U.S. Department of Justice

Civil Rights Division

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

March 9, 1992

Honorable John Hannah, Jr.
Secretary of State
P.O. Box 12060
Austin, Texas 78711-2060

Dear Mr. Secretary:

This refers to Senate Bill No. 1 (1992), which provides the redistricting plan for the Senate of the State of Texas, submitted to the Attorney General pursuant to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 1973c. We received your initial submission on January 9, 1992; supplemental information was received on January 10, 1992.

We note that the submitted redistricting plan is substantively identical to the plan resulting from the settlement of state court litigation in October 1991. Quiroz v. Richards, No. C-4395-91F (332nd Jud. Dist. Ct., Hidalgo County, Tex.); Mena v. Richards, No. C-454-91-F (332nd Jud. Dist. Ct., Hidalgo County, Tex.). As you know, that plan received Section 5 preclearance on November 18, 1991. Since then, there have been significant new developments and submission of new information regarding that redistricting plan.

In December 1991, the Texas Supreme Court invalidated the settlement, thereby precluding its further implementation. Terrazas v. Ramirez, No. D-1817, 1991 WL 269035 (Tex. Dec. 17, 1991). One week later, the three-judge federal court in Terrazas v. Slagle, No. 91-CA-426 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 24, 1991) ("Terrazas"), adopted its own interim plan for Senate elections in 1992.

In January 1992, the legislature enacted the submitted Senate redistricting plan, and the state sought to supplant the Terrazas court plan with the enacted plan. The Terrazas court denied the request to stay implementation of the court's plan for the 1992 elections and, in its January 10, 1992 opinion ruled that the enacted plan could not be implemented, even if it were precleared under Section 5, because it "fails to satisfy the Sec. 2 requirements of the Voting Rights Act," op. at 12-13.

We know that the state has appealed the relevant rulings in the Terrazas action, and that the appeal is pending in the United States Supreme Court. On several occasions, however, the Supreme Court has declined to stay the use of the Terrazas court's Senate redistricting plan for the 1992 election. Thus, at this time the extant orders in the Terrazas action preclude the implementation of the submitted redistricting plan for the 1992 election. Moreover, the finding that the submitted plan violates Section 2 would appear to preclude its use thereafter.

Under these circumstances, it is not clear that the state is entitled to invoke Section 5 to obtain either an administrative or judicial determination on the merits of the submitted plan. We recognize that the Supreme Court's decision on the state's appeal in Terrazas may determine whether the submitted plan is capable of implementation. But in view of the statutory time constraints, an administrative determination under Section 5 may not be deferred pending that ruling.

The Voting Rights Act requires that the submitting authority demonstrate that the proposed change has neither a discriminatory purpose nor a discriminatory effect. Georgia v. United States, 411 U.S. 520 (1973); see also Procedures for the Administration of Section 5 (28 C.F.R. 51.52). In addition, preclearance may not be obtained for a voting change that clearly violates Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 1973; 28 C.F.R. 51.55 and 51.56.

In this situation, a federal district court has ruled that the submitted redistricting plan may not be used, in part, because the plan violates Section 2. That ruling, although challenged by the state, has not been vacated or reversed. Accordingly, I cannot conclude, as I must under the Voting Rights Act, that the plan meets the Act's preclearance requirements. Therefore, on behalf of the Attorney General, I must object to the redistricting plan contained in Senate Bill No. 1 (1992).

Of course, as provided by Section 5, the state has the right to seek a declaratory judgment granting preclearance for the submitted redistricting plan from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. As you are aware, the state has indicated it may do so in the context of the pending preclearance litigation concerning statewide redistricting. Texas v. United States, No. 91-2383 (D.D.C.).

The state also may request that the Attorney General reconsider the objection. In addition, reconsideration at the instance of the Attorney General may be appropriate "[w]here there appears to have been a substantial change in operative fact or relevant law." 28 C.F.R. 51.46(a). However, until the objection is withdrawn or a judgment from the District of Columbia Court is obtained, the submitted redistricting plan for

the Texas Senate continues to be legally unenforceable under Section 5. Clark v. Roemer, 111 S.Ct. 2096 (1991); 28 C.F.R. 51.10 and 51.46.

To enable us to meet our responsibility to enforce the Voting Rights Act, please inform us of the action the State of Texas plans to take concerning this matter. If you have any questions, you should call Steven H. Rosenbaum, Deputy Chief of the Voting Section at (202) 307-3143.

Sincerely,

John R. Dunne
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division