

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>chaos, delay, intimidation, and pandemonium inside the polls and in the lines out the door. Furthermore, the law allowing private challengers was not narrowly tailored to serve Ohio's compelling interest in preventing voter fraud. Because the voters had shown a substantial likelihood of success on the merits on the ground that the application of Ohio's statute allowing challengers at polling places was unconstitutional</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					and the other factors governing the issuance of an injunction weighed in their favor, the court enjoined all defendants from allowing any challengers other than election judges and other electors into the polling places throughout the state on Election Day.			
Charfauros v. Bd. of Elections	United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit	2001 U.S. App. LEXIS 15083	May 10, 2001	Defendants, board of elections and related individuals, appealed from an order of the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of the Northern	Plaintiffs, disqualified voters, claimed that individual members of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Board of Elections violated § 1983 by	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>Mariana Islands reversing a lower court's grant of summary judgment in favor of defendants on the ground of qualified immunity.</p>	<p>administering pre-election day voter challenge procedures which precluded a certain class of voters, including plaintiffs, from voting in a 1995 election. The CNMI Supreme Court reversed a lower court's grant of summary judgment and defendants appealed. The court of appeals held that the Board's pre-election day procedures violated the plaintiffs' fundamental right to vote. The federal court</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>reasoned that the right to vote was clearly established at the time of the election, and that a reasonable Board would have known that that treating voters differently based on their political party would violate the Equal Protection Clause. Further the court added that the allegations of the complaint were sufficient to support liability of the Board members in their individual capacities. Finally, the composition of the CNMI Supreme Court's Special Judge</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					panel did not violate the Board's right to due process of law. The decision of Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Supreme Court was affirmed where defendants' pre--election day voter challenge procedures violated plaintiffs' fundamental right to vote.			
Wit v. Berman	United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit	306 F.3d 1256; 2002 U.S. App. LEXIS 21301	October 11, 2002	Appellant voters who established residences in two separate cities sued appellees, state and city election officials, alleging that provisions of the New York State	Under state election laws, the voters could only vote in districts in which they resided, and residence was limited to one place. The voters contended 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
				<p>Election Law unconstitutionally prevented the voters from voting in local elections in both cities where they resided. The voters appealed the order of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York which granted appellees' motion to dismiss the complaint.</p>	<p>since they had two lawful residences, they were denied constitutional equal protection by the statutory restriction against voting in the local elections of both of the places of their residences. The appellate court held, however, that no constitutional violation was shown since the provisions of the New York State Election Law imposed only reasonable, nondiscriminatory restrictions which advanced important state regulatory</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>interests. While the voters may have interests in electoral outcomes in both cities, any rule permitting voting based on such interests would be unmanageable and subject to potential abuse. Further, basing voter eligibility on domicile, which was always over-- or under-- inclusive, nonetheless had enormous practical advantages, and the voters offered no workable standard to replace the domicile test. Finally, allowing the voters to</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					choose which of their residences was their domicile for voting purposes could not be deemed discriminatory. Affirmed.			
Curtis v. Smith	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas	121 F. Supp. 2d 1054; 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17987	November 3, 2000	Plaintiffs sought a preliminary injunction to prohibit defendant tax assessor-collector from mailing confirmation letters to approximately 9,000 persons who were registered voters in Polk County, Texas.	Plaintiffs sought to prohibit defendant from mailing confirmation letters to approximately 9,000 persons, self-styled "escapees" who traveled a major portion of each year in recreational vehicles, all of whom were registered to vote in Polk County, Texas. In accordance with	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>Texas law, three resident voters filed affidavits challenging the escapees' residency. These affidavits triggered defendant's action in sending confirmation notices to the escapees. The court determined, first, that because of the potential for discrimination, defendant's action required preclearance in accordance with § 5 of the Voting Rights Act and, second, that such preclearance had not been sought or obtained. Accordingly, the</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>court issued a preliminary injunction prohibiting defendant from pursuing the confirmation of residency of the escapees, or any similarly situated group, under the Texas Election Code until the process had been submitted for preclearance in accordance with § 5. The action was taken to ensure that no discriminatory potential existed in the use of such process in the upcoming presidential election or future</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					election. Motion for preliminary injunction was granted, and defendant was enjoined from pursuing confirmation of residency of the 9,000 "escapees," or any similarly situated group, under the Texas Election Code, until the process had been submitted for preclearance under § 5 of the Voting Rights Act.			
Peace & Freedom Party v. Shelley	Court of Appeal of California, Third Appellate District	114 Cal. App. 4th 1237; 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 497; 2004 Cal. App.	January 15, 2004	Plaintiff political party appealed a judgment from the superior court which denied the party's petition for writ of	The trial court ruled that inactive voters were excluded from the primary election. The court of appeals affirmed,	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
		LEXIS 42		mandate to compel defendant, the California Secretary of State, to include voters listed in the inactive file of registered voters in calculating whether the party qualified to participate in a primary election.	observing that although the election had already taken place, the issue was likely to recur and was a matter of continuing public interest and importance; hence, a decision on the merits was proper, although the case was technically moot. The law clearly excluded inactive voters from the calculation. The statutory scheme did not violate the inactive voters' constitutional right of association because it was reasonably designed to ensure			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>that all parties on the ballot had a significant modicum of support from eligible voters. Information in the inactive file was unreliable and often duplicative of information in the active file. Moreover, there was no violation of the National Voter Registration Act because voters listed as inactive were not prevented from voting. Although the Act prohibited removal of voters from the official voting list absent certain conditions, inactive voters in</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					California could correct the record and vote as provided the Act. The court affirmed the denial of a writ of mandate.			
Bell v. Marinko	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio	235 F. Supp. 2d 772; 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21753	October 22, 2002	Plaintiff voters sued defendants, a county board of elections, a state secretary of state, and the state's attorney general, for violations of the Motor Voter Act and equal protection of the laws. Defendants moved for summary judgment. The voters also moved for summary judgment.	The board heard challenges to the voters' qualifications to vote in the county, based on the fact that the voters were transient (seasonal) rather than permanent residents of the county. The voters claimed that the board hearings did not afford them the requisite degree of due process and contravened their rights of privacy	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>by inquiring into personal matters. As to the MVA claim, the court held that residency within the precinct was a crucial qualification. One simply could not be an elector, much less a qualified elector entitled to vote, unless one resided in the precinct where he or she sought to vote. If one never lived within the precinct, one was not and could not be an eligible voter, even if listed on the board's rolls as such. The MVA did not affect the</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>state's ability to condition eligibility to vote on residence. Nor did it undertake to regulate challenges, such as the ones presented, to a registered voter's residency ab initio. The ability of the challengers to assert that the voters were not eligible and had not ever been eligible, and of the board to consider and resolve that challenge, did not contravene the MVA. Defendants' motions for summary judgment were granted as to all</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					claims with prejudice, except the voters' state-law claim, which was dismissed for want of jurisdiction, without prejudice.			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Charles H. Wesley Educ. Found., Inc. v. Cox	United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit	408 F.3d 1349; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 8320	May 12, 2005	Plaintiffs, a charitable foundation, four volunteers, and a registered voter, filed a suit against defendant state officials alleging violations of the National Voter Registration Act and the Voting Rights Act. The officials appealed after the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia issued a preliminary injunction enjoining them from rejecting voter registrations submitted by the	The foundation conducted a voter registration drive; it placed the completed applications in a single envelope and mailed them to the Georgia Secretary of State for processing. Included in the batch was the voter's change of address form. Plaintiffs filed the suit after they were notified that the applications had been rejected pursuant to Georgia law, which allegedly restricted who could collect voter registration	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
				foundation.	forms. Plaintiffs contended that the officials had violated the NVRA, the VRA, and U.S. Const. amends. I, XIV, XV. The officials argued that plaintiffs lacked standing and that the district court had erred in issuing the preliminary injunction. The court found no error. Plaintiffs had sufficiently alleged injuries under the NVRA, arising out of the rejection of the voter registration forms; the allegations in the			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					complaint sufficiently showed an injury--in--fact that was fairly traceable to the officials' conduct. The injunction was properly issued. There was a substantial likelihood that plaintiffs would prevail as to their claims; it served the public interest to protect plaintiffs' franchise--related rights. The court affirmed the preliminary injunction order entered by the district court.			
McKay v.	United	226 F.3d	September	Plaintiff	The trial court	No	N/A	No

013990

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Thompson	States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	752; 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS 23387	18, 2000	challenged order of United States District Court for Eastern District of Tennessee at Chattanooga, which granted defendant state election officials summary judgment on plaintiff's action seeking to stop the state practice of requiring its citizens to disclose their social security numbers as a precondition to voter registration.	had granted defendant state election officials summary judgment. The court declined to overrule defendants' administrative determination that state law required plaintiff to disclose his social security number because the interpretation appeared to be reasonable, did not conflict with previous case law, and could be challenged in state court. The requirement did not violate the Privacy Act of 1974, because it			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>was grand fathered under the terms of the Act. The limitations in the National Voter Registration Act did not apply because the NVRA did not specifically prohibit the use of social security numbers and the Act contained a more specific provision regarding such use. The trial court properly rejected plaintiff's fundamental right to vote, free exercise of religion, privileges and</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>immunities, and due process claims. Order affirmed because requirement that voters disclose social security numbers as precondition to voter registration did not violate Privacy Act of 1974 or National Voter Registration Act and trial court properly rejected plaintiff's fundamental right to vote, free exercise of religion, privileges and immunities, and due process claims.</p>			
Nat'l	United	150 F.	July 5,	Plaintiff, national	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
Coalition for Students with Disabilities Educ. & Legal Def. Fund v. Scales	States District Court for the Southern District of Maryland	Supp. 2d 845; 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9528	2001	organization for disabled students, brought an action against university president and university's director of office of disability support services to challenge the voter registration procedures established by the disability support services. Defendants moved to dismiss the first amended complaint, or in the alternative for summary judgment.	alleged that plaintiff lacked standing to represent its members, and that plaintiff had not satisfied the notice requirements of the National Voter Registration Act. Further, defendants maintained the facts, as alleged by plaintiff, did not give rise to a past, present, or future violation of the NVRA because (1) the plaintiff's members that requested voter registration services were not			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>registered students at the university and (2) its current voter registration procedures complied with NVRA. As to plaintiff's § 1983 claim, the court held that while plaintiff had alleged sufficient facts to confer standing under the NVRA, such allegations were not sufficient to support standing on its own behalf on the § 1983 claim. As to the NVRA claim, the court found that the agency practice of only offering voter</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>registration services at the initial intake interview and placing the burden on disabled students to obtain voter registration forms and assistance afterwards did not satisfy its statutory duties. Furthermore, most of the NVRA provisions applied to disabled applicants not registered at the university. Defendants' motion to dismiss first amended</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					complaint was granted as to the § 1983 claim and denied as to plaintiff's claims brought under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. Defendants' alternative motion for summary judgment was denied.			
Cunningham v. Chi. Bd. of Election Comm'rs	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois	2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2528	February 24, 2003	Plaintiffs, who alleged that they were duly registered voters, six of whom had signed nominating petitions for one candidate and two of whom signed	Plaintiffs argued that objections to their signatures were improperly sustained by defendants, the city board of election commissioners. Plaintiff's argued that 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>nominating petitions for another candidate. They first asked for a preliminary injunction of the municipal election scheduled for the following Tuesday and suggested, alternatively, that the election for City Clerk and for 4th Ward Alderman be enjoined.</p>	<p>registered voters whose names appeared in an inactive file and whose signatures were therefore, and improperly, excluded. The court ruled that by characterizing the claim as plaintiffs did, they sought to enjoin an election because their signatures were not counted, even though their preferred candidates were otherwise precluded from appearing on the ballot. Without regard to their likelihood of</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>obtaining any relief, plaintiffs failed to demonstrate that they would be irreparably harmed if an injunction did not issue; the threatened injury to defendants, responsible as they were for the conduct of the municipal election, far outweighed any threatened injury to plaintiffs; and the granting of a preliminary injunction would greatly disserve the public interest. Plaintiffs' petition for</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					preliminary relief was denied.			
Diaz v. Hood	United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida	342 F. Supp. 2d 1111; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21445	October 26, 2004	Plaintiffs, unions and individuals who had attempted to register to vote, sought a declaration of their rights to vote in the November 2, 2004 general election. They alleged that defendants, state and county election officials, refused to process their voter registrations for various failures to complete the registration forms. The election officials	The putative voters sought injunctive relief requiring the election officials to register them to vote. The court first noted that the unions lacked even representative standing, because they failed to show that one of their members could have brought the case in their own behalf. The individual putative voters raised separate issues: the first had failed to verify her mental	No	N/A	No

014000

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of standing and failure to state a claim.</p>	<p>capacity, the second failed to check a box indicating that he was not a felon, and the third did not provide the last four digits of her social security number on the form. They claimed the election officials violated federal and state law by refusing to register eligible voters because of nonmaterial errors or omissions in their voter registration applications, and by failing to provide any notice to voter</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>applicants whose registration applications were deemed incomplete. In the first two cases, the election official had handled the errant application properly under Florida law, and the putative voter had effectively caused their own injury by failing to complete the registration. The third completed her form and was registered, so had suffered no injury. Standing failed against the secretary of state. Motion to dismiss without</p>			

014002

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					prejudice granted.			
Bell v. Marinko	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio	235 F. Supp. 2d 772; 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21753	October 22, 2002	Plaintiff voters sued defendants, a county board of elections, a state secretary of state, and the state's attorney general, for violations of the Motor Voter Act and equal protection of the laws. Defendants moved for summary judgment. The voters also moved for summary judgment.	The board heard challenges to the voters' qualifications to vote in the county, based on the fact that the voters were transient (seasonal) rather than permanent residents of the county. The voters claimed that the board hearings did not afford them the requisite degree of due process and contravened their rights of privacy by inquiring into personal matters. As to the MVA	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>claim, the court held that residency within the precinct was a crucial qualification. One simply could not be an elector, much less a qualified elector entitled to vote, unless one resided in the precinct where he or she sought to vote. If one never lived within the precinct, one was not and could not be an eligible voter, even if listed on the board's rolls as such. The MVA did not affect the state's ability to</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>condition eligible to vote on residence. Nor did it undertake to regulate challenges, such as the ones presented, to a registered voter's residency ab initio. The ability of the challengers to assert that the voters were not eligible and had not ever been eligible, and of the board to consider and resolve that challenge, did not contravene the MVA. Defendants' motions for</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					summary judgment were granted as to all claims with prejudice, except the voters' state--law claim, which was dismissed for want of jurisdiction, without prejudice.			
Bell v. Marinko	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	367 F.3d 588; 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 8330	April 28, 2004	Plaintiffs, registered voters, sued defendants, Ohio Board of Elections and Board members, alleging that Ohio Rev. Code Ann. §§ 3509.19-3509.21 violated the National Voter Registration Act, and the Equal Protection Clause	The voters contested the challenges to their registration brought under Ohio Code Rev. Ann. § 3505.19 based on Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 3503.02. Specifically, the voters asserted that § 3503.02---which stated that the place	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>of the Fourteenth Amendment. The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio granted summary judgment in favor of defendants. The voters appealed.</p>	<p>where the family of a married man or woman resided was considered to be his or her place of residence---- violated the equal protection clause. The court of appeals found that the Board's procedures did not contravene the National Voter Registration Act because Congress did not intend to bar the removal of names from the official list of persons who were ineligible and improperly registered to vote</p>			

014007

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>in the first place. The National Voter Registration Act did not bar the Board's continuing consideration of a voter's residence, and encouraged the Board to maintain accurate and reliable voting rolls. Ohio was free to take reasonable steps to see that all applicants for registration to vote actually fulfilled the requirement of bona fide residence. Ohio Rev. Code Ann.</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>§ 3503.02(D) did not contravene the National Voter Registration Act. Because the Board did not raise an irrebuttable presumption in applying § 3502.02(D), the voters suffered no equal protection violation. The judgment was affirmed.</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Charles H. Wesley Educ. Found., Inc. v. Cox	United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit	408 F.3d 1349; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 8320	May 12, 2005	Plaintiffs, a charitable foundation, four volunteers, and a registered voter, filed a suit against defendant state officials alleging violations of the National Voter Registration Act and the Voting Rights Act. The officials appealed after the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia issued a preliminary injunction enjoining them from rejecting voter registrations submitted by the	The foundation conducted a voter registration drive; it placed the completed applications in a single envelope and mailed them to the Georgia Secretary of State for processing. Included in the batch was the voter's change of address form. Plaintiffs filed the suit after they were notified that the applications had been rejected pursuant to Georgia law, which allegedly restricted who could collect voter registration	No	N/A	No

014010

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				foundation.	forms. Plaintiffs contended that the officials had violated the NVRA, the VRA, and U.S. Const. amends. I, XIV, XV. The officials argued that plaintiffs lacked standing and that the district court had erred in issuing the preliminary injunction. The court found no error. Plaintiffs had sufficiently alleged injuries under the NVRA, arising out of the rejection of the voter registration forms; the allegations in the			

014011

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>complaint sufficiently showed an injury--in--fact that was fairly traceable to the officials' conduct. The injunction was properly issued. There was a substantial likelihood that plaintiffs would prevail as to their claims; it served the public interest to protect plaintiffs' franchise--related rights. The court affirmed the preliminary injunction order entered by the district court.</p>			
McKay v.	United	226 F.3d	September	Plaintiff	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
Thompson	States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	752; 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS 23387	18, 2000	challenged order of United States District Court for Eastern District of Tennessee at Chattanooga, which granted defendant state election officials summary judgment on plaintiff's action seeking to stop the state practice of requiring its citizens to disclose their social security numbers as a precondition to voter registration.	had granted defendant state election officials summary judgment. The court declined to overrule defendants' administrative determination that state law required plaintiff to disclose his social security number because the interpretation appeared to be reasonable, did not conflict with previous case law, and could be challenged in state court. The requirement did not violate the Privacy Act of 1974, because it			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>was grand fathered under the terms of the Act. The limitations in the National Voter Registration Act did not apply because the NVRA did not specifically prohibit the use of social security numbers and the Act contained a more specific provision regarding such use. The trial court properly rejected plaintiff's fundamental right to vote, free exercise of religion, privileges and</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>immunities, and due process claims. Order affirmed because requirement that voters disclose social security numbers as precondition to voter registration did not violate Privacy Act of 1974 or National Voter Registration Act and trial court properly rejected plaintiff's fundamental right to vote, free exercise of religion, privileges and immunities, and due process claims.</p>			
Nat'l	United	150 F.	July 5,	Plaintiff, national	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
Coalition for Students with Disabilities Educ. & Legal Def. Fund v. Scales	States District Court for the Southern District of Maryland	Supp. 2d 845; 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9528	2001	organization for disabled students, brought an action against university president and university's director of office of disability support services to challenge the voter registration procedures established by the disability support services. Defendants moved to dismiss the first amended complaint, or in the alternative for summary judgment.	alleged that plaintiff lacked standing to represent its members, and that plaintiff had not satisfied the notice requirements of the National Voter Registration Act. Further, defendants maintained the facts, as alleged by plaintiff, did not give rise to a past, present, or future violation of the NVRA because (1) the plaintiff's members that requested voter registration services were not			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>registered students at the university and (2) its current voter registration procedures complied with NVRA. As to plaintiff's § 1983 claim, the court held that while plaintiff had alleged sufficient facts to confer standing under the NVRA, such allegations were not sufficient to support standing on its own behalf on the § 1983 claim. As to the NVRA claim, the court found that the agency practice of only offering voter</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>registration services at the initial intake interview and placing the burden on disabled students to obtain voter registration forms and assistance afterwards did not satisfy its statutory duties. Furthermore, most of the NVRA provisions applied to disabled applicants not registered at the university. Defendants' motion to dismiss first amended</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					complaint was granted as to the § 1983 claim and denied as to plaintiff's claims brought under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. Defendants' alternative motion for summary judgment was denied.			
Cunningham v. Chi. Bd. of Election Comm'rs	United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois	2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2528	February 24, 2003	Plaintiffs, who alleged that they were duly registered voters, six of whom had signed nominating petitions for one candidate and two of whom signed	Plaintiffs argued that objections to their signatures were improperly sustained by defendants, the city board of election commissioners. Plaintiff's argued that 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>nominating petitions for another candidate. They first asked for a preliminary injunction of the municipal election scheduled for the following Tuesday and suggested, alternatively, that the election for City Clerk and for 4th Ward Alderman be enjoined.</p>	<p>registered voters whose names appeared in an inactive file and whose signatures were therefore, and improperly, excluded. The court ruled that by characterizing the claim as plaintiffs did, they sought to enjoin an election because their signatures were not counted, even though their preferred candidates were otherwise precluded from appearing on the ballot. Without regard to their likelihood of</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>obtaining any relief, plaintiffs failed to demonstrate that they would be irreparably harmed if an injunction did not issue; the threatened injury to defendants, responsible as they were for the conduct of the municipal election, far outweighed any threatened injury to plaintiffs; and the granting of a preliminary injunction would greatly disserve the public interest. Plaintiffs' petition for</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					preliminary relief was denied.			
Diaz v. Hood	United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida	342 F. Supp. 2d 1111; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21445	October 26, 2004	Plaintiffs, unions and individuals who had attempted to register to vote, sought a declaration of their rights to vote in the November 2, 2004 general election. They alleged that defendants, state and county election officials, refused to process their voter registrations for various failures to complete the registration forms. The election officials	The putative voters sought injunctive relief requiring the election officials to register them to vote. The court first noted that the unions lacked even representative standing, because they failed to show that one of their members could have brought the case in their own behalf. The individual putative voters raised separate issues: the first had failed to verify her mental	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>moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of standing and failure to state a claim.</p>	<p>capacity, the second failed to check a box indicating that he was not a felon, and the third did not provide the last four digits of her social security number on the form. They claimed the election officials violated federal and state law by refusing to register eligible voters because of nonmaterial errors or omissions in their voter registration applications, and by failing to provide any notice to voter</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>applicants whose registration applications were deemed incomplete. In the first two cases, the election official had handled the errant application properly under Florida law, and the putative voter had effectively caused their own injury by failing to complete the registration. The third completed her form and was registered, so had suffered no injury. Standing failed against the secretary of state. Motion to dismiss without</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					prejudice granted.			
Bell v. Marinko	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio	235 F. Supp. 2d 772; 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21753	October 22, 2002	Plaintiff voters sued defendants, a county board of elections, a state secretary of state, and the state's attorney general, for violations of the Motor Voter Act and equal protection of the laws. Defendants moved for summary judgment. The voters also moved for summary judgment.	The board heard challenges to the voters' qualifications to vote in the county, based on the fact that the voters were transient (seasonal) rather than permanent residents of the county. The voters claimed that the board hearings did not afford them the requisite degree of due process and contravened their rights of privacy by inquiring into personal matters. As to the MVA	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>claim, the court held that residency within the precinct was a crucial qualification. One simply could not be an elector, much less a qualified elector entitled to vote, unless one resided in the precinct where he or she sought to vote. If one never lived within the precinct, one was not and could not be an eligible voter, even if listed on the board's rolls as such. The MVA did not affect the state's ability to</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>condition eligibility to vote on residence. Nor did it undertake to regulate challenges, such as the ones presented, to a registered voter's residency ab initio. The ability of the challengers to assert that the voters were not eligible and had not ever been eligible, and of the board to consider and resolve that challenge, did not contravene the MVA. Defendants' motions for</p>			

014027

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					summary judgment were granted as to all claims with prejudice, except the voters' state-law claim, which was dismissed for want of jurisdiction, without prejudice.			
Bell v. Marinko	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	367 F.3d 588; 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 8330	April 28, 2004	Plaintiffs, registered voters, sued defendants, Ohio Board of Elections and Board members, alleging that Ohio Rev. Code Ann. §§ 3509.19-3509.21 violated the National Voter Registration Act, and the Equal Protection Clause	The voters contested the challenges to their registration brought under Ohio Code Rev. Ann. § 3505.19 based on Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 3503.02. Specifically, the voters asserted that § 3503.02---which stated that the place	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>of the Fourteenth Amendment. The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio granted summary judgment in favor of defendants. The voters appealed.</p>	<p>where the family of a married man or woman resided was considered to be his or her place of residence---- violated the equal protection clause. The court of appeals found that the Board's procedures did not contravene the National Voter Registration Act because Congress did not intend to bar the removal of names from the official list of persons who were ineligible and improperly registered to vote</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>in the first place. The National Voter Registration Act did not bar the Board's continuing consideration of a voter's residence, and encouraged the Board to maintain accurate and reliable voting rolls. Ohio was free to take reasonable steps to see that all applicants for registration to vote actually fulfilled the requirement of bona fide residence. Ohio Rev. Code Ann.</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>§ 3503.02(D) did not contravene the National Voter Registration Act. Because the Board did not raise an irrebuttable presumption in applying § 3502.02(D), the voters suffered no equal protection violation. The judgment was affirmed.</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Hileman v. McGinness	Court of Appeals 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 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 segregated, apportionment was 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>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 determination as to whether fraud was evident in</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					the electoral process. The court reversed the declaration of the trial court, holding that a determination as to whether fraud was involved in the election was necessary to a determination of whether or not a new election was required.			
DeFabio v. Gammersheimer	Supreme Court of Illinois	192 Ill. 2d 63; 733 N.E.2d 1241; 2000 Ill. LEXIS 993	July 6, 2000	Appellant challenged the judgment of the appellate court, which affirmed the trial court's decision granting appellee's summary judgment motion in action brought by	Appellee filed a petition for election contest, alleging that the official results of the Monroe County coroners election were invalid because none of the 524 ballots cast 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>appellee to contest the results of the election for the position of county coroner in Monroe County.</p>	<p>Monroe County's second precinct were initialed by an election judge, in violation of Illinois law. The trial court granted appellee's motion for summary judgment, and the appellate court affirmed the judgment. The Illinois supreme court affirmed, noting that statutes requiring election judges to initial election ballots were mandatory, and uninitialed</p>			

014035

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>ballots could not have been counted, even where the parties agreed that there was no knowledge of fraud or corruption. Thus, the supreme court held that the trial court properly invalidated all of the ballots cast in Monroe County's second precinct. The court reasoned that none of the ballots contained the requisite initialing, and neither party argued that any</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>of the uninitialed ballots could have been distinguished or identified as absentee ballots. The supreme court affirmed the judgment because the Illinois statute requiring election judges to initial election ballots was mandatory, and uninitialed ballots could not have been counted, even where the parties agreed that there was no knowledge of fraud or corruption.</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					Additionally, none of the ballots in Monroe County's second precinct contained the requisite initialing.			
Gilmore v. Amityville Union Free Sch. Dist.	United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York	305 F. Supp. 2d 271; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3116	March 2, 2004	Plaintiffs, two school board candidates, filed a class action complaint against defendants, a school district, the board president, and other district agents or employees, challenging a school board election. Defendants moved to dismiss.	During the election, a voting machine malfunctioned, resulting in votes being cast on lines that were blank on the ballot. The board president devised a plan for counting the machine votes by moving each tally up one line. The two candidates, who were African	No	N/A	No

014038

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>American, alleged that the president's plan eliminated any possibility that an African American would be elected. The court found that the candidates failed to state a claim under § 1983 because they could not show that defendants' actions were done or approved by a person with final policymaking authority, nor was there a showing of intentional or</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>purposeful discrimination on defendants' part. The vote-counting method applied equally to all candidates. The candidates' claims under § 2000a and 2000c--8 failed because schools were not places of public accommodation, as required under § 2000a, and § 2000c--8 applied to school segregation. Their claim under § 1971 of deprivation of voting rights failed because §</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					1971 did not provide for a private right of action. The court declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over various state law claims. Defendants' motion to dismiss was granted with respect to the candidates' federal claims; the state law claims were dismissed without prejudice.			
State ex rel. Mackey v. Blackwell	Supreme Court of Ohio	106 Ohio St. 3d 261; 2005 Ohio	September 28, 2005	Appellants, a political group and county electors who voted by provisional ballot,	The Secretary of State issued a directive to all Ohio county boards of	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
		4789; 834 N.E.2d 346; 2005 Ohio LEXIS 2074		sought review of a judgment from the court of appeals, which dismissed appellants' complaint, seeking a writ of mandamus to prevent appellees, the Ohio Secretary of State, a county board of elections, and the board's director, from disenfranchisement of provisional ballot voters.	elections, which specified that a signed affirmation statement was necessary for the counting of a provisional ballot in a presidential election. During the election, over 24,400 provisional ballots were cast in one county. The electors' provisional ballots were not counted. They, together with a political activist group, brought the mandamus action to compel appellants to prohibit the			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>invalidation of provisional ballots and to notify voters of reasons for ballot rejections. Assorted constitutional and statutory law was relied on in support of the complaint. The court dismissed the complaint, finding that no clear legal right was established under Ohio law and the federal claims could be adequately raised in an action under § 1983. On appeal, the Ohio supreme court</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					held that dismissal was proper, as the complaint actually sought declaratory and injunctive relief, rather than mandamus relief. Further, election--contest actions were the exclusive remedy to challenge election results. An adequate remedy existed under § 1983 to raise the federal--law claims. Affirmed.			
Touchston v. McDermott	United States District Court for	120 F. Supp. 2d 1055; 2000	November 14, 2000	In action in which plaintiffs, registered voters in Brevard County,	In their complaint, plaintiffs challenged 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
	the Middle District of Florida	U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20091		Florida, filed suit against defendants, members of several County Canvassing Boards and the Secretary of the Florida Department of State, challenging the constitutionality of Fla. Stat. Ann. § 102.166(4) (2000), before the court was plaintiffs' emergency motion for temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction.	constitutionality of § 102.166(4), asserting that the statute violated their rights under the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of U.S. Const. amend. XIV. Based on these claims, plaintiffs sought an order from the court stopping the manual recount of votes. The court found that plaintiffs had failed to set forth a valid basis for intervention by federal courts. They had not			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>alleged that the Florida law was discriminatory, that citizens were being deprived of the right to vote, or that there had been fraudulent interference with the vote. Moreover, plaintiffs had not established a likelihood of success on the merits of their claims. Plaintiffs' motion for temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction denied; plaintiffs had</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					not alleged that the Florida law was discriminatory, that citizens were being deprived of the right to vote, or that there had been fraudulent interference with the vote.			
Siegel v. LePore	United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida	120 F. Supp. 2d 1041; 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16333	November 13, 2000	Plaintiffs, individual Florida voters and Republican Party presidential and vice-presidential candidates, moved for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction to enjoin defendants, canvassing board members from four Florida	The court addressed who should consider plaintiffs' serious arguments that manual recounts would diminish the accuracy of vote counts due to ballot degradation and the exercise of discretion in determining	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>counties, from proceeding with manual recounts of election ballots.</p>	<p>voter intent. The court ruled that intervention by a federal district court, particularly on a preliminary basis, was inappropriate. A federal court should not interfere except where there was an immediate need to correct a constitutional violation. Plaintiffs neither demonstrated a clear deprivation of a constitutional injury or a fundamental unfairness in Florida's manual</p>			

014047

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					recount provision. The recount provision was reasonable and non--discriminatory on its face and resided within the state's broad control over presidential election procedures. Plaintiffs failed to show that manual recounts were so unreliable as to constitute a constitutional injury, that plaintiffs' alleged injuries were irreparable, or that they lacked			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					an adequate state court remedy. Injunctive relief denied because plaintiffs demonstrated neither clear deprivation of constitutional injury or fundamental unfairness in Florida's manual recount provision to justify federal court interference in state election procedures.			
Gore v. Harris	Supreme Court of Florida	773 So. 2d 524; 2000 Fla. LEXIS 2474	December 22, 2000	In a contest to results of the 2000 presidential election in Florida, the United States Supreme Court	The state supreme court had ordered the trial court to conduct a manual recount	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>reversed and remanded a Florida Supreme Court decision that had ordered a manual recount of certain ballots.</p>	<p>of 9000 contested Miami--Dade County ballots, and also held that uncounted "undervotes" in all Florida counties were to be manually counted. The trial court was ordered to use the standard that a vote was "legal" if there was a clear indication of the intent of the voter. The United States Supreme Court released an opinion on December 12, 2000, which held that such a</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>standard violated equal protection rights because it lacked specific standards to ensure equal application, and also mandated that any manual recount would have to have been completed by December 12, 2000. On remand, the state supreme court found that it was impossible under that time frame to adopt adequate standards and make necessary evaluations of vote tabulation</p>			

014051

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					equipment. Also, development of a specific, uniform standard for manual recounts was best left to the legislature. Because adequate standards for a manual recount could not be developed by the deadline set by the United States Supreme Court, appellants were afforded no relief.			
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 absentee ballots violated	Plaintiff alleged that defendants counted unlawful absentee ballots	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>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 election results tabulated without such ballots.</p>	<p>that lacked postmarks, 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 court held that plaintiff was not entitled to relief since he failed</p>			

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

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 proper.</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					Plaintiff's request for declaratory and injunctive relief was denied. Invalidation of absentee ballots was not required since the irregularities asserted by plaintiff involved ballots which were in fact valid, were not tabulated by defendants, or were insufficient to change the outcome of the election.			
Shannon v. Jacobowitz	United States Court of Appeals for the	394 F.3d 90; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS	January 7, 2005	Plaintiffs, voters and an incumbent candidate, sued defendants, a challenger	Local election inspectors noticed a problem with a voting machine.	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
	Second Circuit	259		<p>candidate, a county board of election, and commissioners, pursuant to § 1983 alleging violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The United States District Court for the Northern District of New York granted summary judgment in favor of plaintiffs. Defendants appealed.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs asserted that their votes were not counted due to the machine malfunction. Rather than pursue the state remedy of quo warranto, by requesting that New York's Attorney General investigate the machine malfunction and challenge the election results in state court, plaintiffs filed their complaint in federal court. The court of appeals found that United States Supreme</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>Court jurisprudence required intentional conduct by state actors as a prerequisite for a due process violation. Neither side alleged that local officials acted intentionally or in a discriminatory manner with regard to the vote miscount. Both sides conceded that the recorded results were likely due to an unforeseen malfunction with the voting</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>machine.  Because no conduct was alleged that would indicate an intentional deprivation of the right to vote, there was no cognizable federal due process claim. The proper remedy was to assert a quo warranto action to challenge the outcome of a general election based on an alleged voting machine malfunction. The district court's grant of summary judgment was</p>			

014059

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					reversed and its injunctions were vacated. The case was remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.			
GEORGE W. BUSH v. PALM BEACH COUNTY CANVASSING BOARD, ET AL.	United States Supreme Court	531 U.S. 70; 121 S. Ct. 471; 148 L. Ed. 2d 366; 2000 U.S. LEXIS 8087	December 4, 2000	Appellant Republican presidential candidate's petition for writ of certiorari to the Florida supreme court was granted in a case involving interpretations of Fla. Stat. Ann. §§ 102.111, 102.112, in proceedings brought by appellees Democratic presidential candidate, county	The Supreme Court vacated the state court's judgment, finding that the state court opinion could be read to indicate that it construed the Florida Election Code without regard to the extent to which the Florida Constitution could, consistent with	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>canvassing boards, and Florida Democratic Party regarding authority of the boards and respondent Florida Secretary of State as to manual recounts of ballots and deadlines.</p>	<p>U.S. Const. art. II, § 1, cl. 2, circumscribe the legislative power. The judgment of the Florida Supreme Court was vacated and remanded for further proceedings. The court stated the judgment was unclear as to the extent to which the state court saw the Florida constitution as circumscribing the legislature's authority under Article II of the United States Constitution, and as to the</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					consideration given the federal statute regarding state electors.			
Touchston v. McDermott	United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit	234 F.3d 1130; 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS 29366	November 17, 2000	Plaintiff voters appealed from judgment of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, which denied their emergency motion for an injunction pending appeal against defendant county election officials. Plaintiffs sought to enjoin defendants from conducting manual ballot recounts or to enjoin defendants from certifying results of the presidential	Plaintiff voters sought an emergency injunction pending appeal to enjoin defendant county election officials from conducting manual ballot recounts or to enjoin defendants from certifying the results of the Presidential election which contained any manual recounts. The district 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
				election that contained any manual recounts.	denied the emergency injunction and plaintiffs appealed. Upon review, the emergency motion for injunction pending appeal was denied without prejudice. Florida had adequate election dispute procedures, which had been invoked and were being implemented in the forms of administrative actions by state officials and actions in state court.			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>Therefore, the state procedures were adequate to preserve for ultimate review in the United States Supreme Court any federal questions arising out of the state procedures. Moreover, plaintiffs failed to demonstrate a substantial threat of an irreparable injury that would warrant granting the extraordinary remedy of an injunction pending appeal. Denial of</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>plaintiff's petition for emergency injunction pending appeal was affirmed. The state procedures were adequate to preserve any federal issue for review, and plaintiffs failed to demonstrate a substantial threat of an irreparable injury that would have warranted granting the extraordinary remedy of the injunction.</p>			
Gore v. Harris	Supreme Court of Florida	772 So. 2d 1243; 2000 Fla.	December 8, 2000	The court of appeal certified as being of great	Appellants contested the certification of	No	N/A	No

014065

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
		LEXIS 2373		public importance a trial court judgment that denied all relief requested by appellants, candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, in appellants' contest to certified election results.	their opponents as the winners of Florida's electoral votes. The Florida supreme court found no error in the trial court's holding that it was proper to certify election night returns from Nassau County rather than results of a machine recount. Nor did the trial court err in refusing to include votes that the Palm Beach County Canvassing Board found not to be legal votes during a manual			

014066

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>recount. However, the trial court erred in excluding votes that were identified during the Palm Beach County manual recount and during a partial manual recount in Miami--Dade County. It was also error to refuse to examine Miami--Dade County ballots that registered as non--votes during the machine count. The trial court applied an improper standard to</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>determine whether appellants had established that the result of the election was in doubt, and improperly concluded that there was no probability of a different result without examining the ballots that appellants claimed contained rejected legal votes. The judgment was reversed and remanded; the trial court was ordered to tabulate by hand Miami-Dade</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>County ballots that the counting machine registered as non--votes, and was directed to order inclusion of votes that had already been identified during manual recounts. The trial court also was ordered to consider whether manual recounts in other counties were necessary.</p>			