IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA ATLANTA DIVISION

NEW GEORGIA PROJECT, et al., Plaintiffs,

v.

BRAD RAFFENSPERGER, in his official capacity as Georgia Secretary of State, et al., Defendants.

GEORGIA STATE CONFERENCE OF THE NAACP, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BRAD RAFFENSPERGER, Secretary of State of Georgia, in his official capacity,

Defendant.

SECURE FAMILIES INITIATIVE and their members,

Plaintiff,

V

BRAD RAFFENSPERGER, in his official capacity as the Secretary of State of Georgia, et al.,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:24-cv-03412-SDG

Civil Action No. 1:24-cv-04287-SDG

Civil Action No. 1:24-cv-04659-SDG

CONSOLIDATION ORDER

On October 24, 2024, the Court entered an Order directing the parties in each of these cases to show cause why the actions should not be consolidated. No party

¹ Case 3412, ECF 129; Case 4287, ECF 41; Case 4659, ECF 24.

objected to pretrial consolidation.² Accordingly, the Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to **CONSOLIDATE** the above-captioned cases for all pretrial purposes. All filings should be made only in Case No. 1:24-cv-03412-SDG unless the Court otherwise directs. The Court defers ruling on whether consolidation for purposes of trial

(if any) is appropriate.

The parties are **ORDERED** to confer **no later than November 15**, **2024** concerning a proposed schedule for (1) Plaintiffs to file a consolidated amended complaint and (2) Defendants to answer, move to dismiss, or otherwise respond to the amended pleading. Defendants may move to dismiss without regard to whether they filed an answer in response to the initial complaint filed in their individual case(s). The parties shall submit the proposed schedule to the Court **no later than November 22**, **2024**. If the parties are unable to agree on such a schedule, their respective positions shall be set out in the submission.

SO ORDERED this 4th day of November, 2024.

Steven D. Grimberg
United States District Judge

Defendants Brad Raffensperger and the Georgia State Board of Elections, however, argue that – for reasons of judicial efficiency – the Court should rule on motions to dismiss before consolidating. See, e.g., Case 3412, ECF 136.