RECEIPT NUMBER



# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

DETROIT BRANCH OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, LAWYERS COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW,

Plaintiffs,

JUDGE: Rosen, Gerald E.

DECK : S. Division Civil Deck DATE : 11/08/2005 @ 16:43:44 CASE NUMBER : 2:05CV74296 CMP DETROIT BRANCH VS MI

REPUBLICAN STATE (LE)

V.

MICHIGAN REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE, a.k.a. MICHIGAN REPUBLICAN PARTY, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,

Defendants.

McIvin Butch Hollowell (P-37834)
John E. Johnson, Jr. (P-29742)
Harold D. Pope (P-34882)
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
2990 East Grand Boulevard
Detroit, MI 48202
313-871-2087 (O)
313-871-0765 (fax)

Margaret Van Houten (P-51899) Attorney for Defendants 7457 Franklin Road, Suite 250 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48301 248-406-5100 (O) 248-406-5111 (fax) MAGISTRATE JUDGE DONALD A. SCHEER

COMPLAINT

NOW COMES, Plaintiffs, DETROIT BRANCH NAACP, and the LAWYERS
COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW, by and through their attorneys,
Melvin Butch Hollowell, John E. Johnson, Jr, and Harold Pope, assert as follows:

### Parties and Stakeholders

- 1. Plaintiff Detroit Branch NAACP is an organization operating in Michigan. Its Constitution of 1909, Article I, Section 3, provides that a central purpose of the organization is to improve the political, educational, social and economic status of minority groups, to eliminate racial prejudice, and to take lawful action to sdecure its elimination.
- 2. Plaintiff Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights is a national organization which represents minority voter rights in litigation.
- 3. Defendant Michigan Republican Committee is a Michigan based political party.
- 4. Defendant Republican National committee is an organization based in
- 5. Washington, DC, whose operatives are in Michigan at Detroit polling locations.

### Jurisdiction and Venue

- 6. Jurisdiction is vested in this court pursuant to 42 USC Sec 1971 (b), 42 USC Sec
- 7. 1973 (i)(b), and 18 USC Sec 241.
- 8. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of Michigan as the violations of law
- 9. occurred within the city of Detroit.

### Factual Background

- 10. Beginning in the early hours of the general election, and occurring throughout the day, representatives of Defendants, presenting themselves as election challengers challengers, under MCL 168.730, have harassed and intimidated voters, all of whom are African American, at polling locations throughout the city. Affidavits attesting to this illegal conduct is set forth in the Affidavits attached hereto.
- 11. The Defendants has no basis upon which intimidate the voters in question.
- 12. This harassment occurred even though this election is non-partisan and therefore the Defendants have no interest in this election as is required under the Michigan Election Law.
- 13. This intimidation has caused some voters to leave the polling locations thereby denying their right to vote.

## COUNT I VIOLATION OF THE CHALLENGER STATUTE

14. MCL Sec 168.730 requires that there be an "interest" in the election before a political party can enter Michigan polling locations. The general election in Detroit is non partisan and therefore Defendants have no interest and no business being challengers under the statute.

### COUNT II VOTER INTIMIDATION

15. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Act of 1957, along with 18 USC Sec 594, 18 USC Sec 597, and 18 USC Sec 241 make it a crime to intimidate voters.

WHEREFORE, plaintiffs respectfully request declaratory and injunctive relief, barring Defendants from serving as challengers at the polls in the city of Detroit, during the remainder of the November 8, 2005, and grant such other relief as may be warranted including attorneys fees and costs of suit.

Respectfully submitted,

Melvin Butch Hollowell (P-37834)

Attorneys for Plaintiffs 2990 East Grand Boulevard

Detroit, MI 48202

November 8, 2005

### AFFIDAVIT OF LUSHELLE WILLIAMS

- 1. I am the chairperson of the election site, for District 14 Precinct 40, and District 22, Precinct 01. The polling site which I supervise is located at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church.
- 2. There are three Republican Challengers in the building. First, a woman voted absentee. The voter asked the challengers why they are in the building, but the challengers would not answer why they were there. When the voter finished voting, then the challengers said they wanted to challenge the vote. I said that they could not challenge the vote after the voter had already voted. The challengers called their supervisor and he came over the voter and said: I am challenging your vote. The voter said: if you want to challenge my vote, you must challenge it in the beginning not after I voted. I said: that it true. Then the supervisor continued to argue with her, saying: I can challenge your vote if I want to. The voter said: they should not have any business jumping down my throat. The supervisor continued to harass and argue with the voter, and I stepped in and said: you are harassing the voter and it has to stop. The supervisor then stopped.
- 3. This incident was a major disruption in the polling location. There were about 20 or more voters in the polling place when this supervisor was harassing the voter.
- 4. These Republican Challengers are asked by other voters why they are there, and ask for their information, but they will not respond. They refuse to give their information to the voters, but get personal information about the voters (like their address) by peering over the shoulders of the election workers.
- 5. These Challengers are challenging a number of people. However, these Challengers did not have any list of names that they were going off of when they challenge people, but are simply challenging people that they believe are problem voters, without any prior information of their inability to vote, that I noticed. For instance, we could not find the address for one voter, because she had moved, and they wanted to Challenge her vote. The address on the election voter eligibility book was different than her license. I was assisting the woman, and told her to find her voter's registration card, because the voter told me that she had received something in the mail but did not have the card on her. The Republican Challengers then protested, and demanded that I fill out a provisional ballot for her. I started to have her fill out a provisional ballot, but the woman left.
- 6. These Republican Challengers also stand directly behind the table and look over the election workers. They stand within a foot or two of the election workers. These challengers also talk with the voters, harassing them.

Further affiant sayeth not.

Qualiano 11/8/05

dated

Notary Public:

My Commission expires 06/06/2011

 $\square$  2

RECEIPT #

AMOUNT

	Other 440 Other Civil Rights			State Statutes
man1 ⊓ா்	" in One Box Only) red from 3 Remanded from Court Appellate Court	4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred another distriction (specify)		Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are 1945 Vot. 19 Rts Act Brief description of cailse:	filing (Do not cite Jurisdictional state)	ites unless diversity):	
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER F,R.C.P. 23	DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only if JURY DEMAND:	demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE	DO	CKET NUMBER	
11 /8/a5	SIGNATURE OF ATTO	77 3 7 71		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		<u> </u>		

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

APPLYING IFP

### PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 83.11

1.	Is this a case that has been previously dismissed?
If yes, give	e the following information:
Co u rt:	
Case No.:	
Judge:	
:	
2.	Other than stated above, are there any pending or previously discontinued or dismissed companion cases in this or any other court, including state court? (Companion cases are matters in which it appears substantially similar evidence will be offered or the same or related parties are present and the cases arise out of the same transaction or occurrence.)
If yes, give	e the following information:
Court:	
Case No.:	
Notes :	