No. 23-12472

In the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit

CITY OF MIAMI,

Defendant-Appellant,

v.

GRACE, Inc.; Engage Miami, Inc.; South Dade Branch of the NAACP; Miami-Dade Brach of the NAACP; Clarice Cooper; Yanelis Valdes; Jared Johnson; and Alexander Contreras,

Plaintiff-Appellee.

APPELLANT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS OUT OF TIME

George T. Levesque (FBN 55555) GRAYROBINSON, P.A. 301 South Bronough Street, Suite 600 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 george.levesque@gray-robinson.com Christopher N. Johnson (FBN 69329) GRAYROBINSON, P.A. 333 S.E. 2nd Avenue, Suite 3200 Miami, Florida 33131 george.levesque@gray-robinson.com

Attorneys for Defendant-Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS AND CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Appellant, the City of Miami, furnishes this certificate of interested persons and corporate disclosure statement.

- 1. ACLU Foundation of Florida, Inc., Counsel for Plaintiffs/Appellees
- 2. Bardos, Andy, Counsel for Defendant/Appellant
- 3. Carollo, Joe, Defendant/Appellant
- 4. City of Miami, Defendant/Appellant
- 5. Cody, Steven, Defendant/Appellant's expert
- 6. Contreras, Alexander, Plaintiff/Appellee
- 7. Cooper, Clarice, Plaintiff/Appellee
- 8. Covo, Sabina, Defendant/Appellant
- 9. De Grandy, Miguel, Defendant/Appellant's expert
- 10. Dechert LLP, Counsel for Plaintiffs/Appellees
- 11. Diaz de la Portilla, Alex, Defendant/Appellant
- 12. Engage Miami, Inc., Plaintiff/Appellee
- 13. GrayRobinson, P.A., Counsel for Defendant/Appellant
- 14. Grace, Inc., Plaintiff/Appellee
- 15. Greco, John A, Counsel for Defendant/Appellant
- 16. Johnson, Christopher N., Counsel for Defendant/Appellant
- 17. Johnson, Jared, Plaintiff/Appellee

- 18. Jones, Kevin R., Counsel for Defendant/Appellant
- 19. King, Christine, Defendant/Appellant
- 20. Kirsch, Jocelyn Kirsch, Counsel for Plaintiff/Appellee
- 21. Levesque, George T., Counsel for Defendant/Appellant
- 22. McNamara, Caroline A., Counsel for Plaintiff/Appellee
- 23. McNulty, Kerri L., Counsel for Defendant/Appellant
- 24. Méndez, Victoria, Counsel for Defendant/Appellant
- 25. Merken, Christopher J., Counsel for Plaintiff/Appellee
- 26. Miami-Dade Branch of the NAACP, Plaintiff/Appellee
- 27. Moore, K. Michael, United States District Judge, Southern District of Florida
- 28. Quintana, Marlene, Counsel for Defendant/Appellant
- 29. Reyes, Manolo, Defendant/Appellant
- 30. South Dade Branch of the NAACP, Plaintiff/Appellee
- 31. Steiner, Neil A., Counsel for Plaintiff/Appellee
- 32. Suarez, Francis, Defendant/Appellant
- 33. Tilley, Daniel T., Counsel for Plaintiff/Appellee
- 34. Unger, Jason L., Counsel for Defendant/Appellant
- 35. Valdes, Yanelis, Plaintiff/Appellee
- 36. Warren, Nicholas L.V., Counsel for Plaintiff/Appellee

37. Wysong, George, Counsel for Defendant/Appellant

Appellant, the City of Miami, certifies that, to the best of its knowledge, no publicly traded company or corporation has an interest in the outcome of the case or appeal.

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE DOCUMENTS OUT OF TIME

Appellant, the City of Miami, respectfully moves this Court for leave to file the attached Civil Appeal Statement out of time. The delay, which resulted from inadvertence of counsel, has caused no prejudice to any party, and the appeal has not been delayed. Appellees do not oppose the relief requested in this motion.

Respectfully submitted,

George T. Levesque (FBN 55555) GRAYROBINSON, P.A. 301 South Bronough Street, Suite 600 Tallahassee, Florida 32301 george.levesque@gray-robinson.com /s/ Christopher N. Johnson
Christopher N. Johnson (FBN 69329)
GRAYROBINSON, P.A.
333 S.E. 2nd Avenue, Suite 3200
Miami, Florida 33131
george.levesque@gray-robinson.com

Attorneys for Defendant-Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH TYPE-VOLUME LIMIT, TYPEFACE REQUIREMENTS, AND TYPE-STYLE REQUIREMENTS

This document complies with the word limit of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(2)(A) because, excluding the parts of the document exempted by Rule 32(f), this document contains 63 words.

This document was prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in 14-point Times New Roman font and therefore complies with the typeface requirements of Rule 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Rule 32(a)(6).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 23, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF. I also certify that the foregoing document is being served this day on all counsel of record or pro se parties either via transmission of Notice of Electronic Filing generated by CM/ECF or in some other authorized manner for those counsel or parties who are not authorized to receive electronically Notices of Electronic Filing.

/s/ Christopher N. Johnson
Christopher N. Johnson (FBN 69329)
GRAYROBINSON, P.A.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

CIVIL APPEAL STATEMENT

Please TYPE. Attach addit	ional pages if necessary.		11th Circuit Docket Number	: 23-12472
v. GRACE, INC.; EN SOUTH DADE BE MIAMI-DADE BR. CLARICE COOPI JARED JOHNSO CONTRERAS,	endant-Appellant, IGAGE MIAMI, INC.; RANCH OF THE NAACP; ANCH OF THE NAACP; ER; YANELIS VALDES; N; AND ALEXANDER	;	Name of Judge: K. Mich	er: 1:22-cv-24066-KMM 07/30/2023 ction een before this court?
Plaintiff G Defendant Ja Other (Specify) A	Attorney Name RAY ROBINSON, P.A. eorge T. Levesque ason L. Unger ndy Bardos hristopher N. Johnson arlene Quintana	Tallahas	Mailing Address Bronough Street, S-600 ssee, FL 32301 2nd Avenue, S-3200 FL 33131	Telephone, Fax, Email george.levesque@gray-robinson.com jason.unger@gray-robinson.com andy.bardos@gray-robinson.com christopher.johnson@gray-robinson.com marlene.quintana@gray-robinson.com
Plaintiff Ca Defendant Ni Other (Specify) Cr joc Ne	aniel B. Tilley aroline A. McNamara cholas L.V. Warren nristopher J. Merken celyn Kirsch bil A. Steiner	Miami, 336 E. 2929 A Philad Three 1095 A	V. Flagler Street, S-400 FL 33134 College Ave., S-203 Arch Street elphia, PA 19104 Bryant Park Avenue of the Americas York, Y 10036	dtilley@aclufl.org cmcnamara@aclufl.org nwarren@aclufl.org. christopher.merken@dechert.com jocelyn.kirsch@dechert.com neil.steiner@dechert.com
•	PLETE the items below and on page 2 tha	т арріу.		
Jurisdiction	Nature of Judgment	Ι	Type of Order	Relief
Federal Question Diversity US Plaintiff US Defendant	Final Judgment, 28 USC 1291 Interlocutory Order, 28 USC 1292(a)(1) Interlocutory Order Certified, 28 USC 1292(b) Interlocutory Order, Qualified Immunity Final Agency Action (Review) 54(b)		Dismissal/Jurisdiction Default Judgment Summary Judgment Judgment/Bench Trial Judgment/Jury Verdict Judgment/Directed Verdict/NO Injunction Other	Amount Sought by Plaintiff: \$ Amount Sought by Defendant: \$ Awarded: \$ to Injunctions: TRO Preliminary Granted Permanent Denied

Page 2

1)	Does this appeal involve a question of First Impression?
	What is the issue you claim is one of First Impression? Whether a governmental entity may be required to draw a Voting Rights Act protected District, but still have to set the Voting Age Population for the protected cla
2)	at less than 50%. Will the determination of this appeal turn on the interpretation or application of a particular case or statute?
	If Yes, provide
	(a) Case Name/Statute Negron v. City of Miami Beach (b) Citation 113 F.3d 1563
	(b) Citation 113 F.3d 1663 (c) Docket Number if unreported
(3)	Is there any case now pending or about to be brought before this court or any other court or administrative agency that
	(a) Arises from substantially the same case or controversy as this appeal? Yes No
	(b) Involves an issue that is substantially the same, similar, or related to an issue in this appeal?
	If Yes, provide
	(a) Case Name(b) Citation
	(c) Docket Number if unreported
	(d) Court or Agency
(4)	Will this appeal involve a conflict of law
	(a) Within the Eleventh Circuit?
	(a) this is a second of the se
	If Yes, explain briefly:
(5)	Issues proposed to be raised on appeal, including jurisdictional challenges: Whether a governmental entity may be required to draw a Voting Rights Act protected District, but still have to set the Voting Age Population for the protected class at less than 50%. Whether 50.3% Voting Age Population is sufficiently narrowly tailored to meet the strict scrutiny standard articulated in Bethune-Hill v. Va. State Bd. of Elections (Bethune-Hill I), 580 U.S. 178, 195-96 (2017) standard Whether Negron v. City of Miami Beach, 114 F.3d 1563, 1569 (11th Cir. 1997) requires a governmental activity to get the population of Voting Rights Act protected District using Citing Noting Age Population
(5)	Whether a governmental entity may be required to draw a Voting Rights Act protected District, but still have to set the Voting Age Population for the protected class at less than 50%. Whether 50.3% Voting Age Population is sufficiently narrowly tailored to meet the strict scrutiny standard articulated in Bethune-Hill v. Va. State Bd. of Elections (Bethune-Hill I), 580 U.S. 178, 195-96 (2017) standard
	Whether a governmental entity may be required to draw a Voting Rights Act protected District, but still have to set the Voting Age Population for the protected class at less than 50%. Whether 50.3% Voting Age Population is sufficiently narrowly tailored to meet the strict scrutiny standard articulated in Bethune-Hill v. Va. State Bd. of Elections (Bethune-Hill I), 580 U.S. 178, 195-96 (2017) standard Whether Negron v. City of Miami Beach, 114 F.3d 1563, 1569 (11th Cir. 1997) requires a governmental entity to set the population of Voting Rights Act protected District using Citizen Voting Age Population. Whether Plaintiffs unduly delayed seeking injunctive relief pursuant to Purcell v. Gonzalez, 549 U.S. 1 (2006) Whether the District Court exceeded its authority in invalidating a newly passed redistricting map and mandating Plaintiffs' map.
CERT	Whether a governmental entity may be required to draw a Voting Rights Act protected District, but still have to set the Voting Age Population for the protected class at less than 50%. Whether 50.3% Voting Age Population is sufficiently narrowly tailored to meet the strict scrutiny standard articulated in Bethune-Hill v. Va. State Bd. of Elections (Bethune-Hill I), 580 U.S. 178, 195-96 (2017) standard Whether Negron v. City of Miami Beach, 114 F.3d 1563, 1569 (11th Cir. 1997) requires a governmental entity to set the population of Voting Rights Act protected District using Citizen Voting Age Population. Whether Plaintiffs unduly delayed seeking injunctive relief pursuant to Purcell v. Gonzalez, 549 U.S. 1 (2006) Whether the District Court exceeded its authority in invalidating a newly passed redistricting map and mandating Plaintiffs' map. Whether the map mandated by the District Court corrected the alleged deficiencies of the map that was subject to the injunction.
ERT	Whether a governmental entity may be required to draw a Voting Rights Act protected District, but still have to set the Voting Age Population for the protected class at less than 50%. Whether 50.3% Voting Age Population is sufficiently narrowly tailored to meet the strict scrutiny standard articulated in Bethune-Hill v. Va. State Bd. of Elections (Bethune-Hill I), 580 U.S. 178, 195-96 (2017) standard Whether Negron v. City of Miami Beach, 114 F.3d 1563, 1569 (11th Cir. 1997) requires a governmental entity to set the population of Voting Rights Act protected District using Citizen Voting Age Population. Whether Plaintiffs unduly delayed seeking injunctive relief pursuant to Purcell v. Gonzalez, 549 U.S. 1 (2006) Whether the District Court exceeded its authority in invalidating a newly passed redistricting map and mandating Plaintiffs' map. Whether the map mandated by the District Court corrected the alleged deficiencies of the map that was subject to the injunction.
RT	Whether a governmental entity may be required to draw a Voting Rights Act protected District, but still have to set the Voting Age Population for the protected class at less than 50%. Whether 50.3% Voting Age Population is sufficiently narrowly tailored to meet the strict scrutiny standard articulated in Bethune-Hill v. Va. State Bd. of Elections (Bethune-Hill I), 580 U.S. 178, 195-96 (2017) standard Whether Negron v. City of Miami Beach, 114 F.3d 1563, 1569 (11th Cir. 1997) requires a governmental entity to set the population of Voting Rights Act protected District using Citizen Voting Age Population. Whether Plaintiffs unduly delayed seeking injunctive relief pursuant to Purcell v. Gonzalez, 549 U.S. 1 (2006) Whether the District Court exceeded its authority in invalidating a newly passed redistricting map and mandating Plaintiffs' map. Whether the map mandated by the District Court corrected the alleged deficiencies of the map that was subject to the injunction.

11th Circuit Docket Number: _