

United States Court of Appeals

Eleventh Circuit
56 Forsyth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

For rules and forms visit
www.ca11.uscourts.gov

Thomas K. Kahn
Clerk

RECEIVED IN CLERK'S OFFICE
U.S.D.C. - Atlanta

FEB 28 2008

JAMES N. HASTEN, Clerk
Deputy Clerk

February 27, 2008

James N. Hasten
Clerk, U.S. District Court
75 SPRING ST SW STE 2211
ATLANTA GA 30303-3318

Appeal Number: 07-15688-C
Case Style: In Re: Association of Community Organizations
District Court Number: 06-01891 CV-JTC-1

The enclosed order has been entered. No further action will be taken in this matter.

Sincerely,

THOMAS K. KAHN, Clerk

Reply To: CaCelia Williams (404) 335-6190

Encl.

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

07-15688-C

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

FEB 27 2008

THOMAS X. [unclear]
CLERK

IN RE:

ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS FOR REFORMING THE
PROJECT VOTE/VOTING FOR AMERICA, INC.,
GEORGIA COALITION FOR THE PEOPLE'S AGENDA, INC.,
GEORGIA STATE CONFERENCE OF NAACP BRANCHES,
DANA WILLIAMS,

FILED IN CLERK'S OFFICE
U.S.D.C. Atlanta

FEB 28 2008

JAMES N. HATTEN, CLERK

By: [Signature] Clerk

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to
the United States District Court for the
Northern District of Georgia

BEFORE: TJOFLAT, BIRCH, and DUBINA, Circuit Judges.

BY THE COURT:

Petitioners' motion for leave to file a reply in support of the petition is
GRANTED.

To the extent that the response constitutes a motion to dismiss the petition for
lack of subject matter jurisdiction, the motion is DENIED.

"When a party objects to a motion for discovery, a court should rule on the
objections and ordinarily give at least some statement of its reasons. While a court

has discretion to grant or deny the motion, it should not grant the motion in the face of well-developed, bona fide objections without a meaningful explanation of its decision.” In re Ford Motor Co., *supra*, 345 F.3d 1315, 1317 (11th Cir. 2003) (citation and internal punctuation omitted). We cannot discern from the district court’s October 26, 2007, order the extent to which the court considered and rejected Petitioners’ assertions of associational privilege protected by the First Amendment. We therefore GRANT THE PETITION IN PART, to the extent that the district court is directed to enter an order of clarification explaining its ruling on Respondents’ motion to compel, with such order to address Petitioners’ claims of associational privilege. The petition is otherwise DENIED, WITHOUT PREJUDICE to Petitioners’ right to file a renewed mandamus petition upon entry of the district court’s order of clarification.

PETITION GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART.