

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TALLAHASSEE DIVISION**

**UNITED SOVEREIGN  
AMERICANS, INC., et al.,**

*Petitioners,*

v.

**Case No.: 4:24cv327-MW/MAF**

**CORD BYRD, et al.,**

*Respondents.*

---

**ORDER GRANTING STATE RESPONDENTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

This Court has considered, without hearing, the Florida Secretary of State's and the Acting Attorney General of Florida's motion to dismiss, ECF No. 34, Petitioners' response, ECF No. 35, and the Respondents' reply, ECF No. 37. This Court agrees with the Respondents' well-reasoned briefs and concludes that the State Respondents have the better of the argument. Petitioners' claims against the Florida Secretary of State and the Acting Attorney General of Florida are due to be dismissed.

For starters, this Court lacks jurisdiction to review Petitioners' claims against the Florida Secretary of State and the Acting Attorney General, because Petitioners have not demonstrated Article III standing to seek relief against them. *See, e.g.*, ECF No. 34 at 6–10; ECF No. 37 at 2–4. This Court also lacks jurisdiction to grant the

requested relief under the All Writs Act against the Florida Secretary of State and the Acting Attorney General, because these Respondents are state officials and not federal officers or employees. *See* ECF No. 37 at 4–6.

Likewise, this Court agrees with Respondents that, setting aside the jurisdictional defects, Petitioners improperly ask this Court to compel Respondents to perform discretionary duties, including to investigate, correct, and prosecute certain statutory violations. *Id.* at 7; *see also* ECF No. 34 at 12–13. As Respondents correctly note, Petitioners fail to allege any nondiscretionary duty on their part, and thus, Petitioners’ mandamus claim necessarily fails to state a plausible claim for relief.

Accordingly, the motion to dismiss the petition for relief, ECF No. 34, is **GRANTED**. Petitioners’ claims for relief against the Florida Secretary of State and the Acting Attorney General are **DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction**. This case remains pending against the State Supervisors of Elections.

**SO ORDERED on January 29, 2025.**

**s/Mark E. Walker**  
**Chief United States District Judge**