

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					unable to represent fairly the class. The district court's judgment was affirmed.			
Miller v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio	348 F. Supp. 2d 916; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24894	October 27, 2004	Plaintiffs, two voters and the Ohio Democratic Party, filed suit against defendants, the Ohio Secretary of State, several county boards of elections, and all of the boards' members, alleging claims under the National Voter Registration Act and § 1983. Plaintiffs also filed a motion for a temporary restraining order (TRO). Two	Plaintiffs alleged that the timing and manner in which defendants intended to hold hearings regarding pre-election challenges to their voter registration violated both the Act and the Due Process Clause. The individuals, who filed pre-election voter eligibility challenges, filed a motion to intervene. The court held that it would grant the motion to intervene because the individuals had a	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				individuals filed a motion to intervene as defendants.	substantial legal interest in the subject matter of the action and time constraints would not permit them to bring separate actions to protect their rights. The court further held that it would grant plaintiffs' motion for a TRO because plaintiffs made sufficient allegations in their complaint to establish standing and because all four factors to consider in issuing a TRO weighed heavily in favor of doing so. The court found that plaintiffs demonstrated a likelihood of			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>success on the merits because they made a strong showing that defendants' intended actions regarding pre--election challenges to voter eligibility abridged plaintiffs' fundamental right to vote and violated the Due Process Clause. Thus, the other factors to consider in granting a TRO automatically weighed in plaintiffs' favor. The court granted plaintiffs' motion for a TRO. The court also granted the individuals' motion to intervene.</p>			

008265

**Deliberative Process
Privilege**

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Hileman v. McGinness	Appellate Court of Illinois, Fifth District	316 Ill. App. 3d 868; 739 N.E.2d 81; 2000 Ill. App. LEXIS 845	October 25, 2000	Appellant challenged the circuit court's declaration that that the result of a primary election for county circuit clerk was void.	In a primary election for county circuit clerk, the parties agreed that 681 absentee ballots were presumed invalid. The ballots had been commingled with the valid ballots. There were no markings or indications on the ballots which would have allowed them to be segregated from other ballots cast. Because the ballots could not have been	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>segregated, apportionment was the appropriate remedy if no fraud was involved. If fraud was involved, the election would have had to have been voided and a new election held. Because the trial court did not hold an evidentiary hearing on the fraud allegations, and did not determine whether fraud was in issue, the case was remanded for a</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					determination as to whether fraud was evident in the electoral process. Judgment reversed and remanded.			
Eason v. State	Court of Appeals of Mississippi	2005 Miss. App. LEXIS 1017	December 13, 2005	Defendant appealed a decision of the circuit court convicting him of one count of conspiracy to commit voter fraud and eight counts of voter fraud.	Defendant was helping with his cousin's campaign in a run--off election for county supervisor. Together, they drove around town, picking up various people who were either at congregating spots or their homes. Defendant	No	N/A	No

008268

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>would drive the voters to the clerk's office where they would vote by absentee ballot and defendant would give them beer or money. Defendant claimed he was entitled to a mistrial because the prosecutor advanced an impermissible "sending the message" argument. The court held that it was precluded from reviewing the entire context in which the</p>			

008269

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>argument arose because, while the prosecutor's closing argument was in the record, the defense counsel's closing argument was not. Also, because the prosecutor's statement was incomplete due to defense counsel's objection, the court could not say that the statement made it impossible for defendant to receive a fair trial. Judgment affirmed.</p>			
Wilson v.	Court of	2000 Va.	May 2,	Defendant	At trial, the	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Commonwealth	Appeals of Virginia	App. LEXIS 322	2000	appealed the judgment of the circuit court which convicted her of election fraud.	Commonwealth introduced substantial testimony and documentary evidence that defendant had continued to live at one residence in the 13th District, long after she stated on the voter registration form that she was living at a residence in the 51st House District. The evidence included records showing electricity and water usage, records from			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>the Department of Motor Vehicles and school records. Thus, the evidence was sufficient to support the jury's verdict that defendant made "a false material statement" on the voter registration card required to be filed in order for her to be a candidate for office in the primary in question. Judgment affirmed.</p>			

**Deliberative Process
Privilege**

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Townson v. Stonicher	Supreme Court of Alabama	2005 Ala. LEXIS 214	December 9, 2005	The circuit court overturned the results of a mayoral election after reviewing the absentee ballots cast for said election, resulting in a loss for appellant incumbent based on the votes received from appellee voters. The incumbent appealed, and the voters cross--appealed. In the meantime, the trial court stayed enforcement of	The voters and the incumbent all challenged the judgment entered by the trial court arguing that it impermissibly included or excluded certain votes. The appeals court agreed with the voters that the trial court should have excluded the votes of those voters for the incumbent who included an improper form of identification with their absentee ballots. It was undisputed that	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				its judgment pending resolution of the appeal.	at least 30 absentee voters who voted for the incumbent provided with their absentee ballots a form of identification that was not proper under Alabama law. As a result, the court further agreed that the trial court erred in allowing those voters to somewhat "cure" that defect by providing a proper form of identification at the trial of the election contest, because, under those			

008274

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>circumstances, it was difficult to conclude that those voters made an honest effort to comply with the law. Moreover, to count the votes of voters who failed to comply with the essential requirement of submitting proper identification with their absentee ballots had the effect of disenfranchising qualified electors who choose not to vote but rather than to make the effort to comply</p>			

008275

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					with the absentee--voting requirements. The judgment declaring the incumbent's opponent the winner was affirmed. The judgment counting the challenged votes in the final tally of votes was reversed, and said votes were subtracted from the incumbents total, and the stay was vacated. All other arguments were rendered moot as a result.			
ACLU of Minn. v.	United States	2004 U.S. Dist.	October 29, 2004	Plaintiffs, voters and	Plaintiffs argued that Minn. Stat.	No	N/A	No

008276

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Kiffmeyer	District Court for the District of Minnesota	LEXIS 22996		associations, filed for a temporary restraining order pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65, against defendant, Minnesota Secretary of State, concerning voter registration.	§ 201.061 was inconsistent with the Help America Vote Act because it did not authorize the voter to complete registration either by a "current and valid photo identification" or by use of a current utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck, or other government document that showed the name and address of the			

008277

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>individual. The Secretary advised the court that there were less than 600 voters who attempted to register by mail but whose registrations were deemed incomplete. The court found that plaintiffs demonstrated that they were likely to succeed on their claim that the authorization in Minn. Stat. § 201.061, sub. 3, violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>Amendment of the United States Constitution insofar as it did not also authorize the use of a photographic tribal identification card by American Indians who do not reside on their tribal reservations. Also, the court found that plaintiffs demonstrated that they were likely to succeed on their claims that</p> <p>Minn. R. 8200.5100,</p>			

008279

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					violated the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution. A temporary restraining order was entered.			
League of Women Voters v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio	340 F. Supp. 2d 823; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20926	October 20, 2004	Plaintiff organizations filed suit against defendant, Ohio's Secretary of State, claiming that a directive issued by the Secretary contravened the provisions of the Help America Vote Act. The Secretary filed a motion to	The directive in question instructed election officials to issue provisional ballots to first-time voters who registered by mail but did not provide documentary identification at the polling place on election day. When submitting a provisional	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				dismiss.	ballot, a first-time voter could identify himself by providing his driver's license number or the last four digits of his social security number. If he did not know either number, he could provide it before the polls closed. If he did not do so, his provisional ballot would not be counted. The court held that the directive did not contravene the HAVA and otherwise established reasonable			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>requirements for confirming the identity of first-time voters who registered to vote by mail because: (1) the identification procedures were an important bulwark against voter misconduct and fraud; (2) the burden imposed on first-time voters to confirm their identity, and thus show that they were voting legitimately, was slight; and (3) the number of voters unable to meet the</p>			

008282

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					burden of proving their identity was likely to be very small. Thus, the balance of interests favored the directive, even if the cost, in terms of uncounted ballots, was regrettable. The court granted the Secretary's motion to dismiss.			

008283

**Deliberative Process
Privilege**

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
United States v. Madden	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	403 F.3d 347; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 5326	April 4, 2005	Defendant appealed his conviction for violating the federal vote-buying statute. He also appealed the sentence imposed by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky at Pikeville. The district court applied the U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual (Guidelines) § 3B1.1(c) supervisory--role	Defendant paid three people to vote for a local candidate in a primary election. The same ballot contained candidates for the U.S. Senate. While he waived his right to appeal his conviction, he nonetheless asserted two arguments in seeking to avoid the waiver. He first posited that the vote buying statute prohibited only buying votes for federal candidates----a prohibition not	No	N/A	No

008284

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				enhancement and increased defendant's base offense level by two levels.	violated by his conduct. In the alternative, he stated if the statute did criminalize buying votes for state or local candidates, then the statute was unconstitutional. Both arguments failed. Defendant argued that applying the supervisory--role enhancement constituted impermissible double counting because the supervision he exercised was no more than necessary to			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>establish a vote-buying offense. That argument also failed. Defendant next argued that the district court erred by applying the vulnerable--victim enhancement under U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 3A1.1(b)(1). He acknowledged that he knew the mentally ill people who sold their votes were vulnerable, but maintained they were not victims because they received \$50 for</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>their votes. The vote sellers were not victims for Guidelines purposes. The district court erred. Defendant's appeal of conviction was dismissed. Defendant's sentence was vacated, and the case was remanded for resentencing.</p>			
United States v. Slone	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	411 F.3d 643; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 10137	June 3, 2005	Defendant pled guilty to vote buying in a federal election. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of	Defendant offered to pay voters for voting in a primary election. Defendant claimed that the vote buying statute did not apply to him	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>Kentucky sentenced defendant to 10 months in custody and recommended that the sentence be served at an institution that could accommodate defendant's medical needs. Defendant appealed his conviction and sentence.</p>	<p>because his conduct related solely to a candidate for a county office. Alternatively, defendant asserted that the statute was unconstitutional because it exceeded Congress' enumerated powers. Finally, defendant argued that the district court erred when it failed to consider his medical condition as a ground for a downward departure at sentencing. The</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>appellate court found that the vote buying statute applied to all elections in which a federal candidate was on the ballot, and the government need not prove that defendant intended to affect the federal component of the election by his corrupt practices. The facts admitted by defendant at his guilty-plea hearing established all of the essential elements of an</p>			

008289

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>offense. The Elections Clause and the Necessary and Proper Clause combined to provide Congress with the power to regulate mixed federal and state elections even when federal candidates were running unopposed. There was no error in the district court's decision on departure under U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 5H1.4. Defendant's conviction and</p>			

008290

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					sentence were affirmed.			
United States v. Smith	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	139 Fed. Appx. 681; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 14855	July 18, 2005	Defendants were convicted of vote buying and conspiracy to buy votes. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky entered judgment on the jury verdict and sentenced defendants. Defendants appealed.	One of the defendants was a state representative who decided to run for an elected position. Defendants worked together and with others to buy votes. During defendants' trial, in addition to testimony regarding vote buying, evidence was introduced that two witnesses had been threatened. The appellate court found that defendants	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>failed to show evidence of prejudice with regard to denial of the motion for severance. Threat evidence was not excludable under Fed. R. Evid. 404(b) because it was admissible to show consciousness of guilt without any inference as to the character of defendants. Admission of witnesses' testimony was proper because each witness testified that he or she was approached by a</p>			

003292

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>member of the conspiracy and offered money for his or her vote. The remaining incarcerated defendant's challenges to his sentence had merit because individuals who sold their votes were not "victims" for the purposes of U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 3 A1.1. Furthermore, application of U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Manual § 3B1.1(b) violated</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>defendant's Sixth Amendment rights because it was based on facts that defendant did not admit or proved to the jury beyond a reasonable doubt. Defendants' convictions were affirmed. The remaining incarcerated defendant's sentence was vacated and his case was remanded for resentencing in accordance with Booker.</p>			
Nugent v. Phelps	Court of Appeal of	816 So. 2d 349; 2002	April 23, 2002	Plaintiff incumbent	The incumbent argued that: (1)	No	N/A	No

008294

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
	Louisiana, Second Circuit	La. App. LEXIS 1138		police chief sued defendant challenger, the winning candidate, to have the election nullified and a new election held based on numerous irregularities and unlawful activities by the challenger and his supporters. The challenger won the election by a margin of four votes. At the end of the incumbent's	the number of persons who were bribed for their votes by the challenger's worker was sufficient to change the outcome of the election; (2) the trial judge failed to inform potential witnesses that they could be given immunity from prosecution for bribery of voters if they came forth with truthful testimony; (3) the votes of three of his ardent supporters			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>case, the district court for the dismissed his suit. The incumbent appealed.</p>	<p>should have been counted because they were incarcerated for the sole purpose of keeping them from campaigning and voting; and (4) the district attorney, a strong supporter of the challenger, abused his power when he subpoenaed the incumbent to appear before the grand jury a week preceding the election. The appellate court held no more than two votes would be</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>subtracted, a difference that would be insufficient to change the election result or make it impossible to determine. The appellate court found the trial judge read the immunity portion of the statute to the potential witnesses. The appellate court found the arrests of the three supporters were the result of grand jury indictments, and there was no manifest error in holding that the</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					incumbent failed to prove a scheme by the district attorney. The judgment of the trial court was affirmed.			
Eason v. State	Court of Appeals of Mississippi	2005 Miss. App. LEXIS 1017	December 13, 2005	Defendant appealed a decision of circuit court convicting him of one count of conspiracy to commit voter fraud and eight counts of voter fraud.	Defendant was helping with his cousin's campaign in a run--off election for county supervisor. Together, they drove around town, picking up various people who were either at congregating spots or their homes. Defendant would drive the voters to the clerk's office	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>where they would vote by absentee ballot and defendant would give them beer or money. Defendant claimed he was entitled to a mistrial because the prosecutor advanced an impermissible "sending the message" argument. The court held that it was precluded from reviewing the entire context in which the argument arose because, while the prosecutor's closing</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>argument was in the record, the defense counsel's closing argument was not. Also, because the prosecutor's statement was incomplete due to defense counsel's objection, the court could not say that the statement made it impossible for defendant to receive a fair trial.</p> <p>Furthermore, the trial judge did not abuse his discretion when he did not allow defendant</p>			

008300

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					to ask the individual whether she wanted to see defendant go to prison because the individual's potential bias was shown by the individual's testimony that she expected the prosecution to recommend her sentence. The court affirmed defendant's conviction.			
United States v. Turner	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky	2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 31709	November 30, 2005	Defendants were charged with committing mail fraud and conspiracy to commit mail fraud and	Defendants argued that recusal was mandated by 28 U.S.C.S. § 455(a) and (b)(1). The court found no merit in defendants'	No	N/A	No

008301

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>vote--buying. First defendant filed a motion to recuse. Second defendant's motion to join the motion to recuse was granted. First defendant moved to compel the Government to grant testimonial use immunity to second defendant and moved to sever defendants.</p>	<p>arguments. The fact that the judge's husband was the commissioner of the Kentucky Department of Environmental Protection, a position to which he was appointed by the Republican Governor, was not relevant. The judge's husband was neither a party nor a witness. The court further concluded that no reasonable person could find that the judge's spouse had any direct</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>interest in the instant action. As for issue of money donated by the judge's husband to Republican opponents of first defendant, the court could not discern any reason why such facts warranted recusal. First defendant asserted that second defendant should have been granted use immunity based on a belief that second defendant would testify that first defendant did</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>not agree to, possess knowledge of, engage in, or otherwise participate in any of the illegal activity alleged in the indictment. The court found the summary of expected testimony to be too general to grant immunity. In addition, it was far from clear whether the court had the power to grant testimonial use immunity to second defendant. Defendants' motion to recuse</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					was denied. First defendant's motions to compel and to sever were denied.			

**Deliberative Process
Privilege**

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Ways v. Shively	Supreme Court of Nebraska	264 Neb. 250; 646 N.W.2d 621; 2002 Neb. LEXIS 158	July 5, 2002	Appellant felon filed a writ of mandamus, which sought to compel appellee Election Commissioner of Lancaster County, Nebraska, to permit him to register to vote. The District Court for Lancaster County denied the felon's petition for writ of mandamus and dismissed the petition. The felon appealed.	The felon was discharged from the Nebraska State Penitentiary in June 1998 after completing his sentences for the crimes of pandering, carrying a concealed weapon and attempting to possess a controlled substance. The commissioner asserted that as a result of the felon's conviction, the sentence for which had neither been reversed nor annulled, he had lost his right to vote. The commissioner contended that the	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>only method by which the felon's right to vote could be restored was through a warrant of discharge issued by the Nebraska Board of Pardons-- -a warrant of discharge had not been issued. The supreme court ruled that the certificate of discharge issued to the felon upon his release did not restore his right to vote. The supreme court ruled that as a matter of law, the specific right to vote was not restored to the felon upon his discharge from incarceration at the</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					completion of his sentences. The judgment was affirmed.			
Fischer v. Governor	Supreme Court of New Hampshire	145 N.H. 28; 749 A.2d 321; 2000 N.H. LEXIS 16	March 24, 2000	Appellant State of New Hampshire challenged a ruling of the superior court that the felon disenfranchisement statutes violate N.H. Const. pt. I, Art. 11.	Appellee was incarcerated at the New Hampshire State Prison on felony convictions. When he requested an absentee ballot to vote from a city clerk, the request was denied. The clerk sent him a copy of N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 607(A)(2) (1986), which prohibits a felon from voting "from the time of his sentence until his final discharge." The trial court declared the disenfranchisement	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>statutes unconstitutional and ordered local election officials to allow the plaintiff to vote. Appellant State of New Hampshire challenged this ruling. The central issue was whether the felon disenfranchisement statutes violated N.H. Const. pt. I, art. 11. After a review of the article, its constitutional history, and legislation pertinent to the right of felons to vote, the court concluded that the legislature retained the authority under</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>the article to determine voter qualifications and that the felon disenfranchisement statutes were a reasonable exercise of legislative authority, and reversed.</p> <p>Judgment reversed because the court concluded that the legislature retained its authority under the New Hampshire Constitution to determine voter qualifications and that the felon disenfranchisement statutes were a reasonable exercise of legislative</p>			

008310

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					authority.			
Mixon v. Commonwealth	Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania	759 A.2d 442; 2000 Pa. Commw. LEXIS 534	September 18, 2000	Respondents filed objections to petitioners' complaint seeking declaratory relief as to the unconstitutionality of the Pennsylvania Election Code, 25 Pa. Cons. Stat. §§ 2600 -- 3591, and the Pennsylvania Voter Registration Act, 25 Pa. Cons. Stat. §§ 961.101--961.5109, regarding felon voting rights.	Petitioner convicted felons were presently or had formerly been confined in state prison. Petitioner elector was currently registered to vote in respondent state. Petitioners filed a complaint against respondent state seeking declaratory relief challenging as unconstitutional, state election and voting laws that excluded confined felons from the definition of qualified absentee electors and that barred a felon who had been released	No	N/A	No

008311

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>from a penal institution for less than five years from registering to vote. Respondents filed objections to petitioners' complaint. The court sustained respondents' objection that incarcerated felons were not unconstitutionally deprived of qualified absentee elector status because respondent state had broad power to determine the conditions under which suffrage could be exercised. However, petitioner elector had no standing</p>			

008312

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					and the court overruled objection as to deprivation of ex-felon voting rights. The court sustained respondents' objection since incarcerated felons were not unconstitutionally deprived of qualified absentee elector status and petitioner elector had no standing, but objection that ex-incarcerated felons' voting rights were deprived was overruled since status penalized them.			
NAACP Philadelphia	United States District Court	2000 U.S.	August 14, 2000	Plaintiffs moved for a preliminary	Plaintiffs, ex-felon,	No	N/A	No

008313

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Branch v. Ridge	for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania	Dist. LEXIS 11520		injunction, which the parties agreed to consolidate with the merits determination for a permanent injunction, in plaintiffs' civil rights suit contending that the Pennsylvania Voter Registration Act, offended the Equal Protection Clause of U.S. Const. amend. XIV.	unincorporated association, and others, filed a civil rights suit against defendant state and local officials, contending that the Pennsylvania Voter Registration Act, violated the Equal Protection Clause by prohibiting some ex--felons from voting during the five year period following their release from prison, while permitting other ex--felons to vote. Plaintiffs conceded that one plaintiff lacked standing, and the court assumed the remaining			

008314

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>plaintiffs had standing. The court found that all that all three of the special circumstances necessary to invoke the Pullman doctrine were present in the case, but found that abstention was not appropriate under the circumstances since it did not agree with plaintiffs' contention that the time constraints caused by the upcoming election meant that the option of pursuing their claims in state court did not offer plaintiffs an</p>			

008315

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					adequate remedy. Plaintiff's motion for permanent injunction denied; the court abstained from deciding merits of plaintiffs' claims under the Pullman doctrine because all three of the special circumstances necessary to invoke the doctrine were present in the case; all further proceedings stayed until further order.			
Farrakhan v. Locke	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington	2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22212	December 1, 2000	Plaintiffs, convicted felons who were also racial minorities, sued defendants for alleged violations of the Voting Rights Act. The parties filed cross--	The felons alleged that Washington's felon disenfranchisement and restoration of civil rights schemes, premised upon Wash. Const. art. VI § 3,	No	N/A	No

008316

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>motions for summary judgment.</p>	<p>resulted in the denial of the right to vote to racial minorities in violation of the VRA. They argued that race bias in, or the discriminatory effect of, the criminal justice system resulted in a disproportionate number of racial minorities being disenfranchised following felony convictions. The court concluded that Washington's felon disenfranchisement provision disenfranchised a disproportionate number of minorities; as a result, minorities</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>were under--represented in Washington's political process. The Rooker--Feldman doctrine barred the felons from bringing any as--applied challenges, and even if it did not bar such claims, there was no evidence that the felons' individual convictions were born of discrimination in the criminal justice system. However, the felons' facial challenge also failed. The remedy they sought would create a new constitutional problem, allowing</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					disenfranchisement only of white felons. Further, the felons did not establish a causal connection between the disenfranchisement provision and the prohibited result. The court granted defendants' motion and denied the felons' motion for summary judgment.			
Johnson v. Bush	United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida	214 F. Supp. 2d 1333; 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14782	July 18, 2002	Plaintiff felons sued defendant state officials for alleged violations of their constitutional rights. The officials moved and the felons cross-moved for summary judgment.	The felons had all successfully completed their terms of incarceration and/or probation, but their civil rights to register and vote had not been restored. They alleged that	No	N/A	No

008319

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>Florida's disenfranchisement law violated their rights under First, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Twenty--Fourth Amendments to the United States Constitution, as well as § 1983 and §§ 2 and 10 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Each of the felons' claims was fatally flawed. The felons' exclusion from voting did not violate the Equal Protection or Due Process Clauses of the United States Constitution. The First Amendment did not guarantee felons the right to</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>vote. Although there was evidence that racial animus was a factor in the initial enactment of Florida's disenfranchisement law, there was no evidence that race played a part in the re-enactment of that provision. Although it appeared that there was a disparate impact on minorities, the cause was racially neutral. Finally, requiring the felons to pay their victim restitution before their rights would be restored did not constitute an improper poll tax or wealth</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					qualification. The court granted the officials' motion for summary judgment and implicitly denied the felons' motion. Thus, the court dismissed the lawsuit with prejudice.			
King v. City of Boston	United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts	2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8421	May 13, 2004	Plaintiff inmate filed a motion for summary judgment in his action challenging the constitutionality of Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 51, § 1, which excluded incarcerated felons from voting while they were imprisoned.	The inmate was convicted of a felony and incarcerated. His application for an absentee ballot was denied on the ground that he was not qualified to register and vote under Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 51, § 1. The inmate argued that the statute was unconstitutional as it applied to him	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>because it amounted to additional punishment for crimes he committed before the statute's enactment and thus violated his due process rights and the prohibition against ex post facto laws and bills of attainder. The court held that the statute was regulatory and not punitive because rational choices were implicated in the statute's disenfranchisement of persons under guardianship, persons disqualified because of corrupt</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>elections practices, persons under 18 years of age, as well as incarcerated felons. Specifically, incarcerated felons were disqualified during the period of their imprisonment when it would be difficult to identify their address and ensure the accuracy of their ballots. Therefore, the court concluded that Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 51, § 1 did not violate the inmate's constitutional rights. The court found the statute at issue to be</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					constitutional and denied the inmate's motion for summary judgment.			
Hayden v. Pataki	United States District Court for the Southern District of New York	2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10863	June 14, 2004	In a 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 action filed by plaintiffs, black and latino convicted felons, alleging that N.Y. Const. art. II, § 3 and N.Y. Elec. Law § 5--106(2) were unconstitutional, defendants, New York's governor and the chairperson of the board of elections, moved for judgment on the pleadings under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(c).	The felons sued defendants, alleging that N.Y. Const. art. II, § 3 and N.Y. Elec. Law § 5--106(2) unlawfully denied suffrage to incarcerated and paroled felons on account of their race. The court granted defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings on the felons' claims under U.S. Const. amend. XIV, XV because their factual allegations were insufficient	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>from which to draw an inference that the challenged provisions or their predecessors were enacted with discriminatory intent, and because denying suffrage to those who received more severe punishments, such as a term of incarceration, and not to those who received a lesser punishment, such as probation, was not arbitrary. The felons' claims under 42 U.S.C.S. § 1973 were dismissed because § 1973 could not be used to challenge the</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>legality of N.Y. Elec. Law § 5--106. Defendants' motion was granted as to the felons' claims under 42 U.S.C.S. § 1971 because § 1971 did not provide for a private right of action, and because the felons were not "otherwise qualified to vote." The court also granted defendants' motion on the felons' U.S. Const. amend. I claim because it did not guarantee a felon the right to vote. Defendants' motion for judgment on the</p>			

008327

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					pleadings was granted in the felons' § 1983 action.			
Farrakhan v. Washington	United States Court for Appeals for the Ninth Circuit	338 F.3d 1009; 2003 U.S. App. LEXIS 14810	July 25, 2003	Plaintiff inmates sued defendant state officials, claiming that Washington state's felon disenfranchisement scheme constitutes improper race--based vote denial in violation of § 2 of the Voting Rights Act. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington granted of summary judgment dismissing the inmates' claims. The inmates appealed.	Upon conviction of infamous crimes in the state, (that is, crimes punishable by death or imprisonment in a state correctional facility), the inmates were disenfranchised. The inmates claimed that the disenfranchisement scheme violated § 2 because the criminal justice system was biased against minorities, causing a disproportionate minority representation	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>among those being disenfranchised. The appellate court held, inter alia, that the district court erred in failing to consider evidence of racial bias in the state's criminal justice system in determining whether the state's felon disenfranchisement laws resulted in denial of the right to vote on account of race. Instead of applying its novel "by itself" causation standard, the district court should have applied a totality of the circumstances test that included</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>analysis of the inmates' compelling evidence of racial bias in Washington's criminal justice system. However, the inmates lacked standing to challenge the restoration scheme because they presented no evidence of their eligibility, much less even allege that they were eligible for restoration, and had not attempted to have their civil rights restored. The court affirmed as to the eligibility claim but reversed and remanded for</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					further proceedings to the bias in the criminal justice system claim.			
In re Phillips	Supreme Court of Virginia	265 Va. 81; 574 S.E.2d 270; 2003 Va. LEXIS 10	January 10, 2003	The circuit court, entered a judgment in which it declined to consider petitioner former felon's petition for approval of her request to seek restoration of her eligibility to register to vote. The former felon appealed.	More than five years earlier, the former felon was convicted of the felony of making a false written statement incident to a firearm purchase. She then petitioned the trial court asking it to approve her request to seek restoration of her eligibility to register to vote. Her request was based on Va. Code Ann. § 53.1--231.2, allowing persons convicted of non--violent	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>felonies to petition a trial court for approval of a request to seek restoration of voting rights. The trial court declined. It found that Va. Code Ann. § 53.1--231.2 violated constitutional separation of powers principles since it gave the trial court powers belonging to the governor. It also found that even if the statute was constitutional, it was fundamentally flawed for not providing notice to respondent Commonwealth regarding a</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>petition. After the petition was denied, the state supreme court found the separation of powers principles were not violated since the statute only allowed the trial court to determine if an applicant met the requirements to have voting eligibility restored. It also found the statute was not fundamentally flawed since the Commonwealth was not an interested party entitled to notice. OUTCOME: The judgment was reversed and the</p>			

008333

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					case was remanded for further proceedings.			
Howard v. Gilmore	United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit	2000 U.S. App. LEXIS 2680	February 23, 2000	Appellant challenged the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia's order summarily dismissing his complaint, related to his inability to vote as a convicted felon, for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.	Appellant was disenfranchised by the Commonwealth of Virginia following his felony conviction. He challenged that decision by suing the Commonwealth under the U.S. Const. amends. I, XIV, XV, XIX, and XXIV, and under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The lower court summarily dismissed his complaint under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim.	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>Appellant challenged. The court found U.S. Const. amend. I created no private right of action for seeking reinstatement of previously canceled voting rights, U.S. Const. amends. XIV, XV, XIX, and the VRA required either gender or race discrimination, neither of which appellant asserted, and the U.S. Const. amend. XXIV, while prohibiting the imposition of poll taxes, did not prohibit the imposition of a \$10 fee for</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					reinstatement of appellant's civil rights, including the right to vote. Consequently, appellant failed to state a claim. The court affirmed, finding that none of the constitutional provisions appellant relied on were properly pled because appellant failed to assert that either his race or gender were involved in the decisions to deny him the vote. Conditioning reestablishment of his civil rights on a \$10 fee was not unconstitutional.			
Johnson v.	United States	353 F.3d	December	Plaintiffs, ex--felon	The citizens	No	N/A	No

008336

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Governor of Fla.	Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit	1287; 2003 U.S. App. LEXIS 25859	19, 2003	citizens of Florida, on their own right and on behalf of others, sought review of a decision of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, which granted summary judgment to defendants, members of the Florida Clemency Board in their official capacity. The citizens challenged the validity of the Florida felon disenfranchisement laws.	alleged that Fla. Const. art. VI, § 4 (1968) was racially discriminatory and violated their constitutional rights. The citizens also alleged violations of the Voting Rights Act. The court initially examined the history of Fla. Const. art. VI, § 4 (1968) and determined that the citizens had presented evidence that historically the disenfranchisement provisions were motivated by a discriminatory animus. The citizens had met their initial burden of showing that			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>race was a substantial motivating factor. The state was then required to show that the current disenfranchisement provisions would have been enacted absent the impermissible discriminatory intent. Because the state had not met its burden, summary judgment should not have been granted. The court found that the claim under the Voting Rights Act, also needed to be remanded for further proceedings. Under a totality of the circumstances,</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>the district court needed to analyze whether intentional racial discrimination was behind the Florida disenfranchisement provisions, in violation of the Voting Rights Act. The court affirmed the district court's decision to grant summary judgment on the citizens' poll tax claim. The court reversed the district court's decision to grant summary judgment to the Board on the claims under the equal protection clause and for violation of federal voting laws and remanded the</p>			

008339

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					matter to the district court for further proceedings.			
State v. Black	Court of Appeals of Tennessee	2002 Tenn. App. LEXIS 696	September 26, 2002	In 1997, petitioner was convicted of forgery and sentenced to the penitentiary for two years, but was immediately placed on probation. He subsequently petitioned the circuit court for restoration of citizenship. The trial court restored his citizenship rights. The State appealed. The appellate court issued its opinion, but granted the State's motions to supplement the record and to	The appellate court's original opinion found that petitioner had not lost his right to hold public office because Tennessee law removed that right only from convicted felons who were "sentenced to the penitentiary." The trial court's amended judgment made it clear that petitioner was in fact sentenced to the penitentiary. Based upon this correction to the record, the appellate court	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				rehear its decision.	found that petitioner's sentence to the penitentiary resulted in the forfeiture of his right to seek and hold public office by operation of Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-20--114. However, the appellate court concluded that this new information did not requires a different outcome on the merits of the issue of restoration of his citizenship rights, including the right to seek and hold public office. The appellate court adhered to its conclusion that the			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>statutory presumption in favor of the restoration was not overcome by a showing, by a preponderance of the evidence, of good cause to deny the petition for restoration of citizenship rights. The appellate court affirmed the restoration of petitioner's right to vote and reversed the denial of his right to seek and hold public office. His full rights of citizenship were restored.</p>			
Johnson v. Governor of Fla.	United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh	405 F.3d 1214; 2005 U.S.	April 12, 2005	Plaintiff individuals sued defendant members of Florida	The individuals argued that the racial animus motivating the	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
	Circuit	App. LEXIS 5945		Clemency Board, arguing that Florida's felon disenfranchisement law, Fla. Const. art. VI, § 4 (1968), violated the Equal Protection Clause and 42 U.S.C.S. § 1973. The United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida granted the members summary judgment. A divided appellate panel reversed. The panel opinion was vacated and a rehearing en banc was granted.	adoption of Florida's disenfranchisement laws in 1868 remained legally operative despite the reenactment of Fla. Const. art. VI, § 4 in 1968. The subsequent reenactment eliminated any discriminatory taint from the law as originally enacted because the provision narrowed the class of disenfranchised individuals and was amended through a deliberative process. Moreover, there was no allegation of racial discrimination at			

008343

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>the time of the reenactment. Thus, the disenfranchisement provision was not a violation of the Equal Protection Clause and the district court properly granted the members summary judgment on that claim. The argument that 42 U.S.C.S. § 1973 applied to Florida's disenfranchisement provision was rejected because it raised grave constitutional concerns, i.e., prohibiting a practice that the Fourteenth Amendment permitted the state</p>			

008344

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>to maintain. In addition, the legislative history indicated that Congress never intended the Voting Rights Act to reach felon disenfranchisement provisions. Thus, the district court properly granted the members summary judgment on the Voting Rights Act claim. The motion for summary judgment in favor of the members was granted.</p>			

008345

**Deliberative Process
Privilege**

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Jenkins v. Williamson-Butler	Court of Appeal of Louisiana, Fourth Circuit	883 So. 2d 537; 2004 La. App. LEXIS 2433	October 8, 2004	Petitioner, a candidate for a parish juvenile court judgeship, failed to qualify for a runoff election. She filed suit against defendant, the clerk of criminal court for the parish seeking a new election, based on grounds of substantial irregularities. The district court ruled in favor of the candidate	The trial court found that the voting machines were not put into service until two, four, and, in many instances, eight hours after the statutorily mandated starting hour which constituted serious irregularities so as to deprive voters from freely expressing their will. It was impossible to determine the number of voters that were affected by the	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				and ordered the holding of a restricted citywide election. The clerk appealed.	late start up or late arrival of voting machines, making it impossible to determine the result. The appellate court agreed that the irregularities were so serious that the trial court's voiding the election and calling a new election was the proper remedy. Judgment affirmed.			
Hester v. McKeithen	Court of Appeal of Louisiana, Fourth Circuit	882 So. 2d 1291; 2004 La. App. LEXIS 2429	October 8, 2004	Petitioner, school board candidate, filed suit against defendants, Louisiana	The candidate argued that the trial court erred in not setting aside the election, even after	No	N/A	No

008347

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				Secretary of State and district court clerk, contesting the school board election results. The trial court rendered judgment against the candidate, finding no basis for the election to be declared void. The candidate appealed.	acknowledging in its reasons for judgment numerous irregularities with the election process. The appellate court ruled that had the irregularities not occurred the outcome would have been exactly the same. Judgment affirmed.			
In re Election Contest of Democratic Primary Election	Supreme Court of Ohio	88 Ohio St. 3d 258; 2000 Ohio 325; 725 N.E.2d 271; 2000 Ohio	March 29, 2000	Appellant sought review of the judgment of the court of common	Appellant contended that an election irregularity occurred when the board failed	No	N/A	No

008348

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Held May 4, 1999		LEXIS 607		pleas denying his election contest challenging an opponent's nomination for election irregularity.	to meet and act by majority vote on another candidate's withdrawal, instead permitting its employees to make decisions. Appellant had to prove by clear and convincing evidence that one or more election irregularities occurred and it affected enough votes to change or make uncertain the result of the election. Judgment affirmed. The appellant did			

008349

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					not establish election irregularity by the board's actions on the candidate's withdrawal, the board acted diligently and exercised its discretion in keeping the candidate's name on the ballot and notifying electors of his withdrawal.			
In re Election Contest As to Watertown Special Referendum Election	Supreme Court of South Dakota	2001 SD 62; 628 N.W.2d 336; 2001 S.D. LEXIS 66	May 23, 2001	Appellant sought review of the judgment of the circuit court declaring a local election valid and	The burden was on appellants to show not only that voting irregularities occurred, but also show that those irregularities	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				declining to order a new election.	were so egregious that the will of the voters was suppressed. Appellants did not meet their burden, as mere inconvenience or delay in voting was not enough to overturn the election. Judgment affirmed.			
Jones v. Jessup	Supreme Court of Georgia	279 Ga. 531; 615 S.E.2d 529; 2005 Ga. LEXIS 447	June 30, 2005	Defendant incumbent appealed a judgment by the trial court that invalidated an election for the position of sheriff and	After the candidate lost the sheriff's election to the incumbent, he contested the election, asserting that there were sufficient irregularities to	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>ordered that a new election be held based on plaintiff candidate's election contest.</p>	<p>place in doubt the election results. The state supreme court held that the candidate failed to prove substantial error in the votes cast by the witnesses adduced at the hearing who voted at the election. Although the candidate's evidence reflected the presence of some irregularities, not every irregularity invalidated the vote. The absentee ballots</p>			

008352

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>were only to be rejected where the electors failed to furnish required information. Because the ballots cast by the witnesses substantially complied with all of the essential requirements of the form, the trial court erred by finding that they should not have been considered. The candidate failed to establish substantial error in the votes. Judgment reversed.</p>			

008353

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Toliver v. Thompson	Supreme Court of Oklahoma	2000 OK 98; 17 P.3d 464; 2000 Okla. LEXIS 101	December 21, 2000	Petitioner challenged an order of the district court denying his motion to compel a recount of votes from an election.	The court held a recount of votes cast in an election could occur when the ballots had been preserved in the manner prescribed by statute. The trial court noted when the ballots had not been preserved in such a manner, no recount would be conducted. The court further noted a petition alleging irregularities in an election could be based upon an allegation that	No	N/A	No

008354

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>it was impossible to determine with mathematical certainty which candidate was entitled to be issued a certificate of election. The Oklahoma supreme court held petitioner failed to show that the actual votes counted in the election were tainted with irregularity, and similarly failed to show a statutory right to a new election based upon a failure to preserve the</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballots. Judgment affirmed.			
Adkins v. Huckabay	Supreme Court of Louisiana	755 So. 2d 206; 2000 La. LEXIS 504	February 25, 2000	Plaintiff candidate challenged judgment of court of appeal, second circuit, which reversed the lower court's judgment and declared defendant candidate winner of a runoff election for sheriff.	The issue presented for the appellate court's determination was whether the absentee voting irregularities plaintiff candidate complained of rendered it impossible to determine the outcome of the election for sheriff. The Louisiana supreme court concluded that the lower court had applied the correct	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>standard, substantial compliance, to the election irregularities, but had erred in its application by concluding that the contested absentee ballots substantially complied with the statutory requirements. The supreme court found that in applying substantial compliance to five of the ballot irregularities, the trial court correctly vacated the general election</p>			

008357

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>and set it aside because those absentee ballots should have been disqualified. Because of the constitutional guarantee to secrecy of the ballot and the fact that the margin of victory in the runoff election was three votes, it was impossible to determine the result of the runoff election. Thus, the supreme court ordered a new general election.</p> <p>Judgment of the</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					court of appeals reversed.			
In re Gray--Sadler	Supreme Court of New Jersey	164 N.J. 468; 753 A.2d 1101; 2000 N.J. LEXIS 668	June 30, 2000	Appellants, write--in candidates for the offices of mayor and borough council, appealed the judgment of the superior court, appellate division reversing the trial court's decision to set aside the election results for those offices due to irregularities related to the write--in	The New Jersey supreme court held that the votes that were rejected by election officials did not result from the voters' own errors, but from the election officials' noncompliance with statutory requirements. In other words, the voters were provided with patently inadequate instructions and defective voting machines. Moreover,	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				instructions and defective voting machines.	appellants met the statutory requirement for successfully contesting the election results by showing that enough qualified voters were denied the right to cast write--in votes as to affect the outcome of the election. Judgment reversed and the state trial court's decision reinstated.			
Goodwin v. St. Thomas-St. John Bd. of Elections	Territorial Court of the Virgin Islands	43 V.I. 89; 2000 V.I. LEXIS 15	December 13, 2000	Plaintiff political candidate alleged that certain general election	Plaintiff alleged that defendants counted unlawful absentee ballots that lacked postmarks,	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>absentee ballots violated territorial election law, and that the improper inclusion of such ballots by defendants, election board and supervisor, resulted in plaintiff's loss of the election. Plaintiff sued defendants seeking invalidation of the absentee ballots and certification of the</p>	<p>were not signed or notarized, were in unsealed and/or torn envelopes, and were in envelopes containing more than one ballot. Prior to tabulation of the absentee ballots, plaintiff was leading intervenor for the final senate position, but the absentee ballots entitled intervenor to the position. The territorial court held that plaintiff was not entitled to relief since he failed to</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				election results tabulated without such ballots.	establish that the alleged absentee voting irregularities would require invalidation of a sufficient number of ballots to change the outcome of the election. While the unsealed ballots constituted a technical violation, the outer envelopes were sealed and thus substantially complied with election requirements. Further, while defendants improperly			

003362