

ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
2025 Nov 24 AM 11:42  
CLERK OF THE SHAWNEE COUNTY DISTRICT COURT  
CASE NUMBER: 2021-CV-000299  
PII COMPLIANT



**Court:** Shawnee County District Court  
**Case Number:** 2021-CV-000299  
**Case Title:** League of Women Voters of Kansas, et al. vs. Scott Schwab - Kansas Secretary of State, et al.  
**Type:** ORD: Order Originated by Judge order

SO ORDERED,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "T. Watson", is written above a horizontal line.

/s/ Honorable Teresa L Watson, District  
Court Judge

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF SHAWNEE COUNTY, KANSAS  
DIVISION THREE**

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF  
KANSAS, et al.,

Plaintiffs

v.

2021-CV-299

SCOTT SCHWAB, et al.,

Defendants

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STRIKE  
AND GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME  
FOR THE PARTIES TO FILE RESPONSES AND REPLIES  
TO DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS**

Defendants and Plaintiffs both filed motions for summary judgment on November 14, 2025. This matter is before the Court on Defendants' motion to strike Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. Defendants' motion to strike was filed November 19, 2025. Plaintiffs' response in opposition was filed November 21, 2025. Defendants indicated they would not file a reply. The matter is fully briefed, and the Court is ready to rule. Defendants asked for an expedited hearing on the motion to strike, but a hearing is not necessary because it would "not aid the court materially." See Supreme Court Rule 133(c)(1).

Defendants move to strike Plaintiffs' motion based on its remarkable length, voluminous exhibits, and alleged inclusion of non-material statements of fact, causing Defendants to suspect that the motion is designed to harass, intimidate, and overwhelm. The Court finds no basis to strike the Plaintiffs' motion. Defendants' motion to strike is denied.

In the alternative, Defendants ask that this Court allow both sides additional time to respond to the other's motion for summary judgment (until January 9, 2026), then allow an extended time to file reply briefs (until February 2, 2026). Plaintiffs object because this would require moving the existing pretrial conference date and potentially delay resolution of the case. But the lengthy briefs, voluminous exhibits, and complex issues presented here justify additional time for the parties to digest and prepare thoughtful responses. More thorough response briefing will ultimately assist the Court in making an expeditious, well-reasoned decision.

Defendants' request for additional time is granted. The parties' response briefs are due January 9, 2026; the parties' reply briefs are due February 2, 2026. The pretrial conference set for January 20, 2026, is removed from the calendar. The parties are directed to call Division 3 to obtain a new pretrial conference date.

This order is effective on the date and time shown on the electronic file stamp.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

**HON. TERESA L. WATSON  
DISTRICT COURT JUDGE**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the above document was filed electronically on the date stamped on the order, providing notice to counsel of record.

/s Angela Cox  
Administrative Assistant

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM