Ohio's Voter-Identification Law

Northeast Ohio Coalition for the Homeless v. Brunner (Gregory L. Frost and Algenon L. Marbley, S.D. Ohio 2:06-cv-896)

On October 24, 2006, public interest organizations brought a federal constitutional challenge to Ohio's new voter-identification laws.[1] With the complaint, the plaintiffs filed a motion for a temporary restraining order.[2] The court assigned the case to Judge Gregory L. Frost, who held a teleconference with the parties that same day.[3]

When a plaintiff files a motion for a temporary restraining order with a complaint, the clerk's office walks the complaint and motion to the chambers of the assigned judge.[4] The plaintiff is asked to remain present in the courthouse for a possibly immediate conference.[5]

At the first conference, Judge Frost set a hearing on the temporary restraining order motion for the next day.[6] When the parties gathered for the hearing, they informed Judge Frost that the case was related to one before Judge Algenon L. Marbley.[7]

On the case's third day, it was reassigned to Judge Marbley.[8] The earlier case arose from an August 31, 2006, complaint that in the 2004 general election Ohio's voting machines were distributed in an unequal and discriminatory manner to the

---

1. Complaint, NEOCH v. Brunner, No. 2:06-cv-896 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 24, 2006), D.E. 2; NEOCH v. Secretary of State of Ohio, ___ F.3d ___, ___, 2012 WL 3734369 (6th Cir. 2012) (p.3 of filed opinion); NEOCH v. Blackwell, 467 F.3d 999, 1004 (6th Cir. 2006); NEOCH v. Brunner, 652 F. Supp. 2d 871, 876 (S.D. Ohio 2009); *see* Kevin Mayhood, *Groups Sue to Block Voter ID Rules*, Columbus Dispatch, Oct. 25, 2006, at 3D; Mark Rollenhagen, *Suit Calls Ohio's Voter ID Law a Mess, Asks Court to Void It*, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 25, 2006, at B1; Julie Carr Smyth, *Groups Sue Over Voter ID Measure*, Cincinnati Post, Oct. 25, 2006, at A3.

2. Temporary Restraining Order Motion, *NEOCH*, No. 2:06-cv-896 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 24, 2006), D.E. 3.

3. Docket Sheet, *Id.* (Oct. 24, 2006); Interview with Hon. Gregory L. Frost, June 1, 2012.

Tim Reagan interviewed Judge Frost for this report by telephone on June 1, 2012.

4. Interview with Hon. Gregory L. Frost, June 1, 2012.

Judges try to be available in the courthouse on election days in case they are called upon to preside over emergency election cases. *Id.*

5. *Id.*

6. Notice of Hearing, *NEOCH*, No. 2:06-cv-896 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 24, 2006), D.E. 7.

7. Interview with Hon. Gregory L. Frost, June 1, 2012.

Tim Reagan interviewed Judge Marbley for this report by telephone on July 11, 2012.

8. Transfer Order, *NEOCH*, No. 2:06-cv-896 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 26, 2006), D.E. 16; *see* Transcript at 4–5, *id.* Oct. 27, 2006, filed Oct. 30, 2006), D.E. 27 [hereinafter Oct. 27, 2006, Transcript] (noting that transfer does not necessarily imply consolidation); *see also* Mark Rollenhagen, *Federal Hearing on Challenge to Voter ID Rule Is Today*, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 26, 2006, at B3.

disadvantage of urban and African-American voters.[9] As part of the relief sought in that case, the plaintiffs asked Judge Marbley to order Ohio's secretary of state to order each county to preserve 2004 ballots, but, on September 11, Judge Marbley issued an order directly to the counties that they do so.[10] In 2012, Judge Marbley determined that the action was barred by the Eleventh Amendment.[11]

On the day he was assigned the second case, Judge Marbley convened a hearing at 3:00 p.m.[12] Scheduling for the second case was greatly facilitated by the overlap of attorneys working the two cases.[13] The attorneys' considerable familiarity with the applicable areas of law were a great asset in moving the cases forward.[14]

At 5:10 p.m., the court recessed for 45 minutes, and then Judge Marbley issued a temporary restraining order against the new voter-identification laws, finding a likelihood that the plaintiffs could prove some unconstitutionality, and ordered an evidentiary hearing on the morning of Wednesday, November 1.[15]

The State of Ohio sought to intervene on October 27 so that it could appeal the temporary restraining order.[16] Judge Marbley denied the motion, reasoning that the state's interests were adequately represented by the defendant secretary of state.[17]

On October 31, the court of appeals, with one judge dissenting, stayed the temporary restraining order: "There is . . . a strong public interest in permitting legitimate statutory processes to operate to preclude voting by those who are not

---

9. Complaint, King Lincoln Bronzeville Neighborhood Ass'n v. Blackwell, No. 2:06-cv-745 (S.D. Ohio Aug. 31, 2006), D.E. 1; King Lincoln Bronzeville Neighborhood Ass'n v. Blackwell, 448 F. Supp. 2d 876, 877 (S.D. Ohio 2006).

10. *King Lincoln Bronzeville Neighborhood Ass'n*, 448 F. Supp. 2d at 879–80.

11. Opinion, *King Lincoln Bronzeville Neighborhood Ass'n*, No. 2:06-cv-745 (S.D. Ohio Aug. 31, 2006), D.E. 122, *available at* 2012 WL 395030.

12. Transcript, *NEOCH*, No. 2:06-cv-896 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 26, 2006, filed Oct. 27, 2006), D.E. 30 [hereinafter Oct. 26, 2006, Transcript].

13. Interview with Hon. Algenon L. Marbley, July 11, 2012.

14. *Id.*

15. Temporary Restraining Order, *NEOCH*, No. 2:06-cv-896 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 26, 2006, D.E. 17; Oct. 26, 2006, Transcript, *supra* note 12, at 86–103; NEOCH v. Blackwell, 467 F.3d 999, 1002, 1004 (6th Cir. 2006); NEOCH v. Brunner, 652 F. Supp. 2d 871, 876 n.1 (S.D. Ohio 2009); *see* Matt Leingang, *Judge Suspends ID Law on Absentee Ballots*, Cincinnati Post, Oct. 27, 2006, at A4; Kevin Mayhood, Mark Niquette & Alan Johnson, *Judge Suspends Voter-ID Directive*, Columbus Dispatch, Oct. 27, 2006, at 1A (reporting a reprieve from having absentee votes disqualified because the voters provided the wrong numbers from the drivers' licenses as identification—the number above the photo identifying where the license was obtained instead of the driver's identification number).

16. Intervention Motion, *NEOCH*, No. 2:06-cv-896 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 27, 2006, D.E. 22; *NEOCH*, 467 F.3d at 1004; *see* Oct. 27, 2006, Transcript, *supra* note 8, at 10 (observing "a situation in which two state agencies or two state officials disagree on litigation strategy"); *see also* Matt Leingang, *Disagreement Over Challenge to Voter ID Law*, Cincinnati Post, Oct. 28, 2006, at A4.

17. Oct. 27, 2006, Transcript, *supra* note 8, at 45; *NEOCH*, 467 F.3d at 1004–05; *see* Alan Johnson, Mark Niquette & Joe Hallett, *Voter-ID Rules Remain in Limbo*, Columbus Dispatch, Oct. 28, 2006, at 1A (reporting that Ohio's attorney general sought to intervene on behalf of the state because the secretary of state decided not to appeal).

entitled to vote."[18] The court also determined that the state had a right to intervene.[19]

On the following day, six days before the election, Judge Marbley entered a consent order specifying how voters would have to prove their identities in Ohio for the 2006 election.[20] For the 2008 election, Judge Marbley also issued orders based on the parties' negotiations.[21] In 2009, Judge Marbley awarded the plaintiffs $431,374.05 in attorney fees and costs.[22]

Judge Marbley entered a consent decree in 2010.[23] The consent decree approved a revision to the earlier award of fees and costs, increasing it to $504,414.11.[24] On November 30, Judge Marbley awarded an additional $18,943.13 in fees and costs.[25] On July 9, 2012, Judge Marbley ruled that Ohio's new executive administration was not entitled to relief from the decree.[26] An appeal is pending.[27]

On June 22, 2012, five labor organizations filed a federal complaint challenging some of Ohio's laws respecting provisional ballots, especially seeking a declaration that provisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct should be counted if they were cast in the wrong precinct because of poll-worker error.[28] The court deter-

---

18. *NEOCH*, 467 F.3d at 1012; *NEOCH*, 652 F. Supp. 2d at 876 n.1; *see* Mark Rollenhagen, *Voter ID Rules Change a Third Time in Four Days*, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 30, 2006, at A1.

19. *NEOCH*, 467 F.3d at 1008–09.

20. Consent Order, *NEOCH*, No. 2:06-cv-896 (S.D. Ohio Nov. 1, 2006), D.E. 51; NEOCH v. Secretary of State of Ohio, ___ F.3d ___, ___, 2012 WL 3734369 (6th Cir. 2012) (pp.2–3 of filed opinion); *NEOCH*, 652 F. Supp. 2d at 876; *see* Mark Rollenhagen, *Absentee Voter ID Rules Are Suspended*, Cleveland Plain Dealer, Nov. 2, 2006, at A1 ("All absentee ballots will be counted regardless of whether voters supplied identification when they were case."); Julie Carr Smyth, *Court Settlement Clarifies Voter ID Law*, Cincinnati Post, Nov. 2, 2006, at A2; Robert Vitale, *Voter ID Ruling Sets Off a Flurry*, Columbus Dispatch, Nov. 3, 2006, at 1A.

21. Order, *NEOCH*, No. 2:06-cv-896 (S.D. Ohio Oct. 27, 2008), D.E. 143; Order, *id.* (Oct. 24, 2008), D.E. 142; *NEOCH*, ___ F.3d at ___, 2012 WL 3734369 (p.2 of filed opinion); *NEOCH*, 652 F. Supp. 2d at 876; *see* Ohio *ex rel.* Skaggs v. Brunner, 588 F. Supp. 2d 819, 821 (S.D. Ohio 2008).

22 *NEOCH*, 652 F. Supp. 2d at 875.

23. Consent Decree, *NEOCH*, No. 2:06-cv-896 (S.D. Ohio Apr. 19, 2010), D.E. 210; *NEOCH*, ___ F.3d at ___, 2012 WL 3734369 (pp.2–3, 5–6 of filed opinion); Service Employees Int'l Union v. Husted, ___ F. Supp. 2d ___, ___, 2012 WL 3643064 (S.D. Ohio 2012) (p.2 of filed opinion); *see* Transcript, *id.* (Apr. 19, 2010, filed June 24, 2010), D.E. 217; *see also* Ohio ex rel. Painter v. Brunner, 128 Ohio St. 3d 17, 20–21, 941 N.E.2d 782, 788–89 (2011).

24. Consent Decree, *supra* note 23, at 6; Fees and Costs Order at 4, *NEOCH*, No. 2:06-cv-896 (S.D. Ohio Nov. 30, 2010), D.E. 234, *available at* 2010 WL 4939946; *NEOCH*, ___ F.3d at ___, 2012 WL 3734369 (p.4 of filed opinion).

25. Fees and Costs Order, *supra* note 24, *aff'd*, ___ F.3d at ___, 2012 WL 3734369.

26. Opinion, *NEOCH*, No. 2:06-cv-896 (S.D. Ohio Apr. 19, 2012), D.E. 307, *available at* 2012 WL 2711393; *Service Employees Int'l Union*, ___ F. Supp. 2d at ___, 2012 WL 3643064 (p.2 of filed opinion)

27. Docket Sheet, NEOCH v. Husted, No. 12-3916 (6th Cir. July 26, 2012).

28. Complaint, Service Employees Int'l Union v. Husted, No. 2:12-cv-562 (S.D. Ohio June 22, 2012), D.E. 1; *Service Employees Int'l Union*, ___ F. Supp. 2d at ___, 2012 WL 3643064 (p.12 of filed opinion); *see* Second Amended Complaint, *id.* (July 24, 2012), D.E. 63; First Amended Complaint, *id.* (July 13, 2012), D.E. 32; *see* Robert Barnes, *In Ohio, a Fight Over Votes Not Counted*, Wash. Post, Aug. 6, 2012, at A1.

mined that this case was related to Judge Marbley's pending action, and so it was assigned to him as well.[29] On August 27, Judge Marbley determined that provisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct because of poll-worker error must be counted.[30] An appeal is pending.[31]

29. Order, *Service Employees Int'l Union*, No. 2:12-cv-562 (S.D. Ohio June 26, 2012), D.E. 16; *Service Employees Int'l Union*, ___ F. Supp. 2d at ___ n.1, 2012 WL 3643064 (p.1. n.1 of filed opinion).

30. *Service Employees Int'l Union*, ___ F. Supp. 2d at ___, 2012 WL 3643064 (pp.56–57 of filed opinion); *see* Robert Barnes, *Ohio Must Count Some Improperly Cast Ballots, Judge Rules*, Wash. Post, Aug. 28, 2012, at A5.

31. Docket Sheet, Service Employees Int'l Union v. Husted, No. 12-4069 (6th Cir. Sept. 7, 2012).