2 boct





12/20/

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RICHARD VIETH, NORMA JEAN VIETH, and SUSAN FUREY,	HARRICUES, A
Plaintiffs,	BEC 1 9 2002
v. THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA; MARK S. SCHWEIKER, et al.,	No. 1: CV 01-2439 Judge Rambo, Judge Yohn, Judge Nygaard
Defendants.)

PLAINTIFFS' PREHEARING MEMORANDUM

Plaintiffs hereby submit this Prehearing Memorandum in anticipation of the Court's January 9, 2003 hearing. At that hearing, the Court will consider whether Act 34 satisfies the requirement of this Court's April 8, 2002 Decision and Order invalidating Act 1 and directing the General Assembly to "enact and submit for review and final approval by this Court" a constitutional redistricting plan. *Vieth v. Pennsylvania*, 195 F. Supp. 2d 672, 679 (M.D. Pa. 2002). The parties have submitted numerous briefs addressing whether the remedial plan establishes an unjustified deviation from the one-person, one-vote principle expressed in *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725 (1983).

Plaintiffs submit this Prehearing Brief, however, primarily to preserve for appeal their partisan gerrymandering claim previously dismissed by the Court in its February 22, 2002 Order. *See Vieth v. Pennsylvania*, 188 F. Supp. 2d 532, 549

(M.D. Pa. 2002). Plaintiffs appealed that decision to the United States Supreme Court, but, after the enactment of the remedial Act 34, the Supreme Court dismissed the appeal as moot. *See* 123 S. Ct. 68 (2002).

Consequently, should this Court reject plaintiffs' present challenge to the remedial redistricting plan, plaintiffs wish to preserve their argument that Act 34 is an example of unconstitutional partisan gerrymandering, as well as violative of one-person, one-vote requirements, for a possible appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. Plaintiffs therefore ask this Court to consider their partisan gerrymandering challenge to Act 1 in the context of the resulting remedial plan, Act 34.

As plaintiffs have previously argued, *see*, *e.g.*, Plaintiffs' Motion to Impose Districts, at 11-13 (filed April 22, 2002), Act 34 is based on Act 1 and is a similarly egregious partisan gerrymander. Plaintiffs therefore incorporate by reference their substantive briefing on the partisan gerrymandering issue. While plaintiffs recognize that the Court has already rejected their partisan gerrymandering theory with respect to Act 1, the Court now has the benefit of a full factual record which confirms the excessive partisan nature of the legislative actions. *See Vieth*, 195 F. Supp. 2d at 678-679.

Finally, should the Court invalidate Act 34 under any of the plaintiffs' constitutional theories, plaintiffs request the opportunity to brief the various

remedial issues that would necessarily arise.

Respectfully submitted,

REED SMITH LLP

Robert B. Hoffman

P.O. Box 11844

Harrisburg, PA 17108

(717) 257-3042

(202) 639-6000

Paul M. Smith
Thomas J. Perrelli
Bruce V. Spiva
Daniel Mach
JENNER & BLOCK, L.L.C.
601 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

Attorneys for Plaintiffs Richard Vieth, Norma Jean Vieth, and Susan Furey

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RICHARD VIETH et al

Plaintiffs,

:

v.

No. 1: CV 01-2439

: (Judge Nygaard, Judge Rambo,

THE COMMONWEALTH OF :

PENNSYLVANIA;, MARK S.

SCHWEIKER, et al

Defendants

and Judge Yohn)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing document to be served by first class mail, postage prepaid December 19, 2002, as follows:

J. Bart DeLone, Esquire Senior Deputy Attorney General Office of Attorney General Strawberry Square, 15th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17120 John P. Krill, Jr., Esquire Kirkpatrick and Lockhart LLP 240 North Third Street Harrisburg, PA 17101-1507

REED SMITH LLP

Robert B. Hoffmar P. O. Box 11844

Harrisburg, PA 17101

(717) 257-3042