



LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR  
**CIVIL RIGHTS**  
UNDER LAW

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON

# Voting Discrimination Against Racial and Ethnic Minorities 1994–2019



---

## ABOUT THE LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW

The Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law (Lawyers' Committee), a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization, was formed in 1963 at the request of President John F. Kennedy to involve the private bar in providing legal services to address racial discrimination. The principal mission of the Lawyers' Committee is to secure, through the rule of law, equal justice under the law, particularly in the areas of criminal justice, fair housing and fair lending, voting, education, and economic justice. For more information about the Lawyers' Committee, visit **[www.lawyerscommittee.org](http://www.lawyerscommittee.org)**.

---

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A tremendous thank you to the Voting Rights Project team of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law: Pooja Chaudhuri, Jacob Conrack, Brendan Downes, Jon Greenbaum, Julie Houk, Paul Joffe, Marcia Johnson-Blanco, Luis Patino, John Powers, Ezra Rosenberg, and Ryan Snow. We also thank the following firms in our *pro bono* network for their significant contributions: Ballard Spahr LLP; Bryan Cave Leighton Paisner LLP; Carlton Fields, P.A.; Crowell & Moring LLP; Duane Morris LLP; Holland & Knight LLP; King & Spalding LLP; Kirkland & Ellis LLP; Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone, P.L.C.; Nelson Mullins Riley & Scarborough LLP; Preti, Flaherty, Beliveau & Pachios, Chartered, LLP; Proskauer Rose LLP; Ropes & Gray LLP; Seeger Weiss LLP; WilmerHale LLP.

1500 K St., N.W., 9th Floor | Washington, D.C. 20005 | Phone: 202-662-8600

A publication of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law.  
CC-BY2019. This publication is covered by the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (see [creativecommons.org](http://creativecommons.org)). It may be reproduced in its entirety or modified as long as the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law is credited, a link to the license is included, and if changes were made to the original document, notification that changes were made is noted.

**T**his is the Preliminary Report of Racial and Ethnic Discrimination in Voting, 1994-2019 prepared by the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law. When completed, this Report will present in a unified package all administrative actions and court proceedings between 1994 and the present, based on claims of voting discrimination by state or local jurisdictions, that resulted in critical protections for protected racial or ethnic groups.

The Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law has a unique vantage point from which to analyze this information. Since 1963, when President John F. Kennedy enlisted the private bar's leadership and resources in combating racial discrimination, the Lawyers' Committee has been at the forefront of the battle for equal rights. The Lawyers' Committee created and staffed the National Commission on the Voting Rights Act, which made the largest contribution to the record supporting the 2006 reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act,<sup>1</sup> and participated in the legal defense of the two cases challenging the constitutionality of the reauthorization, *Northwest Austin Municipal Utility District No. 1 v. Holder*<sup>2</sup> and *Shelby Coun-*

*ty v. Holder*.<sup>3</sup> In 2014, the Lawyers' Committee organized the National Commission on Voting Rights which issued a report documenting ongoing voting discrimination.<sup>4</sup> For almost two decades, the Lawyers' Committee has led Election Protection, the largest and longest-running non-partisan voter protection program in the country. And, to this day, the Lawyers' Committee's docket of significant voting rights litigation is among the most comprehensive and far-reaching—both geographically and in terms of the issues raised—as any in the nation.

This preliminary report identifies approximately 340 instances between 1994 and the present where actions by state or local governments gave rise to either a finding of racial discrimination in voting by the Attorney General or a court, or a change in the jurisdiction's actions as a result of litigation brought claiming racial discrimination in voting. The vast majority involved court cases from all over the country, but with a disproportionate number arising from jurisdictions once covered by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. The remainder are objections interposed by the Attorney General pursuant to the then authority under

Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act to block or deny proposed changes in voting practices or procedures by jurisdictions formerly covered by Section 5.

The enormous number of findings of discrimination in a relatively small number of years serve as a sobering reminder that our fight for equality in the polling place is yet to be won.

## THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

In some ways, this Report is a response — albeit at this stage, preliminarily and partial — to the majority opinion in *Shelby County*, where the Supreme Court gutted Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, one of the most important and most protective pieces of civil rights legislation in our history. Section 5 required jurisdictions with a history of discrimination, based on a formula set forth in Section 4(b), to obtain preclearance of any voting changes from the Department of Justice or the District Court in the District of Columbia before implementing the voting change. In the *Shelby County* case, the Supreme Court decided in a 5-4 vote that the Section 4(b) coverage formula was unconstitutional.

<sup>1</sup> NATIONAL COMMISSION ON VOTING RIGHTS, PROTECTING MINORITY VOTERS: THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT AT WORK 1982-2005 (Feb. 2006).

<sup>2</sup> 557 U.S. 193 (2009).

<sup>3</sup> 570 U.S. 529 (2013).

<sup>4</sup> NATIONAL COMMISSION ON VOTING RIGHTS, PROTECTING MINORITY VOTERS: OUR WORK IS NOT DONE (2014), <http://votingrightstoday.org/ncvr/resources/discriminationreport>.



The majority in *Shelby County* held that, because the Voting Rights Act “impose[d] current burdens,” it “must be justified by current needs.”<sup>5</sup> The majority went on to rule that because the formula was comprised of data from the 1960s and 1970s, it could not be rationally related to determining which jurisdictions, if any, should be covered under Section 5 decades later. That Congress had reauthorized Section 5 after holding several hearings, reviewing tens of thousands of pages of records of discrimination, and with a 98-0 vote in the Senate did not appear to faze the majority. Indeed, Chief Justice Roberts, writing for the Court, said that “things have changed dramatically” in the South since passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965,<sup>6</sup> and that “[b]latantly discriminatory evasions of federal decrees are rare.”<sup>7</sup> Unfortunately, as seen by even the partial record compiled in this Report, that is an overly optimistic view of the state of voting rights in this country.

Of course, some “things” have changed—we no longer have literacy tests or direct poll taxes, and perhaps more people today understand that discrimination is illegal and actionable.

But, the “[b]latantly discriminatory evasions” of decades past have been replaced by subtler, but equally pernicious discrimination. At a time when the country is progressing towards becoming majority people of color,<sup>8</sup> access to the franchise is under threat by both overt and covert voter suppression laws and tactics, (1) including making voter registration more difficult and restricting organizations from helping people register, (2) voter purges of eligible voters, (3) unduly restrictive photo ID laws, (4) polling place closures and polling place relocations to sites deemed hostile by voters of color, (5) ineffective language assistance for voters with limited English proficiency, (6) long lines at polling places due to insufficient staffing and poll locations, (7) improper handling of absentee ballots, (8) faulty technology, particularly in minority communities, that risks votes not being properly counted and exposes the machines to the risk of tampering, and (9) vote dilution that undermines the ability of people of color to elect candidates of their choice. It is these sorts of cases that this preliminary report summarizes, and which our subsequent final report will discuss in detail.

In this Report, we take a preliminary look back a quarter of a century to the two decades before *Shelby County* and the six years since. We have tried to identify instances of state or local racial discrimination in voting — anywhere in the country — that rose to a such a level of concern as to lead to a change in the conduct because of action by the Attorney General or in the courts. The Attorney General actions have been easy to identify: objection letters by the Attorney General in response to submissions by jurisdictions then covered by Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act notifying the Attorney General of proposed changes in voting practices or procedures. Those objection letters necessarily stopped the proposed changes from taking effect, and thus resulted in benefit to protected populations in those jurisdictions.

Court action is a little more difficult to categorize. First, it is necessary to discern whether the claim being litigated is a claim of racial discrimination relating to voting rights. Most of the cases listed were brought either under Section 2 or Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act and were therefore, necessarily, race-based discrimination claims. We note that, although

---

5 570 U.S. at 536, quoting *Northwest Austin*, 557 U.S. at 203.

6 570 U.S. at 547.

7 570 U.S. at 547, quoting *Northwest Austin*, 557 U.S. at 202.

8 William H. Frey, *The US will become ‘minority white’ in 2045*, *Census projects*, The Brookings Institution (Oct. 15, 2019, 1:22 PM), <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2018/03/14/the-us-will-become-minority-white-in-2045-census-projects/>.

Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act remains a viable weapon in the fight against racial discrimination in voting, it is nowhere near as potent a weapon as was Section 5. Where Section 5 protected against discriminatory changes in voting, against an easily applied standard of whether minority voters would be worse off as a result of the change, Section 2 requires plaintiffs to bear the burden of complex and costly protracted litigation to show that an existing or newly instituted policy or practice is discriminatory. Where, under Section 5, the Department of Justice would necessarily bear the costs of defending against the jurisdiction's claim that the change in voting practices was not retrogressive, Section 2 places those costs on resource-strapped private litigants.

For Section 2 cases, we included both vote denial and vote dilution claims. For Section 5, we included actions seeking to enforce Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, if filed before submission by the covered jurisdiction of its proposed voting practice change to the Attorney General, if the action succeeded in subjecting the proposed change to Section 5 review, even if the proposed change was ultimately precleared. On the other hand, we did not include Section 5 enforcement actions, if the covered jurisdiction had submitted the proposed

change for Section 5 review prior to the filing of the enforcement action, unless the proposed change was ultimately not precleared. Claims for violation of Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act, alleging failure to provide effective language assistance, were categorized as race-based claims.

We also included constitutional claims, typically brought under the Equal Protection Clause, if it was clear that the claim was of racial discrimination in voting. In this context, at least for purposes of this preliminary report, we included cases claiming racial discrimination brought by any racial group. These included, so-called “*Shaw* claims,” brought by white plaintiffs, claiming that district lines were the result of racial gerrymandering.<sup>9</sup>

There were many cases brought under other constitutional and statutory doctrines, like First and Fourteenth Amendment “right-to-vote” claims and claims under the National Voter Registration Act, which we did not include, even though the allegations may have included some race-based themes, such as allegations that the challenged state or local conduct affected minority populations, unless the claims specifically included allegations of discrimination and the benefit achieved was

connected to the discrimination claim.

Determining whether a benefit had been achieved by the racial group also entailed analysis. We included cases where there was a result, preliminarily or final, that benefited the racial or ethnic group in a way sought by the lawsuit. These included final judgments in favor of plaintiffs on racial discrimination grounds, the issuance of preliminary injunctions in favor of such plaintiffs that provided them with concrete relief, and the resolution of the case by way of Consent Decree or settlement — with or without the acknowledgement of liability — so long as plaintiffs received at least some of the relief the plaintiff had sought. In a few other instances, where it appeared clear that the jurisdiction had changed its conduct — by regulation, legislation or otherwise — in response to the litigation, we included such cases.

It should also be noted that we did not include the many cases that are pending around the country, where neither preliminary nor final relief has been issued yet. Nor did we include voting discrimination cases brought in state court. These cases may be discussed in our Final Report.

We consider these criteria to be conservative in

---

9 *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993).

assessing voting discrimination. By not including instances where plaintiffs received relief that inured to the benefit of racial minorities but not based on a theory of racial discrimination, we have excluded many cases, including numerous cases brought by the Lawyers' Committee, where we do not file litigation unless it furthers our racial justice mission. In addition, by including only cases and DOJ objections, we have excluded other instances of racial discrimination.

Finally, we emphasize the preliminary nature of this report. When we announced that the Lawyers' Committee would publish a report of this nature, we set an October 2019 deadline, knowing that the information in this report would be of great interest to the public, as Congress is considering legislation to reestablish the protections removed by the decision in *Shelby County*. Because we intended to undertake a survey of cases in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, we enlisted the

help of our large *pro bono* network of private firms, who, as they have done since President Kennedy's clarion call in 1963, responded enthusiastically to the task. Undoubtedly, some may quibble with some of the choices made to include or not include certain matters, and we welcome feedback as we proceed with preparation of our final report, which will include not only an updated version of the list identifying each instance of racial discrimination in voting based on data from Section 5 objections and

---

# Voting Rights Violations by State

---

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
ALABAMA					
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote denial	Section 5 objection letter, James P. Turner to Lynda K. Oswald (Jan. 31, 1994) (Alabama)
Statewide	case/litigation	2006	Preliminary Injunction	vote denial	United States v. State of Alabama, 2:2006cv00225 (2006)
Statewide	case/litigation	2015	Final Order	racial gerrymandering	Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. State of Alabama, 2:2012cv00691 (2017); Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama, 231 F. Supp. 3d 1026 (M.D. Al. 2017)
Etowah County	case/litigation	1994	Final Order	vote dilution	Presley v. Etowah Cty. Comm’n, 869 F. Supp. 1555 (M.D. Ala. 1994)
City of Greensboro in Hale County	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, James P. Turner to Nicholas H. Cobbs, Jr. (Jan. 3, 1994) (Alabama)
City of Foley	case/litigation	1995	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Dillard v. City of Foley, 926 F. Supp. 1053, 1059 (M.D. Ala. 1995)
Tallapoosa County	Section 5 objection letter	1998	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Bill Lann Lee to E. Paul Jones (Feb. 6, 1998) (Alabama)
Dallas County Commission	case/litigation	2000	Final Order	vote dilution	Wilson v. Minor, 220 F.3d 1297 (11th Cir. 2000)
City of Alabaster	Section 5 objection letter	2000	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Bill Lann Lee to J. Frank Head (Aug. 16, 2000) (Alabama)



Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
City of Calera	Section 5 objection letter	2008	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Grace Chung Becker to Dan Head (Aug. 25, 2008) (Alabama)
Montgomery City	case/litigation	2008	Consent Decree	vote denial	May et al v. City of Montgomery, 2:2007cv00738 (2010)
City of Evergreen	case/litigation	2013	Final Order	vote dilution	Allen v. City of Evergreen, Ala., No. CIV.A. 13-107-CG-M, Document 32, filed 2/2/2013
ALASKA					
Bethel	case/litigation	2009	Preliminary Injunction/Settlement Agreement	language assistance	Nick v. Bethel, No. 3:07-CV-0098 (TMB) (D. Ak. July 9, 2009).
Dillingham, Yukon-Koyukuk, and Wade Hampton Census Areas	case/litigation	2015	Settlement Agreement	language assistance	Toyukak v. Mallott, No. 3:13-cv-00137 (D. Ak. Sept. 30, 2015).
ARIZONA					
Statewide	case/litigation	2002	Final Order	vote dilution	Navajo Nation v. Arizona Indep. Redistricting Comm'n, 230 F. Supp. 2d 998, 1016 (D. Ariz. 2002)
Statewide	case/litigation	2018	Consent Decree	other barriers to voter registration	League of United Latin American Citizens Arizona v. Reagan, No. CV17-4102 PHX DGC, 2018 WL 5983009 (D. Ariz. Nov. 14, 2018)
Statewide	case/litigation	2019	Settlement Agreement	early or absentee voting, language assistance.	Navajo Nation v. Hobbs, No. CV-18-08329-PCT-DWL (D. Ariz. 2019)
Coconino County	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Terence C. Hance (April 8, 1994) (Arizona)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
Navajo County	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to D. Rand Henderson (May 16, 1994) (Arizona)
Coconino Association for Vocations, Industry, and Technology	Section 5 objection letter	2003	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to Jean E. Wilcox (February 4, 2003) (Arizona)
Cochise County	case/litigation	2006	Consent Decree	language assistance	US v. Cochise County, case no. cv 06-304 TUC-FRZ (D. Ariz. 2006)
ARKANSAS					
City of Texarkana	case/litigation	1994	Final Order	vote dilution	Williams v. City of Texarkana, Ark., 32 F.3d 1265 (1994) and Williams v. City of Texarkana, Arkansas, 861 F. Supp. 756, 758 (W.D. Ark. 1992)
Blytheville	case/litigation	1995	Final Order	vote dilution	Harvell v. Blytheville Sch. Dist. No. 5, 71 F.3d 1382(8th Cir. 1995) (en banc)
Crittenden County	case/litigation	2000	Final Order	problems at the polls	Taylor, et. al. v. Howe, et. al., No. 99-2282EA (8th Cir.)
Chicot County	case/litigation	2003	Final Order		Cox, et al v. Donaldson, et al., Case no. 5:02-cv-00319-GH (E.D. Ar.)
Phillips County	case/litigation	2007	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	problems at the polls	Nichols v. Phillips Cty Election Commission, Case No. 2:06-cv-00158-SWW (E.D. Ar.)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
CALIFORNIA					
Statewide	case/litigation	2001	Consent Decree	vote denial	Common Cause v. Jones, 2002 WL 1766436 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 19, 2002)
Alameda County	case/litigation	1996	Settlement Agreement	language assistance	United States v. Alameda County, No. 95-1266 (N.D. Cal. 1996)
Los Angeles	case/litigation	1997	Final Order	vote dilution	Garcia v. Los Angeles, 96-cv-7661 (C.D.Cal. 1997)
Monterey County	case/litigation	1999	Final Order	vote dilution	Lopez v. Monterey County, 871 F. Supp. 1254 (N.D. Cal. 1994), rev'd and remanded, 519 U.S. 9 (1996), appeal after remand, 525 U.S. 266 (1999)
Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District	case/litigation	2001	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	United States v. Upper San Gabriel Valley Municipal Water District, cv-07903-AHM-BQR (C.D. Cal. 2001)
City of Santa Paula	case/litigation	2001	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	United States v. City of Santa Paula, 00-cv-03691 GHK (SHx) (C.D.Cal. 2001)
Monterey County	Section 5 objection letter	2002	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to Willim D. Barr (March 29, 2002) (California)
San Diego County	case/litigation	2004	Settlement Agreement	language assistance	U.S. v. San Diego, 04-cv-1273 IEG (JMA) (S.D. Cal. 2004)
Ventura County	case/litigation	2004	Consent Decree	language assistance	U.S. v. Ventura County, 04-cv-6443 CAS (VBKx) (C.D.Cal. 2004)
San Benito County	case/litigation	2004	Consent Decree	language assistance, problems at the polls	U.S. v. San Benito County, 04-cv-02056 JW (N.D. Cal. 2004)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
City of Paramount	case/litigation	2005	Consent Decree	language assistance	U.S. v. City of Paramount, 05-cv-05132 AHM (JTLx) (C.D.Cal. 2005)
City of Azusa	case/litigation	2005	Consent Decree	language assistance	United States v. City of Azusa, 05-cv-5147 GAF (SSx) (C.D.Cal. 2005)
City of Rosemead	case/litigation	2005	Consent Decree	language assistance	U.S. v. City of Rosemead, 05-cv-5131 GAF (MANx) (C.D.Cal. 2005)
City of Walnut, Los Angeles	case/litigation	2007	Consent Decree	language assistance	United States v. City of Walnut, 07-cv-2437 PA-SJO-MMS (VBKx) (C.D.Cal. 2007)
Riverside County	case/litigation	2010	Settlement Agreement	language assistance	U.S. v. City of Riverside, 10-cv-01059 SJD (OPx) (C.D.Cal. 2010)
Alameda County	case/litigation	2011	Consent Decree	language assistance	U.S. v. Alameda County, 11-cv-3262 EMC-MMS-RS NDCA (. 2011)
Napa County	Attorney General Letter	2016	Settlement Agreement	language assistance	Napa County Memorandum of Agreement
Kern County	case/litigation	2018	Final Order	vote dilution	Luna v. County of Kern, 291 F.Supp.3d 1088 (E.D. Ca. 2018)
COLORADO					
Statewide	case/litigation	1996	Final Order	vote dilution	Sanchez v. State of Colo., 97 F.3d 1303 (10th Cir.).
Montezuma-Cortez School District No. RE-1	case/litigation	1998	Final Order	vote dilution	Cuthair v. Montezuma-Cortez, Colorado School Dist. No. RE-1, 7 F.Supp.2d 1152 (D. Colo. 1998).

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
CONNECTICUT					
City of Bridgeport	case/litigation	1995	Final Order	vote dilution	Bridgeport Coalition for Fair Representation v. City of Bridgeport, Civ. No. 93-1476 (D. Conn.).
FLORIDA					
Statewide	case/litigation	1994	Final Order	racial gerrymandering	Johnson v. Smith, Case No. 94-40025-WS, 1994 U.S. Dist. Lexis 20765, (N.D. Fl. Sept. 2, 1994)(denying PI motion); later proceedings, sub-nom, Johnson v. Mortham, 926 F.Supp. 1460 (N.D.Fla.,1996)(order granting plaintiffs' MSJ).
Statewide	case/litigation	2002	Settlement Agreement	barriers to registration; problems at the polls	NAACP v. Secretary of State, No. 01-120 (S.D. Fla. 2002)
Statewide	case/litigation	2002	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	barriers to registration	Major v. Sawyer, No. 01-10088 (S.D. Fla. 2002)
Statewide	case/litigation	2012	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	barriers to registration	League of Women Voters of Fla., Inc. v. Detzner, Case No. 11-cv-00628 (Aug. 30, 2012, N.D. Fla. 2012)
Statewide	case/litigation	2012	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	barriers to registration	Mi Familia Vota Education Fund, et al v. Detzner, 8:12-cv-01294-JDW-MAP (M.D.Fla. 201
Statewide	case/litigation	2012	Final Order	early voting	Florida v. United States, 885 F. Supp. 2d 299 (D.D.C. 2012)
Statewide	case/litigation	2011	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	early voting	The League of Women Voters of Florida, et al v. Rick Scott, et al, No. 11-cv-10006 (S.D. Fla. 2011)



Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
Statewide	case/litigation	2019	Preliminary Injunction	language assistance	Marta Valentine Rivera Madera, et al., v. Laurel Lee, Florida Secretary of State, et al., Case No. 18-00152, (May 10, 2019, N.D. Fla.)
City of Miami	case/litigation	1997	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	PULSE v. City of Miami, No. 96-cv-3327 (S.D. Fla. 1997)
Ashcroft	case/litigation	2002	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution; barriers to registration	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd Jr. to John M. McKay (July 1, 2002) (Florida)
Dade County	case/litigation	2002	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	Packingham v. Dade County, No. 96-cv-1749 (S.D.Fla. 2002)
Orange County	case/litigation	2002	Consent Decree	language assistance; problems at the polls	United States v. Orange County Florida; 6:02-cv-00737-ACC (M.D.Fla.)
Osceola County	case/litigation	2002	Final Order	language assistance, problems at the polls	United States v. Osceola County Florida; 6:02-cv-00738-ACC (M.D.Fla.)
Miami-Dade County	case/litigation	2002	Consent Decree	Language assistance; problems at the polls	United States v. Miami-Dade County Florida; 1:02-cv-21698 (S.D. Fla 2002)
Volusia County	case/litigation	2004	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	Polling place locations, Early voting	NAACP et al v. Lowe; 6:04-cv-01469-GKS-KRS (M.D.Fla.)
Osceola County	case/litigation	2006	Final Order	vote dilution	United States v. Osceola County Florida; 6:05-cv-01053-GAP-DAB (M.D.Fla. 2006)
Osceola County	case/litigation	2008	Consent Decree	vote dilution	United States v. School Board of Osceola County Florida; 6:08-cv-00582-GAP-DAB (M.D.Fla. 2008)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
Town of Lake Park	case/litigation	2009	Consent Decree	vote dilution	United States v. Town of Lake Park, Florida, No. 09-cv-80507 (S.D. Fla. Oct. 26, 2009)
Volusia County	case/litigation	2010	Settlement Agreement	language assistance, problems at the polls	Perez-Santiago v. Volusia County Department of Elections, 6:08-cv-1868-JA-KRS (M.D.Fla 2008)
<b>GEORGIA</b>					
Statewide	case/litigation	2008	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	identification requirements; other barriers to voter registration	Morales v. Handel, United States District Court for the Northern District Court of Georgia Case No.: 1:08-cv-03172
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	2009	Attorney General Objection	identification requirements; other barriers to voter registration	Section 5 objection letter, Loretta King to Thurbert E. Baker (May 29, 2009) (Georgia)
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	2012	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 Objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to Dennis R. Dunn (December 21, 2012) (Georgia)
Statewide	case/litigation	2017	Settlement Agreement	other barriers to voter registration	Georgia State Conference of the NAACP v. Kemp; No. 2:16-cv-219 (N.D. Ga.)
Statewide	case/litigation	2018	Preliminary Injunction	identification requirements; other barriers to voter registration	Georgia Coalition for the Peoples' Agenda, Inc. v. Brian Kemp, Case 1:18-cv-04727-ELR
Randolph County	case/litigation; Section 5 objection letter	2006	Final Order; Attorney General Objection	barriers to voter registration	Jenkins v. Ray, No. 4:06-CV-43, 2006 WL 1582426 (M.D. Ga. June 5, 2006); Section 5 objection letter, Wan J. Kim to Tommy Coleman (September 12, 2006) (Georgia)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
Lowndes County	Section 5 objection letter	2009	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to Walter G. Elliott (November 30, 2009) (Georgia)
Greene County	Section 5 objection letter	2012	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to Michael S. Greene & Cory O. Kirby (April 13, 2012) (Georgia)
Long County	Section 5 objection letter	2012	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to Andrew S. Johnson & B. Jay Swindell (August 27, 2012) (Georgia)
Fayette County	case/litigation	2015	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Georgia State Conference of the NAACP v. Fayette Cnty. Bd. of Comm'rs, 118 F.Supp 3d 1338 (N.D. Ga. 2015)
Emanuel County	case/litigation	2016	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	Georgia State Conference of the NAACP v. Emmanuel Cnty. Bd. Of Comm'rs; No. 6:16-CV-21 (S.D. Ga.)
Hancock County	case/litigation	2016	Consent Decree	other barriers to voter registration	Georgia State Conference of the NAACP v. Hancock Cnty. Bd. of Elections & Registration; No. 5:15-cv-414 (M.D. Ga.)
<b>HAWAII</b>					
Statewide	case/litigation	2000	Final Order	identification requirements	Rice v. Cayetano, 941 F.Supp. 1529 (1999) ; Rice v. Cayetano, 528 U.S. 495 (2000)
Statewide	case/litigation	2002	Final Order	Identification requirement	Arakaki v. State of Hawaii, 314 F. 3d 1091 (9th Cir 2002)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
ILLINOIS					
City of Chicago Heights	case/litigation	1993	Final Order	vote dilution	Harper v. City of Chicago Heights, 223 F.3d 593 (7th Cir. 2000)
City of Chicago	case/litigation	1998	Final Order	vote dilution	Barnett v. City of Chicago, 17 F. Supp. 2d 753, 759 (N.D. Ill. 1998)
Lake County	case/litigation	2001	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	Vazquez v. Lake County, Case No. 1:01-cv-06541 (N.D. Il. Aug. 22, 2001)
Chicago Board of Elections	case/litigation	2003	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution; problems at the polls	Black et al. v. McGuffage et al., Case No. 1:01-cv-00208 (N.D. Il. Jan. 11, 2001)
Kane County	case/litigation	2007	Settlement Agreement	language assistance	USA v. County of Kane, et al, 07-cv-5451 (ND Ill. Sept. 26, 2007)
St. Clair County	case/litigation	2009	Settlement Agreement	barriers to registration	Chatman et al v. Delaney et al, Case No. 3:09-cv-00259-CJP (S.D. Il. April 3, 2009)
KANSAS					
Ford County	case/litigation	2018	Dismissed after violation addressed	polling place locations	League of United Latin America Citizens, Kansas, Rangel-Lopez v. Cox, No. 2:18-cv-02572 (D. Kan. Oct. 26, 2018)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
KENTUCKY					
Statewide	case/litigation	2013	Final Order	vote dilution	Brown v. Kentucky Legislative Research Comm'n, 966 F. Supp. 2d 709, 718 (E.D. Ky. 2013), judgment entered, No. CV13CV25DJBGFTWOB, 2013 WL 12320875 (E.D. Ky. Oct. 31, 2013). Herbert v. Kentucky State Board of Elections, Case No. 3:13-cv-00025 (E.D. Ky. 2013) (consolidated with Brown)
LOUISIANA					
Statewide	case/litigation	1996	Final Order	vote dilution	Hays v. Louisiana, 936 F. Supp. 360, 365 (W.D. La. 1996)
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	1996	Attorney General Objection	dismissed after violation addressed	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick, to E. Kay Kirkpatrick, (Aug. 12, 1996) (Louisiana)
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	1998	Attorney General Objection	other barriers to voter registration	Section 5 objection letter, Bill Lann Lee to Angie Rogers LaPlace (Jan. 13 1998) (Louisiana)
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	2003	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	House of Representatives v. Ashcroft, No. 1:02-CV-00062 (D.D.C. May 20, 2003)
Statewide	case/litigation	2005	Settlement Agreement	early or absentee voting	Wallace v. Chertoff, No. 2:05-CV-05519 (E.D. La. 2005)
Statewide	case/litigation	2016	Dismissed after Violation Addressed	identification requirements; other barriers to voter registration	VAYLA New Orleans v Schedler, No. 3:16-CV-00305 (M.D. La. 2016)
Veron Parish School Board	case/litigation	1994	Final Order	vote dilution	Dye v. McKeithen, 856 F. Supp. 303 (W.D. La. 1994)



Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
City of Shreveport	case/litigation	1997	Final Order	vote dilution	United States v. Louisiana, 952 F. Supp. 1151 (W.D. La. 1997)
City of Morgan City	case/litigation	2001	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	United States of America v. Morgan City, No. 6:00-CV-01541 (W.D. La. 2001)
St. Bernard Parish	case/litigation	2002	Final Order	vote dilution	St. Bernard Citizens for Better Government v. St. Bernard Parish Sch. Bd., No. 02-2209, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16540 (E.D. La. Aug. 28, 2002)
Ouachita Parish	case/litigation	2002	Preliminary Injunction	vote dilution	Young & Golsby v. Ouachita Parish School Board, No. 3:02-CV-1644 (W.D. 2002)
Pointe Coupee Parish	Section 5 objection letter	2002	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter from Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to Gregory B. Grimes (Oct. 4, 2002) (Louisiana)
DeSoto Parish	Section 5 objection letter	2002	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution; other barriers to voter registration	Section 5 objection letter, Andrew E. Lelling to Walter Lee, (Dec. 31, 2002) (Louisiana)
Richmond Parish	Section 5 objection letter	2003	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution; other barriers to voter registration	Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to John R. Sartin (May 13, 2003) (Louisiana)
Jefferson Parish	case/litigation	2003	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Jefferson Citizens for Better Government v. Parish of Jefferson, No. 2:03-CV-00345, 2003 WL 1595167 (E.D. 2003)
St. John the Baptist Parish City Council and School Board	case/litigation	2003	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Sorapuru v. Mitchell, No. 2:02-CV-02524 (E.D. La. 2003)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
City of Baton Rouge	case/litigation	2004	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	Glasper v. Baton Rouge, No. 3:93-CV-00537 (M.D. La. 2004)
Tangipahoa Parish	case/litigation, Section 5 objection letter	2004	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	Tangipahoa Citizens v. Tangipahoa Parish, No. 2:03-CV-02710, 2004 WL 1638106 (E.D. La. 2004)  Section 5 objection letter, R. Alexander Acosta to Carlos Natarino (October 16, 2003) (Louisiana)
St. Landry Parish	case/litigation	2005	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	NAACP v. St. Landry Parish, No. 6:03-CV-00610 (W.D. La. 2005)
Avoyelles Parish School Board	case/litigation	2006	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	Guillory v. Avoyelles Parish School Board, No. 1:03-CV-00285, 2011 WL 499196 (W.D. La. 2006)
Jefferson Parish	case/litigation	2007	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Williams v McKeithen, No. 2:05-CV-01180, 2007 WL 9676892 (E.D. La. 2007)
City of St. Martinville	case/litigation	2011	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution; vote denial	Greig v. St. Martinville & United States of America, No.6:00-CV-00603 (W.D. La. 2000)
Terrebonne Parish	case/litigation	2017	Final Order	vote dilution	Terrebonne Parish Branch NAACP v. Jindal, 274 F. Supp. 3d 395 (M.D. La. 2017)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
MARYLAND					
Statewide	case / litigation	1994	Final Order	vote dilution	Marylanders for Fair Representation, Inc. v. Schaefer, 849 F. Supp. 1022 (D. Md. 1994)
Worcester County	case / litigation	1994	Final Order	vote dilution	Cane v. Worcester Cty., Md., 840 F. Supp. 1081 (D. Md. 1994).
MASSACHUSETTS					
Statewide	case/litigation	2004	Preliminary Injunction	vote dilution	Black Political Task Force v. Galvin, 300 F. Supp. 2d 291, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2681
City of Lawrence	case/litigation	2001	Preliminary Injunction	identification requirements	Morris, et al v. City of Lawrence, et al
City of Lawrence	case/litigation	2002	Consent Decree	vote dilution	USA v. City of Lawrence, MA, et al
City of Boston	case/litigation	2005	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	language assistance; problems at the polls	United States of America v. City of Boston, Massachusetts et al
City of Lawrence	case/litigation	2006	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	language assistance; problems at the polls	OISTE Inc. et al v. City of Lawrence, Massachusetts et al 1:05-cv-12218
City of Springfield	case/litigation	2007	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	Arise for Social Justice, et al. v. City of Springfield, et al.
City of Springfield	case/litigation	2008	Settlement Agreement	language assistance; problems at the polls	United States of America v. City of Springfield et al
City of Lowell	case/litigation	2019	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Huot v. City of Lowell, No. 1:17-cv-10895-DLC

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
MICHIGAN					
City of Hamtramck	case	1999	Consent Decree	language assistance, identification requirements, problems at polls	United States v. City of Hamtramck, no. 00-73541 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 7, 2000; Sep. 3, 2003; Jan 29, 2004)
City of Eastpointe	case/litigation	2019	Consent Decree	vote dilution	United States v. City of Eastpointe, No. 417CV10079TGBDRG, 2019 WL 2647355, at *2 (E.D. Mich. June 26, 2019)
MINNESOTA					
Statewide	case/litigation	2005	Preliminary Injunction; Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	identification requirements and other barriers to voter registration	American Civil Liberties Union of Minnesota et al v. Kiffmeyer, Case No. 00:2004cv04653
MISSISSIPPI					
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	1995	Attorney General Objection	other - denial of office	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Sandra Murphy Shelson (February 6, 1995) (Mississippi)
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter; case/litigation	1997	Attorney General Objection; Final Order	dual registration	Section 5 objection letter, Isabelle Katz Pinzler to Sandra M. Shelson (September 22, 1997) (Mississippi); Young v. Fordice, 520 U.S. 273 (1997)
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	2010	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to Margarette L. Meeks (March 24, 2010) (Mississippi)
Statewide	case/litigation	2019	Final Order	vote dilution	Thomas v. Bryant, 939 F. 3d 134 (5th Cir. 2019) reh’g granted, 939 F. 3d. 629 (5th Cir. 2019)
Clarke County	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, James P. Turner to Gilford F. Dabbs, III (January 10, 1994) (Mississippi)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
Carroll County	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Kenneth E. Downs (April 18, 1994) (Mississippi)
Quitman (Clarke County)	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Hubbart T. Saunders, IV (December 19, 1994) (Mississippi)
Adams County	Section 5 objection letter	1995	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Marion Smith (January 30, 1995) (Mississippi)
Monroe County	Section 5 objection letter	1995	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Claude A. Chamberlin (March 20, 1995) (Mississippi)
Chickasaw County	Section 5 objection letter	1995	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Isabelle Katz Pinzler to James S. Gore (April 11, 1995) (Mississippi)
Union County	Section 5 objection letter	1995	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Lester F. Sumner (June 20, 1995) (Mississippi)
Aberdeen (Monroe County)	Section 5 objection letter	1995	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Jeffrey M. Navarro (December 4, 1995) (Mississippi)
Calhoun County	case/litigation	1996	Final Order	vote dilution	Clark v. Calhoun Cty., Miss., 88 F.3d 1393 (5th Cir. 1996)
Attala County	case/litigation	1996	Final Order	vote dilution	Teague v. Attala Cty., Miss., 92 F.3d 283 (5th Cir. 1996)
Grenada County	Section 5 objection letter	1997	Attorney General Objection	problems at the polls	Section 5 objection letter, Isabelle Katz Pinzler to James McRae Criss (March 3, 1997) (Mississippi)



Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
Grenada County	Section 5 objection letter	1997	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Bill Lann Lee to T.H. Freeland, IV (August 17, 1998) (Mississippi)
Chickasaw County	case/litigation	1997	Final Order	vote dilution	Gunn v. Chickasaw County, Mississippi, No. CIV.A. 1:92CV142-JAD, 1997 WL 33426761 (N.D. Miss, Oct. 28, 1997)
Lafayette County	case/litigation	1998	Final Order	vote dilution	Houston v. Lafayette Cty., 20 F. Supp. 2d 996 (N.D. Miss. 1998)
Pike County	Section 5 objection letter	1999	Attorney General Objection	polling place locations	Section 5 objection letter, Bill Lann Lee to John H. White, Jr. (June 28, 1999) (Mississippi)
Montgomery County	Section 5 objection letter	2001	Attorney General Objection	denial of voting opportunity	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to Lane Green Lee (December 11, 2001) (Mississippi)
Tupelo	case/litigation	2007	Final Order	vote dilution	Jamison v. Tupelo, Mississippi, 471 F. Supp. 2d 706 (N.D. Miss. 2007)
Noxubee County	case/litigation	2007	Final	vote dilution	United States v. Brown, 494 F. Supp. 2d 440 (S.D. Miss. 2007) aff'd by United States v. Brown, 561 F.3d. 420 (5th Cir. 2009)
Amite County	Section 5 objection letter	2011	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to Tommie S. Cardin (October 4, 2001) (Mississippi)
Adams County	Section 5 objection letter	2012	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to Everett T. Sanders (April 30, 2012) (Mississippi)
Hinds County	Section 5 objection letter	2012	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to Kenneth Dreber and David Wade (December 3, 2012) (Mississippi)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
MISSOURI					
Ferguson-Florissant School District; St. Louis County Board of Election Commissioners	case/litigation	2016	Final Order	vote dilution	Mo. State Conference of NAACP v. Ferguson-Florissant Sch. Dist., 201 F. Supp. 3d 1006 (E.D. Mo. 2016), affirmed, 894 F.3d 924 (8th Cir. 2018), cert. denied sub nom. Ferguson Florissant Sch. Dist. v. Missouri State Conference of N.A.A.C.P., 139 S. Ct. 826, 202 L. Ed. 2d 579 (2019).
MONTANA					
Statewide	case/litigation	2014	Settlement Agreement	polling place locations; early or absentee voting	Wandering Medicine v. Montana Secretary of State, Case No. 1:12-cv-00135-DWM
Blaine County	case/litigation	2001	Final Order	vote dilution	United States v. Blaine Cty., Mont., 157 F. Supp. 2d 1145 (D. Mont. 2001); United States. v. Blaine Cty., Mont., 363 F.3d 897 (9th Cir. 2004), Case No. 4:99-00-00122
Wolf Point School District	case/litigation	2014	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Jackson v. Bd. of Trustees of Wolf Point Sch. Dist., et al., Case No. 4:13-cv-00065-BMM
NEBRASKA					
County of Thurston	case/litigation	1995	Final Order	vote dilution	Stabler v. County of Thurston, No. 8:CV93-00394(D.Neb.Aug.29, 1995), aff'd,129 F.3d 1015 (8th Cir. 1997), cert.denied,523 U.S. 1118 (1998)
Colfax County	case/litigation	2012	Consent Decree	language assistance	US v. Colfax County, 8:12-cv-84 (D.Neb.) Consent Order

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
NEVADA					
Washoe and Mineral Counties	case/litigation	2016	Preliminary Injunction	polling place locations; early voting	Sanchez v. Cegavske, 214 F. Supp. 3d 961 (D. Nev. 2016).
NEW MEXICO					
Sandoval County	case/litigation	2011	Consent Decree	language assistance	U.S. v. Sandoval County, NM, 797 F.Supp.2d 1249 (D. New Mexico 2011)
NEW YORK					
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution; barriers to registration	Section 5 objection letter, Loretta King to G. Oliver Koppell (Dec. 5, 1994) (New York)
City of Hinesville	Section 5 objection letter	1991	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, John R. Dunne to Judith Reed (Jul 19, 1991) (New York)
Kings and New York Counties in New York City, New York	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	language assistance	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Kathy King (May 13, 1994) (New York)
Bronx County, New York	Section 5 objection letter	1996	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Judith Kay (Nov. 15, 1996) (New York)
City of New York	case/litigation	1998	Settlement Agreement	language assistance	Chinatown Voter Education Alliance v. Ravitz, Case 1: 06-Civ-00 913-NRB, S.D.N.Y. 2006 (Reice Buchwald, J.).
Town of Hempstead	case/litigation	1999	Final Order	vote dilution	Goosby v. Town Board of the Town of Hempstead, 180 F.3d 476 (2d Cir. 1999)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
City of Rochelle and city council	case/litigation	2003	Final Order	vote dilution	New Rochelle Voter Defense Fund v. city of New Rochelle, 308 F. Supp. 2d 152 (S.D.N.Y. 2003)
Albany County	case/litigation	2004	Final Order	vote dilution	Arbor Hill Concerned Citizens Ass'n v. County of Albany, 357 F.2d 260 (2d Cir. 2004)
Suffolk County; Suffolk County Board of Elections	case/litigation	2004	Consent Decree	language assistance	Consent Decree, U.S. v. Suffolk County, Case 2:04-cv-02689-TCP-MLO, June 29, 2004.
Westchester County, New York	case/litigation	2005	Consent Decree	language assistance	US v. Westchester County, et al. 05 Civ 0650 (S.D.N.Y. 2005);
Albany County Board of Elections	case/litigation	2011	Final Order	vote dilution	Anne Pope, et al. v. County of Albany, et al. Case No.: 11-cv-00736 (N.D.N.Y.)
County of Orange	case/litigation	2013	Final Order	vote dilution	Order Adopting Special Master's Legislative Redistricting Plan, Molina v. County of Orange, 13-cv-3018-ER (S.D.N.Y. June 14, 2013)
Orange County Board of Elections	case/litigation	2015	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution; language assistance; other barriers to voter registration; problems at polling places	USA v. Orange County Board of Elections et al.; Case No. 7:12-cv-03071 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)
Village of Port Chester	case/litigation	2018	Final Order	vote dilution	United States of America v. Village of Port Chester, 704 F.Supp.2d 411 (S.D.N.Y. 2010)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
NORTH CAROLINA					
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	1996	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Loretta King to Charles M. Hensey (Feb. 13, 1996) (North Carolina)
Statewide	case/litigation	1996	Final Order	vote dilution	Shaw v. Hunt, 517 U.S. 899, 900 (1996)
Statewide	case/litigation	2016	Final Order	identification requirements; barriers to registration; problems at the polls; early voting	North Carolina State Conference of NAACP v. McCrory, 831 F.3d 204 (4th Cir. 2016) cert. denied 137 S. Ct. 1399, 198 L. Ed. 2d 220 (2017)
Statewide	case/litigation	2018	Final Order	racial gerrymandering	Covington v. North Carolina (Covington I), 316 F.R.D. 117 (M.D.N.C. 2016) summarily aff'd North Carolina v. Covington, 137 S.Ct. 2211 (2017)  Covington v. North Carolina (Covington II), 283 F. Supp. 3d 410 (M.D. N.C. 2018), summarily aff'd in part, rev'd in part, North Carolina v. Covington, 138 S.Ct. 2548 (2018).
Anson County Board of Education	case/litigation	1994	Consent Decree	vote dilution	United States v. Anson Board of Education, No. 3:93-cv-00210 (W.D.N.C. 1994)
Cleveland County Board of Commissioners	case/litigation	1994	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Campbell v. Cleveland Co. Board of Commissioners, 4:49-cv-00011 (W.D.N.C. 1994)
Laurinburg City Council	case/litigation	1994	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	Speller v. Laurinburg, No. 3:93-cv-00365 (M.D.N.C. 1994)



Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
Rowan County Board of Education	case/litigation	1994	Consent Decree	vote dilution	N.A.A.C.P. v. Rowan Board of Education, No. 4:91-cv-00293-FWB-RAE (M.D.N.C. 1994)
Tyrrell County	case/litigation	1994	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Rowsom v Tyrrell County Commissioners, No. 2:93-cv-00033 (E.D.N.C. 1994)
Washington County	case/litigation	1994	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Wilkins v. Washington County Commissioners, No. 2:93-cv-0012 (E.D.N.C. 1996)
Town of Mt. Olive	case/litigation	1995	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	Fussell v. Town of Mount Olive, No. 5:93-cv-00303 (E.D.N.C. 1995)
Person County	case/litigation	1995	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Webster v. Board of Education of Person County, No. 1:91-cv-00554 (M.D.N.C. 1995)
Granville County	Section 5 objection letter	1997	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Isabelle Katz Pinzler to Susan K. Nichols (Feb. 3, 1997) (North Carolina)
Harnett County	case/litigation	2003	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	Porter v. Stewart, No. 5:88-cv-00950 (E.D.N.C. 2003)
Franklin County	case/litigation	2004	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	White v. Franklin County, No. 5:03-cv-00481 (E.D.N.C. 2004)
City of Fayetteville	Section 5 objection letter	2007	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Wan J. Kim to Michael Crowell (Jun. 25, 2007) (North Carolina)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
City of Kingston	Section 5 objection letter	2009	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Loretta King to James P. Cauley III (Aug. 17, 2009) (North Carolina)
Pitt County School District	Section 5 objection letter	2012	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Tom Perez to Robert T. Sonnenberg (April 30, 2012) (North Carolina)
Jones	case/litigation	2017	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Hall, et al. v. Jones County Board of Commissioners, Case No. 4-17-cv-18 (ED NC 2017)
NORTH DAKOTA					
Benson County	case/litigation	2000	Consent Decree	vote dilution	United States v. Benson Cty., No. 2:00-cv-00030-RSW-KKK (D.N.D. Mar. 10, 2000).
Benson County	case/litigation	2011	Preliminary Injunction	polling place locations	Spirit Lake Tribe v. Benson Cty., No. 2:10-cv-00095-RRE-KKK, 2010 WL 4226614 (D.N.D. Oct. 21, 2010)
OHIO					
City of Euclid	case/litigation	2008	Final Order	vote dilution	U.S. v. City of Euclid, WL 4790789, Case No. 1:06CV1652, (N.D. Ohio Aug. 1, 2007).
Cuyahoga County	case/litigation	2010	Settlement Agreement	language assistance	United States of America v. Cuyahoga Board of Elections, et al., No. 1:10-cv-01949
Lorain County	case/litigation	2011	Settlement Agreement	language assistance	United States of America v. Lorain County, et al., No. 1:11-cv-02122

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
PENNSYLVANIA					
Statewide	case/litigation	2009	Final Order	problems at the polls	Pa. NAACP v. Cortes, No. 2:08-cv-05048 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 29, 2009), <a href="https://ecf.paed.uscourts.gov/doc1/15315000562">https://ecf.paed.uscourts.gov/doc1/15315000562</a>
Berks County	case/litigation	2003	Final Order	problems at the polls; language assistance	United States v. Berks County, Pa., 277 F. Supp.2d 570 (E.D. Pa. 2003)
City of Philadelphia, et. al.	case/litigation	2007	Settlement Agreement	language assistance	United States v. City of Philadelphia, PA (E.D. Pa. 2006)  <a href="https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2010/12/15/phila_settlement.pdf">https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2010/12/15/phila_settlement.pdf</a>  <a href="https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2010/12/15/phila_amend.pdf">https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/crt/legacy/2010/12/15/phila_amend.pdf</a>
Bethlehem Area School District	case/litigation	2008	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	Negron v. Bethlehem Area School District, No. 2:06-cv-0666 (E.D. Pa. Aug. 12, 2008), <a href="https://ecf.paed.uscourts.gov/doc1/15314381817">https://ecf.paed.uscourts.gov/doc1/15314381817</a>
Bucks County, et. al.	case/litigation	2009	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	polling place locations	Prescod v. Bucks County, Pa., No. 2:08-cv-03778 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 10, 2008), <a href="https://ecf.paed.uscourts.gov/doc1/15314630796">https://ecf.paed.uscourts.gov/doc1/15314630796</a>
Chester County, et. al.	case/litigation	2010	Settlement Agreement	problems at the polls polling place locations	English, et al v. Chester County, Case No. 2:2010cv0044 (E.D. Pa. 2010)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
SOUTH CAROLINA					
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Robert J. Sheheen (May 2, 1994) (South Carolina)
Statewide	case/litigation	1996	Final Order	racial gerrymandering	Smith v. Beasley, 946 F.Supp. 1174 (D.S.C. 1996)
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	1997	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Isabelle Katz Pinzler to John W. Drummond (Apr. 1, 1997) (South Carolina)
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter; case/litigation	2011	Attorney General Objection; Final Court Order	identification requirements; case/litigation	Thomas E. Perez objection letter (5/18/2011); South Carolina v. United States, Civil Action No. 898 F. Supp. 30 (D.D.C. 2012);
Lee County and Lee County School District	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	problems at the polls	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Jacob H. Jennings (June 6, 1994) (South Carolina)
Florence and Williamsburg Counties	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter Deval L. Patrick objection letter
Town of Hemingway	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Gregory B. Askins and Jeffrey N. Thorndahl (July 2, 1994) (South Carolina)
Georgetown County School District	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Kerry Alan Scanlon to C. Havird Jones, Jr. (Oct. 3, 1994) (South Carolina)
North Charleston	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to James E. Gonzales (Oct. 17, 1994) (South Carolina)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
Spartanburg County School District	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to C. Havird Jones (Nov. 20, 1995) (South Carolina)
Spartanburg County School District	Section 5 objection letter	1995	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to C. Havird Jones (No. 20, 1995) (South Carolina)
Gaffney Board of Public Works	Section 5 objection letter	1996	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to James R. Thompson (March 5, 1996) (South Carolina)
Horry County	Section 5 objection letter	1998	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Bill Lann Lee to John C. Henry (May 20, 1998) (South Carolina)
Charleston	Section 5 objection letter	2001	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Alex Acosta to Francis I. Cantwell (Oct. 12, 2001) (South Carolina)
Greer	Section 5 objection letter	2001	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to John B. Duggan (Nov. 2, 2001) (South Carolina)
Sumter County	Section 5 objection letter	2002	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to Charles T. Edens (Jun. 27, 2002) (South Carolina)
Union County School District	Section 5 objection letter	2002	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to C. Havird Jones (Sep. 3, 2002) (South Carolina)
Clinton	Section 5 objection letter	2002	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to C. Samuel Bennett II (Dec. 9, 2002) (South Carolina)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
Charleston County	case/litigation	2003	Final Order	vote dilution	United States v. Charleston Cty., 316 F. Supp. 2d 268 (D.S.C. 2003), aff'd sub nom. United States v. Charleston Cty., S.C., 365 F.3d 341 (4th Cir. 2004)
Cherokee County School District No. 1	Section 5 objection letter	2003	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to C. Havird Jones (Jun. 16, 2003) (South Carolina)
North	Section 5 objection letter	2003	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Alex Acosta to H. Bruce Buckheister (Sep. 16, 2003) (South Carolina)
Charleston County School District	Section 5 objection letter	2004	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Alex Acosta to C. Havird Jones (Feb. 26, 2004) (South Carolina)
Richland-Lexington School District No. 5	Section 5 objection letter	2004	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Alex Acosta to C. Havird Jones (Jun. 25, 2004) (South Carolina)
City of Columbia	case/litigation	2010	Preliminary Injunction	vote dilution (this is a Section 5 case involving a city's failure to preclear a change regarding an election)	Butler v. City of Columbia, No. 3:10-CV-794-CMC-CHH-JFA, 2010 WL 1372299 (D.S.C. 2010)
Fairfield County School District	Section 5 objection letter	2010	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to C. Havird Jones (Aug. 16, 2010) (South Carolina)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
SOUTH DAKOTA					
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	1995	Attorney General Objection	other barriers to voter registration	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Hon. Joyce Hazeltine (Jun. 19, 1995) (South Dakota)
Statewide	case/litigation	2002	Final Order	violation of Section 5 of the VRA	Bone Shirt v. Hazeltine, 200 F. Supp. 2d 1150 (D.S.D. 2002).
Statewide	case/litigation	2002	Consent Decree	violation of Section 5 of the VRA	Quick Bear Quiver v. Hazeltine, No. 02-5069 (D.S.D. 2002).
Statewide	case/litigation	2004	Final Order	vote dilution	Reference: Bone Shirt v. Hazeltine, 336 F.Supp.2d 976 (D.S.D. 2004)
Statewide	case/litigation	2009	Settlement Agreement	other barriers to voter registration	Janis v. Nelson, CIV. 06-5019 (D.S.D. 2009).
Enemy Swim Sanitary District	case/litigation	2000	Settlement Agreement	other barriers to voter registration (maintaining boundaries with the purpose and effect of excluding Native American voters)	United States v. Day County, S.D., CIV. 99-1024 (D.S.D. 2000).
Wagner Community School District	case/litigation	2003	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Weddell v. Wagner Cmty. Sch. Dist., CIV. 02-4056 (D.S.D. 2003).
Buffalo County	case/litigation	2004	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Kirkie v. Buffalo County, S.D., CIV. 03-3011 (D.S.D. 2004).
Charles Mix County	case/litigation	2005	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution, violation of Section 5 of the VRA	Blackmoon v. Charles Mix County, CIV. 05-4017 (2007); Quick Bear Quiver v. Nelson, 387 F. Supp. 2d 1027 (D.S.D. 2005).

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
Charles Mix County	Section 5 objection letter	2008	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Grace Chung Becker to Sara Frankenstein (Feb. 11, 2008) (South Dakota)
Shannon County	case/litigation	2013	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	early or absentee voting	Brooks v. Gant, CIV. 12-5003 (D.S.D. 2013).
TENNESSEE					
Crockett County and the Crockett County Board of County Commissioners	case/litigation	2001	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	United States v. Crockett County, Civil Action 1-01-1129 (W.D. Tenn. 2001); Complaint and Consent Decree.
City of Bolivar	case/litigation	2003	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Hardeman Cty NAACP v. Frost, et al., 03-1041 (W.D. Tenn. Dec. 9, 2003)
TEXAS					
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	1995	Attorney General Objection	language assistance	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Ronald Kirk (Feb. 17, 1995) (Texas)
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	1996	Attorney General Objection	barriers to registration	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Antonio Garza (Jan. 16, 1996) (Texas)
Statewide	case/litigation	1998	Preliminary Injunction	other - change of election structure	LULAC of Texas v. State of Texas, Case no. 96-cv-00930-HFG-SS (W.D. Tex 1996)
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	2001	Attorney General Objection	redistricting	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph R. Boyd to Geoffrey Connor (Nov. 16, 2001) (Texas)
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	2008	Attorney General Objection	other - change in election qualification requirement	Section 5 objection letter, Grace Chung Becker to Phil Wilson (Aug. 21, 2008) (Texas)



Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
Statewide	Section 5 objection letter	2012	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to Keith Ingram (March 12, 2012)(Texas)
Statewide	case/litigation	2013	remedial plan adopted	vote dilution	Perez v. Perry, 891 F. Supp. 2d 808 (W.D. Tex. 2012)
Statewide	case/litigation	2014	Final Order	vote dilution	Texas v. Holder, 888 F.Supp.2d. 113 (D.D.C. 2012), vacated and remanded, 570 U.S. 928 (2013), dismissed, cv. 12-128 (RMC)(2014)
Statewide	case/litigation	2016	Final Order	vote denial	Veasey v. Abbott, 830 F.3d 216 (2016)
Statewide	case/litigation	2018	Final Order	vote dilution	Perez et al v. Perry et al, Case No. 11-CV-360 (W.D. Tex. 2011). Later Abbott v. Perez, 138 S.Ct. 2305 (2018).
Statewide	case/litigation	2019	Final Order	problems at the polls	OCA-Greater Houston et al v. State of Texas et al, 1:2015cv00679, (W. D. Tex. 2015).
Statewide	case/litigation	2019	Preliminary Injunction; Settlement	vote dilution	MOVE Texas Civic Fund et al v. Whitley et al, 5:2019cv00171, (W.D. Tex. 2019).
Tarrant County	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Ronald Kirk (Aug. 15, 1994) (Texas)
Marion County	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	polling place location	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to James P. Finstrom (Apr. 18, 1994) (Texas)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
Midland County	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to John Hannah, Jr. (May 9, 1994) (Texas)
Fort Bend County and Harris County	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Ronald Kirk (May 31, 1994) (Texas)
Limestone County	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to David M. Guinn (Jun. 13, 1994) (Texas)
Galveston Independent School District	case/litigation	1994	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution, polling place locations	Henderson, et al v. Galveston Independent, et al, Case No. 1994cv00144 (S. D. Tex, 1994)
Edna Independent School District	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Stuart Ishimaru to Arturo G. Michel (Aug. 22, 1994) (Texas)
Morton	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	language assistance	Section 5 objection letter, Kerry Scanlon to Paul Lyle (Sep. 12, 1994) (Texas)
San Antonio	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	language assistance	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Lloyd Garcia (Oct. 21, 1994) (Texas)
Gonzalez County Underground Water Conservation District	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Mary Ann Wyatt (Oct. 31, 1994) (Texas)
Judton Independent School District	Section 5 objection letter	1994	Attorney General Objection	language assistance	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Galen R. Elolf (Nov. 18, 1994) (Texas)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
Edwards Underground water District	Section 5 objection letter	1995	Attorney General Objection	problems at the polls	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Sally Tamez-Salas (March 2, 1995) (Texas)
Karnes City	Section 5 objection letter	1995	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Deval L. Patrick to Don Tymrac (Oct. 31, 1994) (Texas)
City of Boerne	case/litigation	1996	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	League of United Latin American Citizens, District 19 v. City of Boerne et al; Case no. 5:96-cv-00808 (W.D. Tex 1996)
Sharyland Independent School District	case/litigation	1997	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	League of United Lat, et al v. Sharyland ISD, et al, Case No. 1996cv00132 (S. D. Tex, 1996)
Galveston County	Section 5 objection letter	1998	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Bill Lann Lee to Barbara E. Roberts (Dec. 14, 1998) (Texas)
Lamesa	Section 5 objection letter	1999	Attorney General Objection	deannexation	Section 5 objection letter, Bill Lann Lee to Robert Gorsline (Jul. 16, 1999) (Texas)
Sealy Independent School District	Section 5 objection letter	2000	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Bill Lann Lee to David Mendez (Jun. 5, 2000) (Texas)
Haskell Consolidated Independent School District	Section 5 objection letter	2001	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd to Cheryl T. Mehl (Sept. 24, 2001) (Texas)
Schleicher County Independent School District	case/litigation	2002	Final Order	vote dilution	Belman, et al v. Schleicher Co ISD, et al., Case No. 6:2002cv00022 (N.D. Tex. 2002).

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
Waller County	Section 5 objection letter	2002	Attorney General Objection	redistricting	Section 5 objection letter, J. Michael Wiggins to Denise Nance Pierce (Jun. 21, 2002) (Texas)
Freeport	Section 5 objection letter	2002	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, J. Michael Wiggins to Wallace Shaw (Aug. 12, 2002) (Texas)
Bexar County	case/litigation	2003	Preliminary Injunction	vote dilution	M Hernandez Chapter v. Bexar County, et al Case No. 5:03-cv-00816-WRF (W.D. Tex. 2003)
Yorktown City Council	case/litigation	2003	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	failure to obtain section 5 preclearance	Perez v. City of Yorktown, The, et al, Case No. 2003-cv-029 (S.D. Tex. 2003)
Waller County	case/litigation	2004	Settlement Agreement	other barriers to voter registration	Prairie View Chapter, et al v. Kitzman, Case No. 2004cv00459 (S. D. Tex. 2004)
Bexar County	case/litigation	2005	Final Order	polling place locations	American GI Forum, et al v. Bexar County, et al, Case No. 5:04-cv-00181-FB (W.D. Tex. 2004)
Ector County	case/litigation	2005	Consent Decree	language assistance	United States, et al v. Ector County, Texas, et al, Case No. 7:05-cv-00131-RAJ (W.D. Tex. 2005)
Hale County, TX	case/litigation	2006	Consent Decree	language assistance	United States of America v. Hale County, Texas et al., Case No. 5:2006cv00043 (N.D. Tex. 2006).
North Harris Montgomery Community College District	Section 5 objection letter	2006	Attorney General Objection	polling place location	Section 5 objection letter, Wan J. Kim to Renee Smith Byas (May 5, 2006) (Texas)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
Brazos County	case/litigation	2006	Consent Decree	language assistance	The United States Of America v. Brazos County, Texas et al, Case No. 2006cv02165 (S. D. Tex. 2006)
North Harris Montgomery Community College District	case/litigation	2006	Settlement Agreement	problems at the polls	The United States Of America v. North Harris Montgomery Community College District et al, Case No. 2006-cv-02488 (S. D. Tex. 2006)
Amarillo College District	case/litigation	2006	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	Bosquez et al v. Amarillo College District, Case No. 2:2005cv00323 (N.D. Tex. 2006).
Dallas Independent School District	case/litigation	2006	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	Villegas, et al v. Dallas Independent S, et al., Case No. 3:2002cv00858 (N.D. Tex. 2006).
Bexar Metropolitan Water District	case/litigation	2007	Preliminary Injunction	vote dilution	Rios v. Bexar Metro. Water, et al - Case no. 5:96-cv-00335 (W.D. Tex 1996)
The City of Amarillo, TX	case/litigation	2007	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	Bosquez et al v. City of Amarillo, TX, Case No. 2:2005cv00324 (N.D. Tex. 2007).
Galveston County	case/litigation	2007	Consent Decree	language assistance; problems at the polls	United States v. Galveston County, Case No. 07-cv-00377 (S.D. Tex. 2007)
City of Hondo, Texas	case/litigation	2007	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance	Garcia, et al v. City of Hondo, Texas, Case No. 09-cv-00394 (W.D. Tex.2007)
Littlefield Independent School District	case/litigation	2007	Consent Decree	language assistance	United States of America v. Littlefield Independent School District et al., Case No. 5:2007cv00145 (N.D. Tex. 2007).

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
Post Independent School District	case/litigation	2007	Consent Decree	language assistance	United States of America v. Post Independent School District et al., Case No. 5:2007cv00146 (N.D. Tex. 2007).
Seagraves Independent School District	case/litigation	2007	Consent Decree	language assistance	United States of America v. Seagraves Independent School District et al., Case No. 5:2007cv00147 (N.D. Tex. 2007).
Smyer Independent School District	case/litigation	2007	Consent Decree	language assistance	United States of America et al v. Lewis, Case No. 5:2007cv00148 (N.D. Tex. 2007).
City of Earth	case/litigation	2007	Consent Decree	language assistance	United States of America v. City of Earth, Texas et al., Case No. 5:2007cv00144 (N.D. Tex. 2007).
Engelman Irrigation District	case/litigation	2008	Final Order	other barriers to voter registration	Shields et al v Engelman Irrigation District et al, Case No. 08-cv-00116 (S.D. Tex. 2008)
Waller County	case/litigation	2008	Consent Decree	other barriers to voter registration	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE v. Waller County et al, Case No. 18-cv-03022 (S.D. Tex. 2008)
Dumas Independent School District	case/litigation	2008	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	League of United Latin American Citizens, Statewide v. Dumas Independent School District et al., Case No. 2:1993cv00154 (N.D. Tex. 2008).
Gonzales County	Section 5 objection letter	2009	Attorney General Objection	language assistance; problems at the polls	Section 5 objection letter, Loretta King to Robert T. Bass (March 24, 2009) (Texas)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
Fort Bend County	case/litigation	2009	Consent Decree	language assistance; other barriers to voter registration; problems at the polls	United States of America v. Fort Bend County, Texas, Case No. 09-cv-01058 (S.D. Tex. 2009)
Texas Democratic Party and State of Texas	case/litigation	2009	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	LULAC of Texas et al v. State of Texas et al, Case 08-cv-00389 (W.D. Tex.2007)
City of Irving	case/litigation	2010	Final Order	vote dilution	Benavidez v. The City of Irving, Texas et al., Case No. 3:2007cv01850 (N.D. Tex. 2010).
Runnels County	Section 5 objection letter	2010	Attorney General Objection	language assistance; problems at the polls	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to Elsa Ocker (Jun. 28, 2010) (Texas)
Val Verde County Clerk, Val Verde County and State of Texas	case/litigation	2010	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	LULAC of Texas et al, Case No. :10-cv-00058 (W.D. Tex. 2010)
Dallas County, Texas	case/litigation	2011	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	Problems at polls	Texas Democratic Party v. Dallas County, Case No. 3:2008cv02117 (N.D. Tex. 2011).
Board of Directors for Garza County Hospital District	case/litigation	2011	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Tobias, et al v. Garza County Hospital, et al,5:2000-cv-00293, (N.D. Tex. 2000).
Galveston County	Section 5 objection letter	2011	Attorney General Objection	language assistance; problems at the polls	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to C. Robert Heath (Oct. 3, 2011) (Texas)
Medina County	case/litigation	2011	Final Order	vote dilution	Vasquez-Lopez et al v. Medina County, Texas et al, Case 5:11-cv-00945 (W.D. Tex. 2011)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
Nueces County	Section 5 objection letter	2012	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	No. 11-1784 (D.D.C. 2011)
Galveston County	Section 5 objection letter; case/litigation	2012	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to James E. Trainor III (March 5, 2012) (Texas); Galveston County, Texas v. United States of America et al., Case No. 11-1837 (D.D.C. 2011)
Galveston County	case/litigation	2012	Preliminary Injunction	vote dilution	Petteway, et al. v. Galveston County, Texas, et al., Case No. 2011cv00511 (S.D. Tex 2011)
Beaumont Independent School District, Jefferson County	Section 5 objection letter	2012	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to Melody Thomas Chappell (Dec. 21, 2012) (Texas)
City of Farmers Branch	case/litigation	2013	Dismissed after alleged violation addressed	vote dilution	Fabela et al v. City of Farmers Branch Texas et al., Case No. 3:2010cv01425 (N.D. Tex. 2013).
Beaumont Independent School District, Jefferson County	Section 5 objection letter	2013	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Thomas E. Perez to Melody Thomas Chappell (Apr. 8, 2013) (Texas)
Lone Star College System District	case/litigation	2013	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Hubbard et al v. Lone Star College System et al, Case No. 2013cv01635 (S.D. Tex 2013)
Irving Independent School District	case/litigation	2014	Final Order	vote dilution	Benavidez v. Irving Independent School District et al., Case No. 3:2013cv00087 (N.D. Tex. 2014).
Grand Prairie Independent School District	case/litigation	2014	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	Rodriguez v. Grand Prairie Independent School District et al., Case No. 3:202013cv01788 (N.D. Tex. 2014).



Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
City of Pasadena	case/litigation	2017	Final Order	vote dilution	Patino et al v. City of Pasadena et al, Case No. 2014cv03241 (S.D. Tex. 2014)
Hereford Independent School District	case/litigation	2018	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	Gamez v. Hereford Independent School District et al., Case No. 2:1995cv00028 (N.D. Tex. 2018).
Richardson Independent School District	case/litigation	2019	Settlement Agreement	vote dilution	Tyson v. Richardson Independent School District et al., Case No. 3:2018cv00212 (N.D. Tex. 2019).
UTAH					
San Juan County	case/litigation	2016	Final Order	vote dilution	Navajo Nation et al v. San Juan Cty., 929 F.3d 1270 (10th Cir. 2019) (affirming the district court); Navajo Nation et al v. San Juan Cty., 162 F. Supp. 3d 1162 (D. Utah 2016); Navajo Nation v. San Juan Cty., 266 F. Supp. 3d 1341 (D. Utah 2017); Navajo Nation v. San Juan Cty., 2:12-cv-39, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 211230 (D. Utah Dec. 21, 2017)
San Juan County	case/litigation	2018	Settlement Agreement	language assistance; polling place location	Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission et al v. San Juan Cty. et al, 215 F. Supp. 3d 1201 (D. Utah 2017); Id. Case No. 2:16-cv-154, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 145158 (D. Utah Sept. 7, 2017); 2:16-cv-154, Dkt. No. 198 (D. Utah Feb. 20, 2018)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				((1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other)	
VIRGINIA					
Statewide	case/litigation	1997	Final Order	vote dilution	Moon v. Meadows, 952 F. Supp. 1141 (E.D. Va.), aff'd, 521 U.S. 1113, 117 S. Ct. 2501 (1997), and aff'd sub nom. Harris v. Moon, 521 U.S. 1113 (1997)
Statewide	case/litigation	2015	Final Order	racial gerrymandering	Page v. Virginia State Bd. Of Elections, No. 3:13CV678, 2015 WL 3604029, at *1 (E.D. Va. June 5, 2015)
Statewide	case/litigation	2018	Final Order	racial gerrymandering	Bethune-Hill v. Virginia State Bd. of Elections, 326 F. Supp. 3d 128 (E.D. Va. 2018), appeal dismissed sub nom. Virginia House of Delegates v. Bethune-Hill, 139 S. Ct. 1945 (2019)
City of Newport News, VA	case/litigation	1994	Consent Decree	vote dilution	U.S. v. City of Newport News, No. 4:94-cv-00155 (E.D. Va. 1994)
Dinwiddie County, VA	Section 5 objection letter	1999	Attorney General Objection	polling place locations	Section 5 objection letter, Bill Lann Lee to Benjamin W. Emerson (Dec. 27, 1999) (Virginia)
Northhampton County, VA	Section 5 objection letter	2001	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to James E. Trainor III (Sept. 28, 2001) (Virginia)
Northhampton County, VA	Section 5 objection letter	2001	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to James E. Trainor III (Sept. 28, 2001) (Virginia)
Pittsylvania County, VA	Section 5 objection letter	2002	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to William D. Sleeper (Apr. 29, 2002) (Virginia)

Jurisdiction	Type of Matter	Date of Interim or Final Resolution	Results	Type of Voting Discrimination	Reference
				(1) vote dilution; (2) language assistance; (3) identification requirements; (4) other barriers to voter registration; (5) problems at the polls; (6) polling place locations; (7) early or absentee voting; and/or (8) other	
Cumberland County, VA	Section 5 objection letter	2002	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to Darvin Satterwhite (July 9, 2002) (Virginia)
Northhampton County, VA	Section 5 objection letter	2003	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, Ralph F. Boyd, Jr. to Bruce D. Jones, Jr. (May 19, 2003) (Virginia)
Northhampton County, VA	Section 5 objection letter	2003	Attorney General Objection	vote dilution	Section 5 objection letter, J. Michael Wiggins to Bruce D. Jones, Jr. (Oct. 21, 2001) (Virginia)
WASHINGTON					
Yakima County	case/litigation	2004	Consent Decree	language assistance	United States v. Yakima County, No. CV-04- 3072-LRS (E.D. Wash. 2004)
City of Yakima	case/litigation	2014	Final Order	vote dilution	Montes v. City of Yakima: <a href="https://aclu-wa.org/file/99782/download?token=OWBlvKUP">https://aclu-wa.org/file/99782/download?token=OWBlvKUP</a>
City of Pasco	case/litigation	2016	Consent Decree	vote dilution	Glatt v. City of Pasco: <a href="https://www.aclu-wa.org/file/101908/download?token=oHPP3kU5">https://www.aclu-wa.org/file/101908/download?token=oHPP3kU5</a>
WISCONSIN					
Statewide	case/litigation	2012	Final Order	vote dilution	Baldus v. Members of Wisconsin Gov't Accountability Board, 849 F.Supp.2d 840 (E.D. Wis 2012)
WYOMING					
Fremont County	case/litigation	2010	Final Order	vote dilution	Large v. Fremont County, Wyo., 709 F. Supp. 2d 1176 (D. Wyo. 2010)











LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR  
**CIVIL RIGHTS**  
U N D E R L A W

1500 K St., N.W., 9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 2005  
Phone: 202-662-8600

**[www.lawyerscommittee.org](http://www.lawyerscommittee.org)**