

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION**

SHANNON PEREZ, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GREG ABBOTT, ET AL.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Civil Action No. SA-11-CV-360

FINAL JUDGMENT

This action was considered by the three-Judge panel, the Honorable Jerry Smith, Orlando Garcia, and Xavier Rodriguez presiding. Pursuant to the various rulings made in this case, it is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that:

In Plan C185, district lines in the Dallas-Fort Worth area were drawn in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment (as both improper racial gerrymanders and the product of intentional vote dilution) and § 2 of the Voting Rights Act. Docket nos. 1339 & 1340.

In Plan H283, district lines were drawn in violation of § 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment as the product of intentional vote dilution in El Paso County (HD78), Bexar County (HD117), Nueces County (the elimination of HD33 and the configuration of HD32 and HD34), HD41 in the Valley, Harris County, western Dallas County (HD103, HD104, and HD105), Tarrant County (HD90, HD93), Bell County (HD54), and with regard to Plan H283 as a whole. District lines in HD117 in Bexar County were drawn as improper racial gerrymanders in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment. District lines were drawn in violation of the one-person, one-vote requirements of the Fourteenth Amendment in

the Nueces County districts (HD32 and HD34), the Hidalgo County districts (HD31, HD36, HD39, HD40, and HD41), and the Bell/Lampasas County districts (HD54 and HD55). Docket nos. 1364 & 1365.

The district lines of HD90 as drawn by the Legislature in 2013 in Plan H358 are the result of an unconstitutional racial gerrymander. Plan H358 is modified to incorporate the district boundaries contained in plan H411 and that the resulting districts shall be used as the district boundaries to elect members of the Texas House of Representatives in the 2020 elections.

All other requested relief is DENIED.

Should any party seek to recover attorney's fees, any such party may file a motion seeking attorney's fees and brief why it is a prevailing party entitled to such fees. This issue will be bifurcated with the panel first ascertaining if the party is a prevailing party and what issues it prevailed on. Thereafter, if a party is found to have been a prevailing party, such a party may thereafter file its application for attorney's fees in conformance with WDTX Local Rule CV-7(j).

SIGNED this 24th day of July, 2019 on behalf of the Three-Judge Panel.



XAVIER RODRIGUEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE