

201 F.Supp.2d 618
(Cite as: 201 F.Supp.2d 618)

be conducted under the 2002 court-ordered redistricting plans, or that any other special elections held prior to the next round of regularly-scheduled elections be conducted under the 2002 court-ordered redistricting plans, we disavow that intent. Such an interpretation would be neither prudent nor practical. In every case, the new district lines omit some persons and/or add others and, in the case of two state House districts, the districts have been completely collapsed and moved to high-growth areas of the state. If special elections held prior to the next round of regularly-scheduled elections were to be held under the new district lines, the effect would be to leave some persons with no representation and others with double representation.^{FN2} Such a situation is obviously not one that the United States Constitution would allow, much less require. Cf. *Gaona v. Anderson*, 989 F.2d 299 (9th Cir.1993) (per curiam) (rejecting Voting Rights Act challenge to use of old version of state senate district for an interim special election); *Political Action Conference of Illinois v. Daley*, 976 F.2d 335 (7th Cir.1992) (holding that city need not alter its redistricting scheme even though four-year terms of aldermen elected in 1991 resulted in a four-year delay in using new 1990 census data); *French v. Boner*, 963 F.2d 890 (6th Cir.1992) (holding that city had no constitutional duty to re-conduct elections held after the new decennial census data became available in 1991, but before a new apportionment plan could be put into effect).

^{FN2}. For example, under the March 20, 2002, redistricting plan for the South Carolina House of Representatives, House District 68, located in the severely under-populated Pee Dee area, was collapsed and moved to a substantially over-populated coastal area in Horry County. If the current representative of House District 68 were to leave office and a special election conducted, the new representative would be elected from Horry County, leaving Horry County residents in the “new” District 68 with two representatives in the House and “old” District 68 residents in the Pee Dee with none.

Under our March 20, 2002 order, the State of South Carolina is only enjoined from conducting the regularly-scheduled 2002 primary and general elections under the existing electoral districts for the United States Congress and for the South Carolina

House of Representatives, and after the November 2002 General Election, from conducting *any* further elections under the existing electoral districts for the United States Congress and the South Carolina House of Representatives. All such regularly-scheduled elections, and all special elections held after the November 2002 General Election, must be conducted in accordance with the redistricting plans for *671 the South Carolina Congressional Delegation and South Carolina House of Representatives adopted by this court in its March 20, 2002 order, unless and until the South Carolina General Assembly, with the approval of the Governor and in accordance with § 5 of the Voting Rights Act, ends its current impasse and enacts an alternative redistricting plan for the legislative body at issue.

The State of South Carolina is likewise enjoined from conducting the regularly-scheduled 2004 primary and general elections under the existing electoral districts for the South Carolina Senate and, after the November 2004 General Election, from conducting *any* further elections under the existing electoral districts for the South Carolina Senate. All such regularly-scheduled elections, and all special elections held after the November 2004 General Election, must be conducted in accordance with the redistricting plans for the South Carolina Senate adopted by this court in its March 20, 2002 order, unless and until the South Carolina General Assembly, with the approval of the Governor and in accordance with § 5 of the Voting Rights Act, ends its current impasse and enacts a redistricting plan for the South Carolina Senate.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

D.S.C.,2002.
Colleton County Council v. McConnell
201 F.Supp.2d 618

END OF DOCUMENT