

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Nos. 92-519, 92-593 AND 92-767

BOLLEY JOHNSON, SPEAKER OF THE FLORIDA HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES,
ET AL., APPELLANTS
92-519 v.
MIGUEL DE GRANDY ET AL.

MIGUEL DE GRANDY, ET AL., APPELLANTS
92-593 v.
BOLLEY JOHNSON, SPEAKER OF THE FLORIDA HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES, ET AL.

UNITED STATES, APPELLANT
92-767 v.
FLORIDA ET AL.

ON APPEALS FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
[June 30, 1994]

JUSTICE THOMAS, with whom JUSTICE SCALIA joins,
dissenting.

For the reasons I explain in *Holder v. Hall, ante*, I would vacate the judgment of the District Court and remand with instructions to dismiss the actions consolidated in these cases for failure to state a claim under §2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. 42 U. S. C. §1973. Each of the actions consolidated in these cases asserted that Florida's apportionment plan diluted the vote of a minority group. In accordance with the views I express in *Holder*, I would hold that an apportionment plan is not a "standard, practice, or procedure" that may be challenged under §2. I therefore respectfully dissent.