AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

(c) When the rules for determining when such a practice or procedure will be implemented are changed.

The failure of the Attorney General to object to a recurrent practice or procedure constitutes preclearance of the future use of the practice or procedure if its recurrent nature is clearly stated or described in the submission or is expressly recognized in the final response of the Attorney General on the merits of the submission.

§ 51.15 Enabling legislation and contingent or nonuniform requirements.

(a) With respect to legislation (1) that enables or permits the State or its political subunits to institute a voting change or (2) that requires or enables the State or its political sub-units to institute a voting change upon some future event or if they satisfy certain criteria, the failure of the Attorney General to interpose an objection does not exempt from the preclearance requirement the implementation of the particular voting change that is enabled, permitted, or required, unless that implementation is explicitly included and described in the submission of such parent legislation.

(b) For example, such legislation includes—

(1) Legislation authorizing counties, cities, school districts, or agencies or officials of the State to institute any of the changes described in § 51.13,

(2) Legislation requiring a political subunit that chooses a certain form of government to follow specified election procedures,

(3) Legislation requiring or authorizing political subunits of a certain size or a certain location to institute specified changes,

(4) Legislation requiring a political subunit to follow certain practices or procedures unless the subunit's charter or ordinances specify to the contrary.

§ 51.16 Distinction between changes in procedure and changes in substance.

The failure of the Attorney General to interpose an objection to a procedure for instituting a change affecting voting does not exempt the substantive change from the preclearance requirement. For example, if the procedure for the approval of an annexation is changed from city council approval to approval in a referendum, the preclearance of the new procedure does not exempt an annexation accomplished under the new procedure from the preclearance requirement.

§ 51.17 Special elections.

(a) The conduct of a special election (e.g., an election to fill a vacancy; an initiative, referendum, or recall election; or a bond issue election) is subject to the preclearance requirement to the extent that the jurisdiction makes changes in the practices or procedures to be followed.

(b) Any discretionary setting of the date for a special election or scheduling of events leading up to or following a special election is subject to the preclearance requirement.

(c) A jurisdiction conducting a referendum election to ratify a change in a practice or procedure that affects voting may submit the change to be voted on at the same time that it submits any changes involved in the conduct of the referendum election. A jurisdiction wishing to receive preclearance for the change to be ratified should state clearly that such preclearance is being requested. See § 51.22 of this part.

§ 51.18 Court-ordered changes.

(a) *In general.* Changes affecting voting that are ordered by a Federal court are subject to the preclearance requirement of section 5 to the extent that they reflect the policy choices of the submitting authority.

(b) *Subsequent changes.* Where a court-ordered change is not itself subject to the preclearance requirement, subsequent changes necessitated by the court order but decided upon by the jurisdiction remain subject to preclearance. For example, voting precinct and polling place changes made necessary by a court-ordered redistricting plan are subject to section 5 review.

(c) *In emergencies.* A Federal court's authorization of the emergency interim use without preclearance of a voting change does not exempt from