

No. 18-877

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

FREDERICK L. ALLEN and
NAUTILUS PRODUCTIONS, LLC,
Petitioners,

v.

ROY A. COOPER, III,
as Governor of North Carolina, *et al.*,
Respondents.

**On Writ of Certiorari to the United States
Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit**

**BRIEF OF CONSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY
CENTER AS *AMICUS CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF
PETITIONERS**

ELIZABETH B. WYDRA
BRIANNE J. GOROD*
DAVID H. GANS
DAYNA J. ZOLLE**
CONSTITUTIONAL
ACCOUNTABILITY CENTER
1200 18th Street NW
Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-6889
brianne@theusconstitution.org

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

August 13, 2019

* Counsel of Record

** Not admitted in D.C.; supervised
by principals of the firm

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| TABLE OF AUTHORITIES | ii |
| INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT | 1 |
| ARGUMENT | 4 |
| I. CONGRESS HAS BROAD ENFORCE- MENT AUTHORITY UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT.... | 4 |
| II. THE CRCA IS VALID LEGISLATION UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT AT LEAST INSOFAR AS IT CREATES A PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION FOR DAMAGES AGAINST STATES FOR ACTUAL CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS, LIKE THOSE ALLEGED IN THIS CASE | 10 |
| III. THE CRCA IS CONSTITUTIONAL UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT BECAUSE IT REMEDIES AND PREVENTS CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS BY THE STATES | 15 |
| IV. CONGRESS DID NOT NEED TO IDENTIFY THE SOURCE OF ITS CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY TO EFFECTIVELY ABROGATE STATE SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY..... | 23 |
| CONCLUSION | 29 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| <u>Cases</u> | Page(s) |
|--|----------------|
| <i>Atascadero State Hosp. v. Scanlon</i> , 473 U.S. 234 (1985)..... | 24 |
| <i>Bd. of Trs. of Univ. of Ala. v. Garrett</i> , 531 U.S. 356 (2001)..... | 16, 25 |
| <i>Blatchford v. Native Vill. of Noatak & Circle Vill.</i> , 501 U.S. 775 (1991)..... | 24 |
| <i>City of Boerne v. Flores</i> , 521 U.S. 507 (1997)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Coleman v. Ct. of Appeals of Md.</i> , 566 U.S. 30 (2012)..... | 18, 19, 24 |
| <i>Dellmuth v. Muth</i> , 491 U.S. 223 (1989)..... | 24 |
| <i>Dred Scott v. Sanford</i> , 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393 (1857)..... | 6 |
| <i>EEOC v. Wyoming</i> , 460 U.S. 226 (1983)..... | 25 |
| <i>Ex parte Virginia</i> , 100 U.S. 339 (1879)..... | 6, 10 |
| <i>Feist Publ'ns, Inc. v. Rural Tel. Serv. Co., Inc.</i> , 499 U.S. 340 (1991)..... | 21 |
| <i>Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer</i> , 427 U.S. 445 (1976)..... | 11 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – cont'd

| | Page(s) |
|---|---------------|
| <i>Fla. Prepaid Postsecondary Ed. Expense Bd. v. Coll. Sav. Bank,</i> 527 U.S. 627 (1999)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Fox Film Corp. v. Doyal,</i> 286 U.S. 123 (1932)..... | 13 |
| <i>Hepburn v. Griswold,</i> 75 U.S. (8 Wall.) 603 (1869)..... | 4 |
| <i>Kimel v. Fla. Bd. of Regents,</i> 528 U.S. 62 (2000)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Knick v. Twp. of Scott,</i> 139 S. Ct. 2162 (2019)..... | 14 |
| <i>McCulloch v. Maryland,</i> 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316 (1819)..... | 4, 5, 6 |
| <i>Nat'l Fed'n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius,</i> 567 U.S. 519 (2012)..... | 27, 28 |
| <i>Nev. Dep't of Human Res. v. Hibbs,</i> 538 U.S. 721 (2003)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Palazzolo v. Rhode Island,</i> 533 U.S. 606 (2001)..... | 2, 13, 14 |
| <i>Pruneyard Shopping Ctr. v. Robins,</i> 447 U.S. 74 (1980)..... | 14 |
| <i>Seminole Tribe of Fla. v. Florida,</i> 517 U.S. 44 (1996)..... | 24 |
| <i>Strauder v. West Virginia,</i> 100 U.S. 303 (1879)..... | 10 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – cont’d

| | Page(s) |
|---|----------------|
| <i>Tennessee v. Lane</i> , 541 U.S. 509 (2004)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>United States v. Gen. Motors Corp.</i> , 323 U.S. 373 (1945)..... | 14 |
| <i>United States v. Georgia</i> , 546 U.S. 151 (2006)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>United States v. Raines</i> , 362 U.S. 17 (1960)..... | 15 |
| <i>United States v. Salerno</i> , 481 U.S. 739 (1987)..... | 11 |
| <i>Wash. State Grange v. Wash. State Republican Party</i> , 552 U.S. 442 (2008)..... | 15 |
| <i>Woods v. Cloyd W. Miller Co.</i> , 333 U.S. 138 (1948)..... | 27 |

Constitutional Provisions and Legislative Materials

| | |
|---|-------|
| 2 Cong. Rec. (1874)..... | 9, 10 |
| 4 <i>The Confederate Records of the State of Georgia</i> (Allen D. Candler ed., 1910) | 9 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 101 <i>et seq.</i> | 1 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 504 | 22 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 507(b)..... | 22 |
| 17 U.S.C. § 510 | 22 |

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.