1300  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Telephone: (202) 787-1060  
Facsimile: (202) 776-0136  
jphillips@schaerr-jaffe.com  
tlindley@schaerr-jaffe.com

Gene C. Schaerr\*  
Justin A. Miller \*  
SCHAERR | JAFFE LLP  
1717 K Street NW, Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 787-1060  
gschaerr@schaerr-jaffe.com  
jmiller@schaerr-jaffe.com

*\*Pro hac vice pending*

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

---

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF UTAH**

---

COMMISSIONER AMELIA POWERS  
GARDNER, a registered Utah voter and  
elected official, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DEIDRE  
HENDERSON, in her official capacity,

Defendant.

**PLAINTIFFS' REPLY TO  
PROPOSED INTERVENOR'S  
OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO  
EXPEDITE BRIEFING AND  
HEARING FOR THEIR MOTION  
FOR PRELIMINARY  
INJUNCTION**

Case No. 2:26-cv-00084-RJS

District Judge Robert J. Shelby

**THREE-JUDGE PANEL  
REQUESTED**

---

The Proposed Intervenors do not dispute any of the deadlines requiring expedition of Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction. The Lieutenant Governor, the only other party currently in this case, informed Plaintiffs yesterday that she needs a decision in this case by February 23, 2026 to implement any relief. Nor do Proposed Intervenors dispute that a decision after that date would be too late to provide Plaintiffs the relief they need. Most importantly, Proposed Intervenors carefully avoid discussing the fact that the only parties who are now actually part of this lawsuit have consented to the proposed briefing schedule.

In fact, the Proposed Intervenors do not identify a single reason why this Court cannot resolve Plaintiffs' preliminary injunction motion (Doc. 19) on an expedited basis. Nor do they identify any concrete prejudice to Proposed Intervenors *from expedited briefing*. Instead, they preview various merits defenses that can be addressed on the same expedited schedule that Plaintiffs have proposed.

In a nutshell, Proposed Intervenors' opposition notes that they want to file motions to dismiss or stay and litigate threshold issues at a leisurely pace. This gamesmanship is precisely why intervention should not be granted. Where a case implicates imminent elections and purely legal constitutional questions, federal courts routinely expedite. Nothing about this case justifies delay. The motion to expedite should be granted.

## ARGUMENT

The Proposed Intervenors offer no reason the Court should not decide the legal questions in this case quickly. They offer only merits arguments why they believe that Plaintiffs are not entitled to relief, based on an as-yet-unseen motion to dismiss. Assuming the panel allows them to intervene, despite their apparent efforts merely to delay these proceedings, Plaintiffs would be willing to brief that motion to dismiss so that it can be decided by February 13th. But none of Proposed Intervenors' arguments justifies the delay they seek.

1. The Proposed Intervenors first raise some sort of laches argument that Plaintiffs waited too long to bring this federal lawsuit. Opp. ¶¶2, 10. Even if their premise were correct, that argument seems better suited for a motion to dismiss than a reason to oppose expedition. But their argument is misguided regardless.

The Proposed Intervenors' distortions make it appear that Plaintiffs have delayed filing their lawsuit for three months. But Map 1 was still being altered until December 5, 2025. *See* Dkt. at 5, *League of Women Voters of Utah v. Utah State Legislature*, No. 220901712 (Utah Dist. Ct., Salt Lake Cnty.) (Ruling Regarding Nov. 21, 2025 Order Clarifying Boundary Issues, Dec. 5, 2025) (Exhibit A). And the final order purporting to make Map 1 Utah's congressional map for 2026 was not entered until January 6, 2026.<sup>1</sup> *See* Ex. A at 6 (Final Judgment, Jan. 6, 2026). Plaintiffs filed

---

<sup>1</sup> This final order came almost one year after the January 31, 2025 hearing on cross-motions for summary judgment from the Attempted Intervenors and the State

this lawsuit only 27 days later and sought a preliminary injunction soon thereafter while waiting for the three-judge panel to be selected. Doc. 19. Most important, Plaintiffs could not have filed their lawsuit until the final order without risking dismissal.<sup>2</sup> *See Growe v. Emison*, 507 U.S. 25, 30, 36 (1993).

What is more, the Proposed Intervenors do not come before this Court with clean hands. When Judge Gibson altered Map 1 to clarify boundary issues on December 5th, the State Legislature sought entry of a final order so it could appeal. *See Ex. A at 5* (Mot. for Entry of Final Judgment, Dec. 9, 2025). But the Proposed Intervenors opposed entry of a final order. *See Ex. A at 5* (Pls.’ Mem. in Opp’n to Mot. for Entry of Final Judgment, Dec. 12, 2025). Judge Gibson sided with the Proposed Intervenors and on December 26th denied the request for a final order. *See Ex. A at 5* (Ruling and Order, Dec. 26, 2025). Judge Gibson did not enter a final order until January 6, 2026. *See Ex. A at 6* (Judgment Entered, Jan. 6, 2026). Having delayed the entry of final judgment there, the Proposed Intervenors can hardly complain that the Plaintiffs were thereby delayed in filing the present suit.

2. Contrary to Proposed Intervenors, standing here is clear, *cf.* Opp. ¶¶3-4, especially following the Supreme Court’s recent decision in *Bost v. Ill. State Bd. of*

---

Legislature. The ruling on those motions was then delayed for seven months until August 22, 2025.

<sup>2</sup> District courts cannot rule on a motion to dismiss until a three-judge panel is appointed. *See Shapiro v. McManus*, 577 U.S. 39, 43-44, 46 (2015) (plaintiffs need clear only the “low bar” of not being “essentially fictitious,” “obviously frivolous,” etc.).

*Elections*, 607 U.S. --, 2026 WL 96707 (2026). See Doc. 19 at 10-18. And only one plaintiff needs standing; the congressional candidates clearly qualify. *Bost*, 2026 WL 96707, at \*3 n.3 (“[O]nly one plaintiff needs standing for a suit to proceed.” (citing *Biden v. Nebraska*, 600 U.S. 477, 489 (2023))). In any event, standing here is primarily a legal question that is already part of the briefing for the motion for preliminary injunction and resolved on an expedited schedule. It is not a reason to postpone briefing altogether.

In any event, the Supreme Court cases that the Proposed Intervenors rely on for their standing arguments favor Plaintiffs, as set out extensively in their motion for preliminary injunction. See Doc. 19 at 13-14 (discussing *Lane v. Coffman*, 549 U.S. 437, 442 (2007)), 16-18 (discussing *Grove v. Emison*, 507 U.S. 25, 32 (1993)).

3. Proposed Intervenors are also wrong in suggesting that the current lawsuit is somehow foreclosed by the pendency of the state court action. The Supreme Court has reiterated that federal and state courts can concurrently exercise jurisdiction over congressional redistricting challenges. Doc. 19 at 17 (citing *Grove*, 507 U.S. at 32); see also *Thompson v. Smith*, 52 F. Supp. 2d 1364, 1368 (M.D. Ala. 1999) (“[I]n *Grove*, the Supreme Court acknowledged that, after the state court had completed its proceeding, the federal court later rightfully took up the remaining [federal] claim.... *Grove* did not require that the plaintiffs there pursue their [federal] claim in state court as well.”). But regardless, the pendency of the other action is still no reason for this Court to *delay* resolution of this proceeding.

4. The Proposed Intervenors also mischaracterize Plaintiffs’ lawsuit as a “collateral attack” on their state judgment against S.B. 200. Not so. Plaintiffs do not challenge that judgment at all and S.B. 200 is not implicated here. Instead, Plaintiffs are challenging the congressional map (Map 1) that the state court purported to adopt as a *remedy* for its finding as to S.B. 200—without any finding that the pre-existing (2021) map was in any way unlawful. That the Proposed Intervenors are the ones who created Map 1 does not mean they get to defend it against “collateral attack” in perpetuity.

The Proposed Intervenors’ perspective that they can step in and thwart constitutional challenges to Map 1 under the “collateral attack” label speaks volumes about who its author is and the constitutionality of that map under the Elections Clause. But it does not provide any basis for denying Plaintiffs’ motion to expedite. Plaintiffs are not seeking any relief against Judge Gibson. Plaintiffs believe the Lieutenant Governor is implementing an unconstitutional map and are entitled to challenge that implementation. Such challenges are not impermissible collateral attacks. *See, e.g., Grove*, 507 U.S. at 36 (federal courts are “empowered to entertain the ... claims relating to ... redistricting ... to the extent those claims challenged the *state court’s* plan”). The Proposed Intervenors’ merits arguments are no reason to deny the motion to expedite.

5. The Proposed Intervenors’ main mission seems to be to delay these proceedings—which counsels strongly against granting their motion to intervene.

And that is ironic, since counsel for the Proposed Intervenors are more often plaintiffs in redistricting litigation, and are no strangers to expedited briefing requests of their own. *See, e.g.*, Pls.-Appellants' Mot. for Expedited Briefing and Decision, *Jackson v. Tarrant County*, No. 25-11055 (5th Cir. Sep. 18, 2025), ECF No. 4.

In all events, the Proposed Intervenors have already demonstrated that they are already well-equipped to meet the briefing schedule the actual parties have already agreed to. The Proposed Intervenors have already previewed their merits arguments here, claim to already have a motion to dismiss nearly ready, and further claim that similar issues are involved in the state lawsuit that they have been litigating for nearly four years.

### **CONCLUSION**

The Proposed Intervenors offer this Court no legitimate reason to deny the pending motion to expedite the briefing and decision of this critically important case. Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court grant their motion to expedite.

February 7, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/James C. Phillips

JAMES C. PHILLIPS

Utah Bar No. 17302

TYLER B. LINDLEY

Utah Bar No. 18635

SCHAERR | JAFFE LLP

299 S. Main Street, Suite 1300

Salt Lake City, UT 84111

jphillips@schaerr-jaffe.com

tlindley@schaerr-jaffe.com

GENE C. SCHAERR\*

D.C. Bar No. 416368

JUSTIN A. MILLER\*

D.C. Bar No. 90022870

SCHAERR | JAFFE LLP

1717 K Street NW, Suite 900

Washington, DC 20006

gschaerr@schaerr-jaffe.com

jmiller@schaerr-jaffe.com

*\*Pro hac vice application pending*

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

### **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

I certify that this motion complies with the requirements of DUCivR 7-1(a)(4)(D) and 10-1 because this motion was prepared in 12-point Century Schoolbook, a proportionally spaced typeface, using Microsoft Word, and because this motion contains 1,448 words.

Dated: February 7, 2026

/s/ James C. Phillips  
James C. Phillips (17302)

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on February 7, 2026, the foregoing motion was filed with the Clerk of the Court by this CM/ECF filing system, which will cause all counsel of record to be served electronically.

Dated: February 7, 2026

/s/ James C. Phillips  
James C. Phillips (17302)

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

# **EXHIBIT A**

**THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT - SALT LAKE COUNTY DISTRICT COURT  
SALT LAKE, STATE OF UTAH**

**LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF UTAH, et al. vs. UTAH STATE LEGISLATURE, et al.**

**CASE NUMBER** 220901712 - Civil Rights

CURRENT ASSIGNED JUDGE: DIANNA GIBSON

**Parties**

<b>Relationship</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Represented By</b>
Defendant	UTAH STATE LEGISLATURE	ROBERT REES JOHN FELLOWS ERIC WEEKS THOMAS VAUGHN TYLER GREEN VICTORIA ASHBY CHRISTINE GILBERT ALAN HOUSTON MICHAEL CURTIS SOREN GEIGER OLIVIA ROGERS James P McGlone MARIE E SAYER
Defendant	UTAH LEGISLATIVE REDISTRICTING	ROBERT REES JOHN FELLOWS ERIC WEEKS THOMAS VAUGHN TYLER GREEN VICTORIA ASHBY CHRISTINE GILBERT ALAN HOUSTON MICHAEL CURTIS SOREN GEIGER OLIVIA ROGERS James P McGlone MARIE E SAYER
Defendant	SCOTT SANDALL	ROBERT REES JOHN FELLOWS ERIC WEEKS THOMAS VAUGHN TYLER GREEN VICTORIA ASHBY CHRISTINE GILBERT ALAN HOUSTON MICHAEL CURTIS SOREN GEIGER OLIVIA ROGERS James P McGlone
Defendant	BRAD WILSON	ROBERT REES JOHN FELLOWS ERIC WEEKS THOMAS VAUGHN TYLER GREEN VICTORIA ASHBY CHRISTINE GILBERT ALAN HOUSTON MICHAEL CURTIS SOREN GEIGER OLIVIA ROGERS James P McGlone

October 28, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
October 28, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
October 29, 2025	Filed: Legislative Defendants Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law
October 29, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
October 29, 2025	Filed: Plaintiffs Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law
October 29, 2025	Filed: Transcript of 10/23 Evidentiary Hearing (Rough)
October 29, 2025	Filed: Transcript of 10/24 Evidentiary Hearing (Rough)
October 29, 2025	Filed: Reply in Support of Plaintiffs Motion for Preliminary Injunction on Counts 16-21 of Third Supplemental Complaint
October 29, 2025	Filed: Request/Notice to Submit (1) Motion for Leave to File Third Supplemental Complaint, and (2) Motion for Preliminary Injunction on Counts 16-21 of Third Supplemental Complaint
October 29, 2025	Filed: Order (Proposed) Granting Plaintiffs Motion for Leave to File Third Supplemental Complaint
October 29, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
October 29, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 03, 2025	Filed: Request and Order For Electronic Media Coverage of Court Proceedings
November 03, 2025	Filed: Final Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing (Day 1)
November 03, 2025	Filed: Final Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing (Day 2)
November 03, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 03, 2025	Filed: Notice of Plaintiff's Hand Delivered Flash Drive
November 03, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 04, 2025	Filed: Audio Request Media/MP3
November 04, 2025	Fee Account created
November 04, 2025	Fee Payment
November 04, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 04, 2025	ORAL ARUGMENT
November 05, 2025	Filed: Minute Entry
November 05, 2025	Filed: Plaintiffs Submission in Response to November 5, 2025 Minute Entry
November 05, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 05, 2025	Filed: Plaintiffs Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law (Final Transcript Citations)
November 05, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 06, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 06, 2025	Filed: Legislative Defendants Amended Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law
November 06, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 07, 2025	Filed: Letter to the Court Regarding Legislative Record Citation and Flash Drives
November 07, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 10, 2025	Filed: Ruling and Order
November 11, 2025	Filed: Order Granting Plaintiffs Motion for Leave to File Third Supplemental Complaint
November 11, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 11, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 13, 2025	Filed: Notice of Conventional Filing of Flash Drive Containing Map 1 Shapefile
November 13, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 13, 2025	Filed: Letter to the Court Regarding ShapeFile for Map 1 Flash Drive Delivery
November 13, 2025	Filed: Notice of Delivery of Shapefile for Map 1
November 13, 2025	Filed: Lieutenant Governor Deidre Henderson s Notice of Receipt of Court-Approved Source GIS Data for Map 1
November 13, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 13, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 14, 2025	Filed: TRANSADMIN TRANSCRIPT for Hearing 11-04-2025

November 14, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 17, 2025	Filed: Audio Request Media/MP3
November 17, 2025	Fee Account created
November 17, 2025	Fee Payment
November 17, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 18, 2025	Filed: Request/Notice to Submit for Decision: Lt. Governor Henderson s Notice of Boundary Issues and 52(b) Motion for Clarification
November 18, 2025	Filed: Declaration of Mark Mitchell in Support of Lieutenant Governor Deidre Henderson s Notice of Boundary Issues and Motion for Clarification
November 18, 2025	Filed: Notice of Boundary Issues and Rule 52(b) Motion for Clarification (Expedited Decision Requested)
November 18, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 19, 2025	Filed: Plaintiffs Submission in Response to Lieutenant Governor s Notice of Boundary Issues and Motion
November 19, 2025	Filed: Affidavit/Declaration of Dr. Jowei Chen in Support of Plaintiffs Response to Lieutenant Governor s Notice of Boundary Issues and Motion
November 19, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 19, 2025	BOUNDARY/CLARIFICATION HEARIN 11/19/2025
November 19, 2025	NOTICE for Case 220901712 ID 25861630
November 19, 2025	BOUNDARY/CLARIFICATION HEARIN 11/19/2025
November 19, 2025	NOTICE for Case 220901712 ID 25861640
November 19, 2025	Filed: Notice for Case 220901712 CR Judge: DIANNA GIBSON
November 19, 2025	Filed: Notice for Case 220901712 CR Judge: DIANNA GIBSON
November 19, 2025	Filed: Order (Proposed) Clarifying Boundary Issues Raised by Lieutenant Governor
November 19, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 19, 2025	BOUNDARY/CLARIFICATION HEARING
November 19, 2025	Filed: Audio Request Media/MP3 for November 4th Hearing
November 19, 2025	Fee Account created
November 19, 2025	Fee Payment
November 19, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 19, 2025	Filed: Legislative Defendants Response to Lieutenant Governor s Notice of Boundary Issues and Rule 52(b) Motion for Clarification
November 19, 2025	Filed: Exhibit A to Legislative Defendants Response--Declaration of Michael Barber
November 19, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 19, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 20, 2025	Filed: Defendant Lt. Governor Henderson s Supplemental Brief Re: Her Rule 52(b) Motion for Clarification
November 20, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 20, 2025	Filed: Audio Request Media/MP3 for November 19th Hearing
November 20, 2025	Fee Account created
November 20, 2025	Fee Payment
November 20, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 20, 2025	Filed: Plaintiffs Submission in Response to Lieutenant Governor s November 20 Supplemental Brief
November 20, 2025	Filed: Affidavit/Declaration Second Declaration of Dr. Oskooii re Boundary Issues
November 20, 2025	Filed: Affidavit/Declaration Second Declaration of Dr. Chen re Boundary Issues
November 20, 2025	Filed: Order (Proposed) Clarifying Boundary Issues Raised by Lieutenant Governor
November 20, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 20, 2025	Filed: Plaintiffs Response to Legislative Defendants Response to Lieutenant Governor s Notice of Boundary Issues and Rule 52(b) Motion for Clarification
November 20, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 21, 2025	Filed: Notice of Conventional Filing of Map 1A Shapefile
November 21, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification

November 21, 2025	Filed: Order Clarifying Boundary Issues Raised by Lieutenant Governor
November 21, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 21, 2025	Filed: Notice of Delivery for Flashdrive Containing Shapefile for Map 1A
November 21, 2025	Filed: Plaintiffs' Conventional Filing of Map 1A Shapefile (Conventionally Filed)
November 21, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 22, 2025	Filed: Plaintiffs' Supplemental Response to Legislative Defendants' Response to Lieutenant Governor's Notice of Boundary Issues and Rule 52(b) Motion for Clarification
November 22, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
November 24, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 05, 2025	Filed: Ruling Regarding November 21, 2025 Order Clarifying Boundary Issues And Denying Legislative Defendants' Request For Reconsideration And For A Stay
December 05, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 09, 2025	Filed: Motion for entry of final judgment (expedited consideration requested)
December 09, 2025	Filed: Ex 1 Proposed Final Judgment
December 09, 2025	Filed: Ex 2 Plaintiffs' Email
December 09, 2025	Filed: Request/Notice to Submit Legislative Defendants' motion for entry of final judgment (expedited consideration requested)
December 09, 2025	Filed: Order (Proposed) granting expedited consideration
December 09, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 11, 2025	Filed: Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification (expedited consideration requested)
December 11, 2025	Filed: Exhibit 1
December 11, 2025	Filed: Motion for expedited consideration of Legislative Defendants' motion for Rule 54(b) certification
December 11, 2025	Filed: Request/Notice to Submit Legislative Defendants' motion for expedited consideration of the motion for Rule 54(b) certification
December 11, 2025	Filed: Order (Proposed) granting expedited consideration of the motion for Rule 54(b) certification
December 11, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 11, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 12, 2025	Filed: Opposition to Legislative Defendants' Motion for Entry of Final Judgment
December 12, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 14, 2025	Filed: Reply to Plaintiffs' Opposition to Legislative Defendants' Motion for Entry of Final Judgment
December 14, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 16, 2025	Filed: Minute Entry re: Briefing Schedule and Rulings on the Pending Motions for Entry of Final Judgment and For Rule 54(B) Certification
December 16, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 17, 2025	Filed: Opposition to Legislative Defendants' Motion for Rule 54(b) Certification
December 17, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 18, 2025	Filed: Reply in support of motion for Rule 54(b) certification
December 18, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 22, 2025	Filed: Court Correspondence
December 22, 2025	MOTION HEARING set on 12/22/2025
December 22, 2025	NOTICE for Case 220901712 ID 25938471
December 22, 2025	Filed: Notice for Case 220901712 CR Judge: DIANNA GIBSON
December 22, 2025	CLARIFICATION HEARING
December 22, 2025	Filed: Audio Request Media/MP3 Expedited Request for Copy of Audio Record
December 22, 2025	Fee Account created
December 22, 2025	Fee Payment
December 22, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 22, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 23, 2025	Filed: Legislative Defendants' Notice of Supplemental Authority and Clarification

December 23, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 23, 2025	Filed: Plaintiffs Response to Legislative Defendants Notice of Supplemental Authority and Clarification
December 23, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 26, 2025	Filed: Ruling and Order Denying Legislative Defendants' Motion for Entry of Final Judgment and Granting Legislative Defendants' Motion for Rule of Certification
December 26, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 29, 2025	Filed: Other - Not Signed Order (Proposed) Clarifying Boundary Issues Raised by Lieutenant Governor
December 29, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 30, 2025	Filed: Other - Not Signed Order (Proposed) granting expedited consideration of the motion for Rule 54(b) certification
December 30, 2025	Filed: Other - Not Signed Order (Proposed) granting expedited consideration
December 30, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
December 30, 2025	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
January 05, 2026	Filed: Objection to Legislative Defendants Proposed Certification as Final Judgment Under Rule 54(b)
January 05, 2026	Filed: Exhibit 1 - Legislative Defendants Proposed Judgment
January 05, 2026	Filed: Exhibit 2 - Redline of Judgment Showing Plaintiffs Changes
January 05, 2026	Filed: Judgment (Proposed) Exhibit 3 - Clean Version of Judgment Incorporating Plaintiffs Changes
January 05, 2026	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
January 05, 2026	Filed: Legislative Defendants Reply in Support of Proposed Rule 54(b) Judgment
January 05, 2026	Filed: Exhibit A - Legislative Defendants Amended Proposed Judgment
January 05, 2026	Filed: Exhibit B - Redline of Legislative Defendants Proposed Judgment
January 05, 2026	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
January 06, 2026	Filed: Judgment Rule 54(b) Certified Judgment
January 06, 2026	Judgment Entered - Amount \$0.00
January 06, 2026	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
January 07, 2026	Filed: Notice of Appeal - Civil (not Interlocutory) Legislative Defendants Notice of Appeal
January 07, 2026	Fee Account created
January 07, 2026	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification
January 08, 2026	Filed: Supreme Court of Utah Letter dated 1-7-2026 - (Appeal filed - Case #20260019-SC should be indicated on future filings)
January 08, 2026	Filed: Return of Electronic Notification

**Account Summary**

Account	Details
REVENUE DETAIL - TYPE: COMPLAINT 0K-2K	Amount Due: \$ 90.00 Amount Paid: \$ 90.00 Amount Credit: \$ 0.00 <b>Balance: * \$ 0.00</b>
REVENUE DETAIL - TYPE: ELEC STORAGE MEDIUM	Amount Due: \$ 15.00 Amount Paid: \$ 15.00 Amount Credit: \$ 0.00 <b>Balance: * \$ 0.00</b>
REVENUE DETAIL - TYPE: FLOPPY DISK COPY	Amount Due: \$ 15.00 Amount Paid: \$ 15.00 Amount Credit: \$ 0.00 <b>Balance: * \$ 0.00</b>