



NATIONAL VOTING RIGHTS INSTITUTE

FACT SHEET: Background on Parties to the Case

For the first time since its decision in Buckley v. Valeo nearly 30 years ago, the Supreme Court has agreed to review the constitutionality of campaign spending limits. The case, Randall v. Sorrell, No. 04-1528, raises issues that go to the heart of our democracy. Vermont's comprehensive reform law was adopted in 1997 out of concern over the escalating arms race in campaign fundraising and spending that has undermined public confidence in government and turned elected officials into full-time fundraisers.

This fact sheet provides background on the parties in the case.

The plaintiffs challenging Vermont's reforms include the Vermont Right-to-Life Committee and the Vermont Republican State Committee, represented by Bopp, Coleson & Bostrom, and a group of candidates and donors represented by Vermont ACLU cooperating attorneys.

The State of Vermont is represented by the Vermont Attorney General, William H. Sorrell.

The National Voting Rights Institute represents a coalition of defendant-intervenors who supported Vermont's reform law, including Vermont Public Interest Research Group, League of Women Voters of Vermont, Rural Vermont, Vermont Older Women's League, Vermont Alliance of Conservation Voters, former Senator Cheryl Rivers, former State Auditor Elizabeth Ready, former Representative Marion Milne, former Vermont governor Phil Hoff, Mike Fiorillo, Frank Huard, Daryl Pillsbury, Nancy Rice, and Maria Thompson. The National Voting Rights Institute is a non-partisan, nonprofit organization that seeks full and meaningful political participation for all, regardless of income. Thomas Goldstein of Goldstein & Howe, Washington, D.C., and Scott Lewis and James Hlawek of Palmer & Dodge LLP, Boston, MA, will also serve as co-counsel for defendant-intervenors.

The cases before the Court are *Randall v. Sorrell*, No. 04-1528, *Vermont Republican State Committee v. Sorrell*, No. 04-1530, and *Sorrell v. Randall*, No. 04-1697, all of which have been consolidated for argument. Argument is expected to be scheduled during the February or March terms of the Court.