

Scorecard

Pending Marriage Equality Lawsuits

There are currently:

86 lawsuits involving the right of same-sex couples to marry or have their out-of-state marriages respected are pending in 30 states (**AL, AK, AZ, AR, CO, FL, GA, ID, IN, KS, KY, LA, MI, MS, MO, MT, NE, NV, NC, ND, OH, OR, PA, SC, SD, TN, TX, VA, WV, WY**) and **Puerto Rico**. (Same-sex couples already are marrying in some of these states, but some litigation still is pending in those states.)

54 of these are in federal court;

19 of those are on appeal.

14 pending federal district court cases and 7 pending federal court of appeals cases are within the 4th, 7th or 10th Circuits, in which the U.S. Supreme Court has denied *certiorari* (review) of rulings that bans on marriage by same-sex couples are unconstitutional.

32 are in state courts;

16 of these are on appeal; and

22 raise federal claims,

6 of which are from states in the 4th, 7th or 10th Circuits.

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 32 rulings in 31 cases from 25 different **federal** courts that have held the laws of 20 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 (AK, AZ, CO, FL, ID, IL, IN, KY, MI, NV, NC, OH, OK, OR, PA, TN, TX, UT, VA, and WI). Including state courts, the total rises to 46 rulings in 42 cases from 37 different **federal and state courts** invalidating or enjoining the enforcement of the marriage bans of 24 states (the states in the last parenthetical, plus AR, CO, MO, NJ, and NM).

Marriage Equality

Marriage equality exists in **30** states and **DC**: 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. It appears that these marriages are now being recognized for at least federal law purposes.

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**, **FL**, **KY**, **TN**, and **TX**) and, in one of the **OH** cases, the court's order has been stayed as to all couples except the named plaintiffs.

Marriage Recognition

Some other states that do not currently allow same-sex couples to marry are recognizing marriages same-sex couples have entered outside the state for all purposes (such as **MO**) or for limited purposes (such as **WY**, for purposes of obtaining a divorce).

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

On 10/6/14, the Supreme Court denied the 7 petitions for *certiorari* seeking review of decisions from the 4th, 7th, and 10th Circuits that struck down the marriage bans that had existed in IN, OK, UT, VA, and WI. On that same day, the 4th Circuit issued its mandate in *Bostic v. Schaefer*, making it possible for same-sex couples to marry in Virginia, and the 10th Circuit issued its mandate in *Herbert v. Kitchen* and *Bishop v. Smith*, making it possible for same-sex couples to marry in Utah and Oklahoma, respectively. On 10/7/14, the 7th Circuit issued its mandate in *Baskin v. Bogan* (which had been consolidated with *Fujii v. Dept. of Revenue* and *Lee v. Pence*) and in *Walker v. Wolf*, making it possible for same-sex couples to marry in Indiana and Wisconsin, respectively.

IN FEDERAL COURTS OF APPEALS

The 9th Circuit dismissed as moot the appeal in *Jackson v. Abercrombie* on October 10, 2014, due to Hawaii's legislative adoption of marriage equality. That case therefore is no longer listed below. In addition, the 10th Circuit granted the state of Colorado's motion to dismiss the *Evans v. Utah* case, which had challenged Utah's previous refusal to recognize marriages entered after the district court struck down Utah's marriage ban and before the district court's ruling was stayed, because Colorado is now recognizing those marriages. That case therefore is no longer listed below either.

STATE	CIRCUIT	CASE NAME	NATURE OF CLAIMS ²	COUNSEL	STATUS
Alaska	9th	<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. Defendants answered on 6/19/14. Plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment on 8/29/14; defendants' response was filed on 9/26/14. Plaintiffs filed their reply to the response on 10/3/14. Oral argument was held for 10/10/14. On 10/12/14, the court granted plaintiffs' motion, ruling that Alaska's bar on marriage for same-sex couples is unconstitutional. Same-sex couples have now married in Alaska. State officials filed an appeal to the 9th Cir. on 10/13/14 and requested issuance of an emergency stay pending appeal. The State's opening brief is due 1/21/15.

² 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.

Colorado	10 th	<i>Burns v. Hickenlooper*</i>	B	Kilmer, Lane & Newman, LLP	<p>Filed 7/1/14, along with a motion for a preliminary injunction. Plaintiffs are six same-sex couples who have entered civil unions, but wish to marry. The suit seeks the freedom to marry and recognition of out-of-state marriages. On 7/23/14, the district court granted plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction, denied defendants' motion to stay the preliminary injunction until resolution of <i>Kitchen v. Herbert</i>, granted a temporary stay; and granted defendants' motion to stay further proceedings in the matter. Defendants appealed. On 7/28/14, Appellant Suthers filed a motion to stay the district court decision. Plaintiffs responded to the stay motion on 8/7/14 and Suthers replied on 8/14/14. Appellant's motion for stay pending appeal was granted on 8/21/14. On 9/2/14 the State asked the court to hold the case in abeyance until after the Supreme Court rules. On 9/16/14, Appellees filed their response to the motion to abate. On 9/18/14, the motion was granted. The case was abated pending the outcome of the <i>Herbert</i> case in the U.S. Supreme Court. On 10/6/14, the Supreme Court denied the petitions for <i>certiorari</i> from the <i>Herbert v. Kitchen</i> and <i>Smith v. Bishop</i> cases, letting stand the 10th Circuit's decision finding bans on marriage for same-sex couples are unconstitutional. Because Colorado is part of the 10th Circuit and is bound by its decisions, defendants on 10/6/14 filed an unopposed motion to lift the stay and dismiss the appeal. Meanwhile, the Colorado Supreme Court lifted its stay in the <i>Bringman v. Long</i> state marriage equality case, permitting same-sex couples to marry throughout the state, which likely will cause the 10th Cir. to grant the motion to dismiss this appeal.</p>
Florida	11 th	<i>Brenner v. Scott*</i> Consolidated with <i>Grimsley v. Scott</i>	B	Sheppard, White & Kachergus, P.A.; Bledsoe, Jackson, Schmidt, Wright, Lang & Wilkinson	<p>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. 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 on 5/12/14. Plaintiffs' opposition to state 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</p>

					denied or lifted in <i>Bostic</i> , <i>Bishop</i> , and <i>Kitchen</i> . Defendants filed a notice of appeal on 9/5/14. Appellants' brief is due 11/14/14.
Florida	11 th	<i>Grimsley v. Scott</i> *	R	ACLU; Podhurst Orseck, P.A.	Recognition case filed by 8 same-sex couples and SAVE (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 state 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> ..
Idaho	9 th	<i>Latta v. Otter</i> *	B	NCLR; Law Office of Deborah A. Ferguson, PLLC; Durham Law Office, PLLC	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 out-of-state marriages is unconstitutional and enjoining enforcement of the ban. The Ninth 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. It further ordered that the briefing schedule be expedited. On 5/30/14, Appellant Otter filed a petition for initial hearing en banc. That petition was denied on 8/19/14. On 6/17/14, the Ninth Circuit ordered that amicus briefs filed in <i>Sevcik v. Sandoval</i> may be considered as also filed in <i>Latta</i> . Opening briefs were filed on 6/19/14. Plaintiffs' brief was filed 7/18/14. Appellant Rich and the State of Idaho, and Appellant Otter filed their reply briefs on 8/1/14. Oral argument was held 9/8/14. On 10/7/14, the 9th 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, after briefing, he referred the matter to the entire Court, which ended the stay on 10/10/14. The Ninth Circuit had recalled its mandate as to Idaho in response to Justice Kennedy's original order, but, in response to further briefing, the Ninth Circuit on 10/13/14 dissolved its stay, effective 9 a.m. on 10/15/14, when same-sex couples should be able to start marrying in Idaho. Gov. Latta has announced that he intends to petition for rehearing en banc and for certiorari.
Indiana	7 th	<i>Bowling v.</i>	R	Richard A. Mann,	Filed 3/14/21. Assigned to same judge hearing <i>Love v. Pence</i> . On

		<i>Pence*</i>		P.C.	4/21/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment. Defendants filed their motion for summary judgment and opposition to plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment on 5/29/14. On 6/16/14, defendants filed their answer to the complaint. On 6/26/14, plaintiffs filed their combined response in opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment and reply in support of plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. Defendants filed their reply in support of their motion for summary judgment on 7/24/14. Plaintiffs filed their opposition to a stay pending appeal on 7/24/14. On 8/19/14, the court granted summary judgment in favor of plaintiffs, but stayed the case in light of the 7th Circuit's pending decision in <i>Baskin v. Bogan</i> . On 8/21/14 defendants filed a notice of appeal. On 8/25/14, the 7 th Circuit on its own motion suspended briefing of the appeal pending the court's decision in <i>Baskin v. Bogan</i> . On 10/6/14, the Supreme Court denied the petitions for certiorari from the <i>Bogan v. Baskin</i> , <i>Dept. of Revenue v. Fujii</i> , <i>Pence v. Lee</i> , and <i>Walker v. Wolf</i> cases, letting stand the 7 th Circuit's decision finding that Indiana's ban on marriage for same-sex couples is unconstitutional. The appeal in <i>Bowling v. Pence</i> likely will be dismissed, as a result.
Kentucky	6 th	<i>Bourke v. Beshear*</i>	R	Clay Daniel Walton & Adams PLC; Fauver Law Office PLLC	Filed 7/26/13. Final judgment declaring refusal to recognize out-of-state marriages of same-sex couples to be unconstitutional was entered 2/27/14, but has been stayed pending appeal. The State Attorney General declined to appeal, but the Governor retained outside counsel to handle the state's appeal. On 3/11/14, plaintiffs' counsel filed a motion for attorneys' fees, which has been granted. Appellant's brief was filed 5/7/14. Appellees' answering brief was filed on 6/9/14. Appellant's reply brief was filed on 6/26/14. The appeal was consolidated for submission and oral argument with <i>Love v. Breshear</i> , below. Oral argument was held 8/6/14.
Kentucky	6 th	<i>Love v. Beshear*</i>	M	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> case (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 case. A motion for preliminary injunction was denied 2/2/14. The Attorney General ordered was 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. Appellants filed their opening brief on 7/17/14. Appellees' brief was filed on 7/24/14. Appellants' reply brief was filed on 7/31/14. Oral argument was held 8/6/14.
Louisiana	5 th	<i>Robicheaux v. George*</i> <i>Robicheaux & Forum for Eq v. Caldwell, et al</i>	R	Law Office of Richard G. Perque LLC; and Scott J. Spivey	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). Status conference held 3/14/14. Defendants answered 4/14/14. Barfield filed motions to dismiss and for summary judgment 4/21/14. Robicheaux filed motion for partial summary judgment on 4/22/14. On 5/12/14, amicus briefs were filed in support of both parties. Cross-responses to the motions were filed on 5/19/14 by plaintiffs and 5/20/14 by Barfield. Replies filed on 6/4/14. Argument 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 marriage recognized. Supplemental briefing was submitted 7/16/14. On 7/17/14, the court granted a motion to dismiss without prejudice the Plaintiffs' claim for violation of Full Faith and Credit Clause of the United States Constitution. On 9/3/14, the court filed its Order and Reasons, denying summary judgment for plaintiffs and granting it to defendants, 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 court granted the motion to expedite briefing. Appellants brief due 10/17/14; Appellee's Brief due on 10/31/14; Reply Brief due on 11/07/14. Argument is to be scheduled for November 2014.
Louisiana	5 th	<i>Forum for Equality Louisiana v. Barfield*</i>	R	Stone Pigman Walther Wittmann LLC	Filed 2/12/14. Consolidated with <i>Robicheaux</i> cases on 3/18/14. (See entries above which apply equally to this case.)
Michigan	6 th	<i>DeBoer v. Snyder</i>	M/A	Carole M. Stanyar; Mogill, Posner & Cohen; Dana P. Nessell; Robert A. Sedler	Case originally filed as a challenge to denial of second parent adoption; subsequently amended, at trial court's insistence, to raise freedom to marry claim. Decision holding state marriage ban unconstitutional on equal protection grounds, applying the rational basis test, issued 3/21/14. Appeal and motion to stay were filed with the Sixth Circuit that day, which granted a temporary stay, and then on 3/25/14 granted a stay

					<p>pending appeal. Appellant's brief was filed 5/7/14. Appellees' brief was filed on 6/9/14. The reply brief was filed 6/26/14. The state filed a motion to expedite the appeal on 3/25/14. 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. On 4/4/14, the state filed a motion to have the appeal heard directly en banc. Counsel for plaintiffs opposed that motion on 4/11/14. Counsel in <i>Obergefell</i> filed an amicus brief also opposing that motion. Counsel for the proposed intervenors in <i>Obergefell</i> subsequently wrote to the 6th Circuit to state that they support direct en banc review. On 4/28/14, the motion for direct en banc review was denied. A married couple residing in Michigan who wish to complete a second parent adoption filed a motion to intervene on appeal. That motion was denied on 6/16/14 as was the motion to expedite. On 6/17/14, a motion for cross filing of amicus briefs was denied. Appellants' reply brief was filed on 6/26/14. Oral argument was held 8/6/14.</p>
Nevada	9 th	<i>Sevcik v. Sandoval</i>	B	Lambda Legal; O'Melveny & Myers LLP; Snell & Wilmer LLP	<p>Fully briefed. Defendants the Carson City Clerk and the Governor have withdrawn their briefs and are no longer opposing the appeal (although intervenor—proponent of ban—is). Motion to expedite oral argument was granted, but, after an argument date was set, it was taken off calendar and then only reset after a further motion was filed. On 8/20/14, the 9th Circuit instructed the parties to file briefs regarding, and to be prepared to discuss at oral argument, whether Intervenor-Defendant-Appellee has standing in light of Defendants-Appellees' withdrawal of their briefs. Oral argument was held 9/8/14. On 10/7/14, the 9th Cir. overturned the district court and ruled that it violates the Equal Protection Clause to deny same-sex couples access to marriage. That same day, the 9th Cir. issued its mandate. On 10/8/14, Justice Kennedy issued a temporary stay but, later that day, clarified that that stay only applied to Idaho. 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 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</p>

					Protection of Marriage) filed a petition for rehearing en banc with the 9th Cir.
Ohio	6 th	<i>Henry v. Himes*</i> (formerly <i>Henry v. Wymyslo</i>)	R	Lambda Legal; Gerhardstein & Branch Co., LPA; Newman & Meeks Co., LPA	Filed 2/10/14. Motion for declaratory relief and permanent injunction filed 2/28/14. At 4/4/14 hearing, the judge indicated he would issue a decision on 4/14/14 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 4/14/14, he did so. 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. The case was docketed with the 6 th Circuit on 5/12/14. Consolidated with <i>Obergefell v. Henry</i> appeal on 5/20/14. Appellant's brief filed on 6/10/14; appellees' brief filed 7/8/14; reply filed 7/15/14. Oral argument was held 8/6/14.
Ohio	6 th	<i>Obergefell v. Himes*</i> (formerly <i>Obergefell v. Wymyslo</i>)	R	ACLU; Gerhardstein & Branch Co., LPA; Newman & Meeks Co., LPA	Filed 7/19/13. Permanent injunction granted 12/23/13 requiring Ohio to recognize marriages validly entered by same-sex couples in other states on death certificates of two men who married same-sex partners. The state appealed. Plaintiffs' motion to expedite the appeal was denied. Appellants' opening brief was filed 4/10/14; answering brief was filed early, on 4/24/14; amicus briefs supporting appellees were filed 5/1/14. On 4/23/14, Equality Ohio, the Equality Ohio Education Fund, and four unmarried same-sex couples (represented by Roberta Kaplan) moved to intervene in the appeal, which Plaintiffs opposed. This was denied on 6/16/14. Consolidated with <i>Henry v. Himes</i> on 5/20/14 for purposes of argument. Oral argument was held 8/6/14.
Oregon	9 th	<i>Geiger v. Kitzhaber*</i>	B	Law Works LLC; Dorsay & Easton LLP	Case originally filed 10/15/13 and subsequently consolidated with <i>Rummell v. Kitzhaber</i> , below. Motion for summary judgment filed 2/18/14 was granted 5/19/14, after state Attorney General decided not to defend and filed a brief 3/18/14 arguing that the state's marriage ban is unconstitutional and that the state would comply with a decision so ruling. National Organization for Marriage (NOM) moved to intervene shortly before argument of the summary judgment motion and unsuccessfully sought to delay argument of that motion. Its motion to intervene was denied 5/14/14. On 5/19/14, plaintiffs' summary judgment motion was granted on both equal protection and liberty grounds, and state declined to appeal. What is before the 9 th Circuit is NOM's appeal of the denial of intervention. NOM also sought a stay from the 9 th Circuit of the district court's grant of summary judgment. The State moved to dismiss NOM's appeal as moot on 5/20/14. The 9 th Circuit denied

					NOM's request for a stay of the district court's ruling on the summary judgment motion. On 5/27/14, NOM asked the Supreme Court to issue such a stay. Respondents filed their responses to this stay application on 6/2/14. The Supreme Court denied the stay on 6/4/14. On 6/13/14 Appellee's Kitzhaber filed a motion to dismiss NOM's appeal, arguing that NOM has no standing to appeal the ruling on the merits. NOM's response to the motion to dismiss was filed on 6/23/14. On 8/27/14, the court dismissed the appeal, holding that NOM lacks standing to appeal the district court's May 19, 2014 final judgment. On 9/10/14, NOM petitioned the 9 th Circuit for rehearing en banc. On 9/25/14, NOM filed a further declaration in support of their petition.
Oregon	9 th	<i>Rummell v. Kitzhaber*</i>	M	ACLU; Perkins Coie LLP; Johnson Johnson & Schaller PC	Case originally filed 12/19/13, and subsequently consolidated with <i>Geiger v. Kitzhaber</i> . (See entries above, which apply to this case as well.)
Pennsylvania	3 rd	<i>Whitewood v. Wolf*</i> (appeal of clerk known as <i>Santai-Gaffney v. Whitewood</i>)	B	ACLU; Hangley Aronchick Segal Pudlin & Schiller; Seth Kreimer	Filed 7/9/13. Motion to dismiss denied 11/15/13. Motion to certify motion to dismiss for interlocutory appeal denied 12/17/13. The state's Attorney General declined to defend. Both the plaintiffs and the defendants filed motions for summary judgment on 4/21/14. On 5/21/14, the court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, finding Pennsylvania's ban on marriage by same-sex couples marrying and refusal to recognize same-sex couples' out-of-state marriages laws are unconstitutional and enjoining the state's bans on marriage equality. On 5/21/14, the Governor announced he would not be appealing the decision. On 6/6/14 Schuylkill County Clerk, Theresa Santai-Gaffney, filed a motion to intervene and a motion to stay the decision. On 6/18/14 the court denied the motion to intervene. The denial of the motion to intervene was appealed to the 3 rd Circuit on 6/19/14. On 7/3/14, the motion to intervene was summarily dismissed by the 3 rd Circuit and the appeal was dismissed. In addition, the motion for a stay pending appeal was dismissed as moot. On 7/3/14, the clerk sought a stay pending appeal from the Supreme Court, which was denied by Justice Alito on 7/9/14. On 7/17/14, the clerk petitioned the 3 rd Circuit for rehearing en banc. This petition was denied on 8/4/14. On 8/13/14, an amended order was filed denying the petition for en banc and panel rehearing.
Tennessee	6 th	<i>Tanco v. Haslam*</i>	R	NCLR; Rubenfeld Law Office; Holland &	Filed 10/21/13. Plaintiffs filed motion for preliminary injunction 11/19/13. On 3/14/14, the court granted a preliminary injunction that the state must recognize the named plaintiffs' marriages pending resolution

				Associates, PLLC; Sherrard & Roe, PLC; Regina M. Lambert	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. Motion to stay pending appeal filed with 6th Circuit on 3/25/14. Opposition filed 4/4/14. Stay granted 4/25/14. Appellants' opening brief was filed 5/7/14. Corrected brief of appellees was filed 6/10/14. Appellants' reply brief was filed 6/26/14. Oral argument was held 8/6/14.
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. The appeal will be argued in November 2014. .

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 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's reply is due 10/22/14; Defendants' surreply is due 10/29/14.
Alabama	11 th	<i>Searcy v. Strange*</i> (formerly <i>Searcy v. Bentley</i>)	M/A	Christine Cassie Hernandex, The Hernandez Firm, LLC; David Kennedy, The Kennedy Law Firm	Filed 5/7/14. A couple, married in California in 2008, and their minor child filed suit claiming violations of the equal protection and due process clauses of the 14 th Amendment and the 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 have 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 motion to dismiss and defendants filed their reply on 6/27/14. The Magistrate's report and recommendations was 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' response to plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment (and cross-motion, if any) is due 10/17/14. Plaintiffs' reply brief is due 10/31/14. Defendant's surreply is due 11/14/14.
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 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. The 9/15/14 scheduling order set these dates: Mediation in 2/2015; Discovery due by 2/4/15; Dispositive motions due by 4/6/15; Pretrial conference ready in 8/15; this case will be trial ready in 9/15. On 9/22/14 the joint motion to dismiss defendant Bentley was granted.
Arizona	9 th	<i>Connolly v. Roche*</i> (formerly <i>Connolly v. Brewer</i>)	B	Shawn Aiken; Griffen & Stevens Law Firm, PLLC; Mikkel Jordahl, P.C.; Dillon Law Office	Filed 1/6/14. Amended complaint was filed dropping class action allegations, state defendants, and Full Faith & Credit Clause claim. Remaining defendants answered 2/24/14. Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment was filed 4/21/14. Defendants filed their response and cross-motion for summary judgment on 6/10/14. On 6/27/14, Plaintiffs filed their response to defendants' motion for judgment as to plaintiffs' nominal damages claim, their response to defendants' cross-motion for summary judgment and their reply in

					support of their own motion for summary judgment. Defendants' reply on their cross-motion for summary judgment was filed on 7/23/14. On 10/9/14, the court issued an order requiring the defendants to file a brief by 10/16/14 as to why the 9th Circuit's decision in <i>Latta v. Otter</i> is not controlling, requiring that Arizona's marriage ban be struck down as well.
Arizona	9 th	<i>Majors v. Jeane</i> * (formerly <i>Majors v. Horne</i>)	B	Lambda Legal; Perkins Coie LLP	Filed 3/12/14. Motion to consolidate with <i>Connolly v. Roche</i> was filed 3/24/14. Response by <i>Connolly</i> plaintiffs filed 3/31/14 not objecting to transfer to same judge, but objecting to consolidation. On 4/15/14, motion to consolidate was denied, but case was transferred to Judge Sedwick, who also is hearing <i>Connolly</i> . Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint on 4/10/14 adding Equality Arizona as a plaintiff and modifying named defendants. The parties filed status report with court on 7/7/14, indicating that cross-motions for summary judgment will be filed. On 8/5/14, plaintiffs filed their second amended complaint. On 8/8/14 Defendants filed their answer. On 8/20/14, plaintiffs filed their 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 temporary restraining order seeking issuance of an accurate death certificate for Martinez, who 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 9/16/14 defendants filed their cross-motion for summary judgment and on 9/18/14 they filed their response to the plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. Plaintiffs' combined reply to the defendants' response and plaintiffs' response to defendants' cross-motion for summary judgment is due 10/15/14. Defendants' reply for the cross-motion is due 10/29/14.
Arkansas	8 th	<i>Jernigan v. Crane</i> *	B	Wagoner Law Firm, P.A.	Filed 7/15/13. Defendants answered and filed motion to dismiss comity claim 11/21/13. Amended complaint was filed 1/17/14. Defendants filed motion to dismiss 1/31/14. Response was filed 2/14/14. Plaintiffs filed their 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.
Georgia	11 th	<i>Inniss v. Aderhold*</i>	B	Lambda Legal; Bryan Cave LLP; White & Case LLP	Filed 4/22/14. Filed as 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. Plaintiffs' response to Aderhold's motion was due 9/5/14, but, 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 their motion to dismiss. On 9/5/14, Plaintiffs filed their opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss. Defendants' reply is due 10/22/14.
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. Status conference held 9/10/14. Amended complaint, dropping damages claim, filed 9/11/14.
Indiana	7 th	<i>Love v. Pence*</i>	R	Clay Daniel Walton & Adams PLC; Fauver Law Office PLLC	Filed 3/7/14 by same (Kentucky) counsel handling <i>Bourke v. Beshear</i> and <i>Love v. Beshear</i> . Motion for preliminary and permanent injunction filed 3/31/14. On 4/4/14, the Governor filed a motion to dismiss. On 4/14/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment and immediate injunctive relief. On 4/25/14, defendant filed a response in opposition to plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary and permanent injunction. On 4/25/14 plaintiffs responded. Replies by both plaintiffs and defendants were filed on 5/8/14. On 6/25/14, this case was dismissed on the ground that the Governor was not a proper defendant. On 7/22/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for reconsideration of the order dismissing the case. On 8/8/14, Defendant filed a response in opposition to reconsideration. On 8/21/14, plaintiffs filed a reply in support of their motion for reconsideration. On 9/16/14, the court reinstated the married plaintiffs' claims and granted plaintiffs' motion to reconsider and vacated its prior entry of final judgment in favor of defendant. On 10/6/14, the Supreme Court denied the petitions for certiorari from the <i>Bogan v. Baskin</i> , <i>Dept. of Revenue v. Fujii</i> , and <i>Pence v. Lee, and Walker v. Wolf</i> cases, letting stand the 7 th Circuit's decision

					finding the Indiana's marriage bans unconstitutional, and likely mooting this case.
Indiana	7 th	<i>Romero v. Brown</i>	R	Quarles & Brady	Filed 9/8/14 on behalf of an Indiana lesbian couple who married in Illinois. They are seeking recognition of their marriage, as one of the women is gravely ill. The defendants agreed not to enforce the state's marriage ban as to the couple and to recognize their marriage, including on a death certificate. As a result, the court on 9/11/14 stayed the proceedings pending the resolution of <i>Baskin</i> . On 10/6/14, the Supreme Court denied the petitions for certiorari from the <i>Bogan v. Baskin</i> , <i>Dept. of Revenue v. Fujii</i> , and <i>Pence v. Lee</i> , letting stand the 7 th Circuit's decision finding Indiana's marriage bans unconstitutional, and likely mooting this case.
Kansas	10th	<i>Marie v. Moser*</i>	M	ACLU; Denton US LLP	Filed 10/10/14. Seeks to have 10th Cir. 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 Cir. On 10/13/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order.
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</i> . Motion for preliminary injunction filed 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 were 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 the plaintiffs' response. A hearing was held on 8/21/14 on the motions to consolidate, for preliminary injunction, to dismiss and to stay.
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. The response to the motion to dismiss was filed 8/28/14, and the reply was filed 9/11/14. Defendants' reply

					regarding the motion to stay was also filed 8/28/14. On 9/11/14, defendants filed their reply to the response to the motion to dismiss.
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 until a decision is reached in the 6 th circuit marriage cases.
Missouri	8 th	<i>Lawson v. Kelly*</i>	M (includes federal claims)	ACLU	Filed on 6/24/14 in state court by two same-sex couples seeking to marry. Jackson County has announced that it will not defend the ban. An unopposed motion to intervene was granted on 7/11/14. Discovery is underway. On 7/15/14 this case was removed from the State court to the US District Court. State defendants' answer to complaint was filed on 7/15/14, defendant Kelly's answer was filed on 7/22/14. The defendants filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings on 8/5/12. 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 Intervenor's motion for judgment on the pleadings was filed on 9/5/14. Plaintiffs filed their motion for summary judgment on 9/5/14 and filed their motion for a permanent injunction on 9/15/14. On 9/17/14, the Missouri Family Policy Council filed their opposition to the motion. On 9/19/14 the State of Missouri filed their reply. Reply suggestions to response in opposition motion for judgment were due 9/22/2014; Reply to Missouri Family Council motion for summary judgment was due 10/6/14; suggestions in opposition/response to plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment are due by 10/21/14.
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. Governor announced that he will 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. A status conference is set for 6/29/15.
North Carolina	4 th	<i>Fisher-Borne v. Smith</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 motion for preliminary injunction 4/9/14. Response filed 4/28/14. Briefing was ordered to address whether consideration of the motion should

					<p>be stayed pending 4th Circuit's decision in <i>Bostic</i>. Defendants filed motion to stay proceedings on 4/11/14. Plaintiffs filed their consolidated memorandum of law in support of their motion for preliminary injunction and opposition to defendants' motion for stay on 5/5/14. Defendant's reply filed 5/22/14. On 6/2/14, Magistrate Judge Peake recommended that the stay be granted pending the Fourth Circuit's decision in <i>Bostic v. Schaefer</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 granted in <i>McQuigg v. Bostic</i>. On 9/10/14 plaintiffs filed a motion for reconsideration of this order; responses are due 10/6/14.</p> <p>On 10/6/14 the Supreme Court denied the petitions for certiorari from the <i>Bostic</i> case, letting stand the 4th 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." Status reports are due on 10/16/14 from the parties addressing if the parties agree with the courts suggestion regarding the effect of <i>Bostic</i>, if discovery is needed prior to the case moving to summary judgment, what issues remain regarding adoption, and parties suggestions regarding additional briefing.</p>
North Carolina	4 th	<i>Gerber v. Cooper*</i>	R	ACLU; Sullivan & Cromwell LLP; Ellis & Winters LLP	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. Motion for preliminary injunction also filed 4/9/14. Responses filed 4/28/14. Briefing was ordered to address whether consideration of the motion should be stayed pending 4 th 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 stay on 5/5/14. Defendants filed their motion to dismiss on 5/6/14. Defendants' reply filed 5/22/14.

					<p>Answer by Defendant Thigpen filed on 5/30/14. On 6/2/14, Magistrate Judge Peake recommended that the stay be granted pending the Fourth 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 their 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 <i>Bostic</i> decision on this case. Briefing in response to the 7/30/14 order was filed by all parties on 8/13/14. On 8/27/14, the court stayed the proceedings pending termination of the stay granted in <i>McQuigg v. Bostic</i>. . On 9/10/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for reconsideration of this order; responses are due 10/6/14.</p> <p>On 10/6/14 the Supreme Court denied the petitions for certiorari from the <i>Bostic</i> case, letting stand the 4th 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. Status reports are due on 10/16/14 from the parties addressing if the parties agree with the courts suggestion regarding the effect of <i>Bostic</i>, if discovery is needed prior to the case moving to summary judgment, what issues remain regarding adoption, and parties suggestions regarding additional briefing. Defendants filed their status report on 10/7/14 stating that the 4th Circuit's decision is binding, no discovery or further briefing is needed, and the adoption claims should be dismissed with prejudice as moot.</p>
North Carolina	4 th	<i>General Synod of the United Church of Christ 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

					<p>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 stayed the proceedings pending the Supreme Court's disposition of <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 are now marrying in the state, and it appears that the defendants may not appeal.</p>
North Carolina	4 th	<i>McCrory & Clark v North Carolina*</i>	B	Pro se	<p>Filed 3/10/14. Seeks recognition of plaintiffs' out-of-state marriage, but seeks to broadly challenge both the NC amendment and NC statute that ban marriage between same-sex couples. Defendants' answer was due 6/10/14, but on 5/19/14 the case was ordered stayed pending the 4th Circuit's decision in <i>Bostic v. Schaefer</i>. On 8/15/14, plaintiffs filed a motion to lift the stay and to grant summary judgment in their favor in light of the decision in <i>Bostic</i>. On 8/25/14, the court denied that motion and stayed the case pending the Supreme Court's disposition of <i>Bostic</i>.</p>
North Dakota	8 th	<i>Jorgensen v. Montplaisir*</i>	R	Lambda Legal; John P. Borger; Faegre Baker Daniels LLP	<p>Filed 6/9/14. Seeks 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.</p>
North Dakota	8 th	<i>Ramsay v. Dalrymple*</i>	B	NCLR; Joshua A. Newville; Thomas D. Fiebiger	<p>Filed 6/6/14. Seven plaintiff couples seek the right to marry and recognition of 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' responses to the</p>

					motion for summary judgment was filed on 8/22/14. Plaintiffs filed their reply on 9/5/14.
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. Answer to complaint by Cissel filed on 5/19/14. Answer to complaint by Himes filed on 5/21/14. On 6/19/14, plaintiffs filed a motion for declaratory judgment and permanent injunctive relief. Defendants' response is due 8/14/14 and plaintiffs' reply is due 8/28/14. Oral argument date is not yet set. On 8/4/14, the court issued an order stating that the case is stayed; plaintiff has 2 weeks following the decision by the Court of Appeals in the <i>DeBoer</i> and <i>Love</i> appeals to supplement their motion.
Pennsyl-vania	3 rd	<i>Palladino v. Corbett*</i>	R	Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP; Jerner & Palmer, PC	Filed 9/26/13. (Lawsuit supported by Equality Forum.) Attorney General filed motion to dismiss 12/9/13. Plaintiffs filed opposition and motion for summary judgment 1/13/14. State filed motion for summary judgment 2/19/14. Plaintiffs replied 3/13/14. State Treasurer filed amicus brief in support of plaintiffs 4/15/14. Argument heard 5/15/14. On 5/28/14, the court ordered the plaintiffs to show cause why the case should not be dismissed in light of <i>Whitewood</i> . A hearing on that order was held on 6/17/14. On 9/8/14, the case was stayed pending expiration of the deadline to petition the U.S. Supreme Court.
Puerto Rico	1 st	<i>Conde-Vidal v. Rius-Armendariz*</i>	B	Lambda Legal; Ada Mercedes Conde-Vidal; Law Offices of Celina Romany; Debevoise & Plimpton LLP	Filed 3/25/14 on behalf of same-sex couple married out of state. Amended complaint filed 6/25/14, adding additional plaintiffs and defendants. Defendants filed a motion to dismiss on 8/27/14. Capellanes Internacionales Cristianos Leon de Juda, Inc. filed a motion to intervene on 8/28/14. On 9/15/14, plaintiffs filed their opposition to the motion to dismiss and a motion for summary. Opposition to summary judgment due by 10/2/14, and opposition/response to file document reply to opposition to motion to dismiss due by 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' response is due 10/17/14.
South Carolina	4 th	<i>Bradacs v. Haley*</i>	R	Warner, Payne & Black, LLP; Bluestein, Nichols, Thompson & Delgado, LLC; Family Law	Filed 8/28/13. State answered 11/14/13. Amended complaint filed 1/23/14. Cross-motions for summary judgment were due 4/14/14. On 4/3/14, defendants filed a motion to stay pending resolution of the 4th Circuit appeal in <i>Bostic v. Schaefer</i> , which was granted

				Consulting	<p>4/22/14. On that date, defendants also filed a motion to have the now-passed deadline for summary judgment motions held in abeyance until after <i>Bostic</i> is decided. On 4/23/14, the court issued an order staying all case deadlines.</p> <p>On 10/6/14, the Supreme Court denied the petitions for certiorari from the <i>Bostic</i> case, letting stand the 4th Circuit's decision finding the marriage bans unconstitutional. On 10/7/14 the court lifted the stay and ordered the parties to file amended briefing schedules by 10/15/14. Several probate judges issued orders after the Supreme Court's ruling 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.</p>
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 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. The motion to dismiss is set for argument on 10/17/14.
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. Motion for class certification filed 2/28/14. On 3/12/14, the state filed an opposed motion to stay pending the 5th Circuit's decision in <i>DeLeon v. Perry</i> . Motion to certify class dismissed and case 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 sex discrimination claim. Motion for preliminary injunction/TRO filed 11/14/13. State opposition was due 12/27/13. The case was then ordered consolidated with <i>Zahrn</i> . On 3/12/14, the state filed what it captioned an unopposed motion to stay pending the 5th Circuit's decision in <i>DeLeon v. Perry</i> but, on 3/22/14, plaintiffs filed an opposition to the stay. Case ordered stayed on 9/10/14.
Texas	5 th	<i>Nuckols v. Perry*</i>	M	In Pro Per	Filed 1/9/14. Motion to dismiss filed 2/13/14, but held moot due to motion for leave to file amended complaint, which was granted 4/9/14. On that date, the court also granted a joint motion to stay pending the 5th Circuit's decision in <i>DeLeon v. Perry</i> . Plaintiff

					filed an amended complaint 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.
Texas	5 th	<i>Freeman v. Parker*</i>	R	Lambda Legal	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> .
Virginia	4 th	<i>Harris v. Rainey*</i> (was v. <i>McDonnell</i>)	B	Lambda Legal; ACLU; Jenner & Block LLP	Filed 8/1/13. Motions to dismiss clerk denied, and Governor dismissed as defendant 12/23/13. Motion for class certification granted 1/31/14. Summary judgment motion filed 9/30/13, fully briefed. Clerk answered 1/23/14, taking no position on constitutionality of state marriage law. Attorney General filed amended answer and notice of switch in position 1/27/14. Case stayed 3/31/14 pending ruling in <i>Bostic v. Schaefer</i> , above. 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 the marriage bans unconstitutional.
West Virginia	4 th	<i>McGee v. Cole*</i>	M	Lambda Legal; Jenner & Block LLP; The Tinney Law Firm PLLC	Filed 10/1/13. Clerk filed motion to dismiss on abstention grounds 11/26/13. State intervention granted 12/2/13. Plaintiffs moved for summary judgment 12/23/13. Court issued order 1/29/14 denying motion to dismiss marriage claims, but dismissing recognition claims with leave to amend, and asking for briefing on effect of decision on non-named clerks, which was submitted 2/12/14. State defendants filed motion to dismiss; opposition filed 3/3/14. Defendants' opposition to plaintiffs' summary judgment motion filed 3/14/14. On 6/10/14, the case was stayed pending a decision in <i>Bostic v. Schaefer</i> . On 7/29/14, defendants filed a motion to continue the stay. On 7/30/14, plaintiffs filed a response in opposition to that motion and a cross-motion to lift the stay and enter judgment. On 7/30/14 defendants filed a response opposing lifting the stay and entry of judgment. 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 the marriage bans unconstitutional. On 10/6/14, plaintiffs filed a motion to lift the stay and enter judgment. On 10/7/14, the court ordered defendants to respond to plaintiffs' motion by 10/21/14; plaintiffs' reply is due 7 days after the response. On 10/9/14, the West Virginia AG announced that defendants would no longer be defending the state's marriage bans, and same-sex couples began marrying in the state.
Wisconsin	7th	<i>Bloechl-Karlsen, v. Walker</i>	I-S R	ACLU; Mayer Brown LLP	<p>Filed on 9/17/14. The case seeks recognition of the marriages entered into in Wisconsin by same-sex couples between June 6 and June 13, 2014, during the one-week period after the court declared the marriage ban unconstitutional, but before the court stayed the judgment pending appeal of <i>Wolf v. Walker</i>.</p> <p>On 10/6/14, the Supreme Court denied the petitions for certiorari from the <i>Bogan v. Baskin, Dept. of Revenue v. Fujii, Pence v. Lee, and Walker v. Wolf</i> cases, letting stand the 7th Circuit's decision finding the marriage bans unconstitutional. On 10/13/14, the State announced that it would be recognizing the marriages entered between June 6 and June 13, 2014, likely making this appeal moot.</p>
Wyoming	10th	<i>. Guzzo v. Meade*</i>	M	NCLR; Tracy Zubrod; Arnold & Porter LLP, Rathod Mohamedbahi LLC	.Plaintiffs filed suit seeking the freedom to marry on behalf of four same-sex couples and Wyoming Equality on 10/7/14. Plaintiffs filed 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 response on 10/13/14. Hearing scheduled for 10/16/14.

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

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. State filed answer to 3rd amended complaint. Cross-motions for summary judgment were filed 2/26/14, responded to 3/19/14, and replied to 4/2/14. Hearing was held 4/17/14. Court issued ruling 5/9/14, holding AR constitutional amendment and statutory bans on same-sex couples marrying or having their out-of-state marriages recognized violated federal guarantees of equal protection and due process. The State has appealed and requested a stay from the trial court pending appeal, which was denied. On 5/16/14 the Arkansas Supreme Court ordered a stay of the trial court decision. Appellant's briefs were filed on 9/15/14. The appellees' brief is due 10/15/14. State Defendant-Appellant filed a motion for a stay on 8/6/14. On 8/15/14, Appellees filed a response to the motion for a stay.
Colorado	Supreme	<i>Brinkman v. Long</i> *	M (includes federal claims)	Wilcox & Ogden, P.C.; Thomas Russell	Filed 10/30/13. Briefing on motion for summary judgment completed. Hearing set for 6/12/14 was vacated. Hearing regarding consolidation with the <i>McDaniel-Miccio</i> case and on motion for summary judgment was held 6/16/14, and consolidation was granted. The court granted summary judgment on 7/9/14, ruling that denial of the freedom to marry to same-sex couples violates the due process and equal protection clauses of the U.S. Constitution, but stayed his ruling pending appeal. The State of Colorado filed an emergency motion for an injunction with the Colorado Supreme Court on 7/14/14, which the Colorado Supreme Court granted on 7/18/14, ordering the clerks of Denver and Adams Counties to refrain from issuing further marriage licenses to same-sex couples pending resolution of the appeal. On 10/7/14, in response to a motion by the State, the Colorado Supreme Court lifted its stay of the injunction, thereby permitting same-sex couples to marry throughout the state.
Colorado	Appeal	<i>McDaniel-Miccio v. Colorado</i> *	B (includes federal claims)	Reilly Pozner LLP; Law of the Rockies; Guterman Griffiths PC	Filed 2/19/14. Defendants answered 4/2/14. Motions for summary judgment were filed by plaintiffs and the state of Colorado on 5/2/14. The case was transferred to a multi-district litigation panel in Adams County. It was then ordered consolidated with <i>Brinkman v. Long</i> case and a hearing on the motions for summary judgment was held 6/16/14. (See entries above for <i>Brinkman</i> , which now apply to this case as well.)
Colorado	Appeal	<i>People of the State of Colorado ex. Rel. Suthers v. Hall</i> *	M	Colorado Attorney General John Suthers filed this case.	State AG filed suit 7/3/14 against the Boulder County Clerk, seeking to stop her from continuing to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples. A motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction was heard 7/9/14. On 7/10/14, the court denied the motion, but ordered the clerk to identify all marriages of same-sex couples and convey that

					information as part of its monthly reporting to the state, and to provide reasonable notice to same-sex couples who have married or marry in the future that the validity of their marriage is dependent upon whether a court would find that the clerk had authority to issue them marriage licenses. On 7/21/14, the State filed its notice of appeal with the Court of Appeals. On 7/29/2014, the Colorado Supreme Court ordered the clerk not to issue any further marriage licenses to same-sex couples pending the appeal. On 10/7/14, in response to a motion by the State, the Colorado Supreme Court lifted its stay of the injunction, thereby permitting same-sex couples to marry throughout the state
Florida	Appeal	<i>Pareto v. Ruvin*</i>	M (includes federal claims)	NCLR; Carlton Fields Jorden Burt, P.A.; Elizabeth F. Schwartz, P.A.; Mary Meeks, P.A.	Filed 1/21/14. Motion for summary judgment and memo in support filed 5/1/14. Liberty Counsel filed 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. 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 4th, 7th, and 10th Circuit appeals. Defendant's initial brief is due 11/17/14.
Florida	Appeal	<i>Huntsman v. Heavlin*</i>	M (includes federal claims)	Restivio, Reilly & Vigil-Farinis	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. Motion for summary judgment filed 5/20/14; argued 7/7/14. On 7/17/14, the court granted plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment on 7/17/14 and ordered the Key West Clerk to allow same-sex couples to marry beginning 7/22/14. Defendants have appealed, which 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. Ruvin</i> , above, have 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> for status since 8/28/14.
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>In re Marriage of Brassner and Lade</i>	D	Bodzki Jacobs & Associates, PI; the Carlyle Law Firm	Divorce case filed by same-sex couple. Broward County judge originally ruled state marriage ban unconstitutional on 8/4/14, but on 9/9/14, the judge vacated that order because proper notice was not given to the state AG of the challenge to a state law. Florida AG filed a motion to intervene 9/12/14, arguing that Florida's marriage ban is constitutional.
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 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. Appellant's brief was filed 9/22/14 in the second district court of appeals. Appellee's initial brief is due 11/10/14.
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) is challenging Florida 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 that the ruling is "strictly limited to the facts before it."
Florida	Appeal	<i>Dousset v. Florida Atlantic</i>	R (includes federal)	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

		<i>University*</i>	claims)		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 AG filed 5/14/14; Florida Atlantic University must respond by 8/20/14. Oral argument requested, but not scheduled yet. 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.
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 AG 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.
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 2/3/14. Kansas filed motion and memo in support of 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 set for 11/14/14.
Kentucky	Trial	<i>Kentucky Equality Federation v. Beshear*</i>	R (includes federal claims)	Harbinger & Associates	Filed 9/10/13. Motion to hold in abeyance denied 2/21/14. Consolidated with <i>Hardee v. Beshear</i> on 4/10/14. Plaintiffs and Defendants filed cross-motions for summary judgment on 7/2/14. Opposition briefs were filed 8/1/14. Argument was held 8/18/14.
Kentucky	Trial	<i>Hardee v. Beshear*</i>	M (includes federal claims)	O'Hara, Ruberg, Taylor, Sloan & Sergent	Filed 3/20/14. Consolidated with <i>Kentucky Equality Federation v. Beshear</i> on 4/10/14. Same briefing schedule applies (that is, Plaintiffs and Defendants filed cross-motions for summary judgment on 7/2/14. Opposition briefs were filed 8/1/14. Argument was held 8/18/14.
Kentucky	Trial	<i>Romero v. Romero*</i>	D	Louis I. Waterman, PLLC	Filed 10/25/13 on behalf of lesbian couple married in MA. Response filed 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 same-sex dissolution of marriage. 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 she plans to appeal if 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, trial court dismissed petition for intra-family adoption by couple married in California. Opening brief filed with intermediate appellate court 9/25/13. Hearing held 4/30/14. Decision rendered on 6/4/14, remanding the case to the trial court to allow the filing of an amended petition. The adoption case decision was rendered 6/11/14, the judgment of

					adoption was vacated and the case was remanded. 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.
Mississippi	Appeal	<i>Czekala-Chatham v. Melancon*</i>	D (includes federal claims)	Holland Law, P.C.	Divorce petition filed 9/11/13. Judge denied divorce on 12/2/13. Appeal filed 12/23/13. State of Mississippi has filed notice of appearance in the appeal. On 5/23/14 Appellant's Brief was filed on behalf of Lauren Beth Czekala-Chatham. Appellee's response was filed on 8/25/14. Appellant's reply was filed on 9/29/14. 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 supreme court.
Missouri	Trial	<i>Messer v. Nixon*</i>	R	Whitehood Law Firm, L.L.C. (challenging recognition of marriages of same-sex couples)	Challenge to governor's Executive Order permitting same-sex couples married in other states can file state taxes jointly, filed 1/9/14. Amended motion/petition filed 2/7/14. Motion for temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction filed 3/26/14. Hearing held 4/3/14, and TRO denied 4/4/14. Hearing on PROMO's motion to intervene held 6/4/14 and order filed 6/9/14 denying intervention, but leaving open alternative motion or amicus possibility. Further hearing was conducted on 8/20/14.
Missouri	Trial	<i>Barrier v. Vasterling*</i>	R (includes federal claims)	ACLU	Filed 2/12/14. Petitioner filed motion for summary judgment, argument of which is scheduled for 9/25/14. On 4/25/14, defendant filed a motion to change venue (transfer the case). On 5/9/14 petitioner 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 response to Defendants' statements of additional facts and Plaintiffs filed their reply suggestions in support of motions for summary judgment against Defendants. On 8/5/14 defendants filed their response to plaintiffs' statement of uncontested facts, a motion for judgment on the pleadings, and suggestions in opposition to summary judgment and in support of judgment on the pleadings. On 8/7/14 Plaintiffs replied to state defendants, requested an oral argument on state defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings, and filed a motion to advance hearing on motions for summary judgment to be consolidated with oral argument on state defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings. . On

					8/18/14 Defendants filed their opposition to the motion to advance hearing and the same day the court denied plaintiffs' motion. The court denied the motion to advance on 8/18/14. 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 prohibition against recognizing marriages performed out of state is a violation of the 14 th amendment to the US Constitution. The state has announced that it will comply with this ruling and recognize marriages same-sex couples have entered outside the state.
Missouri	Trial	<i>State of Missouri v. Jennifer Florida*</i> (formerly <i>State of Missouri v. Carpenter</i>)	M	MO AG Chris Koster filed this 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 AG's motion for a temporary restraining order. Defendants filed answer, affirmative defenses, and counterclaim of defendant. On 8/5/14, defendants filed their motion and suggestions in support of judgment on the pleadings and their answer, defenses and affirmative defenses. A status hearing was held 8/11/14. On 9/9/14, Carpenter filed her 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.
Missouri	Supreme	<i>In re Marriage of M.S. and D.S.*</i>	D (includes federal claims)	Private	Divorce action filed by couple married in Iowa. Dismissed in trial court. Direct appeal to Missouri Supreme Court filed on 3/13/14. ACLU of Missouri has filed amicus brief, joined by Lambda Legal and others.
Nebraska	Trial	<i>Nichols v. Nichols*</i>	D (includes federal claims)	Domina Law Group	Lesbian couple who married in Iowa in 2009 sought divorce in Nebraska. Trial court dismissed their action based on state constitutional amendment. They appealed. ACLU of Nebraska filed amicus brief 3/27/14. Argument held 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 case has returned to the trial court.
Pennsylvania	Appeal	<i>Pennsylvania Health Dept. v. Hanes*</i>	M	Counsel for Clerk Hanes is Montgomery County Solicitor's Office; Rudolf, Clarke & Kirk, LLC; Lowey Dannenberg Cohen & Hart,	Trial court ruled 9/12/13 that county clerk did not have authority to issue marriage licenses before ruling on state marriage ban. Appeal filed 10/1/13. Now fully briefed. On 5/27/14, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court granted an unopposed motion by the clerk to allow him to resume marrying same-sex couples in light of the federal <i>Whitewood v. Wolf</i> decision.

				P.C.	
Pennsylvania	Trial	<i>Cucinotta v. Pennsylvania</i> *	M (includes federal claims)	Lyman & Ash	Filed 9/6/13. Preliminary objections (the equivalent of a motion to dismiss) have been fully briefed and await scheduling of a hearing. Oral argument before the Court sitting en banc scheduled for 6/18/14 was canceled. On 5/23/14, defendants filed an application to dismiss for mootness as a result of the federal <i>Whitewood v. Wolf</i> decision. Plaintiffs filed their answer to the application on 6/9/14. On 6/20/14, plaintiffs filed their answer to defendants' application to dismiss for mootness. On 6/20/14 an order was filed, denying the application to dismiss.
Pennsylvania	Trial	<i>In re Estate of Burgi-Rios</i> *	R (includes federal claims)	Jenner & Palmer, P.C.; Leonore F. Carpenter; Alexander & Pelli, LLC	Estate tax case, filed 9/25/13. Oral argument held 4/29/14.
South Carolina	Trial	<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. Case was appealed. The initial 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 Iowa in 2010 sought 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. Argued 6/27/14. The judge stated he would rule soon. 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.
Texas	Supreme	<i>J.B. v. Dallas County</i>	D (includes federal claims)	James J. Scheske; Jason Stead	Argued 11/5/13. Awaiting decision.
Texas	Supreme	<i>Texas v. Naylor</i>	D (includes federal claims)	Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP; Law Offices of Robert B. Luther, P.C.	Argued 11/5/13. Awaiting decision.
Texas	Trial	<i>Pidgeon v. Parker</i> *	R	Woodfell Law Firm, P.C.; Texas Values; The Olson	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

				Firm, PLLC (all representing taxpayers challenging recognition of out-of-state marriages)	remanded the case back to state court and held that the motions of the federal Freeman plaintiffs (represented by Lambda Legal) to intervene and to consolidate the Freeman case with <i>Pidgeon</i> were therefore moot.
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 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 ban 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. On 5/28/14 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 is pending in the 4 th 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. The 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.
Wyoming	Trial	<i>Courage v. Wyoming*</i>	B (includes federal claims)	NCLR; Arnold & Porter LLP; Zabrod Law Office, PC; Rathod Mohamedbhai LLC	Filed 3/5/14. Plaintiffs filed motion for summary judgment 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.