

*Vote dilution:* the result of a voting standard or practice that abridges a minority population's right to fully participate in the election process and to elect representatives of their choice.

*Single-Member District:* District that elects only one representative.

*Gingles preconditions:*

- 1) that the minority is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district;
- 2) that it is politically cohesive; and
- 3) that, in the absence of special circumstances, bloc voting by the White majority usually defeats the minority's preferred candidate.

*Section 5:* Requires that changes in election procedures and practices (including changes in district lines) be precleared by the U.S. Department of Justice or by a three-judge federal district court in the District of Columbia prior to implementation.

*Preclearance:* A determination by a three-judge federal court in Washington D.C. or the U. S. Attorney General that the submitting jurisdiction has met its burden of demonstrating that a particular voting change (including a districting plan) does not violate Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, *i.e.*, does not have the purpose and will not have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.

*Retrogression:* A voting change that leaves minority voters "worse off" than they had been before the change with respect to their opportunity to exercise their right to vote.

*Submissions:* For states, such as Louisiana, covered by Section 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act, changes in voting practices or procedures cannot be implemented until Section 5 preclearance has been obtained. A state may submit the voting change to the U. S. Attorney General. Once the plan is submitted for preclearance, the Department of Justice has 60 days within which to review a "complete" submission. If the U.S. Attorney General interposes an objection to all or part of the redistricting plan, the legislature may (1) attempt to cure the objection by making changes to the districting plan; (2) request administrative reconsideration from the Attorney General; or (3) seek a declaratory judgment in the District Court of the District of Columbia that the districting plan does not violate Section 5.

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### **United States Constitution:**

Article I, Section 2 .....	6, 8
Fourteenth Amendment (Equal Protection Clause) .....	3, 6, 7, 18
Fifteenth Amendment .....	13, 18, 21

### **Voting Rights Act of 1965:**

Section 2 [42 U.S.C. § 1973] .....	3, 19, 20, 33
Section 5 [42 U.S.C. § 1973c & d] .....	14, 17

### **Federal Law**

2 U.S.C. 2c .....	1
Public Law 94-171 .....	4, 5, 7

### **Federal Regulations:**

28 C.F.R. Part 51, Appendix. (2008) .....	14
28 C.F.R. §§ 51.27 & 51.28 .....	15

### **Louisiana Constitution:**

LA const. art. III, § 1.....	29
LA const. art. III, § 3.....	1, 3
LA const. art. III, § 6.....	1, 2, 6

### **Louisiana Statutes:**

LSA R.S. 13:101 .....	3
LSA R.S. 13:312 .....	3
LSA R.S. 13:477 .....	3
LSA R.S. 13:2601 <i>et seq.</i> .....	3
LSA R.S. 17:2.2 .....	3
LSA R.S. 18:1276 .....	3
LSA R.S. 18:1906.....	7
LSA R.S. 18:1942.....	3
LSA R.S. 24:35.1 .....	3, 16

LSA R.S. 24:35.5 .....	3, 16
LSA R.S. 45:161.4 .....	3

**Federal Cases:**

Abrams v. Johnson, 521 U.S. 74 (1997) .....	10, 13, 28
Bartlett v. Strickland, 129 S.Ct. 1231 (2009) .....	21, 23
Beer v. United States, 425 U.S. 130 (1976) .....	13, 15, 27
Brown v. Thomson, 462 U.S. 835 (1983) .....	11, 12, 13
Bush v. Vera, 517 U.S. 952 (1996) .....	13, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32
Chapman v. Meier, 420 U.S. 1 (1975) .....	11
City of Lockhart v. U.S., 460 U.S. 125 (1985) .....	15
City of Rome v. United States, 446 U.S. 156(1980) .....	13, 14
Connor v. Finch, 431 U.S. 407 (1977) .....	11
Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) v. Klutznick, 486 F. Supp. 564 (D.D.C. 1980) .....	6
Gaffney v. Cummings, 412 U.S. 735 (1973) .....	11
Georgia v. Ashcroft, 539 U.S. 461 (2003) .....	15, 17
Grove v. Emison, 507 U.S. 25 (1993) .....	21, 30
Hays v. Louisiana, 839 F. Supp. 1188 (W.D. La. 1993) .....	25, 27, 28, 29, 30
Holder v. Hall 512 U.S. 874 (1994) .....	22
Johnson v. DeGrandy, 512 U.S. 997 (1994) .....	22
Karcher v. Daggett, 462 U.S. 725 (1983) .....	9, 10, 13
Ketchum v. Byrne, 740 F.2d 1398 (1984) .....	23
King v. State Board of Elections, 979 F. Supp. 619 (N.D. Ill. 1997) .....	32
King v. State Board of Elections, 522 U.S. 1087 (1998) .....	32
Larios v. Cox, 300 F. Supp.2d 1320 (N.D. Ga. 2004).....	12
Latino Political Action Committee v. City of Boston, 784 F.2d 409 (1st Cir. 1986) .....	24
League of United Latin American Citizens v. Perry, 548 U.S. 399 (2006) .....	27, 32
Mahan v. Howell, 410 U.S. 315 (1973) .....	12
Miller v. Johnson, 515 U.S. 900 (1995) .....	13, 25, 27, 28, 30, 32
Northwest Austin Municipal Utility District Number One (NAMUDNO) v. Holder, 557 U.S. ___, 129 S.Ct. 2504 (2009) .....	14
Reno v. Bossier Parish School Bd., 520 U.S. 471 (1997) .....	18, 22

Reno v. Bossier Parish School Bd., 528 U.S. 320 (2000).....	19
Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533 (1964) .....	11, 12
Ridge v. Verity, 715 F. Supp. 1308 (W.D. Pa. 1989) .....	6
Rodriguez v. Pataki, 308 F. Supp. 2d 346 (S.D. NY 2004) (1923) .....	11
Shaw v. Hunt, 517 U.S. 899 (1996) .....	13, 30, 31, 32
Shaw v. Reno, 509 U.S. 630 (1993) .....	13, 25, 26, 28, 29, 31
South Carolina v. Katzenbach, 383 U.S. 301(1966).....	13, 14
Thornburg v. Gingles, 478 U.S. 30 (1986) .....	20, 21, 22
United Jewish Organizations of Wmsburgh, Inc. v. Carey, 430 U.S. 144 (1977) .....	13, 23
Vera v. Richards, 861 F. Supp. 1304 (S.D. Tex. 1994).....	28
Voinovich v. Quilter, 507 U.S. 146 (1993).....	11, 12, 25
Wesberry v. Sanders, 376 U.S. 1 (1964).....	8
White v. Regester, 412 U.S. 755 (1973).....	11, 20

**Other Authorities:**

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES, Redistricting 2000 Population Deviation Table (visited July 30, 2007) <a href="http://www.ncsl.org/programs/legismgt/redistrict/redistpopdev.htm">http://www.ncsl.org/programs/legismgt/redistrict/redistpopdev.htm</a> .....	9, 10
“New Population Estimates Show Slight Changes For 2008 Congressional Apportionment, But Point to Major Changes for 2010,” [Table D]; ( <a href="http://www.electiondataservices.com/images/File/NR_Appor08wTables.pdf">http://www.electiondataservices.com/images/File/NR_Appor08wTables.pdf</a> ) Election Data Services, Dec. 22, 2008.....	1
H.R. Rep. no. 109-478 .....	17, 19
Sen. Rep. no. 97-417 .....	20
Sen. Rep. no. 109-295 .....	19
<a href="http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/apportionment/history.html">http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/apportionment/history.html</a> .....	5
<a href="http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/apportionment/history.html">http://www.census.gov/population/www/censusdata/apportionment/history.html</a> .....	5

Random House Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, 2nd ed.  
(New York: Random House, 2001) .....8