

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

ROBERT L. “ROBB” PITTS, et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

CIVIL ACTION NO.
1:26-MI-00012-JPB

ORDER

Robert L. “Robb” Pitts and the Fulton County Board of Registration and Elections (collectively, “Petitioners”) filed this action against the United States of America (“Respondent”) on February 5, 2026, seeking the return of items seized pursuant to a search warrant. Thus far, Petitioners have filed the following motions: (1) Emergency Motion for Return of Property Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 41(g) [Doc. 1]; (2) Motion to Unseal Affidavit [Doc. 2]; (3) Emergency Motion Pursuant to Local Rule 7.2(B) [Doc. 3]; and (4) Emergency Motion to Determine Whether Filing Under Seal is Warranted [Doc. 4].

The docket in this case as well as the above-referenced motions are currently sealed.¹ Although Petitioners originally filed this case under seal, both parties

¹ In an abundance of caution, Petitioners filed the action under seal because their motions contain references to a search warrant that was executed under seal. [Doc. 4, p. 2].

have now indicated to the Court that they do not oppose unsealing the docket or the motions filed by Petitioners. Moreover, Respondent has stated that it does not oppose the unsealing of the search warrant affidavit and any other papers associated with the warrant subject to the redaction of the names of non-governmental witnesses. [Doc. 7].

Given the importance of the public's access to judicial proceedings, the Clerk is **DIRECTED** to unseal the docket in this case. The Clerk is **FURTHER DIRECTED** to unseal Petitioners' motions [Docs. 1 through 4]. As to the search warrant affidavit, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Respondent shall file, no later than the close of business on Tuesday, February 10, 2026, the search warrant affidavit subject to the redaction of the names of non-governmental witnesses.²

SO ORDERED this 7th day of February, 2026.



J. P. BOULEE
United States District Judge

² Respondent asked that it be allowed to file the redacted affidavit by Tuesday at 5:00 PM. Even though Petitioners agreed to Respondent's request as to the Tuesday deadline, it is the Court's preference that Respondent file the affidavit sooner.