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

FLORIDA DECIDES HEALTHCARE,
INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No. 4:25-cv-211-MW-MAF

CORD BYRD, in his official capacity as Secretary of State of Florida, et al.,

Defendants.		

THE SECRETARY AND ATTORNEY GENERAL'S NOTICE TO THE COURT

In light of the Smart & Safe Plaintiffs' latest preliminary injunction motion, Doc.291, and email correspondence from another Plaintiff-Intervenor group stating that they plan on filing another preliminary injunction *and* amend their pleadings, the Secretary and Attorney General notify this Court of two things.

First, they notify this Court that under the order granting their motion to set a uniform answer deadline, Doc.206, the Secretary and Attorney General will file answers or motions to dismiss—for each of the five operative complaints—thirty days after this Court resolves the next (and presumably final) round of preliminary injunction motions.

Second, although the latest preliminary injunction motion from Smart & Safe concerns only the state attorney defendants, the Secretary and Attorney General note

that the motion, practically speaking, seeks to expand the scope of this Court's second preliminary injunction order, which is on appeal. That's problematic, as Judge Hinkle explained in *Dekker v. Weida*, when addressing a motion to modify a final *judgment* that was on appeal:

Modifying or clarifying a judgment that is on appeal is usually beyond a district court's jurisdiction and always problematic. A district court can enforce a judgment while an appeal is pending, unless a stay has been entered, but this does not mean a district court can modify or clarify the judgment in the course of enforcing it. Here the defendants are complying with the judgment as to the plaintiffs themselves. The dispute turns on whether the defendants' reliance on the waiver statute contravenes the declaratory judgment—an issue on which a modification or clarification, while the appeal is pending, would be problematic.

4:22-cv-325, Doc.266 at 6-7 (N.D. Fla. Jan. 31, 2024). So too here, even though the State has appealed this Court's preliminary injunction order and not a final judgment.

"The filing of a notice of appeal is an event of jurisdictional significance—it confers jurisdiction on the court of appeals and divests the district court of its control over those aspects of the case involved in the appeal." *Griggs v. Provident Consumer Discount Co.*, 459 U.S. 56, 58 (1982); *accord Coinbase, Inc. v. Bielski*, 599 U.S. 736, 740 (2023). Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(d) creates an exception for district courts to modify an injunction to "secure the opposing party's rights," which courts have interpreted as the power for district courts to modify injunctions to help preserve the status quo. *Natural Res. Def. Council v. Sw. Marine, Inc.*, 242 F.3d 1163, 1166 (9th Cir. 2001) (collecting cases).

Absent a stay from the Eleventh Circuit, this Court's preliminary injunction order reflects the status quo when it comes to non-resident (and non-citizen) circulators. Given the acquiescence of the state attorneys to Plaintiffs' requests to date, including their consent to preliminary relief, Doc.291 at 4, Smart & Safe has yet to explain how the most recent preliminary injunction is necessary to maintain that status quo. *See generally* Doc.291.

Consider also the possibility for confusion from another preliminary injunction order that modifies(?) the order on appeal and extends it to other parties. If the Eleventh Circuit grants the Secretary and Attorney General's motion for a stay of this Court's preliminary injunction, then these two state officials can continue enforcing the prohibitions on non-resident (and non-citizen) circulators. But the state attorneys who "do not oppose" the relief sought in the most recent motion, Doc.291 at 4, and presumably won't appeal an order granting that relief, *see id.*, would continue to be barred from enforcing those provisions. It all gets too confusing too quickly. Plaintiffs should have thought through this *before* filing their earlier motion, Doc.165.

In sum, and in addition to the standing requirement that Smart & Safe must satisfy, Doc.294, it must also explain whether the relief it now seeks is proper under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(d).

Dated: July 21, 2025

JAMES UTHMEIER

Attorney General

/s/ Sara E. Spears William H. Stafford III (FBN 70394) SPECIAL COUNSEL Sara E. Spears (FBN 1054270) Assistant Attorney General Maryssa Hardy (FBN 105866) Assistant Attorney General Complex Litigation Division OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PL-01, The Capitol Tallahassee, Florida 32399 (850) 414-3785 William.Stafford@myfloridalegal.com Sara.Spears@myfloridalegal.com Maryssa.Hardy@myfloridalegal.com ComplexLitigation@myfloridalegal.com

Counsel for Defendant-Appellant Florida Attorney General Respectfully submitted,

Bradley R. McVay (FBN 79034)
Deputy Secretary of State for Legal Affairs & Election Integrity
Ashley Davis (FBN 48032)
General Counsel
Genevieve McNalis (FBN 1045151)
Assistant General Counsel
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE
R.A. Gray Building
500 S. Bronough Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
(850) 245-6511
Brad.mcvay@dos.fl.gov
Ashley.davis@dos.fl.gov

/s/ Mohammad O. Jazil
Mohammad O. Jazil (FBN 72556)
Michael Beato (FBN 1017715)
HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN
TORCHINSKY & JOSEFIAK PLLC
119 S. Monroe St. Suite 500
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
(850) 270-5938
mjazil@holtzmanvogel.com
mbeato@holtzmanvogel.com
zbennington@holtzmanvogel.com

Counsel for the Secretary

LOCAL RULES CERTIFICATIONS

As required by Local Rule 5.1 and 7.1(J), I certify that this notice contains 640 words and complies with this Court's word count, spacing, and formatting requirements.

/s/ Mohammad O. Jazil Mohammad O. Jazil

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on July 21, 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court by using CM/ECF, which automatically serves all counsel of record for the parties who have appeared.

/s/ Mohammad O. Jazil Mohammad O. Jazil