

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF MISSOURI  
COLE COUNTY, DIVISION 4  
2 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER K. LIMBAUGH

3 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
MERRIE LUTHER ET AL, )  
PETITIONERS, )  
4 Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official  
vs. ) Case No. 25AC-CC06964  
5 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an  
DENNY HOSKINS, )  
6 Defendant. )  
an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
7

8 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
11-12-2025

10 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
11

12 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
On November 12, 2025, the above cause came on for  
13 hearing before the HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER K. LIMBAUGH,

14 Document Judge of Division 4 of the Circuit Court of Cole County,  
15 Missouri, at Kansas City.

16 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
17

18 Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
19 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
20

21 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
22

23

24 Candice K. Perez, Certified Court Reporter  
Official Court Reporter, Division 9  
25 16th Judicial Circuit, Kansas City

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
APPEARANCES

2 Petitioner: Merrie Luther appears by:  
CHARLES HATFIELD,  
3 ALIXANDRA COSSETTE  
DENISE LIEBERMAN,  
4 STINSON, LLP  
230 West McCarty Street,  
5 Jefferson City, MO 65101

6  
7 an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

8 Defendant: Denny Hoskins appears by:  
9 LOUIS CAPOZZI,  
JOSEPH KIERNAN  
ATTORNEY GENERAL  
450 Massachusetts Avenue Northwest,  
10 Washington, DC 20001

11  
12 Intervenor: Missouri Republican State Committee appears by:  
13 MARC ELLINGER,  
JOHN GORE  
ELLINGER and ASSOCIATES, LLC  
14 428 East Capitol Avenue,  
Jefferson City, MO 65101

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1	Index
2	Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document
3	Not an Official Court Document Wednesday, November 12, 2025 in Official Court Document
4	PROCEEDINGS
5	Case called 7
6	Petitioner's evidence 8
7	Petitioner's argument 9
8	Defendant's argument 23
9	Intervenor's argument 32
10	Petitioner's reply 37
11	Petitioner rests 39
12	Defendant rests 39
13	Intervenor rests 39
14	Trial concluded 39
15	Reporter's Certificate 40
16	Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document
17	Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document
18	Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document
19	Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document
20	Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document
21	Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
2 PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

3 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

4 Document Exhibit A: Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
5 Exhibit B: Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
6 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
7 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
8 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
9 Not an Official Court Document  
10 Not an Official Court Document  
11 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
12 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
13 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
14 Not an Official Court Document  
15 Not an Official Court Document  
16 Not an Official Court Document  
17 Not an Official Court Document  
18 Not an Official Court Document  
19 Not an Official Court Document  
20 Not an Official Court Document  
21 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
22 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
23 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
24 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
25 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document



1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document **INTERVENOR'S EXHIBITS**

2 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

3 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

4 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

5 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

6 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

7 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

8 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

9 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document (No exhibits marked for the record.) Not an Official Court Document

10 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

11 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

12 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

13 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

14 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

15 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

16 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

17 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

18 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

19 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

20 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

21 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

22 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

23

24

25

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
1 11/12/2025  
2 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
2 THE COURT: The Court calls case No. 25AC-CC06964.  
3 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
3 This is Merrie Luther versus Denny Hoskins. Would the  
4 Document attorneys please introduce themselves and whom they represent.  
4

5 MR. HATFIELD: Good morning, Your Honor. Chuck  
5 Hatfield and Alix Cossette from -- from Stinson for the  
6 an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
6 plaintiffs. We'll also be joined shortly by Denise Lieberman.  
7 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
7 She is also entered, but got a flat tire.  
8

9 THE COURT: Oh.

10 MR. CAPOZZI: Good morning, Your Honor. Louis  
10 Capozzi, the Solicitor General for the state, along with Joe  
11 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
11 Kiernan the Assistant Solicitor General.

12 MR. ELLINGER: Good morning, Judge. Marc Ellinger at  
12 Ellinger Bell and John Gore with Jones Day on behalf of the  
13 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
13 intervenor, Missouri Republican State Committee.

14 MR. HART: Good morning. Ryan Hart and Jacqueline  
14 Bryant with the Secretary of State.

15 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. We are here today for  
15 a trial in this matter. And with that said, is there anything  
16 preliminary we need to take up before we present and we start  
16 with evidence?

17 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
17 MR. HATFIELD: Not from plaintiff, Judge.

18 MR. CAPOZZI: No, Your Honor.

19 MR. ELLINGER: No, Judge.

20 THE COURT: Okay. Petitioners, you may proceed.

1 MR. HATFIELD: Thank you, Your Honor. On Casenet a  
2 few days ago, the parties filed joint stipulations of fact and  
3 exhibits. That is the only evidence that the plaintiff will  
4 rely on.

5 So if I could just walk you through that real  
6 quickly; again, filed on Casenet are 19 paragraphs of  
7 stipulated facts; there are two Exhibits A and B as well.  
8 Paragraphs 1 through 8 discuss the plaintiffs in the case,  
9 and the stipulations about that; paragraph 9 is about the  
10 Secretary of State; paragraphs 10, 11, and 12 are about  
11 House Bill 1, and that's Exhibit A. House Bill 1, Your  
12 Honor, as you can see from that exhibit is a bill to  
13 redraw Missouri's congressional districts; then in  
14 paragraphs 13 through 18, there's -- I'm sorry, through  
15 19, there's a discussion of facts surrounding the census;  
16 and then in paragraph 17, we reference House Bill 2909 of  
17 2022, which is Exhibit B. So Exhibit B is the law that  
18 House Bill 1 replaced. Right? So the -- the -- the  
19 congressional districts, that would be replaced by House  
20 Bill 1.  
21 Your Honor, I think we have agreement on all of this,  
22 but just for-the-record, I would move the admission of the  
23 joint stipulation, which is 19 paragraphs, as well as the  
24 two Exhibits A and B.

25 THE COURT: Any objection?

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
1 MR. CAPOZZI: No, Your Honor.

2 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
2 MR. ELLINGER: No, Judge.

3 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
3 THE COURT: Okay. Exhibit A and B will be admitted,  
4 along with the stipulations.

5 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
5 (Exhibit A and B admitted into evidence.)

6 MR. HATFIELD: So plaintiff rests in terms of  
6 an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
7 evidence, Judge.

8 THE COURT: Any evidence for the defendants?

9 MR. CAPOZZI: No, Your Honor.

10 MR. ELLINGER: No evidence for intervenors.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I think it's time to proceed  
11 with arguments if everybody is ready.

12 MR. HATFIELD: Should I stand here, Judge?

13 THE COURT: It's your case, you try it however you

14 want.

15 MR. HATFIELD: I understand. I wasn't sure if I  
15 should stand at the podium.

16 THE COURT: That's just fine. It's whatever you're

17 comfortable with.

18 MR. HATFIELD: Thank you. Well, thank you, Judge. I  
18 also -- I'm a little remiss, our lead plaintiff Ms. Suzanne  
19 Luther lives here in Jefferson City and she has joined us today  
20 as well just for the record.

21 So, Your Honor, we've got an usually full courtroom  
22 for a case like this. I noticed the press is here.

1            Nevertheless, from our standpoint this is just a normal  
2            challenge to a series of statutes and whether those  
3            statutes comply with the Missouri Constitution. You know,  
4            this Court is familiar with those kind of cases. We do  
5            them all the time. It's no different than Judge Stumpe's  
6            recent decision that outlawing backyard chickens is  
7            unconstitutional in that particular context.  
8            So in spite of what the Attorney General and  
9            intervenor have said in their briefing, there's nothing  
10            particularly unusual about congressional redistricting  
11            either. It's simply a bill of the legislature, Exhibit A,  
12            that was passed. The United States Supreme Court has  
13            actually spoken on whether congressional redistricting  
14            needs to comply with state laws. In a case called Moore  
15            versus Harper, which I think both of the parties -- or all  
16            of the parties have cited in their case, the North  
17            Carolina Supreme Court struck congressional maps and  
18            actually appointed a special master to draw the maps  
19            instead of the legislature, and there was an objection to  
20            that. In a 6-3 majority opinion, Chief Justice Roberts  
21            wrote that there can be no doubt that state -- that  
22            congressional redistricting is subject to state laws, and  
23            that congressional districting must comply with other  
24            normal state laws, such as state constitutions.

25            I was going to redo the current, but I put it

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document somewhere else -- well, there it is.

2 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document So Justice Roberts said in that case, "Were there any

3 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document doubt, historical practice confirms that state

4 Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document legislatures remain bound by state constitutional

5 restraints when exercising authority under the elections

6 clause." As Your Honor has read, the elections clause

7 an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document talks about congressional redistricting and involvement of

8 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document state legislatures. He also said later, "The election

9 Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document clause does not exempt state legislators from the ordinary

10 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document constraints imposed by state law." So again, just a

11 normal case. Missouri courts have regularly reviewed

12 congressional redistricting. If you go back through the

13 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document case law, you can see that it seems like almost every ten

14 Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document years, if not every ten years, there is some litigation

15 about congressional redistricting. The Supreme Court has

16 said that many of those cases state claims, including one

17 of the cases we're going to talk a little bit about today,

18 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document which is Pearson versus Koster.

19 Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document So this is totally normal to do and there's no doubt

20 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document that this Court has authority to review House Bill 1 to

21 see if it complies with the Missouri Constitution. The

22 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document issue here then as plaintiffs have raised, when may the

23 Missouri legislature conduct congressional redistricting.

24 We've quoted you some case law on that, but if I could

25 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document approach, Your Honor, I've got just a handout that

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
2 everyone has.

1 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
2 THE COURT: Yes, sir.

1 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
2 MR. HATFIELD: This is simply law. There's no

3 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
4 citations to evidence or anything like that. If you turn to

5 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
6 that first page, we've pulled out the language of the provision

7 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
6 that we rely on, which is Article 3, Section 45. So if the

7 question is when may the legislature do congressional

8 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
8 redistricting, we start with this article that says, "When the

9 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
9 number of representatives to which the state is entitled in the

10 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
10 House of Congress of the United States, under the census of

11 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
11 1950 and each census thereafter, is certified to the governor"

12 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
12 And then it goes on, but we shortened it up for purposes of

13 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
13 this, "when that happens, then the legislature may redistrict."

14 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
14 So again, when do you do it? When you get the census of 1950,

15 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
15 and then at each census if it's been certified to the governor.

16 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
16 That is the clear plain language of the Constitution. You see

17 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
17 in joint stipulation 14, 15, and 18, that when the census for

18 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
18 2020 was certified to the governor -- that's stipulation 15 --

19 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
19 the General Assembly drew congressional districts based on that

20 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
20 census. That is joint stipulation 16. The United States

21 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
21 Census Bureau has not certified census results since then. And

22 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
22 in stipulation 19, no census has been certified to the governor

23 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
23 since that 2020 census that was certified back when Exhibit B

24 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
24 was adopted. So Exhibit B was adopted, congressional districts

25 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
25 were put in place. When can the -- the legislature redo it?

1 When they get new census data. That is the plain reading.

2 Now we looked in -- and the parties have discussed

3 all of this, but just to review the language, that is

4 quite a bit different than the language on the next page

5 of the slide that I gave you. Article 3, Section 10,

6 discusses how we do state level redistricting. Right? So

7 state representatives and state senators. Article 3,

8 Section 10, says, "The last decennial census of the United

9 States shall be used in apportioning representatives and

10 determining the population of senatorial and

11 representative districts. Such districts may be altered

12 from time to time as public convenience may require." So

13 in Article 3, Section 10, the drafters of the Constitution

14 specifically said you can alter the districts as public

15 convenience required, but that language is not in Article

16 3, Section 45, which uses the "when" language and says

17 that when you get a census. So it's obvious to Your

18 Honor, I know, but I think it's important to just point

19 out that these were both adopted in the 1945 Constitution

20 of the Constitutional Convention. The same people who

21 voted to adopt Article 3, Section 10, and put in the

22 language "Such districts may be altered from time to

23 time," also voted to adopt Article 3, Section 45, which

24 does not contain that language. These are not sections

25 that were adopted at different points in time. They were

1 the same people, at the same Congressional Convention.

2 Now we think that language is pretty clear on its

3 face, but were there any doubt about it, we've brought to

4 your attention to the Missouri Supreme Court case law on the

5 issue. So you'll see in the next -- in the next slide

6 there on your deck that in Pearson versus Koster, the

7 Missouri Supreme Court looked at Article 3, Section 45,

8 and this is the quote from their 2012 decision. This was

9 congressional redistricting and a challenge to

10 congressional redistricting. We've got it quoted there,

11 "Article 3, Section 45, was triggered when the results of

12 the 2010 United States Census revealed that the population

13 of the state of Missouri grew, et cetera." And then on

14 the last one it says, "The new districts will take effect

15 for the 2012 election and remain in place for the next

16 decade, or until a census shows that the districts should

17 change." That is obviously what the Constitution says and

18 it is what the Missouri Supreme Court has held about

19 Article 3, Section 45. The new districts that were drawn

20 for the legislature in this case in 2022, remain in place

21 for the decade or until there's a new census. Now if

22 there had been a new census certified to the governor,

23 we -- we would have a different issue here; but because

24 there has been no census, we think the issue is pretty

25 straightforward.

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
1 And then we also gave you in the slide deck, and this  
2 is the last one because there weren't really many we  
3 needed to talk about, some discussion of a case called  
4 Preisler versus Doherty. Now, Judge Preisler is actually  
5 talking about Article 3, Section 10, which is the  
6 state-level. This is the one that says, "May be altered  
7 from time to time." When you read Preisler, they conclude  
8 that in spite of that language in Article 3, Section 10,  
9 that you still have to wait for new census data and that  
10 is the quote that you have in that last slide, "We think  
11 only one valid apportionment is intended for each  
12 decennial period." That is the Missouri Supreme Court in  
13 1955, after the Census of 1950.  
14 Document Not an Official Court Document  
14 This reading that you saw in Preisler, is the law in  
15 most other states. The -- the courts there -- the -- the  
16 parties talk about different cases in different  
17 jurisdictions. I don't know that we cited the South  
18 Dakota Supreme Court decision certification -- this is the  
19 title of the case believe it or not -- Certification of a  
20 Question of Law From the United States District Court of  
21 South Dakota. They're one of those states where the feds  
22 can ask the State Supreme Court to weigh in. This is 615  
23 N.W.2d 590. This is a 2000 decision. In there the  
24 Supreme Court of South Dakota served a bunch of other  
25 states, and they concluded that other jurisdictions

1 examining state constitutions with provisions similar to  
2 the South Dakota 1982 Amendment, that is with no express  
3 prohibition of apportionment at a time other than that  
4 constitutionally prescribed have reached the same  
5 conclusion. "It is the general rule that once a valid  
6 apportionment law is enacted, no future act may be passed  
7 by the legislature until after the next regular  
8 apportionment period prescribed by the Constitution."  
9 They cite the Kansas Supreme Court, the Massachusetts  
10 Supreme Court, the Alabama Supreme Court, the Oklahoma  
11 Supreme Court, the New York Supreme Court, and amateur.  
12 It's been a while since I've read amateur. Also, I think  
13 he mentioned the decision of the Colorado Supreme Court in  
14 In Re -- well, that's not the right one, but the Colorado  
15 Supreme Court has similarly said in their case -- I'm  
16 sorry. People Ex Rel. Salazar versus Davidson, which is  
17 79 P.3d 1221 2003 case, and this case is really  
18 interesting. It's very similar to Missouri. The quote,  
19 "The congressional redistricting found in their  
20 Constitution has always provided that general assembly  
21 shall redistrict congressional seats when a new  
22 apportionment shall be made by Congress." There is no  
23 language empowering the General Assembly to redistrict  
24 more frequently or at any other time. That language is  
25 almost identical to the language that we see in Missouri.

1 So plaintiff's request here is very simple; the Court  
2 should follow the Missouri Supreme Court precedent in  
3 Pearson versus Koster and in Preisler, which interprets  
4 the Missouri Constitution in its plain language and should  
5 acknowledge that congressional redistricting can only  
6 occur when there is a new census. It is only then that  
7 the districts can be replaced.

8 Now the state and the intervenors ask you to depart  
9 from that precedent. Judge, I bet you've seen it; but in  
10 case you haven't, there's a movie called Air Bud. And in  
11 Air Bud, the kid wants his dog to play basketball. They  
12 put the dog in the suit and they -- they go in and try to  
13 play basketball. There's a famous scene where the referee  
14 says, "Ain't no rule says a dog can't play basketball,"  
15 and they allow the dog to play. It's farcical and it's  
16 kind of ridiculous. We don't do Air Bud rules in Missouri  
17 for very good reason, but that is essentially what the  
18 argument is from the state here, that well, ain't no rule  
19 says a dog can't play basketball. There's no specific  
20 language that says "Thou shall not redistrict in between  
21 census." And therefore, the legislature has kind of like  
22 a -- like a power up. They can kind of just do whatever  
23 they want to do and not worry about the rules. The -- the  
24 state argues that there must be express prohibition, but  
25 express prohibition simply means a stated prohibition

versus an implied prohibition. That doesn't mean that you have to have some extremely strong statement that you can never do it. The Supreme Court seems to think the statement is clear. We think the rules of statutory construction and constitutional construction are pretty similar. Finding a state of limitation involves the normal rules. So for example, Judge, in the state's brief, I think on the first or second page when they talk about the express prohibition, they cite a case called Blaske B-L-A-S-K-E, and I -- I read that case again last night. That's an Article 1, Section 14, case. Article 1, Section 14, is The Open Courts Provision.

And so the Supreme Court has many times taken up whether the statute violates The Open Courts Provision of the Missouri Constitution. And here's what the -- here's what Article 3, Section 14 -- I got it wrong -- Article 1, Section 14 -- I'm sorry -- says that, "That the courts of justice shall be opened to every person and certain remedy afforded for every injury to person, property, or character, in that right in justice shall be administered without sale, denial, or delay." There is no language in there about what the legislature cannot do. There is no language in there that addresses the general assembly in any way. The states brief says you have to find language that says the general assembly cannot do something, but

Court Document. Not an Official Court Document.

2 Sheriff's Retirement System, the Missouri Supreme Court

<sup>3</sup> Not an Officer found that the legislature could not impose court costs

4 Document that go to sheriff's retirement because they read this

5 section implying that ordinary rules of construction, and

6 found it to prohibit that. This is also well before any

7 of our time. This is also a provision that the Supreme

8 Court relied upon to find unconstitutional, a dramshop law

9 that said you can only bring civil suits in certain

circumstances where a criminal act had been involved.

II Yet, all we do -- all they did to do that was read the  
an Official Com Document Not in Official Com Document

12 provision and use ordinary rules. You don't look for s

13 sort of thou shall not. it's just like everything else we

14 do in the courts. We have to look at the -- the rules

15 ~~CONFIDENTIAL~~ This is an Official Court Document. No CAN Official Court Document Not

So how do you do that? Number one, you look at plain text an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

18 a minute ago. That's the first thing. And I struggled to

19 Document try to find an analogy that kind of fits here to make it

20 clear that the language to everyday people I think means

21 what it says. You know, our lead plaintiff here Ms.

22 Luther was a school teacher for many years. When I was in

23 school, they would say when the bell rings you may change

24 classes, and then we would change classes, and then you

25 would sit there until the bell rings again. So it says,  
19

1           "When you get the census data, you shall wait until you  
2           get more census data." That's the ordinary meaning of it.

3           You don't get to get up and walk around in the middle of  
4           class and say, "Oh well, I changed classes when the bell  
5           rang, so now I can do whatever I want." That's not the

6           plain language of the Constitution; it's pretty clear of  
7           it.

8           The second rule of construction you would look at is  
9           what's known as empowering material. Right? You look at  
10           other provisions of the Constitution in order to get a  
11           sense of what this language means. That's why we brought  
12           to your attention Article 3, Section 10, which tells you  
13           that the legislature clearly notes how to say that

14           redistricting can be done when convenience requires or  
15           when politics necessitate, but that language is not  
16           contained in Article 3, Section 45.

17           The other one that I just wanted to bring to Your  
18           Honor's attention, I don't think we mentioned it in

19           this -- in the brief, but in looking through the  
20           Constitution last night to prepare for this, I noticed  
21           Article 3, Section 34, which is not related to the  
22           congressional redistricting at all; but in Article 3,  
23           Section 34, the framers of the 1945 Constitution said, "In  
24           the year of 1949, and at least every ten years thereafter,  
25           all general statutes shall be revised, digested, and

1 propagated as may be provided by law." So this language  
2 tells you that you have to do it at least every ten years,  
3 meaning at least you could do it more often than that. But  
4 that language is not in Article 3, Section 45.

5 And then finally, the rule of construction that  
6 expression of the one is the exclusion of the other. The  
7 fact that the power is specifically as expressed as it is,  
8 excludes the ability to do others. And I'm sure the state  
9 and the intervenor are going to talk to you as they should  
10 about the fact that the legislature's power is plenary,  
11 and that does -- that's not a talisman; again, that means  
12 they can do whatever they want, but it does raise the  
13 question of what is Article 3, Section 45, doing in the  
14 Constitution? What is the point of having it there if the  
15 legislature's power is plenary? What -- what is happening  
16 in that section? Well, what's happening is a limitation  
17 on the authority and requirements of the legislature. If  
18 it wasn't there, the legislature could pass laws as they  
19 normally do, and we wouldn't be here.

20 So as I started, I know this is a case with a lot of  
21 attention, but I think the Court's options are pretty  
22 limited here. There are two Missouri Supreme Court cases  
23 that tell you what to do, and those are binding on this  
24 Court. Missouri has always followed that rule. Missouri  
25 has never done a voluntary redistricting in between census

1 in the history since 1945 -- since the 1945 Constitution.

2 That's what everyone has always understood the law to be.

3 The state talks a little bit I think about some cases.

4 where it was done after court orders, but of course when a

5 redistricting is done and a court orders it

6 unconstitutional, it never happened. The Supreme Court

7 has said that in Kehoe versus Normandy and other cases.

8 So there have been some redistricting, particularly in the

9 60s when everybody was trying to figure out what one

10 person, one vote meant. But those were all done because

11 of court orders that invalidated earlier months. So it's

12 never been done voluntarily without having a previous one

13 voided. This -- neither the state nor the intervenor will

14 give you a single case that tells you that Missouri

15 legislatures for the last 80 years have simply missed this

16 power and ability, and it's always been there. They have

17 not missed it. The power is not there.

18 So plaintiffs would ask that you rule that House Bill

19 1 is unconstitutional because the legislature is not

20 authorized to redraw congressional districts until they

21 have received new census data. Unless you have questions.

22 THE COURT: I don't have any questions at this time.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. HATFIELD: Thank you, Judge.

25 THE COURT: Argument for the defendants.

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
1 MR. CAPOZZI: Good morning, Your Honor. Whenever

1 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
2 you're ready.

3 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
4 THE COURT: You may proceed.

5 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
6 MR. CAPOZZI: This case, frankly, is an easy one.

7 The Missouri Supreme Court has law, and repeatedly instructed  
8 that the General Assembly has the power to act, unless the

9 Missouri Constitution expressly takes a particular power away.

10 The Missouri Constitution says nothing about mid-decade

11 redistricting. Thus, plaintiffs state constitutional plan

12 fails, and this Court should enter in favor of the state.

13 I agree with my friend on the other side. Let's

14 start with the text, which he has helpfully provided part

15 of the text of Article 3, Section 45. The text says that

16 the General Assembly wants -- they shall redistrict when

17 decennial census numbers are certified to the governor.

18 That language imposes a duty on the General Assembly to

19 redistrict at the start of the decade, but that's all it

20 says. The General Assembly has a duty to redistrict at

21 the start of the decade. That language says nothing about

22 whether they have the option to redistrict at other times.

23 My friend relies heavily on the negative implication

24 candor; he calls it the expressio unius canon. And the

25 theory is, well, the state Constitution says that the

General Assembly has to redistrict at the start of the

decade, so that implies -- that implies that they can not

1 redistrict at other times. Now there's lots of case law,  
2 including in State v Clay from the Missouri Supreme Court,  
3 which we cite. State v Clay says specific data that  
4 negative implication can -- cannot provide a clear official  
5 statement to divest the General Assembly of its plenary  
6 power. But the Court doesn't even need to rely on that  
7 principle because with respect, my friend is misapplying  
8 the negative implications canon in this case.

9 As the Missouri Supreme Court explained in the power  
10 of decision, that's 227.S.W.2d at 723, "An express Not:  
11 enumeration of legislative powers and privileges in the  
12 Constitution cannot be considered as the exclusion of  
13 others not named, unless the company by negative terms."

14 And there's no negative terms here. Properly deployed,  
15 the negative implication canon suggest that the General  
16 Assembly does not have the obligation to redistrict at any  
17 time other than at the start of the decade. In other  
18 words, I could not sue the General Assembly because it  
19 didn't redistrict in 2024. That is the correct way to  
20 employ the negative implication canon.

21 Now my friend offered a hypothetical to try to  
22 illustrate how this works, and he gave the example of the  
23 bell in school. And as a student, you know that you're  
24 not allowed to change classes until the bell rings and not  
25 at other points. My friend is smuggling context into that

1 hypothetical, which is very different than the context  
2 here. That hypothetical works because there is a  
3 background understanding that students are supposed to do  
4 what they're told in school, and that their movements and  
5 activities are strictly controlled by their teachers. So  
6 they're expected to stay where they are until the bell  
7 rings. Here the context is quite different. The default  
8 rule is that the General Assembly has the power to act.  
9 They have preliminary power, until that power is taken  
10 away. And so here is a more accurate hypothetical for  
11 this case. Imagine you have a lease term that says you  
12 have to pay your rent by the fifth day each month. Now  
13 what -- what is the implication? If you will apply the  
14 negative implication like my friend does, you cannot be  
15 found in breach of the lease if you pay your rent by the  
16 3rd of the month. Right? The fact that you have to pay  
17 the rent by the 5th, implies that you don't have to pay it  
18 by the 3rd of the month, but no one would say that you  
19 can't voluntarily pay your rent on the 3rd of the month.  
20 Everyone agrees that you can do that. And so with  
21 respect, plaintiffs misemploy the negative implication  
22 canon here.

23 Next I want to talk about history. My friend asks,  
24 you know, what is the point of Article 3, Section 45, what  
25 is it doing here if not to limit when redistricting

1           happens? Well, if you read the entirety of Article 3,  
2           Section 45, you'll see there's a bunch of other stuff in  
3           the provision. I want to address, what is the function of  
4           the specific language in the slideshow. Article 3, official

5           Section 45, was enacted in 1945, as my friend explained.

6           In the prior decades, as the state discusses in detail of  
7           its brief, the General Assembly had failed altogether to

8           pass redistricting maps. I think it was -- you know, for

9           40 years the General Assembly just didn't pass a  
10           redistricting map. What happened is the state had to use

11           at-large congressional districts. You know, basically the

12           statewide vote determines how congressional districts are

13           allocated. That's no longer constitutional. It was back

14           then, but even back then, nobody liked that. Everybody

15           agreed that that was a bad thing, and that it was frankly

16           a scandal in Missouri politics that the legislature was

17           not doing its job. And so this extensive discussion at

18           the 1940s Missouri Constitutional Convention about "We

19           need to make sure that the legislature actually does

20           redistrict once per decade," which is why we have this

21           provision. That is meant to solve the prior problem of no

22           redistricting. And notably, if you read the convention

23           records, there is no discussion of mid-decade

24           redistricting, none. That's not really a surprise. The

25           delegates didn't think mid-decade redistricting was a

1 problem. That point is significant because as the state  
2 detailed in its brief, the General Assembly had in the  
3 late 1800s, engaged in mid-decade redistricting. Thus,  
4 the framers of the 1945 Constitution knew about the  
5 prospect of mid-decade redistricting, yet they didn't  
6 debate it or include any language prohibiting it. That  
7 silence speaks volumes, and confirms the framers did not  
8 intend to prohibit mid-decade redistricting.

9 Precedent confirms what texted history clearly  
10 demonstrate. In *Pearson v Koster*, which my friend also  
11 talked about, except I think we read *Pearson v Koster*  
12 quite differently. The Missouri Supreme Court considered  
13 whether the Missouri Constitution prohibits political  
14 gerrymander, and that's what the case was about. In  
15 answering that question in the negative, the court  
16 considered the limits of Article 3, Section 45, imposed on  
17 the General Assembly. Here is what the court said in  
18 *Pearson*, "Article 3, Section 45, of the Missouri

19 Constitution sets about only -- only three requirements  
20 for the redistricting of states in Missouri. The  
21 districts shall be composed of continuous territory as  
22 compact and as nearly equal in population as may be."

23 Those are the three requirements. And *Pearson* says quite  
24 explicitly, "If the General Assembly complies with those  
25 three requirements, courts must defer to their political

1 and policy judgments in adopting a particular  
2 congressional map." Now my friend invites the Court to  
3 adopt a fourth limit on congressional redistricting. That

4 invitation is foreclosed by Pearson.

5 Now what did plaintiffs have to say in response to  
6 all this? First they say that their rule is dictated by  
7 precedent, but that is simply not true. We already talked  
8 about Pearson v Koster, which directly forecloses their  
9 arguments. They quote some language from Pearson in their  
10 slides. This language is descriptive dictum. It's

11 certainly not holding as my friend claims. There's  
12 absolutely no discussion of mid-decade redistricting in  
13 Pearson; and so there's no holding about mid-decade

14 redistricting in Pearson, but that -- the descriptive

15 dictum that my friend quotes from Pearson is accurate. It  
16 is true that we all agree the General Assembly must  
17 redistrict at the start of the decade. You know, a lot of  
18 what my friend said proved that point; which the state

19 agrees, they must do it at the start of the decade. The

20 Pearson dictum also said that when the General Assembly

21 enacts a redistricting bill, the bill will be in effect  
22 for 10 years until the next decennial census. That is  
23 typically how redistricting bills work. That is the

24 default rule. The Missouri Supreme Court did not

25 consider, let alone speak to the possibility of a new

1 redistricting bill. So Pearson again forecloses and does  
2 not support plaintiff's case.

3 Not an Official Document - Not for Citation The same is true of *Preisler v. Hearns*, which they

4 Document No. cited in their brief. Once again, it's the same Official

5 descriptive dictum that they cite from Pearson. "The

6 General Assembly has to redistrict at the start of the  
7 decade." And typically, redistricting bills last for ten  
8 years, but there's certainly no holding in *Preisler v.*

9           Hearns, and they just didn't consider the possibility of  
10           mid-decade redistricting because it wasn't at issue in the  
11           case.

12 And finally my friend invokes the Missouri Supreme

13 Court in *Preisler v. Doherty*, and quotes some language on

14 that case in the slides. I'm grateful that my friend

15 brought this up because Preisler is actually very helpful

16 in illustrating one of the state's points here. My friend

17 points to state constitutional language about state

18 legislative districts and how those can be adjusted from

19 Document time to time. And he says, well, you don't have that

20 similar language in Article 3, Section 45, so maybe that

21 implies that the General Assembly can't redistrict from  
Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Docu  
22 time to time; but we're dealing with different contexts.

23 State legislative districts are drawn by a redistricting

24 commission. Under well-established Missouri law, which

25 Missouri Supreme Court talks about in Preisler and I'll

1 quote the language in a minute, redistricting commissions  
2 or commissions in general can only exercise the powers  
3 specifically delegated to them. With the General Assembly  
4 Assembly, it is the opposite assumption. They have  
5 preliminary power until the power is specifically taken  
6 away, and indeed Preisler v. Doherty itself says this a  
7 couple of pages before the language my friend quotes. And  
8 I want to read this language because I think it's quite  
9 important. So this is from Preisler, "In this case we are  
10 not dealing with the law enacted by our General Assembly."  
11 They are dealing with state legislative districts enacted  
12 by a commission. Returning to the quote, "In this case we  
13 are not dealing with the law enacted by our General  
14 Assembly, which as a coordinate branch of our government  
15 has all of the legislative power of the state, except that  
16 denied it by express limitations of the Constitution."  
17 And so Preisler itself explains the difference -- explains  
18 why that case is different than this case. That case  
19 dealt with a commission, which exercises delegated powers.  
20 This case involves the General Assembly, which has  
21 reserved plenary power. And as Preisler said, you need  
22 express language taking that authority away.

23 My friend also cites some out-of-state cases, which  
24 of course are not binding on this Court. He didn't cite  
25 any of them in his brief and so it's hard to know whether

1 these cases are different. The Colorado case that he  
2 cited in particular is different though. As my friend  
3 admitted, the Colorado Supreme Court said that the  
4 legislature needed specific authority to act and to do  
5 mid-decade redistricting. If that is the law in Colorado,  
6 that's simply not the law in Missouri. I mean we've cited  
7 at least five or six cases in our brief, and we could cite  
8 dozens more saying that the General Assembly has the power  
9 to act, unless the power is specifically taken away. So  
10 unlike in Colorado, the General Assembly does not need a  
11 permission slip to do mid-decade redistricting.

23 Thank you, unless Your Honor has question.

24 THE COURT: Not at this time. Thank you.

25 MR. CAPOZZI: Thank you.

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
1 THE COURT: Will there be any argument for  
2 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
2 intervenors?

3 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
3 MR. GORE: Yes, Your Honor, briefly.  
4 Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official  
4 THE COURT: You may proceed.

5 a Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an  
5 MR. GORE: Good morning, Your Honor. John Gore for  
6 interenor, Missouri Republican State Committee. I thank the  
6 an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
7 Court for allowing me to be here today and present argument.

8 THE COURT: And for the record, pro hac vice status  
9 has been granted to Mr. Gore, and I don't think that was  
10 opposed by anybody. So

11 MR. GORE: Thank you.

12 THE COURT: -- you may proceed.

13 MR. GORE: I thank my friend on the other side for

14 not opposing. The Court should enter judgment for the state  
15 because plaintiffs cannot carry their heavy burden to show that  
16 mid-decade congressional redistricting clearly and undoubtedly  
17 contravenes the Constitution. The Missouri Constitution does  
18 not even address, much less prohibit mid-decade congressional

19 redistricting. Moreover, the elections clause and the US  
20 Constitution empowers the General Assembly to perform  
21 congressional redistricting, including mid-decade.

22 I would like to read to the Court the standard -- the  
23 legal standard that applies in this case. As the Supreme  
24 Court held in *Liberty Oil Company*, "The Constitution is  
25 not a grant, but a restriction upon the powers of the

1 legislature. Consequently, the General Assembly has the

2 power to do whatever is necessary to perform its

3 functions, except as expressly restrained by the

4 Constitution." That's at 813 S.W.2d at page 297. This

5 rule alone requires judgment for the state. Nothing in

6 Article 3, Section 45, or any other provision of the

7 Constitution, expressly prohibits the General Assembly

8 from conducting mid-decade congressional redistricting.

9 Plaintiffs haven't pointed to anything. They've

10 pointed to nothing in section 45, and nothing in any of

11 the other provisions of the Constitution. So this case is

12 over. This is an easy case, but let me briefly address a

13 few of the arguments they have made. They point to the

14 language in Section 45, that the General Assembly shall

15 redistrict when census results are certified to the

16 government -- to the governor. That's correct. That

17 imposes a duty -- a minimum mandatory duty to redistrict

18 after those results are certified. Prior to 1945,

19 formerly, the General Assembly had authority to decline to

20 redistrict -- to decline to draw out congressional

21 districts, even when the census results were certified to

22 the governor. That's the problem that framers were

23 attempting to solve. If anything, Section 45 requires

24 the -- the General Assembly to redistrict more often, not

25 less often, than it had prior to 1945. And if the framers

had wanted to prohibit mid-decade redistricting anywhere in the Constitution, including in Section 45, they would have used language expressly digesting the General Assembly of that power. And for example, look at Article 3, Section 39; it states, "Limitation of power of General Assembly. The General Assembly shall not have power." And then it lists several things the General Assembly can't do. There are similar provisions elsewhere in Article 3, that you shall not or shall have no power. No such language appears in Section 45 or anywhere with respect to mid-decade congressional redistricting.

17 Now let's go to Article 3, Section 10. They point  
18 out that has different language than Section 45, but of  
19 course it does because the redistricting commission does  
20 not inherently have any authority to do anything. It has  
21 to be granted that authority under the Constitution. So  
22 it makes sense that the Constitution authorized it to  
23 alter districts from time to time; but by contrast, the  
24 General Assembly has all legislative power, except  
25 expressly restrained in the Constitution. So Section 45's

1 silence on mid-decade congressional redistricting

2 underscores that the General Assembly retains that

3 authority. That alone proves our point.

4 Now they pointed to decisions from the Missouri

5 Supreme Court. They pointed to Pearson; the statement

6 they lift from Pearson is in the background and it's  
7 indicative; it's not holding. Pearson addressed only

8 compactness claims and other issues. In fact, if

9 anything, we cite, Your Honor, to pages 39 and 40 of

10 Pearson. There Pearson made clear that the courts must

11 defer to the General Assembly's political judgments in

12 redistricting. So if anything, Pearson supports judgment

13 for the state here as well.

14 Counsel for the other side has cited a few cases from

15 other states, but none of the states and none of those

16 courts are bound by the Liberty Oil Company. They do not

17 apply the Expressly Restains Rule, which is the rule for

18 adjudicating the General Assembly's legislative power here

19 in Missouri. They didn't view the Constitution as a

20 limitation rather than a grant of authority, they viewed

21 it exactly the opposite. Well, that explains Colorado,

22 South Dakota, and all of the other cases that they've

23 cited.

24 They've also cited some rules of construction, but

25 the most important rule of construction in Missouri is

1 plain language, and they haven't pointed to any plain  
2 language divested in the General Assembly's authority to  
3 conduct mid-decade redistricting.  
4 All of this, Your Honor, and for all of these official  
5 reasons, the Court should enter judgment for the state.  
6 And if there is any doubt on that score, the Elections  
7 Clause in the US Constitution requires that as a result as  
8 well. Counsel cited to Moore versus Harper. Moore --  
9 Moore versus Harper makes it clear that the courts must  
10 respect the Election Clause's delegation of authority to  
11 legislatures. That means courts, including this Court, do  
12 not have free reign to review and invalidate state  
13 legislative enactments on federal elections, including  
14 congressional redistricting plans. Courts are bound by  
15 the ordinary rules of judiciary review and may not  
16 transgress those bounds without violating the elections  
17 clause. And here that is precisely what would happen if a  
18 court were to conclude that the Missouri Constitution  
19 precludes the General Assembly from engaging in the  
20 mid-decade congressional redistricting. The law in  
21 Missouri is clear; the General Assembly has all authority,  
22 except as expressly restrained by the Constitution; and  
23 nothing in the Constitution expressly restrains it from  
24 conducting mid-decade congressional redistricting. Any  
25 other conclusion would violate the elections clause in the

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
United States Constitution.

2 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Does  
3 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
the Court have any questions?

4 Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official  
THE COURT: Not at this time. Thank you.

5 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an  
MR. GORE: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else we need to  
7 take up on-the-record?

8 MR. HATFIELD: Judge, would you entertain just a  
9 brief reply?

10 THE COURT: Brief.

11 MR. HATFIELD: So we gave you the language. I  
12 read -- plain language is where you start. Right? So in the  
13 slide you have, I highlighted some words kind of anticipating  
14 how the argument might go. So the first one we have is "when,"  
15 and then you could skip down to each census thereafter  
16 recertified. So we need census thereafter recertified, and the  
17 General Assembly shall redistrict, and that's essentially our  
18 argument.

19 The state seemed and the intervenor seemed to say

20 that you need a "thou shall not," sentence in here, and  
21 that's never been the law in Missouri. And if it was the  
22 law in Missouri, then several Supreme Court cases were  
23 wrong; including the ones I cited to you earlier in *Fowler*  
24 versus Missouri Sheriff, et cetera. The law has always  
25 been in that you look to see what the meaning of the

1 languages using the regular -- regular rules. So we both  
2 told you about Pearson versus Koster, and I would urge you  
3 to read that. I haven't heard anybody explain why they --  
4 a plain language of what the Supreme Court said there is  
5 wrong, and why you can disregard that language. I urge  
6 you to read it.

7 I urge you also, in light of what intervenor just  
8 said, to take a look at that Moore case. I mean that

9 was -- if we all remember back, that was the independent

<sup>10</sup> state legislature theory, and the Supreme -- the United

11 States Supreme Court rejected that with a 6-3 decision.

14 redistricting. It does not say, but I'll let you read it,

15 that the state court cannot invalidate a legislatively

16 enact of congressional redistricting. This -- this Court

17 has done it. Pearson actually -- the Supreme Court there

18 in congressional redistricting remanded it back to the

19 trial court for additional findings because what Pearson

28 This document is a copy of the original court document. It is not an official court document. It is not a record of the court proceedings.

22 when it says that there are three requirements for

23 redistricting, it's talking about when you do

24 redistricting, these are the three requirements; but it

25 clearly says when you do it is when you have new census 38

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
data.

2 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
Thank you, Judge.

3 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Is there anything else  
4 we need to put on-the-record or is there any response to that?

5 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an  
arguments.

6 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
MR. CAPOZZI: No, Your Honor. We will rest on our

7 arguments.

8 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
MR. ELLINGER: Likewise, Your Honor. Thank you.

9 Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
MR. HATFIELD: Nothing further from plaintiff, sir.

10 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Offi  
THE COURT: Okay. The Court is going to take this  
matter under advisement. If I do end up having any other  
11 questions for the parties, I may order additional briefing. At  
12 this time we are not there, so we are adjourned.

13 Plaintiff Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court  
PLAINTIFF: Would you like proposed judgments or not,

14 Judge? Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Offi

15 THE COURT: It's really up to you all. If you all  
want to submit proposed judgments, we can do that.

16 MR. HATFIELD: I mean I think we were planning to do  
17 it. I don't know that they need to be long since we have  
18 stipulated facts.

19 THE COURT: Okay. Why doesn't everybody submit  
proposed judgments within the next ten days?

20 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
MR. HATFIELD: Thank you, Judge.

21 Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document  
MR. CAPOZZI: Thank you, Your Honor.

22 THE COURT: Thank you all. We are adjourned.

23 24 25 (Trial concluded.)

1 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
2 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

3 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
4 I, Candice Perez, Certified Court Reporter, hereby

5 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
6 certify that I am the official court reporter for Division

7 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
8 4 of the Cole County Circuit Court, that on 12th of

9 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
10 November, 2025, I was present and reported all of the

11 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
12 proceedings in MERRIE LUTHER ET AL V. DENNY HOSKINS. I

13 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
14 further certify that the foregoing \*39 pages contain a

15 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
16 true and accurate reproduction of the ordered portions of

17 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
18 the proceedings transcribed.

19 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
20

21 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
22

23 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
24

25 Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an O  
/s/ Candice Perez  
Candice Perez, C.C.R  
Official Court Reporter, Division 4