

THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST
OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

v.

JANE DOE

*

*

Misc. No. 1

*

September Term, 2024

*

*

THE KEY SCHOOL INC., ET AL.

v.

VALERIE BUNKER

*

Misc. No. 2

*

September Term, 2024

*

*

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF
HARFORD COUNTY

v.

JOHN DOE

*

No. 10

*

September Term, 2024

*

ORDER

Upon consideration of the “Joint Motion to Consolidate Briefing, Consolidate Argument, and Modify Briefing Schedule” filed by the parties in the above-captioned cases on June 20, 2024, in which the parties request consolidated briefing and argument addressing the common issue in the above-captioned cases, separate briefing and argument as to the standing question in No. 10, September Term, 2024, as well as a modification of the briefing schedule and the word count for the briefs, it is this 22nd day of June 2024,

ORDERED, by the Supreme Court of Maryland, that the Joint Motion to Consolidate Briefing, Consolidate Argument, and Modify Briefing Schedule is GRANTED; and it is further

ORDERED, that the briefing in the above-captioned cases is consolidated as to the constitutionality question¹ common to all three cases, and therefore, the parties shall file one set of consolidated briefs addressing the question, and the parties in *Board of Education of Harford County v. John Doe*, No. 10, September Term, 2024, shall file separate briefs as to the standing question² in that case; and it is further

ORDERED, that the word-count limit of Maryland Rule 8-503(d) for the Appellants' consolidated opening brief and the Appellees' consolidated response brief is extended from 13,000 words to 18,000 words, and the word-count limit for the Appellants' consolidated reply brief, if any is filed, is extended from 6,500 words to 9,000 words; and it is further

ORDERED, that the word-count limit for briefing of the standing question in No. 10, Sept. Term, 2024, is 6,500 words for the parties' principal briefs and 3,900 words for Appellants' reply brief, if any is filed; and it is further

¹ The constitutionality question is: Does the Maryland Child Victims Act of 2023, 2023 Md. Laws ch. 5 (S.B. 686), (codified at Md. Code Ann., Cts. & Jud. Proc. § 5-117), constitute an impermissible abrogation of a vested right in violation of Article 24 of the Maryland Declaration of Rights and/or Article III, Section 40 of the Maryland Constitution?

² The standing question is: As a subdivision of the State, see *Bd. of Educ. v. Sec'y of Personnel*, 317 Md. 34, 44-45 (1989), does the petitioner have standing to challenge the constitutionality of the Maryland Child Victims Act of 2023, 2023 Md. Laws ch. 5 (S.B. 686), (codified at Md. Code Ann., Cts. & Jud. Proc. § 5-117)?

ORDERED, that there will be two sets of oral arguments:

1. As to the constitutionality question, each side will have 40 minutes for argument and the Appellants may reserve time from their allotted 40 minutes for rebuttal;
2. As to the standing question, each side will have 20 minutes for argument and the Appellants may reserve time from their allotted 20 minutes for rebuttal; and it is further

ORDERED, that, in accordance with Maryland Rule 8-522(c), not more than two attorneys may argue for each side, and the parties shall file a final notice of arguing counsel with the Clerk no later than August 26, 2024; and it is further

ORDERED, that the Appellants' briefs as to both questions shall be filed on or before July 8, 2024, Appellees' Briefs as to both questions shall be filed on or before August 7, 2024, and Appellants' Reply Briefs, if any, shall be filed on or before August 26, 2024. The parties shall file with the Appellants' briefs a consolidated joint record extract covering both questions.



/s/ Shirley M. Watts
Senior Justice

* Justice Gould did not participate in this matter.