UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

STATE OF TEXAS,	
Plaintiff,	
v.	**Civil Action No. 11-1303 (TBG-RMC-BAH)**
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, and ERIC H. HOLDER, in his official capacity as Attorney General of the United States	
Defendants, and	
Wendy Davis, *et. al.*,	
Intervenor-Defendants.	

ORDER

Before the Court is a motion to intervene in this action by *pro se* movant Michael Idrogo. Mr. Idrogo complains that he is "currently under aggravated kidnaping . . . false imprisonment, extortion, frauds [sic], tortures [sic], and violation of civil rights under the color of law" and demands release from being a "political prisoner." Mot. to Intervene [Dkt. 213] at 1. Mr. Idrogo further complains of an unconstitutional filing fee for candidacy to the U.S. House of Representatives in the State of Texas and that "party candidates" are listed twice on election ballots in violation of his equal protection rights. *Id*.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a)(2) provides that a party seeking to intervene as of right must satisfy four requirements: 1) the application to intervene must be timely; 2) the party must have an interest relating to the property or transaction which is the subject of the action; 3) the party must be so situated that the disposition of the action may, as a

practical matter, impair or impede the party's ability to protect that interest; and 4) the party's interest must not be adequately represented by existing parties to the action." *Building and Const. Trades Dept., AFL-CIO v. Reich*, 40 F.3d 1275, 1282 (D.C. Cir. 1994).

A court may also allow permissive intervention under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b) where a movant: 1) makes a timely motion; 2) has a claim or defense; and 3) that claim or defense shares with the main action a common question of law or fact. Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b); *see also EEOC v. Nat'l Children's Ctr.*, 146 F.3d 1042, 1046 (D.C. Cir. 1998).

Mr. Idrogo does not meet the requirements for intervention as of right or permissive intervention as he states no interest in this litigation or a question of law or fact in common with this litigation. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Mr. Idrogo's Motion to Intervene [Dkt. 213] is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED.

Date: August 28, 2012

/s/
THOMAS B. GRIFFITH
United States Circuit Judge

/s/
ROSEMARY M. COLLYER
United States District Judge

/s/
BERYL A. HOWELL
United States District Judge