PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019-6064
TELEPHONE (2 1 2) 373-3000



1700 Seventh Ave, Suite 2100 | Seattle, WA 98101

July 6, 2023

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Lyle W. Cayce Clerk of the Court United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit 600 South Maestri Place New Orleans, LA 70130

Robinson v. Ardoin; Galmon v. Ardoin, No. 22-30333

Dear Mr. Cayce:

Plaintiffs-Appellees in this consolidated appeal submit this letter in response to the Court's Memorandum of June 28, 2023. The Memorandum requests the parties to address whether, following the Supreme Court's decision in *Allen* v. *Milligan*, No. 21-1086 (June 8, 2023), the Court should remand the appeal of this matter to allow the district court to consider the new authority. The Memorandum also directs the parties to submit supplemental briefs addressing *Milligan* and any other developments or caselaw that would have been appropriate for Rule 28(j) letters over the past year.

As Appellants have acknowledged, following *Milligan*, "the law in the section 2 context has not substantially changed." Letter from Jeff Landry to Hon. Scott S. Harris in *Ardoin* v. *Robinson*, No. 21A814 (Sup. Ct. June 14, 2023), at 3. In *Milligan*, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the standards governing actions under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act that the Court first adopted thirty-seven years ago in *Thornburg* v. *Gingles*, 478 U. S. 30 (1986), and squarely "reject[ed] Alabama's invitation to change existing law." *Milligan*, slip op. at 22. Applying those settled standards, the Court affirmed the judgment of the three-judge panel that the Alabama congressional redistricting plan at issue likely violated Section 2. *Id*.

Milligan thus reaffirms the applicability of the Gingles standards applied by the district court and a motions panel of this Court in this case. The district court, in a comprehensive and thoughtful 152-page opinion, rejected Appellants' suggestion that "the well-worn Gingles test is endangered and, possibly, bound for extinction," and instead "appl[ied] Gingles and its progeny" to conclude that Louisiana's congressional redistricting plan likely violated Section 2. Robinson v. Ardoin, 605 F. Supp. 3d 759, 818

Document: 245

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

Date Filed: 07/06/2023

(M.D. La. 2022). A motions panel of this Court applied the same standards when it concluded that Appellants "ha[d] not met their burden of showing likely success on the merits" and denied their motion for a stay pending appeal. Robinson v. Ardoin, 37 F.4th 208, 215 (5th Cir. 2022) (Smith, Higginson, and Willett, JJ.); see also id. at 224 ("Gingles remains good law, and so the defendants have not shown that they are likely to succeed on that basis.").

Page: 2

Because Milligan reaffirmed the standards that the district court applied, Appellees respectfully submit that the Court need not remand for the district court to consider Milligan, and should instead allow the appeal to proceed in the ordinary course following the submission of the parties' supplemental briefs.

Date: July 6, 2023

Case: 22-30333

By: /s/Abha Khanna Abha Khanna Jonathan P. Hawley ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP 1700 Seventh Ave. Suite 2100 Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 656-0177

Jacob D. Shelly
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
250 Massachusetts Ave
Washington, D C
(202) 960

J. E. Cullens, Jr. Andrée Matherne Cullens S. Layne Lee WALTERS, THOMAS, CULLENS, LLC 12345 Perkins Road, Bldg. One Baton Rouge, LA 70810 (225) 236-3636

Counsel for Galmon Plaintiffs

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/Jonathan H. Hurwitz Jonathan H. Hurwitz Robert A. Atkins Yahonnes Cleary **Amitav Chakraborty** Adam P. Savitt PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP 1285 Avenue Of The Americas, New York, NY 10019 Tel.: (212) 373-3000 Fax: (212) 757-3990 jhurwitz@paulweiss.com ratkins@paulweiss.com ycleary@paulweiss.com achakraborty@paulweiss.com asavitt@paulweiss.com

John Adcock Adcock Law LLC 3110 Canal Street New Orleans, LA 70119 Tel: (504) 233-3125 jnadcock@gmail.com

Counsel for Robinson Plaintiffs (Continued on next page)

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

Document: 245

Date Filed: 07/06/2023

Leah Aden (admitted *pro hac vice*) Stuart Naifeh (admitted pro hac vice) Victoria Wenger (admitted *pro hac vice*) NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. 40 Rector Street, 5th Floor New York, NY 10006 Tel: (212) 965-2200 laden@naacplef.org snaifeh@naacpldf.org vwenger@naacpldf.org

Case: 22-30333

R. Jared Evans I. Sara Rohani (admitted *pro hac vice*) NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. 700 14th Street N.W. Ste. 600 Washington, DC 20005 Tel: (202) 682-1300 ievans@naacpldf.org srohani@naacpldf.org

Nora Ahmed ACLU Foundation of Louisiana 1340 Poydras St, Ste. 2160 New Orleans, LA 70112 Tel: (504) 522-0628 nahmed@laaclu.org msnider@laaclu.org

Tracie L. Washington Louisiana Justice Institute Suite 132 3157 Gentilly Blvd New Orleans LA, 70122 Tel: (504) 872-9134 tracie.washington.esq@gmail.com

Counsel for Robinson Plaintiffs

Sophia Lin Lakin American Civil Liberties Union Foundation 125 Broad Street, 18th Floor New York, NY 10004 slakin@aclu.org

Page: 3

Sarah Brannon American Civil Liberties Union Foundation 915 15th St., NW Washington, DC 20005 sbrannon@aclu.org

T. Alora Thomas Lundborg Election Law Chnic Harvard Law School 6 Everett Street, Ste. 4105 Cambridge, MA 02138 (617) 495-5202 tthomaslundborg@law.harvard.edu

All counsel of record (via electronic filing)