# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

STEPHEN LAROQUE 2312 Hodges Road Kinston, N.C. 28504, **ANTHONY CUOMO** 802 Westminster Lane Kinston, N.C. 28501, JOHN NIX 3003 Hillman Road Kinston, N.C. 28504, **KLAY NORTHRUP** 3016 Johnson Street Kinston, N.C. 28504, LEE RAYNOR 710 Rountree Kinston, N.C. 28501, and KINSTON CITIZENS FOR **NON-PARTISAN VOTING** 2312 Hodges Road Kinston, N.C. 28504, Plaintiffs, Civ. No.: **COMPLAINT** ٧. ERIC H. HOLDER, JR. ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE **UNITED STATES** U.S. Department of Justice 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20530-0001, Defendant.

#### I. INTRODUCTION

1. This is an action challenging the constitutionality of Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended in 2006 (hereinafter "Section 5"). Plaintiffs are voters. prospective candidates, and proponents of citizen referenda in the city of Kinston, North Carolina, which has been covered by Section 5 pursuant to election data from November 1964. Plaintiffs successfully sponsored and voted for a referendum that would have amended the Kinston city charter to change from partisan to nonpartisan local elections—specifically, to replace the current system where the only candidates for election are the winners of party primaries and eligible unaffiliated candidates able to gather sufficient signatures to gain access to the ballot, with a new system where any candidate can run for election and the candidates are unaffiliated on the ballot with any party. But Plaintiffs' efforts, as well as the benefits they would have derived from nonpartisan elections as voters and candidates, have been completely nullified because the Attorney General denied preclearance under Section 5. They seek a declaration that Section 5 is unconstitutional and an injunction against any application of that statute to Kinston's nonpartisan-elections referendum and other future voting changes.

#### II. THE PARTIES

2. Plaintiff Stephen LaRoque is a registered voter and resident of Kinston, North Carolina. He is a former state legislator and is involved in local politics. LaRoque organized a successful petition drive (the "Petition Drive") to place a referendum on the ballot for the November 2008 election that would change the method of local elections from partisan to nonpartisan. The referendum won by a 64% margin and garnered a

majority of votes in 5 of 7 of Kinston's majority-black precincts. LaRoque intends to offer additional positive changes to Kinston's electoral system in the future.

- 3. Plaintiff John Nix is a registered Republican voter and resident of Kinston who voted for the referendum. Nix intends to run for election to the Kinston City Council in November of 2011. He has a direct interest in doing so on a ballot where he is unaffiliated with any party, against opponents similarly unaffiliated, and without the preliminary need to either run in a party primary or obtain sufficient signatures to obtain access to the ballot as a candidate.
- 4. Plaintiff Klay Northrup is a registered unaffiliated voter and resident of Kinston who voted for the referendum. Northrup intends to run for election to the Kinston City Council in November of 2011. He has a direct interest in doing so on a ballot where he is unaffiliated with any party, against opponents similarly unaffiliated, and without the preliminary need to either run in a party primary or obtain sufficient signatures to obtain access to the ballot as a candidate.
- 5. Plaintiff Lee Raynor is a registered voter and resident of Kinston. She is involved in local politics, helped organize and run the Petition Drive, and voted for the referendum.
- 6. Plaintiff Anthony Cuomo is a registered voter and resident of Kinston. He is involved in local politics, helped collect signatures for the Petition Drive, and voted for the referendum.
  - 7. Plaintiff Kinston Citizens for Non-Partisan Voting ("KCNV") is an

unincorporated membership association dedicated to eliminating the use of partisan affiliation in Kinston municipal elections. Its members consist of Kinston registered voters who have joined the association because they agree with its objectives and its means for achieving them. These members include Kinston voters who supported and voted for the nonpartisan-elections referendum and prospective candidates for Kinston municipal elections who have a direct interest in running in nonpartisan elections. Plaintiffs LaRoque, Nix, Northrup, Raynor, and Cuomo are all members of Plaintiff KCNV.

8. Defendant Eric Holder is sued in his official capacity as the Attorney
General of the United States. The Attorney General heads the United States
Department of Justice, which is the department in the executive branch of the United
States that enforces the Voting Rights Act generally, and Section 5 of the Voting Rights
Act in particular.

#### III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. This court has jurisdiction and venue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343 and 42 U.S.C. § 1973 (b).

#### IV. THREE-JUDGE PANEL

10. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 291(b), 2284 and 42 U.S.C. § 1973c(a), Plaintiffs request appointment of a three-judge panel to hear and resolve this Complaint.

#### V. BACKGROUND

11. Kinston is a municipality located in Lenoir County, North Carolina. Lenoir

County is covered by Section 5.

- 12. Kinston conducts periodic elections for mayor and city council, and these elections are conducted in compliance with the Voting Rights Act, including the preclearance provisions of Section 5.
- 13. Currently, only 8 of 551 localities in North Carolina hold partisan local elections.
- 14. In March 2008, Plaintiff LaRoque began to collect signatures on petitions to call for a referendum to amend the charter of the city of Kinston to provide for nonpartisan elections of the mayor and city council. By July 2008, he and Plaintiffs Raynor and Cuomo had collected more than the 1424 signatures required to place the issue on the November 2008 ballot. In August, Plaintiff LaRoque submitted the petition signatures to the Lenoir County Board of Elections and, subsequently, to the Kinston City Council. As required by North Carolina General Statutes §160A-104, the City Council voted to place the referendum on the ballot for the November, 2008 election.
- 15. Kinston voters approved the referendum by almost a 2 to 1 margin (64%), and the referendum passed in 5 of the 7 precincts where blacks were a majority of voters.
- 16. Since Kinston is a political subdivision of Lenoir County, which is covered by Section 5, Kinston submitted the change to nonpartisan elections to Defendant Holder, the Attorney General, for preclearance.
  - 17. No voting change from Kinston or Lenoir County had previously ever been

denied preclearance under Section 5. There has also never been a finding that Kinston engaged in discriminatory practices in voting.

- 18. The Acting Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division, Loretta King, exercising delegated authority from the Attorney General, objected to the change in a letter dated August 17, 2009.
- 19. The stated reason for the objection was that the "elimination of party affiliation on the ballot will likely reduce the ability of blacks to elect candidates of choice," in a city where, according to the objection letter, blacks constitute a least 62.6% of the total population (66.6% based on current estimates), 58.8% of the voting age population and 64.6% of registered voters. Objection Letter, pp. 1-2. The objection letter contended that the change had a discriminatory racial effect because, "while the motivating factor for this change may be partisan," "statistical analysis supports the conclusion that given a change to a nonpartisan election, black preferred candidates will receive fewer white cross-over votes" because nonpartisan elections will not allow "either [an] appeal to [Democratic] party loyalty or the ability to vote a straight ticket" for all Democratic candidates. *Id.* at 2. Accordingly, since all "black-preferred candidates" were Democratic and "given that the city's electorate is overwhelmingly Democratic," Section 5 prohibited any change which would likely diminish "cohesive support" for Democratic candidates of any race. *Id.*
- 20. The Justice Department does not seek and has not sought to apply Section 5's protections to nonminority voters, and has never denied preclearance to a voting change in any jurisdiction on the ground that it diminishes the electoral power or

chances of success of nonminority voters on the basis of their race.

- 21. In July 2006, Congress reauthorized Section 5, extending it for twenty-five years (until 2031). It relied on generalized findings which do not specifically identify evidence of continuing intentional discrimination in covered jurisdictions. Nor did it have evidence that adequately distinguished conditions in covered jurisdictions from those in non-covered jurisdictions in a way that would justify the continuing difference in treatment for another twenty-five years.
- 22. The conditions of 1964 that caused Lenoir County to be covered by Section 5 have long been remedied. Lenoir County had 72% voter turnout for the November 2008 election, and 67% of its population is registered to vote. Nonetheless, under the 2006 reenactment coverage formula, Lenoir County is a covered jurisdiction and will continue to be covered until 2031. Congress' determination that Lenoir County should continue to be covered was based upon data that is more than 45 years old and fails to account for current political conditions. There has never been any analysis of the conditions in the City of Kinston, where black citizens constitute a super-majority of the population and registered voters.
- 23. Section 5 requires covered jurisdictions and any political subdivisions contained therein to seek preclearance for any changes in voting practices or procedures. The preclearance process is costly and burdensome and requires unnecessary and disruptive delays. It also deprives local jurisdictions of essential attributes of self-governance, including jurisdictions, like Kinston, where minority citizens predominate, and even with respect to measures, like the nonpartisan election

referendum, that are apparently supported by a majority of minority voters.

- 24. In 2006, Congress did not simply extend Section 5's substantive mandate on covered jurisdictions. It significantly expanded the substantive standards to coerce jurisdictions to maintain and adopt race-based electoral schemes that prefer certain groups.
- 25. First, Congress expanded the prohibition against voting changes with the purpose or effect of "denying or abridging the right to *vote*," 42 U.S.C. 1973c(a) (emphasis added), to also prohibit changes with the purpose or effect of "*diminishing the ability* of any citizens . . . to *elect* their preferred *candidates* of choice," *id.* § 1973c(b) (emphasis added). The Justice Department and the 2006 Congress interpret Section 5 to protect only "members of a racial or language minority group." *See* 28 C.F.R. § 51.54(a); *see also* Pub. L. No. 109-246, § 2(b)(9) ("racial and language minority citizens"). This 2006 amendment thus established a floor for minority electoral success in all covered jurisdictions until 2031, regardless of whether minorities in those jurisdictions have an equal opportunity to elect their preferred candidates or to participate in the political process under the voting change, and regardless of whether there are compelling reasons supporting the voting change.
- 26. Second, Congress authorized the Attorney General to require enhancement of minority-preferred candidates' electoral success by authorizing Section 5 objections not only to changes with a *retrogressive* purpose, but also to those which the Attorney General deems to have been motivated by "*any* discriminatory purpose." 42 U.S.C. § 1973c(c) (emphasis added). Particularly given the Justice Department's

Section 5 enforcement record concerning changes that do not increase minoritypreferred candidates' success to the maximum practicable extent, this expansion of
Section 5's scope constitutes at least an implicit command for covered jurisdictions to
engage in race-based voting practices and procedures.

- 27. But for Section 5's presumptive invalidation of the change to nonpartisan elections and the Attorney General's refusal to eliminate that barrier by preclearing the change, Kinston would now have such nonpartisan elections.
- alters the competitive environment in which Plaintiffs Nix and Northrup will run. It directly increases the burdens and costs for candidates like Nix and Northrup to be placed on the ballot. *Compare, e.g.,* N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 163-292, 163-294.2 (allowing any putative candidate to run in a nonpartisan election), *with, e.g., id.* § 163-106, 163-111, 163-122, 163-291, 163-296 (requiring putative candidates in a partisan election to obtain either 40% of the vote in a party primary or signatures from 4% of all registered voters). Moreover, Section 5's perpetuation of the partisan election scheme forces candidates like Nix and Northrup to associate with a political party or disassociate from all of them, thus burdening their freedom of political association. It also forces them to anticipate and respond to a broader range of competitive tactics and issues than otherwise would be necessary. In addition, it substantially harms their chances for election by, among other things, making party affiliation a factor in voter's choices.
- 29. The denial of Section 5 preclearance has completely nullified all of Plaintiffs' efforts in support of the referendum. It has also nullified and infringed their

right under North Carolina law to participate in the electoral, political and law-making process through citizen referenda. Moreover, the partisan election scheme perpetuated by Section 5 will, relative to nonpartisan elections, impose additional burdens and costs on candidates they support in running for, and being elected to, the relevant local offices. Partisan primaries and general elections also burden their right to politically associate, or refrain from associating, with others.

- 30. Section 5, particularly as implemented by the Attorney General, denies Plaintiffs equal, race-neutral treatment, and an equal opportunity to political and electoral participation, by subjecting them to a racial classification and by intentionally providing minority voters and their preferred candidates a preferential advantage in elections.
- 31. Section 5 poses immediate or threatened injury to members of Plaintiff KCNV who would have standing to challenge Section 5 in their own right, including Plaintiffs LaRoque, Nix, Northrup, Raynor, and Cuomo. And Plaintiff KCNV's purpose of eliminating partisan municipal elections in Kinston is germane to those interests that give its members standing to sue. Neither the claim asserted by Plaintiff KCNV nor the relief requested require the participation of KCNV's members.

#### VI. CLAIMS

#### Claim I

- 32. Plaintiffs incorporate paragraphs 1-31 of this complaint.
- 33. Section 5 exceeds Congress' powers because it is not appropriate

legislation to enforce either the Fourteenth Amendment or the Fifteenth Amendment.

34. Section 5, as amended and extended in 2006, is not a rational, congruent or proportional means to enforce the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendment's nondiscrimination requirements and, in fact, undermines and violates those nondiscrimination guarantees. This is so because, among other reasons, there is no continuing justification for Section 5's extraordinary burdens on and denials of local selfgovernance: there is no persuasive or even rational reason for selectively visiting those burdens on certain jurisdictions based on electoral results from many decades ago; there is no rational or sufficient reason for imposing on covered jurisdictions alone raceconscious requirements in tension with the Constitution and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act; a continuation of Section 5 until today and 2031 is completely out of proportion to any legitimate, remedial or preventive objective; making Section 5's substantive requirements more onerous in 2006 than they were in 1965 is irrational and not congruent or proportional; and the more onerous 2006 standards do not broadly enforce the nondiscrimination guarantees of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, but instead require actions that undermine and violate those Amendments.

#### Claim II

- 35. Plaintiffs incorporate paragraphs 1-34 of this complaint.
- 36. Section 5, as amended in 2006, which authorizes denial of preclearance to changes which improve (or do not diminish) minority voting strength and which also affirmatively prohibits all changes which diminish the ability of select minority groups to elect their preferred candidates, violates the nondiscrimination requirements of the Fifth.

Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, particularly as enforced by the Attorney General.

37. At a minimum, Section 5, as amended in 2006, is presumptively unconstitutional and requires the most searching judicial scrutiny, which it cannot survive.

#### VII. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court enter a judgment for the Plaintiffs

- (1) declaring that Section 5 unconstitutionally exceeds Congressional authority;
- (2) declaring that the Section 5, as amended in 2006, violates the Fifth,

  Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, particularly as applied
  by the Attorney General, both generally and in his specific refusal to permit Kinston's
  change to nonpartisan elections;
- (3) enjoining the Attorney General from enforcing Section 5 against Kinston's change to nonpartisan elections;
  - (4) enjoining any enforcement of Section 5 against Kinston in the future; and
  - (5) any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

#### April 7, 2010

# Respectfully submitted,

#### /s/ Michael A. Carvin

Michael A. Carvin
D.C. Bar No. 366784
Noel J. Francisco
D.C. Bar No. 464752
Hashim M. Mooppan
D.C. Bar No. 981758
David J. Strandness
D.C. Bar No. 987194
JONES DAY
51 Louisiana Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20001-2113
(202) 879-3939

### /s/ Michael E. Rosman

Michael E. Rosman D.C. Bar No. 454002 Michelle A. Scott D.C. Bar No. 489097 CENTER FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS 1233 20th St. NW, Suite 300 Washington, DC 20036 (202) 833-8400

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

# 

JS-44

#### N 19-561 308

# **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

(Rev.1/05 DC)												
I (a) PLAINTIFFS					DEFE	NDAN'	LZ-			. <b></b> -	. <b></b>	
Stephen LaRoque, Anthony Cuomo, John Nix, Klay Northrup, and Lee Raynor					Eric Holder, Jr., Attorney General of the United States							
				ir	COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED			INTIFF CASES ONLY) -	N OF THE TRA	CT OF		
<del></del>	(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)						LAND INVOLVED					
(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM Michael A. Carvin, N				David	Case. 1:10-cv-00561							
J. Strandness, JONI	ES DAY, 51 Louis	siana Ave., NW,	Assigned To : Bates.			es, John D.		1				
Washington, DC 20001-2113 (202) 879-3939; Michael E. Rosman, Michelle A. Scott, Center For Individual Rights,				Assign. Date : 4/7/2010					1 1			
20th Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 833-8400 Description: 3-Judge Court												
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION  (PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX ONLY)			III CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PL. FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) FOR D								<u></u>	
			PTF DFT						PTF	DFT		
U.S Governme	_	overnment Not a Party)	Citiz	en of this St	tate	O 1	0		corporated or Principal Pla Business in This State	ce <b>O</b> 4	<b>O</b> 4	
2 U.S. Governmen Defendant	2 U S. Government O 4 Diversit Defendant (Indicat		Citizen of Another State O 2 O 2		2 Inc	corporated and Principal P Business in Another State	lace O 5	<b>O</b> 5				
	Parties	ın ıtem III)		en or Subjectign Country		<b>O</b> 3	0	3	reign Nation	<b>O</b> 6	O 6	
		CASE ASS		MENTE	ANID	AT A CEDIT	11313	OFCI	IXA			
(Place a X ir		. CASE ASSI -N, that best repi								re of Suit)		
O A. Antitrust	(Place a X in one category, A-N, that best represents your cause of action and one in a corresponding Nature of Suit)  O A. Antitrust  O B. Personal Injury/  O C. Administrative Agency  O D. Temporary Restraining									ninina		
Malpractice			Review			Order/I	Order/Preliminary					
410 Antitrust 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander			151 Medicare Act			Injunct	Injunction					
		Social Security:						Any nature of suit from any category may be selected for this category of case				
			861 HIA ((1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923)					assignment.	· .			
	330 Federal Employers Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle		863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)  864 SSID Title XVI  865 RSI (405(g)					*(If Antitrust, then				
355 Motor Vehicle Product Liabil 360 Other Personal Injury		891 Agricultural Acts										
	362 Medical Malpractice 365 Product Liability 368 Asbestos Product Liability		892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 890 Other Statutory Actions (If									
<del></del>				A	Administr	ative Ag	ency i	s Involved	)			
	Civil (Other)	OR		0	_			eral Ci	vil		<u>-</u>	
Real Property 210 Land Condemna	tion	Bankruptcy 422 Appeal 28	USC 1	158		<u>iture/Pe</u> 10 Agric		e	470 Racketee	er Influenced &	ž.	
220 Foreclosure 423 Withdraw 230 Rent, Lease & Ejectment		al 28 USC 157		620 Other Food &Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure					Organization	s		
240 Torts to Land <u>Prisoner Petitions</u>		425 Withdraw				25 Drug						
II 1245 LOTT Product Lie		Prisoner Petitions				of Pr	operty	21 USC 8	81	atellite TV		
290 All Other Real P	ability	Prisoner Petitions 535 Death Pen 540 Mandamu	alty is & O	ther	63 64	of Pr 30 Liqu 40 RR &	operty or Lav & Truc	vs :k	81 490 Cable/S:	atellite TV e Service es/Commoditie	es/	
290 All Other Real P  Personal Property	ability	Prisoner Petitions 535 Death Pen	ialty is & O its		63 64 65	of Pr 30 Liqu 40 RR & 50 Airli 50 Occu	operty or Lav & Truc ne Reg pation	vs :k ;s :al	81 490 Cable/Si 810 Selective 850 Securitie Exchan 875 Custome	atellite TV e Service es/Commoditie		
290 All Other Real P	ability roperty	Prisoner Petitions 535 Death Pen 540 Mandamu 550 Civil Righ	ialty is & O its		65 66 66	of Pr 30 Liqu 40 RR & 50 Airli 50 Occu	operty or Lav & Truc ne Reg patior y/Hea	vs :k ;s :al	490 Cable/S:	atellite TV e Service es/Commoditio ge er Challenge 1	2 USC	
Personal Property 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lendin 380 Other Personal I	ability roperty g Property Damage	Prisoner Petitions  535 Death Pen 540 Mandamu 550 Civil Righ 555 Prison Co  Property Rights 820 Copyright	ialty is & O its ndition		65 66 66	of Pr 30 Liqu 40 RR & 50 Airli 60 Occu Safet	operty or Lav & Truc ne Reg patior y/Hea	vs :k ;s :al	490 Cable/S:	atellite TV e Service es/Commoditio ge er Challenge 1 of fee determin qual access to	2 USC nation Justice	
Personal Property 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lendin	ability roperty g Property Damage	Prisoner Petitions  535 Death Pen 540 Mandamu 550 Civil Righ 555 Prison Co	aalty is & O its indition		63 64 65 66 69	of Pr 30 Liqu 40 RR & 50 Airli 60 Occu Safet 90 Othe	operty or Lav & Truc ne Reg pation y/Hea r	vs :k ;s :aal ith	490 Cable/Si   810 Selective   850 Securitie   Exchan   3410   900 Appeal e under e   950 Constitue   5tatutes	atellite TV e Service es/Commoditio ge er Challenge 1 of fee determin qual access to titionality of St	2 USC nation Justice nte	
Personal Property 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lendin 380 Other Personal I	ability roperty g Property Damage	Prisoner Petitions  535 Death Pen 540 Mandamu 550 Civil Righ 555 Prison Co  Property Rights 820 Copyright 830 Patent 840 Trademar	nalty is & O its indition	a	65 66 66 66 67 68 68 68	of Pr 30 Liqu 40 RR & 50 Airli 60 Occu Safet 00 Othe  Statute 10 State 80 Bank	operty or Lav & Truc ne Reg pation y/Hea r Reapp s & B	vs ck sal lth oortionmer anking	490 Cable/Si   810 Selective   850 Securitie   Exchan   3410   900 Appeal e under e   950 Constitute   5tatutes   14   890 Other Si not adm	atellite TV e Service es/Commodition ge er Challenge 1 of fee determin qual access to attionality of St itionality Action unistrative age	2 USC nation Justice nate	
Personal Property 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lendin 380 Other Personal I	ability roperty g Property Damage	Prisoner Petitions  535 Death Pen 540 Mandamu 550 Civil Righ 555 Prison Co  Property Rights 820 Copyright 830 Patent 840 Trademar	nalty is & O its indition is k	a	65 66 66 66 67 68 68 68	of Pr 30 Liqu 40 RR & 50 Airli 60 Occu Safet 90 Othe  Statute 00 State	operty or Lav or Lav or Truc ne Reg patior y/Hea r Reapp s & B merce	vs ck sal lth oortionmer anking	490 Cable/Si	atellite TV e Service es/Commodition ge er Challenge 1 of fee determin qual access to attionality of St itionality Action unistrative age	2 USC nation Justice nate	

O G. Habeas Corpus/ 2255  530 Habeas Corpus-General 510 Motion/Vacate Sentence	O H. Employment Discrimination  442 Civil Rights-Employment (criteria: race, gender/sex, national origin, discrimination, disability age, religion, retaliation)	O I. FOIA/PRIVACY ACT  895 Freedom of Information Act 890 Other Statutory Actions (if Privacy Act)	O J. Student Loan  152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (excluding veterans)						
	*(If pro se, select this deck)*	*(If pro se, select this deck)*							
O K. Labor/ERISA (non-employment)  710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Labor Railway Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	O L. Other Civil Right (non-employment)  441 Voting (if not Voting Righ Act)  443 Housing/Accommodations 444 Welfare 440 Other Civil Rights 445 American w/Disabilities-	110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment Enforcement of Judgment 153 Recovery of Overpayment Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholder's Suits	of						
V ORIGIN O 1 Original Proceeding from State Court  Appellate Court O 4 Reinstated or Reopened or Reopened (specify) O 5 Transferred from another district (specify) O 6 Multi district O 7 Appeal to Litigation District Judge from Mag. Judge									
		HICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE A tes the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendm							
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C P. 23	DEMAND \$ [ 0 JURY DEMAND:	Check YES only if demanded in complain						
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY	(See instruction) YES	NO If yes, please com	plete related case form.						
DATE 4-8-2010	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECO	ord - Muhult K	osmai						
•									

#### INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET JS-44

Authority for Civil Cover Sheet

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. Listed below are tips for completing the civil cover sheet. These tips coincide with the Roman Numerals on the Cover Sheet.

- I. COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF/DEFENDANT (b) County of residence. Use 11001 to indicate plaintiff is resident of Washington, D.C.; 88888 if plaintiff is resident of the United States but not of Washington, D.C., and 99999 if plaintiff is outside the United States.
- III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES. This section is completed only if diversity of citizenship was selected as the Basis of Jurisdiction under Section II
- IV. CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT: The assignment of a judge to your case will depend on the category you select that best represents the <a href="mailto:primary">primary</a> cause of action found in your complaint. You may select only <a href="mailto:one">one</a> category. You <a href="mailto:must] also select <a href="mailto:one">one</a> corresponding nature of suit found under the category of case.
- VI. CAUSE OF ACTION: Cite the US Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of the primary cause.
- VIII. RELATED CASES, IF ANY. If you indicated that there is a related case, you must complete a related case form, which may be obtained from the Clerk's Office.

Because of the need for accurate and complete information, you should ensure the accuracy of the information provided prior to signing the form.