

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

GEORGIA STATE CONFERENCE OF  
THE NAACP, et al,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STATE OF GEORGIA, et al,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION FILE

No. 1:21-CV-5338-SCJ

ORDER

This matter is before the Court *sua sponte* upon review of the Complaint in this matter. In their Complaint, Plaintiffs request that a three-judge panel be convened pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2284(a) and that the Court enter a judgment declaring numerous Congressional, State Senate, and State House districts to be unconstitutionally drawn. Doc. No. [1] ¶¶ 31, 234, 238. Plaintiffs also request a judgment declaring that the drawing of certain voting districts violates Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, 52 U.S.C. § 10301 (“Section 2”) (Doc. No. [1] ¶¶ 239–247) and that the “new Congressional, State House and State Senate plans


... were adopted, at least in part, for the purpose of disadvantaging voters of color” in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and Section 2 (id. ¶¶ 248–257).

“A district court of three judges shall be convened . . . when an action is filed challenging the constitutionality of the apportionment of congressional districts or the apportionment of any statewide legislative body.” 28 U.S.C. § 2284(a). “Upon the filing of a request for three judges, the judge to whom the request is presented shall, unless he determines that three judges are not required, immediately notify the chief judge of the circuit, who shall designate two other judges, at least one of whom shall be a circuit judge.” Id. § 2284(b)(1); see also Shapiro v. McManus, 577 U.S. 39, 43–44 (2015) (stating that a district court considering a request for the appointment of a three-judge panel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2284 must simply determine whether the request for three judges is made in a case covered by § 2284). Once the three-judge panel is convened, it may later determine whether it should not have been constituted. See Merced Rosa v. Herrero, 423 F.2d 591, 593 n.2 (1st Cir. 1970).

The Court finds that because “this action challenges the constitutionality of the apportionment of a statewide legislative body, as well as the

apportionment of a State's Congressional delegation" (Doc. No. [1] ¶ 31), this action is "covered by [28 U.S.C.] § 2284." Shapiro, 577 U.S. at 44. Because this case is covered by § 2284, the Court must notify the Chief Judge of the Eleventh Circuit so that he may appoint a three-judge panel. Accordingly, the Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk of Court to transmit this Order and a copy of the Complaint in this action to the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of January, 2022.



---

**HONORABLE STEVE C. JONES**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**