

Nos. 07-21, 07-25

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

WILLIAM CRAWFORD, *ET AL.*,
Petitioners,

v.

MARION COUNTY ELECTION BOARD, *ET AL.*,
Respondents.

INDIANA DEMOCRATIC PARTY, *ET AL.*,
Petitioners,

v.

TODD ROKITA, *ET AL.*,
Respondents.

*On Writs of Certiorari to the United States
Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit*

**BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE, UNITED STATES
CONGRESSMAN KEITH ELLISON,
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS**

GERARD TREANOR *
VENABLE LLP
575 7TH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004
(202) 344-4000

** Counsel of Record for Amicus Curiae*

November 12, 2007 *U.S. Congressman Keith Ellison*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

INTEREST OF THE *AMICUS CURIAE* 1

CONSENT OF THE PARTIES 2

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT 2

ARGUMENT 5

I. THE INDIANA PHOTO ID
REQUIREMENT IS AN
UNCONSTITUTIONAL POLL TAX AND
OFFENDS DECISIONS OF THIS COURT
AND THE TWENTY-FOURTH
AMENDMENT 5

II. CONGRESS HAS CONSIDERED AND
REJECTED PHOTO ID REQUIREMENTS
SIMILAR TO THOSE IN INDIANA 10

III. INDIANA'S PHOTO ID REQUIREMENT
WILL HAVE A DISPARATE IMPACT ON
AFRICAN-AMERICANS 13

CONCLUSION 19

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Members of Congress in support of
Amicus Curiae, Representative Keith
Ellison 1a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Common Cause / Georgia v. Billups</i> , 406 F. Supp. 2d 1326 (N.D. Ga. 2005)	18
<i>Crawford v. Marion County Election Bd.</i> , 472 F.3d 949 (7th Cir. 2007)	9, 10, 16
<i>Harman v. Forssenius</i> , 380 U.S. 528 (1965)	3, 5, 6, 8, 17
<i>Harper v. Virginia State Bd. of Elections</i> , 383 U.S. 663 (1966)	3, 7, 9, 18
<i>Wesberry v. Sanders</i> , 376 U.S. 1 (1964)	10

Constitution

U.S. Const. amend. XXIV	<i>passim</i>
-----------------------------------	---------------

Statutes

Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 1971 <i>et seq.</i>	4, 7, 10, 12, 18
Ind. Code § 3-5-2-40.5	3, 5, 7
Ind. Code § 3-167-5-25	7
Ind. Code § 9-24-16-10(b)	5

Legislative

H.R. 2250, 109th Cong. (2005)	12
<i>Same Day Voter Registration Act of 2007</i> , H.R. 2457, 110th Cong. (2007)	2
H.R. 3910, 109th Cong. (2005)	12
<i>Voter Access Protection Act of 2007</i> , H.R. 4026, 110th Cong. (2007)	2, 13
H.R. 4462, 109th Cong. (2006)	12
<i>Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006</i> , H.R. 4844, 109th Cong. (2006)	12
H.R. 5913, 109th Cong. (2005)	12
H.R. Rep. No. 89-439, at 10 (1965), <i>reprinted in</i> 1965 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2437, 2443	7
H.R. Rep. No. 87-1821, at 3, 5 (2d Sess. 1962) .	17
Help America Vote Act of 2002, (“HAVA”), Pub.L. No. 107-252, 116 Stat. 1666 (codified at 42 U.S.C. § 15301 (2002))	4, 11, 12
148 Cong. Rec. S1224, 1227 (daily ed. Feb. 27, 2002)	11
148 Cong. Rec. S10488 (2002)	12, 16

Other

Matt A. Barreto *et al.*, *The Disproportionate Impact of Indiana Voter ID Requirements on the Electorate*, at 16 (Wash. Inst. for the Study of Ethnicity and Race, Working Paper, Nov. 8, 2007), *available at* http://depts.washington.edu/uwiser/documents/indiana_voter.pdf 14

Richard L. Hansen, *A Voting Test for the High Court*, Wash. Post, Sept. 19, 2007 , at A23. 16

Adam Liptak, *Fear but Few Facts in Debate over Photo ID's*, N.Y. Times, Sept. 24, 2007 16

Spencer Overton, *Voter Identification*, 105 Mich L. Rev. 631, 635 (2007) 17

Sara Sanchez, *Voter Photo Identification and Section 5 Reauthorization: An Exposition of Two Carter-Baker Commission Proposals and Their Current Status*, 10 N.Y.U. J. Legis. & Pub. Pol'y. 261, 263 (2006-2007) 11

The Election; Surprise! Elections Have Margins of Error, Too, N.Y. Times, Nov. 19, 2000, Week in Review, § 4, at 3 10

Websites

<http://www.bls.gov/cpi/> (last visited Nov. 12, 2007) 9

<http://www.dmv.org> (last visited Nov. 12, 2007) . . 5

Indiana's Income by Race, available at
http://www.incontext.indiana.edu (last visited Nov. 8,
2007) 13

INTEREST OF THE *AMICUS CURIAE**

Amicus Curiae, Keith Ellison, a Member of Congress representing Minnesota’s Fifth District, and a member of the House Judiciary Committee, submits this brief on behalf of himself and other concerned Members of Congress in support of Petitioners’ challenge to Indiana’s statute requiring voters to present government-issued photographic identification (hereinafter “photo ID”) as a prerequisite to voting.¹ *Amicus* is committed to ensuring that all Americans have an equal opportunity to exercise their right to vote. *Amicus* is concerned that the Indiana requirement violates the Twenty-Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution because it imposes a financial obligation as a prerequisite to voting.

Congressman Ellison is deeply committed to equal rights for all citizens. He has worked extensively on the issues of voting and civil rights. During his time in the Minnesota State Legislature, Congressman

* *Amicus* would like to acknowledge the work of Lara J. Cole, Legislative Assistant, and Ericke S. Cage, Congressional Black Caucus Foundation Congressional Fellow. Under the supervision of *Amicus*, these two lawyers co-authored this brief. *Amicus* would also like to thank Venable LLP for its legal expertise and services.

¹ *Amicus Curiae* certifies that no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no counsel or party made a monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief. No person other than *amicus curiae* or his counsel made a monetary contribution to its preparation or submission. The parties have consented to the filing of this brief. Counsel of record of all parties received notice at least 10 days prior to the due date of the *amicus curiae*’s intention to file this brief.

Ellison frequently introduced legislation protecting voting rights. He authored legislation restoring voting rights to persons with felony convictions and initiatives to require local units of government to notify ex-offenders that their civil and voting rights had been restored.

In his first term in Congress, Congressman Ellison has taken a strong interest in civil and voting rights. The Congressman currently serves on the House Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties. Additionally, he has authored two major bills on voting rights, the *Same Day Voter Registration Act of 2007*, H.R. 2457, 110th Cong. (2007), and the *Voter Access Protection Act of 2007*, H.R. 4026, 110th Cong. (2007). H.R. 2457 would require states to permit individuals to register to vote in a federal election on the day of the election. H.R. 4026 would prohibit election officials from requiring an individual to provide photo ID as a condition for voting in a federal election.

CONSENT OF THE PARTIES

With the consent of all the parties, Congressman Keith Ellison respectfully submits this brief as *amicus curiae* in support of Petitioners, and urges the reversal of the appellate court's judgment.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

The Twenty-Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits a state from abridging a citizen's right to vote by prohibiting "any poll tax or

other tax.”² Indiana’s photo ID requirement violates the Twenty-Fourth Amendment.³ The requirement is unconstitutional not only because voters must initially spend money to obtain the requisite government-issued photo ID or obtain related documentation, but also because voters who wish to qualify as “indigent” under the statute must make a separate trip to a county office and “affirm” their economic status before being allowed to vote. This is an unconstitutional burden on the fundamental right to vote. This Court has made clear that “[a] state violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment whenever it makes the affluence of the voter or payment of a fee an electoral standard.” *Harper v. Virginia State Bd. of Elections*, 383 U.S. 663, 666 (1966). In *Harman v. Forssenius*, 380 U.S. 528, 541 (1965), this Court further explained that even “providing a procedural alternative to a poll tax unquestionably erects a real obstacle to voting in federal elections.” The Indiana statute requires all voters to pay the requisite fee to obtain photo ID and/or to pay fees to obtain underlying documentation necessary to get IDs. If voters do not have ID because they cannot afford these fees, they must vote a provisional ballot at the polls, and then make a separate trip to a county office to affirm that they are indigent. It is unquestionable that this scheme creates

² U.S. Const. amend. XXIV.

³ Effective July 1, 2005, Indiana law was changed to require voters to present a photo ID, issued by the United States or Indiana, that is not expired or expired after the date of the most recent general election. Ind. Code § 3-5-2-40.5.

a real obstacle to voting in a federal election, and thus it is unconstitutional.

Like literacy tests, poll taxes are a particularly egregious form of discrimination because they make income a voting requirement. While the Indiana photo ID requirement does not precisely mimic the poll taxes of the 1960's, it has the same effect and intent. The label a state chooses to place on fees it charges its citizens cannot change the fundamentally unconstitutional character of those fees.

Voter equality is the singular thread which runs through Congress' voting rights legislation. Over the past 137 years, Congress, with the support of the Civil Rights movement, has worked steadfastly to secure equal voting rights for all citizens. Through the proposal of the Twenty-Fourth Amendment to the Constitution, and the enactment of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Help America Vote Act of 2002, Congress has rejected any requirement that conditions the franchise on a voter's economic status. Poll taxes have been used throughout American history as tools of disenfranchisement.

The Indiana photo ID requirement would also have a disparate impact on African-Americans, a class of citizens specifically protected by Congressional legislation. African-American residents are less likely to own a motor vehicle and thus are less likely to have a driver's license. As a practical matter, this statute would have the effect of disenfranchising a greater number of African-American citizens, because, for many, such a requirement presents a financial burden and hardship.

ARGUMENT**I. THE INDIANA PHOTO ID REQUIREMENT IS AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL POLL TAX AND OFFENDS DECISIONS OF THIS COURT AND THE TWENTY-FOURTH AMENDMENT**

The Indiana statute is unconstitutional because it conditions voting rights on payment of a “tax”—either the fee of twenty-one dollars that the state ordinarily charges for a driver’s license, or where citizens qualify for a free identification card, the fees they must pay to acquire underlying documentation necessary to get a photo identification card. Ind. Code §§ 3-5-2-40.5, 9-24-16-10(b).⁴ The practice of using poll taxes to prevent access to the franchise was banned in federal elections in 1964 by the Twenty-Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution, passed by Congress in 1962 and ratified by the states in 1964.⁵ The Twenty-Fourth Amendment states, “The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President...shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.”⁶

In *Harman v. Forssenius*, 380 U.S. 528 (1965), this Court concluded that no state may constitutionally present a federal voter with the requirement that

⁴ See <http://www.dmv.org> (last visited Nov. 12, 2007).

⁵ U.S. Const. amend. XXIV.

⁶ *Id.*

either he pay a poll tax, or file a certificate of residence. This requirement was an abridgement of the right to vote and thus unconstitutional under the Twenty-Fourth Amendment. *Id.* at 538. This Court recognized the long Congressional history opposing the constitutionality of the poll tax. *Id.* at 538-39. In other words, creating a procedural workaround voters must go through to avoid a poll tax does not redeem the poll tax's fundamental unconstitutionality. This Court further recognized the long and rich history in this country that "a state may not impose a penalty upon those who exercise a right guaranteed by the Constitution." *Id.* at 540.

In this case, Petitioners seek to protect their constitutional right to vote without being charged a tax. In order to demonstrate that the Indiana statute is invalid, Petitioners need only show that the law "imposes a material requirement solely upon those who refuse to surrender their constitutional right to vote in federal elections without paying a poll tax." *Harman*, 380 U.S. at 541. This Court opined that in *Harman*, the \$1.50 poll tax and the alternative of filing a certificate of residence "unquestionably erects a real obstacle" to voting in federal elections. *Harman*, 380 U.S. at 541. The Indiana statute imposes similarly burdensome requirements on a voter and as a result also "unquestionably erects a real obstacle" to voting in a federal election and is therefore unconstitutional. *Id.* at 541.

Since then, this Court has separately identified the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause as a source of protection against the conditioning of the franchise on payment of a fee, even in state elections.

See Harper, 383 U.S. 663 (1966). In *Harper*, this Court concluded that a state violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment whenever it makes the affluence of the voter or payment of a fee an electoral standard. *Harper*, 383 U.S. at 666. Introducing wealth or payment of a fee as a measure of a voter’s qualification is, under the Court’s *Harper* analysis, a “capricious or irrelevant” factor. *Id.* at 668. When fundamental rights and liberties are at stake, any classifications such as wealth or class that might abridge those rights must be closely scrutinized and carefully confined. *Id.* at 670. The fundamental right to vote should not be conditioned on a citizen’s economic status.

While the Indiana law at issue does not label the fees charged as “taxes,” the labels a state chooses to assign its disenfranchising tactics cannot determine the constitutional analysis, or else no protection at all is afforded by the Twenty-Fourth Amendment. *Cf.* H.R. Rep. No. 89-439, at 10 (1965), *reprinted in* 1965 U.S.C.C.A.N. 2437, 2443 (noting in enacting Voting Rights Act, “Indeed, even after apparent defeat resisters seek new ways and means of discriminating. Barring one contrivance too often has caused no change in result, only in methods.”).

Effective July 1, 2005, Indiana required voters to present a photo ID, issued by the United States or Indiana, that is not expired or expired after the date of the most recent general election. Ind. Code § 3-5-2-40.5. If the voter does not present this identification, he or she is entitled only to vote provisionally. Ind. Code § 3-167-5-25. A provisional ballot requires a voter to return to the Clerk of the circuit court or the County

Election Board within ten days after the election and either produce a satisfactory ID or execute an affidavit stating that either he is indigent and unable to obtain proof of identification without having to pay a fee, or that he has a religious objection to being photographed. The state provides the opportunity to obtain a photo ID card without fee, but would-be voters must show supporting documentation to get the photo ID that typically cannot be obtained for free. For example, most United States-born voters will need to produce a birth certificate along with another form of documentation to get a photo ID. *See* Pet. App. 32-33. A certified birth certificate costs \$10 and a voter born out of state may have to pay as much as \$45. Brief for *Amicus Curiae*, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law in support of Appellants at 19, *Crawford and Democratic Party of Indiana*, Nos. 07-21 and 07-25 (7th Cir. Nov. 12, 2007).

The statute's exception for the "indigent" is no exception at all; it requires those who cannot obtain identification without a fee to separately travel to a county office within ten days after the election to affirm their indigency, thus imposing a severe additional burden in lieu of the poll tax. In *Harman*, this Court rejected Virginia's requirement that voters either pay a poll tax or execute a certificate of residence prior to the election. *See Harman*, 383 U.S. 663. Similarly, in this case, Indiana requires voters either to pay a poll tax—the cost involved in procuring ID or in procuring the underlying documentation—or to execute an affidavit of indigency on a separate trip to a county office after the election. Like the Virginia law at issue in *Harman*, Indiana's law is unconstitutional. It is also no answer for the state to

suggest that the tax charged in this instance—the twenty-one dollars a driver’s license ordinarily costs, or the ten dollars Indiana routinely charges for a birth certificate, is *de minimis*. In *Harper*, this Court found unconstitutional Virginia’s conditioning of the right to vote on payment of a \$1.50 tax. In 2007 dollars, that tax would be \$9.63, less than the price of any of the acceptable photo IDs.⁷

Proponents of photo ID requirements argue that because the majority of Americans already possess some form of photo ID, the requirement is not burdensome or unconstitutional. *Crawford v. Marion County Election Board*, 472 F.3d 949 (7th Cir. 2007), *reprinted in* Petitioners’ Appendix to the Petition for Writ of Certiorari, 1-15. They further argue that those who really want to vote will simply obtain the required photo ID. *Id.* This is simply wrong. The right to vote belongs to the individual voter, not to any group of people. The fact that the majority of the population has photo ID does not make this law constitutional. Of course, some people who do not have photo ID may be able to afford its cost or the cost of underlying documents, but the fact that they are *required* to pay for it is exactly what makes this law a poll tax. The Twenty-Fourth Amendment admits of no exception: poll taxes are unconstitutional on their face, and it is immaterial how many people can afford to pay them.

In the Seventh Circuit’s opinion below, Judge Posner opined:

⁷ <http://www.bls.gov/cpi/> (last visited Nov. 12, 2007).

[A] vote in a political election rarely has any *instrumental* value, since elections for political office at the state or federal level are never decided by just one vote...very slight costs in time or bother or out-of-pocket expense deter many people from voting, or at least from voting in elections they're not much interested in.

Id. at 3.

These opinions are dangerously misguided. The presidential election of 2000 was decided by only hundreds, not thousands of votes out of over one hundred million. *The Election; Surprise! Elections Have Margins of Error, Too*, N.Y. Times, Nov. 19, 2000, Week in Review, § 4, at 3. Every single vote was absolutely crucial. Furthermore, every citizen is guaranteed the right to have his or her vote counted, regardless of the view that any vote does not have “instrumental value.” See *Wesberry v. Sanders*, 376 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1964) (“No right is more precious in a free country than” the right to vote.)

II. CONGRESS HAS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED PHOTO ID REQUIREMENTS SIMILAR TO THOSE IN INDIANA

Congress has long defined a poll tax as a cost or a fee that abridges the right to vote, first through its enactment of the Twenty-Fourth Amendment, and later through its direction to the Attorney General to challenge the use of the poll tax under section 10 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Since the Twenty-Fourth Amendment was ratified, Congress has continued to ensure that voters are guaranteed access to the ballot

box. During its consideration of the Help America Vote Act of 2002, (“HAVA”), Pub. L. No. 107-252, 116 Stat. 1666 (codified at 42 U.S.C. § 15301 (2002)), Congress considered and rejected photo identification requirements for federal elections. *See generally*, 148 Cong. Rec. S1224, 1227 (daily ed. Feb. 27, 2002) (Statements of Sen. Schumer and Sen. Landrieu); Sara Sanchez, *Voter Photo Identification and Section 5 Reauthorization: An Exposition of Two Carter-Baker Commission Proposals and Their Current Status*, 10 N.Y.U. J. Legis. & Pub. Pol’y. 261, 263 (2006-2007). In the Congressional debate surrounding HAVA, Congress considered other documentary requirements that are generally much less restrictive than Indiana’s photo ID provisions. It allowed proof of identity through non-photo identification. This proof was limited to individuals voting for the first time whose identities had not been previously verified by the state, because a general requirement would suppress poor and minority voters. Indeed, the Senate Conference Report on HAVA highlights this concern:

[A]s with the other methods of disenfranchisement in American history, such as literacy tests and *poll taxes*, the photo identification requirement would present barriers to voting and have a chilling effect on voter participation. There are voters who simply do not have identification and requiring them to purchase photo identification *would be tantamount to requiring them to pay a poll tax*. As a disproportionate number of racial and ethnic minority voters, the homeless, as well as voters with disabilities and certain religious objectors, do not have photo identification nor

the financial means to acquire it, the burden of this requirement would fall disproportionately and unfairly upon them, perhaps even violating the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. s1973.

148 Cong. Rec. S10488 (2002) (emphasis added).

Following the passage of HAVA, Congress again considered and rejected several items of legislation that would have broadened federal voter identification requirements. For example, H.R. 2250, 109th Cong. (2005), would have required voters and applicants for voter registration to present government-issued photo identification when appearing in person, or to submit a copy of that identification with mailed applications or ballots. H.R. 3910, 109th Cong. (2005), would have required all voters, beginning with the 2008 election, to present state-issued photo identification when voting and would have established specifications for those identification documents. H.R. 4462, 109th Cong. (2006), and H.R. 5913, 109th Cong. (2005), would have required voters to provide proof of citizenship when voting or to have such proof on file with the state election office. The *Federal Election Integrity Act of 2006*, H.R. 4844, 109th Cong. (2006), would have required states to provide photo identification documents to qualified voters who did not have such documents, and to provide them to indigent voters at no extra cost.⁸ While a negative implication from legislative history is not absolute proof of

⁸ H.R. 4844 would have gone so far as to authorize the appropriation of funding to cover the cost of providing identification to indigent voters.

Congressional intent, the failure of these bills to become law reflects Congress' reluctance to embrace stringent photo identification requirements.

Currently under consideration is the *Voter Access Protection Act of 2007*, H.R. 4026, 110th Cong. (2007), a bill which would prohibit election officials from requiring an individual to provide photo ID as a condition for voting in an election for federal office.

III. INDIANA'S PHOTO ID REQUIREMENT WILL HAVE A DISPARATE IMPACT ON AFRICAN-AMERICANS

The existence of poverty in Indiana's African-American community is pervasive. A review of the poverty levels in Indiana's ten largest counties in 2007 reveals that African-Americans disproportionately represent the largest percentage of county residents living in poverty.⁹ For example, in Elkhart County, Indiana, African-Americans made up only 5% of the total population, yet represented 21% of the county's poverty rate.¹⁰ In Vanderburgh County, African-Americans made up only 8% of the population yet represented 31.2% of the county's total poverty rate. And in Vigo County, African-Americans made up 6% of the population yet represented 31.9% of the county's total poverty rate. A large percentage of Indiana's African-American voters are included in the more than

⁹ See *Indiana's Income by Race*, available at <http://www.incontext.indiana.edu> (last visited Nov. 8, 2007).

¹⁰ *Id.*

2.5 million Indiana households that do not own a motor vehicle, and they most likely will not have the requisite photo ID for voting purposes.

A newly-released study concluded that the disproportionate effects of Indiana's photo identification requirements are not "confined to a narrow segment of the Indiana population." Matt A. Barreto *et al.*, *The Disproportionate Impact of Indiana Voter ID Requirements on the Electorate*, at 16 (Wash. Inst. for the Study of Ethnicity and Race, Working Paper, Nov. 8, 2007), *available at* http://depts.washington.edu/uwiser/documents/indiana_voter.pdf. Indeed, the study results suggest that "income has the *most robust impact on access to valid forms of identification in Indiana*. [The] law therefore directly impacts roughly one-fifth of Indiana residents, as 21% of Indiana households earned less than \$20,000 in the year 2000. Similarly, African-Americans who are also less likely to have access to photo identification in our study *comprise nearly 9% of the state population*." *Id.* (emphasis added). See Figure 1, reproduced from Barreto study.

**Percent of registered voters without
valid Photo ID in Indiana**

	(1b) Driver's License	(2b) Current DL or State ID Card	(3b) Valid ID + Full Name	(4b) Valid ID + Name Match
All RVs	16.6	13.3	16.3	17.3
Voted06	14	10.7	13.9	14.1

**Percent of registered voters without
valid Photo ID in Indiana**

	(1b) Driver's License	(2b) Current DL or State ID Card	(3b) Valid ID + Full Name	(4b) Valid ID + Name Match
Non-Voter	22.8	19.3	21.9	24.9
Non-Registered†	35.2	22.2	24.6	n/a
White	14	11.5	15	15.8
Black	33.3	18.1	19.3	21.8
Men	17.5	15.2	18.5	18.7
Women	15.8	11.5	14.3	16.1
18-34	26.6	20.3	20.3	22
35-54	12.6	11	14.8	16.2
55-69	12.3	9.4	13.6	14.1
70+	21.3	16.4	19.4	19.4
HS Grad	21.7	16.7	19.9	21
College grad	8.6	7.9	10.7	11.5
Less \$40K	25.2	17.5	19.5	21.1
\$40K - \$80K	12.9	11.2	12	12.7
Over \$80K	11.8	11.8	16.5	17
Marion County	25	18.5	19.6	21.9

It has been reported that the Department of Justice has also recognized the suppressive effects that photo ID on requirements have on African-Americans:

The Department of Justice (DOJ) has consistently raised objections to imposing photo identification as a prerequisite for voting because such requirements are likely to have a disproportionately adverse impact on black voters and will lessen their political participation opportunities. In 1994, DOJ found that African-American persons in Louisiana were four to five times less likely than white persons to have driver's licenses or other picture identification cards. In addition, the Federal Elections Commission noted in its 1997 report to Congress that photo identification entails major expenses, both initially and in maintenance, and presents an undue and potentially discriminatory burden on citizens in exercising their basic right to vote.

148 Cong. Rec. S10488 (2002).

By requiring the presentation of photo ID as a precondition to voting, Indiana ignored the predictable disparate impact the law would have on Indiana's African-American residents. Although the stated rationale for enacting the law was to combat voter fraud, the record shows that the Indiana Legislature conducted no research or received no testimony to determine the level of voter fraud in the State. *See Crawford v. Marion County Election Bd.*, 472 F.3d 949 (2007), reprinted in Petitioners' Appendix to the Petition for Writ of Certiorari, 1-15; Richard L. Hansen, *A Voting Test for the High Court*, Wash. Post, Sept. 19, 2007, at A23; Adam Liptak, *Fear but Few Facts in Debate over Photo ID's*, N.Y. Times, Sept. 24, 2007. Indeed, it has been established that "no

systematic, empirical study of the magnitude of voter fraud has been conducted at either the national level or in any state...but the best existing data suggest that a photo identification requirement would do more harm than good.” Spencer Overton, *Voter Identification*, 105 Mich L. Rev. 631, 635 (2007). Based on Indiana’s poverty numbers alone, the proponents of the Indiana statute knew or should have known that a photographic identification requirement would disproportionately affect African-Americans. Indiana’s photographic identification requirement is a poll tax which will disproportionately affect Indiana’s African-American community. While the new costs associated with voting in Indiana may not be directly payable at the precinct door, the deterrent effect is the same.

Ratification of the Twenty-Fourth Amendment marked the culmination of an endeavor that Congress began in 1939 to eliminate the poll tax as a qualification for voting in federal elections. Congress viewed the qualification as “an obstacle to the proper exercise of a citizen’s franchise” and expected its removal to “provide a more direct approach to participation by more of the people in their government.” H.R. Rep. No. 87-1821, at 3, 5 (2d Sess. 1962); *see Harman*, 380 U.S. at 538-40.

Congress remains opposed to any requirements that place an economic burden on the right to vote. The State of Indiana points to the fact that it, like many states, waives the cost of the photo ID required for voting for voters unable to pay the fees. This fails to account for the cost of underlying documentation required to get an identification card. Moreover, the

argument reflects a failure to focus on the key factor surrounding the State's law – the Twenty-Fourth Amendment. Through the passage of the Twenty-Fourth Amendment Congress made clear that any voter requirement that calls into question a voter's economic status presents a "capricious and irrelevant factor" that is impermissible under the Constitution. *See Harper*, 383 U.S. 663 (1966); *Common Cause / Georgia v. Billups*, 406 F. Supp. 2d 1326 (N.D. Ga. 2005). Thus, Indiana's photo identification requirement directly conflicts with the Twenty-Fourth Amendment, not only because it requires voters to spend money to obtain the requisite government-issued photo identification, but also because it requires indigent voters to affirm their economic status before being allowed to vote.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 1971 *et seq.*, defines the word "vote" as encompassing "all actions necessary to make a vote effective including, but not limited to, registration or other actions required by State law prerequisite to voting, casting a ballot and having such ballot counted and included in the appropriate totals of votes with respect to candidates for public office." 42 U.S.C. § 1971(e). Because African-Americans are among the class of individuals Congress intended to protect under the Voting Rights Act, and since Indiana's photo ID requirement touches upon "an action to make a vote effective," Indiana's photo identification requirement is both discriminatory and contrary to the intent of Congress.

CONCLUSION

For the forgoing reasons, this Court should reverse the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

Dated: November 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

GERARD TREANOR*
COUNSEL OF RECORD
VENABLE LLP
575 7TH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004
(202) 344-4000

**Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

APPENDIX A

Members of Congress in support of *Amicus Curiae*, Representative Keith Ellison

Sen. Barack Obama
Rep. Sanford Bishop, Jr.
Rep. Corrine Brown
Rep. G.K. Butterfield
Delegate Donna Christian-Christensen
Rep. Yvette Clarke
Rep. William Lacy Clay
Rep. Emanuel Cleaver, II
Rep. James E. Clyburn
Rep. John Conyers, Jr.
Rep. Elijah E. Cummings
Rep. Artur Davis
Rep. Danny K. Davis
Rep. Chaka Fattah
Rep. Al Green
Rep. Alcee L. Hastings
Rep. Jesse L. Jackson, Jr.
Rep. William J. Jefferson
Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson
Rep. Henry “Hank” Johnson
Rep. Stephanie Tubbs Jones
Rep. Carolyn Cheeks Kilpatrick

Rep. Barbara Lee
Rep. Sheila Jackson-Lee
Rep. John Lewis
Rep. Kendrick B. Meek
Rep. Gregory W. Meeks
Rep. Gwen Moore
Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton
Rep. Donald M. Payne
Rep. Charles B. Rangel
Rep. Laura Richardson
Rep. Bobby L. Rush
Rep. Robert C. "Bobby" Scott
Rep. David Scott
Rep. Bennie G. Thompson
Rep. Edolphus Towns
Rep. Maxine Waters
Rep. Diane E. Watson
Rep. Melvin L. "Mel" Watt
Rep. Albert R. Wynn