

Virginia:

In the Circuit Court of the City of Richmond, John Marshall Courts Building

**CHRISTALYN M. JETT, ET AL.,**

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

**Case No.: CL25-5352**

**G. PAUL NARDO, ET AL.,**

*Defendants.*

**ORDER**

On November 3, 2025, the parties appeared, in person and by counsel, on Plaintiffs' motions for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction relating to a pending constitutional amendment affecting congressional redistricting. Having considered the undisputed facts, the relevant authorities, and the arguments of counsel, the Court rules as follows:

*(a) The Plaintiffs Lack Standing.*

Plaintiffs, three elected Clerks of Circuit Courts in the Commonwealth, claim imminent harm on the basis that they are unable to comply with the notice provisions of Va. Code Ann. § 30-13 (Lexis 2025) due to alleged infirmities in an ongoing act of the General Assembly to amend the Constitution of the Commonwealth. Section 30-13 requires clerks of the various Circuit Courts to publicly post proposed amendments when they have been journaled by the Clerk of the House of Delegates at the end of the respective session of the General Assembly. See *id.* Plaintiffs acknowledge that Defendant Nardo, as Clerk of the House of Delegates, has not journaled any proposed

amendment to the Constitution. As such, Plaintiffs' obligations under § 30-13 have not arisen, and any claimed harm is entirely speculative. See *Friends of Rappahannock v. Caroline Cnty.*, 286 Va. 38, 48 (2013) (complainant must allege facts demonstrating a particularized harm). Plaintiffs lack standing.

*(b) The Matter is not Justiciable.*

Plaintiffs' action also invites the Court to prematurely invade the province of the legislature. For well over a century, the courts of the Commonwealth have recognized a bedrock principle that amending the Constitution is a process left exclusively to the sound judgment of the legislature that proposes amendments and the citizens that ratify or reject them. See *Scott v. James*, 114 Va. 297 (1912). While that process is ongoing, "the courts cannot interfere to stop any of the proceedings." See *id.* at 304. This matter is not currently justiciable.

For the foregoing reasons, the motions currently before the Court must be **DENIED.**

Pursuant to Rule 1:13, the Court dispenses with the parties' endorsement of this Order. The Clerk is directed to forward a certified copy of this Order to the parties.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

ENTER: November 5, 2025

  
Tracy Thorne-Begland, Judge

*Duplicate original*