



Washington, D.C.
Virginia
Florida
Arizona
New York
Tennessee
Utah
holtzmanvogel.com

May 17, 2026

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

The Honorable Scott Harris
Clerk of Court
Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street NE
Washington, DC 20002

Re: *Trevino v. Hobbs* (25-918)

Dear Mr. Harris:

Petitioners write to inform the Court that on May 15, 2026, the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington issued an Order Denying Intervenor-Defendants' Motion for Relief from Judgment Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), *Soto Palmer v. Hobbs*, No. 3:22-cv-5035-RSL (May 15, 2026), ECF No. 318 (the "Order").

The Order is relevant to the Court's consideration of Petitioners' Motion to Expedite Consideration of Petition for a Writ of Certiorari and to Expedite Consideration of This Motion filed on May 15, 2026 (the "Motion"). As discussed in the Motion (Mot. at 1 n.1), before seeking expedited relief from this Court, on May 4, 2026, Petitioners first filed a motion in the district court for relief from the judgment (the "Rule 60(b) Motion"). Petitioners' Rule 60(b) Motion argued that the district court's Section 2 liability finding and court-imposed remedial map fail to satisfy the proper Section 2 framework that this Court recently articulated in *Louisiana v. Callais*, 608 U.S. ___ (2026), and that the appropriate remedy was vacatur of the court-imposed remedial map and reinstatement of the prior map adopted by Washington's independent and bipartisan districting commission.

The district court denied the Rule 60(b) Motion based on the Ninth Circuit's errant holding that Petitioners lack standing to challenge the district court's Section 2 liability determination. Order at 7–8, 10. The court noted that the Ninth Circuit's decision was "binding." Order at 9. Accordingly, a decision by this Court correcting the Ninth Circuit's flawed standing holding and vacating the district court's judgment and remedial order is the only remaining avenue to afford Washington voters the same opportunity as those of other States to use a state districting map in its upcoming elections that is unburdened by an federal court injunction imposing a map directly contrary to this Court's analysis in

HV

Callais. The district court entered the Order hours after Petitioners filed the Motion, and Petitioners were therefore unable to bring it to the Court's attention in the Motion.

I would greatly appreciate it if you could provide this letter to the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jason B. Torchinsky
Jason B. Torchinsky
Counsel for Petitioners

CC: Mark Peter Gaber, Esq.
Peter Benjamin Gonick, Esq.

Attachment