

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI  
NORTHERN DIVISION

MISSISSIPPI STATE CONFERENCE OF  
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR  
THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED  
PEOPLE, ET AL.

PLAINTIFFS

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:22-CV-734-DPJ-HSO-LHS

STATE BOARD OF ELECTION  
COMMISSIONERS, ET AL.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Yesterday, Plaintiffs filed a notice [236] asking the Court to establish a briefing schedule; Defendants objected [237]. Because Local Rule 7(b) requires a motion whenever a party seeks court action, the Court instructed the Clerk of Court to re-docket the submissions as a motion and response.

Under Plaintiffs' proposed schedule, objections to the newly enacted re-districting plans would be due March 14, 2025, Defendants would have until March 21 to respond, and Plaintiffs could reply by March 26. *See* Mot. [238]. Defendants oppose this because they believe time is of the essence and that the objections are currently due on March 12. Defs.' Resp. [239] at 2. According to them, "[a]dditional briefing threatens expeditious judicial approval." *Id.* at 3.

Given the mere two-day difference in the parties' suggested due dates for objections, the Court sees no prejudice in granting Plaintiffs' request to object by March 14. Plaintiffs have informed the Court that they intend to file substantive objections with supporting materials and expert reports. While Defendants understandably seek a speedy

resolution, they will need to file a substantive response, and the proposed deadline for that seems as tight as practical. Plaintiffs' reply will be due seven days after Defendants respond.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that Plaintiffs' motion [238] to impose a briefing schedule is GRANTED consistent with the deadlines stated in this Order.

**SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** this the 11th day of March, 2025.

*s/ Daniel P. Jordan III*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE