

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

ADAM P. FAUST, et al.,

Plaintiff(s),

v.

TELEPHONE STATUS CONFERENCE

Case No. 21-C-548

THOMAS J. VILSACK, et al.,

Defendant(s).

HONORABLE WILLIAM C. GRIESBACH presiding
Proceeding Held: June 24, 2021
Deputy Clerk: Mara

Time Called: 2:31 p.m.
Time Concluded: 2:45 p.m.
Tape: 062421

Appearances:

Plaintiff(s): Daniel Lennington

Defendant(s): Emily Sue Newton
Christian Larsen

The Court inquires if the decision entered from the Middle District of Florida has any effect on this case. Mr. Lennington discusses Plaintiff's position and believes this court should rule on the pending motion for preliminary injunction for the following three reasons:

- 1) An expedited appeal in the Middle District of FL is likely.
- 2) The existing temporary restraining order will turn into a preliminary injunction on July 7th per 7th Circuit case law.
- 3) The 7th Circuit would benefit from an opinion from this court on the preliminary injunction briefing.

Ms. Newton discusses Defendants' position and does not believe Plaintiff has not established irreparable harm or urgency that would entitle them to another preliminary injunction.

Ms. Newton responds as to an expedited appeal in the 11th Circuit and notes there was an oral argument hearing on the motion for preliminary injunction in the Middle District of FL. Ms. Newton does not believe further argument is necessary on the preliminary injunction motion in this case, but will consider it.

Mr. Lennington states he does not believe it is abnormal for there to be overlapping injunctions and notes Plaintiffs' argument that there is established irreparable harm is set forth in the preliminary injunction briefing.

The Court requests that Mr. Lennington supplement the record by submitting any similar case law for the Court's review. Ms. Newton responds as to irreparable harm.

The Court will issue a decision on the motion for preliminary injunction, if the Court decides it is appropriate. The Court notes the motion for preliminary injunction is already fully briefed and does not believe there is any need for further argument. The parties agree the motion is fully briefed.

Counsel for defendants may file a supplemental response in light of the recent decision issued in FL, if necessary.