

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

At a regular term of the Supreme Court of Appeals, continued and held at Charleston, Kanawha County, on November 8, 2011, the following order was made and entered:

State of West Virginia ex rel. County Commission of Monroe County, by and through its members: Michael Shane Ashley, Clyde Gum, Jr., and William Miller, Petitioners

vs.) No. 11-1516

Richard Thompson, Speaker of the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia; and Richard Thompson, Speaker of the House of Delegates of the State of West Virginia; Respondents

AND

State of West Virginia ex rel. Eldon A. Callen, Jim Boyce, Petra Wood, John Wood and Frank Deem, Petitioners

vs.) No. 11-1517

Natalie E. Tennant, Secretary of the State of West Virginia, Respondent

AND

State of West Virginia ex rel. Thornton Cooper, Petitioner

vs.) No. 11-1525

Natalie E. Tennant, Secretary of the State of West Virginia, Respondent

SCHEDULING ORDER

On November 4, 2011, came the petitioners, Monroe County Commission, et al., by Jeffrey A. Pritt, Pritt Law Firm, PLLC, their attorney, and presented to the Court their petition praying for a writ of prohibition to be directed against the respondents, Richard Thompson, Speaker of the House of Delegates, and Natalie E. Tennant, Secretary of State, as therein set forth in Supreme Court Docket No. 11-1516.

On the same day, came the petitioners, Eldon A. Callen, et al., by Roger D. Forman and Daniel T. Lattanzi, The Law Office of Roger D. Forman, L.C., their attorneys, and presented to the Court their petition praying for a writ of mandamus to be directed against the respondent, Natalie E. Tennant, Secretary of State, as therein set forth in Supreme Court Docket No. 11-1517.

Finally, on November 7, 2011, came the petitioner, Thornton Cooper, *pro se*, and presented to the Court his petition praying for a writ of mandamus to be directed against the respondent, Natalie E. Tennant, Secretary of State, as therein set forth in Supreme Court Docket No. 11-1525.

It is hereby ordered that the respondents file a response to the petitions, pursuant to Revised Rule 16(g), or a summary response, pursuant to Revised Rule 16(h), on or before Monday, November 14, 2011.

It is further ordered that although the above-captioned matters are not consolidated, consolidated responses are permitted to the extent practicable.

Once the deadline for filing the responses has passed, this matter will be mature for consideration by the Court pursuant to Revised Rule 16(i). In due course thereafter, all parties will be notified in writing of any decision in the case.

A True Copy

Attest: /s/ Rory L. Perry II, Clerk of Court

