



AlaFile E-Notice

03-CV-2022-900892.00

Judge: JIMMY B POOL

To: DEGNAN ELLEN LEE
ellen.degnan@splcenter.org

NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY, ALABAMA

TIARA YOUNG HUDSON V. KAY IVEY ET AL
03-CV-2022-900892.00

The following matter was FILED on 8/12/2022 10:10:35 PM

Notice Date: 8/12/2022 10:10:35 PM

GINA J. ISHMAN
CIRCUIT COURT CLERK
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, ALABAMA
251 S. LAWRENCE STREET
MONTGOMERY, AL, 36104

334-832-1260

HUDSON TIARA YOUNG,
Plaintiff,

V.

KAY IVEY,
PATRICK TUTEN,
TOM PARKER,
Defendants.

)
)
)
) Case No.: CV-2022-900892.00
)
)
)
)

Before the Court is Defendants' Motion to Dismiss. Doc. 34. Upon consideration of the briefing and the arguments of counsel at the hearing held on August 8, 2022, and the briefing submitted by the parties thereafter, the Court finds that Plaintiff's Complaint is due to be dismissed.

First, the Complaint is due to be dismissed because a *quo warranto* action is the “exclusive remedy to determine whether a party is usurping a public office.” *Riley v. Hughes*, 17 So. 3d 643, 646 (Ala. 2009); see Ala. Code § 6-6-591, *et seq.* In this action,

elements of traceability and redressability because Defendants cannot afford her the relief she seeks. See *Stamps v. Jefferson Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, 642 So. 2d 941, 944 (Ala. 1994).

Third, in the alternative, the Complaint is due to be dismissed because the Court finds that the Complaint fails to state a claim on which relief could be granted. The Legislature lawfully established the Judicial Resources Allocation Commission and the Commission lawfully reallocated a circuit judgeship from Jefferson County to Madison County. The Act creating the Commission carries significant standards that limit the Commission's discretion and foreclose Plaintiff's argument that the Legislature unlawfully delegated its authority. *Monroe v. Harco, Inc.*, 762 So. 2d 828, 831 (Ala. 2000); *Bailey v. Shelby Cnty.*, 507 So. 2d 438, 442 (Ala. 1987). To the extent matters outside the pleadings have been presented to the Court, those matters are excluded. The Court has considered only matters in the pleadings in deciding that the Complaint is due to be dismissed.

Upon consideration of the briefing and the arguments of counsel at the hearing and the briefing submitted thereafter, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 34) is GRANTED. The Complaint is DISMISSED; and

2. All other pending motions are DENIED as moot.

This is a final judgment.

DONE this 12th day of August, 2022.

/s/ JIMMY B POOL
CIRCUIT JUDGE