## Postponement of a City Council Election for Preclearance of New Districts

LULAC Council #682 v. City of Seguin (Orlando L. Garcia, W.D. Tex. 5:02-cv-369)

A federal judge enjoined a May 4 city-council election, because a previous districting plan had become malapportioned and a new plan had not yet received preclearance. The election was held on September 14.

*Subject:* District lines. *Topics:* Enjoining elections; section 5 preclearance; malapportionment; three-judge court; attorney fees; early voting.

On April 12, 2002, the day that a voting-rights group filed a federal complaint in the Western District of Texas, Judge Orlando L. Garcia ordered briefing for an April 15 hearing on the legal implications of a planned May 4 city-council election for which districts had become malapportioned, but a new districting plan had not yet received preclearance pursuant to section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.<sup>1</sup>

Following the hearing, held two days before early voting was to begin, Judge Garcia enjoined the election and set the case for hearing again on April 24.<sup>2</sup> The circuit's chief judge named Circuit Judge Emilio M. Garza and Western District of Texas Judge Edward C. Prado to join Judge Garcia as a three-judge district court to hear section 5 claims.<sup>3</sup> On April 30, the three-judge court converted the temporary restraining order into a preliminary injunction.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1.</sup> Order, LULAC Council #682 v. City of Seguin, No. 5:02-cv-369 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 12, 2002), D.E. 3; see Voting Rights Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-110, § 5, 79 Stat. 437, 439, as *amended*, 52 U.S.C. § 10304 (2014) (requiring preclearance of changes to voting procedures in jurisdictions with a certified history of discrimination and requiring that preclearance disputes be heard by a three-judge district court).

On June 25, 2013, the Supreme Court declined to hold section 5 unconstitutional, but the Court did hold unconstitutional the criteria for which jurisdictions require section 5 preclearance. Shelby County v. Holder, 570 U.S. 529 (2013).

<sup>2.</sup> Order, *LULAC Council* #682, No. 5:02-cv-369 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 16, 2002), D.E. 6; see Sonja Garza, *Judge Postpones Seguin Election*, San Antonio Express-News, Apr. 16, 2002, at 1B; see also Roger Croteau, Seguin Accepts Delayed Election, San Antonio Express-News, Apr. 17, 2002, at 7B.

<sup>3.</sup> Order, LULAC Council #682, No. 5:02-cv-369 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 16, 2002), D.E. 7.

Judge Garza retired on January 5, 2015; Judge Prado was elevated to the court of appeals on May 5, 2003, and he retired on April 2, 2018. Federal Judicial Center Biographical Directory of Article III Federal Judges, www.fjc.gov/history/judges.

<sup>4.</sup> Order, LULAC Council #682, No. 5:02-cv-369 (W.D. Tex. Apr. 30, 2002), D.E. 9.

Following May 17 preclearance of new districts, the three-judge court issued an order on June 26 approving settlement of the case by holding the election on September 14.<sup>5</sup> The parties agreed to an award of \$10,000 in attorney fees and costs.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5.</sup> Order, *id*. (June 26, 2002), D.E. 13. 6. *Id*. at 4.