In this case, there is no evidence that the challenged law either "resulted in" the denial or abridgement of the right to vote or that any such denial or abridgement of the right to vote was "on account of race or color" under Section 2(a). 52 U.S.C. § 10301(a). Lacking a showing of evidence necessary to demonstrate the "sort of causal connection between racial bias and disparate effect necessary to make a vote-denial claim" dooms Plaintiff's claims. *Johnson*, 405 F.3d at 1239 (Tjoflat, J., specially concurring). Nonetheless, Plaintiffs have also submitted evidence that relates to the factors set forth by the Supreme Court in *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 44 (1986).[43] Plaintiffs argue that the district court, in failing to analyze these *Gingles* factors, erred.

The *Gingles* factors provide a way to examine, in certain circumstances, the totality of the circumstances provided for in Section 2(b) of the Voting Rights Act. *Id*. In *Gingles*, the Court stated that "[i]n order to answer this question [posed by 2(b)], a court must assess the impact of the contested structure or practice on minority electoral opportunities on the basis of objective factors." *Id*. (internal quotations omitted). As an initial (and critically important) matter, *Gingles* involved a state's redistricting plan that was challenged as impermissible vote

[43] These factors are also called the "Senate factors" because they were "detailed in a Senate Report accompanying the 1982 amendments." *Johnson*, 405 F.3d at 1227 n.26.