

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND  
Southern Division**

<p><b>ROBYN KRAVITZ, <i>et al.</i>,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>Plaintiffs,</b></p> <p><b>v.</b></p> <p><b>UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, <i>et al.</i>,</b></p> <p><b>Defendants.</b></p>	<p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p>	<p><b>Case No.: GJH-18-1041</b></p>
<p>*   *   *   *   *   *   *   *   *   *   *   *   *</p>		

<p><b>LA UNIÓN DEL PUEBLO ENTERO, <i>et al.</i>,</b></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><b>Plaintiffs,</b></p> <p><b>v.</b></p> <p><b>WILBUR ROSS, <i>et al.</i>,</b></p> <p><b>Defendants.</b></p>	<p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p> <p>*</p>	<p><b>Case No.: GJH-18-1570</b></p>
<p>*   *   *   *   *   *   *   *   *   *   *   *   *</p>		

**ORDER**

For the reasons to be stated in a forthcoming Memorandum Opinion, it is ordered by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland that Plaintiffs’ Request for Indicative Ruling Under Rule 62.1(a), ECF No. 162, is **GRANTED**. The Court concludes that Plaintiffs’ Rule 60(b)(2) Motion raises a substantial issue.

