

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Malliotakis v. Williams

607 U.S. ____ (2026) · No. 25A914 · Decided March 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The Supreme Court granted applications for a stay of a New York trial-court order requiring the redrawing of a congressional district, pending state-court proceedings and possible review by the Supreme Court. Justice Alito concurred, reasoning that the order likely violated the Equal Protection Clause and that the Court had jurisdiction and authority under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1257(a) and 1651(a). Justice Sotomayor, joined by Justices Kagan and Jackson, dissented, arguing that the Court lacked jurisdiction, improperly interfered with state-court proceedings, and acted inconsistently with federalism and the Purcell principle.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of the United States
JURISDICTION	Supreme Court of the United States
DECIDED	March 2, 2026
DOCKET	25A914
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Applicants sought emergency stays of a New York trial court order requiring the redrawing of a congressional district while appeals proceeded in the New York courts and, if timely sought, a petition for certiorari proceeded in this Court.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The Court's order did not state a standard of review. Justice Alito's concurrence discussed jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1257(a) and authority to issue a stay under the All Writs Act.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Emergency stay order; the per curiam order is unexplained, and jurisdictional and merits reasoning appears in separate opinions.
PARTIES	Nicole Malliotakis, et al., Peter Kosinski, et al. v. Michael Williams, et al.

TOPICS

- redistricting
- equal protection
- election administration
- appellate jurisdiction
- federalism

PRACTICE AREAS

constitutional law

election law

redistricting

appellate procedure

federalism

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether to stay the January 21, 2026 order of the Supreme Court of New York, New York County, pending disposition of the state-court appeal and any timely petition for certiorari.
2. Whether the Supreme Court of the United States had jurisdiction and authority to grant emergency relief from the New York trial court order.

HOLDINGS

1. The applications for stay were granted, and the January 21, 2026 order of the Supreme Court of New York, New York County, was stayed pending disposition of the appeal in the New York state courts and disposition of a timely petition for certiorari, if sought.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The applications for stay presented to JUSTICE SOTOMAYOR and by her referred to the Court are granted.” (607 U.S. ____ (2026), order at 1)

“The January 21, 2026 order entered by the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, Index No. 164002/2025, is stayed pending the disposition of the appeal in the New York state courts and disposition of a petition for a writ of certiorari in this Court, if such a writ is timely sought.” (607 U.S. ____ (2026), order at 1)

“The same is true here: The New York Court of Appeals’ decision not to grant a stay or hear a direct appeal was effectively a final determination on the merits of the applicants’ claim that the outstanding injunction is depriving them of their constitutional rights pending appeal.” (607 U.S. ____ (2026), Alito concurrence at 3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The New York Supreme Court concluded that the existing lines of New York's Eleventh Congressional District diluted Black and Latino votes in violation of the New York Constitution. It enjoined the existing congressional map and ordered the Independent Redistricting Commission to draw a new crossover congressional district designed to enable minority voters to elect preferred candidates. At the time of the Supreme Court's order, no new district had yet been drawn.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

New York voters challenged the lines of New York's Eleventh Congressional District under the New York Constitution. After a four-day trial, the Supreme Court of New York, New York County, entered an order on January 21, 2026, enjoining the existing congressional map and directing the Independent Redistricting Commission to draw a new crossover district. The applicants appealed in the New York courts and sought stays. The Supreme Court of the United States granted the emergency applications and stayed the January 21 order pending disposition of the state-court appeal and any timely certiorari petition.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President and Fellows of Harvard College*, 600 U.S. 181, 206–208 (2023)
- *National Socialist Party of America v. Skokie*, 432 U.S. 43, 43–44 (1977) (per curiam)
- *Atlantic Coast Line R. Co. v. Locomotive Engineers*, 398 U.S. 281, 295 (1970)
- *Purcell v. Gonzalez*, 549 U.S. 1 (2006) (per curiam)
- *Merrill v. Milligan*, 595 U.S. ____ (2022)
- *Jefferson v. City of Tarrant*, 522 U.S. 75, 81 (1997)
- *Yeshiva Univ. v. YU Pride Alliance*, 597 U.S. ____ (2022)
- *New Jersey Transit Corp. v. Colt*, 606 U.S. 1051 (2025)
- *Bartlett v. Strickland*, 556 U.S. 1, 18, 21 (2009)
- *Bethune-Hill v. Virginia State Bd. of Elections*, 580 U.S. 178, 192 (2017)
- *Allen v. Milligan*, 599 U.S. 1, 23 (2023)
- *United States v. New York*, 2022 WL 1473259, *1 (N.D.N.Y. May 10, 2022)
- *Harkenrider v. Hochul*, 38 N.Y.3d 494, 522, 197 N.E.3d 437, 454–455 (2022)