

1 ROB BONTA  
2 Attorney General of California  
3 ANYA M. BINSACCA  
4 LARA HADDAD  
5 Supervising Deputy Attorneys General  
6 RYAN EASON  
7 DAVID GREEN  
8 JENNIFER E. ROSENBERG  
9 S. CLINTON WOODS  
10 IRAM HASAN  
11 Deputy Attorneys General  
12 State Bar No. 320802  
13 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000  
14 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004  
15 Telephone: (415) 510-3793  
16 Fax: (415) 703-5480  
17 E-mail: Iram.Hasan@doj.ca.gov

*18 Attorneys for Defendants California Governor  
19 Gavin Newsom and Secretary of State Shirley  
20 Weber*

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION

DAVID TANGIPA, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

and

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Intervenor

v.

GAVIN NEWSOM, in his official  
capacity as the Governor of California,  
*et al.*,

Defendants,

and

DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL  
CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE, *et al.*,

Defendant-Intervenors.

2:25-cv-10616-JLS-WLH-KKL  
Three-Judge Court

**GOVERNOR NEWSOM AND  
SECRETARY WEBER'S  
NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL  
AUTHORITY**

Judge: Hon. Josephine L.  
Staton, Hon. Kenneth  
K. Lee, and Hon.  
Wesley L. Hsu  
Action Filed: Nov. 5, 2025

1 Defendants respectfully submit this notice regarding the Supreme Court’s  
2 recent order in *Abbott v. League of United Latin American Citizens*, No. 25A608,  
3 2025 WL 3484863 (U.S. Dec. 4, 2025), granting a stay of a three-judge court’s  
4 decision to preliminarily enjoin Texas’s new congressional district map pending  
5 appeal. For several reasons, that per curiam order shows that Plaintiffs and  
6 Plaintiff-Intervenors (together, Challengers) cannot succeed on the merits of their  
7 claims. As argued in Defendants’ opposition (ECF No. 113), Challengers’ motions  
8 for preliminary injunction should be denied.

9 The Court’s order begins by emphasizing that both Texas and California have  
10 “redrawn their congressional districts in ways that are predicted to favor the State’s  
11 dominant political party.” *Abbott*, 2025 WL 3484863 at \*1. Echoing the  
12 arguments that Defendants have made in explaining that Proposition 50 was a  
13 partisan gerrymander, the Court recognized that “Texas adopted the first new map,  
14 *then California responded with its own map for the stated purpose of counteracting*  
15 *what Texas had done.*” *Id.* (emphasis added); *see* Defs.’ Br., ECF No. 113. In a  
16 concurrence, Justices Alito, Thomas, and Gorsuch explained that “it is  
17 *indisputable*” that “the impetus for the adoption for the Texas map (*like the map*  
18 *subsequently adopted in California*) was partisan advantage pure and simple.”  
19 *Abbott*, 2025 WL 3484863 at \*1. (Alito, J., concurring) (emphasis added).  
20 Challengers’ motions must fail for this reason alone.

21 The Court’s opinion requires denial of the motions for preliminary injunctions  
22 in at least three other ways. First, it concludes that the Texas court committed  
23 “serious error[]” by “fail[ing] to honor the presumption of legislative good faith”  
24 when it “constru[ed] ambiguous direct and circumstantial evidence against the  
25 legislature.” *Abbott*, 2025 WL 3484863 at \*1. Challengers ask this Court to  
26 commit that same “serious error[]” here. *See* Defs.’ Br. at 3, 14-15, 36-37.

27 Second, the Court made clear that it is too late for court-ordered changes to  
28 electoral districts when there is “an active primary campaign underway,” as such

1 court-ordered changes threaten “much confusion” and will “upset[] the delicate  
2 federal-state balance in elections.” *Abbott*, 2025 WL 3484863 at \*1. California,  
3 like Texas, “needs certainty on which map will govern the 2026 midterm  
4 elections.” *Id.* (Alito, J., concurring). Indeed, signature collection for California’s  
5 congressional primaries begins in just 9 days, on December 19. *See* Defs.’ Br. 46;  
6 *see also id.* at 45.

7 Third, the Court reiterated that a “dispositive or near-dispositive adverse  
8 inference” must be drawn when a plaintiff fails to “produce a viable alternative map  
9 that [meets] the State’s . . . partisan goals.” *Abbott*, 2025 WL 3484863 at \*1. Here,  
10 Challengers have made no attempt to submit alternative maps for all but one  
11 district, and the purported alternative maps submitted with respect to District 13  
12 result in minimal or no improvement in Democratic performance—the partisan  
13 objective that the State plainly sought to achieve. *See* Defs.’ Br. at 36-37. That too  
14 is fatal to Challengers’ request for preliminary injunctive relief.

15 At bottom, Challengers fail “to disentangle race and politics,” *Abbott*, 2025  
16 WL 3484863 at \*2 (Alito, J., concurring) (citing *Alexander v. South Carolina St.*  
17 *Conf. of the NAACP*, 602 U.S. 1, 6 (2024)), and thus cannot meet their high burden  
18 to show that race predominated in the Proposition 50 map. That is an incurable  
19 shortcoming, as demonstrated by the record developed thus far. And as the  
20 Supreme Court’s order makes clear, Challengers’ claims will fare no better on  
21 appeal.

22     ///

23     ///

24     ///

25     ///

26     ///

27     ///

28     ///

1 Dated: December 10, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

2 ROB BONTA  
3 Attorney General of California  
4 ANYA M. BINSACCA  
5 LARA HADDAD  
6 Supervising Deputy Attorneys General  
7 RYAN EASON  
8 DAVID GREEN  
9 JENNIFER E. ROSENBERG  
10 S. CLINTON WOODS  
11 Deputy Attorneys General

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
/s/ *Iram Hasan*  
IRAM HASAN  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Attorneys for Defendants California*  
*Governor Gavin Newsom and*  
*Secretary of State Shirley Weber*