

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

VOTE.ORG, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 4:23-cv-111-AW-MAF

**CORD BYRD, in his official capacity as
SECRETARY OF STATE OF
FLORIDA, et al.,**

Defendants,

**REPUBLICAN NATIONAL
COMMITTEE and REPUBLICAN
PARTY OF PASCO COUNTY,**

Intervenor-Defendants.

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO INTERVENE

Plaintiffs challenge a voter-registration signature requirement. They sued Florida's Secretary of State and sixty-seven county election supervisors. The Republican National Committee and Republican Party of Pasco County moved for permissive intervention as defendants. Those organizations represent party members, candidates, and voters.

This order grants the motion. The motion indicates it is unopposed by Plaintiffs and most Defendants. ECF No. 58 at 1.¹ In any event, no party has filed a timely response opposing the motion. *See* N.D. Fla. Loc. R. 7.1(H).

I have also independently considered the motion on its merits. District courts have broad discretion on whether to allow permissive intervention. *Chiles v. Thornburgh*, 865 F.2d 1197, 1213 (11th Cir. 1989) (citing *Sellers v. United States*, 709 F.2d 1469, 1471 (11th Cir. 1983)). The motion here—filed early in the case—is timely. There is no indication that its timing caused any party any prejudice. *See Comm’r, Ala. Dep’t of Corr. v. Advance Loc. Media, LLC*, 918 F.3d 1161, 1171 (11th Cir. 2019). Moreover, the movants intend to defend the same signature requirement that Plaintiffs contend is unlawful and that the current Defendants enforce. *See* ECF No. 58-2. Movants’ defenses will thus share questions of law and fact common with the main action. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1).

The motion to intervene (ECF No. 58) is GRANTED. The Republican National Committee and Republican Party of Pasco County are added as defendants. Their proposed answer (ECF No. 58-2) is accepted and deemed filed as of today.

SO ORDERED on May 26, 2023.

s/ Allen Winsor
United States District Judge

¹ Two Defendants were expressly unopposed, others took no position, and the remaining Defendants did not provide a view before the motion was filed. *Id.*