

Pending Marriage Equality Cases

As of April 27, 2015

Scorecard

Pending Marriage Equality Lawsuits

There are currently:

85 lawsuits involving the right of same-sex couples to marry or have their out-of-state marriages respected are pending in 28 states (**AL, AK, AZ, AR, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MI, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NC, ND, OH, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA,** and **WY**) as well as **Guam and Puerto Rico**. (Same-sex couples already are able to marry in some of these states, but some marriage litigation is still pending in each of these states.)

54 of these lawsuits are in federal court;

6 of these, involving the marriage laws of 4 states (KY, MI, OH, and TN), have been accepted for review by the U.S. Supreme Court and will be argued April 28, 2015;

3 additional petitions for Supreme Court review have been filed regarding the decision of the 9th Circuit holding the marriage bans of ID and NV unconstitutional;

2 further petitions have been filed with the Supreme Court seeking review prior to judgment in cases currently before the 4th Circuit regarding the marriage bans of NC;

a petition for writ of certiorari filed by the National Organization for Marriage seeking review of a 9th Circuit decision rejecting its efforts to appeal the decision striking down OR's marriage ban was denied by the Supreme Court on 4/20/15.

24 of the federal cases are before U.S. courts of appeal (3 of which are simultaneously subject to cert. petitions to the Supreme Court);

21 are in federal district courts;

Circuit court appeals stayed pending Supreme Court resolution of *Obergefell et al.*:

4th Circuit	9th Circuit	11th Circuit
Fisher-Borne, General Synod, and Gerber (NC) Bleckley/Condon, Bradacs (SC)	Hamby (AK) Connolly, Majors (AZ) Rolando (MT)	Searcy, Strawser (AL) Brenner , Grimsley (FL) Inniss (GA)

District Court Cases currently stayed:

Within the 5th Circuit	Within the 6th Circuit	Within the 8th Circuit	Within the 11th Circuit
DeLeon (WD TX) McNosky (WD TX) Zahrn (WD TX)	Blankenship (ED MI) Morgan (WD MI) Gibson (SD OH)	Jorgensen (D ND) Ramsay (D ND)	Hard (MD AL)

31 cases are in state courts;

18 of these are on appeal, 7 of which are now before state supreme courts; and

22 of the cases in state courts raise federal claims.

Marriage equality lawsuits are pending in **all states** that do not currently allow same-sex couples to marry.

Post-*Windsor* Cases Ruling in Favor of Marriage Equality Claims

In 2013, the Supreme Court ruled that it is unconstitutional for the federal government to refuse to recognize marriages entered by same-sex couples. Since that decision (*U.S. v. Windsor*), there has been a nearly unbroken string of 48 rulings in 47 cases from 29 different **federal** courts that have held the laws of 29 states that barred same-sex couples from marrying or having their marriages recognized to be unconstitutional or that have entered partial or full injunctions against them (AL, AK, AR, AZ, CO, FL, ID, IL, IN, KS, KY, MI, MS, MT, NE, NV, NC, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, WI, and WY). Including state courts, the

total rises to 65 rulings in 61 cases from 44 different **federal and state courts** invalidating or enjoining the enforcement of the marriage bans of 32 states (the states in the last parenthetical, plus MO, NJ, and NM).

Marriage Equality

Marriage equality currently exists in **36** states, **DC**, and **parts of KS and MO**: Explore our [interactive map](#) (click on “Marriage and Relationships”).

In addition, more than **500** same-sex couples married in **AR** and more than **300** same-sex couples married in **MI** before stays were issued of rulings that those states’ marriage bans are unconstitutional or orders were issued directing that no further marriage licenses be issued pending appeals of lower court rulings. The marriages entered in MI have been ordered recognized by the state (although that ruling has been temporarily stayed) and are now being recognized for at least federal law purposes, but the federal government has not yet announced whether it will recognize the marriages entered in AR.

In **OH**, the District Court’s rulings in two cases requiring recognition of marriages entered outside the state by same-sex couples remain in effect as to the named plaintiffs in both cases.

In other cases in which state marriage laws have been ruled unconstitutional in which appellate rulings have not yet issued, the rulings have been stayed pending appeal (in **AR, SD, TX, and WY**) and, in one of the **OH** cases, the court’s order has been stayed as to all couples except the named plaintiffs.

Marriage Recognition

Although **MO** does not currently allow same-sex couples to marry, it has decided to recognize marriages same-sex couples have entered outside the state for all purposes. Whether other states that do not currently allow same-sex couples to marry will recognize marriages entered by same-sex couples out-of-state for all or at least some purposes is not yet fully resolved.

Other Relationship Recognition

As a result of recent rulings, **all** states that provide comprehensive civil union or domestic partnership also now provide or have appellate court rulings mandating the current ability of same-sex couples to marry throughout the state. Civil union and domestic partnership ordinances and policies also exist in numerous local jurisdictions. Explore our [interactive map](#) (click on “Marriage and Relationships”).

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

STATE	CIRCUIT	CASE NAME	NATURE OF CLAIMS ¹	COUNSEL	STATUS
Idaho	9 th	<i>Otter v. Latta*</i> and <i>Idaho v. Latta*</i>	B	NCLR; Law Office of Deborah A. Ferguson, PLLC; Durham Law Office, PLLC	Complaint filed 11/8/13. On 5/13/14, the district court granted plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, declaring that Idaho's ban on same-sex couples marrying and on recognizing same-sex couples' out-of-state marriages is unconstitutional and enjoining enforcement of the ban. The 9 th Circuit stayed that ruling pending decision on a motion for a stay pending appeal on 5/15/14, and then stayed the ruling pending appeal on 5/21/14. On 5/30/14, appellant Otter filed a petition for initial hearing en banc. That petition was denied on 8/19/14. On 10/7/14, the 9 th Circuit affirmed the district court, ruling that the denial of access to marriage violates the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution. It issued its mandate that same day. On 10/8/14, Gov. Otter sought a stay from the Supreme Court. Justice Kennedy granted a temporary stay but the entire Court ended the stay on 10/10/14. The 9 th Circuit had recalled its mandate as to Idaho in response to Justice Kennedy's original order, but, in response to further briefing, the 9 th Circuit dissolved its stay, effective 10/15/14, when same-sex couples became able to marry in Idaho. On 10/21/14, Gov. Latta petitioned the 9 th Circuit for rehearing en banc. On 1/9/15, the petition for rehearing was denied. However, prior to that decision, Gov. Otter on 12/30/14 filed a petition for certiorari before judgment with the Supreme Court. The response to that petition was filed on 1/29/15. On 2/9/15, Gov. Otter replied. The petition was distributed for consideration at the Supreme Court's 2/27/15 conference. On 1/2/15, the State of Idaho filed a separate petition for certiorari before judgment. Respondent Otter filed a brief in response on 1/8/15, and Gov. Otter replied on 2/9/15. This petition also was distributed for consideration at the Supreme Court's 2/27/15 conference. The Supreme Court has not yet acted upon these cert. petitions.
Kentucky	6 th	<i>Bourke v. Beshear*</i>	R	ACLU; Jeffrey Fisher; Clay Daniel Walton & Adams PLC; Fauver Law	Complaint filed 7/26/13. On 2/27/14, the district court entered a final judgment declaring the state's refusal to recognize out-of-state marriages of same-sex couples to be unconstitutional, but it stayed the judgment pending appeal. The Kentucky Attorney General declined to appeal, but the Governor retained outside

¹ Cases seeking only the freedom to marry for unmarried same-sex couples are marked "M." Cases seeking only recognition of marriages entered by same-sex couples in other jurisdictions are marked "R." Cases seeking both are marked "B." Cases seeking in-state recognition of marriages entered in-state are marked "I-S R." Cases in which same-sex couples are seeking a divorce are marked "D." Cases in which second-parent adoptions are also being sought are marked "A." Cases filed, or that newly included a marriage claim, since the decision in *Windsor* are marked with an asterisk.

				Office PLLC	counsel to handle the state's appeal. The appeal was consolidated for submission and oral argument with <i>Love v. Beshear</i> , below. Oral argument was held 8/6/14. On 11/6/14, the 6 th Circuit reversed the ruling of the district court and upheld the state's marriage ban. On 11/18/14, Bourke filed a petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court. On 12/8/14, respondent Beshear filed its response, supporting the grant of cert. On 12/17/14, Idaho's Gov. Latta filed an amicus brief in all of the cases in which cert. petitions were then pending, urging the Court to defer deciding which case to hear until it could also or instead hear a cert. petition in the <i>Latta</i> case. The <i>Bourke</i> cert. petition was considered at the Supreme Court's 1/9/15 conference. On 1/12/15, the writ of certiorari was granted limited to the following questions: 1) Does the Fourteenth Amendment require a state to license a marriage between two people of the same sex? 2) Does the Fourteenth Amendment require a state to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage was lawfully licensed and performed out-of-state? The brief of petitioners was filed on 2/27/15. The brief of respondents was filed on 3/27/15. More than 70 amicus briefs were filed in support of the petitioners; more than 60 amicus briefs filed in support of respondents; and several amicus briefs filed in support of neither. The reply brief was filed on 4/17/15. Oral argument is being heard 4/28/15.
Kentucky	6 th	<i>Love v. Beshear</i> *	M	ACLU; Jeffrey Fisher; Clay Daniel Walton & Adams PLC; Fauver Law Office PLLC	On 2/14/14, two same-sex couples moved to intervene in what was <i>Bourke v. Beshear</i> (after the judge granted summary judgment in favor of the plaintiffs in that case, which raised only marriage recognition claims) to raise freedom to marry claims. That motion was granted and the judge renamed the new case. A motion for preliminary injunction was denied 2/2/14. The Attorney General was ordered dismissed as a defendant on 3/24/14. Plaintiffs-Intervenors filed motions for summary judgment and immediate injunctive relief on 4/18/14. On 7/1/14, the trial court ruled in favor of plaintiffs, concluding that Kentucky's marriage ban violates the Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution. The trial court stayed its ruling pending an appeal. Appellees filed a motion to consolidate the appeal with the <i>Bourke</i> case, above, which was granted. See post-consolidation entries for <i>Bourke v. Beshear</i> , above, which apply equally to this case.
Michigan	6 th	<i>DeBoer v. Snyder</i>	M/A	GLAD; Carole M. Stanyar; Mogill, Posner & Cohen; Dana P. Nessel; Robert A. Sedler	Case originally filed as a challenge to denial of second parent adoption; subsequently amended, at trial court's instance, to raise freedom to marry claim. A trial was held on the bifurcated issue of whether the state's ban on same-sex couples marrying failed the rational basis test under the federal equal protection clause. The trial court ruled that it did and declared the state's marriage ban unconstitutional on 3/21/14. An appeal and a motion to stay were filed with the 6 th Circuit that day, which granted a temporary stay, and then on 3/25/14 granted

					<p>a stay pending appeal. On 3/26/14, the Governor issued a statement that the more than 300 marriages entered before the stay were validly entered, but that state benefits would be “suspended” until further court rulings are issued. By contrast, U.S. Attorney General Holder issued a statement on 3/27/14 that the federal government would treat the couples equally to all other validly married couples. Oral argument of the appeal was held 8/6/14. On 11/6/14, the 6th Circuit reversed the ruling of the district court and upheld the state’s marriage ban. On 11/14/14, DeBoer filed a petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court. Respondents filed a brief in support of cert. on 11/24/14. On 12/17/14, Idaho’s Gov. Latta filed an amicus brief in all of the cases in which cert. petitions were then pending, urging the Court to defer deciding which case to hear until it could also or instead hear a cert. petition in the <i>Latta</i> case. The <i>DeBoer</i> cert. petition was considered at the Supreme Court’s 1/9/15 conference. On 1/12/15, the writ of certiorari was granted limited to the following questions: 1) Does the Fourteenth Amendment require a state to license a marriage between two people of the same sex? 2) Does the Fourteenth Amendment require a state to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage was lawfully licensed and performed out-of-state? The brief of petitioners was filed on 2/27/15. The brief of respondents was filed on 3/27/15. More than 70 amicus briefs were filed in support of petitioners; more than 60 amicus briefs filed in support respondents; and several amicus briefs filed in support of neither. The reply brief was filed on 4/17/15. Oral argument is being heard 4/28/15.</p>
Nevada	9 th	<i>Sevcik v. Sandoval</i>	B	Lambda Legal; O’Melveny & Myers LLP; Snell & Wilmer LLP	<p>On 10/7/14, the 9th Circuit overturned the adverse ruling of the district court and held that it violates the Equal Protection Clause to deny same-sex couples access to marriage and issued its mandate. On 10/8/14, Justice Kennedy issued a temporary stay but, later that day, clarified that that stay only applied to the appeal in the Idaho <i>Latta v. Otter</i> case. The district court judge who had ruled against the plaintiff recused himself and the case was reassigned. On 10/9/14, a permanent injunction was issued prohibiting enforcement of Nevada’s marriage ban and ordering that otherwise eligible same-sex couples must be allowed to marry. Same-sex couples began marrying later that day. On 10/13/14, the intervenor (the Coalition for the Protection of Marriage) filed a petition for rehearing en banc with the 9th Circuit. On 1/9/15, the 9th Circuit denied the petition for rehearing en banc. A petition for certiorari was filed by Coalition for the Protection of Marriage on 4/9/15. Responses to the petition are due 5/11/15.</p>
North Carolina	4 th	<i>Berger v. Fisher-Borne</i>	B/A	ACLU; Sullivan & Cromwell LLP; Ellis & Winters	<p>The <i>Fisher-Borne v. Smith</i> case was a second-parent adoption case, but it was amended post <i>Windsor</i> to raise marriage claims. It subsequently was consolidated with the later-filed <i>Gerber v. Cooper</i> case. On 10/6/14, the district</p>

		(formerly <i>Fisher-Borne v. Smith and Gerber v. Cooper</i>)		LLP	court filed an order stating that the "Virginia marriage ban declared unconstitutional in <i>Bostic</i> is indistinguishable from the North Carolina prohibitions challenged in this matter." Status reports were filed on 10/7/14 from the parties agreeing that <i>Bostic</i> is binding and that the adoption claim should be dismissed as moot. On 10/9/14, however, two North Carolina legislators filed a motion to intervene. That motion was granted on 10/14/14, but only for the purpose of lodging an objection and preserving that objection to the court's application of <i>Bostic</i> for purposes of a possible effort by the legislators to appeal. On 10/15/14, the court issued an amended order declaring that North Carolina's constitutional amendment and statutes banning marriage for same-sex couples violate the U.S. Constitution. Same-sex couples can now marry in the state and have their out-of-state marriages recognized by the state. This decision was appealed on 11/12/14 by the legislators. On 11/21/14, a cross-appeal was filed by the <i>Fisher-Borne</i> and <i>Gerber</i> plaintiffs. On 1/9/15, the legislators filed a petition for certiorari before judgment with the Supreme Court. On 1/30/15, respondents filed a waiver of the right to respond. On 3/4/15, the petition was distributed for consideration at the Supreme Court's 3/20/2015 conference. On 3/18/15, the Supreme Court requested a response to the cert. petition, which was filed on 4/17/15.
Ohio	6 th	<i>Henry v. Hodges*</i> (formerly <i>Henry v. Himes</i> and <i>Henry v. Wymyslo</i>)	R	Lambda Legal; Gerhardstein & Branch Co., LPA; Newman & Meeks Co., LPA; Ellen Essig	Complaint filed 2/10/14. A motion for declaratory relief and a permanent injunction was filed 2/28/14. On 4/4/14, the court ruled that marriages entered by same-sex couples outside the state must be recognized for all purposes and that adoptions secured by same-sex couples in other states must be given full faith and credit. On 4/15/14, defendant filed a motion to stay, which the district court on 4/16/14 declined to enter as to the named plaintiffs, but otherwise granted. On 5/20/14, the appeal was consolidated with the <i>Obergefell v. Henry</i> appeal for purposes of argument. Oral argument was held 8/6/14. On 11/6/14, the 6 th Circuit reversed the ruling of the district court and upheld the state's marriage recognition ban. On 11/14/14, the plaintiffs in the <i>Henry</i> and <i>Obergefell</i> cases filed a joint petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court. On 12/12/14, respondents filed a brief supporting cert. on the marriage recognition question in the case, but opposing the grant of cert. on the full faith and credit issue. On 12/17/14, Idaho's Gov. Latta filed an amicus brief in all of the cases in which cert. petitions were then pending, urging the Court to defer deciding which case to hear until it could also or instead hear a cert. petition in the <i>Latta</i> case. The <i>Obergefell/Henry</i> cert. petition was considered at the Supreme Court's 1/9/15. On 1/12/15, the writ of certiorari was granted limited to the following questions: 1) Does the Fourteenth Amendment require a state to

					license a marriage between two people of the same sex? 2) Does the Fourteenth Amendment require a state to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage was lawfully licensed and performed out-of-state? The brief of petitioners was filed on 2/27/15. The brief of respondents was filed on 3/27/15. More than 70 amicus briefs were filed in support of the petitioners; more than 60 amicus briefs filed in support respondents; and several amicus briefs filed in support of neither. The reply brief was filed on 4/17/15. Oral argument is being heard 4/28/15.
Ohio	6 th	<i>Obergefell v. Hodges</i> * (formerly <i>Obergefell v. Himes</i> and <i>Obergefell Wymyslo</i>)	R	ACLU; Gerhardstein & Branch Co., LPA; Newman & Meeks Co., LPA	Complaint filed 7/19/13. A permanent injunction was granted 12/23/13 requiring Ohio to recognize marriages validly entered by same-sex couples in other states on the death certificates of two men who married same-sex partners. The state appealed. On 5/20/14, the appeal in this case was ordered consolidated with the <i>Henry v. Himes</i> (now <i>Henry v. Hodges</i>) appeal for purposes of argument. Oral argument was held 8/6/14. On 11/6/14, the 6 th Circuit reversed the ruling of the district court and upheld the state's marriage ban. On 11/14/14, the plaintiffs in the <i>Henry</i> and <i>Obergefell</i> cases filed a joint petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court. See post-filing of cert. petition entries for the <i>Henry v. Hodges</i> case, above, which apply equally to this case.
Oregon	9 th	<i>Nat'l Organization for Marriage v. Geiger</i>			Petition for certiorari filed on 2/23/15 by anti-gay organization that unsuccessfully sought to intervene and then to appeal marriage equality victory that the defendants decided not to appeal. Waivers of right the right to respond were filed by respondents in early March. On 4/1/15, the case was distributed for the Supreme Court's conference of 4/17/15. The petition for cert. was denied on 4/20/15, putting an end to this litigation, and assuring the freedom to marry in Oregon.
Tennessee	6 th	<i>Tanco v. Haslam</i> *	R	NCLR; Rubenfeld Law Office; Holland & Associates, PLLC; Sherrard & Roe, PLC; Regina M. Lambert; Ropes & Gray LLP	Complaint filed 10/21/13. Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction on 11/19/13. On 3/14/14, the court granted a preliminary injunction requiring the state to recognize the named plaintiffs' marriages pending resolution of the case. On 3/19/14, the state filed its notice of appeal and filed a motion with the district court for a stay pending appeal, which was denied on 3/20/14. Defendants filed a motion for a stay pending appeal with 6 th Circuit on 3/25/14. Opposition was filed 4/4/14. The stay was granted 4/25/14. Oral argument of the appeal was held 8/6/14. On 11/6/14, the 6 th Circuit reversed the ruling of the district court and upheld the marriage recognition ban. On 11/14/14, the Tanco plaintiffs filed a petition for writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court. On 12/15/14, respondents filed a brief opposing the grant of cert. On 12/17/14, Idaho's Gov. Latta filed an amicus brief in all of the cases in which cert. petitions were then pending, urging the Court to defer deciding which case to hear until it

					could also or instead hear a cert. petition in the <i>Latta</i> case. The cert. petition was considered at the Supreme Court's 1/9/15 conference. On 1/12/15, the writ of certiorari was granted limited to the following questions: 1) Does the Fourteenth Amendment require a state to license a marriage between two people of the same sex? 2) Does the Fourteenth Amendment require a state to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage was lawfully licensed and performed out-of-state? The brief of petitioners was filed on 2/27/15. The brief of respondents was filed on 3/27/15. More than 70 amicus briefs were filed in support of the petitioners; more than 60 amicus briefs filed in support respondents; and several amicus briefs filed in support of neither. The reply brief was filed on 4/17/15. Oral argument is being heard 4/28/15.
--	--	--	--	--	--

IN FEDERAL COURTS OF APPEALS

STATE	CIRCUIT	CASE NAME	NATURE OF CLAIMS	COUNSEL	STATUS
Alaska	9 th	<i>Hamby v. Parnell</i> *	B	Heather Gardner Law Office; Law Offices of Caitlin Shortell; Mendell & Associates	Complaint filed 5/12/14. Suit by four same-sex couples married in other states and one unmarried couple. On 10/12/14, the court granted plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, ruling that Alaska's bar on marriage for same-sex couples is unconstitutional. State officials filed an appeal to the 9 th Circuit on 10/13/14 and requested issuance of an emergency stay pending appeal. The 9 th Circuit granted a temporary stay until the Supreme Court ruled on a request for a stay to it, which the appellants proceeded to seek. The Supreme Court denied the request for a stay on 10/17/14, and the 9 th Circuit's temporary stay therefore expired, making it possible for same-sex couples to marry in the state. On 10/22/14, the state petitioned the 9 th Circuit for initial en banc review. Because no judge requested a vote on this petition within the time period allowed by the Court's rules, the request was denied. On 2/27/15, the 9 th Circuit stayed the proceedings pending the Supreme Court's decision of the 6 th Circuit appeals.
Alabama	11 th	<i>Searcy v.</i>	M/A	Christine Cassie	Filed 5/7/14. A couple married in California in 2008 and their minor

		<i>Strange*</i> (formerly <i>Searcy v. Bentley</i>)		Hernandez, The Hernandez Firm, LLC; David Kennedy, The Kennedy Law Firm	child filed suit claiming violations of the Equal Protection and Due Process clauses of the 14th Amendment and the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the U.S. Constitution. The non-biological mother wanted to use Alabama's step-parent adoption statutes to adopt the child, but the Alabama statute only allows spouses to adopt. Defendants filed several motions to dismiss. On 6/12/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment, but on 6/13/14 the judge ordered that it was premature and that the court would address that motion after the motions to dismiss have been adjudicated. On 6/24/14, plaintiffs filed their response to the motions to dismiss and defendants filed their reply on 6/27/14. The Magistrate's report and recommendations were filed on 7/30/14, suggesting the case proceed solely against Attorney General Strange in his official capacity. The court so ordered, dismissing claims against other defendants on 8/28/14. Defendants filed their motion for summary judgment and opposition to plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment on 10/17/14. Plaintiffs' reply brief was filed 10/31/14. Defendants' surreply was filed 11/13/14. On 1/23/15, the court granted plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, finding that the state's constitutional and statutory bans on marriage for same-sex couples violate the U.S. Constitution. The defendants immediately filed a motion asking the trial court to stay its ruling, which the plaintiffs opposed. On 1/25/15, the motion for a stay was granted for 14 days. On 1/26/15, a notice of appeal was filed. On 1/26/15, the appellants filed a motion with the 11 th Circuit, asking it to stay the trial court's order and, on 1/29/15, the Appellees opposed the motion. On 1/30/15, the Governor and the Alabama Probate Judges Association filed amicus briefs in support of Alabama. On 2/3/15, the 11 th Circuit consolidated this case with the <i>Strawser</i> case and denied all motions to stay the trial court's order pending the appeals. On 2/3/15, the Attorney General applied to the Supreme Court for a stay of the trial court's order, which the Supreme Court denied on 2/9/15. On 2/4/15, the 11 th Circuit ordered the appeal held in abeyance until the Supreme Court decides the <i>Orbergefell</i> and related appeals.
Alabama	11 th	<i>Strawser v. Strange</i>	B	NCLR	Complaint filed in the District Court on 9/11/14 by an Alabama gay couple seeking the right to marry. On 1/26/15, the court granted a preliminary injunction. A notice of appeal and a motion to stay the preliminary injunction was filed by Appellant, Attorney General Strange on 1/26/15. On 1/30/15, the Governor and the Alabama Probate Judges

					<p>Association filed amicus briefs in support of Alabama. On 1/30/15, the Appellees filed their response to the motion for stay. On 2/3/15, the appeal in this case was consolidated with <i>Searcy</i>, above, and the motion for a stay of the preliminary injunction denied. See entries above for <i>Searcy</i> for further updates regarding the appeal, which is now being held in abeyance.</p> <p>Proceedings have continued in the district court while the appeal proceeds. An amended complaint was filed and then responded to on 2/10/15. A hearing was held on 2/12/15 and a preliminary injunction was granted. On 2/17/15, the plaintiffs filed an emergency motion for enforcement of the injunction, which has been opposed by defendants. On 2/20/15, the court denied plaintiffs' emergency motion for enforcement of judgment. On 2/24/15, defendant Strange answered the amended complaint. Defendant Davis filed a motion to stay on 3/5/15. On 3/6/15, plaintiffs filed a motion to amend the complaint, to certify plaintiff and defendant classes, and for a preliminary injunction. On 3/9/15, defendant Strange filed his response in opposition. On 3/13/15, plaintiffs filed their response in opposition to the motion for a stay. On 3/16/15, the court denied defendant Davis' motion to stay the Court's 2/12/15 preliminary injunction. On 3/17/15, Davis filed his response in opposition to plaintiffs' motion to amend the complaint and to certify plaintiff and defendant classes. On 3/18/15, the court granted plaintiffs' motion to amend the complaint. The amended complaint was filed on 3/19/15. On 3/23/15, Strange filed oppositions to the motion to certify the classes and the motion for a preliminary injunction. Plaintiffs filed their reply brief on 3/24/15. Responses to the amended complaint were filed by Davis and Strange on 4/6/15 and by Russell on 4/10/15. On 4/13/15, a response in opposition to Russell's motion to dismiss was filed by Strawser. The motions to dismiss were denied on 4/23/15.</p>
Arizona	9 th	<i>Connolly v. Roche</i>	B	Shawn Aiken; Griffen & Stevens Law Firm, PLLC; Mikkel Jordahl, P.C.; Dillon Law Office	Complaint filed 1/6/14. An amended complaint was filed dropping class action allegations, state defendants, and a Full Faith & Credit Clause claim. Plaintiffs moved for summary judgment on 4/21/14 and defendants cross-moved for summary judgment on 6/10/14. On 10/9/14, the court issued an order requiring the defendants to file a brief by 10/16/14 as to why the 9 th Circuit's decision in <i>Latta v. Otter</i> is not controlling, requiring Arizona's marriage ban to be struck down as well. On 10/17/14, the court granted plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment,

					holding the state's marriage ban unconstitutional. The state appealed on 11/18/14. On 12/1/14, the parties asked the court to stay the proceedings until the Supreme Court acts on the cert. petitions from the 6th Circuit <i>DeBoer</i> decision and, if it granted one or more of the pending cert. petitions, until the Supreme Court rules. The 9th Circuit so ordered on 12/2/14. The parties' stipulation to further stay appellate proceedings was granted and the case has been stayed until 6/8/15.
Arizona	9 th	<i>Majors v. Horne*</i>	B	Lambda Legal; Perkins Coie	Filed 3/12/14. On 4/15/14, a motion to consolidate with <i>Connolly v. Roche</i> , above, was denied, but the <i>Majors</i> case was transferred to Judge Sedwick, who also was hearing <i>Connolly</i> . Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint on 4/10/14 adding Equality Arizona as a plaintiff and modifying the named defendants. On 8/5/14, plaintiffs filed their second amended complaint. On 8/20/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment and a motion for preliminary injunction for plaintiffs Martinez & McQuire, based on Martinez's terminal cancer. On 9/2/14, McQuire filed a motion for a temporary restraining order seeking issuance of an accurate death certificate for Martinez, who had passed away prior to the hearing on the preliminary injunction. The court granted the temporary restraining order on 9/12/14. On 9/22/14, the court ordered the preliminary injunction motion moot after the granting of the TRO. On 10/17/14, the court granted plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, holding the state's marriage ban unconstitutional. The state appealed on 11/18/14. On 12/1/14, the parties asked the court to stay the proceedings until the Supreme Court acts on the cert. petitions from the 6th Circuit <i>DeBoer</i> decision and, if it granted one or more of the pending cert. petitions, until the Supreme Court rules. The 9 th Circuit so ordered on 12/2/14. The parties' stipulation to further stay appellate proceedings was granted and the case has been stayed until 6/25/15.
Arkansas	8 th	<i>Jernigan v. Crane*</i>	B	Wagoner Law Firm, P.A.	Filed 7/15/13. Defendants answered and filed a motion to dismiss the plaintiffs' comity claim on 11/21/13. An amended complaint was filed 1/17/14. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss on 1/31/14. Plaintiffs' response was filed 2/14/14. Plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment on 7/16/14 and their memorandum in support on 7/17/14. On 7/30/14, defendants Hopkins, McDaniel, and Weiss filed their response to plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. On 8/6/14, defendants Hopkins, McDaniel, and Weiss filed a motion to stay. On 8/13/14, plaintiffs filed a response opposing the motion to stay. The stay was denied as moot on 10/17/14. A hearing on the motions to dismiss and

					for summary judgment was held 11/20/14. On 11/25/14, the court declared that Arkansas's marriage bans violate the U.S. Constitution's Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses and discriminate on the basis of gender, which it stayed pending an appeal. An appeal was docketed 1/7/15. Appellants' opening brief was filed 2/17/15, Appellees filed their brief on appeal on 3/20/15. Appellants' reply brief was filed 4/3/15. Oral argument of the appeal has been set for 5/12/15. In the district court, plaintiffs filed a motion on 2/20/15 to vacate the court's stay of the judgment, defendants responded on 3/2/15, and the court denied the motion on 3/4/15.
Florida	11 th	<i>Brenner v. Scott*</i>	B	Sheppard, White & Kachergus, P.A.; Bledsoe, Jackson, Schmidt, Wright, Lang & Wilkinson	Same-sex couple married in Canada filed suit as well as a motion for preliminary injunction on 2/28/14. On 3/18/14, plaintiffs filed an amended motion for declaratory and injunctive relief, adding an unmarried same-sex couple as additional plaintiffs. This case was ordered consolidated, by consent, with <i>Grimsley v. Scott</i> . Florida Family Action moved to intervene, which was opposed 4/21/14, and denied 4/24/14. Plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction. Defendant Washington County Clerk and state defendant officials filed motions to dismiss and oppositions to plaintiffs' preliminary injunction motion on 5/12/14. Plaintiffs' opposition to the motions to dismiss and plaintiffs' reply in support of their preliminary injunction motion were filed 5/27/14. On 8/21/14, the court denied the motions to dismiss and granted a preliminary injunction in favor of plaintiffs, which it stayed until 91 days after stays have been denied or lifted in <i>Bostic</i> , <i>Bishop</i> , and <i>Kitchen</i> . On 10/7/14, plaintiffs filed a motion to lift the stay, on 10/24/14 the AG opposed this, and on 10/28/14 the other defendants filed a response in opposition to lifting the stay as well. On 10/28/14, the <i>Grimsely</i> plaintiffs filed a brief in support of lifting the stay. Meanwhile, on 9/5/14, defendants filed a notice of appeal of the preliminary injunction. Appellants' opening brief to the 11 th Circuit was filed 11/14/14. On 11/18/14, they also filed a motion with the 11 th Circuit for a stay of the preliminary injunction pending appeal. On 11/26/14, plaintiffs-appellees opposed the stay motion. On 12/3/14, the stay was denied. However, the stay ordered by the district court remained in effect until the end of the day on 1/5/15. On 12/15/14, defendants-appellants applied to the Supreme Court to extend that stay pending appeal. The <i>Brenner</i> and <i>Grimsley</i> plaintiffs filed their responses on 12/18/14. Justice Thomas referred the application to the

					full court and, on 12/19/14, the application was denied. On 12/15/14, appellees' brief was filed in the 11 th Circuit. On 1/2/15, appellants notified the court that they will not file a reply brief and that the case could be submitted to the court. On 2/4/15, the 11 th Circuit ordered the appeal held in abeyance until the Supreme Court decides the <i>Obergefell</i> and related appeals.
Florida	11 th	<i>Grimsley v. Scott*</i>	R	ACLU; Podhurst Orseck, P.A.	Recognition case filed by 8 same-sex couples and SAVE (a Florida LGBT group) on 3/12/14. Florida Family Action moved to intervene, which was opposed 4/21/14, and denied 4/24/14. Consolidated by consent with <i>Brenner v. Scott</i> . On 4/10/14, the complaint was amended to add a widow, and plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction. Defendants' response was filed 5/12/14. Plaintiffs' opposition to the state's motion to dismiss and plaintiffs' reply in support of their preliminary injunction motion were filed 5/27/14. On 8/21/14, the court denied the motions to dismiss and granted a preliminary injunction in favor of plaintiffs, which it stayed until 91 days after stays have been denied or lifted in <i>Bostic</i> , <i>Bishop</i> , and <i>Kitchen</i> . See discussion of <i>Brenner v. Scott</i> , above, with which this case is consolidated, for subsequent developments.
Georgia	11 th	<i>Inniss v. Aderhold*</i>	B	Lambda Legal; Bryan Cave LLP; White & Case LLP	Filed 4/22/14 as a putative class action on behalf of all unmarried same-sex Georgia couples and all Georgia residents who have married same-sex spouses. Defendants' responses were filed on 7/21/14, including a motion to dismiss by defendant Aderhold. On 8/1/14, the court granted plaintiffs' motion to amend their complaint to add two additional plaintiffs and an additional defendant. Plaintiffs filed their amended complaint on 8/4/14. On 8/8/14, the court granted defendants' unopposed motion to stay further proceedings until the court rules on the motion to dismiss. On 8/18/14, defendants filed a further motion to dismiss. On 9/5/14, plaintiffs filed their opposition to defendants' motion to dismiss. Defendants filed their reply on 10/22/14. On 1/8/15, the court denied defendants' motion to dismiss. On 1/20/15, defendants filed an unopposed motion for a stay. On 1/29/15 the motion was granted in part by staying discovery and denied in part by requiring defendants to answer the complaint. The court also certified for interlocutory appeal to the 11 th Circuit whether its rulings on the motion to dismiss were correct. On 2/9/15, plaintiffs filed a petition with the 11 th Circuit to appeal pursuant to the district court's certification. On 2/11/15, defendants filed a similar motion. On 2/17/15, the 11 th Circuit

					held these petitions in abeyance pending the Supreme Court's ruling in <i>Obergefell</i> and the related appeals. In the district court proceedings, defendants filed their answer on 2/13/15.
Kansas	10 th	<i>Marie v. Moser</i>	B	ACLU; Denton US LLP	<p>Filed 10/10/14. Seeks to have 10th Circuit rulings in <i>Kitchen v. Herbert</i> and <i>Bishop v. Smith</i> that denying same-sex couples access to marriage is unconstitutional applied to Kansas, which is also in the 10th Circuit. On 10/13/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order. On 10/22/14, a heterosexual married couple (the Unruhs) filed a motion to intervene, claiming that allowing same-sex couples to marry would harm them and deprive them of property interests in their marriage. That motion was denied on 10/24/14. On 10/23/14, defendants filed separate oppositions to plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. On 10/26/14, Westboro Baptist Church filed a motion to intervene. That motion was denied on 11/7/14. Plaintiffs filed their reply in support of their preliminary injunction motion on 10/27/14. A hearing was held on 10/31/14 on plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order on their freedom to marry claims. On 11/4/14, plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction was granted. This was appealed on 11/5/14. On 11/7/14, the 10th Circuit denied a stay of the injunction pending appeal. On 11/10/14, Justice Sotomayor granted a temporary stay; however, on 11/12/14, the full Supreme Court vacated the stay. On 11/6/14, defendant-appellants filed for initial hearing of the appeal en banc. On 11/19/14, plaintiffs-appellees responded in opposition. In addition to the appeal of the preliminary injunction by the defendants, the Unruhs and Westboro Baptist Church appealed their denials of intervenor status. On 12/2/14, the motion for initial hearing en banc was denied. Appellants' opening brief was filed on 1/28/15. On 3/2/15, the appellee/respondent's brief was filed. Meanwhile, in the ongoing district court proceedings, defendants filed their answers to the complaint on 11/18/14. On 11/26/14, plaintiffs amended their complaint to include marriage recognition claims and, on 12/8/14, plaintiffs moved for summary judgment on those claims. Defendants moved to dismiss the amended complaint on 12/10/14. On 12/18/14, the court denied a renewed motion by the Westboro Baptist Church to intervene. On 12/22/14, plaintiffs filed their response to the motion to dismiss and, on 1/5/15, defendants filed their reply. On 1/20/15, defendants filed a motion to dismiss. On 2/6/15, plaintiffs filed their response. On 2/13/15, plaintiffs filed a</p>

					<p>motion for summary judgment. On 2/20/15, defendants filed their opposition. On 2/27/15, defendants filed a motion to stay discovery and other pretrial activities. Appellant/Petitioner's reply brief was filed on 3/19/15. Deadlines: deposition/final discovery was ordered to be completed by 4/22/15; proposed pretrial order is due by 4/30/15; final pretrial conference is set for 5/7/15.</p>
Louisiana	5 th	<p><i>Robicheaux v. George*</i></p> <p><i>Robicheaux & Forum for Equality v. Caldwell*</i></p>	R	<p>Lambda Legal; Law Office of Richard G. Perque LLC; and Scott J. Spivey</p>	<p>Consolidated with the (now-dismissed) <i>Robicheaux v. Caldwell</i> case (in which the court had held that the plaintiffs did not sue any defendant responsible for non-recognition). Defendants answered 4/14/14. Defendant Barfield filed motions to dismiss and for summary judgment 4/21/14. Robicheaux filed motion for partial summary judgment on 4/22/14. Cross-responses to the motions were filed on 5/19/14 by plaintiffs and on 5/20/14 by defendant Barfield. Replies were filed on 6/4/14. Argument was held 6/25/14, at which the judge indicated he desired further briefing in order to reach all issues related to the state's ban on allowing same-sex couples to marry or to have their out-of-state marriages recognized. Supplemental briefing was submitted 7/16/14. On 7/17/14, the court granted denied defendants' motion to dismiss without prejudice plaintiffs' claim for violation of Full Faith and Credit Clause of the U.S. Constitution. On 9/3/14, the court filed its Order and Reasons, denying plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment for plaintiffs and granting defendants motion for summary judgment, stating, "The State of Louisiana has a legitimate interest under a rational basis standard of review for addressing the meaning of marriage through the democratic process." Plaintiffs have filed a notice of appeal. On 9/25/14, the 5th Circuit granted their motion to expedite briefing. Appellants' opening brief was filed on 10/17/14. Appellees' brief was filed on 10/31/14. Appellants' Reply brief was filed on 11/7/14. Appellants filed a petition for writ of certiorari before judgment on 11/20/14, which was denied on 1/12/15. The case was argued in the 5th Circuit on Friday, 1/9/15, along with the <i>DeLeon</i> (Texas) and <i>Campaign for Southern Equality</i> (Mississippi) appeals.</p>
Louisiana	5 th	<p><i>Forum for Equality Louisiana v. Barfield*</i></p>	R	<p>Lambda Legal; Stone Pigman Walther Wittmann LLC</p>	<p>Filed 2/12/14. Consolidated with <i>Robicheaux</i> cases on 3/18/14. (See entries for those cases, which apply equally to this case.)</p>
Mississippi	5 th	<p><i>Campaign for Southern</i></p>	B	<p>Paul, Weiss, Rifkin, Wharton</p>	<p>Complaint and motion for preliminary injunction filed on 10/20/14 on behalf of the state's LGBT equality organization and two couples, one</p>

		<i>Equality v. Bryant*</i>		and Garrison LLP; McDuff and Byrd; Walton Law Office; Silin & Ellis; Dale Carpenter	seeking the freedom to marry and the other seeking recognition of an out-of-state marriage. Defendants Bryant and Hood filed their answer and response on 11/10/14. Defendant Dunn filed a response 11/10/14. Plaintiffs' reply was filed 11/11/14. A hearing was held 11/12/14. On 11/25/14, the district court granted the preliminary injunction. Defendants' appeal was docketed 11/26/14. A motion for a stay of the preliminary injunction was filed by the appellants on 11/26/14. This motion was opposed by appellees, who also sought to have the appeal expedited. Both the stay motion and the motion to expedite were granted. Appellants' brief was filed on 12/19/14; appellees' brief was filed on 12/23/14; and appellants' reply brief was filed on 1/2/15. Oral argument was heard on 1/9/15, along with the <i>Robicheaux</i> (Louisiana) and <i>DeLeon</i> (Texas) appeals.
Missouri	8 th	<i>Lawson v. Kelly*</i>	M	ACLU	Filed on 6/24/14 in state court by two same-sex couples seeking to marry. After Jackson County announced that it would not defend the ban, an unopposed motion by the State of Missouri to intervene was granted on 7/11/14. On 7/15/14, the case was removed from state court to U.S. District Court. The state defendants' answer to the complaint was filed on 7/15/14, and defendant Kelly's answer was filed on 7/22/14. Defendants filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings on 8/5/14. On 8/12/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for remand to the state court. Defendants filed their opposition to that motion on 8/28/14. Plaintiffs' response to the intervenor's motion for judgment on the pleadings, motion for summary judgment and motion for a permanent injunction were filed on 9/5/14. On 9/17/14, the Missouri Family Policy Council filed their opposition to the motion. On 9/19/14, the State of Missouri filed its reply. Reply suggestions in response to the opposition to the motion for judgment on the pleadings were filed on 9/19/14. On 10/10/14, the court issued an order stating that the Missouri Family Council would be considered an amicus in this case. Missouri filed its suggestions in opposition/response to plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment on 10/21/14. On 10/22/14, plaintiffs filed their reply to the intervenor's suggestions in opposition to plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. On 11/7/14, the district court issued an order granting in part and denying in part plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment but staying its decision. On 11/21/14, plaintiffs filed a motion to lift the stay. This motion was denied on 11/25/14. On 12/10/14, the state of Missouri filed an appeal to the 8 th Circuit and Lawson filed a cross-appeal. Plaintiffs

					filed a motion to vacate the stay on 12/10/14. On 12/24/14, appellants filed their response in opposition to the motion to vacate the stay and a motion for an expedited appeal. On 1/9/15, appellees filed a letter requesting a ruling on their motion. On 1/21/15, appellants filed a motion for a stay and appellees responded in opposition. On 1/22/15, the court denied both appellees' and appellants' motions. On 2/18/15, Appellants' opening brief on appeal was filed. On 3/23/15, the brief of appellee/cross-appellee was filed. On 4/8/15, appellees Kelly and Lawson notified the court that they will not be filing a brief in this case; and Missouri filed its reply brief and cross-appellee brief. Oral argument of the appeal has been set for 5/12/15.
Montana	9 th	<i>Rolando v. Fox*</i>	B	ACLU; Goetz, Gallik & Baldwin, P.C.; Morrison & Foerster LLP	Filed 5/21/14 on behalf of four same-sex couples, some seeking the freedom to marry and some seeking recognition of their out-of-state marriages. Montana's Governor announced that he would not defend, although the state Attorney General is doing so. Defendants' answer was filed on 7/17/14. Preliminary pretrial statements, a joint discovery plan, and a statement of stipulated facts were filed on 8/13/14. Plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment on 10/15/14. Defendants filed their response on 11/5/14. On 11/19/14, the court granted the motion for summary judgment. Notice of appeal was filed on 11/19/14. On 2/6/15, Appellants filed a motion to stay the appeal until after the Supreme Court's ruling is issued in <i>Obergefell</i> and the related appeals. That motion was granted on 2/9/15, and the appeal was stayed until 8/28/15.
Nebraska	8th	<i>Waters v. Ricketts*</i> (formerly <i>Waters v. Heineman</i>)	B	ACLU	Filed 11/17/14 on behalf of same-sex couples seeking to marry in Nebraska or to have their out-of-state marriages recognized by Nebraska. An amended complaint and a motion for a preliminary injunction were filed 12/2/14. Defendants' answer to the complaint was filed on 1/20/15. On 1/21/15, defendants filed a motion to stay the proceedings. Defendants' response to the motion for preliminary injunction was filed on 1/22/15. On 1/23/15, plaintiffs filed their opposition to a stay. Defendants replied on 1/25/15. The court denied the stay on 1/27/15. On 1/29/15, plaintiffs filed their reply brief in support of the motion for preliminary injunction. A hearing on the motion on preliminary injunction was held on 2/19/15. On 3/2/15, the court found that "Nebraska's "Defense of Marriage" Constitutional Amendment, Section 29, is an unabashedly gender-specific infringement of the equal rights of its citizens." The court also issued an injunction effective 3/9/15. The State filed an interlocutory appeal on 3/2/15. On

					3/3/15, appellants filed a motion to stay pending appeal. On 3/5/14, the 8 th Circuit granted the stay of the preliminary injunction and ordered an expedited briefing schedule. Appellants' opening brief was filed 3/31/15; appellees' brief was filed 4/20/15; and the reply brief is due 4/30//15. Oral argument has been scheduled for 5/12/15, along with the appeals in <i>Jernigan v. Crane</i> (from AR); <i>Lawson v. Kelly</i> (from MO), and <i>Rosenbrahn v. Daugaard</i> (from SD).
North Carolina	4 th	<i>Fisher-Borne v. Smith</i> Consolidated with <i>Gerber v. Cooper</i> and <i>General Synod of the United Church of Christ v. Cooper</i> Petition for cert. before judgment pending in <i>Fisher-Borne v. Smith</i> and <i>Gerber v. Cooper</i>	B/A	ACLU; Sullivan & Cromwell LLP; Ellis & Winters LLP	This was a second-parent adoption case, but it was amended post <i>Windsor</i> to raise marriage claims. Defendants' motion to dismiss was fully briefed as of 11/14/13. Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction on 4/9/14. Defendants' response was filed 4/28/14. Briefing was ordered to address whether consideration of the motion should be stayed pending the 4 th Circuit's decision in <i>Bostic v. Schaefer</i> . Defendants filed a motion to stay proceedings on 4/11/14. Plaintiffs filed a consolidated brief in support of their motion for preliminary injunction and in opposition to defendants' motion for a stay on 5/5/14. Defendants' reply was filed 5/22/14. On 6/2/14, Magistrate Judge Peake recommended that the stay be granted pending the 4 th Circuit's decision in <i>Bostic</i> . Plaintiffs filed their objections to the magistrate's ruling on 6/13/14. Defendants filed their responses to plaintiffs' objections on 6/30/14. On 7/10/14, the case was referred to the Chief Judge of the district. On 7/30/14, the judge ordered briefing from the parties on the impact of the <i>Bostic</i> decision on this case. On 8/13/14, the parties filed their briefs in response to the court order. On 8/27/14, the court stayed the proceedings pending termination of the stay that the Supreme Court granted in <i>McQuigg v. Bostic</i> . On 9/10/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for reconsideration of this order; responses were filed 10/6/14. On that date, the Supreme Court denied the petitions for certiorari from the <i>Bostic</i> case, letting stand the 4 th Circuit's decision finding Virginia's marriage bans unconstitutional. The district court then filed an order stating that the "Virginia marriage ban declared unconstitutional in <i>Bostic</i> is indistinguishable from the North Carolina prohibitions challenged in this matter." Status reports were filed on 10/7/14 from the parties agreeing that <i>Bostic</i> is binding, that the adoption claim should be dismissed as moot, and that there should be no discovery or further briefing. On 10/9/14, however, two North Carolina legislators filed a motion to intervene. It was granted on 10/14/14, but only for the purpose of lodging an objection and preserving that objection to the court's

					<p>application of <i>Bostic</i> for purposes of a possible effort by the legislators to appeal. On 10/15/14, the court issued an amended order declaring North Carolina's constitutional amendment and statutes banning marriage for same-sex couples unconstitutional. Same-sex couples can now marry in the state and have their out-of-state marriages recognized by the state. This decision was appealed on 11/12/14 by the legislators. On 11/21/14, a cross-appeal was filed by Fisher-Borne and Gerber. On 12/10/14, the <i>General Synod</i> appeal (discussed below) was consolidated on appeal with <i>Fisher-Borne</i> and <i>Gerber</i>. On 12/12/14, appellants filed a motion for a stay of the proceedings pending resolution of the pending petitions for writ of certiorari. On 12/22/14, the <i>Fisher-Borne</i> appellees' filed a response in opposition to the stay, and, on 12/23/14, the <i>General Synod</i> appellees' filed a response in opposition to the stay. On 1/5/15, the court denied the motion to stay. Appellants' opening brief was ordered due 3/16/15. Appellees' response and cross-appeal opening brief were ordered due 4/20/15. Reply/response briefs were ordered due 5/26/15. On 1/9/15, the legislators filed a petition for certiorari before judgment with the Supreme Court. On 2/10/15, the appeal was placed in abeyance pending a decision from the Supreme Court in the 6th Circuit marriage cases it is hearing.</p>
North Carolina	4 th	<p><i>Gerber v. Cooper*</i></p> <p>Consolidated with <i>Fisher-Borne v. Smith</i> and <i>General Synod of the United Church of Christ v. Cooper</i></p>	R	<p>ACLU; Sullivan & Cromwell LLP; Ellis & Winters LLP</p>	<p>Filed 4/9/14 on behalf of three same-sex couples married in other jurisdictions, one of whom is elderly and the others of whom face medical needs to have their marriages promptly respected. A motion for a preliminary injunction also was filed 4/9/14. Responses were filed 4/28/14. Briefing was ordered to address whether consideration of the motion should be stayed pending the 4th Circuit's decision in <i>Bostic</i>. Plaintiffs filed their consolidated memorandum of law in support of their motion for preliminary injunction and opposition to defendants' motion for a stay on 5/5/14. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss on 5/6/14. Defendants' reply brief was filed 5/22/14. Defendant Thigpen answered the complaint on 5/30/14. On 6/2/14, Magistrate Judge Peake recommended that the stay be granted pending the 4th Circuit's decision in <i>Bostic v. Schaefer</i>. Plaintiffs filed their objections to the magistrate's ruling on 6/13/14. On 6/16/14, defendant Catawba County filed its answer and affirmative defenses. Defendants filed their responses to plaintiffs' objections on 6/30/14. On 7/30/14, the judge ordered briefing from the parties on the impact of the 4th Circuit's <i>Bostic</i> decision on this case. Briefing in response to the 7/30/14 order was filed by all parties on</p>

					8/13/14. On 8/27/14, the court stayed the proceedings pending termination of the stay granted by the Supreme Court in <i>McQuigg v. Bostic</i> . On 9/10/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for reconsideration of this order; responses were filed 10/6/14. That same day, the Supreme Court denied the petitions for certiorari from the <i>Bostic</i> case, letting stand the 4 th Circuit’s decision finding the marriage bans unconstitutional. The district court then filed an order stating that the “Virginia marriage ban declared unconstitutional in <i>Bostic</i> is indistinguishable from the North Carolina prohibitions challenged in this matter.” (See subsequent entries for <i>Fisher-Borne</i> , which apply equally to this case.)
North Carolina	4 th	<i>General Synod of the United Church of Christ v. Cooper*</i> Consolidated with <i>Fisher-Borne v. Smith</i> and <i>Gerber v. Cooper</i>	M	Arnold & Porter LLC; Tin Fulton Walker & Owen	Filed 4/28/14. Includes free exercise of religion and expressive association claims on behalf of church and clergy plaintiffs, as well as due process and equal protection claims on behalf of same-sex couple plaintiffs. Plaintiffs simultaneously filed a motion or a preliminary injunction. On 5/27/14, defendants filed a motion to stay pending the 4 th Circuit’s decision in <i>Bostic v. Schaefer</i> . On 6/3/14, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint. On 6/10/14, defendants filed responses to the motion for a preliminary injunction. On 6/13/14, plaintiffs filed an opposition to the motion for a stay. On 6/20/14, plaintiffs filed their reply brief on their motion for a preliminary injunction. On 6/24/14, defendants filed their reply in support of their motion for a stay. On 7/1/14, plaintiffs filed a request for oral argument of the preliminary injunction and stay motions. On 7/18/14, defendants filed a response in opposition to the motion for oral argument. On 8/12/14, the court stayed this case. On 8/25/14, the court issued a further order staying the proceedings pending the Supreme Court’s disposition of the cert. petition in <i>Bostic</i> . On 9/8/14, plaintiffs filed a motion to lift the stay. On 9/24/14 and 9/26/14, defendants filed responses to this motion; replies to these responses were filed 10/6/14. On 10/10/14, the court granted plaintiffs’ motion, ruling that North Carolina’s ban on marriage by same-sex couples is unconstitutional, and enjoining its enforcement. Same-sex couples may now marry in the state. The appeal by Thigpen and Tillis was docketed 11/10/14. The appeal was been consolidated with <i>Fisher-Borne</i> and <i>Gerber</i> cases on 12/10/14. (See entries for that case, which applies equally to this case.)
Puerto Rico	1 st	<i>Conde-Vidal v. Rius-Armendariz*</i>	B	Lambda Legal; Ada Mercedes Conde-Vidal;	Filed 3/25/14 on behalf of same-sex couple married outside of Puerto Rico. An amended complaint was filed 6/25/14, adding additional plaintiffs (some unmarried couples and some couples married outside of

				Law Offices of Celina Romany; Debevoise & Plimpton LLP; Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP	Puerto Rico) and defendants. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss on 8/27/14. On 9/15/14, plaintiffs filed their opposition to the motion to dismiss and a motion for summary judgment. Opposition to the summary judgment motion was filed on 10/2/14, and a reply was filed on 10/14/14. On 9/29/14, defendants filed a motion requesting an order to deny or hold in abeyance plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. Plaintiffs' responded on 10/15/14. On 10/21/14, the district court issued an opinion and order granting defendants' motion to dismiss, based on the Supreme Court's 1972 decision in <i>Baker v. Nelson</i> dismissing the appeal in that case for want of a substantial federal question. On 10/28/14, plaintiffs filed their notice of appeal. The case docketed with the 1 st Circuit on 11/13/14. Appellants' opening brief was filed on 1/26/15. Defendants-appellees filed their brief on 3/20/15, changing their position, so that now the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is no longer defending its marriage ban. On 3/24/15 appellees filed their brief and on 4/6/15 appellants filed their reply brief.. On 4/6/15 the appellants filed a motion to schedule oral argument as soon as possible. On 4/14/15, the court instead directed the parties to agree to a schedule for further briefing and argument within 14 days after the Supreme Court rules in its pending marriage cases. On 4/14/15 as well, 8 Puerto Rico senators and 4 representatives moved to intervene as a party-appellee. Opposition to that motion was filed 4/27/15.
South Carolina	4 th	<i>Bleckley v. Wilson*</i> (formerly <i>Condon v. Haley</i>)	M	Lambda Legal; Callison Tighe and Robinson; Nexsen Pruet Jacobs and Pollard	Filed on 10/15/14 on behalf of a lesbian couple seeking the right to marry. Plaintiffs filed motions for a preliminary injunction and for summary judgment on 10/22/14. Responses to the motion for preliminary injunction and defendant Condon's answer were filed 11/3/14. Plaintiffs replied on 11/5/14. Defendant Hayley filed a motion to dismiss on 11/7/14. On 11/10/14, defendants filed their responses to the motion for summary judgment. On 11/12/14, plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment was granted. The appeal was docketed on 11/13/14. The 4 th Circuit and the Supreme Court denied stays of the injunction in this case, and same-sex couples can now marry in the state. On 12/15/14, the 4 th Circuit consolidated this appeal and the appeal in <i>Bradacs v. Wilson</i> , below, and stayed the appeals in both cases pending resolution of the cert. petitions now before the Supreme Court and any cert. petition filed by South Carolina.
South Carolina	4 th	<i>Bradacs v. Wilson*</i>	R	Warner, Payne & Black, LLP;	Marriage recognition case filed 8/28/13. The State defendants answered on 11/14/13. An amended complaint was filed 1/23/14. On 4/3/14,

		(formerly <i>Bradacs v. Haley</i>)		Bluestein, Nichols, Thompson & Delgado, LLC; Family Law Consulting	defendants filed a motion to stay pending resolution of the 4 th Circuit appeal in <i>Bostic v. Schaefer</i> , which was granted 4/22/14. On that date, defendants also filed a motion to have the summary judgment motions held in abeyance until after <i>Bostic</i> was decided. On 4/23/14, the court issued an order staying all case deadlines. On 10/6/14, the Supreme Court denied the petitions for certiorari from the <i>Bostic</i> case, letting stand the 4 th Circuit's decision finding Virginia's marriage bans unconstitutional. On 10/7/14, the district court lifted the stay in this case. On 10/20/14, the plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment. On 10/23/14, defendants filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings. Several probate judges issued orders after the Supreme Court's ruling in <i>Bostic</i> allowing same-sex couples to marry. On 10/9/14, the South Carolina Supreme Court ordered them to cease until the ruling in this case is issued. On 10/28/14, defendants filed their response to plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. Plaintiffs' reply to the response was filed 10/31/14. On 11/10/14, the court denied defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings and granted immunity for Defendant Hayley. On 11/18/14, the court granted plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, except with respect to the full faith and credit claim, which was rejected. An appeal was docketed 12/9/14. Appellants filed a motion to stay the appeal pending the Supreme Court's resolution of pending petitions for certiorari or, if granted, pending decisions of those appeals, to which appellees consented. On 12/15/14, the 4 th Circuit consolidated this appeal and the appeal in <i>Condon v. Haley</i> , above, and stayed the appeals in both cases pending resolution of the cert. petitions now before the Supreme Court and any cert. petition filed by South Carolina. For updates see <i>Bleckley v. Wilson</i> , above.
South Dakota	8 th	<i>Rosenbrahn v. Daugaard</i> *	B	NCLR; Joshua Newville; Burd & Voigt Law Office	Filed on 5/22/14 on behalf of four same-sex couples, seeking the freedom to marry and recognition of marriages entered by same-sex couples outside the state. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss on 6/17/14. On 7/3/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment. On 7/7/14, NCLR joined the case as co-counsel for plaintiffs. On 7/14/14, defendants filed their reply to plaintiffs' response to defendants' motion to dismiss. On 11/14/14, the court issued an order granting in part and denying in part the motion to dismiss. On 11/25/14, defendants filed their response to plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment; their answer to the complaint; and a motion for summary judgment. On 12/1/14, plaintiffs filed their reply to defendants' response. On 12/8/14,

					defendants filed their reply in support of their motion for summary judgment. On 1/12/15, the court struck down South Dakota's statute and constitutional provision banning marriage between persons of the same sex as violations of the Due Process and Equal Protection clauses of the 14th Amendment, but stayed its ruling. On 1/26/15, a notice of appeal was filed. On 2/3/15, the parties' joint motion to expedite the appeal was granted. Appellants filed their statement of issues on 2/11/15. Appellants' opening brief was filed 3/2/15. The motion to vacate the stay was denied by the district court on 3/2/15. Appellees' brief and addendum was filed on 3/19/15, and appellants' reply brief was filed on 4/2/15. Oral argument has been scheduled for 5/12/15.
Texas	5 th	<i>DeLeon v. Perry*</i>	B	Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP	The court granted plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction barring enforcement of the state's ban on same-sex couples marrying or recognition of their out-of-state marriages on 2/26/14, but stayed the injunction pending appeal. The state appealed. On 3/7/14, the district court case also was stayed pending appeal. On 4/14/14, the plaintiffs filed an opposed motion to expedite the appeal, which was denied on 5/21/14. Appellant's opening brief was filed on 7/28/14. Appellees' brief was filed on 9/9/14, and appellant's reply brief was filed on 10/13/14. On 10/6/14, appellees filed an opposed motion to expedite oral argument. On 10/7/14, that motion was granted. On 10/10/14, appellants filed their reply brief. Argument was heard on 1/9/2015, along with the <i>Robicheaux</i> (Louisiana) and <i>Campaign for Southern Equality</i> (Mississippi) appeals. On 2/12/15, appellees filed a motion to lift the stay; on 2/19/15 appellants responded; and on 2/20/15 appellees filed a reply.

FEDERAL DISTRICT COURTS

STATE	CIRCUIT	CASE NAME	NATURE OF CLAIMS	COUNSEL	STATUS
Alabama	11 th	<i>Hard v. Bentley*</i>	R	Southern Poverty Law Center	Filed 12/16/13, but not announced until 1/13/14. Case seeks recognition of marriage on behalf of widower whose husband was killed in car accident, including for purposes of recovery of

					proceeds of pending wrongful death lawsuit. On 3/20/14, mother of decedent (represented by anti-gay group) sought to intervene, which widower filed non-opposition to on 3/24/14. Intervention was granted on 3/31/14. Complaint was voluntarily dismissed against only defendant Reed on 4/11/14. Answer by intervenor-defendant was filed 4/21/14. On 7/24/14, defendant Gov. Bentley filed a motion to dismiss the claims against him. On 8/4/14, plaintiffs filed their opposition to the motion to dismiss. Plaintiffs moved for summary judgment on 8/29/14; defendants filed their motions for summary judgment and opposition to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on 10/1/14. Plaintiff responded to defendant's motion for summary judgment on 10/13/14, and filed his reply on 10/21/14. Defendants' surreply was filed 10/29/14. On 2/24/15, the court granted intervention by the law firm holding the proceeds of the wrongful death lawsuit for purposes of having them paid into the court pending distribution upon resolution of this case. On 3/10/15, the court granted Governor Bentley's motion to dismiss all claims against the Governor. The case also was ordered stayed until further order of the court. On 3/19/15, the court denied the plaintiffs' motion to compel and defendants' motion for a protective order.
Alabama	11 th	<i>Hedgepeth v. Bentley*</i> (formerly <i>Hendgepath v. Probate Court of Mobile County</i>)	M	The Hernandez Firm, LLC; The Kennedy Law Firm	Complaint filed on 2/9/15 against defendant county clerks who refuse to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples in compliance with the court order in the <i>Searcy</i> case. On 2/18/15, Gov. Bentley filed a motion to dismiss. On 2/24/15, a motion to dismiss claims against the AG was filed. On 3/17/15, defendant Moore filed a motion to dismiss. Plaintiffs' response is due 4/9/15; defendant's reply is due 4/16/15. On 3/24/15, plaintiffs filed a motion to dismiss as they have obtained marriage licenses. The court granted the motions to dismiss on 3/26/15. Nevertheless, on 4/2/15, defendant Moore responded to the motion to dismiss.
Alabama	11 th	<i>Searcy v. Davis*</i>	A	The Hernandez Firm, LLC; The Kennedy Law Firm	Complaint filed on 2/9/15 challenging Alabama Probate Judge Davis's refusal to grant a final adoption despite being specifically enjoined to do so. Plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction. On 2/27/15, defendant filed a motion to dismiss, motion to postpone hearing, motion to quash subpoena, motion to stay and a response to plaintiffs' motion for injunction. On 3/6/15 Plaintiffs filed their response to the motion to dismiss. On 3/11/15, defendant

					filed his reply in support of his motion to dismiss and an amended motion to dismiss in which he indicated that he has amended the interlocutory adoption order and recused himself. On 3/13/15, plaintiff filed a motion to file a surreply which was granted on 3/16/15. On 3/16/15, the court granted plaintiffs leave to file a brief on any issues remaining by 3/31/15, and further granting defendants leave to reply by 4/7/15. On 3/24/15, plaintiffs filed a motion to dismiss, stating that defendant has removed the qualifying language and recused himself and there is no longer an impediment. On 3/25/15, defendants filed a response in support of the motion to dismiss. On 3/26/15, the court granted Searcy's motion to dismiss and Davis' amended motion to dismiss.
Alabama	11 th	<i>Aaron-Brush v. Bentley*</i>	R	ACLU; The Crew Law Firm; Baxley, Dillard, McKnight & James; Copeland, Franco, Screws & Gill, P.A.; and Edward Still Law Firm LLC	Filed on 6/10/14 by a same-sex couple seeking recognition of their marriage validly entered out-of-state. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss on 7/14/14 and their answer on 7/15/14. Plaintiffs' response to the motion to dismiss Gov. Bentley was filed on 7/24/14 and defendants' reply was filed on 7/28/14. On 9/22/14, the motion to dismiss defendant Bentley was granted. The 9/15/14 scheduling order was amended on 2/5/15: all potentially dispositive motions are to be filed by 7/31/15.
Alabama	11 th	<i>Hathcote v. Green</i>	M		Filed on 2/16/15 by a same-sex couple living in Blount County who were refused a marriage license by Blount County Probate courts. The plaintiffs filed a motion to dismiss on 3/24/15. The court dismissed the action without prejudice on 3/26/15.
Florida	11 th	<i>Wall-Desousa v. Florida Dept. of Highway Safety*</i>	R	Sheppard, White, Kachergus & DeMaggio	Filed on 11/25/14. Seeks recognition of out-of-state marriage by Florida and issuance of drivers' licenses using plaintiffs' married names. On 12/5/14, the court ordered supplemental briefing from the parties addressing the following: (1) whether the preliminary injunction entered the federal district court in <i>Brenner</i> renders moot plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction; and (2) whether this case should be stayed pending the 11 th Circuit's resolution of the appeal of the <i>Brenner</i> preliminary injunction. Plaintiffs filed their brief responding to those questions on 12/9/14. Plaintiffs' motion to expedite was denied. Defendants filed their brief on 1/9/15. Due to the lifting of the stay in <i>Brenner</i> , plaintiffs have now obtained correct drivers licenses with their married names. However, on 1/23/15, plaintiffs' filed an amended complaint alleging first amendment retaliation. On 2/5/15, defendants filed a motion to

					dismiss plaintiffs' first amended complaint. Plaintiffs filed their opposition to the motion to dismiss on 2/19/15. On 3/3/15, defendants Johnson and Walden's filed a motion to dismiss. On 3/10/15, plaintiffs filed their response in opposition to the motion to dismiss. The court issued a scheduling order on 4/2/15. Amended pleadings and joinder of parties are due 7/1/15; discovery is to be completed by 1/15/16; dispositive motions are due 2/26/16; a mediation hearing is to be completed by 3/25/16; pretrial statements are due 7/11/16; all other motions are due 6/1/16; plaintiff disclosure of expert reports is due 11/2/15; defendant disclosure of expert reports is due 12/1/15; trial status conference is set for 7/21/16; and a jury trial is set for the trial term commencing 8/1/16.
Guam	9 th	<i>Aguero v. Calvo*</i>	M	Thompson Gutierrez and Alcantara, LLC; Guam Family Law Office	Filed 4/13/15. Seeks the freedom to marry for same-sex couple. That same date, plaintiffs also filed a motion for summary judgment, a motion for a preliminary injunction, and a request for expedited ruling. Guam's attorney general has directed the issuance of marriage licenses to same-sex couples, but the Dept. of Public Health and Social Services has declined to comply and the Governor has stated that it is up to the Legislature to change current law. On 4/16/15, plaintiffs filed an amended request for expedited hearing.
Idaho	9 th	<i>Taylor v. Brasuell*</i>	R	NCLR; Law Offices of Deborah A. Ferguson, PLLS; Durham Law Office, PLLC	Filed 7/7/14. Seeks recognition of marriage same-sex couple entered in California for purposes of joint burial in state-run veteran's cemetery of ashes of veteran plaintiff's late wife with plaintiff's ashes, when she dies. An amended complaint, dropping damages claim, was filed 9/11/14. As a result of the 9 th Circuit's ruling on 10/7/14 that Idaho's marriage ban is unconstitutional, Idaho state officials have agreed to the plaintiff's request, which will moot this case. On 10/29/14, defendants filed a motion to dismiss and plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment. On 12/11/14, the parties filed their replies to responses. On 12/16/14, the court ordered the parties to file briefs by 1/9/15 addressing why the case should not be stayed pending resolution of the <i>Latta</i> appeal before the 9 th Circuit. Parties filed their briefs on 1/9/15. Also on 1/9/15, the 9 th Circuit denied the petitions for rehearing <i>en banc</i> , therefore this case will not be stayed and the motions will be taken up by the Court in its ordinary course of business.

Michigan	6 th	<i>Caspar v. Snyder*</i>	I-S R	ACLU; Sachs Waldman PC; Julian Davis Mortenson	Filed 4/14/14. Seeks recognition by the state of marriages entered by same-sex couples prior to the issuance of the stay in <i>DeBoer v. Snyder</i> . Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction on 5/29/14. On 6/5/14, defendants filed a motion to stay and a motion to dismiss. On 6/19/14, defendants filed their response to the motion for a preliminary injunction. On 6/30/14, plaintiffs filed their response to defendants' motion to hold the case in abeyance and to defendants' motion to dismiss. On 7/1/14, defendants filed a motion to consolidate. Plaintiffs filed a reply in support of their preliminary injunction motion on 7/7/14. Defendants' reply to plaintiffs' response to their motions to dismiss and to hold the case in abeyance was filed on 7/14/14. On 7/18/14, plaintiffs filed a response to the motion to consolidate. On 7/25/14, defendants filed a reply to plaintiffs' response. A hearing was held on 8/21/14 on the motions to consolidate, for preliminary injunction, to dismiss and to stay. Following the 6 th Circuit's decision in <i>DeBoer</i> , the court ordered supplemental briefing on the impact of that decision on this case. Defendants filed their brief on 11/14/14. Plaintiffs filed their brief on 11/19/14. On 1/15/15, the court granted the preliminary injunction. The court stated that the plaintiffs' marriages were legal when entered into and concluded that "the continued legal validity of an individual's marital status in such circumstances is a fundamental right comprehended within the liberty protected under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment." On 2/24/15, the court issued its declaratory judgment and permanent injunction.
Michigan	6 th	<i>Blankenship v. Snyder*</i>	R	Law Offices of Gregory T. Gibbs	Filed on 6/5/14. Seeks recognition of a same-sex couple's out-of-state marriage. Defendants filed a motion to stay and a motion to dismiss on 7/24/14. Plaintiffs filed an opposition to the stay motion on 8/14/14. Defendants' reply regarding the motion to stay was filed 8/28/14. On 9/11/14, defendants filed their reply to the plaintiffs' opposition to their motion to dismiss. On 2/10/15, the motion to stay was granted.
Michigan	6 th	<i>Morgan v. Snyder*</i>	R	Rhoades McKee PC	Filed 6/11/14. Seeks recognition of a same-sex couple's out-of-state marriage. On 7/14/14, defendant filed a motion for a stay and a motion dismiss for failure to state a claim. On 8/11/14, the court ordered a stay pending the decision in the 6 th Circuit marriage cases. On 12/2/14, the court ordered the parties to show cause why

					the case should not be dismissed by 12/16/14. Defendant Hollinrake filed her response on 12/9/14. Defendant Snyder and plaintiffs filed their responses on 12/16/14. On 12/23/14, the court ordered a stay and dismissed the defendants' motion to dismiss. On 4/2/15, plaintiffs filed a motion for relief from the stay. Plaintiffs' motion to lift the stay was denied on 4/21/15.
North Dakota	8 th	<i>Jorgensen v. Montplaisir</i> *	R	Lambda Legal; John P. Borger; Faegre Baker Daniels LLP	Complaint filed 6/9/14, seeking recognition of plaintiffs' out-of-state marriage. Plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment on 6/17/14. On 7/2/14, the state filed a motion to dismiss. Defendants' responses to the motion for summary judgment and plaintiffs' response to the motion to dismiss were filed on 8/22/14. On 9/4/14, replies to the responses were filed by defendants and, on 9/5/14 plaintiffs filed their reply to the response to their motion for summary judgment. On 1/20/15, the court on its own motion stayed this case pending resolution of the Supreme Court marriage cases.
North Dakota	8 th	<i>Ramsay v. Dalrymple</i> *	B	NCLR; Joshua A. Newville; Thomas D. Fiebiger	Filed 6/6/14 on behalf of seven plaintiff couples who seek the right to marry or recognition of their out-of-state marriages. One couple resides outside of the state of North Dakota, but one member of the couple works for the state. NCLR subsequently joined the case as co-counsel. On 7/1/14, the state filed a motion to dismiss, joined by the clerk on 7/2/14. On 7/22/14, plaintiffs filed their combined opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment and in support of their motion for summary judgment. Defendants' response to the motion for summary judgment was filed on 8/22/14. Plaintiffs filed their reply on 9/5/14. On 1/20/15, the court on its own motion stayed this case pending resolution of the Supreme Court marriage cases.
Ohio	6 th	<i>Gibson v. Himes</i> *	M	Gerhardstein & Branch Co. LPA	On 4/30/14, six same-sex couples filed a freedom to marry claim, citing violations of the freedom of association and Due Process and Equal Protection clauses. Defendant Cissel answered the complaint on 5/19/14. Defendant Himes answered on 5/21/14. On 6/19/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for declaratory judgment and permanent injunctive relief. Defendants' response was due 8/14/14 and plaintiffs' reply was due 8/28/14, but, on 8/4/14, the court issued an order staying the case and providing plaintiffs 2 weeks following the decision by the 6 th Circuit in the <i>DeBoer</i> and <i>Love</i> appeals to supplement their motion. On 11/20/14, a joint motion was filed to

					extend the stay pending resolution of cert. petitions from the <i>DeBoer</i> decision. On 12/18/14, the court entered an order extending the stay. A 3/13/15 order stayed the case until the Supreme Court rules on the related 6 th circuit marriage cases.
South Carolina	4 th	<i>McEldowney v. South Carolina Dept. of Motor Vehicles*</i>	R	Andrew S. Radeker Harrison & Radeker, P.A.	Filed on 10/24/14 on behalf of a lesbian seeking recognition of her out-of-state marriage by the state and its agencies, including the ability to change her name on her driver's license now that she has adopted her wife's name. Answers were filed by defendants on 12/8/14 and 1/12/15. Defendant Hayley file a motion for summary judgment on 2/9/15. On 2/24/15, the court dismissed the action pursuant to a settlement, retaining jurisdiction to enforce the settlement. On 3/5/15, McEldowney filed a stipulation of dismissal without prejudice.
South Carolina	4 th	<i>Haas v. South Carolina Dept. of Motor Vehicles*</i>	R	ACLU of South Carolina; Nexsen Pruet, LLC; Callison Tighe and Robinson	Filed on 10/31/14 on behalf of three same-sex couples who have been refused South Carolina driver's licenses that reflect their married names. On 11/21/14, the answer to the complaint was filed. On 2/18/15 defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. Plaintiffs filed their response in opposition to the motion for summary judgment on 3/17/15. Defendants' reply to the response was filed on 3/30/15.
Texas	5 th	<i>Zahrn v. Perry*</i>	B	Bell Nunnally & Martin, LLP; James J. Scheske PLLC; Jorgeson Pittman LLP	Filed 10/31/13 as a putative class action. Defendants answered 11/21/13. The case was then ordered consolidated with <i>McNosky v. Perry</i> , below. A motion for class certification was filed 2/28/14. On 3/12/14, the state filed an opposed motion to stay pending the 5 th Circuit's decision in <i>DeLeon v. Perry</i> . The motion to certify a class was dismissed and the case was ordered stayed on 9/10/14.
Texas	5 th	<i>McNosky v. Perry*</i>	M	In Pro Per	Filed 10/9/13 by two men, raising only a sex discrimination claim. A motion for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order was filed 11/14/13. The state defendants' opposition was due 12/27/13. The case was then ordered consolidated with <i>Zahrn v. Perry</i> , above. On 3/12/14, the state filed what it captioned an unopposed motion to stay pending the 5 th Circuit's decision in <i>DeLeon v. Perry</i> but, on 3/22/14, plaintiffs filed an opposition to the stay. The case was ordered stayed on 9/10/14.
Texas	5 th	<i>Nuckols v. Perry*</i>	M	In Pro Per	Filed 1/9/14. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss 2/13/14, which was held moot due to plaintiffs' filing of a motion for leave to file an amended complaint, which was granted 4/9/14. On that date, the

					<p>court also granted a joint motion to stay pending the 5th Circuit's decision in <i>DeLeon v. Perry</i>. Nonetheless, the plaintiff filed an amended complaint on 4/15/14 and defendant Rosen has filed a further motion to dismiss. On 5/28/14, defendants filed consent to proceed before a magistrate judge.</p>
Texas	5 th	<i>Freeman v. Parker*</i>	R	Lambda Legal	<p>Filed 12/26/13, to maintain recognition of out-of-state marriages of same-sex couples for purposes of Houston city employee spousal benefits, in response to <i>Pidgeon v. Parker</i>, listed in state cases below. On 8/29/14, plaintiffs filed an unopposed motion for a preliminary injunction to keep the benefits in place pending resolution of the case, which the court granted. The court also stayed the proceedings pending resolution of the constitutionality of the Texas marriage ban in <i>DeLeon v. Perry</i>.</p>
Wyoming	10th	<i>Guzzo v. Meade*</i>	M	NCLR; Tracy Zubrod; Arnold & Porter LLP, Rathod Mohamedbahi LLC	<p>Plaintiffs filed suit seeking the freedom to marry on behalf of four same-sex couples and Wyoming Equality on 10/7/14. Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order on 10/8/14, seeking to have the 10th Circuit's rulings in <i>Kitchen v. Herbert</i> and <i>Bishop v. Smith</i> applied to Wyoming, which is in the 10th Circuit and governed by its rulings. Defendants filed a response on 10/13/14. Plaintiffs filed a reply on 10/15/14 and a hearing was held on 10/16/14. The Court granted the preliminary injunction and temporary stay on 10/17/14. The state gave notice that it will not appeal the preliminary injunction ruling and the Court ordered the stay lifted on 10/21/14 and enjoined the defendants from enforcing the marriage ban, making it possible for same-sex couples to marry in the state. On 10/24/14, the Laramie County Clerk filed an answer. On 10/31/14, the state defendants filed an answer. On 11/10/14, the state defendants filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings. On 11/17/14, plaintiffs responded to that motion and on 11/24/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings. Defendants filed their response to motion for judgment on 12/8/14. On 12/12/14, plaintiffs filed their reply. On 1/14/15, plaintiffs filed a motion for a hearing on the parties' motions for judgment on pleadings. The motion for a hearing was denied on 1/15/15. On 1/29/15, the court granted judgment on the pleadings and a permanent injunction in favor of the plaintiffs, concluding that banning same-sex couples from</p>

					marrying violates the Due Process and Equal Protection clauses of the Constitution.
--	--	--	--	--	---

Marriage equality currently exists in all states within the First, Second, and Third Circuits (although not in Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands), as well as in the District of Columbia, within the D.C. Circuit. Marriage equality cases are now pending in or have been decided by all Circuits in which the freedom to marry does not yet exist in all states in the circuit.

IN STATE COURTS

STATE	COURT LEVEL	CASE NAME	NATURE OF CASE	COUNSEL	STATUS
Alabama	Supreme	<i>Alabama Policy Institute v. King*</i>	M	Liberty Counsel represents the petitioners	Filed on 2/11/15. An emergency petition for writ of mandamus was filed by conservative legal group, Liberty Counsel, seeking a writ of mandamus directed to each Respondent probate judge, commanding each judge not to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples and not to recognize any marriage licenses issued to same-sex couples. The defendants filed their responses by 2/18/15. The petitioners filed their reply on 2/23/15. The petition was granted on 3/3/15, ordering state probate judges who are not named in federal injunctions not to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples. On 3/10/15, the Alabama Supreme Court enjoined Mobile Probate Judge Don Davis from issuing marriage licenses to same-sex couples. Clarke County Probate Judge Davis filed her response on 3/10/15. On 3/17/15, Judge Reed applied for a rehearing; this was denied 3/20/15.
Arkansas	Trial	<i>Frazier-Henson v. Walther</i>	R (includes federal claims)	Wagoner Law Firm, P.A.; Cheryl K. Maples	Amended complaint filed on 3/3/15 seeking recognition of marriages validly entered into in Arkansas and one plaintiff seeking death and survivor benefits through Social Security. A motion to dismiss was filed on 4/1/15. Plaintiffs requested an extension of time to respond on 4/15/15.
Arkansas	Supreme	<i>Wright v. Arkansas*</i>	B (includes federal claims)	Wagoner Law Firm, P.A.; Cheryl K. Maples	Filed 7/3/13. Both defendants' motion to dismiss and plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction were denied. The state then filed an answer to plaintiffs' 3 rd amended complaint. Cross-motions for summary judgment were filed 2/26/14, responded to 3/19/14, and replied to 4/2/14. A hearing was held 4/17/14. The court issued a ruling 5/9/14 holding that the state's constitutional amendment and statutory bans on same-sex couples marrying or having their out-of-state marriages recognized violate federal guarantees of equal protection and due process. The State appealed and requested a stay from the trial court pending appeal, which was denied. On 5/16/14, the

					Arkansas Supreme Court ordered a temporary stay of the trial court decision. The state defendant-appellants' opening brief was filed on 9/15/14. The appellees' brief was filed 10/15/14. The state filed a motion with the state Supreme Court for a further stay on 8/6/14. On 8/15/14, appellees filed a response to the motion for a stay. On 10/7/14, appellees filed their merits brief on appeal. The further stay was denied on 10/9/14. Appellants' reply brief was filed on 10/17/14. Oral argument was held on 11/20/14. On 1/23/15, the State filed a motion for a second oral argument. On 1/27/15, the plaintiffs opposed the motion. On 2/17/15, the appellees filed a response regarding the second oral argument request and a motion to immediately lift the stay. On 2/26/15, appellees filed a motion to lift the stay. The state appellants responded on 2/27/15, and on 3/4/15 separate appellants (clerks) responded to the motion. On 3/6/15, the State appellants responded to the court's order, and separate defendants White, Lonoke, Washington, Saline and Conway County Clerk defendant's-appellants' responded to the court's order regarding the composition of the presiding court. On 4/2/15, the Court ordered that the responses to the court's per curiam order of February 5, 2015, were to be taken as a new case, designated as Case No. CV-15-227.
Florida	Appeal	<i>Pareto v. Ruvin*</i>	M (includes federal claims)	NCLR; Carlton Fields Jordan Burt, P.A.; Elizabeth F. Schwartz, P.A.; Mary Meeks, P.A.	Filed 1/21/14. A motion for summary judgment was filed 5/1/14. Liberty Counsel filed a motion to intervene on 2/25/14, which was denied on 4/28/14. Florida Family Action, Inc., Florida Democratic League, Inc., and People United to Lead the Struggle for Equality, Inc. (PULSE) also filed motions to intervene as defendants, and those motions were denied on 6/3/14. The summary judgment motion was argued 7/2/14. On 7/25/14, the court granted plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment and held Florida's ban on same-sex couples marrying unconstitutional. The case was appealed on 7/28/14. Plaintiffs and the plaintiffs in <i>Huntsman v. Heavlin</i> , below, filed motions to have the two cases consolidated. Defendants moved to stay briefing. On 8/20/14, plaintiffs filed their opposition to the stay motion and requested that the case be certified for direct review by the Florida Supreme Court. On 8/28/14, the court consolidated the <i>Pareto</i> and <i>Huntsman</i> cases, denied the stay motion, and carried the certification request for subsequent decision. On 10/13/14, defendants filed a supplemental brief requesting certification in light of the U.S. Supreme Court's denial of cert. from the 4 th , 7 th , and 10 th Circuits. Defendant's initial brief was filed on 11/17/14. Appellees filed their answer briefs on 12/15 and 12/17. The court has now lifted its stay in light

					of the <i>Brenner</i> decision, and same-sex couples may now marry in Florida.
Florida	Appeal	<i>Huntsman v. Heavilin*</i>	M (includes federal claims)	Restivio, Reilly & Vigil-Farinas	Filed 4/1/14 by same-sex couple in Key West. Amended complaint, notice of constitutional question, answer and affirmative defenses, and reply to answer and affirmative defenses all have been filed. A motion for summary judgment was filed by plaintiffs on 5/20/14 and argued 7/7/14. On 7/17/14, the court granted the motion and ordered the Key West Clerk to allow same-sex couples to marry beginning 7/22/14. Defendants appealed, which under Florida law stayed the trial court's order automatically. On 7/23/14, plaintiffs filed a motion to vacate the stay. On 7/28/14, plaintiffs requested the Florida Appeals Court exercise "pass through" jurisdiction and allow this case to proceed directly to the Florida Supreme Court. Plaintiffs and the plaintiffs in <i>Pareto v. Ruvín</i> , above, filed motions to have the two cases consolidated. On 8/21/14, Appellees replied to the response of appellants regarding certification to the Florida Supreme Court and responded to the motion to stay briefing. On 8/28/14, the motion to stay was denied and this case was consolidated with <i>Pareto</i> . See entries for <i>Pareto</i> from 8/28/14 forward, which apply equally to this case.
Florida	Appeal	<i>Shaw v. Shaw*</i>	D (includes federal claims)	The Ware Law Group; Brett Rahall, P.A.	Petition for dissolution by married same-sex couple filed on 3/17/14. Argument was heard 4/22/14. On 5/9/14, the judge issued a decision refusing to grant the dissolution based on the state's ban on recognizing marriages of same-sex couples. A notice of appeal to the second district court of appeals was filed on 5/16/14. A notice of cross appeal was filed on 5/28/14. The Florida second district court of appeals certified the case to the Supreme Court of Florida on 8/27/14. On 9/5/14, the Florida Supreme Court declined to take the case. The state attorney general subsequently intervened in the appeal. Appellant's brief was filed 9/22/14 in the second district court of appeals. Appellee's answer brief was filed on 10/13/14, and Intervenor-Appellee's answer brief was filed on 10/20/14. On 11/17/14, appellants filed their reply brief. Oral Argument was scheduled for 4/27/15. On 4/6/15, the State filed a motion to cancel the oral argument, or alternatively excuse them from participation. This was denied on 4/21/15. Oral argument is set for 4/27/15.
Florida	Appeal	<i>Dousset v. Florida Atlantic University*</i>	R (includes federal claims)	NCLR; Law Offices of George Castrataro, PA	Suit filed directly in state intermediate appellate court by gay student married in Massachusetts who was denied in-state tuition by Florida state university because of state's ban on recognition of marriages entered by same-sex couples in other jurisdictions. (Florida Administrative Procedures Act provides for direct appeal such as this of final state agency decisions.) Opening appellate brief and notice of constitutional question to the state

					Attorney General were filed 5/14/14. On 8/20/14, appellees filed their answer. On 9/8/14, appellants filed their reply brief. On 9/12/14 the State of Florida filed a motion to intervene to defend the state's marriage ban. The State's motion to be an additional appellee was granted. The State filed its brief on 11/20/14. Appellant's reply brief was filed on 12/10/14. On 4/22/15, the court ordered the appellant to show cause why the appeal should not be dismissed as moot. Oral argument is scheduled for 6/9/15.
Florida	Trial	<i>Trepanier v. Heavilin*</i>	M	Wayne LaRue Smith	Filed 5/21/14 by same-sex couple who alleged that they are particularly concerned about the impact of not being able to marry upon their children.
Florida	Trial	<i>Simpson v. Bondi*</i> (also known as <i>Estate of Bangor</i>)	R (includes federal claims)	Minerley Fein, P.A.	Surviving spouse seeking to be appointed personal representative under Florida Probate Code (which only allows out-of-state "spouses" to be appointed) challenged Florida's ban on recognizing marriages same-sex couples entered outside the state. On 5/12/14, an amended petition for administration was filed. On 7/15/14, a memorandum of law was filed in support of the amended petition. A hearing on the petition was held 7/15/14. The trial court issued its decision on 8/5/14, holding that Florida's marriage laws unconstitutionally impair Mr. Bangor's right to choose a personal representative and that the marriage bans are "unconstitutional as applied in this estate," but stating that the ruling is "strictly limited to the facts before it." On 2/10/15, Simpson filed a petition to amend surviving spouse designation on the death certificate. A response was filed on 3/2/15. On 3/13/15, a hearing was held on the petition and an order was filed granting the petition to amend the death certificate.
Kansas	Supreme	<i>Kansas v. Moriarty*</i>	M	Filed by KS AG to block marriages by same-sex couples	Original proceeding filed directly with Kansas Supreme Court on 10/10/14 by state Attorney General to block further grant of marriage licenses pursuant to the order of the Chief Judge of one of the state's judicial districts. That same day, the Kansas Supreme Court granted a temporary stay, ordered a response by 10/21/14, allowed additional briefing by 10/28/14, and scheduled oral argument for 11/6/14 (which was later postponed). A response to the writ was filed on 10/21/14 by counsel for the Chief Judge of that judicial district and an amicus brief was submitted by All's Fair Kansas (a marriage equality group) on 10/23/14. Both sides filed their briefs on 10/28/14. On 11/5/14, the court issued a show cause order. On 11/10/14, Moriarty filed a motion for immediate termination of temporary stay, and the State responded. On 11/14/14, both sides filed their

					responses to the show cause order. On 11/18/14, the court ordered the stay lifted.
Kansas	Trial	<i>Nelson v. Kansas Dept. of Revenue*</i>	R (for tax purposes only)	Law Office of David J. Brown	Filed 12/31/13. Defendant answered on 2/3/14. Kansas filed a motion for summary judgment on 5/2/14. Plaintiffs filed their opposition and a cross-motion for summary judgment on 7/7/14. Defendant's response was filed on 7/31/14. Oral argument was held 11/14/14.
Kentucky	Trial	<i>Kentucky Equality Federation v. Beshear*</i>	R (includes federal claims)	Harbinger & Associates	Filed 9/10/13. Defendants' motion to hold in abeyance was denied 2/21/14. On 4/10/14, this case was consolidated with <i>Hardee v. Beshear</i> , below. See entries there for further developments.
Kentucky	Trial	<i>Hardee v. Beshear*</i>	M (includes federal claims)	O'Hara, Ruberg, Taylor, Sloan & Sergent	Filed 3/20/14. On 4/10/14, this case was consolidated with <i>Kentucky Equality Federation v. Beshear</i> , above. Plaintiffs and defendants filed cross-motions for summary judgment on 7/2/14. Opposition briefs were filed 8/1/14. Oral argument was held 8/18/14. On 4/16/15, the court ruled that Kentucky's marriage ban is unconstitutional, but stayed that ruling pending the U.S. Supreme Court's ruling in the marriage cases now before it.
Kentucky	Trial	<i>Romero v. Romero*</i>	D	Louis I. Waterman, PLLC	Filed 10/25/13 on behalf of a lesbian couple who married in Massachusetts. A response was filed on 11/15/13. In February 2014, the judge requested and the parties submitted a memorandum of fact and law setting forth the jurisdiction of the Court to address the dissolution of a marriage of a same-sex couple. In April 2014, the parties entered into a property settlement agreement and a motion for a decree of dissolution. The couple's lawyer has announced that she plans to appeal if the divorce petition is dismissed.
Louisiana	Appeal	<i>In re Costanza and Brewer*</i>	R/A (includes federal claims)	Paul R. Baier; Joshua S. Gillory	On 7/26/13, the trial court dismissed a petition for intra-family adoption sought by a same-sex couple married in California. The couple's opening brief was filed with the intermediate appellate court on 9/25/13. A hearing was held 4/30/14, and the appellate court's decision was rendered on 6/4/14, remanding the case to the trial court to allow the filing of an amended petition. On remand, the trial court was instructed to hear arguments on all issues raised by both the petitioners and the Attorney General. On 9/22/14, the trial court found Louisiana's marriage ban unconstitutional. On 9/25/14, defendants filed a motion for a suspensive appeal. On 9/26/14, they then filed an application for direct appeal to the state supreme court, which agreed to hear the appeal, with briefing due by the end of 2014. Briefing is complete. Oral argument was held 1/29/15.
Mississippi	Appeal	<i>Czekala-Chatham v.</i>	D (includes	Holland Law, P.C.	Divorce petition filed 9/11/13. The trial court judge denied the petition for divorce on 12/2/13. An appeal was filed 12/23/13. The State of

		<i>Melancon*</i>	federal claims)		Mississippi filed a notice of appearance in the appeal. On 5/23/14, appellant Lauren Beth Czekala-Chatham's opening brief was filed. Appellee's response was filed on 8/25/14. Appellant's reply was filed on 9/29/14. On 11/14/14, Mississippi filed a supplemental brief in response to an amicus brief filed by the ACLU and ACLU of Mississippi. Oral argument of the appeal was held 1/21/15. On 2/26/15, the court ordered further briefing on what rational basis might support denying a divorce to a Mississippi resident who married a same-sex partner outside the state. On 3/26/15, Mississippi filed their supplemental brief. On 3/27/15, Czekala-Chatham filed her supplemental brief.
Missouri	Trial	<i>In re Marriage of M.S. and D.S.*</i>	D (includes federal claims)	Capes, Sokol, Goodman, & Sarachan, PC	Divorce action filed by member of couple married in Iowa. The divorce petition was dismissed in the trial court. A direct appeal was filed with the Missouri Supreme Court on 3/13/14. The ACLU of Missouri filed an amicus brief, joined by Lambda Legal and others. Oral argument was heard on 12/3/14. On 2/10/15, the court reversed and remanded the dismissal of the divorce petition, holding that the circuit court had subject matter jurisdiction over the case. There were no requests for rehearing. On 2/26/15, the court issued the mandate.
Missouri	Appeal	<i>State of Missouri v. Jennifer Florida*</i> (formerly <i>State of Missouri v. Carpenter</i>)	M	MO AG Chris Koster filed this action to block further marriages	After the City of St. Louis issued marriage licenses to four same-sex couples, the state Attorney General filed suit on 6/26/14 to block further issuance of marriage licenses. Based on the City's statement that it would cease issuance of further marriage licenses, the court denied the state Attorney General's motion for a temporary restraining order. On 8/5/14, defendants filed their motion and suggestions in support of judgment on the pleadings and their answer and counterclaims. A status hearing was held on 8/11/14. On 9/9/14, the state filed its opposition to defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings. A hearing was held on 9/29/14. On 10/1/14, defendants filed their reply. On 11/5/14, the court found the Missouri statutes banning marriage unconstitutional. On 11/6/14, the State appealed. The case was taken by the Missouri Supreme Court. On 1/22/15, Missouri filed a motion to hold briefing in abeyance. On 1/28/15, the court stayed the briefing schedule until the United States Supreme Court resolves the marriage cases pending before it.
Missouri	Trial	<i>Messer v. Nixon*</i>	R	Whitehood Law Firm, L.L.C. (challenging recognition of marriages of	Challenge to governor's Executive Order permitting same-sex couples married in other states can file state taxes jointly, filed on 1/9/14. An amended motion/petition was filed on 2/7/14. A motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction was filed on 3/26/14. A hearing was held on 4/3/14, and the motion for a temporary restraining

				same-sex couples)	order was denied on 4/4/14. The state LGBT equality group PROMO filed a motion to intervene, which was heard on 6/4/14, and on 6/9/14 the court denied intervention but left open the possibility of filing an amicus brief. A further hearing was conducted on 8/20/14.
Missouri	Trial	<i>Barrier v. Vasterling*</i>	R (includes federal claims)	ACLU	Filed 2/12/14. Plaintiffs moved for summary judgment. On 4/25/14, defendant filed a motion to change transfer the case to another venue. On 5/9/14, Plaintiffs filed a motion to file an amended petition, which was granted on 5/21/14. Plaintiffs filed their motion for summary judgment on 5/30/14. On 6/2/14, defendant City answered the amended petition. On 6/10/14, the court denied the motion for change of venue. On 7/16/14, the defendants filed their opposition to plaintiffs' first and second summary judgment motions. On 7/28/14, plaintiffs filed their reply suggestions in support of their motions for summary judgment. On 8/5/14, defendants filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings and suggestions in opposition to plaintiffs; summary judgment motions. On 8/7/14, plaintiffs replied to the state defendants' opposition, requested an oral argument on state defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings. On 9/25/14, a hearing on all pending motions was conducted. On 10/3/14, the court issued its order and judgment finding the state's prohibition on recognizing marriages of same-sex couples performed out of state violates the 14 th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The state has announced that it will comply with this ruling and recognize marriages same-sex couples have entered outside the state. Amended order and judgment filed on 10/27/14. On 11/26/14, a motion to intervene was filed by the Missouri General Assembly. On 12/5/14, a notice of appeal was filed by the General Assembly, and both the city and the plaintiffs opposed the motion to intervene. On 12/9/14, the court denied the General Assembly's motion to intervene as a party-defendant for purposes of appeal. On 12/16/14 the General Assembly filed a notice of dismissal of its appeal.
Nebraska	Trial	<i>Nichols v. Nichols*</i>	D (includes federal claims)	Domina Law Group	Lesbian couple who married in Iowa in 2009 sought a divorce in Nebraska. The trial court dismissed their action based on the state's constitutional amendment. They appealed. The ACLU of Nebraska filed an amicus brief in support on 3/27/14. Argument was held on 5/27/14. On 6/13/14, the Nebraska Supreme Court dismissed the appeal for lack of jurisdiction because it was made on a conditional order rather than a final judgment and the case therefore has returned to the trial court.
Pennsylvania	Trial	<i>In re Estate of Burgi-</i>	R (includes	Jenner & Palmer, P.C.; Leonore F.	Estate tax case, filed 9/25/13. Oral argument was held 4/29/14. In mid-June, Raus (partner of deceased) won her exemption and did not have to

		<i>Rios*</i>	federal claims)	Carpenter; Alexander & Pelli, LLC	pay the inheritance tax. She continues to press for declaratory and injunctive relief to update the tax code to use genderless terms in order to protect all same-sex couples.
South Carolina	Appeal	<i>Swicegood v. Thompson*</i>	D	John G. Reckenbeil, LLC	Divorce case involving same-sex couple who allege they were in a common law marriage, filed 3/13/14. An adverse decision in the case was appealed. The response brief of Intervenor-Attorney General and a motion to dismiss by respondent Thompson have been filed.
Tennessee	Appeal	<i>Borman v. Borman</i>	D (includes federal claims)	Mark N. Foster	Same-sex couple who married in Iowa in 2010 sought a divorce in Tennessee in 2011. The state Attorney General submitted briefing arguing that the state's marriage ban precludes granting the divorce, to which counsel for the petitioner responded. The case was argued 6/27/14. The trial court issued its decision on 8/5/14, holding that Tennessee's ban on marriage for same-sex couples does not violate the Equal Protection or the Full Faith and Credit clauses of the U.S. Constitution. Plaintiff appealed on 9/16/14. Appellant's brief was filed on 12/19/14. On 1/22/15, the Tennessee Attorney General filed his brief as appellee/intervening defendant. On 2/3/15, the appellant filed his reply brief. On 2/5/15, the court ordered the appellee, who had failed to file a responsive brief, to file that brief by 2/19/15 or else show cause why this appeal should not be submitted for decision only on the record and briefs submitted and oral argument to be submitted. No brief was filed by 2/19/15. Appellee's brief was filed on 2/27/15. Oral argument was held on 3/9/15. On 3/11/15, the attorney general filed a motion to stay the proceedings, which was opposed on 3/12/15. The court granted the motion to stay pending resolution of the marriage cases pending before the Supreme Court.
Texas	Supreme	<i>Goodfriend v. DeBeauvoir*</i>	M (includes federal claims)	Herring & Irwin,, L.L.P.	On 2/19/15, a petition for a temporary restraining order was filed on behalf of a Travis County lesbian couple seeking to be allowed to marry without delay because one of the partners is terminally ill. On 2/19/15, the court ordered the clerk to issue a license. That same day, the Texas Attorney General asked the Texas Supreme Court to stay the effect of the order (which was granted), and filed a petition for a writ of mandamus. On 3/6/15 an amended petition for writ of mandamus was filed. The response to the amended petition is due 5/13/15.
Texas	Supreme	<i>Estate of Powell*</i>	R	Hopper Mikeska	In a case where the surviving partner is seeking her common law marriage to be recognized for estate purposes, a 2/17/15 ruling from the Travis County Probate Court held, "Texas Family Code and Article I, 32 of the Texas Constitution are unconstitutional insofar as they restrict marriage in the State of Texas to a union of a man and woman and prohibit the creation

					or recognition of marriage to same-sex couples, because such restrictions and prohibitions violate the Due Process Clause and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.” On 2/20/15 the Texas Attorney General filed a petition for writ of mandamus stating that the ruling was an abuse of discretion because of its unnecessary overbreadth and its failure to defer to the Texas Supreme Court’s resolution of serious constitutional issues that are currently under its review. In response, the Texas Supreme Court stayed the ruling. A motion to extend time to respond was filed and granted by the court, making a response due 5/13/15.
Texas	Supreme	<i>J.B. v. Dallas County</i>	D (includes federal claims)	James J. Scheske; Jason Stead	Divorce case in which lower court granted a divorce was appealed by state Attorney General and argued to the state supreme court on 11/5/13. Awaiting decision.
Texas	Supreme	<i>Texas v. Naylor</i>	D (includes federal claims)	Akin Gump Strauss Hauever & Feld LLP; Law Offices of Robert B. Luther, P.C.	Divorce case involving same-sex couple in which lower court granted a divorce was appealed by state Attorney General and argued to the state supreme court on 11/5/13. Awaiting decision.
Texas	Appeal	<i>Pidgeon v. Parker*</i>	R	Woodfell Law Firm, P.C.; Texas Values; The Olson Firm, PLLC (all representing taxpayers challenging recognition of out-of-state marriages)	Filed 2/17/13. Effort to block provision of spousal health insurance benefits to city employees married to same-sex spouses out of state. Removed to federal court 12/27/13. On 8/28/14, the federal district court remanded the case back to state court and held that the motions of the federal <i>Freeman</i> plaintiffs (represented by Lambda Legal) to intervene and to consolidate the <i>Freeman</i> case with <i>Pidgeon</i> were therefore moot. Plaintiff resought and again obtained an injunction from the trial court, in conflict with the federal court ruling. The trial court order has been appealed, which stayed it. The appeal has now been fully briefed on the merits, but the court has requested supplemental briefs on the impact of the marriage cases now before the U.S. Supreme Court. Oral argument of the appeal has been scheduled for 7/22/15.
Texas	Appeal	<i>In the Matter of the Marriage of A.L.F.L. and K.L.L.*</i>	D (includes federal claims)	Judith K. Wemmert Law Offices	Dissolution case filed 2/18/14 by a lesbian couple in Bexar County, Texas who had married in Washington and are having a custody dispute. On 4/22/14, the trial court ruled that Texas’s bar on marriage for same-sex is unconstitutional, as would be its refusal to recognize the parental presumption of custody for married same-sex couples. On 4/24/14, the state intermediate court granted an emergency motion by the state Attorney General to stay that ruling while it considers his motion to vacate the ruling.

					<p>On 5/28/14, the state Attorney General’s petition for writ of mandamus was conditionally granted, vacating the trial court’s opinion on the ground that notice of the constitutional challenge was not given to the Texas AG as required by statute. On 6/16/14, the trial court judge vacated her order. The appeal of that order was pending in the 4th court of appeals; however, on 6/13/14, a motion for involuntary dismissal was filed by the appellees. On 7/23/14, an amended notice of appeal was filed. On 8/11/14, appellants filed a motion for emergency relief, and appellees filed a response. That motion was granted on 8/13/14. On 8/18/14, appellees filed a motion for reconsideration; appellants responded on 8/20/14. On 9/9/14, appellees filed a reply in support of their motion for reconsideration. On 9/12/14, the motion was denied. On 12/15/14, appellees filed a motion for clarification of the 8/13/14 stay order. The state responded on 12/19/14. On 1/28/15, the court denied the motion for clarification.</p>
Wyoming	Trial	<i>Courage v. Wyoming*</i>	B (includes federal claims)	NCLR; Arnold & Porter LLP; Zabrod Law Office, PC; Rathod Mohamedbhai LLC	<p>Filed 3/5/14. Plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment on 7/1/14. On 7/29/14, the judge denied defendants’ request for a stay, but deferred a hearing on the motion for summary judgment for 90 days to give the state an opportunity to conduct discovery. On 10/6/14, a joint motion was filed to lift the stay and enter judgment.</p>