Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					additional punishment for crimes he committed before the statute's enactment and thus violated his due process rights and the prohibition against ex post facto laws and bills of attainder. The court held that the statute was regulatory and not punitive because rational choices were implicated in the statute's disenfranchisement of persons under guardianship, persons disqualified because of corrupt elections practices, persons under 18			

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

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					motion for summary judgment.			
Hayden v. Pataki	United States District Court for the Southern District of New York	2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10863	June 14, 2004	In a 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 action filed by plaintiffs, black and latino convicted felons, alleging that N.Y. Const. art. II, § 3 and N.Y. Elec. Law § 5--106(2) were unconstitutional, defendants, New York's governor and the chairperson of the board of elections, moved for judgment on the pleadings under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(c).	The felons sued defendants, alleging that N.Y. Const. art. II, § 3 and N.Y. Elec. Law § 5--106(2) unlawfully denied suffrage to incarcerated and paroled felons on account of their race. The court granted defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings on the felons' claims under U.S. Const. amend. XIV, XV because their factual allegations were insufficient from which to draw an inference	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
					that the challenged provisions or their predecessors were enacted with discriminatory intent, and because denying suffrage to those who received more severe punishments, such as a term of incarceration, and not to those who received a lesser punishment, such as probation, was not arbitrary. The felons' claims under 42 U.S.C.S. § 1973 were dismissed because § 1973 could not be used to challenge the legality of N.Y. Elec. Law § 5--106. Defendants'			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					motion was granted as to the felons' claims under 42 U.S.C.S. § 1971 because § 1971 did not provide for a private right of action, and because the felons were not "otherwise qualified to vote." The court also granted defendants' motion on the felons' U.S. Const. amend. I claim because it did not guarantee a felon the right to vote. Defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings was granted in the felons' § 1983			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					action.			
Farrakhan v. Washington	United States Court for Appeals for the Ninth Circuit	338 F.3d 1009; 2003 U.S. App. LEXIS 14810	July 25, 2003	Plaintiff inmates sued defendant state officials, claiming that Washington state's felon disenfranchisement scheme constitutes improper race--based vote denial in violation of § 2 of the Voting Rights Act. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington granted of summary judgment dismissing the inmates' claims. The inmates appealed.	Upon conviction of infamous crimes in the state, (that is, crimes punishable by death or imprisonment in a state correctional facility), the inmates were disenfranchised. The inmates claimed that the disenfranchisement scheme violated § 2 because the criminal justice system was biased against minorities, causing a disproportionate minority representation among those being disenfranchised. The appellate court held, inter alia, 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
					the district court erred in failing to consider evidence of racial bias in the state's criminal justice system in determining whether the state's felon disenfranchisement laws resulted in denial of the right to vote on account of race. Instead of applying its novel "by itself" causation standard, the district court should have applied a totality of the circumstances test that included analysis of the inmates' compelling evidence of racial			

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

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					claim.			
In re Phillips	Supreme Court of Virginia	265 Va. 81; 574 S.E.2d 270; 2003 Va. LEXIS 10	January 10, 2003	The circuit court, entered a judgment in which it declined to consider petitioner former felon's petition for approval of her request to seek restoration of her eligibility to register to vote. The former felon appealed.	More than five years earlier, the former felon was convicted of the felony of making a false written statement incident to a firearm purchase. She then petitioned the trial court asking it to approve her request to seek restoration of her eligibility to register to vote. Her request was based on Va. Code Ann. § 53.1--231.2, allowing persons convicted of non--violent felonies to petition a trial court for approval of a request to seek	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
					restoration of voting rights. The trial court declined. It found that Va. Code Ann. § 53.1--231.2 violated constitutional separation of powers principles since it gave the trial court powers belonging to the governor. It also found that even if the statute was constitutional, it was fundamentally flawed for not providing notice to respondent Commonwealth regarding a petition. After the petition was denied, the state supreme court			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					found the separation of powers principles were not violated since the statute only allowed the trial court to determine if an applicant met the requirements to have voting eligibility restored. It also found the statute was not fundamentally flawed since the Commonwealth was not an interested party entitled to notice. OUTCOME: The judgment was reversed and the case was remanded for further proceedings.			
Howard v.	United States	2000	February	Appellant	Appellant was	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
Gilmore	Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit	U.S. App. LEXIS 2680	23, 2000	challenged the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia's order summarily dismissing his complaint, related to his inability to vote as a convicted felon, for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.	disenfranchised by the Commonwealth of Virginia following his felony conviction. He challenged that decision by suing the Commonwealth under the U.S. Const. amends. I, XIV, XV, XIX, and XXIV, and under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The lower court summarily dismissed his complaint under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim. Appellant challenged. The court found U.S. Const. amend. I			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					created no private right of action for seeking reinstatement of previously canceled voting rights, U.S. Const. amends. XIV, XV, XIX, and the VRA required either gender or race discrimination, neither of which appellant asserted, and the U.S. Const. amend. XXIV, while prohibiting the imposition of poll taxes, did not prohibit the imposition of a $10 fee for reinstatement of appellant's civil rights, including the right to vote. Consequently,			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					appellant failed to state a claim. The court affirmed, finding that none of the constitutional provisions appellant relied on were properly pled because appellant failed to assert that either his race or gender were involved in the decisions to deny him the vote. Conditioning reestablishment of his civil rights on a $10 fee was not unconstitutional.			
Johnson v. Governor of Fla.	United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit	353 F.3d 1287; 2003 U.S. App. LEXIS	December 19, 2003	Plaintiffs, ex--felon citizens of Florida, on their own right and on behalf of others, sought review of a	The citizens alleged that Fla. Const. art. VI, § 4 (1968) was racially discriminatory and violated their	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
		25859		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.	constitutional rights. The citizens also alleged violations of the Voting Rights Act. The court initially examined the history of Fla. Const. art. VI, § 4 (1968) and determined that the citizens had presented evidence that historically the disenfranchisement provisions were motivated by a discriminatory animus. The citizens had met their initial burden of showing that race was a substantial motivating factor. The state was then required to show			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					that the current disenfranchisement provisions would have been enacted absent the impermissible discriminatory intent. Because the state had not met its burden, summary judgment should not have been granted. The court found that the claim under the Voting Rights Act, also needed to be remanded for further proceedings. Under a totality of the circumstances, the district court needed to analyze whether intentional racial discrimination was			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					behind the Florida disenfranchisement provisions, in violation of the Voting Rights Act. The court affirmed the district court's decision to grant summary judgment on the citizens' poll tax claim. The court reversed the district court's decision to grant summary judgment to the Board on the claims under the equal protection clause and for violation of federal voting laws and remanded the matter to the district court for further proceedings.			
State v. Black	Court of	2002	September	In 1997, petitioner	The appellate	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
	Appeals of Tennessee	Tenn. App. LEXIS 696	26, 2002	was convicted of forgery and sentenced to the penitentiary for two years, but was immediately placed on probation. He subsequently petitioned the circuit court for restoration of citizenship. The trial court restored his citizenship rights. The State appealed. The appellate court issued its opinion, but granted the State's motions to supplement the record and to rehear its decision.	court's original opinion found that petitioner had not lost his right to hold public office because Tennessee law removed that right only from convicted felons who were "sentenced to the penitentiary." The trial court's amended judgment made it clear that petitioner was in fact sentenced to the penitentiary. Based upon this correction to the record, the appellate court found that petitioner's sentence to the penitentiary resulted in the			

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

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					showing, by a preponderance of the evidence, of good cause to deny the petition for restoration of citizenship rights. The appellate court affirmed the restoration of petitioner's right to vote and reversed the denial of his right to seek and hold public office. His full rights of citizenship were restored.			
Johnson v. Governor of Fla.	United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit	405 F.3d 1214; 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 5945	April 12, 2005	Plaintiff individuals sued defendant members of Florida Clemency Board, arguing that Florida's felon disenfranchisement law, Fla. Const.	The individuals argued that the racial animus motivating the adoption of Florida's disenfranchisement laws in 1868 remained legally	No	N/A	No

014392

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				art. VI, § 4 (1968), violated the Equal Protection Clause and 42 U.S.C.S. § 1973. The United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida granted the members summary judgment. A divided appellate panel reversed. The panel opinion was vacated and a rehearing en banc was granted.	operative despite the reenactment of Fla. Const. art. VI, § 4 in 1968. The subsequent reenactment eliminated any discriminatory taint from the law as originally enacted because the provision narrowed the class of disenfranchised individuals and was amended through a deliberative process. Moreover, there was no allegation of racial discrimination at the time of the reenactment. Thus, the disenfranchisement provision was not			

014393

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					a violation of the Equal Protection Clause and the district court properly granted the members summary judgment on that claim. The argument that 42 U.S.C.S. § 1973 applied to Florida's disenfranchisement provision was rejected because it raised grave constitutional concerns, i.e., prohibiting a practice that the Fourteenth Amendment permitted the state to maintain. In addition, the legislative history indicated that Congress never			

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

014403

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

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

014405

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

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

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

014408

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

014409

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

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

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

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

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.			

014414

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

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

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

014418

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

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.			

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

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

014422

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

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

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

014425

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

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

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

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

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

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

014431

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
New York v. County of Del.	United States District Court for the Northern District of New York	82 F. Supp. 2d 12; 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1398	February 8, 2000	Plaintiffs brought a claim in the district court under the Americans With Disabilities Act and filed a motion for a preliminary injunction and motion for leave to amend their complaint, and defendants were ordered to show cause why a preliminary injunction should not be issued.	In their complaint plaintiffs alleged that defendants violated the ADA by making the voting locations inaccessible to disabled persons and asked for a preliminary injunction requiring defendants to come into compliance before the next election. The court found that defendants were the correct parties, because	No	N/A	No

014432

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					pursuant to New York election law defendants were responsible for the voting locations. The court further found that the class plaintiffs represented would suffer irreparable harm if they were not able to vote, because, if the voting locations were inaccessible, disabled persons would be denied the right to vote. Also, due to the alleged			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					facts, the court found plaintiffs would likely succeed on the merits. Consequently, the court granted plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. The court granted plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction and granted plaintiffs' motion for leave to amend their complaint.			
New York v. County of Schoharie	United States District	82 F. Supp. 2d 19; 2000	February 8, 2000	Plaintiffs brought a claim in the	In their complaint, plaintiffs	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
	Court for the Northern District of New York	U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1399		district court under the Americans With Disabilities Act and filed a motion for a preliminary injunction and a motion for leave to amend their complaint, and defendants were ordered to show cause why a preliminary injunction should not be issued.	alleged defendants violated the ADA by allowing voting locations to be inaccessible for disabled persons and asked for a preliminary injunction requiring defendants to come into compliance before the next election. The court found that defendants were the correct party, because pursuant to New York election law,			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					defendants were responsible for the voting locations. The court further found that the class plaintiffs represented would suffer irreparable harm if they were not able to vote, because, if the voting locations were inaccessible, disabled persons would be denied the right to vote. Also, the court found that plaintiffs would likely succeed on the			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					merits of their case. Consequently, the court granted plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. The court granted plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction because plaintiffs showed irreparable harm and proved likely success on the merits and granted plaintiff's motion for leave to amend the complaint.			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Westchester Disabled on the Move, Inc. v. County of Westchester	United States District Court for the Southern District of New York	346 F. Supp. 2d 473; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24203	October 22, 2004	Plaintiffs sued defendant county, county board of elections, and election officials pursuant to 42 U.S.C.S. §§ 12131--12134, N.Y. Exec. Law § 296, and N.Y. Elec. Law § 4--1--4. Plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction, requesting (among other things) that the court order defendants to modify the polling places in the county so that they	The inability to vote at assigned locations on election day constituted irreparable harm. However, plaintiffs could not show a likelihood of success on the merits because the currently named defendants could not provide complete relief sought by plaintiffs. Although the county board of elections was empowered to	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				were accessible to disabled voters on election day. Defendants moved to dismiss.	select an alternative polling place should it determine that a polling place designated by a municipality was "unsuitable or unsafe," it was entirely unclear that its power to merely designate suitable polling places would be adequate to ensure that all polling places used in the upcoming election actually conformed			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Substantial changes and modifications to existing facilities would have to be made, and such changes would be difficult, if not impossible, to make without the cooperation of municipalities. Further, the court could order defendants to approve voting machines that conformed to			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					the ADA were they to be purchased and submitted for county approval, but the court could not order them to purchase them for the voting districts in the county. A judgment issued in the absence of the municipalities would be inadequate. Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction was denied, and defendants' motion to dismiss was granted.			

014441

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Nat'l Org. on Disability v. Tartaglione	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania	2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16731	October 11, 2001	Plaintiffs, disabled voters and special interest organizations, sued defendants, city commissioners, under the Americans with Disabilities Act and § 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and regulations under both statutes, regarding election practices. The commissioners moved to dismiss for failure (1) to	The voters were visually impaired or wheelchair bound. They challenged the commissioners' failure to provide talking voting machines and wheelchair accessible voting places. They claimed discrimination in the process of voting because they were not afforded the same opportunity to participate in the voting process as non--disabled	No	N/A	Yes-see if the case was refiled

014442

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				state a cause of action and (2) to join an indispensable party.	voters, and assisted voting and voting by alternative ballot were substantially different from, more burdensome than, and more intrusive than the voting process utilized by non--disabled voters. The court found that the complaint stated causes of actions under the ADA, the Rehabilitation Act, and 28 C.F.R. §§ 35.151 and			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					35.130. The court found that the voters and organizations had standing to raise their claims. The organizations had standing through the voters' standing or because they used significant resources challenging the commissioners' conduct. The plaintiffs failed to join the state official who would need to approve any talking voting machine as a			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					party. As the court could not afford complete relief to the visually impaired voters in that party's absence, it granted the motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(7) without prejudice. The court granted the commissioners' motion to dismiss in part, and denied it in part. The court granted the motion to dismiss the claims of the			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					visually impaired voters for failure to join an indispensable party, without prejudice, and with leave to amend the complaint.			
TENNESSEE, Petitioner v. GEORGE LANE et al.	United States Supreme Court	541 U.S. 509; 124 S. Ct. 1978; 158 L. Ed. 2d 820; 2004 U.S. LEXIS 3386	May 17, 2004	Respondent paraplegics sued petitioner State of Tennessee, alleging that the State failed to provide reasonable access to court facilities in violation of Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act	The state contended that the abrogation of state sovereign immunity in Title II of the ADA exceeded congressional authority under U.S. Const. amend XIV, § 5, to enforce substantive constitutional guarantees.	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
				of 1990. Upon the grant of a writ of certiorari, the State appealed the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit which denied the State's claim of sovereign immunity.	The United States Supreme Court held, however, that Title II, as it applied to the class of cases implicating the fundamental right of access to the courts, constituted a valid exercise of Congress's authority. Title II was responsive to evidence of pervasive unequal treatment of persons with disabilities in the administration of state			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					services and programs, and such disability discrimination was thus an appropriate subject for prophylactic legislation. Regardless of whether the State could be subjected to liability for failing to provide access to other facilities or services, the fundamental right of access to the courts warranted the limited requirement that the State reasonably			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					accommodate disabled persons to provide such access. Title II was thus a reasonable prophylactic measure, reasonably targeted to a legitimate end. The judgment denying the State's claim of sovereign immunity was affirmed.			

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

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

014451

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

014452

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

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

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

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

014450

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

014457

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Miller v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the southern District of Ohio	348 F. Supp. 2d 916; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24894	October 27, 2004	Plaintiffs, two voters and the Ohio Democratic Party, filed suit against defendants, the Ohio Secretary of State, several county boards of elections, and all of the boards' members, alleging claims under the National Voter Registration Act and § 1983. Plaintiffs also filed a motion for a temporary restraining order. Two individuals filed a motion to intervene as defendants.	Plaintiffs alleged that the timing and manner in which defendants intended to hold hearings regarding pre--election challenges to their voter registration violated both the Act and the Due Process Clause. The individuals, who filed pre--election voter eligibility challenges, filed a motion to intervene. The court held that it would grant the motion to intervene because the individuals had a substantial legal interest 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
					the subject matter of the action and time constraints would not permit them to bring separate actions to protect their rights. The court further held that it would grant plaintiffs' motion for a TRO because plaintiffs made sufficient allegations in their complaint to establish standing and because all four factors to consider in issuing a TRO weighed heavily in favor of doing so. The court found that plaintiffs demonstrated a			

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

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					court also granted the individuals' motion to intervene.			
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 polls.	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	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
					allowing challengers to challenge voters' eligibility would place an undue burden on voters and impede their right to vote, was not speculative and could be redressed by removing the challengers. The court held that in the absence of any statutory guidance whatsoever governing the procedures and limitations for challenging voters by challengers, and the questionable enforceability of the State's and			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					County's policies regarding good faith challenges and ejection of disruptive challengers from the polls, there existed an enormous risk of 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			

014463

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					substantial likelihood of success on the merits on the ground that the application of Ohio's statute allowing challengers at polling places was unconstitutional 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			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					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 Mariana Islands reversing a lower court's grant of summary judgment in favor of defendants on the ground of qualified immunity.	Plaintiffs, disqualified voters, claimed that individual members of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Board of Elections violated § 1983 by 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	No	N/A	No

014465

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

014466

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

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					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 Election Law unconstitutionally prevented the voters from voting in local elections in both cities where they resided. The voters appealed the order of the	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, since they had two lawful residences, they were denied constitutional equal protection by the statutory restriction against voting in the local elections of both	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
				United States District Court for the Southern District of New York which granted appellees' motion to dismiss the complaint.	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 interests. While the voters may have interests in electoral outcomes in both cities, any rule permitting voting based on such interests would be			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					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 choose which of their residences was their domicile for voting purposes could not be deemed			

014470

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					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 Texas law, three resident voters filed affidavits challenging the escapees'	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
					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 court issued a preliminary injunction			

014472