Voting-Rights Challenge to a School-District Consolidation

North Forest Independent School District v. Texas Educational Agency (David Hittner, S.D. Tex. 4:13-cv-1786)

School-district trustees filed a federal voting-rights challenge to consolidation of the school district with a neighboring school district. On the day after the case was heard, the challenge pursuant to section 5 of the Voting Rights Act became moot because of the Supreme Court's holding that the criteria for application of section 5 were unconstitutional. The district judge denied immediate relief on a section 2 claim, consolidation proceeded, and the parties stipulated a nonsuit.

Subject: District lines. *Topics:* Section 2 discrimination; section 5 preclearance; laches.

The seven trustees of the North Forest Independent School District filed a federal complaint¹ in the Southern District of Texas on June 19, 2013, claiming that state-ordered absorption of the North Forest school district into the Houston Independent School District violated section 2 of the Voting Rights Act,² and the consolidation had not yet been precleared pursuant to section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.³ With their complaint, the plaintiffs filed a motion for a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction.⁴

On the day that the case was filed, Judge David Hittner set a hearing for June 24.⁵ On June 25, the Supreme Court declined to hold section 5 unconstitutional, but the Court did hold unconstitutional the criteria for which jurisdictions require section 5 preclearance.⁶ On June 26, Judge Hittner determined that the plaintiffs' section 5 claim was no longer valid.⁷

^{1.} Complaint, North Forest Indep. School Dist. v. Texas Educ. Agency, No. 4:13-cv-1786 (S.D. Tex. June 19, 2013), D.E. 1.

^{2.} Voting Rights Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-110, § 2, 79 Stat. 437, 437, as amended, 52 U.S.C. § 10301.

^{3.} *Id.*, § 5, 79 Stat. at 439, *as amended*, 52 U.S.C. § 10304 (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 court).

^{4.} Motion, North Forest Indep. School Dist., No. 4:13-cv-1786 (S.D. Tex. June 19, 2013), D.E. 2.

^{5.} Order, id. (June 19, 2013), D.E. 6; see Minutes, id. (June 24, 2013), D.E. 11.

^{6.} Shelby County v. Holder, 570 U.S. 529 (2013); see Harvey Rice, Voting Rights Decision Ripples, Hous. Chron., July 1, 2013, at 1.

^{7.} Opinion, *North Forest Indep. School Dist.*, No. 4:13-cv-1786 (S.D. Tex. June 26, 2013), D.E. 14 (noting that preclearance had been sought on April 2, 2013); Order, *id.* (June 27, 2013), D.E. 15 (denying as moot the plaintiffs' request for a three-judge court to hear their section 5 claim).

Judge Hittner did not dismiss the section 2 claim, but he denied the plaintiffs immediate relief.⁸ Noting the majority-minority North Forest school district's "well-documented educational struggles," Judge Hittner reasoned, "A halt in the further effectuation of this transition, just days before the consolidation goes into effect, would no doubt have dire consequences."⁹ Judge Hittner also noted the plaintiffs' late bringing of the case.¹⁰

The North Forest school district had been absorbed by the Houston school district by the time that schools opened on August 26.¹¹

On September 9, Judge Hittner granted the parties a stipulated nonsuit.¹²

^{8.} Opinion, *supra* note 7, at 7–11; *see* Ericka Mellon, *North Forest Loses Another Court Ruling*, Hous. Chron., June 27, 2013, at 5.

^{9.} Opinion, *supra* note 7, at 10–11.

^{10.} Id. at 10 n.3.

^{11.} See Ericka Mellon, HISD Staffers and Their Children Look to Future at Former N. Forest School, Hous. Chron., Aug. 27, 2013, at 1; see also Ericka Mellon, For North Forest ISD, It's All Over, Hous. Chron., July 1, 2013, at 1.

^{12.} Order, *North Forest Indep. School Dist.*, No. 4:13-cv-1786 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 9, 2013), D.E. 19.