



Court Rule 382, which governs the institution of and procedure for such actions. And finally, there is ample precedent for the principle that, while *laches* may bar the granting of redistricting relief in relation to an imminent election, it does not bar the granting of relief in relation to *subsequent* elections, which is what plaintiffs here are seeking. See, e.g., *Martin v. Soucie*, 109 Ill. App. 3d 731, 732-34 (1982); *Wilson v. Kasich*, 963 N.E.2d 1282 (Ohio 2012).

In light of these considerations, I would grant plaintiffs' request for leave to file their original action, give them their day in court, and then decide this important matter of public policy on the merits rather than on the equitable and purely discretionary doctrine of *laches*.

JUSTICES GARMAN and KARMEIER join in this dissent.