

EXHIBIT A

VIRGINIA:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF ALBEMARLE COUNTY


IN RE:)
Santolla v. Katz, No. CL26001139 (Washington Cnty.))
Crump v. Katz, No. CL26000201 (Lancaster Cnty.))
Curtis v. Katz, No. CL26002454 (Spotsylvania Cnty.))
Black v. Hook, No. CL26000241 (Fauquier Cnty.))


ORDER DENYING APPLICATION TO TRANSFER
PURSUANT TO VA. CODE § 8.01-267.4

THIS MATTER came before this three-judge panel, appointed by the Supreme Court of Virginia on June 12, 2026, on the Application to Transfer Pursuant to Va. Code § 8.01-267.4 filed by the Commonwealth of Virginia, Superintendent of the Virginia State Police Jeffrey S. Katz, and Commonwealth's Attorneys Ross P. Spicer, Erin Barr, Matthew Hamel, and Krysten Reid (the "Application"). The Court having considered the pleadings filed and the arguments of counsel made at the July 6, 2026, hearing; it is hereby

ORDERED that the Application is DENIED for the reasons stated in open court and on the record at the July 6, 2026, hearing.

attached hereto.
SO ORDERED, this 6th day of July, 2026. *The Panel's findings of fact are not judge*


Hon. Cheryl W. Higgins
Chief Judge
Sixteenth Judicial Circuit



Hon. J. William Watson, Jr.
Judge
Tenth Judicial Circuit



Hon. Helivi L. Holland
Judge
Fifth Judicial Circuit

SEEN AND

Agreed



Jonathan P. Lienhard, VA Bar #41648
Daniel Bruce, VA Bar #98120
HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN
TORCHINSKY & JOSEFIK PLLC
15405 John Marshall Highway
Haymarket, VA 20169
(540) 341-8808
jlienhard@holtzmanvogel.com
dbruce@holtzmanvogel.com

Erin E. Murphy, VA Bar #73254
Matthew D. Rowen, VA Bar #100113
Kevin Wynosky, VA Bar #100624
CLEMENT & MURPHY, PLLC
706 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(202) 742-8900
erin.murphy@clementmurphy.com
matthew.rowen@clementmurphy.com
kevin.wynosky@clementmurphy.com

Counsel for the Black v. Hook Plaintiffs

SEEN AND

Agreed



Kenneth T. Cuccinelli, II, Attorney at Law, PLLC
10007 N. Harris Farm Road
Spotsylvania, Virginia 22553
Ph: 804-286-2550
E: KTCLaw@proton.me

Counsel for the Curtis v. Katz Plaintiffs

SEEN AND

Agreed


David G. Browne (VSB No. 65306)
Spiro & Browne, PLC
2400 Old Brick Road
Glen Allen, VA 23060
Telephone: 804-573-9220
Email: dbrowne@sblawva.com

SEEN + AGREED


G. RYAN MCHAFFEY
SPOTSYLVANIA CO. ATT'Y


Robert J. Olson (VSB No. 82488)
William J. Olson (VSB No. 15841)
William J. Olson, P.C.
370 Maple Avenue West, Suite 4
Vienna, VA 22180
Telephone: 703-356-5070
114 Creekside Lane
Winchester, VA 22602
Telephone: 540-450-8777
Email: wjo@mindspring.com

Oliver M. Krawczyk (VSB No. 99918)
Gilbert Ambler (VSB No. 94325)
Ambler Law Offices, LLC
210 South Braddock Street
Winchester, VA 22601
Telephone: 540-550-4236
Email: oliver@amblerlawoffices.com
Email: gilbert@amblerlawoffices.com

Counsel for the Crump v. Katz Plaintiffs

SEEN AND

Agreed


William M. Stanley (VSB # 37209)
Anthony F. Troy (VSB # 05985)
STANLEY LAW GROUP PLLC
13508 Booker T. Washington Hwy.
Moneta, VA 24121
bstanley@vastanleylawgroup.com
ttroy@vastanleylawgroup.com
Phone: (540) 721-6028

John Parker Sweeney*
BRADLEY ARANT BOULT CUMMINGS LLP
1900 K Street, NW, Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202) 303-7150
jsweeney@bradley.com

James W. Porter III*
W. Chadwick Lamar, Jr.*
BRADLEY ARANT BOULT CUMMINGS LLP
1819 Fifth Avenue N.
Birmingham, AL 35203
Telephone: (205) 521-8000
jporter@bradley.com
clamar@bradley.com

**Pro Hac Vice*

Counsel for the Santolla v. Katz Plaintiffs

SEEN AND *Objected to* for the reasons stated in Defendants' Application for
Order to Transfer Brief in Support of same, and on the record in oral argument
Jacqueline C. Hedblom including but not limited to the Panel's finding that
Gretchen Nygaard (VSB No. 82475) the common questions of law and fact do not
Calvin C. Brown (VSB No. 93192) predominate, that the Commonwealth's employees will
Office of the Attorney General not be inconvenienced and that the inconvenience to parties,
202 North Ninth Street witnesses and counsel does not support transfer; that the
Richmond, Virginia 23219 remaining factors do not support transfer, including
(804) 317-0977 the disadvantages of duplicative and inconsistent rulings,
gnygaard@oag.state.va.us orders or judgments.
cbrown@oag.state.va.us
jhedblom@oag.state.va.us - VSB No. 68234
Counsel for the Commonwealth of Virginia, Superintendent Katz, and Commonwealth's
Attorneys Spicer, Barr, Hamel, Reid, and Hook

IN RE:

Santolla v. Katz, No. CL 26001139 (Washington County)

Crump v. Katz No. CL 26000201 (Lancaster County)

Curtis v. Katz No. CL26002454 (Spotsylvania County)

Black v. Hook No. CL26000241 (Fauquier County)

FINDINGS AND RULING OF THE PANEL

Factors to be considered by the court include, but are not limited to

- (i) the nature of the common questions of law or fact;

We find the common questions of law or fact do not predominate the actions.

There are different questions of law and there are multiple causes of action. We do not find Separate civil actions brought by six or more plaintiffs involve common questions of law or fact and arise out of the same transaction, occurrence or series of transactions or occurrences;

While there is some logical connection, there is not the same statutory framework, and the fundamental questions are not the same.

- (ii) the convenience of the parties, witnesses and counsel;

Some of the plaintiffs will incur significant inconvenience to travel to another forum during hours that people usually work and potentially then bear the expenses of travel and accommodations. The Commonwealth is not claiming inconvenience to its employees.

- (iv) the efficient utilization of judicial facilities and personnel;

- (iii) the calendar of the courts;

There was no evidence about problems with any specific judicial facilities and personnel or the calendar of the courts. What the panel is aware of is that court hearings have been proceeding in a timely manner.

- (iv) the likelihood and disadvantages of duplicative and inconsistent rulings, orders or judgments;

Separate cases have already presented arguments and declarations on the issue of whether a preliminary injunction should be granted in the various jurisdictions where

the cases are filed. Further the courts have ruled on those preliminary injunctions in three of the four cases.

It is too late to properly prevent inconsistent rulings.

The Commonwealth has not met the burden of showing the necessary factors to grant the application to transfer and it is denied.