

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>counted one ballot where a sealed ballot envelope and a loose ballot were in the same outer envelope, the one vote involved did not change the election result. Plaintiff's other allegations of irregularities were without merit since ballots without postmarks were valid, ballots without signatures were not counted, and ballots without notarized signatures were</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					proper.			
Johnson v. Lopez--Torres	Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Second Department	2005 NY Slip Op 7825; 2005 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 11276	October 21, 2005	In a proceeding for a re--canvass of certain affidavit ballots cast in the Democratic Party primary election for the public office of surrogate, the supreme court denied appellant candidate's petition requesting the same and declared appellee opponent the winner of	Finding that the candidate had waived her right to challenge the affidavit ballots and had not sufficiently established her claim of irregularities to warrant a hearing, the trial court denied her petition and declared the opponent the winner of the primary. However, on appeal, the appellate division held that no waiver occurred.			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				that election.	Moreover, because hundreds of apparently otherwise eligible voters failed to fill in their party enrollment and/or prior address, it could be reasonably inferred that these voters were misled thereby into omitting the required information. Finally, the candidate failed to make a sufficient showing of voting irregularities in			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					the machine vote to require a hearing on that issue. Judgment reversed.			
Ex parte Avery	Supreme Court of Alabama	843 So. 2d 137; 2002 Ala. LEXIS 239	August 23, 2002	Petitioner probate judge moved for a writ of mandamus directing a circuit judge to vacate his order requiring the probate judge to transfer all election materials to the circuit clerk and holding him in contempt for failing to do so. The	The issuance of a writ of mandamus was appropriate. The district attorney had a right to the election materials because he was conducting a criminal investigation of the last election. Furthermore, the circuit judge had no jurisdiction or authority to issue an order	No	N/A	No

008366

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				probate judge also requested that said material be turned over to the district attorney, pursuant to an outstanding subpoena.	directing that the election materials be given to the clerk. The district attorney received several claims of irregularities in the election, some of which could constitute voter fraud. Petition granted and writ issued.			
Harpole v. Kemper County Democratic Exec. Comm.	Supreme Court of Mississippi	908 So. 2d 129; 2005 Miss. LEXIS 463	August 4, 2005	After his loss in a primary election for the office of sheriff, appellant candidate sued appellees, a political party's executive	The candidate alleged the sheriff had his deputies transport prisoners to the polls, felons voted, and the absentee voter law was breached. The committee	No	N/A	No

008367

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>committee and the incumbent sheriff, alleging irregularities in the election. The circuit court dismissed the candidate's petition for judicial review with prejudice. He appealed.</p>	<p>agreed with the last contention and threw out the absentee ballots (seven percent of votes cast); after a recount, the sheriff still prevailed. The trial court dismissed the case due to alleged defects in the petition; in the alternative, it held that the candidate failed to sufficiently allege violations and irregularities in the election. The supreme court held that the petition was</p>			

008363

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>not defective. Disqualification of seven percent of the total votes was not substantial enough so as to cause the will of the voters to be impossible to discern and to warrant a special election, and there were not enough illegal votes cast for the sheriff to change the outcome. A blanket allegation implying that the sheriff had deputies transport prisoners to the</p>			

006369

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					polls was not supported by credible evidence. Judgment affirmed.			

**Deliberative Process
Privilege**

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Am. Ass'n of People with Disabilities v. Shelley	United States District Court for the Central District of California	324 F. Supp. 2d 1120; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12587	July 6, 2004	Plaintiffs, disabled voters and organizations representing those voters, sought to enjoin the directives of defendant California Secretary of State, which decertified and withdrew approval of the use of certain direct recording electronic voting systems. One voter applied for a temporary restraining order, or, in	The voters urged the invalidation of the Secretary's directives because, allegedly, their effect was to deprive the voters of the opportunity to vote using touch--screen technology. Although it was not disputed that some disabled persons would be unable to vote independently and in private without the use of DREs, it was clear that they would not be	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
				the alternative, a preliminary injunction.	deprived of their fundamental right to vote. The Americans with Disabilities Act did not require accommodation that would enable disabled persons to vote in a manner that was comparable in every way with the voting rights enjoyed by persons without disabilities. Rather, it mandated that voting programs be made accessible.			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>Defendant's decision to suspend the use of DREs pending improvement in their reliability and security of the devices was a rational one, designed to protect the voting rights of the state's citizens. The evidence did not support the conclusion that the elimination of the DREs would have a discriminatory effect on the visually or manually impaired. Thus, the voters</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					showed little likelihood of success on the merits. The individual's request for a temporary restraining order, or, in the alternative, a preliminary injunction, was denied.			
Am. Ass'n of People with Disabilities v. Hood	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida	310 F. Supp. 2d 1226; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5615	March 24, 2004	Plaintiffs, disabled voters, and a national organization, sued defendants, the Florida Secretary of State, the Director of the Division of Elections of the Florida	The voters were visually or manually impaired. The optical scan voting system purchased by the county at issue was not readily accessible to visually or manually impaired	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>Department of State, and a county supervisor of elections, under Title II of the Americans With Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Summary judgment was granted for the Secretary and the Director as to visually impaired voters.</p>	<p>voters. The voters were unable to vote using the system without third--party assistance. If it was feasible for the county to purchase a readily accessible system, then the voters' rights under the ADA and the RA were violated. The court found that the manually impaired voter's rights were violated. To the extent "jelly switches" and "sip and puff" devices</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>needed to be attached to a touch screen machine for it to be accessible, it was not feasible for the supervisor to provide such a system, since no such system had been certified at the time of the county's purchase. 28 C.F.R. § 35.160 did not require that visually or manually impaired voters be able to vote in the same or similar manner as non--</p>			

008376

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>disabled voters. Visually and manually impaired voters had to be afforded an equal opportunity to participate in and enjoy the benefits of voting. The voters' "generic" discrimination claim was coterminous with their claim under 28 C.F.R. § 35.151. A declaratory judgment was entered against the supervisor to the extent another voting</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>system would have permitted unassisted voting. The supervisor was directed to have some voting machines permitting visually impaired voters to vote alone. The supervisor was directed to procure another system if the county's system was not certified and/or did not permit mouth stick voting. The Secretary and Director were granted judgment against the</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					voters.			
Troiano v. Lepore	United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida	2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25850	November 3, 2003	Plaintiffs, disabled voters, sued defendant a state county supervisor of elections alleging discrimination pursuant to the Americans With Disability Act, 42 U.S.C.S. § 12132 et seq., § 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C.S. § 794 et seq., and declaratory relief for the discrimination. Both sides moved for summary	The complaint alleged that after the 2000 elections Palm Beach County purchased a certain number of sophisticated voting machines called the "Sequoia." According to the voters, even though such accessible machines were available, the supervisor decided not to place such accessible machines in each precinct because it would slow	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
				judgment.	things down too much. The court found that the voters lacked standing because they failed to show that they had suffered an injury in fact. The voters also failed to show a likely threat of a future injury because there was no reasonable grounds to believe that the audio components of the voting machines would not be provided in the future. The voters also			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>failed to state an injury that could be redressed by a favorable decision, because the supervisor was already using the Sequoia machines and had already trained poll workers on the use of the machines. Finally, the action was moot because the Sequoia machines had been provided and there was no reasonable expectation that the machines would not have</p>			

008381

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					audio components available in the future. The supervisor's motion for summary judgment was granted. The voters' motion for summary judgment was denied.			
Troiano v. Supervisor of Elections	United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit	382 F.3d 1276; 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 18497	September 1, 2004	Plaintiff visually impaired registered voters sued defendant county election supervisor, alleging that the failure to make available audio components in	The district court granted the election supervisor summary judgment on the grounds that the voters did not have standing to assert their claims and the claims were moot. 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>voting booths to assist persons who were blind or visually impaired violated state and federal law. The United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida entered summary judgment in favor of the election supervisor. The voters appealed.</p>	<p>appellate court agreed that the case was moot because the election supervisor had furnished the requested audio components and those components were to be available in all of the county's voting precincts in upcoming elections. Specifically, the election supervisor had ceased the allegedly illegal practice of limiting access to the audio</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>components prior to receiving notice of the litigation. Moreover, since making the decision to use audio components in every election, the election supervisor had consistently followed that policy and taken actions to implement it even prior to the litigation. Thus, the appellate court could discern no hint that she had any intention of removing the</p>			

008384

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					accessible voting machines in the future. Therefore, the voters' claims were moot, and the district court's dismissal was affirmed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The decision was affirmed.			
Am. Ass'n of People with Disabilities v. Smith	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida	227 F. Supp. 2d 1276; 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21373	October 16, 2002	Plaintiff organization of people with disabilities and certain visually and manually impaired voters filed an action against defendant state	Individual plaintiffs were unable to vote unassisted with the equipment currently used in the county or the equipment the county had recently purchased. In	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>and local election officials and members of a city council, claiming violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C.S. § 12101 et seq., and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and Fla. Const. art. VI, § 1. Defendants filed motions to dismiss.</p>	<p>order to vote, the impaired individuals relied on the assistance of third parties. The court held that it could not say that plaintiffs would be unable to prove any state of facts that would satisfy the ripeness and standing requirements. The issue of whether several Florida statutory sections were violative of the Florida Constitution were so intertwined</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>with the federal claims that to decline supplemental jurisdiction be an abuse of discretion. Those statutes which provided for assistance in voting did not violate Fla. Const. art. VI, § 1. Because plaintiffs may be able to prove that visually and manually impaired voters were being denied meaningful access to the service, program, or activity, the</p>			

008387

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>court could not say with certainty that they would not be entitled to relief under any state of facts which could be proved in support of their claims. Defendant council members were entitled to absolute legislative immunity. The state officials' motion to dismiss was granted in part such that the counts were dismissed with prejudice to the extent plaintiffs</p>			

008388

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>asserted that they had been excluded from or denied the benefits of a program of direct and secret voting and in part was dismissed with leave to amend. The local officials motion to dismiss was granted in part such that all counts against the city council members were dismissed.</p>			

**Deliberative Process
Privilege**

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
United States v. Rogelio Mejorada-Lopez	Alaska	05-CR-074	December 5, 2005	Mejorada-Lopez, a Mexican citizen, completed several voter registration applications to register to vote in Alaska and voted in the 2000, 2002, and 2004 general elections. He was charged with three counts of voting by a non-citizen in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 611 and pled guilty. Mejorada-Lopez was sentenced to probation for	No	N/A	No

008390

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				one year.			
United States v. Shah	Colorado	1:04-CR-00458	March 1, 2005	Shah was indicted on two counts of providing false information concerning United States citizenship in order to register to vote in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 911 and 1015(f). Shah was convicted on both counts.	No	N/A	No
United States v. Mohsin Ali	Northern Florida	4:05-CR-47	January 17, 2006	A misdemeanor was filed against Ali charging him with voting by a non-citizen of 18 U.S.C. section 611. Trial was set for January 17, 2006	No	N/A	Yes-need information on the outcome of the trial.

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
United States v. Chaudhary	Northern Florida	4:04-CR-00059	May 18, 2005	Chaudhary was indicted for misuse of a social security number in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 408 and for making a false claim of United States citizenship on a 2002 driver's license application in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 911. A superceding indictment was returned, charging Chaudhary with falsely claiming United States citizenship on a driver's license	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				application and on the accompanying voter registration application. He was convicted of the false citizenship claim on his voter registration application.			
United States v. Velasquez	Southern Florida	1:03-CR-20233	September 9, 2003	Velasquez, a former 1996 and 1998 candidate for the Florida legislature, was indicted on charges of misrepresenting United States citizenship in connection with voting and for making false statements	No	N/A	No

008393

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 911, 1015(f) and 1001. Velasquez was convicted on two counts of making false statements on his naturalization application to the INS concerning his voting history.			
United States v. McKenzie; United States v. Francois; United States v. Exavier; United States v. Lloyd Palmer; United	Southern Florida	0:04-CR-60160; 1:04-CR-20488; 0:04-CR-60161; 0:04-CR-60159;	July 15, 2004	Fifteen non-citizens were charged with voting in various elections beginning in 1998 in	No	N/A	No

008394

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
States v. Velrine Palmer; United states v. Shivdayal; United States v. Rickman; United States v. Knight; United States v. Sweeting; United States v. Lubin; United States v. Bennett; United States v. O'Neil; United States v. Torres-Perez; United States v. Phillip; United States v. Bain Knight		0:04-CR-60162; 0:04-CR-60164; 1:04-CR-20491; 1:04-CR-20490; 1:04-CR-20489; 0:04-CR-60163; 1:04-CR-14048; 0:04-CR-60165; 2:04-CR-14046; 9:04-CR-80103; 2:04-CR-14047		violation of 18 U.S.C. section 611. Four of the defendants were also charged with making false citizenship claims in violation of 18 U.S.C. sections 911 or 1015(f). Ten defendants were convicted, one defendant was acquitted, and charges against four defendants were dismissed upon motion of the government.			
United States v. Brooks	Southern Illinois	3:03-CR-30201	February 12, 2004	East St. Louis election official Leander Brooks was indicted for	No	N/A	No

008395

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				submitting fraudulent ballots in the 2002 general election in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(c), 1973i(e), 1973gg-10(2)(B), and 18 U.S.C. sections 241 and 371. Brooks pled guilty to all charges.			
United States v. Scott; United States v. Nichols; United States v. Terrance Stith; United States v. Sandra Stith; United States v. Powell, et al.	Southern Illinois	3:05-CR-30040; 3:05-CR-30041; 3:05-CR-30042; 3:05-CR-30043; 3:05-CR-30044	June 29, 2005	Four Democrat precinct committeemen in East St. Louis were charged with vote buying on the 2004 general election in violation of 42 U.S.C.	No	N/A	No

008396

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>section 1973i(c). All four pled guilty. Also indicted were four additional Democrat committeemen, Charles Powell, Jr., Jesse Lewis, Sheila Thomas, Kelvin Ellis, and one precinct worker, Yvette Johnson, on conspiracy and vote buying charges in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 371 and 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(c). All five defendants were convicted. Kelvin Ellis</p>			

008397

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				also pled guilty to one count of 18 U.S.C. section 1512(c)(2) relative to a scheme to kill one of the trial witnesses and two counts of 18 U.S.C. section 1503 relative to directing two other witnesses to refuse to testify before the grand jury.			
United States v. McIntosh	Kansas	2:04-CR-20142	December 20, 2004	A felony information was filed against lawyer Leslie McIntosh for voting in both Wyandotte County, Kansas and Jackson	No	N/A	No

008393

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				County, Missouri, in the general elections of 2000 and 2002 in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(e). A superseding misdemeanor information was filed, charging McIntosh with causing the deprivation of constitutional rights in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 242, to which the defendant pled guilty.			
United States v. Conley; United States v. Slone; United States v.	Eastern Kentucky	7:03-CR-00013; 7:03-CR-00014;	March 28, 2003 and April 24, 2003	Ten people were indicted on vote buying charges in	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Madden; United States v. Slone et al.; United States v. Calhoun; United States v. Johnson; United States v. Newsome, et al.		7:03-CR-00015; 7:03-CR-00016; 7:03-CR-00017; 7:03-CR-00018; 7:03-CR-00019		connection with the 1998 primary election in Knott County, Kentucky, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(c). Five of the defendants pled guilty, two were convicted, and three were acquitted.			
United States v. Hays, et al.	Eastern Kentucky	7:03-CR-00011	March 7, 2003	Ten defendants were indicted for conspiracy and vote buying for a local judge in Pike County, Kentucky, in the 2002 general election, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				1973i(c) and 18 U.S.C. section 371. Five defendants were convicted, one defendant was acquitted, and charges against four defendants were dismissed upon motion of the government.			
United States v. Turner, et al.	Eastern Kentucky	3:05-CR-00002	May 5, 2005	Three defendants were indicted for vote buying and mail fraud in connection with the 2000 elections in Knott, Letcher, Floyd, and Breathitt Counties, Kentucky, in violation of 42	No	N/A	Yes-need update on case status.

008401

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				U.S.C. section 1973i(c) and 18 U.S.C. section 341.			
United States v. Braud	Middle Louisiana	3:03-CR-00019	May 2, 2003	Tyrell Mathews Braud was indicted on three counts of making false declarations to a grand jury in connection with his 2002 fabrication of eleven voter registration applications, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 1623. Braud pled guilty on all counts.	No	N/A	No
United States v. Thibodeaux	Western Louisiana	6:03-CR-60055	April 12, 2005	St. Martinsville City Councilwoman Pamela C. Thibodeaux was indicted on	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				two counts of conspiring to submit false voter registration information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 371 and 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(c). She pled guilty to both charges.			
United States v. Scherzer; United States v. Goodrich; United States v. Jones; United States v. Martin	Western Missouri	4:04-CR-00401; 4:04-CR-00402; 4:05-CR-00257; 4:05-CR-00258	January 7, 2005; March 28, 2005; September 8, 2005; October 13, 2005	Two misdemeanor informations were filed charging Lorraine Goodrich and James Scherzer, Kansas residents who voted in the 2000 and 2002 general elections on	No	N/A	No

008403

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>both Johnson County, Kansas and in Kansas City, Missouri. The informations charged deprivation of a constitutional right by causing spurious ballots, in violation of 18 U.S.C. sections 242 and 2. Both pled guilty. Additionally, similar misdemeanor informations were filed against Tammy J. Martin, who voted in both Independence and Kansas</p>			

008404

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				City, Missouri in the 2004 general election and Brandon E. Jones, who voted both in Raytown and Kansas City, Missouri in the 2004 general election. Both pled guilty.			
United States v. Raymond; United States v. McGee; United States v. Tobin; United States v. Hansen	New Hampshire	04-CR-00141; 04-CR-00146; 04-CR-00216; 04-CR-00054	December 15, 2005	Two informations were filed charging Allen Raymond, former president of a Virginia-based political consulting firm called GOP Marketplace, and Charles McGee, former executive director of the	No	N/A	No

008405

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>New Hampshire State Republican Committee, with conspiracy to commit telephone harassment using an interstate phone facility in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 371 and 47 U.S.C. section 223. The charges stem from a scheme to block the phone lines used by two Manchester organizations to arrange drives to the polls during the 2002 general</p>			

008406

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>election. Both pled guilty. James Tobin, former New England Regional Director of the Republican National Committee, was indicted on charges of conspiring to commit telephone harassment using an interstate phone facility in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 371 and 47 U.S.C. section 223. An information was filed charging Shaun Hansen, the</p>			

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>principal of an Idaho telemarketing firm called MILO Enterprises which placed the harassing calls, with conspiracy and aiding and abetting telephone harassment, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 371 and 2 and 47 U.S.C. section 223. The information against Hansen was dismissed upon motion of the government. A superseding indictment was</p>			

008403

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>returned against Tobin charging conspiracy to impede the constitutional right to vote for federal candidates, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 241 and conspiracy to make harassing telephone calls in violation of 47 U.S.C. section 223. Tobin was convicted of one count of conspiracy to commit telephone harassment and one count of aiding and abetting of</p>			

008409

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				telephone harassment.			
United States v. Workman	Western North Carolina	1:03-CR-00038	June 30, 2003	A ten-count indictment was returned charging Joshua Workman, a Canadian citizen, with voting and related offenses in the 200 and 2002 primary and general elections in Avery County, North Carolina, in violation of 18 U.S.C. sections 611, 911, 1001, and 1015(f). Workman pled guilty to providing false information to election	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				officials and to a federal agency.			
United States v. Shatley, et al.	Western North Carolina	5:03-CR-00035	May 14, 2004	A nine-count indictment was returned charging Wayne Shatley, Anita Moore, Valerie Moore, Carlos "Sunshine" Hood and Ross "Toogie" Banner with conspiracy and vote buying in the Caldwell County 2002 general election, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(c) and 18 U.S.C. section 371. Anita and Valerie Moore pled guilty.	No	N/A	No

008411

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				Shatley, Hood, and Banner were all convicted.			
United States v. Vargas	South Dakota	05-CR-50085	December 22, 2005	An indictment was filed against Rudolph Vargas, for voting more than once at Pine Ridge in the 2002 general election in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(e). Vargas pled guilty.	No	N/A	No
United States v. Wells; United States v. Mendez; United States v. Porter; United States v. Hrutkay; United States v. Porter;	Southern West Virginia	02-CR-00234; 2:04-CR-00101; 2:04-CR-00145; 2:04-CR-00149;	July 22, 2003; July 19, 2004; December 7, 2004; January 7, 2005; March 21,	Danny Ray Wells, Logan County, West Virginia, magistrate, was indicted and charged with violating 18	No	N/A	No

008412

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
United States v. Stapleton; United States v. Thomas E. Esposito; United States v. Nagy; United States v. Adkins; United States v. Harvey		2:04-CR-00173; 2:05-CR-00002; 05-CR-00019; 05-CR-00148; 05-CR-00161	2005; October 11, 2005; December 13, 2005	U.S.C. section 1962. Wells was found guilty. A felony indictment was filed against Logan County sheriff Johnny Mendez for conspiracy to defraud the United States in violation 18 U.S.C section 371. Mendez pled guilty. An information was filed charging former Logan County police chief Alvin Ray Porter, Jr., with making expenditures to influence voting in violation of 18			

008413

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>U.S.C. section 597. Porter pled guilty. Logan County attorney Mark Oliver Hrutkay was charged by information with mail fraud in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 1341. Hrutkay pled guilty. Earnest Stapleton, commander of the local VFW, was charged by information with mail fraud. He pled guilty. An information was filed charging Thomas E. Esposito, a former mayor</p>			

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>of the City of Logan, with concealing the commission of a felony, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 4. Esposito pled guilty. John Wesley Nagy, Logan County Court marshal, pled guilty to making false statements to a federal agent, a violation of 18 U.S.C. section 1001. An information charging Glen Dale Adkins, county clerk of Logan County, with accepting payment for voting, in</p>			

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				violation of 18 U.S.C. section 1973i(c). Adkins pled guilty. Perry French Harvey, Jr., a retired UMW official, pled guilty to involvement in a conspiracy to buy votes.			
United States v. Adkins, et al.	Southern West Virginia	2:04-CR-00162	December 28 & 30, 2005	Jackie Adkins was indicted for vote buying in Lincoln County, West Virginia, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(c). A superceding indictment added Wandell "Rocky" Adkins to the indictment and charged both	No	N/A	No

008416

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>defendants with conspiracy to buy votes in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 371 and vote buying. A second superseding indictment was returned which added three additional defendants, Gegory Brent Stowers, Clifford Odell "Groundhog" Vance, and Toney "Zeke" Dingess, to the conspiracy and vote buying indictment. Charges were later dismissed against Jackie Adkins. A third</p>			

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>superseding indictment was returned adding two additional defendants, Jerry Allen Weaver and Ralph Dale Adkins. A superseding information was filed charging Vance with expenditures to influence voting, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 597. Vance pled guilty. Superseding informations were filed against Stowers and Dingess for expenditures to influence</p>			

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				voting, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 597. Both defendants pled guilty. Weaver also pled guilty. Superseding informations were filed against Ralph and Wandell Adkins for expenditures to influence voting, in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 597. Both defendants pled guilty.			
United States v. Davis; United States v. Byas; United States v. Ocasio; United States v. Prude;	Eastern Wisconsin	2:05-MJ-00454; 2:05-MJ-00455; 2:05-CR-00161;	September 16, 2005; September 21, 2005; October 5, 2005;	Criminal complaints were issued against Brian L. Davis and Theresa J. Byas	No	N/A	Need updated status on Gooden and the Anderson, Cox, Edwards, and Little cases.

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
United States v. Sanders; United States v. Alicea; United States v. Brooks; United States v. Hamilton; United States v. Little; United States v. Swift; United States v. Anderson; United States v. Cox; United States v. Edwards; United States v. Gooden		2:05-CR-00162; 2:05-CR-00163; 2:05-CR-00168; 2:05-CR-00170; 2:05-CR-00171; 2:05-CR-00172; 2:05-CR-00177; 2:05-CR-00207; 2:05-CR-00209; 2:05-CR-00211; 2:05-CR-00212	October 26, 2005; October 31, 2005, November 10, 2005	charging them with double voting, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(e). Indictments were filed against convicted felons Milo R. Ocasio and Kimberly Prude, charging them with falsely certifying that they were eligible to vote, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973gg-10(2)(B), and against Enrique C. Sanders, charging him with multiple			

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>voting, in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(e). Five more indictments were later returned charging Cynthia C. Alicea with multiple voting in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973i(e) and convicted felons Deshawn B. Brooks, Alexander T. Hamilton, Derek G. Little, and Eric L. Swift with falsely certifying that they were</p>			

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>eligible to vote in violation of 42 U.S.C. section 1973gg-10(2)(B). Indictments were filed against Davis and Byas charging them with double voting. Four more indictments were returned charging convicted felons Ethel M. Anderson, Jiyto L. Cox, Correan F. Edwards, and Joseph J. Gooden with falsely certifying that they were</p>			

008422

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>eligible to vote. Ocasio and Hamilton pled guilty. Prude was found guilty. A mistrial was declared in the Sanders case. Brooks was acquitted. Byas signed a plea agreement agreeing to plead to a misdemeanor 18 U.S.C. section 242 charge. Swift moved to change his plea. Davis was found incompetent to stand trial so the government dismissed the case. Gooden is</p>			

008423

Name of Case	District	Case Number	Date	Facts	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				a fugitive. Alicea was acquitted. Four cases are pending --- Anderson, Cox, Edwards, and Little.			

008424

**Deliberative Process
Privilege**

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
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 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.	No	N/A	No

008425

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>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 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</p>			

008426

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>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 qualification. The court granted the officials' motion for summary judgment and implicitly denied the felons' motion. Thus, the court dismissed the lawsuit with prejudice.</p>			
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	The felons alleged that Washington's felon disenfranchisement and restoration of civil rights	No	N/A	No

008427

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>violations of the Voting Rights Act. The parties filed cross--motions for summary judgment.</p>	<p>schemes, premised upon Wash. Const. art. VI § 3, 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</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>minorities; as a result, minorities 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</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					constitutional problem, allowing 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.			
Farrakhan v. Washington	United States Court of 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	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.	No	N/A	No

008430

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>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.</p>	<p>The inmates claimed that the disenfranchisement scheme violated § 2 because the criminal justice system was biased against minorities, causing a disproportionate minority representation 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</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>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 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</p>			

008432

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					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 further proceedings to the bias in the criminal justice system claim.			
Muntaqim v. Coombe	United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit	366 F.3d 102; 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 8077	April 23, 2004	Plaintiff inmate appealed a judgment of the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York, which granted summary judgment in favor of defendants in the inmate's action alleging violation	At issue was whether the VRA could be applied to N.Y. Elec. Law § 5-106, which disenfranchised currently incarcerated felons and parolees. The instant court concluded that the Voting Rights Act did not apply to the	No	N/A	No

008433

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				of § 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.	New York law. Applying the Act to state law would alter the traditional balance of power between the states and the federal government. The court was not convinced that there was a congruence and proportionality between the injury to be prevented or remedied (i.e., the use of vote denial and dilution schemes to avoid the strictures of the VRA), and the means adopted to that end (i.e., prohibition of state felon disenfranchisement law that resulted in			

008434

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>vote denial or dilution but were not enacted with a discriminatory purpose). Further, there was no clear statement from Congress that the Act applied to state felon disenfranchisement statutes. Inter alia, defendants were entitled to qualified immunity as to claim asserted against them in their personal capacities, and to Eleventh Amendment immunity to the extent the inmate sought damages against defendants in their official capacities. The</p>			

008435

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					district court's judgment was affirmed.			
Johnson v. Governor of Fla.	United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit	353 F.3d 1287; 2003 U.S. App. LEXIS 25859	December 19, 2003	Plaintiffs, ex--felon 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.	The citizens 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 of appeals 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	No	N/A	No

008436

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>discriminatory animus. The citizens had met their initial burden of showing that 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 of appeals found that the claim under the Voting Rights Act, also needed to</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>be remanded for further proceedings. Under a totality of the circumstances, the district court needed to analyze whether intentional racial discrimination was behind the Florida disenfranchisement provisions. 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</p>			

008438

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					violation of federal voting laws and remanded the matter to the district court for further proceedings.			
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	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>declared the disenfranchisement 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</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>authority under the article to determine voter qualifications and that the felon disenfranchisement statutes were a reasonable exercise of legislative authority, and reversed. 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 authority.</p>			
Johnson v. Governor of	United States Court of	405 F.3d 1214;	April 12, 2005	Plaintiff individuals sued	The individuals argued that the	No	N/A	No

008441

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Fla.	Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit	2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 5945		defendant members of Florida Clemency Board, arguing that Florida's felon disenfranchisement law, Fla. Const. art. VI, § 4 (1968), violated the Equal Protection Clause and the Voting Rights Act. 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.	racial animus motivating the 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			

003442

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>discrimination at 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 the Voting Rights Act applied to Florida's disenfranchisement provision was rejected because it raised grave constitutional concerns, i.e., prohibiting a practice that the Fourteenth Amendment</p>			

008443

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					permitted the state 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.			
Mixon v. Commonwealth	Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania	759 A.2d 442; 2000 Pa. Commw.	September 18, 2000	Respondents filed objections to petitioners' complaint seeking declaratory relief	Petitioner convicted felons were presently or had formerly been confined in state	No	N/A	No

008444

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
		LEXIS 534		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.	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 from a penal institution for less than five years from registering to vote. Respondents filed objections to petitioners'			

008445

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>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 and the court overruled objection as to deprivation of ex-felon voting rights. The court sustained respondents' objection since</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					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.			
Rosello v. Calderon	United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico	2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27216	November 30, 2004	Plaintiff voters filed a § 1983 action against defendant government officials alleging violations the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the U.S. Const. amend. XIV, resulting from the	The voters' § 1983 action against government officials alleged that absentee ballots for a gubernatorial election were untimely mailed and that split votes, which registered two votes for the	No	N/A	No

008447

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>invalidity of absentee and split ballots in a gubernatorial election.</p>	<p>same office, were null. The court asserted jurisdiction over the disparate treatment claims, which arose under the U.S. Constitution. The court declined to exercise discretionary abstention because the case was not merely a facial attack on the constitutionality of a statute, but was mainly an applied challenge, requiring a hearing in order to develop the record, and because equal protection and due process were secured under the state and federal</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>constitutions. The court held that the voters had a fundamental due process right created by Puerto Rico Election Law and suffered an equal protection violation in further violation of the U.S. Const. amend. I right to vote, thereby creating their total disenfranchisement. The court held that the evidence created an inference that the split ballots were not uniformly treated and that it was required to examine a mixed question of fact and constitutional law</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					pursuant to federal guidelines to determine whether potential over votes were invalid. The court asserted jurisdiction over the voters' claims.			
Woodruff v. Wyoming	United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit	49 Fed. Appx. 199; 2002 U.S. App. LEXIS 21060	October 7, 2002	Plaintiffs, pro se inmates, appealed from an order of the United States District Court for the District of Wyoming, dismissing their complaint brought under § 1983, challenging Wyo. Stat. Ann. § 6--10-106, which denied them, as convicted felons, the right to vote. The district court dismissed the action for failure to state a claim upon	The inmates argued that the statute violated their Eighth Amendment right and their State constitutional right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment, their equal protection rights under the Fourteenth Amendment and State Constitution, and their federal and state rights to due process. One inmate had not paid the appellate filing	No	N/A	No

008450

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>which relief could be granted and as frivolous.</p>	<p>fee or filed a motion to proceed on appeal without prepayment of costs or fees, and his appeal was dismissed. The court found that U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 2 had long been held to exclude felons from the right to vote. It could scarcely be unreasonable for a state to decide that perpetrators of serious crimes should not take part in electing the legislators who made the laws, the executives who enforced them, the prosecutors who tried the cases, or the judges who</p>			

008451

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					heard their cases. The court also found the dismissed suit constituted a "strike" under 28 U.S.C.S. § 1915(g), although the suit did not challenge prison conditions per se. One inmate's appeal was dismissed; the judgment dismissing the other's complaint was affirmed.			
N.J. State Conf.--NAACP v. Harvey	Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division	381 N.J. Super. 155; 885 A.2d 445; 2005 N.J. Super. LEXIS 316	November 2, 2005	The Superior Court of New Jersey, Chancery Division, Union County, dismissed a complaint filed by plaintiff interested parties to invalidate N.J. Stat. Ann. § 19:4--1(8) on the ground	The statute at issue prohibited all people on parole or probation for indictable offenses from voting. The interested parties alleged that the criminal justice system in New Jersey	No	N/A	No

003452

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>that it denied African--Americans and Hispanics equal protection of the law. Defendant, the New Jersey Attorney General, moved to dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim, and said motion was granted. The interested parties then appealed.</p>	<p>discriminated against African-Americans and Hispanics, thereby disproportionately increasing their population among parolees and probationers and diluting their political power. As a result, the alleged that enforcement of the statute resulted in a denial of equal protection under the state Constitution. The appeals court disagreed. N.J. Const. art. II authorized the New Jersey Legislature to disenfranchise persons convicted of certain crimes from voting.</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					Moreover, those convicts could not vote unless pardoned or unless otherwise restored by law to the right of suffrage. The statute also limited the period of disenfranchisement during a defendant's actual service on parole or probation. Thus, it clearly complied with this specific constitutional mandate. The judgment was affirmed.			
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	The inmate was convicted of a felony and incarcerated. His application for an absentee ballot was denied on 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
				ch. 51, § 1, which excluded incarcerated felons from voting while they were imprisoned.	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 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			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>rational choices were implicated in the statute's disenfranchisement of persons under guardianship, persons disqualified because of corrupt 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</p>			

008456

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					violate the inmate's constitutional rights. The court found the statute at issue to be constitutional and denied the inmate's motion for summary judgment.			
Southwest Voter Registration Educ. Project v. Shelley	United States District Court for the Central District of California	278 F. Supp. 2d 1131; 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14413	August 15, 2003	Plaintiffs, several groups, brought suit alleging that the proposed use of "punch-card" balloting machines in the California election would violate the United States Constitution and Voting Rights Act. Plaintiffs moved for an order delaying that election, scheduled for October 7, 2003, until such time as it could be	Plaintiffs claimed voters using punch-card machines would have a comparatively lesser chance of having their votes counted in violation of the Equal Protection Clause and the counties employing punch-card systems had greater minority populations thereby disproportionately disenfranchising and/or diluting the	No	N/A	No

008457

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>conducted without use of punch--card machines.</p>	<p>votes on the basis of race, in violation of § 2 of the Voting Rights Act. While the court did not need to decide the res judicata issue at this juncture, there was ample reason to believe that plaintiffs would have had a difficult time overcoming it as they were seeking to establish the same constitutional violations alleged in prior litigation, but to secure an additional remedy. Plaintiffs failed to prove a likelihood of success on the merits with regard to both of their claims. Even if</p>			

008458

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>plaintiffs could show disparate treatment, such would not have amounted to illegal or unconstitutional treatment. The balance of hardships weighed heavily in favor of allowing the election to proceed. The public interests in avoiding wholesale disenfranchisement, and/or not plunging the State into a constitutional crisis, weighed heavily against enjoining the election. Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction (consolidated with</p>			

008459

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					plaintiffs' ex parte application for temporary restraining order) was denied.			
Igartua--de la Rosa v. United States	United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit	417 F.3d 145; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 15944	August 3, 2005	Plaintiff, a U.S. citizen residing in Puerto Rico, appealed from an order of the United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico, that rejected his claim that he was deprived of the constitutional right to vote for President and Vice President of the United States, and was also violative of three treaty obligations of the United States.	The putative voter had brought the same claims twice before. The court pointed out that U.S. law granted to the citizens of states the right to vote for the slate of electors to represent that state. Although modern ballots omitted the names of the electors and listed only the candidates, and in form it appeared that the citizens were voting for President and Vice President directly, they were	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>not, but were voting for electors. Puerto Rico was not a state, and had not been enfranchised as the District of Columbia had by the 23rd Amendment. The franchise for choosing electors was confined to "states" by the Constitution. The court declined to turn to foreign or treaty law as a source to reverse the political will of the country. The judgment of the district court was affirmed.</p>			

008461

**Deliberative Process
Privilege**

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Spencer v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio	347 F. Supp. 2d 528; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22062	November 1, 2004	Plaintiff voters filed a motion for temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction seeking to restrain defendant election officials and intervenor State of Ohio from discriminating against black voters in Hamilton County on the basis of race. If necessary, they sought to restrain challengers from being allowed at the	The voters alleged that defendants had combined to implement a voter challenge system at the polls that discriminated against African--American voters. Each precinct was run by its election judges but Ohio law also allowed challengers to be physically present in the polling places in order to challenge voters' eligibility to vote. The court held that the injury asserted, that allowing	No	N/A	No