

General has conducted an independent investigation of Grayson County to determine if it has satisfied the necessary requirements for a bailout under Section 4(a). As a result of that investigation, and also based on information provided to the Attorney General by the County, the Attorney General has determined that the County meets all of the requirements of Section 4(a) and has determined that the Attorney General would consent to a declaratory judgment granting bailout to the County under Section 4(a).

3. The parties have conferred concerning a resolution of this litigation and have agreed on the terms of the attached Consent Judgment and Decree, which if entered by this Court, will grant the requested bailout to Grayson County.

4. The attached Consent Judgment and Decree is similar to those that have been entered by three-judge courts in other declaratory judgment actions brought in this Court under Section 4(a) of the Voting Rights Act. *See, e.g., City of Williamsburg v. Holder*, No. 11-1415 (D.D.C. Nov. 28, 2011); *James City County v. Holder*, No. 11-1425 (D.D.C. Nov. 9, 2011); *Culpeper County v. Holder*, No. 11-1477 (D.D.C. Oct. 3, 2011); *City of Bedford v. Holder*, No. 11-0473 (D.D.C., Aug. 31, 2011); *Bedford County v. Holder*, No. 11-0499 (D.D.C. Aug. 30, 2011); *Rappahannock County v. Holder*, No. 11-1123 (D.D.C. Aug. 9, 2011); *City of Manassas Park v. Holder*, No. 11-749 (D.D.C. Aug. 3, 2011); *Alta Irrigation District v. Holder*, No. 11-0758 (D.D.C. July 15, 2011); *City of Kings Mountain v. Holder*, No. 10-1153 (D.D.C. Oct. 22, 2010); *Amherst County v. Mukasey*, No. 08-780 (D.D.C. Aug. 13, 2008); *Middlesex County v. Gonzales*, No. 07-1485 (D.D.C. Jan. 7, 2008).

5. The parties request that this Court wait 30 days after the filing of this motion before approving the Consent Judgment and Decree. During that time, the proposed settlement will be publicized pursuant to Section 4(a)(4) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1973(a)(4).

For the reasons above and as set forth in the attached Consent Judgment and Decree, the parties respectfully submit that this Joint Motion should be granted and the attached Consent Judgment and Decree entered.

Respectfully submitted,

For the Plaintiff

GRAYSON COUNTY:

/s/ John G. Butler III
JOHN G. BUTLER III (DCB # 460969)
SANDS ANDERSON, PC
P.O. Box 1998
Richmond, VA 23218
Phone: (804) 648-1636
Fax: (804) 783-7291
Email: jbutler@sandsanderson.com

PHYLLIS C. KATZ (VSB #22259)(Pro hac vice)
SANDS ANDERSON, PC
P.O. Box 1998
Richmond, VA 23218
Phone: (804) 783-7287
Fax: (804) 783-7291
Email: pkatz@sandsanderson.com

Dated: June 14, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

For Defendants Eric H. Holder, Jr., Attorney General
of the United States, and Thomas E. Perez, Assistant
Attorney General, Civil Rights Division:

RONALD C. MACHEN, JR.
United States Attorney
District of Columbia

THOMAS E. PEREZ
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

/s/ Ernest A. McFarland
T. CHRISTIAN HERREN, JR.
ERNEST A. MCFARLAND
MARIA H. RIOS
ernest.a.mcfarland@usdoj.gov
maria.rios@usdoj.gov
Attorneys
Voting Section
Civil Rights Division
United States Department of Justice
Room 7254 - NWB
950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20530
Phone: (202) 307-6552
Fax: (202) 307-3961

Dated: June 14, 2012

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

GRAYSON COUNTY, VIRGINIA, a political)
subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia,)
))
Plaintiff,)
))
v.)
))
ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., the Attorney General of)
the United States of America, and THOMAS E.)
PEREZ, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights)
Division, United States Department of Justice,)
))
Defendants.)
))

No. 1:12-CV-00718- JDB-TBG-ESH
Three-Judge Court

CONSENT JUDGMENT AND DECREE

1. This action was initiated on May 3, 2012, by Plaintiff Grayson County, Virginia (“County”), against Defendants Eric H. Holder, Jr., Attorney General of the United States, and Thomas E. Perez, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division (collectively, “the Attorney General”). The County is a governmental entity organized under the constitution and laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

2. The Commonwealth of Virginia became covered as a whole by certain special provisions of the Voting Rights Act, based on a coverage determination under Section 4(b) of the Act made by the Attorney General and the Director of the Census, and published in the Federal Register on August 7, 1965. *See* 30 Fed. Reg. 9,897 (Aug. 7, 1965). By virtue of this coverage determination, the Commonwealth of Virginia and all of its political subdivisions (including Grayson County) must receive preclearance under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act for all changes enacted or implemented after November 1, 1964, that affect voting.

3. In this action, Grayson County seeks a declaratory judgment pursuant to Section 4(a)(1) of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1), exempting it from coverage under Section 4(b) of the Act, 42 U.S.C. 1973b(b). Exemption under Section 4(b) would in turn exempt the County and its political subunits from the preclearance provisions of Section 5, 42 U.S.C. § 1973c.

4. This three-judge Court has been convened as provided in 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(5) and 28 U.S.C. § 2284 and has jurisdiction over this matter.

5. Section 4(a) of the Voting Rights Act provides that a state or political subdivision subject to the special provisions of the Act may be exempted or “bailed out” from those provisions, through an action for a declaratory judgment before this Court, if it can demonstrate fulfillment of the specific statutory conditions in Section 4(a), for the time period “during the ten years preceding the filing of the action” and “during the pendency of such action,” as described below:

(A) no such test or device has been used within such State or political subdivision for the purpose or with the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color or (in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection) in contravention of the guarantees of subsection (f)(2) of this section (42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(A));

(B) no final judgment of any court of the United States, other than the denial of declaratory judgment under this section, has determined that denials or abridgements of the right to vote on account of race or color have occurred anywhere in the territory of such State or political subdivision or (in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection) that denials or abridgements of the right to vote in contravention of the guarantees of subsection (f)(2)

of this section have occurred anywhere in the territory of such State or subdivision and no consent decree, settlement, or agreement has been entered into resulting in any abandonment of a voting practice challenged on such grounds; and no declaratory judgment under this section shall be entered during the pendency of an action commenced before the filing of an action under this section and alleging such denials or abridgements of the right to vote (42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(B));

(C) no Federal examiners or observers under subchapters I-A to I-C of this chapter have been assigned to such State or political subdivision (42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(C));

(D) such State or political subdivision and all governmental units within its territory have complied with section 1973c of this title, including compliance with the requirement that no change covered by section 1973c of this title has been enforced without preclearance under section 1973c of this title, and have repealed all changes covered by section 1973c of this title to which the Attorney General has successfully objected or as to which the United States District Court for the District of Columbia has denied a declaratory judgment (42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(D));

(E) the Attorney General has not interposed any objection (that has not been overturned by a final judgment of a court) and no declaratory judgment has been denied under section 1973c of this title, with respect to any submission by or on behalf of the plaintiff or any governmental unit within its territory under section 1973c of this title, and no such submissions or declaratory judgment actions are pending (42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(E)); and

(F) such State or political subdivision and all governmental units within its territory - (i) have eliminated voting procedures and methods of election which inhibit or dilute equal access to the electoral process; (ii) have engaged in constructive efforts to eliminate intimidation and harassment of persons exercising rights protected under subchapters I-A to I-C of this chapter; and (iii) have engaged in other constructive efforts, such as expanded opportunity for convenient registration and voting for every person of voting age and the appointment of minority persons as election officials throughout the jurisdiction and at all stages of the election and registration process (42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(F)(i-iii)).

6. Section 4(a) provides the following additional requirements to obtain bailout:

To assist the court in determining whether to issue a declaratory judgment under this subsection, the plaintiff shall present evidence of minority participation, including evidence of the levels of minority group registration and voting, changes in such levels over time, and disparities between minority-group and non-minority-group participation. (42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(2));

No declaratory judgment shall issue under this subsection with respect to such State or political subdivision if such plaintiff and governmental units within its territory have, during the period beginning ten years before the date the judgment is issued, engaged in violations of any provision of the Constitution or laws of the United States or any State or political subdivision with respect to discrimination in voting on account of race or color or (in the case of a State or subdivision seeking a declaratory judgment under the second sentence of this subsection) in contravention of the guarantees of subsection (f)(2) of this section unless the plaintiff establishes that any such violations were trivial, were promptly corrected, and were not repeated. (42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(3));

The State or political subdivision bringing such action shall publicize the intended commencement and any proposed settlement of such action in the media serving such State or political subdivision and in appropriate United States post offices . . . (42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(4)).

7. Section 4(a)(9) provides that the Attorney General can consent to entry of a declaratory judgment granting bailout “if based upon a showing of objective and compelling evidence by the plaintiff, and upon investigation, he is satisfied that the State or political subdivision has complied with the requirements of [Section 4(a)(1)]” (42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(9)).

8. The Attorney General has conducted a comprehensive and independent investigation to determine the County’s eligibility for bailout. Department of Justice attorneys

have interviewed members of the local community and reviewed a significant quantity of documentary evidence, including background information, demographic data, minutes of the Grayson County Board of Supervisors, Grayson County Electoral Board, Grayson County School Board, and the Town Councils of Independence, Fries and Troutdale, as well as the preclearance submissions of these jurisdictions.

9. The Attorney General and Grayson County agree that Grayson County has fulfilled all conditions required by Section 4(a) and is entitled to the requested declaratory judgment. The parties have filed a Joint Motion for Entry of this Consent Judgment and Decree.

AGREED STIPULATION OF FACTUAL FINDINGS

10. Grayson County is a political subdivision of the Commonwealth of Virginia and thus a political subdivision of a state within the meaning of Section 4(a) of the Voting Rights Act. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(A); *see also Northwest Austin Mun. Util. Dist. No. One v. Holder*, 557 U.S. 193 (2009). There are four other elected governmental units within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. §1973b(a)(1) that exist within Grayson County: the Grayson County School District and the Towns of Independence, Fries and Troutdale.

11. The Grayson County Board of Supervisors is the governing body that formulates policies for the administration of government in Grayson County. It is comprised of five supervisors elected by plurality vote to serve four-year staggered terms. Four of the supervisors are elected from single-member districts, and one is elected at-large.

12. The Grayson County School District (“School District”) is coterminous with the County and governed by the Grayson County School Board. The Grayson County School Board is comprised of five members elected by plurality vote to four-year staggered terms. Four

members are elected from the same single-member districts as are members of the Grayson County Board of Supervisors. One member is elected at-large.

13. In addition to the County and the School District, located within Grayson County are the Towns of Independence, Fries and Troutdale (“Towns”). The Town of Independence is governed by a six-member council and a Mayor; they are elected at large to serve four-year staggered terms. The Town of Fries is governed by a seven-member council; they are elected at large to serve two-year terms. Once a year, the council selects one of its members to serve as the Mayor of the Town of Fries. The Town of Troutdale is governed by a six-member council and a Mayor; they are elected at large to serve two-year terms.

14. Residents of each Town are eligible to participate in County, School District, and their respective Town elections.

15. Grayson County, Virginia has a total population of 15,553 persons, according to the 2010 Census. The racial composition of the County’s population is 14,627 (94.2%) non-Hispanic white, 366 (2.4%) non-Hispanic black, 416 (2.7%) Hispanic, 85 (0.6%) non-Hispanic Native American, and 20 (0.1%) non-Hispanic Asian. According to the 2010 Census, Grayson County has a total voting age population of 12,583. The racial composition of this voting age population is 11,977 (95.2%) non-Hispanic white, 252 (2%) non-Hispanic black, 260 (2.1%) Hispanic, 69 (0.6%) non-Hispanic Native American, and 15 (0.1%) non-Hispanic Asian.

16. The Grayson County School District has the same total population and voting age population as the County.

17. The Town of Independence has a total population of 947 persons according to the 2010 Census. The racial composition of the Town’s population is 807 (85.2%) non-Hispanic

white, 79 (8.3%) non-Hispanic black, 45 (4.8%) Hispanic, 8 (0.8%) non-Hispanic Native American, and 2 (0.2%) non-Hispanic Asian. According to the 2010 Census, the Town of Independence has a voting age population of 794. The racial composition of this voting age population is 693 (87.3%) non-Hispanic white, 64 (8.1%) non-Hispanic black, 27 (3.4%) Hispanic, 6 (0.8%) non-Hispanic Native American, and no non-Hispanic Asian.

18. The Town of Fries has a total population of 484 persons according to the 2010 Census. The racial composition of the Town's population is 465 (96.1%) non-Hispanic white, 10 (2.1%) non-Hispanic black, 6 (1.2%) Hispanic, 2 (0.4%) non-Hispanic Native American, and one (0.2%) non-Hispanic Asian. According to the 2010 Census, the Town of Fries has a voting age population of 425. The racial composition of this voting age population is 411 (96.7%) non-Hispanic white, 6 (1.4%) non-Hispanic black, 5 (1.2%) Hispanic, 2 (0.5%) non-Hispanic Native American, and 1 (0.2%) non-Hispanic Asian.

19. The Town of Troutdale has a total population of 178 persons according to the 2010 Census. The racial composition of the Town's population is 163 (91.6%) non-Hispanic white, no non-Hispanic black, 13 (7.3%) Hispanic, 2 (1.1%) non-Hispanic Native American, and no non-Hispanic Asian. According to the 2010 Census, the Town of Troutdale has a voting age population of 146. The racial composition of this voting age population is 136 (93.2%) non-Hispanic white, no non-Hispanic black, 8 (5.5%) Hispanic, 2 (1.4%) non-Hispanic Native American, and no non-Hispanic Asian.

20. No African-Americans have been elected to the County Board of Supervisors or the County School Board.

21. No African-Americans have been elected to the Town Council for Independence, Fries, or Troutdale.

22. The Grayson County General Registrar and the Grayson County Electoral Board are primarily responsible for all election-related functions, including voter registration, list maintenance, voter outreach, conduct of elections, and the selection of polling sites and certain poll workers, in the County.

23. No African-Americans have been appointed or have served on the County Electoral Board or as the County General Registrar.

24. Citizens in Grayson County may register to vote in person at the office of the County General Registrar of Voters located in the Town of Independence. Citizens may also obtain voter registration applications at additional locations in the County, including the Grayson County Department of Health, Department of Social Services, Department of Rehabilitative Services, Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Substance Abuse Services, Department for the Blind and Vision Impaired, the Virginia Office for Protection and Advocacy, Regional Offices of the Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, Armed Forces Recruitment Offices, Department of Deaf and Hard of Hearing, and other agencies whose primary function is to provide state-funded assistance to persons with disabilities. Citizens can also register to vote at the Department of Motor Vehicles locations in the neighboring independent City of Galax, Town of Wytheville (Wythe County) and Town of Pulaski (Pulaski County). In addition, citizens may obtain mail-in voter registration applications from the State Board of Elections website and the County General Registrar.

25. Since the County, like other jurisdictions in Virginia, does not record the race of its registered voters, it cannot present evidence of minority participation in registering and voting. Current data show, however, that a significant portion of the County's voting age population is registered to vote. As of December 2010, there were 10,340 registered voters in Grayson County, which is approximately 82.2% of the County's 2010 Census voting age population of 12,583. The number of registered voters in the County has risen over the last decade. In 2000, there were 10,271 registered voters in the County. Thus, between 2000 and 2010, the total number of registered voters in the County increased by 0.7% while the total population decreased 15.2%.

26. On Election Day, the County uses 15 polling places and a central absentee voter precinct, which are all accessible to voters with physical disabilities.

27. African-Americans have been appointed and have served as poll workers in the County. In elections since 2000, Grayson County has employed at least five African-American poll workers.

28. Voter turnout in elections within Grayson County (*i.e.* the percentage of those registered voters who cast ballots) varies according to the offices up for election. In the last three Presidential elections, for example, voter turnout was 67.7% in 2000, 68.2% in 2004, and 72.4% in 2008. Voter turnout for the last three elections in November and for which statewide offices appeared on the ballot was 52.5% in 2001, 49.0% in 2005, and 42.5% in 2009.

29. Since Section 5 coverage of Virginia began, neither the Attorney General nor the United States District Court for the District of Columbia has denied preclearance to any voting changes included in any submission made on behalf of Grayson County. Since 2001, there were

8 submissions on behalf of the County. The most recent submission for the County—three polling place changes—was precleared by the Attorney General on November 8, 2011.

30. Since Section 5 coverage of Virginia began, neither the Attorney General nor the United States District Court for the District of Columbia has denied preclearance to any voting changes included in any submission made on behalf of the Grayson County School District. Since 2001, there were two submissions on behalf of the County School District. The most recent submission for the County School—a redistricting plan—was precleared by the Attorney General on August 5, 2011.

31. Since Section 5 coverage of Virginia began, neither the Attorney General nor the United States District Court for the District of Columbia has denied preclearance to any voting changes included in any submission made on behalf of the Town of Independence. Since 2001, there was only one submission on behalf of the Town of Independence. This submission—special election procedures—was precleared by the Attorney General on October 23, 2006.

32. Since Section 5 coverage of Virginia began, neither the Attorney General nor the United States District Court for the District of Columbia has denied preclearance to any voting changes included in submissions made on behalf of the Town of Fries. Since 2001, there was only one submission made on behalf of the Town of Fries. This submission—a polling place change—was precleared by the Attorney General on April 10, 2007.

33. No submissions have been made on behalf the Town of Troutdale.

34. The County publicized the intended commencement of this bailout action prior to its being filed by posting a notice regarding this action at United States post offices within the

County. Notices were also posted beginning in February 2011 in the County courthouse and municipal and private buildings, and remained posted for several months.

35. The County publicized the proposed settlement of this bailout action by publishing a notice in the *Declaration* on May 16, 2012, and in the May 9-10, 2012, edition of the *Galax Gazette*. The *Declaration* and the *Galax Gazette* are newspapers of general circulation in the County. Notice of this proposed settlement was posted in the County courthouse. The County also requested that this notice of proposed settlement be posted in United States post offices within the County and municipal and School District buildings.

36. The Attorney General has determined that it is appropriate to consent to a declaratory judgment allowing bailout by the County, pursuant to Section 4(a)(9) of the Voting Rights Act. The Attorney General's consent in this action is based upon his own independent factual investigation of the County's fulfillment of all of the bailout criteria, and consideration of all of the circumstances of this case, including the views of citizens in the County, and the absence of racial discrimination in the electoral process within the County. This consent is premised on an understanding that Congress intended Section 4(a)(9) to permit bailout in those cases where the Attorney General is satisfied that the statutory objectives of encouraging Section 5 compliance, and preventing the use of racially discriminatory voting practices, would not be compromised by such consent.

AGREED FINDINGS ON STATUTORY BAILOUT CRITERIA

37. Grayson County, the Grayson County School District, and the Towns of Independence, Fries and Troutdale are covered jurisdictions subject to the special provisions of the Voting Rights Act, including Section 5 of the Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1973c. Under Section 5 of the

Act, the County, School District, and Towns are required to obtain preclearance from either this Court or from the Attorney General for any change in voting standards, practices, and procedures adopted or implemented since the Act's coverage date for the Commonwealth of Virginia.

38. During the 10 years preceding the filing of this action and during the pendency of this action, there has been no test or device as defined in Section 4(c) of the Voting Rights Act used within the County for the purpose or with the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color. 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(A).

39. During the 10 years preceding the filing of this action, and during the pendency of this action, no final judgment of any court of the United States has determined that denials or abridgements of the right to vote on account of race or color have occurred anywhere in the territory of the County. Further, no consent decree, settlement, or agreement has been entered into resulting in any abandonment of a voting practice challenged on such grounds. No action is presently pending alleging such denials or abridgements of the right to vote. 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(B).

40. During the 10 years preceding the filing of this action, and during the pendency of this action, no Federal examiners or observers have been assigned to the County. 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(C).

41. During the 10 years preceding the filing of this action, and during the pendency of this action, the County, School District and Towns have complied with Section 5. The County, School District, and Towns have submitted a number of voting changes to the Attorney General for review under Section 5. There has been no need for the County, School District, or Towns to repeal any voting changes to which the Attorney General has objected, or to which this Court has

denied a declaratory judgment, since no such objection or denials have occurred. 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(D).

42. The Attorney General has never interposed any objection to voting changes submitted by or on behalf of the County, School District, or Towns for administrative review under Section 5. No such administrative submissions by or on behalf of the County, School District, or Towns are presently pending before the Attorney General. Neither the County, School District, nor Towns have ever sought judicial preclearance from this Court under Section 5. Thus, this Court has never denied the County, School District, or Towns a declaratory judgment under Section 5, nor are any such declaratory judgment actions now pending. 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(E).

43. During the 10 years preceding the filing of this action, and during the pendency of this action, neither the County, School District, nor Towns have employed voting procedures or methods of election which inhibit or dilute equal access to the electoral process. 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(F)(i).

44. There is no evidence that any persons in elections in the County, School District, or Towns have been subject to intimidation or harassment in the course of exercising their rights protected under the Voting Rights Act. 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(F)(ii).

45. Over the years, the County has engaged in constructive efforts to expand the opportunity for registration and voting for every person of voting age through a variety of ways, including offering additional opportunities for convenient voter registration and appointment of minority persons as poll officials. 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1)(F)(iii).

46. The County has presented available evidence concerning rates of voter registration and voter participation over time. 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(2).

47. During the preceding 10 year period, neither the County, School District, nor Towns have engaged in violations of any provision of the Constitution or laws of the United States or any State or political subdivision with respect to discrimination in voting on account of race or color. 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(3).

48. The County publicized notice of the intended commencement of this action in United States post offices within the County, the County courthouse, and newspapers with general circulation in the County. The County has also publicized a notice of the proposed settlement of this action. 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(4). The parties request that this Court wait 30 days after filing of the Joint Motion for Entry of this Consent Judgment and Decree, before approving this settlement, while this notice of proposed settlement is advertised.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED, ADJUDGED and DECREED:

1. The Plaintiff, Grayson County, is entitled to a declaratory judgment in accordance with Section 4(a)(1) of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(1).

2. The parties' Joint Motion for Entry of Consent Judgment and Decree is GRANTED, and Grayson County, the Grayson County School District and the Town of Independence, the Town of Fries and the Town of Troutdale are exempted from coverage under Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(b), provided that this Court shall retain jurisdiction over this matter for a period of ten years pursuant to Section 4(a)(5), 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(5). This action shall be closed and placed on this Court's inactive docket, subject to being reactivated upon application by either the Attorney General or any aggrieved person in

accordance with the procedures set forth in Section 4(a)(5), 42 U.S.C. § 1973b(a)(5).

3. Each party shall bear its own fees, expenses and costs.

Entered this _____ day of _____, 2012.

THOMAS B. GRIFFITH
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

JOHN D. BATES
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

ELLEN S. HUVELLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Approved as to form and content:

For the Plaintiff
GRAYSON COUNTY:

/s/ John G. Butler III
JOHN G. BUTLER III (DCB # 460969)
SANDS ANDERSON, PC
P.O. Box 1998
Richmond, VA 23218
Phone: (804) 648-1636
Fax: (804) 783-7291
Email: jbutler@sandsanderson.com

PHYLLIS C. KATZ (VSB #22259)(Pro hac vice)
SANDS ANDERSON, PC
P.O. Box 1998
Richmond, VA 23218
Phone: (804) 783-7287
Fax: (804) 783-7291
Email: pkatz@sandsanderson.com

Dated: June 14, 2012

Approved as to form and content:

For Defendants Eric H. Holder, Jr., Attorney General of the United States, and Thomas E. Perez, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division:

RONALD C. MACHEN, JR.
United States Attorney
District of Columbia

THOMAS E. PEREZ
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

/s/ Ernest A. McFarland

T. CHRISTIAN HERREN, JR.

ERNEST A. MCFARLAND

MARIA H. RIOS

ernest.a.mcfarland@usdoj.gov

maria.rios@usdoj.gov

Attorneys

Voting Section

Civil Rights Division

United States Department of Justice

Room 7254 - NWB

950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.

Washington, DC 20530

Phone: (202) 307-6552

Fax: (202) 307-3961

Dated: June 14, 2012