

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

JILL STEIN, et al., <div style="text-align: center;">Plaintiffs,</div> <div style="text-align: center;">v.</div> PEDRO A. CORTÉS, <i>in his official capacity as Secretary of the</i> <i>Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, et al.,</i> <div style="text-align: center;">Defendants.</div>	: : : : : : : : : :	Civ. No. 16-6287
--	--	-------------------------

JUDGMENT

AND NOW, this 7th day of September, 2018, upon consideration of Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 74), Plaintiffs’ Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 75), Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 76), Defendants’ Response in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment and Reply in Support of their Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 78), Plaintiffs’ Reply in Support of their Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 79), Defendants’ Sur-Reply (Doc. No. 80), Defendants’ Supplemental Motion (Doc. No. 87), Plaintiffs’ Renewed Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. No. 88), Plaintiffs’ Response (Doc. No. 89), and Defendants’ Response (Doc. No. 90), it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (Doc. Nos. 74, 87) is **GRANTED in part** as follows:
 - a. Plaintiff Jill Stein’s claims based on the 2016 presidential election are **DISMISSED without prejudice** for lack of standing;
 - b. Plaintiffs Randall Reitz, Emily Cook, Robin Howe, and Shannon Knight’s First Amendment and Equal Protection claims that they were subjected to an unconstitutional risk of casting an ineffective vote in the 2016 election are **DISMISSED without prejudice** for lack of standing;

- c. Mr. Reitz and Ms. Cook's First Amendment claim that the Commonwealth's recount procedures unduly burdened their rights to vote is **DISMISSED**;
 - d. Dr. Stein's claim that Pennsylvania's recount produces deny her Equal Protection is **DISMISSED**;
 - e. Plaintiffs' claim that they were arbitrarily denied their state-law right to a recount in violation of Due Process is **DISMISSED**; and
 - f. Defendants' Motion is otherwise **DENIED**; and
2. Plaintiffs' Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. Nos. 75, 88) is **DENIED**.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Paul S. Diamond

Paul S. Diamond, J.