

The Supreme Court Update - April 29, 2026

by Andrew Brantingham, Ian Blodger, Jessica M. Leano, and Brock Huebner

On April 29, 2026, the Supreme Court of the United States issued two decisions:

Louisiana v. Callais, No. 24-109: This decision involving two consolidated appeals addresses whether the Voting Rights Act can provide a compelling reason for race-based districting. In 2022, a federal district judge in Louisiana held that a new redistricting map adopted by the Louisiana State Legislature likely violated section 2 of the Voting Rights Act ("Section 2"), 52 U.S.C. § 1031 et seq., because it did not include an additional majority-black district. Louisiana drew up a new map, SB8, containing such a district, which was then challenged as an unconstitutional racial gerrymander in violation of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution. A three-judge panel of federal district judges held that SB8 was a racial gerrymander, and Louisiana appealed to the Supreme Court. In a 6-3 decision authored by Justice Alito, the Court held that the Voting Rights Act did not require Louisiana to create an additional majority-minority district, no compelling interest justified Louisiana's use of race in creating SB8, and SB8 is an unconstitutional racial gerrymander. In the majority's view of Section 2, the Court starts with the "general rule that the Constitution almost never permits the Federal Government or a State to discriminate on the basis of race." Section 2 guarantees minority voters an opportunity to contribute their votes to their preferred candidate, but voters' opportunity to contribute their votes to a winning cause is "whatever opportunity results from the application of the State's combination of permissible districting criteria." The majority held that Section 2 imposes liability only where the circumstances give rise to a strong inference that intentional discrimination occurred. Justice Thomas filed a concurring opinion joined by Justice Gorsuch. Justice Kagan filed a dissent, joined by Justices Sotomayor and Jackson, arguing that the majority's interpretation of Section 2 permits a state to "systematically dilute minority citizens' voting power."

View the Court's [decision](#).

First Choice Women's Resource Centers, Inc. v. Davenport, No. 24-781: This case

Related People

- Andrew Brantingham
- Ian Blodger
- Jessica M. Leano
- Brock Huebner

Related Capabilities

- Appellate

addresses whether an organization that is the subject of a subpoena seeking the identities of its donors has standing to challenge the subpoena under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, even where a court has not yet issued an order compelling production of the requested information. First Choice Women's Resource Centers, Inc. ("First Choice") is a religious nonprofit organization that provides counseling and resources to pregnant women in New Jersey. First Choice believes life begins at conception and the group does not provide abortions or refer clients to others for abortions. In 2022, the New Jersey Attorney General issued a subpoena to First Choice commanding the group to produce, among other things, documents reflecting the names, phone numbers, addresses, and places of employment of individuals who made donations to First Choice. First Choice filed suit in federal district court under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, arguing that the Attorney General's subpoena for donor information violated its First Amendment rights and that being forced to provide this information would discourage donors from associating with the group. The district court dismissed the complaint, holding that the group had not suffered an injury because the state court had not yet issued an order compelling production. The Third Circuit affirmed. In a unanimous decision authored by Justice Gorsuch, the Supreme Court reversed, holding that First Choice has established a present injury to its First Amendment associational rights sufficient to confer Article III standing. The Court noted that the demand for donor information inevitably discourages associations with groups engaged in protected First Amendment advocacy, and that such discouragement exists as long as the demand is outstanding, not just when it is enforced through a court order.

View the Court's [decision](#).

On Monday, April 27, the Supreme Court of the United States granted certiorari in one case:

Department of Labor v. Sun Valley Orchards, LLC, No. 25-966: This case concerns the scope of the Department of Labor's ("DOL") power to adjudicate claims and to issue monetary penalties for violations of seasonal farm worker visa programs. The Third Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the DOL was required to file suit in federal district court, rather than relying on administrative proceedings. The questions presented are: (1) Whether Article III of the Constitution precludes the DOL from adjudicating proceedings to collect monetary remedies from employers who have allegedly violated the terms and conditions of employment of H-2A workers and domestic workers in corresponding employment; and (2) whether 8 U.S.C. § 1188(g)(2) authorizes the DOL to adjudicate proceedings to collect monetary remedies from employers who have allegedly violated the terms and conditions of employment of H-2A workers and domestic workers in corresponding employment.