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			

011348

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

011349

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			

011350

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			

011351

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

011352

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			

011353

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			

011354

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

011355

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			

011356

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					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 election. Motion for preliminary injunction was			

011357

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					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. LEXIS 42	January 15, 2004	Plaintiff political party appealed a judgment from the superior court which denied the party's petition for writ of mandate to compel	The trial court ruled that inactive voters were excluded from the primary election. The court of appeals affirmed, observing that although the	No	N/A	No

011358

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

011359

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

011350

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					certain conditions, inactive voters in 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	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	No	N/A	No

011361

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				moved for summary judgment.	afford them the requisite degree of due process and contravened their rights of privacy 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			

011362

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

011363

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					resolve that challenge, did not contravene the MVA. Defendants' motions for 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.			

011364

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

011365

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			

011366

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

011367

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			

011368

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

011369

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					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.			
Nat'l	United	150 F.	July 5,	Plaintiff, national	Defendants	No	N/A	No

011370

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			

011371

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

011372

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

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

011373

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

011374

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

011375

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

011376

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of standing and failure to state a claim.	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			

011377

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

011378

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

011379

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

011380

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

011381

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

011392

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

011383

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

011384

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

011385

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
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 of the Fourteenth Amendment. The United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio	The voters asserted that § 3503.02---- which stated that the place 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	No	N/A	No

011386

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				granted summary judgment in favor of defendants. The voters appealed.	not intend to bar the removal of names from the official list of persons who were ineligible and improperly registered to vote 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			

011387

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					all applicants for registration to vote actually fulfilled the requirement of bona fide residence. Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 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.			

011388

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Wilson v. Commonwealth	Court of Appeals of Virginia	2000 Va. App. LEXIS 322	May 2, 2000	Defendant appealed the judgment of the circuit court which convicted her of election fraud.	On appeal, defendant argued that the evidence was insufficient to support her conviction because it failed to prove that she made a willfully false statement on her voter registration form and, even if the evidence did prove that she made such a statement, it did not prove that the voter registration form was the form required by Title 24.2. At trial, the Commonwealth	No	N/A	No

011389

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

011390

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					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 by Title 24.2 in order for her to be a candidate for office in the primary in question. Judgment of conviction affirmed. Evidence, including			

011391

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					records showing electricity and water usage, records from the Department of Motor Vehicles and school records, was sufficient to support 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.			
ACLU of Minn. v.	United States	2004 U.S. Dist.	October 29, 2004	Plaintiffs, voters and	Plaintiffs argued that	No	N/A	No

011392

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.	Minn. Stat. § 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			

011393

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

011394

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

011395

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					their claims that Minn. R. 8200.5100, violated the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution. A temporary restraining order was entered.			
Kalsson v. United States FEC	United States District Court for the Southern District of New York	356 F. Supp. 2d 371; 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2279	February 16, 2005	Defendant Federal Election Commission filed a motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction plaintiff individual's action, which sought a declaration that	The individual claimed that his vote was diluted because the NVRA resulted in more people registering to vote than otherwise would have been the case. The court held that the	No	N/A	No

011396

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				the National Voter Registration Act was unconstitutional on the theories that its enactment was not within the enumerated powers of the federal government and that it violated Article II of the United States Constitution.	individual lacked standing to bring the action. Because New York was not obliged to adhere to the requirements of the NVRA, the individual did not allege any concrete harm. If New York simply adopted election day registration for elections for federal office, it would have been entirely free of the NVRA just as were five other states. Even if the individual's vote were diluted, and			

011397

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					even if such an injury in other circumstances might have sufficed for standing, any dilution that he suffered was the result of New York's decision to maintain a voter registration system that brought it under the NVRA, not the NVRA itself. The court granted the motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.			
Peace &	California	114 Cal.	January 15,	Plaintiff	The trial court	No	N/A	No

011398

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Freedom Party v. Shelley	Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District	App. 4th 1237; 8 Cal. Rptr. 3d 497; 2004 Cal. App. LEXIS 42	2004	political party appealed a judgment from the superior court which denied the party's petition for writ of 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.	ruled that inactive voters were excluded from the primary election calculation. The court of appeals affirmed, 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			

011399

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					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 that all parties on the ballot had a significant modicum of support from eligible voters. Information in the inactive file			

011400

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

011404

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					vote. Affirmed.			
McKay v. Thompson	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	226 F.3d 752; 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS 23387	September 18, 2000	Plaintiff 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.	The trial court 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 caselaw, and could be	No	N/A	No

011402

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					challenged in state court. The requirement did not violate the Privacy Act because it 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. Plaintiff			

011403

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					could not enforce § 1971 as it was enforceable only by the United States Attorney General. The trial court properly rejected plaintiff's fundamental right to vote, free exercise of religion, privileges and immunities, and due process claims. Although the trial court arguably erred in denying certification of the case to the USAG under			

011404

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					28 U.S.C.S. § 2403(a), plaintiff suffered no harm from the technical violation. 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			

011405

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					right to vote, free exercise of religion, privileges and immunities, and due process claims.			
Lucas County Democratic Party v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio	341 F. Supp. 2d 861; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21416	October 21, 2004	Plaintiff organizations brought an action challenging a memorandum issued by defendant, Ohio's Secretary of State, in December 2003. The organizations claimed that the memorandum contravened provisions of the Help America Vote	The case involved a box on Ohio's voter registration form that required a prospective voter who registered in person to supply an Ohio driver's license number or the last four digits of their Social Security number. In his memorandum, the Secretary informed all	No	N/A	No

011306

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				Act and the National Voter Registration Act. The organizations moved for a preliminary injunction.	Ohio County Boards of Elections that, if a person left the box blank, the Boards were not to process the registration forms. The organizations did not file their suit until 18 days before the national election. The court found that there was not enough time before the election to develop the evidentiary record necessary to determine if the organizations			

011407

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					were likely to succeed on the merits of their claim. Denying the organizations' motion would have caused them to suffer no irreparable harm. There was no appropriate remedy available to the organizations at the time. The likelihood that the organizations could have shown irreparable harm was, in any event, slight in view of the fact that			

011408

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					they waited so long before filing suit. Moreover, it would have been entirely improper for the court to order the Boards to re--open in--person registration until election day. The public interest would have been ill--served by an injunction. The motion for a preliminary injunction was denied sua sponte.			
Nat'l Coalition for Students with Disabilities	United States District Court for	150 F. Supp. 2d 845; 2001 U.S. Dist.	July 5, 2001	Plaintiff, national organization for disabled	Defendants alleged that plaintiff lacked standing to	No	N/A	No

011409

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Educ. & Legal Def. Fund v. Scales	the District of Maryland	LEXIS 9528		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.	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 registered			

011410

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

011411

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					the court found that the agency practice of only offering voter 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			

011412

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					university. Defendants' motion to dismiss first amended complaint was granted as to the § 1983 claimand denied as to plaintiff's claims brought under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. Defendants' alternative motion for summary judgment was denied.			
People v. Disimone	Court of Appeals of Michigan	251 Mich. App. 605; 650 N.W.2d 436; 2002	July 11, 2002	Defendant was charged with attempting to vote more than once in the	Defendant was registered in the Colfax township for the 2000	No	N/A	No

011413

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
		Mich. App. LEXIS 826		2000 general election. The circuit court granted defendant's motion that the State had to prove specific intent. The State appealed.	general election. After presenting what appeared to be a valid voter's registration card, defendant proceeded to vote in the Grant township. Defendant had voted in the Colfax township earlier in the day. Defendant moved the court to issue an order that the State had to find that he had a specific intent to vote twice in order to be convicted. The appellate court			

011414

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					reversed the circuit court judgment and held that under the rules of statutory construction, the fact that the legislature had specifically omitted certain trigger words such as "knowingly," "willingly," "purposefully," or "intentionally" it was unlikely that the legislature had intended for this to be a specific intent crime. The court also rejected the			

011415

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					defendant's argument that phrases such as "offer to vote" and "attempt to vote" should be construed as synonymous terms, as when words with similar meanings were used in the same statute, it was presumed that the legislature intended to distinguish between the terms. The order of the circuit court was reversed.			
Diaz v. Hood	United States District	342 F. Supp. 2d 1111; 2004	October 26, 2004	Plaintiffs, unions and individuals who	The putative voters sought injunctive relief	No	N/A	No

011416

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
	Court for the Southern District of Florida	U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21445		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 moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of standing	requiring the election officials to register themto 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 capacity, the second failed to check a box			

011417

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				and failure to state a claim.	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			

011418

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

011419

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					injury. Standing failed against the secretary of state. The motions to dismiss the complaint were granted without prejudice.			
Charles H. Wesley Educ. Found., Inc. v. Cox	United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia	324 F. Supp. 2d 1358; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12120	July 1, 2004	Plaintiffs, a voter, fraternity members, and an organization, sought an injunction ordering defendant, the Georgia Secretary of State, to process the voter registration application forms that they mailed in	The organization participated in numerous non--partisan voter registration drives primarily designed to increase the voting strength of African--Americans. Following one such drive, the fraternity members	No	N/A	No

011420

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				following a voter registration drive. They contended that by refusing to process the forms defendants violated the National Voter Registration Act and U.S. Const. amends. I, XIV, and XV.	mailed in over 60 registration forms, including one for the voter who had moved within state since the last election. The Georgia Secretary of State's office refused to process them because they were not mailed individually and neither a registrar, deputy registrar, or an otherwise authorized person had collected the applications as			

011421

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					required under state law. The court held that plaintiffs had standing to bring the action. The court held that because the applications were received in accordance with the mandates of the NVRA, the State of Georgia was not free to reject them. The court found that: plaintiffs had a substantial likelihood of prevailing on the merits of their claim that			

011422

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					the applications were improperly rejected; plaintiffs would be irreparably injured absent an injunction; the potential harmto defendants was outweighed by plaintiffs' injuries; and an injunction was in the public interest. Plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction was granted. Defendants were ordered to process the applications received from			

011423

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					the organization to determine whether those registrants were qualified to vote. Furthermore, defendants were enjoined from rejecting any voter registration application on the grounds that it was mailed as part of a "bundle" or that it was collected by someone not authorized or any other reason contrary to the NVRA.			
Moseley v. Price	United States	300 F. Supp. 2d	January 22, 2004	Plaintiff alleged, that	The court concluded that	No	N/A	No

011424

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
	District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia	389; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 850		defendants' actions in investigating his voter registration application constituted a change in voting procedures requiring § 5 preclearance under the Voting Rights Act, which preclearance was never sought or received. Plaintiff claimed he withdrew from the race for Commonwealth Attorney because of the investigation.	plaintiff's claim under the Voting Rights Act lacked merit. Plaintiff did not allege, as required, that any defendants implemented a new, uncleared voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure with respect to voting. Here, the existing practice or procedure in effect in the event a mailed registration card was			

011425

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				Defendants moved to dismiss the complaint.	returned was to "resend the voter card, if address verified as correct." This was what precisely occurred. Plaintiff inferred, however, that the existing voting rule or practice was to resend the voter card "with no adverse consequences" and that the county's initiation of an investigation constituted the implementation of a change that had not been pre--cleared.			

011426

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					The court found the inference wholly unwarranted because nothing in the written procedure invited or justified such an inference. The court opined that common sense and state law invited a different inference, namely that while a returned card had to be resent if the address was verified as correct, any allegation of			

011427

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					fraud could be investigated. Therefore, there was no new procedure for which preclearance was required. The court dismissed plaintiff's federal claims. The court dismissed the state law claims without prejudice.			
Thompson v. Karben	Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Second Department	295 A.D.2d 438; 743 N.Y.S.2d 175; 2002 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 6101	June 10, 2002	Respondents filed a motion seeking the cancellation of appellant's voter registration and political party enrollment on the ground that	Respondents alleged that appellant was unlawfully registered to vote from an address at which he did not reside and that he should	No	N/A	No

011428

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				appellant was unlawfully registered to vote in a particular district. The Supreme Court, Rockland County, New York, ordered the cancellation of appellant's voter registration and party enrollment. Appellant challenged the trial court's order.	have voted from the address that he claimed as his residence. The appellate court held that respondents adduced insufficient proof to support the conclusion that appellant did not reside at the subject address. On the other hand, appellant submitted copies of his 2002 vehicle registration, 2000 and 2001 federal income tax returns, 2002 property tax bill, a May			

011429

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					2001 paycheck stub, and 2000 and 2001 retirement account statements all showing the subject address. Appellant also testified that he was a signatory on the mortgage of the subject address and that he kept personal belongings at that address. Respondents did not sustain their evidentiary burden. The judgment of the trial court was reversed.			
Nat'l Coalition	United	2002 U.S.	August 2,	Plaintiffs, a	The court	No	N/A	No

011430

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
v. Taft	States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio	Dist. LEXIS 22376	2002	nonprofit public interest group and certain individuals, sued defendants, certain state and university officials, alleging that they violated the National Voter Registration Act in failing to designate the disability services offices at state public colleges and universities as voter registration sites. The group and individuals moved for a	found that the disability services offices at issue were subject to the NVRA because the term "office" included a subdivision of a government department or institution and the disability offices at issue were places where citizens regularly went for service and assistance. Moreover, the Ohio Secretary of State had an obligation under the NVRA to designate the			

011431

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				preliminary injunction.	disability services offices as voter registration sites because nothing in the law superceded the NVRA's requirement that the responsible state official designate disability services offices as voter registration sites. Moreover, under Ohio Rev. Code Ann. § 3501.05(R), the Secretary of State's duties expressly included			

011432

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ensuring compliance with the NVRA. The case was not moot even though the Secretary of State had taken steps to ensure compliance with the NVRA given his position to his obligation under the law. The court granted declaratory judgment in favor of the nonprofit organization and the individuals. The motion for a preliminary			

011433

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					injunction was granted in part and the Secretary of State was ordered to notify disabled students who had used the designated disability services offices prior to the opening day of the upcoming semester or who had pre--registered for the upcoming semester as to voter registration availability.			
Lawson v. Shelby County	United States Court of Appeals for the	211 F.3d 331; 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS	May 3, 2000	Plaintiffs who were denied the right to vote when they	Plaintiffs attempted to register to vote in October, and	No	N/A	No

011434

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
	Sixth Circuit	8634		refused to disclose their social security numbers, appealed a judgment of the United States District Court for the Western District of Tennessee at Memphis dismissing their amended complaint for failure to state claims barred by U.S. Const. amend. XI.	to vote in November, but were denied because they refused to disclose their social security numbers. A year after the election date they filed suit alleging denial of constitutional rights, privileges and immunities, the Privacy Act of 1974 and § 1983. The district court dismissed, finding the claims were barred by U.S. Const. amend. XI, and the one			

011435

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					year statute of limitations. The appeals court reversed, holding the district court erred in dismissing the suit because U.S. Const. amend. XI immunity did not apply to suits brought by a private party under the Ex Parte Young exception. Any damages claim not ancillary to injunctive relief was barred. The court also held the statute of limitations ran from the date plaintiffs			

011436

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					were denied the opportunity to vote, not register, and their claim was thus timely. Reversed and remanded to district court to order such relief as will allow plaintiffs to vote and other prospective injunctive relief against county and state officials; declaratory relief and attorneys' fees ancillary to the prospective injunctive relief, all permitted under			

011437

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					the Young exception to sovereign immunity, to be fashioned.			
Curtis v. Smith	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas	145 F. Supp. 2d 814; 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8544	June 4, 2001	Plaintiffs, representatives of several thousand retired persons who called themselves the "Escapees," and who spent a large part of their lives traveling about the United States in recreational vehicles, but were registered to vote in the county, moved for preliminary injunction seeking to	Before a general election, three persons brought an action alleging the Escapees were not bona fide residents of the county, and sought to have their names expunged from the rolls of qualified voters. The plaintiffs brought suit in federal district court. The court issued a	No	N/A	No

011438

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				enjoin a Texas state court proceeding under the All Writs Act.	preliminary injunction forbidding county officials from attempting to purge the voting. Commissioner contested the results of the election, alleging Escapees' votes should be disallowed. Plaintiffs brought present case assertedly to prevent the same issue from being relitigated. The court held, however, the issues were different, since,			

011439

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					unlike the case in the first proceeding, there was notice and an opportunity to be heard. Further, unlike the first proceeding, the plaintiff in the state court action did not seek to change the prerequisites for voting registration in the county, but instead challenged the actual residency of some members of the Escapees, and such challenge			

011460

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					properly belonged in the state court. The court further held that an election contest under state law was the correct vehicle to contest the registration of Escapees. The court dissolved the temporary restraining order it had previously entered and denied plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction of the state court proceeding.			
Pepper v. Darnell	United States Court	24 Fed. Appx. 460;	December 10, 2001	Plaintiff individual	Individual argued on	No	N/A	No

011441

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
	of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	2001 U.S. App. LEXIS 26618		appealed from a judgment of the district court, in an action against defendant state officials seeking relief under § 1983 and the National Voter Registration Act, for their alleged refusal to permit individual to register to vote. Officials had moved for dismissal or for summary judgment, and the district court granted the motion.	appeal that the district court erred in finding that the registration forms used by the state did not violate the NVRA and in failing to certify a class represented by individual. Individual lived in his automobile and received mail at a rented box. Officials refused to validate individual's attempt to register to vote by mail. Tennessee state law forbade			

011442

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					accepting a rented mail box as the address of the potential voter. Individual insisted that his automobile registration provided sufficient proof of residency under the NVRA. The court upheld the legality of state's requirement that one registering to vote provide a specific location as an address, regardless of the transient lifestyle of the			

011443

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					potential voter, finding state's procedure faithfully mirrored the requirements of the NVRA as codified in the Code of Federal Regulations. The court also held that the refusal to certify individual as the representative of a class for purposes of this litigation was not an abuse of discretion; in this case, no representative party was available as the			

011444

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					indigent individual, acting in his own behalf, was clearly unable to represent fairly the class. The district court's judgment was affirmed.			
Miller v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio	348 F. Supp. 2d 916; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24894	October 27, 2004	Plaintiffs, two voters and the Ohio Democratic Party, filed suit against defendants, the Ohio Secretary of State, several county boards of elections, and all of the boards' members, alleging claims under the	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	No	N/A	No

014745

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				National Voter Registration Act and § 1983. Plaintiffs also filed a motion for a temporary restraining order (TRO). Two individuals filed a motion to intervene as defendants.	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 the subject matter of the action and time constraints would not permit them to bring separate actions to protect their rights. The			

011445