

No. 19A60

In the Supreme Court of the United States

DONALD J. TRUMP, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS
PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, *ET. AL.*,
Applicants,

v.

SIERRA CLUB, *ET AL.*,
Respondents.

On Application for a Stay Pending Appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and Pending Further Proceedings in this Court and Request for an Immediate Administrative Stay

To the Honorable Elena Kagan,
Associate Justice of the United States and
Circuit Justice for the Ninth Circuit

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE *AMICUS* BRIEF, MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF IN COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 33.2,
AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF OF REP. ANDY BARR IN SUPPORT
OF APPLICANTS**

CHRISTOPHER J. HAJEC
Immigration Reform Law Institute
25 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Suite 335
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 232-5590
chajec@irli.org

LAWRENCE J. JOSEPH
Counsel of Record
1250 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 700-1A
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 355-9452
lj@larryjoseph.com

Counsel for Movant and Amicus Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	ii
Motion for Leave to File <i>Amicus</i> Brief	1
Motion for Leave to File under Rule 33.2	4
<i>Amicus Curiae</i> Brief in Support of Applicants	6
Introduction.....	6
Standard of Review.....	8
Summary of Argument.....	8
Argument.....	10
I. The grant of a writ of <i>certiorari</i> is likely.	10
II. The Government is likely to prevail	10
A. The courts below lacked jurisdiction.	10
1. The All Writs Act gives this Court jurisdiction <i>now</i> to preserve its <i>future</i> jurisdiction over the Government’s eventual petition for a writ of <i>certiorari</i>	11
2. Plaintiffs’ interests are insufficiently related to an “injury in fact” to satisfy Article III jurisdiction.	12
3. Plaintiffs’ interests fall outside the relevant zones of interests.	16
4. Plaintiffs do not have standing under <i>Havens</i> <i>Realty</i>	17
5. Plaintiffs’ challenge to the transfer of funds — as distinct from the allocation of funds to a project — is not ripe.	20
6. Sovereign immunity bars Plaintiffs’ challenge.	21
a. Plaintiffs cannot sue under the APA.	21
b. Plaintiffs cannot bring a non-APA and pre- APA suit in equity.	23
B. The Government is likely to prevail on the merits.	25
1. These DoD projects qualify as “unforeseen” within the meaning of § 8005.	25
2. CAA did not “deny” an item to DoD within the meaning of 8005.	26
III. The other stay criteria tip in the Government’s favor.	27
A. The Government’s harm is irreparable.	27
B. Plaintiffs’ harm is trivial to non-existent.	28
C. The public interest favors a stay.....	29
Conclusion	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Abbott Labs. v. Gardner</i> , 387 U.S. 136 (1967).....	22
<i>Action Alliance of Senior Citizens v. Heckler</i> , 789 F.2d 931 (D.C. Cir. 1986).....	20
<i>Air Courier Conference v. Am. Postal Workers Union</i> , 498 U.S. 517 (1991).....	17
<i>Alabama Power Co. v. Ickes</i> , 302 U.S. 464 (1938).....	16, 24
<i>Allen v. Wright</i> , 468 U.S. 737 (1984).....	13
<i>Allied Chem. Corp. v. Daiflon, Inc.</i> , 449 U.S. 33 (1980).....	12
<i>Animal Legal Def. Fund v. USDA</i> , 632 F. App'x 905 (9th Cir. 2015).....	18
<i>Ass'n of Data Processing Serv. Orgs., Inc. v. Camp</i> , 397 U.S. 150 (1970).....	22
<i>Bender v. Williamsport Area Sch. Dist.</i> , 475 U.S. 534 (1986).....	12
<i>Burford v. Sun Oil Co.</i> , 319 U.S. 315 (1943).....	30
<i>Burns v. Dir., Office of Workers' Comp. Programs</i> , 41 F.3d 1555 (D.C. Cir. 1994).....	23
<i>Canadian Lumber Trade All. v. United States</i> , 517 F.3d 1319 (Fed. Cir. 2008).....	10, 25
<i>Cheney v. United States Dist. Court</i> , 542 U.S. 367 (2004).....	12
<i>Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA</i> , 568 U.S. 398 (2013).....	18
<i>DaimlerChrysler Corp. v. Cuno</i> , 547 U.S. 332 (2006).....	14
<i>Davis v. Mineta</i> , 302 F.3d 1104 (10th Cir. 2002).....	29
<i>Dep't of Army v. Blue Fox, Inc.</i> , 525 U.S. 255 (1999).....	21

<i>Diamond v. Charles</i> , 476 U.S. 54 (1986)	15-16, 28
<i>Ecosystem Inv., Partners v. Crosby Dredging, L.L.C.</i> , 729 F.App'x 287 (5th Cir. 2018)	19
<i>Elrod v. Burns</i> , 427 U.S. 347 (1976)	28
<i>Ex parte Young</i> , 209 U.S. 123 (1908)	24
<i>Fair Hous. Council of San Fernando Valley v. Roommate.com, LLC</i> , 666 F.3d 1216 (9th Cir. 2012).....	18
<i>Flast v. Cohen</i> , 392 U.S. 83 (1968)	15-16
<i>FTC v. Dean Foods Co.</i> , 384 U.S. 597 (1966)	11
<i>FTC v. Standard Oil Co.</i> , 449 U.S. 232 (1980)	23
<i>Gladstone, Realtors v. Bellwood</i> , 441 U.S. 91 (1979)	19
<i>Graddick v. Newman</i> , 453 U.S. 928 (1981)	27
<i>Hardin v. Ky. Utils. Co.</i> , 390 U.S. 1 (1968)	16
<i>Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman</i> , 455 U.S. 363 (1982)	8, 18-20, 29
<i>Heckler v. Lopez</i> , 464 U.S. 879 (1983)	29
<i>Hernandez v. Sessions</i> , 872 F.3d 976 (9th Cir. 2017).....	28
<i>Hollingsworth v. Perry</i> , 558 U.S. 183 (2010)	8, 25
<i>In re Border Infrastructure Eenvtl. Litig.</i> , 915 F.3d 1213 (9th Cir. 2019).....	15
<i>Insurance Corp. of Ireland v. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee</i> , 456 U.S. 694 (1982)	12
<i>Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.</i> , 511 U.S. 375 (1994)	12

<i>Lane v. Pena</i> , 518 U.S. 187 (1996).....	21
<i>Lewis v. Casey</i> , 518 U.S. 343 (1996).....	14
<i>Linda R.S. v. Richard D.</i> , 410 U.S. 614 (1973).....	15
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	13, 14
<i>Lujan v. Nat’l Wildlife Fed’n</i> , 497 U.S. 871 (1990).....	12
<i>McConnell v. FEC</i> , 540 U.S. 93 (2003).....	15-16
<i>Monsanto Co. v. Geertson Seed Farms</i> , 561 U.S. 139 (2010).....	29
<i>Mount Evans Co. v. Madigan</i> , 14 F.3d 1444 (10th Cir. 1994).....	10, 25
<i>Mountain States Legal Found. v. Glickman</i> , 92 F.3d 1228 (D.C. Cir. 1996).....	19
<i>Muskrat v. United States</i> , 219 U.S. 346 (1911).....	13
<i>Nader v. Saxbe</i> , 497 F.2d 676 (D.C. Cir. 1974).....	15
<i>Nat’l Ass’n of Home Builders v. Defs. of Wildlife</i> , 551 U.S. 644 (2007).....	26-27
<i>Novartis Consumer Health, Inc. v. Johnson & Johnson-Merck Consumer Pharm. Co.</i> , 290 F.3d 578 (3d Cir. 2002).....	29
<i>Pennsylvania v. New Jersey</i> , 426 U.S. 660 (1976).....	18
<i>People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals v. U.S. Dept. of Agriculture</i> , 797 F.3d 1087 (D.C. Cir. 2015).....	18
<i>Rochester Tel. Corp. v. United States</i> , 307 U.S. 125 (1939).....	21, 23
<i>Second City Music, Inc. v. City of Chicago</i> , 333 F.3d 846 (7th Cir. 2003).....	29
<i>Secretary of State of Md. v. Joseph H. Munson Co.</i> , 467 U.S. 947 (1984).....	13-14

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.