

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
VALDOSTA DIVISION

FRANCES HOOD and
MATTHEW A. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MAYOR RONELLE SEARCY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CASE NO:
7:25-cv-184-WLS

ORDER

Pending before the Court is Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) (Doc. 26) (“Motion to Dismiss”). On February 18, 2026, Plaintiffs filed their First Amended Complaint (Doc. 30).¹ Upon the filing of the First Amended Complaint, pending motions to dismiss with respect to the original complaint became moot.

Accordingly, the Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 26) is **DENIED, AS MOOT, WITHOUT PREJUDICE.**

SO ORDERED, this 20th day of February 2026.

/s/W. Louis Sands

**W. LOUIS SANDS, SR. JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

¹ A party may amend its pleadings once as a matter of course “if the pleading is one to which a responsive pleading is required, 21 days after service of a responsive pleading or 21 days after service of a motion under Rule 12(b), (e), or (f), whichever is earlier.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)(B). The Court extended the time for Plaintiffs to respond to the Motion to Dismiss until February 18, 2026. (*See* Doc. 29).