

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Norfolk Division**

LATASHA HOLLOWAY et. al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:18-cv-69

CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH, et. al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Before the Court is Craig M. Henson’s (“Henson”) Motion to Intervene pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24 (“Rule 24”). Mot. to Intervene, ECF No. 367 (“Int. Mot.”). Rule 24 provides for two kinds of intervention: intervention of right and permissive intervention. A court must permit a party to intervene of right when a federal statute gives it an unconditional right to intervene or when two conditions are met: the party (1) “claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject of the action” and (2) “is so situated that disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede [its] ability to protect its interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a). A court may permit a party to intervene permissively when a federal statute gives it a conditional right to intervene or when it “has a claim or defense that shares with the main action a common question of law or fact.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1).

On November 4, 2025, Craig Henson filed a Motion to Intervene pursuant to Rule 24 seeking to intervene as of right or, in the alternative, permissively. Mot. to Intervene at 1. He argues that the City of Virginia Beach’s (“The City”) 10-1 voting system, impairs the rights of voters with disabilities, to equally participate in local elections and governance in violation of the Americans


with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) 42 U.S.C. § 12132 and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (“RA”) 29 U.S.C. § 794. The underlying action in this case challenges the City of Virginia Beach’s proposed 7-3-1 voting system, on the grounds that the system will deny minority voters an equal opportunity to participate in the political process and to elect the representatives of their choice in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act (“VRA”) 52 U.S.C. § 10301 and the Virginia Voting Rights Act (“VAVRA”) Va. Code Ann. § 24.2-125 *et seq.* ECF No. 340.

The Court finds that Henson’s motion does not satisfy the requirements for intervention as of right or permissively. The Court finds no federal statute providing Henson an unconditional right to intervene. Furthermore, his claims under the ADA and RA do not share a common question of law or fact with the underlying claims for racial vote dilution under Section 2 of the VRA and the VAVRA. Thus, Henson fails to satisfy the requirements of Rule 24(a) and (b).

Accordingly, Henson’s motion to intervene is **DENIED**. The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to the Parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Norfolk, Virginia
November 6, 2025



Raymond A. Jackson
United States District Judge