

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION

TENNESSEE STATE CONFERENCE OF )  
THE NAACP, ET AL., )  
 )  
Plaintiffs, )  
 ) NO. 3:26-CV-00638  
v. )  
 ) JUDGE RICHARDSON  
TRE HARGETT *in his official capacity as* )  
*Secretary of State of the State of* )  
*Tennessee*, ET AL., )  
 )  
Defendants. )

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is the “Defendants Unopposed Motion and Memorandum of Law for Reassignment of Related Case Under Administrative Order 176” (Doc. No. 7, “Motion”), wherein they move the Court for an entry of an order reassigning this action to Chief Judge William L. Campbell, Jr. Within the Motion, Defendants argue that this case is related to *Hale et al. v. Lee et al.*, (Case No. 3:26-cv-00603) and *Sherman et al. v. Hargett et al.*, (Case No. 3:26-cv-00616), which are currently pending before Chief Judge Campbell, and that therefore this case should be reassigned to him in accordance with Administrative Order No. 176 of the Middle District of Tennessee (“A.O. 176”).

A.O. 176 provides in relevant part:

b. Reassignment of Related Cases. A civil case assigned to a District Judge may be reassigned to another District Judge as a Related Case as set forth herein when such reassignment is in the interest of justice. Nothing herein shall create a right of reassignment of Related Cases. The reassignment of cases is discretionary and is within the exclusive province of the Court.

c. Definition of Related Cases. Cases may be considered “Related Cases” based on the following non-exclusive factors:

1. The cases arise out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences (*see, e.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P. 20);
2. The cases involve common questions of law or fact (*see, e.g.*, Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a));
3. The cases involve one or more of the same parties or the same property;
4. The relief sought in the cases could result in a party being subject to conflicting orders or judgments;
5. Substantial duplication of effort and expense by the Court and the parties could occur if different District Judges presided over the cases;
6. Substantial savings of judicial time and resources could result if the cases were handled by the same District Judge; or
7. It is in the interest of justice, based on the totality of circumstances, for the same District Judge to preside over each of the cases.

A.O. 176 §§ I(b); I(c).

Having reviewed the Motion and relevant filings, the Motion is well taken. The court has little difficulty ascertaining that these three cases are all related to one another and that the interests of justice supports reassigning this case to Chief Judge Campbell. The Court finds that substantial judicial resources would be conserved if these cases were handled by the same judge and that a substantial duplication of effort could occur if the undersigned jurist and Chief Judge Campbell presided over these cases separately.

Accordingly, the Court finds that this case, *Hale*, and *Sherman* are properly deemed “Related Cases” in accordance with Order No. 176, and therefore the Motion is **GRANTED**. This case is hereby reassigned to Chief Judge Campbell.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

*Eli Richardson*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ELI RICHARDSON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM