UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MAINE

DINNER TABLE ACTION et al.,)	
)	
Plaintiffs)	
)	
v.)	No. 1:24-cv-00430-KFW
)	
WILLIAM J. SCHNEIDER,)	
in his official capacity as)	
Chairman of the Maine)	
Commission on Governmental)	
Ethics and Election Practices,)	
et al.,)	
)	
Defendants)	

REPORT AND ORDER¹

On December 19, 2024, I held a conference with Attorney Charles M. Miller, Attorney Joshua D. Dunlap, and Maine Assistant Attorney Jonathan R. Bolton to discuss scheduling matters in this action challenging the constitutionality of "An Act to Limit Contributions to Political Action Committees That Make Independent Expenditures," which was recently enacted in Maine by ballot initiative.

The parties outlined their proposed scheduling plan for my approval. The challenged law is set to take effect on December 25, 2024, but the Defendants (all of whom are sued in their official capacities as State officials) have agreed not to enforce the law until May 30, 2025, to allow time to resolve this case and avoid the need for

¹ Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), the parties have consented to me conducting all proceedings in this matter including entry of judgment. See ECF No. 11.

the Plaintiffs to seek a temporary restraining order. The parties will brief the issues—which they agree are largely legal in nature—in January and February 2025, with the goal of having a combined hearing on injunctive relief and the merits sometime in March 2025. The parties anticipate that they will be able to stipulate to most—if not all—facts but reserve the right to present limited testimony at the

I accept the parties' proposed schedule and hereby set the following deadlines:

Defendants' Answer: January 6, 2025²

Plaintiffs' Brief: January 15, 2025

Defendants' Brief: February 14, 2025

Plaintiffs' Reply Brief: February 28, 2025

Once the parties' briefing is complete, I will hold another conference to discuss and schedule the combined hearing.

SO ORDERED.

combined hearing, if necessary.

Dated: December 20, 2024

/s/ Karen Frink Wolf United States Magistrate Judge

² Because the Defendants agreed to waive service, *see* ECF No. 10, their answer would ordinarily be due in mid-February 2025. Nevertheless, because of the tight timeframe agreed upon by the parties, it seems prudent for the Defendants to file their answer before the Plaintiffs file their opening brief.