

Order Adopting Recommended Ruling.

Plaintiff commenced this action against Defendants State of Connecticut and the Connecticut Reapportionment Commission, challenging Connecticut's 2020 congressional district maps as unconstitutionally gerrymandered, in alleged violation of Article I of the U.S. Constitution, the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, and the Connecticut Constitution. See generally ECF No. 1. For the reasons set forth below, and having considered Plaintiff's objection to Judge Garcia's recommended ruling ("RR"), the Court adopts the RR in full.

If a party objects to a magistrate judge's recommended ruling, the Court must "determine de novo any part of the magistrate's disposition that has been properly objected to." Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 72(b)(3); see also D. Conn. Local Rule 72.2(b). First, the Court agrees with Judge Garcia that the Eleventh Amendment bars Plaintiff's claims against the State of Connecticut. The Eleventh Amendment bars claims against states and their agencies "regardless of the nature of the relief sought." *Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Halderman*, 465 U.S. 89, 100 (1984). This jurisdictional bar, however, does not apply to claims brought against state actors in their official capacities where the plaintiff seeks prospective injunctive relief from continuing violations of law. See *id.* at 102; *Edelman v. Jordan*, 415 U.S. 651, 663 (1974); *Ex Parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908). Plaintiff clarifies in his objection that he seeks injunctive relief against the secretary of state, see ECF No. 1 (naming as a defendant "State of Connecticut c/o Secretary of State"), insofar as he asks the Court to invalidate the congressional district maps. Such a claim might ordinarily overcome the Eleventh Amendment bar, as Plaintiff alleges both an ongoing violation of federal law and seeks injunctive relief to discontinue that violation. But it is unclear whether the secretary of state is an intended party, given that she is unnamed, and the complaint does not indicate whether she is being sued in her official or individual capacity (though the allegations imply an official-capacity claim).

In any event, the Court need not resolve this issue because Plaintiff's federal claims fail for the reasons discussed below. Judge Garcia properly found that Plaintiff's claims brought under the First and Fourteenth Amendments and Article I are not justiciable. The U.S. Supreme Court has held that claims of partisan gerrymandering "present political questions beyond the reach of the federal courts" and that federal courts lack authority to reallocate political power among political parties. *Rucho v. Common Cause*, 588 U.S. 684, 718 (2019). Thus, to the extent that Plaintiff asks this Court to order Defendants to redraw Connecticut's districting maps or otherwise declare them invalid, it lacks authority to do so. Plaintiff contends in his objection that the 2020 congressional district maps -- and resulting election of five Democrats -- led to the passage of the Clean Energy Future Act, which has in turn increased utility rates for constituents. Plaintiff attaches a copy of his utility bills and argues that this case implicates federal interests, including matters affecting interstate commerce and energy policy. The Court notes that Plaintiff did not raise these allegations in his complaint and they are therefore improper objections. Additionally, since these new allegations spring from Plaintiff's challenge to the congressional district maps, they still raise political questions that cannot be decided by this Court. With respect to Plaintiff's state claim, Judge Garcia properly declined to exercise supplemental jurisdiction, as Plaintiff's federal claims were dismissed. See *Motorola Credit Corporation v. Uzan*, 388 F.3d 39, 56 (2d Cir. 2004); 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c). Declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction will promote the values of judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity. See *Catzin v. Thank You & Good*

Luck Corp., 899 F.3d 77, 85 (2d Cir. 2018). In particular, the Connecticut state courts are best equipped to address potential violations of the Connecticut Constitution, and it does not promote judicial economy for the federal court to retain jurisdiction over a case that would raise purely state law constitutional claims, given that the federal claims have been dismissed.

Accordingly, the Court adopts Judge Garcia's R&R in full. Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed without leave to amend. As the reasons for this dismissal are substantive and would not be curable through better pleading, the Court denies Plaintiff's request to amend the complaint. See *Cuoco v. Moritsugu*, 222 F.3d 99, 112 (2d Cir. 2000). The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case. Signed by Judge Sarala V. Nagala on 1/20/2026. (Glover, S) (Entered: 01/20/2026)