

Important Supreme Court (SC) Congressional District (CD) *Redistricting Decisions* are listed below in chronological order – and an explanation is offered about how these Opinions affect the instant case.

Karcher v. Daggett, 462 U.S. 725 (1983) (NJ). This decision required State Legislatures to try and create CD's with population differences as close to zero as possible. *Karcher* was later modified and severely undermined in *Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74 (1997).

Shaw v. Reno, 509 U.S. 630 (1993) (NC). *Shaw* favors compact CDs and disfavors gerrymandering. This decision led to a highly sophisticated way to measure CD compaction scores. The higher the score, the more compact your proposed CD is. We believe we are the only participant to list the compaction scores for all of our proposed CDs on “NELIS.”

Abrams v. Johnson, 521 U.S. 74 (1997) (Ga.). This was/is a turning point case. The SC veered sharply away from a strict adherence to “one person, one vote” expressed in *Karcher v. Daggett*, and for practical purposes overturned *Karcher sub silentio*. The Court, in its final paragraph, stated that there could be *many reasons* or “myriad factors” that allow a State to deviate from strict adherence to “one person one vote.” In *Abrams* the Court *specifically approved* a 0.35% CD deviation in Georgia, (between the State's smallest and largest CD), and implied that this deviation could go higher if a State had a reason for doing so. In 2001 Arkansas, relying on the Arkansas River as a CD boundary line, took this smallest to largest deviation all the way to a full 1%, and other states exceeded a 0.35% deviation.

Vieth v. Jubelirer, 541 U.S. 267 (2004) (Pa.). Expands the prerogatives and latitude of State Legislatures. *Vieth* overturned *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109 (1986) (Ind.).

League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) v. Perry, 548 U.S. 399 (2006) (Texas). Adds and expands upon State prerogatives and latitude expressed in *Vieth*.

Bartlett v. Strickland, 556 U.S. ___, (2009) (NC). Clarifies the limits of minority redistricting rights and adds to the prerogatives of State Legislatures.

We have listed these SC cases because there seems to be a misunderstanding regarding current SC law. Both Nevada's Republican and Democratic Parties seem to have a religious fervor for long dead *Karcher*, at the expense of *Shaw*. If you disregard *Shaw* and *Abrams* you end up with CD boundary lines that look like shark's teeth. These jagged gerrymandered boundary lines are bad *for everyone*, and as explained in *Abrams* these population numbers quickly shift; so a year after these ragged lines are drawn, population perfection is far away in the rearview mirror. These counterproductive terrible lines are bad for the voters who live near them, bad for our election departments, bad for door-to-door campaign walkers - *they are not good for anyone*. Yet, our Nevada Democratic and Republican Legislators seem to be in a contest to see who can draw the most gerrymandered district lines. Hopefully *The Court* will recognize that these jagged boundary lines are *totally unnecessary*, and hurtful to many people in our State.