

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

_____	)	
LOUISIANA HOUSE OF	)	
REPRESENTATIVES,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 11-cv-00770
	)	(Three-Judge District Court)
UNITED STATES and	)	
ERIC HOLDER, Attorney General	)	
of the United States,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

On April 21, 2011, the plaintiff filed a complaint for a declaratory judgment pursuant to section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 1973c, and, shortly thereafter, a motion requesting expedition of the matter and an immediate pretrial conference pursuant to Rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Through this action, the plaintiff seeks a judicial determination that implementation of its 2011 State House of Representatives redistricting plan “neither has the purpose nor will have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color, or in contravention of the guarantees set forth” elsewhere. 42 U.S.C. § 1973c(a).

On the same date, April 21, 2011, the plaintiff filed an application for preclearance with the United States Attorney General using the alternative mechanism provided in section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. The statute provides that the Attorney General has sixty calendar days, following the receipt of a covered jurisdiction’s preclearance submission, to “interpose[] an objection” or “affirmatively indicate[] that such objection will not be made.” *See id.*; 28 C.F.R.

§ 51.9. Because preclearance by the Attorney General would moot the complaint, *see Berry v. Doles*, 438 U.S. 190, 192-93 (1978) (per curiam), and Congress envisioned administrative preclearance to be the “speedy alternative” to declaratory judgment actions before a three-judge district court, *Morris v. Gressette*, 432 U.S. 491, 503 (1977); *see also McCain v. Lybrand*, 465 U.S. 236, 246-47 (1984), we deny the plaintiff’s motion for expedition.

The Court orders the following schedule:

June 20, 2011	Defendants’ Answer to be filed
June 21, 2011	Status Report from the Attorney General to be filed addressing preclearance review and any proposed schedule before this Court
June 23, 2011	Plaintiff’s Response to the Status Report from the Attorney General to be filed
June 24, 2011	Status Hearing and Scheduling Conference in Courtroom 2 at 10:00 a.m.

**SO ORDERED.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
JUDITH W. ROGERS  
United States Court of Appeals for  
the District of Columbia Circuit

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
JOHN D. BATES  
United States District Court for  
the District of Columbia

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
AMY BERMAN JACKSON  
United States District Court for  
the District of Columbia

DATE: May 16, 2011