



**U.S. Department of Justice**

Office of the Solicitor General

---

*Washington, D.C. 20530*

May 11, 2023

Honorable Scott S. Harris  
Clerk  
Supreme Court of the United States  
Washington, D.C. 20543

Re: Timothy K. Moore, et al. v. Rebecca Harper, et al., No. 21-1271

Dear Mr. Harris:

On May 4, 2023, this Court invited the parties and the United States to file supplemental letter briefs addressing the effect of the North Carolina Supreme Court’s April 28, 2023 order on this Court’s jurisdiction. In that order, the North Carolina Supreme Court held that the North Carolina Constitution imposes no judicially enforceable limits on partisan gerrymandering, overruled the court’s contrary decision in *Harper I*, and dismissed the underlying suit with prejudice. In our view, that order moots the question this Court granted certiorari to decide because it means that the Court’s resolution of that question could have no effect on the outcome of this case.

1. This Court granted certiorari to review the North Carolina Supreme Court’s February 4, 2022 order in *Harper I*, which held that the congressional and legislative maps adopted by the North Carolina General Assembly in 2021 were partisan gerrymanders that violated the North Carolina Constitution. Pet. 5; see Pet. App. 224a-242a (order); Pet. App. 1a-223a (opinion). In reaching that conclusion, *Harper I* rejected petitioners’ contention that the Elections Clause of the U.S. Constitution prohibits state courts from reviewing state laws governing congressional elections for compliance with state constitutions. Pet. App. 121a-122a. *Harper I* was interlocutory insofar as it contemplated further remedial proceedings to determine the maps to be used in future elections. *Id.* at 231a-233a. But the Court’s grant of certiorari presumably reflected at least a provisional determination that *Harper I* nonetheless qualified as a “[f]inal judgment” reviewable under 28 U.S.C. 1257(a). See U.S. Letter Br. 2. Specifically, it appears that this Court determined that *Harper I* fit within the second category set forth in *Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469 (1975), because the federal issue had been “finally decided by the highest court in the State” and would “survive and require decision regardless of the outcome of future state-court proceedings.” *Id.* at 480; see U.S. Letter Br. 2-3.

The state-court remedial proceedings contemplated in *Harper I* continued after this Court’s grant of certiorari. Specifically, on December 16, 2022, the North Carolina Supreme Court issued

*Harper II*, which upheld the state legislature’s remedial plan for the state house but rejected the legislature’s senate and congressional plans. See *Harper v. Hall*, 881 S.E.2d 156, 162 (2022).

On February 3, 2023, however, the North Carolina Supreme Court issued an order granting rehearing in *Harper II*. This Court directed the parties and the United States to file supplemental letter briefs addressing the effect of that order on this Court’s jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. 1257(a) and *Cox*. Our letter brief explained that the grant of rehearing in *Harper II* made it difficult to conclude that the North Carolina Supreme Court had entered a final judgment reviewable under Section 1257(a). U.S. Letter Br. 3-5. We observed that the questions on which the North Carolina Supreme Court had granted rehearing included the Elections Clause issue, which suggested that it could no longer be said that the State’s highest court had “finally determined the federal issue” in this case. *Cox*, 420 U.S. at 477. In addition, and of most relevance here, we explained that if the court concluded on rehearing that the state constitution contains no judicially enforceable limits on partisan gerrymandering, “its decision would effectively moot the federal Elections Clause issue in this case: There would be no need to decide whether the Elections Clause prevents state courts from enforcing particular types of state-law requirements in a case where the state courts have found that no such state-law requirements exist.” U.S. Letter Br. 5; see *id.* at 3, 6.

2. The North Carolina Supreme Court’s April 28 decision resolved the issues on rehearing in exactly that manner, holding “that partisan gerrymandering claims present a political question that is nonjusticiable under the North Carolina Constitution.” Slip op. 10; see, e.g., *id.* at 53-54. The court referenced the federal Elections Clause only briefly and in passing, in the course of explaining its conclusion that partisan gerrymandering claims are nonjusticiable under the North Carolina Constitution. See *id.* at 61; see generally *id.* at 52-96. In that discussion, the court concluded that “redistricting is explicitly and exclusively committed to the General Assembly” and that the state constitution “does not provide any judicially discernible or manageable standards for determining how much partisan gerrymandering is too much.” *Id.* at 53; see *id.* at 71. The court further held that none of the provisions of the North Carolina Declaration of Rights it had relied upon in *Harper I* imposes judicially enforceable limits on the use of partisan considerations in redistricting. *Id.* at 96-129. The court therefore determined that “*Harper I* was wrongly decided.” *Id.* at 136. The court “overruled” *Harper I* and “withdr[ew]” *Harper II*, superseding it with the court’s opinion on rehearing. *Id.* at 145-146. The court also “affirm[ed] the [trial court’s] 11 January 2022 Judgment”—*i.e.*, the judgment that *Harper I* had reversed. *Ibid.* And the court “dismissed” the non-State respondents’ claims “with prejudice.” *Id.* at 146.

3. The North Carolina Supreme Court’s April 28 decision means that the federal Elections Clause question on which this Court granted review no longer has any live significance in this case. The Court granted certiorari to decide whether the Elections Clause prohibits state courts from reviewing state legislation governing federal congressional elections for compliance with state constitutions. U.S. Amicus Br. I; see Pet. i. Here, that question arises in the context of the non-State respondents’ claims that the North Carolina General Assembly violated the North Carolina Constitution by engaging in partisan gerrymandering. Pet. App. 19a-20a. But in its April 28 decision, the North Carolina Supreme Court held that the North Carolina Constitution imposes no judicially enforceable limits on partisan gerrymandering and dismissed the non-State respondents’ claims with prejudice. Slip op. 145-146. A decision of this Court determining whether and under what circumstances the Elections Clause might limit state courts’ authority to review state

election legislation for compliance with state constitutions could have no effect on the resolution of those already-dismissed claims. The Court should therefore dismiss the writ of certiorari because the question presented “is now moot in [t]his case.” *Aikens v. California*, 406 U.S. 813, 814 (1972) (per curiam); cf. *ibid.* (dismissing writ of certiorari after oral argument because an intervening decision of the California Supreme Court holding that capital punishment violated the California Constitution meant that “the issue on which certiorari was granted—the constitutionality of the death penalty under the Federal Constitution—is now moot in [t]his case”).

4. A few potential counterarguments warrant mention, but none changes our view that the North Carolina Supreme Court’s April 28 decision on rehearing moots the Elections Clause question in this case.

First, in suggesting that the North Carolina Supreme Court’s grant of rehearing would not affect this Court’s jurisdiction, petitioners previously stated that although the court’s rehearing decision could “overrule[ *Harper I*] as precedent,” it could “not disturb the [*Harper I*] judgment.” Pets. Letter Br. 3 (emphasis omitted). In its April 28 opinion, however, the North Carolina Supreme Court not only overruled *Harper I* as precedent, but also affirmed the trial court order that *Harper I* had reversed and dismissed the non-State respondents’ claims with prejudice. Slip op. 145-146. Whatever the status of the *Harper I* order as a matter of state law, therefore, it remains true that the question this Court granted certiorari to decide is now moot because the Court’s resolution of that question could not affect the disposition of this case.

Second, petitioners have also previously argued that this Court would retain jurisdiction notwithstanding the outcome of the rehearing proceedings because the North Carolina Supreme Court’s decision in *Harper I* and its subsequent denial of a stay affected the districts used in the 2022 congressional elections. Pets. Letter Br. 4 (asserting that “[r]egardless of what the North Carolina Supreme Court does in *Harper II*, it will remain the case that the North Carolina Supreme Court in *Harper I* invalidated the General Assembly’s duly drawn congressional map under an improper understanding of the Elections Clause and in its subsequent stay denial allowed the 2022 congressional election in North Carolina to be conducted under a court-drawn map”). But because the 2022 congressional election has passed and the court-drawn map will not be used again, see slip op. 139, this Court can no longer redress that injury. And in light of the North Carolina Supreme Court’s decision on rehearing, there is no reason to think that *Harper I* and the subsequent denial of a stay will have any effect on the rules governing North Carolina’s congressional elections going forward. See, e.g., *Hall v. Beals*, 396 U.S. 45, 48 (1969) (per curiam) (finding challenge to state election provision moot because the relevant election was “history” and changes to the legal regime made it unlikely that injury would recur).

Third, the Elections Clause question in this case does not come within the mootness exception for issues that are capable of repetition yet evade review. “A dispute falls into that category, and a case based on that dispute remains live, if ‘(1) the challenged action is in its duration too short to be fully litigated prior to its cessation or expiration, and (2) there is a reasonable expectation that the same complaining party will be subjected to the same action again.’” *Turner v. Rogers*, 564 U.S. 431, 439-440 (2011) (brackets and citation omitted). The federal Elections Clause issue in this case has become moot not because of the duration of the challenged action—decennial districting—but rather because of the North Carolina Supreme Court’s unusual grant of

rehearing. And the court’s rehearing decision also makes it highly unlikely that a dispute like this one will recur between the parties. Petitioners are North Carolina legislators; respondents are North Carolina voters, a North Carolina-focused organization, and North Carolina executive officials. Any partisan gerrymandering claim the non-State respondents would bring in the future would be foreclosed by the North Carolina Supreme Court’s holding that such claims are nonjusticiable as a matter of state law. That same holding means that petitioners are unlikely to suffer the same alleged injury—state courts’ invalidation of the State’s congressional map as a partisan gerrymander, see Pet. i—in the future.

Finally, our prior letter brief explained that although this Court might determine that there are limits on a state court’s ability to take actions that would deprive this Court of jurisdiction after it has granted certiorari, any such limits do not appear to warrant the continued exercise of jurisdiction in this case. U.S. Letter Br. 5-6. We continue to maintain that view. As we previously observed, even if this Court were to conclude that its grant of certiorari deprived the North Carolina Supreme Court of authority to reconsider the federal Elections Clause issue in the context of the ongoing rehearing proceedings, the state court retained jurisdiction to reconsider its antecedent state-law determination that the North Carolina Constitution prohibits partisan gerrymandering. *Id.* at 6. Because the North Carolina Supreme Court’s reconsideration of that antecedent state-law issue on rehearing foreclosed non-State respondents’ claims and fully resolved this litigation, the federal Elections Clause question is moot.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth B. Prelogar  
Solicitor General

cc: See Attached Service List

21-1271

MOORE, TIMOTHY, ET AL.  
REBECCA HARPER, ET AL.

JOHN CHRISTIAN ADAMS  
PUBLIC INTEREST LEGAL FOUNDATION  
32 E. WASHINGTON ST.  
SUITE 1675  
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204  
317-203-5599  
ADAMS@ELECTIONLAWCENTER.COM

VIKRAM DAVID AMAR  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
2510 E. CASTLEROCK DRIVE  
URBANA, IL 61802  
925-858-8855  
AMAR@ILLINOIS.EDU

JESSICA RING AMUNSON  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
1099 NEW YORK AVENUE NW  
SUITE 900  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001  
202-639-6023  
JAMUNSON@JENNER.COM

MEL BARNES  
LAW FORWARD, INC.  
222 W. WASHINGTON AVE.  
MADISON, WI 53703  
MBARNES@LAWFORWARD.ORG

RICHARD DOUGLAS BERNSTEIN  
1875 K STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006  
301-775-2064  
RBERNSTEINLAW@GMAIL.COM

SARAH GARDNER BOYCE  
NC DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
POST OFFICE BOX 629  
RALEIGH, NC 27602  
7046747708  
SBOYCE@NCDOJ.GOV

NICHOLAS JACOB BRONNI  
SOLICITOR GENERAL OF ARKANSAS  
323 CENTER ST.  
SUITE 209  
LITTLE ROCK, AR 72201  
501-682-6302  
NICHOLAS.BRONNI@ARKANSASAG.GOV

CHRISTOPHER J. CARIELLO  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
51 WEST 52ND STREET  
NEW YORK, NY 10019  
212-506-5000

DAVID WILLIAM TELFORD CARROLL  
CARROLL, UCKER & HEMMER LLC  
PO BOX 1245  
COLUMBUS, OH 43212  
614-423-9820  
DCARROLL@CUHLAW.COM

GREGORY L. DISKANI  
PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB & TYLER, LLP  
1133 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
NEW YORK , NY 10036  
212-336-2000  
GLDISKANT@PBWT.COM

MICHAEL NICHOLAW DONOFRIO  
STRIS & MAHER LLP  
15 EAST STATE STREET  
2ND FLOOR  
MONTPELIER, VT 05602  
802-522-0649  
MDONOFRIO@STRIS.COM

JOHN C. EASTMAN  
CONSTITUTION COUNSEL GROUP  
174 W. LINCOLN AVE.  
#620  
ANAHEIM, CA 92805  
909-257-3869  
JEASTMAN@CCG1776.COM

ILANA H. EISENSTEIN  
DLA PIPER LLP  
ONE LIBERTY PLACE  
1650 MARKET STREET  
SUITE 5000  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103  
215-656-3351  
ILANA.EISENSTEIN@DLAPIPER.COM

DAVID C. FREDERICK  
KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD, FIDGEL &  
FREDERICK, P.L.L.C  
1615 M STREET, N.W.  
SUITE 400  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036  
202-326-7900  
DFREDERICK@KELLOGGHANSEN.COM

FAITH GAY  
SELENDY GAY EISBERG PLLC  
1290 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS  
17TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10104  
212-390-9000  
FGAY@SELENDYGAY.COM

EUGENE H. GOLDBERG  
686 HARRISON AVE.  
EAST MEADOW, NY 11554  
516-695-2035  
EMAN352@OPTONLINE.NET

LEE ELTON GOODMAN  
WILEY REIN LLP  
2050 M. STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036  
202-719-7000  
IGOODMAN@WILEY.LAW

PHILLIP MICHAEL GORDON  
HOLTZMAN VOGEL BARAN TORCHINSKY  
JOSEFIK, PLLC  
15405 JOHN MARSHALL HWY  
HAYMARKET, VA 20169  
540-341-8808  
PGORDON@HOLTZMANVOLGEL.COM

JOHN MATTHEW GORE  
JONES DAY  
51 LOUISIANA AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001  
202-879-3939  
JMGORE@JONESDAY.COM

BRIANNE JENNA GOROD  
CONSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY  
CENTER  
1200 18TH ST., NW  
SUITE 501  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036  
202-296-6889  
BRIANNE@THEUSCONSTITUTION.ORG

MICHAEL GOTTIEB  
WALLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER OOPP  
1875 K STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006  
202-303-1442  
MGOTTIEB@WALLKIE.COM

RICHARD HASEN  
UCLA SCHOOL OF LAW  
385 CHARLES E. YOUNG DRIVE EAST  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90095  
310-206-3103  
HASEN@LAW.UCLA.EDU

ANTHONY R. HOLTZMAN  
K&L GATES LLP  
17 NORTH SECOND STREET  
HARRISBURG, PA 17101  
717-231-4570  
ANTHONY.HOLTZMAN@KLGATES.COM

BRETT WILLIAM JOHNSON  
SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.  
400 E. VAN BUREN  
PHOENIX, AZ 85004  
602-382-6312  
BWJOHNSON@SWLAWCOM

LAWRENCE J. JOSEPH  
LAW OFFICE OF LAWRENCE J. JOSEPH  
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW  
SUITE 700-1A  
WSASHIGTON, DC 20036  
202-355-9452  
LJOSEPH@LARRYJOSEPH.COM

ERICK G. KAARDAL  
MOHRMAN, KAARDA & ERICKSON  
150 SOUTH FIFTH STREET  
SUITE 3100  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402  
612-465-0927  
KAARDAL@MKLAW.COM

NEAL KUMAR KATYAL  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
COLUMBIA SQUARE  
555 THIRTEENTH STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20004  
202-637-5600  
NEAL.KATYAL@HOGANLOVELLS.COM

ABHA KHANNA  
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP  
1700 SEVENTH AVE.  
SUITE 2100  
SEATTLE, WA 98101  
206-656-0177  
AKHANNA@ELIAS.LAW

JOHN J. KORZEN  
WAKE FOREST UNIV. SCHOOL OF LAW  
APPELLATE ADVOCACY CLINIC  
POST OFFICE BOX 7206  
REYNOLDA STATION  
WINSTON-SALEM, NC 27109  
336-758-5832  
KORZENJJ@WFU.EDU

GARY MICHAEL LAWKOWSKI  
DHILLON LAW GROUP  
2121 EISENHOWER AVENUE  
SUITE 402  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314  
703-965-0330  
GLAWKOWSKI@DHILLONLAW.COM

ROBERT ALLEN LONG  
COVINGTON & BURLING, L.L.P.  
ONE CITYCENTER  
850 TENTH STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001  
202-662-6000  
RLONG@COV.COM

JORGE MARTINEZ-LUCIANO  
ML & RE LAW OFFICE  
COBIAN'S PLAZA  
SUITE 404  
1607 PONCE DE LEON AVE.  
SAN JUAN, PR 00909  
787-999-2972  
JORGE@MIRELAW.COM

JONATHAN F. MITCHELL  
MITCHELL LAW PLLC  
111 CONGRESS AVENUE  
SUITE 400  
AUSTIN , TX 78701  
512-686-3940  
JONATHAN@MITCHELL.LAW

CAMERON THOMAS NORRIS  
CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC  
1600 WILSON BLVD.,  
STE 700  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209  
703-243-9423  
CAM@CONSOVOYMCCARTHY.COM

WILLIAM JEFFREY OLSON  
WILLIAM J. OLSON, PC  
370 MAPLE AVENUE W.  
SUITE 4  
VIENNA, VA 22180  
703-356-5070  
WJO@MINDSPRING.COM

JESUS ARMANDO OSETE  
SECRETARY OF STATE OF MISSOURI  
600 W. MAIN ST.  
JEFFERSON CITY, MO 65101  
573-751-4875  
JESUS.OSETE@SOS.MO.GOV

CARTER G. PHILLIPS  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
1501 K STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
202-736-8270  
CPHILLIPS@SIDLEY.COM

DAVID B. RIVKIN  
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP  
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036  
202-861-1731  
DRIVKIN@BAKERLAW.COM

H. DAVID ROSENBLOOM  
CAPLIN & DRYSDATE  
ONE THOMAS CIRCLE, N.W.  
SUITE 1100  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
202-862-5000  
HDR@CAPDALE.COM

JOSHUA AARON ROSENTHAL  
PUBLIC RIGHTS PROJECT  
490 43RD STREET  
UNIT 115  
OAKLAND, CA 94609  
330-607-0730  
JOSH@PUBLICRIGHTSPROJECT.ORG

CHARLES ROTHFIELD  
MAYER BROWN LLP  
1999 K ST. NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006  
202-263-3233

KARL J. SANDSTROM  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
700 13TH STREET, NW  
8TH FLOOR  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005  
202-654-6202  
KSANDSTROM@PERKINSCOIE.COM

ARI SAVITZKY  
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION  
FOUNDATION  
125 BROAD STREET  
NEW YORK, NY 10004  
212-549-2681  
ASAVCVITKY@ACLU.ORG

ZACHARY CHARLES SCHAUF  
JENNER & BLOCK, LLP  
1099 NEW YORK AVE., NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001  
202-637-6379  
ZSCHAUF@JENNER.COM

PAUL MARCH SMITH  
CAMPAIGN LEGAL CENTER  
1101 14TH STREET, NW  
SUITE 400  
WASHINGTON, 20005  
202-736-2200  
PSMITH@CAMPAIGNLEGALCENTER.ORG

DAVID H. THOMPSON  
COOPER & KIRK, PLLC  
1523 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036  
202-220-9600  
DTHOMPSON@COOPERKIRK.COM

JASON BRETT TORCHINSKY  
HOLTZMAN VOGEL JOSEFIK TORCHINSKY  
PLLC  
15405 JOHN MARSHALL HWY  
HAYMARKET, VA 20169  
540-341-8808  
JTORCHINSKY@HVJT.LAW

MISHA TSEYTLIN  
TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDRS LLP  
227 W. MONROE STREET  
SUITE 3900  
CHICAGO, IL 60606  
312-759-5947  
MISHA.TSEYTLIN@TROUTMAN.COM

DONALD B. VERRILLI  
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP  
601 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE NW  
SUITE 500 E  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001  
202-220-1100  
DONALD.VERRILLI@MTO.COM

DAVID STEVENSON WALKER  
WALKR KIGER, PLLC  
100 PROFESSIONAL CT.  
SUITE 102  
GARNER, NC 27529  
984-200-1930  
STEVEN@WALKERKIGER.COM

SETH P. WAXMAN  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037  
2026636000  
SETH.WAXMAN@WILMERHALE.COM