

Nos. 18-422, 18-726

In the Supreme Court of the United States

ROBERT A. RUCHO, et al., Appellants ,
v.

COMMON CAUSE, et al., Appellees.

LINDA H. LAMONE, et al., Appellants ,
v.

O. JOHN BENISEK, et al., Appellees.

On Appeals from the United States District Courts for the
Middle District of North Carolina and the District of Maryland

BRIEF FOR AMICI CURIAE

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE ; COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA ;
DEMOCRACY 21; DEMOS ; FRIENDS OF THE EARTH ;
GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT ; LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS , MARYLAND CHAPTER ; NATIONAL
COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN ; NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
DBMOL **OMEN**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

A i. S A i. I R i i i i

1 B S 1 B B

A M i

B U.S. 1 B

B U.S. 1 1 B B B

B i L

B F.S. B M 1 i

B U i S

U.S. 1 B 1

B O i

B U.S. 1 1 1

B B E

B U.S. B 1 B

B B E

B U.S. 1 B

U i S

1 B S 1

U.S. 1 1 B 1

U.S. B 1 L i i t 1

U.S. 1 1

U.S. 1 1 1

U.S. 1 B

F.S. B M.NT i

U.S. 1 1 1

U.S. 1 1 1

E i S i 1

F U.S. BB 1 B

1 U.S. B 1 B B

U.S. 1 B 1

U.S. 1 1 BB

U.S. 1 1 B B

U.S. BB 1 B

S
U.S. B 1 B B
B U.S. B B 1
H I i A L i Bi
B U.S. B 1 1
1 U.S. 1 1
T i
U.S. 1 B 1 B 1
I S
B U.S. B 1 1
M O i
B U.S. B 1 1
M M i
U.S. 1 B 1 B 1 1 B
M i
U.S. B B 1
M F. B S. N. F.
i. l 1 1
M i U i S
B U.S. 1 1 1
M E i
U.S. B 1 1
M M
1 U.S. B 1

Mi . . . U.S. B B

Mi i . . . B 1

Mi . . . A i 1 B

O . . . U.S.

O . . . U.S.

. . . R 1

. . . M 1 1

R . . . Si B 1 B B

R . . . L B

S . . . R B B

S 1

Ti . . . I i U.S.

T . . . R U.S.

U.S. T... Li i... I... T... 1
 U.S. 1

U i... S... B...
 U.S. B... B... 1

U i... S... M... F...
 U.S. B... 1 ...

U... i...
 U.S. ...

U... A... H... M... H...
 U.S. 1 ...

U... i...
 U.S. 1 ...

U... S...
 U.S. 1 1 ... B B B

U... R...
 U.S. 1 B... B B

CONSTITUTION

U.S. ... I... 1

U.S. ... I... 1

U.S. ... I... 1

U.S. ... I... 1

OTHER AUTHORITIES

A... T... 1 i 1

T... F... i... i... i... B... 1

R... L... 1 ... 1

S. A. T. Ri.

R.

B. T. M. i. N.

i. O. S. L.

F. i. 1

T. U.S. 1

T. S.

A. i. F.

E. i. B. A. H. 11. 1

Ri. H. F. M.

S. M. i. 11 H.

L. R. 1 B.

Ri. H. F. T. S. 1

T. F. I. i.

111 H. L. R. 1 1

T. F. i. N. M. i. F.

S. 1 1 1 B.

T. F. i. N. B. M. i. F.

S. 1 1 11

H. M. H. H. i. i. A.

A. H. L. R. 1 1

S. M. i. T.

S. A. F. T. i.

L. R. 1 1 11

R. N. T.
H i i T H i
F i i
i i F 1
i i F 1 1
A i S i T R L L R
U. i. L. R. 11 1 B B
i i F A
U i S 1 i
i S. N. 1 1 S 1 1 B
E. i i T
i i O H A. L.
B 1 1 11 1

STATEMENT OF INTEREST¹

A i t i

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The following summary of the argument is presented in the form of a series of questions and answers. The questions are the issues raised by the facts and the law, and the answers are the conclusions reached by the court. The summary is divided into two parts, the first dealing with the facts and the second dealing with the law.

The first part of the summary deals with the facts. The facts are as follows: The plaintiff, a citizen of the State of New York, brought this action against the defendant, a citizen of the State of New York, for the recovery of a sum of money. The plaintiff claims that the defendant owes him the sum of money because of a contract entered into between them. The defendant denies the existence of the contract and claims that the plaintiff is not entitled to the money.

The second part of the summary deals with the law. The law is as follows: The plaintiff has the burden of proving the existence of the contract. The defendant has the burden of proving that the plaintiff is not entitled to the money. The court has found that the plaintiff has failed to prove the existence of the contract and that the defendant is not liable for the money.

I M ... M i O M ... i i
M ... 11 ... B i
L ... B ... F. S. ... B ... B ... M ...
O M ... i ... i
I. E. H ... i
M ... i
R ... i ... i
R ... I. ... B
I ... i
i i i i ... i ... i ... I N ...
R ... i L ... i ... i
R ... B ... i ... 1
R ... i ... i ... 11
R ... i ... i ... I M ... B ... F. S. ... B
O M ... i ... i ... i
F i ... S i ... i ... S i
F i ... i ... S i
S ... B ... B ... L ... B ... F.

... i ... i ... B U.S. B ...

U.S. B. B. 1 B. i i

T. R. A i i
i i i i i i i i
A B. i N. 1
R. B. 1 A B. i N. 1
L. B. BB. i i i i

I R. i i i i
i i i i i i i i
i i i i i i i i
M i i i i i i i
i i i i i i i i B

U.S. T. i i i i
i i i i i i i i E
i i i i i i i i
i R. i i i i

S. U. i S. B. U.S. B. B. B
F. A i i i i i i
i i i i i i i i
i i i i i i i i
i i i i i i i i

S. R. I. BB. U.S. BB. B
O. i i i i i i i i
i i i i i i i i S. i
B. U.S. B. B. 1 i i i
i i i i i i i i i i

... I ... M ...
Ti ... I ... N ... 1 ... 1 ... U.S. ...
... Ei ...
A ... E ... Fi ...
... i ... i ... i ... i ...
... i ... i ... i ... T ...
... i ... i ... i ...
... S ... T ... R ...

B

M... A...
i...
... U.S. ...
...
...
...

...
... I ... Li ... B U.S. BB
B ...
...
A ... T ...
...

T ... B ...

... .O i
... i
... i
... i
... i

I F
... E
...
B U.S. B
U.S. 1 1 1
... S
... A

I i
B11 B1 B1 BB1 B
I A i

3
i R... R... i L...
A... i...
i... R... A... i...
... T...
i... i...

H... i... i... i...
i... i... i...
i... i... i...
i... i... i... B...
i... i... i... B...
1 U.S. B... i...
A... i... i...
i... i... i...
i... I... B... A...
i...

B... R... L... i... i...
i... i... i...

¹¹ A... R... i... i... A... i...
S... i... i...
i... i... i...
B... F.S. B... 1.

F.S. B. L. B. F.S.
B. 1. T. i. i. T.
i. i. i. i. i.
i. i. i. i. i.
i. i. i. i. i.
i. i. i. i. i.
S. B. H. S. R. B. F.
i. i. i. i. i. N.
H. i. L. B. F. S. B. M.
i. i. i. i. M.
i. i. i. i. i.
i. i. i. i. i.
i. i. S. R. B. F. S. B.
i. i. i. i. Fi A
i. i. i. i. i. i.
i. i. i. i. i. i.
i. i. i. i. i. i.

I. i. i. i. i. i. E.
i. i. i. i. i. i. Fi A
A. I. T. R. A. i. i. i. i. i.
i. i. i. i. i. i. i. i.
i. i. i. i. i. R. B. I. i. i. i. i.
i. i. i. i. i. i. i. i. i. i. i.

Supreme Court, L. R. v. U. S. L. R. 11 11 11 11 11

B. Adjudication of Severe Partisan Gerrymanders Is Not Barred by the Political Question Doctrine.

The Supreme Court in *Vieth v. Jones*, 541 U.S. 26 (2004), held that the political question doctrine does not bar the federal courts from adjudicating claims of partisan gerrymandering. The Court in *Vieth* distinguished the political question doctrine from the justiciability doctrines of standing, ripeness, and mootness. The Court stated that the political question doctrine is a narrow exception to the general principle that all cases and controversies are justiciable. The Court cited *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962), as the leading case on the political question doctrine. In *Baker*, the Court held that the political question doctrine did not bar the federal courts from adjudicating claims of apportionment. The Court in *Vieth* held that the political question doctrine does not bar the federal courts from adjudicating claims of partisan gerrymandering. The Court stated that the political question doctrine is a narrow exception to the general principle that all cases and controversies are justiciable. The Court cited *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962), as the leading case on the political question doctrine. In *Baker*, the Court held that the political question doctrine did not bar the federal courts from adjudicating claims of apportionment. The Court in *Vieth* held that the political question doctrine does not bar the federal courts from adjudicating claims of partisan gerrymandering.

B

O. i. S. ... i. O. i.
A. I. ... F. ... i. i.
... i. ...
... i. i.

B. U.S. ... l. B ...
... i. ... i. i. i. i. ...
... i. ... i. i. ... i. S. ...
... i. i. i. ... I.

T. i. ... i. i. ...
... i. R. ... Si ...
... i. i. ... i. i. i. i. ...
... i. ... i. i. ... O. ...
... i. ... i. i. ... i. ...
... i. ... B. U.S. ... T. ...
... i. ... S. ...
T. i. ... i. i. ... i. i. ...
... i. ... i. i. ...
i. ... i. A. I. B. U.S. ...

A. i. ... i. ...
... i. ... i. ...
... i. N. ... M. ...
... i. ... I. ...
... A. ...
... i. ... O. ...
... i. ... i. i. ...
... i. ... i. i. ...
... i. ... i. ...
R. ... B. U.S. ... F. ...
... i. R. ... i. ...

B

CONCLUSION

T
w

A

R

LEIT

R

NATALIE RANER

LO ENSTEIN SAN LER LL

O L i i

R N

B

i i

A i i

APPENDIX

... A ... FAE
 ...
 ... A ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...

The Government Accountability Project

A ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ... R ...
 ... S ...
 ... A ...
 ...
 ...
 ...
 ...

The League of Women Voters, Maryland

Chapter L M ... S ...
 M ... L M ... 1 ...
 ... U i S ...

The North Carolina Justice Center

... I ...
... N ...
...
... A ...
... N ...
... T ...
... N ...

1 1 S I . Si i i i