

only applies when a voter arrives at the polls without a valid photo ID and it is only one option available to that voter to be able to cast a vote.

Lastly, Plaintiffs argue that the district court erred “by suggesting that, even if the voucher test were a voting requirement, it would only be invalid if it were used in an ‘improper manner.’” But Plaintiffs mischaracterize the district court’s finding, which specifically states that the court “need not determine whether [the PIP] is being used in an improper manner,” before noting that “evidence on this record shows that it is not.” *Greater Birmingham Ministries*, 284 F.Supp. at 1282–83. The court merely underscored the point that Plaintiffs have not presented any evidence that the PIP was used in an improper manner.

For all of these reasons, we hold that the PIP is valid.

IV. CONCLUSION

The burden of providing a photo ID pursuant to Ala. Code § 17-9-30 in order to vote is a minimal burden on Alabama’s voters—especially when Alabama accepts so many different forms of photo ID and makes acquiring one simple and free for voters who lack a valid ID but wish to obtain one. The Alabama voter ID law does not violate the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the Constitution, nor does it violate the Voting Rights Act.

Because Plaintiffs have failed to identify any genuine disputes of material facts and because no reasonable factfinder could find that Alabama’s voter ID law

is unconstitutionally discriminatory based on the evidence presented, we **AFFIRM** the decision of the district court.