Nos. 24-109, 24-110

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

LOUISIANA,

Appellant,

v.

PHILLIP CALLAIS, *et al.*,

Appellees.

PRESS ROBINSON, *et al.*,

Appellants,

v.

PHILLIP CALLAIS, *et al.*,

Appellees.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* LOUISIANA LEGISLATIVE BLACK CAUCUS IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANTS

STEPHEN M. IRVING
MARTIN K. MALEY, SR.
THE MALEY LAW FIRM
P.O. Box 3154 (70821)
4707 Bluebonnet Boulevard, Suite B
Baton Rouge, LA 70809

JONATHAN MILLER
Counsel of Record
GRAHAM PROVOST
ELAINE POON
SAMANTHA PERLMAN
PUBLIC RIGHTS PROJECT
490 43rd Street, Unit #115
Oakland, CA 94609
(510) 738-6788
jon@publicrightsproject.org

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

131470

COUNSEL PRESS
(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

Cited Authorities

Page

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

STATUTES AND RULES

Page

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Cited Authorities

Page

STATEMENT OF INTEREST

Amicus is the Louisiana Legislative Black Caucus ("LLBC"), an association of African American members of the Louisiana Legislature serving as a voice for equal representation in voting for over forty years.[1] The LLBC was first established in 1977 with the founding mission to provide equal opportunities for African Americans in recognizing the need to repeal, enact, or re-enact laws affecting their lives; to strengthen African-American economic development; and to intercede and bridge the communication gap between government and African Americans.

For decades, the LLBC has fought to protect the political opportunities of Black voters in Louisiana. Its members have prioritized meaningful involvement in the deliberative process, legislative debate, and litigation over Louisiana's legislative and congressional district maps. For example, in 1983 and 1990, the LLBC successfully passed reapportionment legislation that allowed more African American voters to elect the legislative candidates of their choice. Most recently, *amicus* engaged extensively in the post-2020-census congressional redistricting process. Members solicited community input from across Louisiana, challenged the State's 2022 congressional map, introduced several map proposals in both 2022 and the 2024 extraordinary session, and ultimately supported the political compromise embodied in SB8.

1. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 37.6, no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no party or counsel for a party made any monetary contribution intended to fund its preparation or submission. No person other than *amicus* or *amicus*' counsel made a monetary contribution to the preparation or submission of this brief.

Although the SB8 map was not the first choice of most LLBC members, it is a map that provides actual congressional representation to constituents who previously lacked it. As such, all LLBC members ultimately voted in favor of SB8's passage. Accordingly, the LLBC and its members have a strong interest in ensuring that the Legislature's validly enacted map remains in effect. The LLBC comes before this Court to ensure that Black Louisianans have fair representation and to defend the Voting Rights Act ("VRA") from yet another attack.

Having run for and successfully attained office in the State, members of the LLBC have first-hand expertise navigating Louisiana politics, including its racially polarized voting and the barriers that continue to confront both Black voters and Black candidates. Particularly given Louisiana's decision to abandon its complete defense of SB8 and the current congressional map, the LLBC provides an indispensable perspective to the Court, as the representatives of the very Louisianians who depend on §2 of the VRA to protect their ability to meaningfully participate in the political process.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Congress enacted §2 of the VRA to enforce the Fifteenth Amendment and establish equal access to the political process. Under the framework established in *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30 (1986), current conditions dictate where §2 continues to apply. Based on the factual findings of several courts and the experiences of Louisiana's Black legislators, there can be no doubt that current conditions continue to demand the enforcement

of the Fifteenth Amendment through §2. "In the past 37 years . . . Congress and the President have not disturbed *Gingles,* even as they have made other changes to the Voting Rights Act." *Allen v. Milligan,* 599 U.S. 1, 42 (2023) (Kavanaugh, J., concurring). The Court should not do so now, especially given the particulars of this case.

Appellees suggest that Louisiana's current conditions are such that §2 is no longer constitutional as applied, but this argument is supported by no factual record in the case and is flatly contradicted by the reality LLBC members experience as Black legislators in Louisiana. Black candidates face both open and subtle racial indignities when campaigning and some have observed that open racism has only increased in recent years. Black voters and their interests continue to be ignored in districts represented only by white elected officials. And even with §2 in place, efforts to dilute the Black vote persist. Indeed, without even waiting for this Court's decision, the Louisiana Legislature is currently preparing to hold a special session in October with a goal of eliminating at least one and potentially both of Louisiana's opportunity districts. Without this vital bulwark against anti-Black policies and practices, ongoing efforts to gerrymander and dilute the Black vote will proceed uninterrupted. Black voters will be deprived of their right to meaningfully participate in the political process, plunging Louisiana into a new era of racial ignominy.

Finally, and most simply, the Court need not decide whether VRA compliance is a compelling state interest to resolve this case. As described in LLBC's prior brief filed in this case, politics and not race predominated in the drawing of the SB8 map. That determination should end

the analysis. Even if the Court disagrees and concludes that in drawing the SB8 map, "the legislature subordinated traditional race-neutral districting principles," *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900, 916 (1995), such a conclusion only reasonably applies to the challenged map. LLBC members introduced other map proposals that clearly adhered to traditional districting criteria while also complying with the VRA. At the very most, this Court could reject SB8 on narrow grounds and remand to require the Legislature to enact maps akin to those promoted by the LLBC during the 2024 extraordinary session.

ARGUMENT

I. CONDITIONS IN LOUISIANA WARRANT VIGILANCE IN VOTING RIGHTS ENFORCEMENT, AND SUNSETTING SECTION 2 WOULD PROVE DISASTROUS.

Abandoning the doctrines set out in *Gingles* and *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630 (1993), would prove disastrous for Black Louisianians and the country as a whole. The current racial realities in Louisiana counsel strongly against any weakening of §2. Racist practices, incidents, and effects are still pernicious. Removing the safeguard of §2 would have devastating and predictable effects. Appellees, and now Louisiana as well, assert that current conditions are such that §2 can no longer be constitutionally applied. This is not supported by the record before this Court, and simply not the lived experience of members of the LLBC. The VRA may have helped bring an end to Louisiana's shameful history of Jim Crow but efforts to undermine the political participation of Black voters both by the State

and by many white politicians and residents persist.[2] This Court should not diminish the enforcement power of §2 in the face of these conditions.

A. Black Candidates Continue to Face Unique and Significant Barriers.

Running as a Black candidate in Louisiana continues to be rife with racist barriers and attitudes in 2025. If anything, the racially polarized political environment in Louisiana has become worse, not better in recent years. Black candidates face racist comments in face-to-face conversations with voters, white political opponents seek to use race as a factor to influence voter preference, and Black candidates struggle to gain traction in majority-white districts. This is not history. This is the current experience of LLBC members.

In recent years, campaigning door to door has become increasingly unsettling. When one LLBC member recently went door knocking in a predominately white neighborhood, he was questioned by a constituent as to

2. As Louisiana readily acknowledges, "'[s]hortly before enactment of the [VRA],' 'only 31.8 percent [of the black voting age population] in Louisiana' was registered to vote—'roughly 50 percentage points . . . below the figures for whites.'" Br. of La. at 27 (quoting *Shelby Cnty., Ala. v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529, 545–46 (2013)). Things have undoubtedly improved in Louisiana as a result of the VRA, but rather than simply report the latest numbers, the State reports recent turnout rates stratified by educational attainment, thereby eliding both the fact that white voter turnout remains higher than Black voter turnout and the fact that white Louisianians continue to have better educational opportunities than Black Louisianians.

why he was campaigning there (despite it being squarely within his district). The not so subtle message was that even as a Black elected leader, he was not welcome to walk in this predominately white neighborhood. Another member, who has held public office in various capacities for almost fifty years, has experienced open racism on the campaign trail that is just as terrible, if not worse, than when he began his career in the 1970s. Earlier in his career, neighbors who disagreed (or took issue with the color of his skin) were still cordial and polite as he went door to door for his campaigns. During his most recent campaign, doors were slammed in his face. Racist comments were uttered as he sought to engage with voters and constituents.

In August, the mayoral race in New Orleans was marred by a leaked email in which a major donor queried whether and when to inject racial conflict into the campaign. The email referenced an allegedly fabricated story that the staff of a Black candidate had called the donor's preferred mayoral candidate a "white devil."[3] Such overt and subtle racial appeals have a long history in Louisiana. In a recent decision, the Fifth Circuit highlighted several additional examples, including use of coded racial messages such as campaign advertisements showing an all white district attorney staff and questioning candidates' stances on crime. *Nairne v. Landry*, No. 24-30115, 2025 WL 2355524, at *21 (5th Cir.

3. James Finn, *Moreno Holds Big Lead in WWL Poll as Attacks Fly in New Orleans Mayor's Race* (Aug. 22, 2025), NOLA.COM, https://perma.cc/9TKH-K8L8; *see also* Petition for Injunction filed Aug. 15, 2025, *Emanuel Smith, Jr. v. William M. Hammack, Sr. and Leadership Matters,* Civ. Case No. 2025-07954 (Civ. Dist. Ct. Orleans Parish).

Aug. 14, 2025). Also noted was the reelection campaign of Senator John Kennedy, "which famously released a video of Senator Kennedy speaking over images of Black Lives Matter protests with the quip, '[i]f you hate cops just because they're cops, the next time you're in trouble, call a crackhead.'" *Id.*

Black candidates also face direct racist threats when running for office. In 2018, LLBC member Representative Steve Jackson received a death threat when running for mayor in Shreveport. Upon returning home one day during the campaign, he found a computer printout on his doorstep in which someone had placed a photo of his face with a noose around it. Representative Jackson had been advocating to remove a Confederate statue from the local courthouse property. Below the image, the perpetrator typed out: "LEAVE OUR STATUE & PROPERTY ALONE & GET OUT OF THE RACE N——" on the sheet of paper.[4]

If the blatant racism is not enough to deter a would-be candidate, many promising leaders are discouraged from running due to unequal investment as well as both the real and perceived lack of viability in districts that are not majority-minority. The current LLBC Chair experienced this deterrence when he ran his first political race for mayor in his own hometown. Friends and colleagues alike predicted that "the demographics" of the community foretold the outcome—no matter his credentials or support. Their predictions turned out to be right. Another

4. KLFY Staff, *Shreveport Mayoral Candidate Says He Was Threatened with Lynching*, KLFY (Aug. 16, 2018), https://perma.cc/BD5B-2MND.

representative recalls that he won his first race for city council only after litigation created a majority-minority district in which he had a fair shot to win a seat. Louisiana voted consistently along racial lines then—almost fifty years ago—and in his experience, it still does today. To their knowledge, LLBC members cannot remember any circumstance in which a Black candidate has been elected to the legislature in a majority white district outside of New Orleans.

B. The Needs and Interests of Many Black Voters Are Not Adequately Represented by Their Legislators.

Lack of adequate representation has concrete long-term impacts on Black Louisianans. Several districts in Louisiana with significant Black populations are represented only by white elected officials who are largely unresponsive to their needs. In their recent tours leading up to redistricting, LLBC members heard over and over again the refrain that Black community needs were ignored and allowed to fester without representatives willing to listen and act.

Through the years, concerns of Black communities have been so widely disregarded that pastors requested that this problem be addressed on the agenda of a past retreat of the LLBC. The discussion confirmed that white elected officials often fail to respond to, or do not prioritize, the issues of entire cities and towns—those which happen to be majority Black. Obstacles to receiving basic government services such as road repair and sewage system maintenance in Black neighborhoods are left unaddressed as white representatives refuse to even visit with Black communities within their districts. After years

of reaching out to their white legislators with questions and requests and failing to receive adequate responses, many Black local officials and residents reach out to LLBC members who represent other districts. This puts a strain on Black elected officials who feel a sense of obligation to support these community members.

For example, one New Orleans representative is regularly requested in neighboring districts to provide legislative updates and hear concerns because the local Black communities feel ignored by their white representatives. Already this year, she has provided several listening sessions and legislative update events for communities *outside* of her district. The LLBC Chair also fields regular requests from outside of his district due to this lack of representation. One representative was struck by the level of emotion she has received from older Black women who rushed up to hug her during the 2022 redistricting outreach events. They explained that she was the first state-level Black woman representative they had ever met. These experiences have informed current practices by the LLBC. As a result, the Caucus has created an informal network to connect the closest LLBC official to those underrepresented communities in order to ensure that their voices are heard—at least in some way—at the state capital.

C. Efforts to Dilute the Black Vote Remain Common.

Successful and unsuccessful attempts to dilute, remove, and deter the Black vote abound. Louisiana's need for continued §2 protection is made plain by two recent and ongoing efforts to dilute the Black vote. First, a successful reduction of Black representation is already

in progress in Louisiana's First and Nineteenth judicial districts. Last session, the Legislature passed House Bill 124, which may violate a consent order entered in 1986.[5] The Legislature removed one of two majority-minority districts and created an at-large seat, a tried and true method of diluting the Black vote. *See, e.g.*, *City of Mobile v. Bolden*, 446 U.S. 55 (1980). When asked whether this change was motivated by race, supporters did not deny the effort to reduce the ratio of Black judges to non-Black, and intimated that it was the only way to get "competent" judges on the bench. Meanwhile, the makeup of the state's First Circuit Court of Appeals bench remains predominately white despite a sizable Black population in the district.[6] Representative Denise Marcelle presented legislation to address this lack of minority representation, but the bill did not pass.[7]

Even more galling, LLBC members received a text message while preparing this brief informing them that they must hold dates in late October for a potential special session shortly after the hearing for this case.[8]

5. Alyse Pfeil, *The Latest Legal Battle over Louisiana Voting Maps: Baton Rouge's Court System* (Aug. 5, 2025), NOLA.COM, https://perma.cc/F9KX-TAPV.

6. Allison Bruhl, *Chief Judge Urges Louisiana Leaders to Call Special Session to Redistrict Judicial Districts* (June 10, 2025), LOUISIANAFIRSTNEWS, https://perma.cc/7AKB-J4FT.

7. Alyse Pfeil, *Some Legislators Want to Change How Baton Rouge Elects Judges. Others Have Concerns* (May 15, 2025), NOLA.COM, https://perma.cc/QSB4-VD8L.

8. Alyse Pfeil, *Louisiana Legislature Prepares for Possible Redistricting Session as Supreme Court Case Looms* (Aug. 20, 2025), NOLA.COM, https://perma.cc/5SJ8-EAC6.

There is no question that the goal of the majority in such a session is to redistrict the State's congressional map despite no directive from the Court nor any change in the census (or underlying facts). The primary purpose of this redistricting will almost certainly be to alter the district that elected former LLBC chair, Congressman Cleo Fields of District 6. It is highly likely a map also carving up District 2—the district containing New Orleans—will be introduced, which could completely eliminate Black congressional representation in Louisiana. The Legislature is poised to act to roll back the progress made over the past several decades—forecasting how rapidly and aggressively Louisiana will act if this Court removes protections under §2.

II. SECTION 2 OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT IS CONSTITUTIONAL.

As this Court recognized just two years ago, §2 continues to be a valid application of Congress's power to enforce the Fifteenth Amendment. The Fifteenth Amendment was ratified in 1869 in the aftermath of the Civil War to secure the voting rights of freed slaves and other Black Americans. The Amendment gave Congress the primary responsibility for enforcing these rights. During Reconstruction, Congress did so, enacting several enforcement laws that temporarily ensured meaningful voting rights for Black voters. These protections ushered in an era of unprecedented representation of Black voters in southern States. During the period between 1868 and 1876, at least one hundred twenty-three Black members served in Louisiana's Reconstruction-era legislature. Following the end of Reconstruction, however, state laws and practices completely barred Black Louisianians

from meaningful participation in the political process. Louisiana did not elect another Black legislator until 1969, when enforcement of the VRA finally made the promise of the Fifteenth Amendment real again for Black voters in the South. Its work is not done.

As this Court has long recognized and recently reaffirmed, "'even if § 1 of the [Fifteenth] Amendment prohibits only purposeful discrimination, the prior decisions of this Court foreclose any argument that Congress may not, pursuant to § 2 [of the Fifteenth Amendment] outlaw voting practices that are discriminatory in effect.'" *Milligan*, 599 U.S. at 41 (quoting *City of Rome v. United States*, 446 U.S. 156, 173 (1980)) (alterations in original). The VRA's "'ban on electoral changes that are discriminatory in effect . . . is an appropriate method of promoting the purposes of the Fifteenth Amendment.'" *Id.* (quoting *City of Rome*, 446 U.S. at 177); *see also Shelby Cnty., Ala. v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529, 557 (2013) ("Our decision in no way affects the permanent, nationwide ban on racial discrimination in voting found in § 2.").

Section 2 is appropriately tailored to enforce the Fifteenth Amendment. In *Shelby County*, this Court struck down the coverage formula of VRA §5. 570 U.S. at 557. The problem with the §5 coverage formula, this Court concluded, was that it failed to update, placing a continuing burden on specific States even if conditions on the ground had changed. *See id.* at 556. The opposite is true of §2 under the *Gingles* framework. When the "totality of circumstances" can no longer demonstrate that the political process is not "equally open" to minority voters, it will no longer be possible to state a vote dilution claim under §2. *See* Br. of Robinson Appellants at 23–24

(noting that "as race diminishes as a salient driver of politics and the political process in a jurisdiction—as it has done in many parts of the country—plaintiffs will no longer be able to succeed on §2 claims"). So too when voting ceases to be racially polarized or white majorities no longer vote as a bloc to defeat minorities' preferred candidates. This Court's existing standards thus ensure that §2 does not apply where no longer justified by current conditions.

Now is not the moment to eliminate the efficacy of §2 in Louisiana. Members of the LLBC wish that Black voters did not face unique barriers to participating in the political process and electing their candidates of choice. Unfortunately, as described above, that is not the reality. Racialized and racist barriers to equal political participation in Louisiana persist and without the protections of §2, Black voters in Louisiana would struggle to have their voices heard at all. Federal courts have repeatedly reached these same conclusions over the past few years.

Just last month, a unanimous panel of the Fifth Circuit in a separate case affirmed what LLBC members know from their personal experience: Black Louisianans have "less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice." *Nairne*, 2025 WL 2355524, at *7 (quoting 52 U.S.C. § 10301(b)).[9] In that

9. Recent decisions by this Court and others also demonstrate ongoing discrimination in areas outside of voting. *See, e.g.*, *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 590 U.S. 83, 86–88, 111 (2020) (striking down Louisiana's racially discriminatory non-unanimous jury rule); *Snyder v. Louisiana*, 552 U.S. 472, 484–85 (2008) (finding that state

decision, the panel affirmed that *all* the Senate Factors under the *Gingles* framework are currently satisfied in Louisiana.[10] *Id.* at *20–22. The Court of Appeals concluded not only that Louisiana has a history of discrimination in voting (Senate Factor One), *id.* at *20, but also that *currently* in Louisiana:

- Voting continues to be racially polarized, even within the Democratic Party, with white Democrats preferring white candidates (Senate Factor Two), *id.*;

- The State employs voting practices or procedures that enhance the opportunity for discrimination—these include a majority vote requirement of the type explicitly listed in *Gingles* as a voting practice that enhances discrimination (Senate Factor Three), *id.*;

- Black Louisianians continue to bear the effects of discrimination in areas such as education (with de-facto segregated public schools), health (experiencing higher rates of disease and mortality), and incarceration, which hinder their ability to participate in the political process (Senate Factor Five), *id.* at *21;

officials discriminated in jury selection); *United States v. Town of Franklinton*, 24-cv-1633, 2024 WL 3739103 (E.D. La. June 28, 2024) (finding racial discrimination in housing).

10. Senate Factor Four is inapplicable in Louisiana because its legislative elections do not use candidate slating. *See Nairne*, 2025 WL 2355524, at *21 n.25.

- Political campaigns have been and continue to be characterized by overt and subtle racial appeals (Senate Factor Six), *id.*;

- Black politicians continue to be underrepresented in most elected offices, particularly statewide offices—with no Black candidates elected to be Governor, Lieutenant Governor, or Senator since Reconstruction (148 years ago) (Senate Factor Seven), *id.* at *22;

- Elected officials are insufficiently responsive to the particularized needs of Black Louisianians, for instance ignoring calls for more representative maps and nearly 70% of Black survey respondents indicated that their elected officials do not care what "people like [me] think" (Senate Factor Eight), *id.*; and

- The State's "use of voting practices and procedures is tenuous to anything other than disenfranchising Black voter participation in the political process" (Senate Factor Nine), *id.*

As described above, the lived experience of LLBC members aligns with the reality of racialized politics in Louisiana recognized by the Fifth Circuit. If the bulk of these factors eventually cease to be satisfied, §2 will no longer apply to Louisiana maps. But given the current realities in the State, there can be no doubt that application of §2 remains justified, and indeed necessary, to vindicate the purposes of the Fifteenth Amendment.

III. THE COURT NEED NOT DECIDE WHETHER VRA COMPLIANCE IS A COMPELLING STATE INTEREST.

A. Strict Scrutiny Does Not Apply to SB8.

As *amicus* explained in its prior brief, the contours of the final SB8 map were dominated not by race but by politics, specifically the majority's desire to protect powerful incumbents including the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader, as well as to punish the Governor's political rival, Congressman Garret Graves. Although the Louisiana Legislature did consider race when it created the map—seeking to comply with orders from the Middle District of Louisiana and the Fifth Circuit—race did not predominate over political and other considerations. As such, strict scrutiny should not apply, and the Court need not address whether VRA compliance is a compelling state interest. *See Miller*, 515 U.S. at 916 (applying strict scrutiny only where "the legislature subordinated traditional race-neutral districting principles, including but not limited to compactness, contiguity, and respect for political subdivisions or communities defined by actual shared interests, to racial considerations"); *see generally Alexander v. S.C. State Conf. of the NAACP*, 602 U.S. 1 (2024) (declining to apply strict scrutiny where the plaintiff failed to show that race predominated over partisanship).

The SB8 map was a political compromise and not the preferred map of most LLBC members. LLBC members in both legislative chambers introduced maps—including SB4 and HB5—that placed greater weight on adhering

to traditional districting criteria. These maps resembled illustrative maps introduced by plaintiffs in LLBC's prior litigation. *Robinson v. Ardoin*, 605 F. Supp. 3d 759 (M.D. La. 2022). The district court in that case examined those illustrative maps and rejected arguments that race predominated in their drawing—a finding twice affirmed by the Fifth Circuit. *Id.* at 838; *Robinson v. Ardoin*, 37 F.4th 208, 222–23 (5th Cir. 2022); *Robinson v. Ardoin*, 86 F.4th 574, 595 (5th Cir. 2023). Nevertheless, the Legislature rejected LLBC's maps and opted for a less compact map in order to achieve its political objectives.

B. The Predominance of Race, Not the Intention to Create Opportunity Districts, Triggers Strict Scrutiny.

As this Court has articulated on numerous occasions, it is not the intention to create opportunity districts that triggers strict scrutiny, but rather the predominance of race in the districting process. *See, e.g.*, *Miller*, 515 U.S. at 916. "To make that showing," this Court has required more than mere knowledge or consideration of race. "[A] plaintiff must prove that the State 'subordinated' race-neutral districting criteria such as compactness, contiguity, and core preservation to 'racial considerations.'" *Alexander*, 602 U.S. at 7 (quoting *Miller*, 515 U.S. at 916); *accord Cooper v. Harris*, 581 U.S. 285, 291 (2017). "Redistricting legislatures will . . . almost always be aware of racial demographics; but it does not follow that race predominates in the redistricting process." *Miller*, 515 U.S. at 916.

Even though legislators almost always enact district maps with the "intention" of complying with

the VRA—including creating any required opportunity districts—this intention rarely, if ever, requires a legislature to draw a map in which race-neutral districting criteria are subordinated. This is because the VRA requires opportunity districts only where, among other requirements, a minority group is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority in a single-member district. There is a good reason that this Court has never been forced to decide whether VRA compliance is a compelling state interest. *See, e.g.*, *Cooper*, 581 U.S. at 301 ("[W]e have long assumed that complying with the VRA is a compelling interest."). When race predominates in the drawing of a district map, it is almost always because the legislature went beyond or misinterpreted the requirements of the VRA. *See, e.g.*, *id.* at 302–06; *Shaw v. Hunt*, 517 U.S. 899, 911 (1996); *Miller*, 515 U.S. at 923.

The same is true here. Based on their experience enacting SB8, *amicus* does not believe that race predominated in the drawing of the map. But if it did, it was not because §2 required such a map, but because the Louisiana Legislature rejected more compact VRA-compliant maps and instead opted for the SB8 map. Thus, a rejection of this map falls in line with other Court precedent to reject the overreach of state legislatures, not a new line to eviscerate the crucial tool of §2 to remedy repeated efforts to undermine Black voters.

Accordingly, if the Court were to disapprove of the SB8 map, the appropriate remedy would be to remand to the Legislature and to encourage its passage of VRA-compliant maps similar to those suggested by the LLBC during the 2024 session.

CONCLUSION

Appellees and Louisiana suggest that there is no longer a need for §2 enforcement in the State. The facts underlying the Congressional redistricting and the experience of LLBC members demonstrate the exact opposite. For all of the foregoing reasons, the judgment of the district court should be reversed.

Dated: September 3, 2025 Respectfully submitted,

Stephen M. Irving
Martin K. Maley, Sr.
The Maley Law Firm
P.O. Box 3154 (70821)
4707 Bluebonnet Boulevard,
Suite B
Baton Rouge, LA 70809

Jonathan Miller
Counsel of Record
Graham Provost
Elaine Poon
Samantha Perlman
Public Rights Project
490 43rd Street, Unit #115
Oakland, CA 94609
(510) 738-6788
jon@publicrightsproject.org

Counsel for Amicus Curiae