

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF STEUBEN

-----X

TIM HARKENRIDER, GUY C. BROUGHT,
LAWRENCE CANNING, PATRICIA CLARINO,
GEORGE DOOHER, JR., STEPHEN EVANS, LINDA
FANTON, JERRY FISHMAN, JAY FRANTZ,
LAWRENCE GARVEY, ALAN NEPHEW, SUSAN
ROWLEY, JOSEPHINE THOMAS, and MARIANNE
VOLANTE,

Index No. _____

PETITION

Petitioners,

-against-

GOVERNOR KATHY HOCHUL, LIEUTENANT
GOVERNOR AND PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE
BRIAN A. BENJAMIN, SENATE MAJORITY LEADER
AND PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE
ANDREA STEWART-COUSINS, SPEAKER OF THE
ASSEMBLY CARL HEASTIE, NEW YORK STATE
BOARD OF ELECTIONS, and THE NEW YORK STATE
LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE ON DEMOGRAPHIC
RESEARCH AND REAPPORTIONMENT,

Respondents.

-----X

Petitioners Tim Harkenrider, Guy C. Brought, Lawrence Canning, Patricia Clarino, George Dooher, Jr., Stephen Evans, Linda Fanton, Jerry Fishman, Jay Frantz, Lawrence Garvey, Alan Nephew, Susan Rowley, Josephine Thomas, and Marianne Volante, by their counsel, Keyser Maloney & Winner LLP, and Troutman Pepper Hamilton Sanders LLP, for their Petition against Respondents Governor Kathy Hochul, Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate Brian A. Benjamin, Senate Majority Leader and President *Pro Tempore* of the Senate Andrea Stewart-Cousins, Speaker of the Assembly Carl E. Heastie, the New York State Board of Elections, and the New York State Legislative Task Force on Demographic Research and Reapportionment, allege as follows:

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1. The People of New York in 2014 enshrined in the New York Constitution an exclusive process for enacting replacement congressional and state legislative districts, while also prohibiting partisan and incumbent-protection gerrymandering. Yet, in the very first redistricting cycle after these landmark constitutional amendments, the Democratic Party politicians who control the New York Legislature and Governor's office brazenly enacted a congressional map that is undeniably politically gerrymandered in their party's favor. As Dave Wasserman, a nonpartisan national elections expert correctly noted, these politicians' congressional map is "an effective gerrymander," designed so that Democrats will "gain three seats and eliminate four Republican seats," creating "probably the biggest shift in the country."¹ The non-partisan election analysis website FiveThirtyEight similarly explained that the map is so "skewed toward Democrats" and "egregious" as to "represent[] a failure for [New York's] new redistricting process."² And even a top attorney for the famously left-leaning Brennan Center for Justice opined that the congressional map "isn't good for democracy," because it is "a master class in gerrymandering, . . . tak[ing] out a number of Republican incumbents very strategically."³ Indeed, the congressional map is so obviously biased that it favors Democratic partisan interests more than *any* of 5,000 computer-generated maps, drawn without partisan considerations.

¹ Grace Ashford & Nicholas Fandos, *N.Y. Democrats Could Gain 3 House Seats Under Proposed District Lines*, N.Y. Times (Jan. 30, 2022), available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/30/nyregion/new-york-redistricting-congressional-map.html> (all websites last visited on Feb. 2, 2022).

² Nathaniel Rakich, *New York's Proposed Congressional Map Is Heavily Biased Toward Democrats. Will It Pass?*, FiveThirtyEight (Jan. 31, 2022), available at <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/new-yorks-proposed-congressional-map-is-heavily-biased-toward-democrats-will-it-pass/>.

³ Nick Reisman, *How the Proposed Congressional Lines Could Alter New York's Politics*, Spectrum News 1 (Feb. 1 2022), available at <https://spectrumlocalnews.com/nys/central-ny/ny-state-of-politics/2022/02/01/how-the-proposed-congressional-lines-could-alter-ny-s-politics>.

2. The People of New York in 2014 amended Sections 4 and 5 of Article III of the New York Constitution, establishing an *exclusive* process for redistricting that, both as a matter of procedure and substance, prohibits partisan and incumbent-protection gerrymandering. Through the creation of the New York Independent Redistricting Commission (“IRC” or “the Commission”), the requirements for multiple public hearings to receive public comment on proposed maps, and limiting the New York State Legislature’s (“Legislature”) authority to an up or down vote on IRC-proposed maps, these amendments designed a process to preclude gerrymandering. Indeed, these amendments explicitly prohibit drawing maps “for the purpose of favoring or disfavoring incumbents or other particular candidates or political parties.” N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(c)(5). These amendments thus bar the sorts of gamesmanship and self-interested gerrymandering that plagued the redistricting process in this State for years.

3. The State of New York even bragged about these reforms to its redistricting process before the U.S. Supreme Court, claiming that Article III, Section 4(c)(5) was powerful evidence that States could fight partisan gerrymandering by barring the drawing of district lines for the purpose of favoring or disfavoring a political party.⁴

4. The Democrat-controlled Legislature attempted, but failed, to gut these reforms in 2021 through a proposed constitutional amendment. That amendment would have allowed the Legislature to assume vast redistricting authority if the Commission failed to vote on redistricting plans for the Legislature’s consideration.

⁴ Amicus Br. for States of N.Y., et al. at 18, *Rucho v. Common Cause*, 558 U.S. ____ (2019) (No. 18-422).

5. But the People decisively voted this measure down in 2021, re-confirming the IRC’s exclusive redistricting process under New York law.

6. Undeterred, the Democrats who control the Legislature and Governor Kathy Hochul have egregiously violated both the procedural and substantive protections in the New York Constitution to seek precisely the type of advantage for their party that the People outlawed in 2014 and reaffirmed in 2021. Governor Hochul thus lived up to her promise to “use [her] influence to help Democrats expand the House majority through the redistricting process,” and help the Democratic Party “regain its position that it once had when [she] was growing up.”⁵

7. This Court should invalidate the unconstitutional congressional map on two separate and independent bases.

8. First, the Legislature had no authority to enact the new map because the Legislature did not follow the *exclusive* process for enacting replacement maps that the People enshrined through the 2014 amendments, meaning that the congressional map is entirely void. Accordingly, the only validly enacted or adopted maps are those that the Legislature and courts adopted for New York after the 2010 decennial census. But the congressional map is now unconstitutionally malapportioned after the 2020 census and does not have the correct number of seats. This Court should expeditiously adopt a new map—prior to the impending deadlines for candidates to access the ballot—to cure the malapportionment now affecting the post-2010-census congressional map.

⁵ Katie Glueck & Luis Ferré-Sadurní, *Interview with Kathy Hochul: “I Feel a Heavy Weight of Responsibility”*, N.Y. Times (Aug. 25, 2021), available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/25/nyregion/kathy-hochul-interview.html>.

9. Second, if this Court holds that the Legislature somehow had the authority to adopt a replacement map notwithstanding these procedural failures, this Court should reject it as a matter of substance, as the map is an obviously unconstitutional partisan and incumbent-protection gerrymander. If this Court takes this approach, it should invalidate the map and then send it back to the Legislature to create a new congressional map, which complies with the law.

THE PARTIES

10. Petitioner Tim Harkenrider is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 22 Spruce Street, Canisteo, NY 14823, in Steuben County, within Congressional District 23.

11. Petitioner Guy C. Brought is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 170 Horton Lane, Apt. 462, Port Ewen, NY 12466, in Ulster County, within Congressional District 19.

12. Petitioner Lawrence Canning is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 2843 Johnny Cake Hill Road, Hamilton, NY 13346, in Madison County, within Congressional District 19.

13. Petitioner Patricia Clarino is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 274 Garden Street, New Windsor, NY 12553, in Orange County, within Congressional District 18.

14. Petitioner George Dooher, Jr. is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 209 Dixon Dr., Syracuse, New York 13219, in Onondaga County, within Congressional District 22.

15. Petitioner Stephen Evans is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 440 West 41st Street, Apt. 4G, New York, NY 10036, in New York County, within Congressional District 10.

16. Petitioner Linda Fanton is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 2347 Fulmer Valley Road, Wellsville, NY 14895, in Allegany County, within Congressional District 23.

17. Petitioner Jerry Fishman is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 8200 Narrows Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11209, in Kings County, within Congressional District 11.

18. Petitioner Jay Frantz is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 39 Orchard Place, Gowanda, NY 14070, in Cattaraugus County, within Congressional District 23.

19. Petitioner Lawrence Garvey is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 2 Hillman Road, New City, NY 10956, in Rockland County, within Congressional District 17.

20. Petitioner Alan Nephew is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 28 Aldrich Street, Gowanda, NY 14070, in Cattaraugus County, within Congressional District 23.

21. Petitioner Susan Rowley is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 876 Ford Peterson Road, Frewsburg, NY 14738, in Chautauqua County, within Congressional District 23.

22. Petitioner Josephine Thomas is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 322 Wynthrop Road, Syracuse, NY 13209, in Onondaga County, within Congressional District 22.

23. Petitioner Marianne Volante is an elector of the state of New York, residing at 170 Loder Road, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598, in Westchester County, within Congressional District 16.

24. Respondent Kathy Hochul is the Governor of the State of New York. She is being sued in her official capacity.

25. Respondent Brian A. Benjamin is the Lieutenant Governor of the State of New York and President of the New York State Senate. He is being sued in his official capacity.

26. Respondent Andrea Stewart-Cousins is the New York State Senate Majority Leader and President *Pro Tempore* of the New York State Senate, representing the 35th Senate District.

Majority Leader Stewart-Cousins has offices in Albany and at 28 Wells Avenue, Building #3, 5th Floor, Yonkers, NY 10701. She is being sued in her official capacity.

27. Respondent Carl E. Heastie is the Speaker of the New York State Assembly, representing the 83rd Assembly District. Speaker Heastie has offices in Albany and at 1446 East Gun Hill Road, Bronx, NY 10469. He is being sued in his official capacity.

28. Respondent New York State Board of Elections was established on June 1, 1974, as an Executive Department agency vested with the authority and responsibility for administration and enforcement of the laws relating to election in the State of New York. It has its principal place of business at 40 North Pearl Street, Suite 5, Albany, NY 12207.

29. Respondent New York State Legislative Task Force on Demographic Research and Reapportionment (“LATFOR”) was established by the Legislature in 1978 pursuant to New York Legislative Law § 83-m, with the principal responsibility—at least before the 2014 constitutional amendments to Article III, Section 4—of preparing and formulating reapportionment plans to the Legislature following each decennial census. LATFOR’s principal place of business is located at 250 Broadway, Suite 2100, New York, NY 10007.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

30. This Court has jurisdiction over this lawsuit pursuant to Article III, Section 5 of the New York Constitution, CPLR § 3001, and Unconsolidated Laws § 4221, the latter of which grants authority to the “supreme court” to “review” any “petition of any citizen” challenging “[a]n apportionment by the legislature.”

31. Venue is proper in this County under Article III, Section 5 of the New York Constitution, CPLR § 503(a), and Unconsolidated Laws § 4221, the latter of which authorizes the

filing of a petition challenging “[a]n apportionment by the legislature” in “the supreme court where any such petitioner resides.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Redistricting in New York

32. Following each federal decennial census, the New York Constitution requires the State of New York to redraw its congressional districts to adjust for population changes. The process of redrawing these district lines is known as redistricting.

33. New York congressional districts must be redrawn so that each district is contiguous; contains, to the extent possible, an equal number of inhabitants; and is in as compact a form as possible, as required by Article III, Section 4 of the New York State Constitution.

34. Redistricting is an extremely time-sensitive requirement, including because candidates must know what their districts are in advance of an election, in order to meet state-ballot-access requirements. Multiple petition and signature-related deadlines are looming for New York congressional candidates. *See generally* N.Y. Election Law § 6-100, *et seq.*

i. The Redistricting Process Before 2014

35. Before 2014, the Legislature maintained primary responsibility for redistricting.

36. To aid the Legislature in its task, LATFOR would prepare proposed redistricting maps for the Legislature’s vote.

37. Established in 1978, LATFOR is a partisan body that has consistently produced partisan maps. It consists of six members, including four legislators and two non-legislators. The Temporary President of the Senate appoints one legislator and one non-legislator. The Speaker of

the Assembly also appoints one legislator and one non-legislator. The Minority Leader of the Assembly appoints one legislator, and the Minority Leader of the Senate appoints one legislator.

38. Under the LATFOR system, “legislators w[ould never] give up their right to draw district lines.” David Freedlander, *Backgrounder: How Redistricting Will Reshape New York’s Battle Lines*, Observer (Dec. 27, 2010).⁶ Indeed, legislators could effectively control redistricting under the LATFOR process in a partisan manner, by controlling “who winds up on [LATFOR]—those who make it are likely to be the favorites of [incumbent legislative leaders] and are likely to get exactly the districts that they want.” *Id.*

39. Over time, the Legislature manipulated its role in the redistricting process to protect existing incumbents. Under this pre-2014 system, elections were often predestined, with state legislative incumbents winning reelection more than 98% of the time, “usually overwhelmingly.” *Elections With No Meaning*, N.Y. Times (Feb. 21, 2004), at A14.⁷ The “major reason” for this seemingly insurmountable incumbency advantage was gerrymandering, allowing the party in power to draw districts with “surgical precision” to “exclude the homes of rival candidates” and making favorable districts nearly “impregnable.” *Id.* With incumbents facing little chance of defeat under the then-existing process, elections became uncompetitive, and voters became increasingly disillusioned by the reality that they could not choose their representatives.

40. This system granted political parties significant leeway to gerrymander for partisan and incumbent gain. Only the requirement of “one person, one vote,” and requirements that

⁶Available at <http://observer.com/2010/12/backgrounder-how-redistricting-will-reshape-new-yorks-battle-lines/>.

⁷ Available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2004/02/21/opinion/elections-with-no-meaning.html>.

districts “shall contain as nearly as may be an equal number of inhabitants, excluding aliens, and be in as compact form as practicable, and shall remain unaltered until the first year of the next decade . . . , and shall at all times consist of contiguous territory,” N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4 (2014), constrained the party leaders responsible for drawing new maps. The New York Constitution required respect for county and city lines, noting that “no county shall be divided in the formation of a senate district except to make two or more senate districts wholly in such county,” and “[n]o town, except a town having more than a full ratio of apportionment, and no block in a city inclosed by streets or public ways, shall be divided in the formation of senate districts,” as well as the “block on border” and “town on border” requirements. *Id.*; *see also* N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(c)(6) (current version). But even these “requirements” were largely not meaningful constraints. *See Schneider v. Rockefeller*, 31 N.Y.2d 420, 426–27, 293 N.E.2d 67 (1972).

41. Additionally, prior to 2014, some New York Courts had interpreted the then-pertinent constitutional provisions as not providing for a claim of partisan gerrymandering. *Bay Ridge Cmty. Council, Inc. v. Carey*, 479 N.Y.S.2d 746, 749, 103 A.D.2d 280 (2d Dep’t 1984) (*per curiam*), *aff’d* 66 N.Y.2d 657, 486 N.E.2d 830 (1985) (order).

42. Therefore, the pre-2014 system for redistricting and reapportionment gave broad discretion to the politicians in power, and *required* only that all state legislative and congressional districts largely abided by the equal-population principle, creating unfair and undemocratic maps that ensconced powerful parties in the seat of government.

ii. The Redistricting Process After the 2014 Reforms

43. In recent years, however, the People of this State explicitly outlawed partisan gerrymandering and constitutionalized an exclusive, nonpartisan procedure for redistricting.

44. In 2014, New Yorkers enacted a constitutional amendment, amending Article III, Sections 4 and 5 of the New York Constitution, and adding a new Section 5-b to the same Article, voting in favor of the following ballot measure:

The Proposed amendment to sections 4 and 5 and addition of new section 5-b to Article 3 of the State Constitution revises the redistricting procedure for state legislative and congressional districts. The proposed amendment establishes a redistricting commission every 10 years beginning in 2020, with two members appointed by each of the four legislative leaders and two members selected by the eight legislative appointees; prohibits legislators and other elected officials from serving as commissioners; establishes principles to be used in creating districts; requires the commission to hold public hearings on proposed redistricting plans; subjects the commission's redistricting plan to legislative enactment; provides that the legislature may only amend the redistricting plan according to the established principles if the commission's plan is rejected twice by the legislature; provides for expedited court review of a challenged redistricting plan; and provides for funding and bipartisan staff to work for the commission. Shall the proposed amendment be approved?

*2014 N.Y. State Prop. No. 1: An Amendment Revising State's Redistricting Procedure.*⁸

45. Proposition 1 amended the New York Constitution to vest primary redistricting responsibility in the newly created IRC, as well as establishing numerous procedural safeguards against the Legislature's continued gerrymandering practices.

46. One procedural safeguard is the IRC's 10-member composition. Two Commissioners are appointed by the New York State Senate Majority Leader and Temporary President, two are appointed by the New York State Senate Minority Leader, two are appointed by the Speaker of the New York State Assembly, and two are appointed by the New York State Assembly Minority Leader. The final two members are then selected by these eight appointees

⁸ Available at <https://www.elections.erie.gov/Files/Election%20Results/2014/11042014/2014-General.pdf>.

and cannot be enrolled as a Democrat or Republican in the past five years. All Commission members must be registered voters in New York.

47. Article III, Section 4 of the New York Constitution requires the IRC to hold public hearings in cities and counties around the State and release draft plans, data, and related information to facilitate public review of proposed district lines. Draft plans must be made available at least thirty days before the first public hearing and no later than September 15 of the year following the census.

48. Article III, Section 5-b(f) and (g) of the New York Constitution governs IRC voting and the procedure for approving and submitting redistricting maps to the Legislature. Five members of the IRC constitute a quorum. IRC approval of a plan requires seven votes, which must include a member appointed by each of the legislative leaders. In the event no plan gets seven votes, the IRC must submit the plan(s) with the highest vote to the Legislature.

49. Article III, Section 4 of the New York Constitution requires the IRC to submit an initial set of maps and the necessary implementing legislation to the Legislature no later than January 15 of the second year following the census. The Legislature then votes on the maps and implementing legislation without amendment. N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(b); *see also* N.Y. Legis. Law § 93(1).

50. If the Legislature fails to adopt the first set of maps and implementing legislation, or the Governor vetoes adopted implementing legislation, the redistricting process reverts back to the IRC. The IRC must submit a second set of maps and implementing legislation to the Legislature, subject to the requirements outlined above, within 15 days of being notified of the first rejection and no later than February 28. The Legislature then votes on the second set of

proposed maps and implementing legislation without amendment. N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(b); *see also* N.Y. Legis. Law § 93(1).

51. If (and only if) the Legislature fails to adopt the IRC's second set of maps and implementing legislation, or the Governor vetoes the second adopted implementing legislation, can the Legislature amend the IRC's proposed redistricting maps and enact its own replacement maps.

52. The 2014 amendments to Article III, Section 4 also changed and added to the *substantive* redistricting requirements. Now, the New York Constitution specifically provides that districts "shall not be drawn to discourage competition or for the purpose of favoring or disfavoring incumbents or other particular candidates or political parties." N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(c).

53. The Legislature must follow all of the substantive requirements for redistricting applicable to the IRC. That is, any maps and implementing legislation adopted by the Legislature cannot involve partisan gerrymandering or incumbent-favoring gerrymandering, must be compact and contiguous, and must have equal population between districts, in addition to the already-noted procedural requirement that all maps be enacted via a single mandatory process involving the IRC.

54. The Legislature also established an additional guardrail against partisan gerrymandering with Section 3 of the Redistricting Reform Act of 2012. 2012 N.Y. Sess. Laws 17, § 3. Applicable above and apart from New York Legislative Law §§ 93, 94, Section 3 of the Redistricting Reform Act of 2012 provides, in pertinent part, that "[a]ny amendments by the senate or assembly to a redistricting plan submitted by the independent redistricting commission, shall not affect more than two percent of the population of any district contained in such plan." 2012 N.Y. Sess. Laws 17, § 3.

iii. The Legislative Democrats Fail To Derail These Reforms With A Proposed 2021 Constitutional Amendment

55. In 2021, the Legislature referred a constitutional amendment to New York voters that would have gutted the 2014 constitutional reforms, in favor of the Legislature over the Commission, but the People decisively voted this measure down.

56. The ballot proposal would have amended the New York Constitution in a number of ways, including section 4(b) of Article III, to provide:

If either house shall fail to approve the legislation implementing the second redistricting plan, or the governor shall veto such legislation and the legislature shall fail to override such veto, or the redistricting commission fails to vote on a redistricting plan and implementing legislation by the required deadline and makes a submission to the legislature pursuant to subdivision (g-1) of section five-b of this article, each house shall introduce such implementing legislation with any amendments each house of the legislature deems necessary.

2021 Statewide Ballot Proposals, New York State Board of Elections (amendment underlined).⁹

57. The IRC's exclusive redistricting process, enshrined in Article III, Section 4 of the New York Constitution, can only be altered by a constitutional amendment. Yet, within days of the People voting down the 2021 constitutional amendment, the Legislature referred a bill that purports to achieve largely the same result as the failed amendment would have to the Governor for her signature. The Governor signed this unconstitutional bill on November 24, 2021.

58. This law attempts to avoid the Constitution's limitations by purporting to amend only section 4(c) of the Redistricting Reform Act of 2012, notwithstanding the expressed desires of the People of this State:

If either house shall fail to approve the legislation implementing the second redistricting plan, or the governor shall veto such legislation and the legislature

⁹ Available at <https://www.elections.ny.gov/2021BallotProposals.html>.

shall fail to override such veto within ten days of such veto, or if the commission does not vote on any redistricting plan or plans, for any reason, by the date required for submission of such plan and the commission submitted to the legislature pursuant to subdivision (a) of this section all plans in its possession, both completed and in draft form, and the data upon which such plans are based, each house shall introduce such implementing legislation with any amendments each house deems necessary. If approved by both houses, such legislation shall be presented to the governor for action within three days.

L.2021, c. 633, § 1 (amendment underlined).

B. The Post-2010 Census Map For Congress Is Unconstitutional Under The New York Constitution

59. Following the 2010 Census, the Legislature in 2012 reapportioned New York's state legislative districts, but it could not agree on new congressional districts. As a result, a panel of three federal judges appointed a federal magistrate judge, Roanne Mann, to propose a new congressional map for New York. On March 19, 2012, the judicial panel imposed its congressional map, which was largely the same as the map issued by Judge Mann. *Favors v. Cuomo*, No. 11-CV-5632, 2012 WL 928223 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 19, 2012); *see also* Thomas Kaplan, *New Congressional Lines Imposed by Federal Court*, N.Y. Times (Mar. 19, 2012).¹⁰

60. After the 2010 census, New York had a population goal of 719,298 residents for each of its 27 congressional districts.

61. In the interim, various population shifts caused congressional districts to become unconstitutionally malapportioned.

62. New York's 26 congressional districts have a population goal of 776,971 residents.

¹⁰ Available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/20/nyregion/judges-impose-new-congressional-map-for-new-york.html>.

63. The prior congressional map does not comply with this new population target or the constitutional requirements for population equality.

64. In other words, none of the districts complies with the “strict standard of population equality applicable to congressional apportionment,” which require “maximum population equality.” *Schneider v. Rockefeller*, 31 N.Y.2d 420, 427–28, 293 N.E.2d 67 (1972).

65. None of the prior districts matches exactly (or even within 1,000 residents) the population goal of 776,971 residents.

66. For example, in prior Congressional District 23, where Petitioners Tim Harkenrider, Linda Fanton, Jay Frantz, Alan Nephew, and Susan Rowley reside, the current population is 83,462 residents below the population goal (a -10.7% deviation).

67. In prior Congressional District 22, where Petitioner Lawrence Canning resides, the current population is 80,361 residents below the population goal (a -10.3% deviation).

68. In prior Congressional District 19, where Petitioner Guy C. Brought resides, the current population is 78,298 residents below the population goal (a -10.1% deviation).

69. In prior Congressional District 24, where Petitioners George Dooher, Jr. and Josephine Thomas reside, the current population is 59,664 residents below the population goal (a -7.7% deviation).

70. Moreover, the prior congressional map includes 27 congressional districts, and New York only receives 26 congressional seats after the most recent census, so that map is plainly

invalid. U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Census: Apportionment of the U.S. House of Representatives (April 26, 2021).¹¹

C. The IRC And Legislature Failed To Follow The Constitutional Process For Redistricting To Cure This Malapportionment

i. The Commission's Initial Efforts To Develop Redistricting Maps

71. On April 26, 2021, the U.S. Census Bureau released the population counts from the 2020 Census, showing that New York's resident population increased by more than 4 percent, or 823,147 residents, from 19,378,102 a decade ago, to 20,201,249 in 2020. Because of national population shifts, however, New York lost one of its congressional seats in the United States House of Representatives, leaving the State with a total of 26 such districts.

72. The 2020 Census data further showed, as previously mentioned, that New York's congressional districts are now unconstitutionally malapportioned.

73. Pursuant to the 2014 constitutional amendments, the New York Constitution established an exclusive process for adopting any replacement redistricting maps, granting the IRC and Legislature specifically defined roles.

74. The IRC's current members are David Imamura, serving as Chair, Jack M. Martins, serving as Vice Chair, Eugene Bengler, Ross Brady, John Conway III, Dr. Ivelisse Cuevas-Molina, Dr. John Flateau, Elaine Frazier, Charles H. Nesbitt, and Willis H. Stephens, Jr.

75. Consistent with the procedures established by the 2014 amendments, Democratic leaders in the Legislature appointed the "Democratic Caucus" of the Commission, made up of:

¹¹ Available at <https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/2021/dec/2020-apportionment-map.html>.

David Imamura, Eugene Bengler, John Flateau, and Elaine Frazier, along with non-party enrollee Ivelisse Cuevas-Molina.

76. Similarly, Republican leaders in the Legislature selected the “Republican Caucus” of the Commission, made up of: Jack Martins, John Conway, Charles Nesbitt, and Willis Stephens, joined by Conservative Party member Ross Brady.

77. From the outset, Democratic legislative leaders attempted to hamstring the new Commission with multiple challenges and delays.

78. The Democrats attempted to impede the Commission by delaying its receipt of state funding from the Legislature. Despite a \$1 million allocation in the 2020 state budget, the funding never materialized, forcing Commission staff to work on a voluntary basis for months. After more than a year, the Legislature finally allocated \$4 million to the Commission’s redistricting efforts in April 2021. Ethan Geringer-Sameth, *New York Redistricting Commission Kicks Off State’s New Map-Drawing Process*, Gotham Gazette (July 20, 2021);¹² Sarah Darmanjian, *NY’s Independent Redistricting Commission Clinches \$4M Budget*, News10 (Apr. 12, 2021).¹³

79. Finally, beginning on June 20, 2021, the IRC held a series of nine public meetings across the State to hear public testimony about the new maps and the redistricting process, as required by the New York Constitution. N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(c).

80. On September 15, 2021, members of the IRC released initial map drafts, consistent with constitutional requirements. N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(c).

¹² Available at <https://www.gothamgazette.com/state/10664-new-york-redistricting-commission-set-to-kick-off>.

¹³ Available at <https://www.news10.com/news/redistricting-commission/>.

81. Republican members had hoped to submit a single bipartisan set of draft maps. Speaking to reporters about the two draft plans, Commissioner Martins said the IRC “should end up with the maps being negotiated and presented jointly,” but the Democratic commissioners had not agreed to meet over the weekend before the Commission released the draft maps. See Rebecca C. Lewis & Zach Williams, *Takeaways From New York’s (Competing!) Redistricting Draft Maps*, City & State N.Y. (Sept. 15, 2021).¹⁴

82. The Democratic members viewed the competing draft maps differently, with Commissioner Imamura stating that “the fact that we put out two plans does not indicate that the commission will be unable to come to a bipartisan agreement.” *Id.*

83. The IRC held an additional fourteen public hearings across the State, during which residents voiced concerns, desires, and suggestions regarding the draft maps and the redistricting process. The IRC also solicited written comments and draft maps from the public.

84. Democratic members revised their respective maps between the end of November and when the full Commission met to deliberate in December. Testimony of Eugene Banger at 23:44–24:10, Virtual Public Meeting of the NYIRC, Jan. 3, 2022 (“1/3/22 IRC Meeting”).¹⁵

85. The IRC held its last public hearing on December 5, 2021, and the final deadline for public comments and draft maps was December 6, 2021.

¹⁴ Available at <https://www.cityandstateny.com/policy/2021/09/new-yorks-first-draft-2022-redistricting-maps-have-been-released/185374/>.

¹⁵ Available at <https://totalwebcasting.com/view/?func=VOFF&id=nysirc&date=2022-01-03&seq=1>.

86. Following the public comment period, the IRC scheduled meetings to negotiate and finalize a single set of maps to submit to the Legislature. The IRC agreed on a procedure for putting together this set of consensus maps:

- a. First, two third-party redistricting organizations, Redistricting Partners and Redistricting Insight, would prepare a set of maps without IRC input, using the draft maps released by the IRC in September, as well as the public testimony and written comments.
- b. The Commission would then hold a series of meetings, breaking into subgroups, to review the organizations' preliminary maps.
- c. Based on these discussions, the IRC would make changes to the preliminary maps and work to arrive at a single map.

87. All of the members of the Commission initially followed their agreed-upon plan and worked together on a set of consensus maps for over two weeks, moving toward a bipartisan consensus.

88. On December 22, 2021, the full Commission met to discuss the bipartisan maps. By this point, only a small number of issues remained open, and the Commission was close to reaching a consensus. After discussing the open issues for two hours, the Commission broke at 1:00 p.m., agreeing to reconvene at 4:00 p.m. to reach an agreement on the remaining issues. Testimony of Jack Martins at 8:44–9:14, 1/3/22 IRC Meeting, *supra*.

89. When the IRC reconvened at 4:00 p.m. on December 22, Commissioner Imamura read a statement announcing that the Democratic Caucus would no longer negotiate the bipartisan maps, as all members previously agreed to do. Instead, the Democratic Caucus was only willing

to negotiate on the latest iteration of the maps it had released unexpectedly, and without explanation, the day prior. Testimony of Jack Martins at 9:16–9:49, 1/3/22 IRC Meeting, *supra*.

ii. The IRC Submits Two Sets Of Maps To The Legislature

90. On January 3, 2022, the IRC met to vote on maps to send to the Legislature.

91. The Democratic Caucus again refused to negotiate with the full Commission, discuss the bipartisan maps, or make any concessions. Commissioner Martins expressed his disappointment with the impasse, noting that the Republican members had reached an agreement with Democrats on 90 percent of the new district lines before talks broke down.

92. The Commission then voted on two redistricting plans—the Democratic members’ partisan maps presented on December 21 (“Plan A”) and the consensus maps, which were based on the preliminary maps drawn by independent organizations and negotiated by the full Commission throughout December 2021 (“Plan B”).

93. Both plans received five votes each, resulting in both being delivered to the Legislature on January 3.

94. The Legislature rejected both plans out-of-hand, without consideration of the public’s input, the Commission’s negotiations and reflections on the public’s testimony, bipartisan priorities, and the other considerations New Yorkers enshrined in the Constitution.

95. The Assembly set the plans for a party vote, rejecting them all. Before the final vote, Assemblyman Colin Schmitt asked Assemblyman Kenneth Zebrowski, a Democrat representing the 96th District who sponsored Plan A, whether the Assembly would “follow[] all of the currently prescribed State Law and State constitutional process for redistricting” if the Legislature failed to approve any of the IRC’s plans—including taking public input before enacting

new maps. Assemblyman Zebrowski did not give a concrete answer, saying “I don't—I don't think that's germane to—to this debate right now.” Transcript at 12–14, Session, New York State Assembly (Jan. 10, 2022) (Questioning of Assemblyman Zebrowski by Assemblyman Colin Schmitt).¹⁶

96. In the Senate, Plan A's maps received no votes in favor of enactment. Seventeen senators voted in favor of Plan B's Senate and Assembly districts, with forty-six voting no, while nineteen senators voted to enact Plan B's congressional map, with forty-four voting against. Before voting in favor of Plan B, Senator Andrew Lanza commented on the Commission's lack of real autonomy, saying, “I think it's been the worst-kept secret in Albany, if not the entire country, that this Independent Redistricting Commission was never going to be allowed to remain independent.” Transcript at 73:14–17, Regular Session, New York State Senate (Jan. 10, 2022) (Testimony of Senator Andrew Lanza).¹⁷

97. On January 10, the Legislature advised the Commission that it had rejected the submitted plans.

98. Following this rejection, the IRC had until January 25 to submit a revised plan under the 2014 amendments to the Constitution.

99. The full Commission met to discuss a single plan for the final submission to the Legislature, as required by Article III, Section 4(b) of the New York Constitution. The Republican members attempted to restart negotiations on the previously negotiated bipartisan maps. Chairman

¹⁶ Available at <https://www.nyassembly.gov/av/session/>.

¹⁷ Available at <https://legislation.nysenate.gov/pdf/transcripts/2022-01-10T15:51/>.

Imamura stated that the Democratic members wanted to re-submit virtually the same plan that the legislature had rejected. Despite multiple entreaties from the Republican members, the Democratic members refused to meet to discuss bipartisan maps.

100. On January 18, before the IRC's constitutional window for revision expired, Speaker Carl Heastie announced he had appointed Assembly Democrat Kenneth Zebrowski to be the temporary co-chair of LATFOR. Speaker Heastie stated that "the results of reapportionment will determine the path our state and our nation take for the coming decade," and "Assemblymember Zebrowski is the right person for the job." Assembly Speaker Carl E. Heastie, News Release, *Speaker Heastie Announces Assemblymember Zebrowski Appointed Temporary Co-Chair of LATFOR* (Jan. 18, 2022).¹⁸

101. On January 24, 2021, Commissioner Imamura announced that the IRC was at an impasse and would not be submitting a second set of redistricting maps to the Legislature at all.

102. On the same day, Commissioner Martins made a statement on behalf on the Republican members on the Commission, outlining the Democratic members' refusal to engage with anything other than their partisan maps and expressing his disappointment that the Commission failed its constitutional mandate.

103. On January 25, 2022, the 15-day window for the IRC to submit revised maps to the Legislature closed without the IRC submitting new maps, as required by the Constitution.

104. Upon information and belief, the Democratic Caucus of the IRC decided not to submit a compromise congressional map within the constitutional timeframes after receiving

¹⁸ Available at <https://www.nyassembly.gov/Press/?sec=story&story=100542>.

encouragement to undermine the constitutional process from Democratic Party politicians and officials.

iii. Notwithstanding The Failure Of The Constitutional Process, The Legislature Nevertheless Attempted To Enact A Replacement Congressional Map, And The Map It Enacted Is An Unconstitutional Partisan And Incumbent-Protection Gerrymander

105. Despite the failure of the IRC to vote on and present a second set of maps, the Legislature proceeded to craft its own congressional map, turning a blind eye to the mandatory and exclusive constitutional process for redistricting established in Article III, Section 4.

106. In doing so, the Legislature ignored calls from all across the aisle to engage with the public and be more transparent about the choices it was making in drawing district lines. Clifford Michel & Farah Javed, *Albany Democrats Seize Control of Redistricting, With Unclear Role for Public*, The City (Jan. 27, 2022).¹⁹

107. Instead, Democratic leaders crafted and pushed through legislation to enact its own new congressional map over the course of only a few days, releasing the Legislature's proposed map on Sunday evening, January 30, without a single public hearing. Ashford & Fandos, *supra*.

108. This map bears no resemblance to the two maps proposed by the IRC.

109. To underscore how different the Legislature's map is, and to make adoption of this unrecognizable congressional map possible, the Legislature added a "notwithstanding clause" to the enacting legislation, exempting the map from any laws to the contrary, including the 2% rule embodied in 2012 New York Session Laws 17, § 3.

¹⁹ Available at <https://www.thecity.nyc/2022/1/26/22903787/albany-democrats-seize-control-of-redistricting-with-unclear-role-for-public>.

110. The result is an unmistakably gerrymandered map for Congress.

111. The Legislature created a congressional map that, without a doubt, creates “an effective [Democratic] gerrymander, resulting in the Democrats “gain[ing] three seats and eliminat[ing] four Republican seats,” and creating the biggest shift in the country” with “the stroke of a pen.” Ashford & Fandos, *supra*.

112. As noted by Laura Ladd Bierman, the executive director of the League of Women Voters of New York, “New Yorkers deserve a transparent and fair redistricting process, and it is shameful that the Legislature has denied them this.” *NYC Would Get More Seats in State Senate Under Proposed Maps*, N.Y. Daily News Feb. 1, 2022).²⁰ So, even though the New York Constitution prohibits partisan gerrymandering, she noted that the congressional map “reflect[s] a Legislature that appears to care more about favoring partisan interests than it does for fair maps.” *Id.*

113. In fact, the Legislature’s congressional gerrymander was so successful, so biased in favor of Democrats, that the enacted congressional map is more favorable to Democrats than *any* of the 5,000 computer simulated maps, designed specifically to follow New York’s redistricting requirements without focusing on any goal of increasing partisan advantage.

114. The Legislature concocted numerous individual congressional districts with boundaries with no honest explanation except for impermissible partisan and incumbent-favoring gerrymandering. The following examples are illustrative.

²⁰ Available at <https://www.nydailynews.com/news/politics/new-york-elections-government/ny-state-senate-nyc-seats-legislative-redistricting-20220202-2xoyaqnvlfhdliax5tosbnuage-story.html>.

115. In Long Island, the Legislature completely changed Congressional Districts 1 and 2, swapping Republican voters for Democratic voters in an egregious gerrymander.


116. In particular, the Legislature placed areas with high concentrations of Republican voters into new Congressional District 2 while moving solidly Democrat communities into Congressional District 1—all of the Republican communities in Brookhaven on the south shore are now in District 2, whereas the heavily Democrat areas in the center of Long Island are now channeled into District 1.

117. This partisan reconfiguration creates several new town splits, and an additional county split, where Congressional District 1 now reaches into Nassau County between Oyster Bay and Huntington. By packing Republicans into Congressional District 2, the Legislature effectively flipped Congressional District 1.


118. The result of this blatant gerrymandering has turned Congressional District 1 from a strong Republican district, solely in Suffolk County, into a lean Democratic district, unnecessarily sprawling across two counties.

119. Similarly, the redrawing shifted District 2 from a safe Republican district into an outright uncompetitive Republican stronghold.

Map of Prior Congressional Districts 1 & 2²¹



Map of New Congressional Districts 1 & 2



²¹ All maps, unless otherwise specified, come from the LATFOR government website, available at <https://www.latfor.state.ny.us/maps/>.

120. The new Congressional District 3 is dramatically different from the old map in order to accomplish the Legislature's partisan goals.

121. The old District 3 bridged Suffolk and Nassau counties, with a slight reach into Queens County. The new map reaches from Suffolk County, through Nassau and Queens counties, and then skips through Bronx County all the way up into Westchester County across the Long Island Sound in a thin strip up to the town of Rye, capturing overwhelmingly Democrat-voting towns along the shore.


122. This combination of Westchester, with a district largely populated on Suffolk and Nassau counties, makes no sense. These communities have no nexus and share no communities of interest.

123. With these stark and otherwise unexplainable changes, the Legislature has decreased competitiveness, shifting Congressional District 3 from a competitive Democratic-leaning district to a strong Democrat district.

Map of Old Congressional District 3



Map of New Congressional District 3



124. The new Congressional Districts 8, 9, 10, and 11 radically break up established communities of interest in Brooklyn to create a partisan advantage for Democrats.

125. The new map divides closely knit, concentrated Orthodox Jewish and Russian communities with strong social and cultural ties, resulting in conservative Republican-leaning voters spread or “cracked” across multiple districts.

126. These new districts are drawn as vertical stripes across the southern two-thirds of Brooklyn, moving large numbers from the Russian Jewish communities in Brooklyn into Congressional District 8 and dividing the Orthodox Jewish communities between Congressional District 9 and Congressional District 10.

127. This partisan gerrymander also split other communities of interest—in Congressional District 10, the Legislature cut across an established Asian community, moving half of it into Congressional District 11.

128. In particular, it cuts Sunset Park off from northern Brooklyn and the Lower East Side of Manhattan, separating the Asian American, Pacific Islander, and Latino communities—which have formed the “backbone” of the district for nearly 30 years, since the 1992 reapportionment process—from its related communities of interest in northern Brooklyn and Manhattan’s Lower East side. Kristyn Brendlen, *Brooklyn Electeds, Community leaders Ask State Gov Officials to Reconsider Redistricting Maps*, Brooklyn Paper (Feb. 1, 2022).²² This new split breaks up these linked communities from the North Brooklyn area, which is especially important given the recent “rise in anti-Asian hate.” *Id.*

²² Available at <https://www.brooklynpaper.com/brooklyn-electeds-community-redistricting/>.

129. Democratic Assemblymember Marcela Mitaynes also decried this inexplicable particular line-drawing, noting that the Legislature had “separate[d]” these “culturally and historically connected” communities for nothing more than “political expediency to ensure a[n] electoral advantage in the near term,” and “fail[ed] to meet the necessary level of transparency, accountability, and public participation that our constituents rightfully deserve from our democratically elected leaders,” before concluding that she would “not dismantle the political voice of [her] constituents by voting to approve the proposed Congressional Districts.” Assemblymember Marcela Mitaynes’ Statement on New York State’s Proposed 2022 Congressional Maps (Feb. 2, 2022).²³

130. The Legislature designed this particular shift with the intent of unseating incumbent Republican Congresswoman Nicole Malliotakis from Congressional District 11. Carl Campanile, *Dems Plan to Topple GOP Rep. Malliotakis in Redistricting Plan*, N.Y.Post (Jan. 27 2022);²⁴ Jeff Coltin, *Rep. Nicole Malliotakis is (Probably) Screwed*, City & State New York (Jan. 31, 2022).²⁵

131. Congressional District 11 shifted from the previous map where it covered Staten Island and adjacent southern portions of Brooklyn, to now covering Staten Island and winding northwestward into the heavily liberal areas of Brooklyn—Sunset Park, Red Hook, Gowanus, Windsor Terrace, and Park Slope, thereby drastically changing the political composition of this district, providing the Democrats a drastically increased chance of flipping the seat.

²³ Available at https://docs.google.com/document/d/16jJFKDH-_U8P5aAsjwEOCQaLZSIXsAkTnaZiW9xaCMs/edit?usp=sharing.

²⁴ Available at <https://nypost.com/2022/01/27/dems-plan-to-topple-gop-rep-nicole-malliotakis-in-redistricting-plan/>.

²⁵ Available at <https://www.cityandstateny.com/politics/2022/01/rep-nicole-malliotakis-probably-screwed/361412/>.

132. As the Asian American Legal Defense Fund noted on Twitter, “[t]he legislature’s map does not keep our [Asian American] communities together”²⁶:




133. These redrawn Brooklyn districts are blatant gerrymanders, with bizarre, roving boundaries crossing multiple bodies of water and snaking between each other for no discernible reason besides partisan advantage.

134. These shifts allowed the Legislature to place additional, safe Democratic voters into District 11, changing that district from a strong Republican district to a Democratic district.

²⁶ Available at <https://twitter.com/aaldef/status/1488223479371599876>.

Map of Old Congressional Districts 8, 9, 10, & 11



Map of New Congressional Districts 8, 9, 10, & 11



Map of Old Congressional District 8



Map of New Congressional District 8



Map of Old Congressional District 9



Map of New Congressional District 9




Map of Old Congressional District 10



Map of New Congressional District 10




Overlay of Old Congressional District 10 and New Congressional District 10²⁷




²⁷ Nicholas Fandos, *How N.Y. Democrats Came Up With Their Gerrymandered Districts on Their New Map*, N.Y. Times (Jan. 31, 2022), available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/31/nyregion/nyc-congressional-district-nadler.html>.

Map of Old Congressional District 11



Map of New Congressional District 11



135. The old Congressional District 16 was almost entirely contained in Westchester County, with only a small section of the Bronx for population purposes, while the new District connects a section of the Bronx to Mount Vernon and Yonkers—Democratic strongholds—then winds in a narrow segment up through Westchester County into Putnam County, grabbing rural and suburban Republican communities, in order to “crack” them out of Congressional District 18.

136. The towns of Putnam Valley, Carmel, Yorktown, and Somers—strongly Republican areas—are awkwardly connected to highly populated Democratic communities, neutralizing these Republican votes. The bisection of Westchester County and added county split into Putnam County creates a district with geographically distanced communities.


137. Furthermore, the gerrymander of Congressional District 16 removes Republican voters from Congressional District 18 into a strong Democratic district, making Congressional District 18 a safer Democratic district, without jeopardizing the Democratic Party’s interests in Congressional District 16.

138. Congressional District 18 is now oddly shaped, like a sitting dog, with a tail that extends into the Ulster County towns of Rochester and Wawarsing, with legs made of Peekskill, Cortlandt, North Salem, Lewisboro, Bedford, and Pound Ridge, and a noticeable space between those legs where the central portions of Putnam and Westchester counties were scooped out for Congressional District 16.


139. The legislative Democrats made these shifts not only to shore up their party’s chances in Congressional District 18, but also to protect incumbent Democratic Congressman Sean Maloney, the newly elected chair of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

140. As a result of this gamesmanship, Congressional District 16 moves only somewhat from a very strong Democratic district to a still-strong Democratic one, whereas District 18 shifts from a lean Republican district to a lean Democratic district.


Map of Old Congressional District 16




Map of New Congressional District 16



Map of Old Congressional District 18



Map of New Congressional District 18



141. The new Congressional District 17 is similarly stretched to include strong Democrat-voting communities with rural Republican areas, while splitting the conservative Jewish communities to neutralize their Republican votes.

142. The old Congressional District 17 was compactly located in Rockland and Westchester counties.

143. Now, the District reaches from Sullivan County through Orange County into Rockland County, finally crossing the river to connect with Democrat strongholds in Westchester County, including Greenburgh and Mount Kisco.


144. The District also includes part of the strongly Democrat city of White Plains.

145. The district combines the Orthodox communities in Sullivan and Rockland counties but excludes the Kiryas Joel Jewish community in Orange County, despite the extensive public testimony and overwhelming evidence in support of keeping these communities together.


146. The resulting new District cracks those conservative communities, spreading Republican voters among multiple districts to decrease their voting power, without jeopardizing any Democratic districts.

147. Thus, Congressional District 17 shifted only slightly from a Democratic stronghold to a still-reliable but less Democratic district.

Map of Old Congressional District 17



Map of New Congressional District 17



148. Congressional District 19 is similarly drawn for the impermissible purpose of strengthening the Democratic Party’s political interests, with the four reaching corners of Congressional District 19 showing how the Legislature shopped for Democratic voters in order to turn the district from Republican-leaning to a Democratic-advantage district.

149. The new Congressional District 19 extends through the Republican communities in Columbia and Greene counties to pick up part of Albany County—specifically the Town of Bethlehem—to add Democrat voters and a new county split.


150. In Ulster County, the District picks up Democrats while specifically avoiding communities with large numbers of Republican voters.

151. The new Congressional District 19 then stretches far west to encompass the mostly Democratic city of Binghamton, to pick up additional Democratic voters there.

152. Finally, the District extends northward to pick up the Democrat-voting city of Utica.

153. All of these particular partisan choices flipped this District into a Democratic advantage.

Map of Old Congressional District 19



Map of New Congressional District 19



154. The Legislature also gerrymandered Congressional District 21 to pack it with additional Republican voters.

155. The new Congressional District 21 now extracts Saratoga and Schenectady counties, in addition to splitting off a portion of Warren County, from the surrounding areas, replacing those regions with much of Oneida County and Herkimer County, half of Montgomery County, and all of Schoharie County, thereby packing additional Republican voters into this single district and eliminating their ability to make surrounding districts more competitive for Democratic candidates.

Map of Old Congressional District 21




Map of New Congressional District 21




156. In Congressional District 22, the Legislature removed Republican areas and replaced them with Tompkins County, including the city of Ithaca, to flip the district from a competitive Republican district to a strong Democratic one.

157. As a result, Congressional District 22 underwent a massive political swing, changing from a very competitive Republican district to a strong Democratic district.

Map of Old Congressional District 22



Map of New Congressional District 22




158. The Legislature gerrymandered Congressional District 23 by “packing” as many Republican votes into this district as it could, for partisan gain.

159. The new District now includes southern Erie County towns—first-ring suburbs to the city of Buffalo—connecting them with far away and rural areas around Binghamton.


160. The old district also included some heavily Democratic areas in Tompkins County, but the Legislature removed those areas, as noted above, placing them in Congressional District 22, in order to flip that district.

161. As a result, Congressional District 23 became less competitive and shifted from a very strong Republican district to an uncontestable Republican district.

Map of Old Congressional District 23



Map of New Congressional District 23




162. Previously, District 24 compactly encompassed the bordering counties of Wayne, Cayuga, and Onondaga, as well as part of Oswego County.

163. Now, this District extends from Lewiston, in Niagara County, and various similarly Republican areas in northeast Erie County, traveling all the way eastward and northward to Jefferson County (all the way to the St. Lawrence County line), while notably avoiding certain portions of Monroe and Ontario counties.


164. Indeed, this District now stretches across four media markets, connecting numerous areas, over more than 250 miles, with little or nothing in common.

165. As a result, the Legislature shifted Congressional District 24 from a highly competitive Democratic district into a very strong Republican district, designed to protect numerous surrounding districts from any serious Republican challenge.

Map of Old Congressional District 24



Map of New Congressional District 24



166. Each of these blatantly gerrymandered districts, both individually and together, have no reasonable explanation except for the Legislative Democrats’ specific goal of increasing their political power. These examples are only illustrative of the map’s partisan design as a whole.

167. On February 2, 2022, notwithstanding the egregious gerrymander within the Legislature’s map, the Democrats in the Assembly and State Senate adopted the congressional map (with only slight modifications not related to their gerrymandering efforts), despite every Republican in the Assembly and State Senate voting against the map. *See* 2021–2022 N.Y. Reg. Sess. Leg. Bills S.8196 and A.9039 (as technically amended by A.9167).

168. In addition to the Republican legislators, all of whom voted against this egregious gerrymander, Democratic Assemblymembers Simcha Eichenstein and Marcela Mitaynes voted against the congressional maps as well.

iv. The Governor Signs The Legislature’s Unfair Congressional Map Into Law Despite Widespread Objection From New Yorkers

169. After the Legislature released its proposed congressional map, there was extensive public outcry over both the process and substance.

170. Members of the public took to the IRC’s public comment page to decry the Legislature’s opaque approach to redrawing the maps. Submissions, New York Independent Redistricting Committee (“IRC Public Submissions”).²⁸ As one comment said, “[t]his is clearly gerrymandering at its worst.” IRC Public Submissions, *supra* (submitted by Anthony on Jan. 31, 2022). Betsy Gotbaum, the executive director of good-government group Citizens Union, described the Legislature’s lack of process succinctly: “There was no public input.” Jacob Kaye, *State Legislature Shares Version of Congressional Redistricting Map*, Queens Daily Eagle (Feb. 1, 2022).²⁹ She also noted that the Legislature’s actions completely deprived the process of an accurate understanding of the public’s desires in a new map: “We don’t really know what groups of people really wanted once the commission couldn’t come to any kind of a conclusion and then the legislators took it over. We don’t know.” *Id.*

171. New Yorkers across the state quickly flagged the new map as a highly partisan gerrymander. “If it looks like gerrymandering and sounds like gerrymandering—it’s most likely

²⁸ Available at <https://nyirc.gov/submissions>.

²⁹ Available at <https://queenseagle.com/all/state-legislature-shares-version-of-congressional-redistricting-map>.

gerrymandering,” said Brian Browne, a political science professor at St. John’s University in New York City. Kaye, *supra*. “This is why people don’t trust politicians,” observed Pat Kiernan, a local morning news anchor on NY1, “[a]nd the Democrats have given up any high ground they had over Republicans on gerrymandering.” Nicholas Fandos, *How N.Y. Democrats Came Up With Gerrymandered Districts on Their New Map*, N.Y. Times (Jan. 31, 2022).³⁰

172. Even Democratic politicians condemned the map. Cynthia Appleton, the Democratic chair for Wyoming County, described the congressional map as “an absolute travesty.” Jerry Zremski, *New Congressional Map Sparks Gerrymandering Outcry*, Buffalo News (Jan. 31, 2022).³¹ Nate McMurray, a former Democratic congressional candidate, offered a similar view on the new map, calling it “nuts.” *Id.* Melanie D’Arrigo, a Democratic candidate running in Congressional District 3, harshly criticized the new map as well: “We cannot stay silent as we watch the state legislature publish a map that extreme gerrymanders our district.” Kaye, *supra*. Describing the redrawn District 3, which now spans five counties, D’Arrigo despaired, “How is this fair to the people who live in any of these counties?” *Id.* She further noted that “[c]onstituent services will be more difficult, more expensive and less efficient: the needs of someone living on the border of Connecticut being wildly different from someone in Huntington,” and “[a]ll of the voters at stake deserve real representation, not to be used as political pawns.” *Id.*

173. On February 3, 2022, Governor Hochul signed the Legislature’s congressional map into law, thereby blessing her fellow Democrats’ blatant gerrymandering efforts.

³⁰ Available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/01/31/nyregion/nyc-congressional-district-nadler.html>.

³¹ Available at https://buffalonews.com/news/new-congressional-map-sparks-gerrymandering-outcry/article_0ab6b528-82e6-11ec-8d7b-07d7c0c217b8.html.

D. The Map's Impact On Petitioners

174. The Legislature's blatant gerrymandering has caused grave harm to Petitioners, all of whom want a fair, representative government at both the state and national level, unhindered by partisan interests and egregious gerrymandering.

175. Broadly, this kind of partisan gerrymandering is profoundly undemocratic and cuts deeply into the public's confidence in their representative government. The Legislature's egregious attempt to entrench the majority party's incumbents and political power harms the franchise of all New York voters, Petitioners included.

176. For example, the proposed map treats Petitioners unequally and dilutes their voting power based on their political beliefs. Through this map, Democrats have essentially guaranteed that they will win more congressional districts—and thus more power—than is warranted by the party's popular support. As a result, representatives will subject Petitioners to laws and policies that do not fairly reflect the public will.

177. Moreover, when incumbents choose their voters—rather than voters electing their chosen representatives—the public's faith in the franchise is diminished.

178. Participation in the democratic process will decrease, as voting holds little appeal to those in gerrymandered districts because their votes cannot change the preordained outcomes of elections. New Yorkers made their will clear when they voted to ban partisan gerrymandering.

179. Allowing this map to be enacted deals a crushing blow to the State's representative democracy and the faith of the People in those governing them.

180. More specifically, each of Petitioners suffers directly from this map, including because they lose the opportunity to vote for their preferred congressional candidate, rather than one selected for them by the Legislature's cynical line-drawing.

181. For example, the new Congressional District 16, a strong Democratic district where Petitioner Marianne Volante lives, moved Republican voters from Congressional District 18, where Petitioner Patricia Clarino lives, decreasing competition and turning District 18 into a safe Democratic district, without jeopardizing the Democratic Party's interests in District 16. As a result, Petitioner Clarino's vote is diluted, while Petitioner Volante and other District 16 Republicans' votes will never outweigh the Democratic vote that has been gerrymandered around them.

182. In the new Congressional District 23, where Petitioners Tim Harkenrider, Linda Fanton, Jay Frantz, Alan Nephew, and Susan Rowley reside, the Legislature "packed" as many Republican votes into the district as it could. As a result, the Republican votes of Petitioners and similar voters in the District are far in excess of what their candidates need to win in elections. Rather than fairly spreading Republicans through logically constructed districts, the Legislature has ensured that many of their votes are wasted in District 23.

183. Conversely, in the new Congressional District 10, where Petitioner Stephen Evans resides, and Congressional District 11, where Petitioner Jerry Fishman resides, the Legislature broke up conservative communities of interest, "cracking" and effectively neutralizing Republican voters in these districts. As a result, these Petitioners' votes are diluted, and they are subjected to political policies that do not align with their own views or the will of their communities.

184. Similarly, new Congressional District 17, where Petitioner Lawrence Garvey resides, new Congressional District 19, where Petitioners Guy C. Brought and Lawrence Canning reside, and new Congressional District 22, where Petitioners George Dooher, Jr. and Josephine Thomas reside, each “crack” and neutralize Republican votes by breaking up communities of interest and unnaturally reaching across the state to add Democratic voters to each of these districts. These Petitioners will be forced to endure representatives who do not reflect the communities they represent, enforcing their unwelcome policies.

185. Petitioners regularly vote for Republicans running for Congress and engage in campaign activity for Republicans running for Congress, so the gerrymandering of the congressional map dilutes the power of their votes and political action efforts.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(b); N.Y. Legis. Law § 93(1) – Failure To Follow Constitutional And Statutory Procedures For Redistricting)

186. Petitioners hereby incorporate each of the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

187. Article III, Section 4(e) of the New York Constitution provides that “[t]he process for redistricting congressional . . . districts established by this section and sections five and five-b of this article *shall govern* redistricting in this state,” with limited exceptions not relevant here. N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(e) (emphases added); *see* N.Y. Legis. Law § 93(3) (same).

188. Section 4(b) of Article III requires that, should the Legislature “fail to approve the legislation implementing the first redistricting plan” prepared by the IRC, the IRC then “*shall* prepare and submit to the legislature a second redistricting plan and the necessary implementing

legislation for such plan,” and that “[s]uch legislation *shall* be voted upon, without amendment.” N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(b) (emphases added); *see also* N.Y. Legis. Law § 93(1).

189. Only then, after having considered and rejected such a *second* redistricting plan, or, after the Governor vetoes any such second plan after the Legislature approved it, may the Legislature “introduce” its own “implementing legislation” along with “any amendments” that comply with Article III, Section 4. N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(b); *see also* N.Y. Legis. Law § 93(1).

190. Because the Legislature never received, let alone considered and acted upon, a second redistricting plan from the Commission, it never obtained redistricting authority under the *exclusive* process established by the New York Constitution for introducing redistricting maps.

191. After the Legislature rejected both of the first-round maps introduced by the IRC out of hand, the Commission did not adopt and introduce second-round maps to the Legislature within 15 days, leaving the Legislature with no maps to act on within the scope of its limited constitutional role.

192. As a result, the Legislature did not consider a second map or maps from the IRC, which mandatory consideration was required before the Legislature was constitutionally permitted to adopt its own congressional map. N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(b).

193. The 2021 legislation enacted by the Legislature and Governor purporting to give the Legislature authority to circumvent the Constitution, to adopt its own maps if the Commission failed to vote on second-round maps, L.2021, c. 633, § 1, is unconstitutional. There is no provision of law that allows the Legislature to sidestep the Constitution’s exclusive process for redistricting in New York via legislative enactment.

194. The Legislature enacted L.2021, c. 633, § 7150 in an effort to avoid the effect of the People voting down a constitutional amendment to provide for what L.2021, c. 633, § 7150(1) purports to do. But, of course, a constitutional amendment is necessary to make the changes to New York’s exclusive, constitutionally enshrined redistricting process

195. The Legislature cannot act contrary to the Constitution’s restrictions on the respective duties and responsibilities allocated to it and other entities responsible for redistricting. Because the Legislature acted contrary to the Constitution when it enacted L.2021, c. 633, § 7150, the 2022 congressional map is invalid.

196. Since the Legislature had and has no constitutional authority to draw congressional districts given the IRC’s failure to follow the exclusive, constitutionally mandated procedures, this Court cannot give the Legislature another opportunity to draw curative districts.

197. Thus, this Court should draw its own map for Congress prior to the upcoming deadlines for candidates to gain access to the ballot, just as happened after the 2010 census.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(c)(2); N.Y. Legis. Law § 93(2)(b) – Unconstitutional Malapportionment)

198. Petitioners hereby incorporate each of the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

199. Article III, Section 4(c)(2) provides that “[t]o the extent practicable, districts shall contain as nearly as may be an equal number of inhabitants,” and that “[f]or each district that deviates from this requirement,” the entity responsible for drawing the map “shall provide a specific public explanation as to why such deviation exists.” N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(c)(2).

200. This constitutional requirement establishes a population-equality standard for congressional districts, absent a “specific” and “public” explanation from the mapdrawer as to why any deviation is necessary. N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(c)(2).

201. Therefore, following any decennial census, all congressional districts must abide by this equal-population requirement.

202. As explained above, the congressional map enacted by the Legislature following the 2020 decennial census is ultra vires because the Legislature ignored entirely the mandatory, *exclusive* process established by the 2014 constitutional amendments for enacting any such redistricting, as well as applicable substantive requirements for any Legislature-created map. *See supra* First Cause Of Action.

203. That is, the Legislature enacted its congressional map without abiding by the constitutional and statutory requirement that the IRC present a second round of maps following the Legislature’s decision not to approve the first round of maps. N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(b). Indeed, the Constitution *requires* that the Legislature “vote[] upon” the “second redistricting plan and the necessary implementing legislation” before it may introduce its own plan, and yet the Legislature never complied with these rules. *Id.*; *see also supra* First Cause Of Action.

204. These violations render the 2022 congressional map invalid, leaving only the vestigial map that the court adopted after the 2010 decennial census in place.

205. But the map that the federal court adopted in the wake of the 2010 census is plainly unconstitutional *today*, following the 2020 census, given New York’s inarguable population shifts, because it does not meet the equal-population requirement of the New York Constitution.

206. That is, following the 2022 Census, none of those congressional districts “[t]o the extent practicable” “contain as nearly as may be an equal number of inhabitants.” N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(c)(2); N.Y. Legis. Law § 93(2)(b).

207. Thus, this Court must now also declare that the court-adopted congressional map—the only validly-adopted map in existence, *supra* First Cause Of Action—is invalid, and adopt a replacement, constitutional congressional map.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(c)(5); N.Y. Legis. Law § 93(2)(e) – Unlawful/Unconstitutional Partisan And Incumbent-Protection Gerrymandering)

208. Petitioners hereby incorporate each of the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

209. Article III, Section 4(c)(5) of the New York Constitution provides that “in the creation of . . . congressional districts . . . [d]istricts shall not be to discourage competition or for the purpose of favoring or disfavoring incumbents or other particular candidates or political parties.” N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(c)(5).

210. New York Legislative Law § 93(2)(e) provides that, “in the creation of . . . congressional districts . . . [d]istricts shall not be drawn to discourage competition or for the purpose of favoring or disfavoring incumbents or other particular candidates or political parties.” N.Y. Legis. Law § 93(2)(e).

211. New York Legislative Law § 93(4) also provides that “any law establishing congressional . . . districts found to violate the provisions of this article shall be invalid in whole or in part.” N.Y. Legis. Law § 93(4).

212. The 2022 congressional map violates the clear prohibitions against partisan and incumbent-favoring/disfavoring gerrymandering found in Article II, Section 4(c)(5) of the New York Constitution and New York Legislative Law § 93(2)(e).

213. The Legislature drew the 2022 congressional map “to discourage competition or for the purpose of favoring or disfavoring incumbents or other particular candidates or political parties,” N.Y. Const. art. III, § 4(c)(5), as discussed in detail above, *supra* ¶¶ 102–68.

214. Governor Hochul, who signed the congressional map into law, previously acknowledged that it was her intention “to use [her] influence to help Democrats” by way of “the redistricting process,” and claimed that she fully “embrace[d] that” role as Governor. Glueck & Ferré-Sadurní, *supra*.

215. For that reason, the enacted congressional map violates both the New York Constitution and New York Legislative Law § 93, requiring this Court to strike it as “invalid.” N.Y. Legis. Law § 93(4).

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(CPLR § 3001 – Declaratory Judgment)

216. Petitioners hereby incorporate each of the foregoing paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

217. Petitioners seek a declaratory judgment from the Court “as to the rights and other legal relations of the parties,” CPLR § 3001, regarding the substantive and procedural requirements for redistricting in this State.

218. It is imperative that the New York Courts properly construe the recent amendments to Article 3, Section 4 of the New York Constitution and New York Legislative Laws § 93.

219. The 2014 amendments to the New York Constitution prohibit the Legislature and Governor from reapportioning seats for Congress in a manner that

- a. disregards the exclusive procedures for redistricting, including the requirement that the IRC submit two rounds of maps for the Legislature's consideration before the Legislature may undertake the redistricting function itself;
- b. creates districts that fail to contain as nearly as possible an equal number of inhabitants, requiring, as practicable, no deviation from perfect population equality;
- c. creates a partisan gerrymander with the intent to favor of any political party; and
- d. creates an incumbent-protection or incumbent-disfavoring gerrymander with the intent of aiding or hurting any incumbent.

Each of these violations, alone and in tandem, requires the Court to invalidate the congressional map.

220. Respondents' actions in violating each of these constitutional requirements come from a determined effort to advance the interests of the Democratic Party by entrenching incumbent Democrats and targeting incumbent Republicans, in direct contravention of the will of the citizens of the State of New York, who voted in favor of ridding such partisan interests from the redistricting process.

221. Further, the 2021 legislation, L.2021, c. 633, § 7150, enacted by the Legislature and Governor in an attempt to give the Legislature authority to circumvent the Constitution and

adopt this unlawful map, is unconstitutional. The Legislature cannot contravene the Constitution's exclusive process for redistricting in New York through legislative enactment.

222. Each of these constitutional violations has harmed Petitioners, who are now subject to a gerrymandered and highly partisan map for their representatives in Congress.

223. This issue is ripe for judicial review.

224. Absent resolution of these constitutional questions, neither Respondents nor the citizens of New York will have adequate guidance regarding the propriety of the enacted map and the prior court-drawn map, in preparation for impending elections.

225. If each of these fundamental issues regarding the redistricting processes in New York is not resolved in short order, it will be too late to do so without threatening the integrity of upcoming elections.

226. Therefore, this Court should enter judgment declaring that the 2022 enacted congressional map violates the New York Constitution, declare that the 2012 congressional map now violates the New York Constitution in light of the population shifts identified in the 2020 Census, strike down the 2021 legislation, L.2021, c. 633, § 7150, as unconstitutional, and itself draw a new congressional map cured of all legal infirmities.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully demand that this Court review the constitutionality of the congressional apportionment and enter judgment and order against Respondents as follows:

A. Declaring pursuant to CPLR § 3001 that:

- i) the 2022 congressional map constitutes an unconstitutional map enacted without complying with the mandatory constitutional procedures for redistricting in Article III, Section 4(b) of the New York Constitution;
 - ii) the prior congressional map, court-adopted after the 2010 decennial census, is the only validly enacted map currently in existence, but is now unconstitutionally malapportioned, failing to comply with the mandatory constitutional requirements that each district contain an equal number of inhabitants, found in Article III, Section 4(c)(2) of the New York Constitution;
 - iii) the 2022 congressional map, apart and aside from procedural deficiencies, constitutes an unconstitutional partisan and incumbency-favoring/disfavoring gerrymander, in violation of Article III, Section 4(c)(5) of the New York Constitution and New York Legislative Law § 93(2)(e); and
 - iv) the 2012 congressional districts are unconstitutional in light of the population shifts identified in the 2020 census;
- B. Enjoining Respondents from conducting any elections under the post-2010 congressional map;
- C. Enjoining Respondents from conducting any elections under the 2022 congressional map;
- D. Adopting a new, legally compliant congressional map;
- E. Alternatively, and only if the Court does not agree with Petitioners' procedural claim, ordering the Legislature to attempt to cure the legal and constitutional infirmities in 2022 congressional map and adopt a lawful congressional map;

F. Suspending or enjoin the operation of any other state laws that would undermine this Court’s ability to offer effective and complete relief to Petitioners for the November 2022 elections and related primaries.

G. Awarding Petitioners all of their reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs; and

H. Awarding such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: New York, New York

February 3, 2022

TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON
SANDERS LLP

KEYSER MALONEY &
WINNER LLP



By: s/ George H. Winner, Jr.

Bennet J. Moskowitz, Reg. No. 4693842
875 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022
(212) 704-6000
bennet.moskowitz@troutman.com

George H. Winner, Jr., Reg. No. 1539238
150 Lake Street
Elmira, New York 14901
(607) 734-0990
gwinner@kmw-law.com

Misha Tseytlin, Reg. No. 4642609
227 W. Monroe St.
Suite 3900
Chicago, IL 60606
(608) 999-1240
misha.tseytlin@troutman.com