- 1. Complaint (redacted)
  - UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

Plaintiff, Pro Se

-V-

State of Connecticut c/o Secretary of the State 450 Columbus Blvd Hartford, CT 06103 and

Connecticut Reapportionment Commission c/o Office of Legislative Management State Capitol

Hartford, CT 06106

Defendants.

Case No.: [To be assigned by the Court]

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND DAMAGES

INTRODUCTION

•

- Plaintiff, [redacted], a registered voter in Connecticut, brings this action pro se to challenge the constitutionality of the 2020 congressional district maps, seeking fair representation for all voters.
- This lawsuit seeks declaratory and injunctive relief to invalidate the current congressional district maps adopted following the 2020 census, compensatory damages to be

determined, and a precedent to compel fair redistricting.

- JURISDICTION AND VENUE
  - 3. This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (federal question jurisdiction) due to claims arising under the U.S. Constitution and 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for deprivation of rights under color of state law. This includes potential violations of the Voting Rights Act due to vote dilution within diverse voter blocs.
  - 4. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) as Defendants reside in Connecticut, and the events giving rise to this claim occurred here.
- **PARTIES**
- 5. Plaintiff [redacted] is a citizen of the United States and a resident of [redacted], Connecticut, registered to vote, and directly affected by the challenged redistricting. Plaintiff resides in [redacted], where his votes have been consistently nullified by the current map's design, causing direct harm.
- 6. Defendant State of Connecticut, through its Secretary of the State, oversees election administration and redistricting compliance under Conn. Gen. Stat. § 9-3.

7. Defendant Connecticut Reapportionment Commission is responsible for drawing congressional and state legislative districts pursuant to Conn. Const. Art. VI, § 4.

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

8. Following the 2020 census, Connecticut retained five congressional seats, with district maps redrawn and adopted by the Reapportionment Commission. These maps have resulted in a 5-0 Democratic delegation in the U.S. House of Representatives for the 2022 and 2024 election cycles, despite approximately 41% of the state's voters supporting Republican candidates in recent elections (e.g., 40.8% for the gubernatorial race in 2022, per Connecticut Secretary of State records).

9. Historical redistricting records, including the 2001 map drawn by a bipartisan commission to protect incumbents (documented in Connecticut State Library archives), and the 2011 redistricting following the prior census, show a pattern of gerrymandering that has evolved to exclude competitive districts.

10. Voter data from the Connecticut Secretary of State indicates that in the 2022 midterm elections, candidates opposing the dominant delegation averaged 39-42% of the vote across districts, yet no seat was won, suggesting potential vote dilution.

- 11. The current maps interact with social and historical conditions to cause an inequality in the opportunity to elect preferred representatives.
- 12. Adverse laws passed by the current Congress, such as regulatory expansions, may disproportionately affect underrepresented voters due to the lack of balanced representation.
- LEGAL CLAIMS
  - COUNT I: VIOLATION OF THE EQUAL PROTECTION **CLAUSE (14TH AMENDMENT)** 
    - 13. The gerrymandered maps violate the Equal Protection Clause by diluting the voting strength of approximately 41% of the electorate, denying equal protection. Reynolds v. Sims (377 U.S. 533, 1964) established the "one person, one vote" principle, which is breached here by the 5-0 outcome despite significant support.
  - COUNT II: VIOLATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT (FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION)

By excluding representation for a substantial voter bloc, the maps infringe on the right to associate with chosen representatives and have that association reflected in Congress, as recognized in Benisek v. Lamone (585 U.S. 897, 2018).

COUNT III: VIOLATION OF ARTICLE I, SECTION 2

Article I, Section 2 mandates that representatives be chosen "by the People," implying a process free from undue interference. The current maps subvert this principle, as held in Wesberry v. Sanders (376 U.S. 1, 1964), by failing to reflect the electorate's diversity.

 COUNT IV: VIOLATION OF THE CONNECTICUT CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE VI, SECTION 4

•

Article VI, Section 4 requires electoral districts to ensure fair representation. The Reapportionment Commission's maps, criticized historically, dilute voter strength, breaching state constitutional standards.

## RELIEF SOUGHT

•

## 17. Plaintiff requests:

- a. A declaratory judgment that the current congressional district maps are unconstitutional and violate state law.
- b. Injunctive relief to invalidate the maps and order a nonpartisan redraw.
- c. Compensatory damages to be determined for loss of voting rights and policy impacts.
- d. A precedent to guide fair redistricting nationwide.
- e. Costs and any further relief the Court deems just.

## EVIDENCE

•

18. Voter Data: 2022 Connecticut election results show 39-42% support, per Secretary of State records (ct.gov/sots).

•

19. Historical Records: 2001 and 2011 redistricting documents indicate potential manipulation, available via the Connecticut State Library (ctstatelibrary.org).

- 20. Policy Impacts: Examples include regulatory expansions, documented in federal legislative records (congress.gov).
- PRAYER FOR RELIEF WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court:
  - a. Declare the current congressional maps unconstitutional and violative of state law.
  - b. Issue an injunction to redraw the maps.
  - c. Award compensatory damages to be determined.
  - d. Establish a precedent for fair redistricting.
  - e. Grant costs and further relief as appropriate.

•	Respectfully submitted,

At A hel

Pro Se Plaintiff

Date: August 11, 2025