

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Plaintiff,

v.

SHENNA BELLOWS, in her official  
capacity as the Secretary of State of  
Maine and the STATE OF MAINE,

Defendants.

Case No: 1:25-cv-00468-LEW

---

**UNITED STATES' RESPONSE TO NOTICE  
OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY (Dkt. 106)**

The United States respectfully submits this response to the Notice of Supplemental Authority filed by Intervenor-Defendants Intervenor John Schneck and Marpheen Chann, Dkt. 106. In *United States v. Galvin*, No. 25-13816, 2026 WL 972129 (D. Mass. Apr. 9, 2026) (*Galvin*), the District Court ruled that Title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (CRA), 52 U.S.C. § 20703, requires that the Attorney General's written demand for records must provide a "factual basis," not just a legal basis, to support a demand. *Galvin*, 2026 WL 972129 at \*3 (emphasis added). *Galvin* acknowledged that in *Kennedy v. Lynd*, 306 F.2d 222 (5th Cir. 1962), the stated basis for the demand was merely that there was "information in the possession of the Attorney General tending to show that" the states were violating the law. *Id.* at 229 n.6. Nevertheless, *Galvin* ruled that the Attorney General's written demand letters did not provide a factual basis that satisfied *Lynd*. See 2026 WL 972129 at \*4. The United States respectfully disagrees with *Galvin*'s overly formalistic interpretation of CRA procedure. Another out-of-circuit district noted in a footnote that a similar pair of demand letters "collectively put [the State] on notice of the basis and purpose of its request, which is sufficient to comply with the CRA." *United States v. Benson*, No. 1:25-cv-

01148-HYJ-PJG, 2026 WL 362789 at \*8 n.3 (W.D. Mich. Feb. 10, 2026), *appeal docketed*, No. 26-1225 (6th Cir. Feb. 27, 2026). If the Court is persuaded by *Galvin*'s formalistic approach, the United States requests that the Court provide leave for the United States to send Secretary Bellows a curing elaboration letter rather than dismiss on the merits to avoid unnecessary delay in resolution of the underlying legal issues.<sup>1</sup>

Dated: April 14, 2026.

Respectfully submitted:

HARMEET K. DHILLON  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Rights Division

ROBERT J. KEENAN  
Acting Deputy Assistant Attorney General

ERIC V. NEFF  
Acting Chief, Voting Section  
Civil Rights Division

/s/ James Thomas Tucker  
TIMOTHY F. MELLETT  
JAMES THOMAS TUCKER  
Attorneys, Voting Section  
Civil Rights Division  
U.S. Department of Justice  
4 Constitution Square  
150 M Street NE, Room 8.923  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
Telephone: (202) 307-2767  
Email: james.t.tucker@usdoj.gov

---

<sup>1</sup> Judge Kari A. Dooley, United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, suggesting the requisite cure for any alleged deficiency in the written demand, said: "If . . . I find the [written demand] letter does not meet the requisites for a court order, aren't we just back here in six months after a new letter has been sent?" *United States v. Thomas*, No. 3:26-cv-00021-KAD, Tr. of Oral Arg. 85:19-22 (D. Conn. Mar. 19, 2026) (attached as Ex. 1).

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on April 14, 2026, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served via the Court's ECF system to all counsel of record.

/s/ James Thomas Tucker  
James Thomas Tucker

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM