


Not only do the various Plaintiff Groups focus their challenges on different districts,³ they also base their challenges on different legal theories.⁴

Thus, by **September 24, 2025**, Plaintiffs **SHALL JOINTLY FILE** a chart summarizing which Plaintiff groups will be challenging which districts at the upcoming Preliminary Injunction Hearing, and on which legal theories (*i.e.*, intentional vote dilution under the U.S. Constitution, effects-based vote dilution under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, racial gerrymandering under the U.S. Constitution, malapportionment under the Equal Protection Clause, etc.).

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 16th day of September 2025.



DAVID C. GUADERRAMA
SENIOR U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

And on behalf of:

Jerry E. Smith
United States Circuit Judge
U.S. Court of Appeals, Fifth Circuit

-and-

Jeffrey V. Brown
United States District Judge
Southern District of Texas

³ Compare, *e.g.*, Texas NAACP's Prelim. Inj. Mot., ECF No. 1142, at 17 ("Plaintiff Texas NAACP challenges the following districts: *CD 32 and CD 33* (Dallas and Tarrant Counties); *CD9* (Harris and Fort Bend counties); and *CD 35* (Austin-San Antonio Area).") (emphases added)), *with, e.g.*, Brooks, LULAC, & MALC Pls.' Joint Prelim. Inj. Mot., ECF No. 1150, at 40–44 (also raising challenges to various districts not listed in the preceding parenthetical, including CD18, CD27, and CD30).

⁴ Compare, *e.g.*, Reply Supporting Mot. Schedule Prelim. Inj. Hr'g, ECF No. 1130, at 2 (indicating that neither the LULAC Plaintiffs, nor the Brooks Plaintiffs, nor the Gonzales Plaintiffs, nor MALC "seek a preliminary injunction on Section 2 grounds"), *with* Intervenor's Prelim. Inj. Mot., ECF No. 1143, at 9–11 (claiming that "Plan C2333 violates Section 2" under the *Gingles* standard).