

SUPREME COURT OF ARKANSAS

No. 10-985

APRIL FORRESTER, INDIVIDUALLY
AND AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF ALL
SIMILARLY SITUATED CITIZENS OF
ARKANSAS,

PETITIONER,

VS.

CHARLIE DANIELS, IN HIS OFFICIAL
CAPACITY AS SECRETARY OF
STATE OF ARKANSAS,

RESPONDENT,

Opinion Delivered September 30, 2010

MOTION TO SHORTEN THE TIME
WITHIN WHICH THE
RESPONDENT HAS TO FILE AN
ANSWER OR RESPONSIVE
PLEADING AND TO SHORTEN THE
BRIEFING TIME SET BY RULE 4-4
OF THE RULES OF THE ARKANSAS
SUPREME COURT

MOTION TO EXPEDITE GRANTED;
BRIEFING SCHEDULE
ESTABLISHED; ORAL ARGUMENT
GRANTED.

PER CURIAM

Petitioner April Forrester, individually and as a representative of all similarly situated voter-citizens of Arkansas, has filed a petition for injunctive relief and petition for writ of mandamus against Respondent Charlie Daniels, the Secretary of State of Arkansas. The substance of Forrester's petition asks this court, among other things, to order Secretary of State Daniels to withdraw the certified ballot title for proposed constitutional amendment No. 2, which is currently set to be voted upon by the voters of Arkansas at the November 2, 2010 election.

In conjunction with her petition for injunctive relief and petition for writ of mandamus, Forrester has filed a motion asking the court to expedite the proceedings, establish

Cite as 2010 Ark. 362

a briefing schedule, and grant oral argument on her petition. Because of the time-sensitive nature of this matter, we grant Forrester's motion to expedite and set the following briefing schedule for the response and briefs. Secretary of State Daniels shall have until October 4, 2010 to file a pleading responsive to Forrester's petition. Forrester shall then have until October 8, 2010 to file a brief in this matter, and Secretary of State Daniels's brief shall be due on October 15, 2010. No reply brief will be permitted. We further grant Forrester's request for oral argument and set oral argument for October 21, 2010.

In addition to the issues raised in Forrester's brief, we request that the parties brief and address the question of whether this court has original jurisdiction to hear this controversy pursuant to Arkansas Constitution amendment 80.