

January 19, 2021

The Federal Contested Elections Act: Overview and Recent Contests in the House of Representatives

The Federal Contested Elections Act (FCEA; 2 U.S.C. §§ 381-396), enacted in 1969, rests at the intersection of federal election law and policy, legislative procedure, and constitutional provisions regarding congressional authority over House elections and membership. This CRS In Focus provides a brief overview of the FCEA and highlights recent contests initiated under the statute. FCEA contests rarely change election results, as doing so typically requires the House to overturn a state-certified election result.

The FCEA covers general election or runoff races for the U.S. House of Representatives (including elections for Delegate and Resident Commissioner). Pursuing a contest under the FCEA does not preclude other options that might be available to candidates under state law, through litigation, or by other methods prescribed by the House. Specifically, although an election contest may be initiated in other ways—for example, by a floor challenge to a Member’s right to be sworn in—in modern practice, the FCEA is the primary method by which election contests come before the House. As such, other contest methods generally are not discussed here.

What is a Contested Election?

Generally, *contested elections* entail reexamining election conduct, such as ballot-counting or other election and voting procedures, after an election jurisdiction has finalized, or *certified*, the results. Contests are distinct from the standard *canvass* process used to verify election results and from *recounts*, *audits*, or other processes used to verify election accuracy, although investigations accompanying contests can involve recounts or audits.

Constitutional Framework

The Elections Clause of the U.S. Constitution empowers the states with the initial and principal authority to administer the “Times, Places and Manner” of federal elections within their jurisdictions (Art. I, § 4, cl. 1). At the same time, the Elections Clause provides Congress with overriding authority to “make or alter” such state laws. Thus, congressional election recounts or challenges are typically conducted at the state level, including in state courts, and then presented to the House of Representatives.

Under the Constitution, each house of Congress has the express authority to be the final judge of the “Elections, Returns and Qualifications” of its Members (Art. I, § 5, cl. 1). The Supreme Court has held that, in so judging these elections, Congress’s determination of the right to a seat is “a nonjusticiable political question,” resulting in “an unconditional and final judgment” (*Roudebush v. Hartke*, 405 U.S. 15, 19 (1972)). The Court has also observed that in the context of election contests, each house of Congress

“acts as a judicial tribunal” (*Barry v. United States*, 279 U.S. 597, 616 (1929)). Consistent with these Supreme Court rulings, the House, in considering contested elections, has at times accepted state counts, recounts, or other state determinations, whereas at others it has conducted its own recounts and made its own determinations and findings.

Overview of the FCEA

Key Terms. Two key terms—contestant and contestee—are integral to understanding the FCEA. The *contestant* is the candidate who brings the complaint (2 U.S.C. § 381(3)). The *contestee* is the responding candidate, typically the state-certified winner (2 U.S.C. § 381(4)).

Filing a Contest. Contests must be filed with the Clerk of the House within 30 days after the relevant state election authority (e.g., the secretary of state or a canvassing board) has declared the results, and must state “with particularity” the grounds for contesting the election (2 U.S.C. § 382). The FCEA specifies various requirements for the contents of the notice to contest and the service of notice on the contestee. The contestee has 30 days to respond, although failure to respond “shall not be deemed an admission of the truth” of the contest claims by the contestee (2 U.S.C. § 381(5)). Even before providing a written answer, a contestee could raise several defenses to the contest, for example, that the contestant lacks standing to bring a contest under the act (3 U.S.C. § 383).

Even where there is little question of the outcome, FCEA’s procedural timelines typically preclude the House from disposing of contests for at least the first few months of a new Congress. More complicated contests, although rare, can require substantial time to take depositions, conduct investigations, or seek assistance from state authorities or legislative support agencies (e.g., the Government Accountability Office (GAO)) to conduct audits or recounts.

Burden of Proof. Simply objecting to the election results is insufficient for a successful FCEA claim. Rather, “the burden is upon contestant to prove that the election results entitle him to contestee’s seat” (2 U.S.C. § 385). Therefore, the contestant must demonstrate that, but for voting irregularities or acts of alleged fraud, the contestant would have prevailed. (See, e.g., *Pierce v. Pursell*, H.Rept. 95-245 (1977).) In addition, although the House has broad authority over its elections, a state-issued election certificate generally provides *prima facie* evidence of the regularity and results of an election to the House (*Deschler’s Precedents of the United States House of Representatives*, H. Doc. 94-661, 94th Cong., 2nd sess., (Washington: GPO, 1994) vol. 2, ch. 8, § 15).

Pocket Constitution



The Declaration of Independence
The Constitution of the United States
The Bill of Rights
Amendments XI–XXVII
Gettysburg Address



TheCapitolNet

TCNFPC.com

Committee of Jurisdiction. House Rule X and the FCEA (2 U.S.C. §381(7)) assign the Committee on House Administration jurisdiction over contests filed under the act. The committee may establish task forces or subcommittees to assist it in its work.

Legislative Procedure and the FCEA

While election contests are pending, the House may provisionally seat the contestee. In rare instances, the House has directed that a seat remain vacant pending the outcome of an investigation (Charles W. Johnson, John V. Sullivan, Thomas J. Wickham, Jr., *Precedents of the United States House of Representatives*, Vol. 1, House Doc. 115-62, 115th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: GPO, 2018), ch. 2, §§, 2.0, 2.3, pp. 174, 177-178).

Resolutions disposing of election contests are privileged for consideration under House rules and debate on such a resolution is under the Hour Rule, with extensions of time permitted by unanimous consent. Such resolutions might resolve the case in various ways, including dismissing the contest; declaring one of the parties entitled to the seat; or directing the returns from the election be rejected, that the seat be declared vacant, and that a new election be held. If not a sitting Member, the contestant in an election contest may be permitted on the floor during the consideration of the case in the House but must abide by the rules of proper decorum. Such an individual may not participate in debate. A sitting Member may debate, may insert remarks in the Record, and may vote on the resolution disposing of the contest (Charles W. Johnson, John V. Sullivan, Thomas J. Wickham, Jr., *House Practice, A Guide to the Rules, Precedents and Procedures of the House* (Washington: GPO, 2017), ch. 22, §6, p. 495).

Selected Contests Brought Under the FCEA

House candidates who lose an election according to state-certified results rarely prevail under the FCEA. As discussed above, the burden of proof is on the contestant to show entitlement to the seat, and contestants fail to overcome motions to dismiss in most contests. Selected examples of prominent and recent contests appear below.

Most recent contests: As of this writing media reports suggest that two FCEA contests have been filed in the 117th Congress. One concerns the Iowa 2nd District; the other concerns the Illinois 14th District. Before the current Congress, the House has not considered FCEA contests since the 113th Congress (2013-2014). At that time, the House dismissed contests to 2012 election results in California (H.Res. 278), Tennessee (H.Res. 277), and Texas (H.Res. 127).

Jennings-Buchanan: 110th Congress. The FCEA contest to the 2006 Florida 13th District race focused on “undervotes” (ballots without a marked choice in the congressional race) and voting equipment in Sarasota County. Ms. Jennings contested the state-certified results of the open-seat race under the FCEA. The House seated Mr. Buchanan while considering the contest. A Committee on House Administration Task Force directed GAO to investigate

whether voting machine malfunctions had affected the election outcome. In February 2008, the House confirmed Florida’s certification of Representative Buchanan’s victory and dismissed the contest (110th Cong., H.Res. 989; see also H.Rept. 110-528).

Dornan-Sanchez: 105th Congress. Then-Representative Robert Dornan filed an FCEA contest to Representative-elect Loretta Sanchez’s certified victory in the 46th District of California in 1996. The House seated Ms. Sanchez while considering the contest. A Committee on House Administration Task Force determined that more than 700 votes had been improperly cast in the election, but that the number was insufficient to change the election results. Congressional consideration of the contest, which paralleled state and federal investigations, lasted until February 1998. The House dismissed the contest (105th Cong., H.Res. 355; see also H.Rept. 105-416).

Non-FCEA Contests and Other Disputes

Since Congress enacted the FCEA in 1969, this method appears to be the most common for contesting House election results. There are, however, other options, separate from the FCEA, to bring contests within the House (in addition to litigation or state processes). In particular, a Member-elect may challenge the right of another to be sworn in, usually when the House convenes for a new Congress. The most prominent such example in recent history concerned the 1984 election in Indiana’s 8th District. This contest, between candidates McCloskey and McIntyre, was perhaps the most contentious in modern House history. The Indiana Secretary of State certified Mr. McIntyre as Representative-elect after a recount reversed incumbent McCloskey’s 72-vote election day lead. Neither candidate was sworn in, pending an investigation of the contest. A Committee on House Administration Task Force found various inconsistencies in state election practices and ordered a GAO-administered recount that yielded a four-vote victory for Mr. McCloskey. The House seated Representative McCloskey and dismissed the contest in May 1985 (99th Cong., H.Res. 146; see also H.Rept. 99-58).

Even high-profile election disputes do not necessarily result in contests that the House considers. In some cases, candidates choose to contest election results under state law, or circumstances outside Congress might render a potential contest moot. For example, after an investigation of absentee ballot practices in North Carolina in 2018, the State Board of Elections ordered a new election for the 9th District House seat. The Committee on House Administration noted that it was monitoring developments in the case. However, no FCEA contest was filed.

R. Sam Garrett, Specialist in American National Government

L. Paige Whitaker, Legislative Attorney

Christopher M. Davis, Analyst on Congress and the Legislative Process

IF11734

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.

Learn how Capitol Hill really works

All of our programs and any combination of their topics can be tailored for custom training for your organization.

For more than 40 years, TheCapitol.Net and its predecessor, Congressional Quarterly Executive Conferences, have been teaching professionals from government, military, business, and NGOs about the dynamics and operations of the legislative and executive branches and how to work with them.

Our training, on-site and online, and publications include congressional operations, legislative and budget process, communication and advocacy, media and public relations, research, testifying before Congress, legislative drafting, critical thinking and writing, and more.

- **Diverse Client Base**—We have tailored hundreds of custom on-site and online training programs for Congress, numerous agencies in all federal departments, the military, law firms, lobbying firms, unions, think tanks and NGOs, foreign delegations, associations and corporations, delivering exceptional insight into how Washington works.™
- **Experienced Program Design and Delivery**—We have designed and delivered hundreds of custom programs covering congressional/legislative operations, budget process, media training, writing skills, legislative drafting, advocacy, research, testifying before Congress, grassroots, and more.
- **Professional Materials**—We provide training materials and publications that show how Washington works. Our publications are designed both as course materials and as invaluable reference tools.
- **Large Team of Experienced Faculty**—More than 150 faculty members provide independent subject matter expertise. Each program is designed using the best faculty member for each session.
- **Non-Partisan**—TheCapitol.Net is non-partisan.
- **GSA Schedule**—TheCapitol.Net is on the GSA Schedule for custom training: GSA Contract GS02F0192X.

Please see our Capability Statement on our web site at TCNCS.com.

Custom training programs are designed to meet your educational and training goals, each led by independent subject-matter experts best qualified to help you reach your educational objectives and align with your audience.

As part of your custom program, we can also provide online venue, classroom space, breaks and meals, receptions, tours, and online registration and individual attendee billing services.


For more information about custom on-site training for your organization, please see our web site: TCNCustom.com or call us: 202-678-1600, ext 115.



TheCapitol.Net

Non-partisan training and publications that show how Washington works.™

PO Box 25706, Alexandria, VA 22313-5706
202-678-1600 • www.thecapitol.net



TheCapitol.Net is on the GSA Schedule for custom training.
GSA Contract GS02F0192X

