

No. 19-2005

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT**

STUDENTS FOR FAIR ADMISSIONS, INC.,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

PRESIDENT AND FELLOWS OF HARVARD COLLEGE,
Defendant-Appellee.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS IN CASE NO. 1:14-cv-14176-ADB,
JUDGE ALLISON D. BURROUGHS

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* WALTER DELLINGER
IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT-APPELLEE ON THE ISSUE OF
STANDING**

APALLA U. CHOPRA
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 SOUTH HOPE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071
(213) 430-6000

ANTON METLITSKY
PATRICK D. MCKEGNEY
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
TIMES SQUARE TOWER
7 TIMES SQUARE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10036
(212) 326-2000

BRADLEY N. GARCIA
ANNA O. MOHAN*
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
1625 EYE STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
(202) 383-5300

**Admitted only in Virginia; supervised by
principals of the firm*

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae

STATEMENT REGARDING LEAVE TO FILE, AUTHORSHIP, AND MONETARY CONTRIBUTIONS

Both parties to the appeal have expressly consented to the filing of this brief by *amicus curiae* pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(2). *See* Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(2).

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29(a)(4)(E), *amicus curiae* states that no counsel for any of the parties authored this brief in whole or in part; neither the parties nor their counsel contributed money that was intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief; and no person, other than the *amicus curiae*, or his counsel, contributed money that was intended to fund this brief's preparation or submission. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(4)(E).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENT REGARDING LEAVE TO FILE, AUTHORSHIP, AND MONETARY CONTRIBUTIONS.....	i
INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i>	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
ARGUMENT	2
I. Article III’s Standing Requirement Limits Federal Courts To Adjudicating Concrete Disputes And Precludes Them From Resolving Individuals’ Generalized, Ideological Grievances.	2
II. These Important Limits On Federal Court Jurisdiction Cannot Be Avoided Through Artificial Means.	8
III. The District Court Erred In Treating SFFA As A Genuine Membership Organization Instead Of Probing The Nature Of SFFA’s Relationship With Its Purported Members.....	10
CONCLUSION.....	17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Allen v. Wright</i> , 468 U.S. 737 (1984).....	3, 9, 10
<i>Ariz. Christian Sch. Tuition Org. v. Winn</i> , 563 U.S. 125 (2011).....	3
<i>Arizonans for Official English v. Arizona</i> , 520 U.S. 43 (1997).....	4
<i>Camel Hair & Cashmere Inst. of Am., Inc. v. Associated Dry Goods Corp.</i> , 799 F.2d 6 (1st Cir. 1986).....	12, 14
<i>Clapper v. Amnesty Int’l USA</i> , 568 U.S. 398 (2013).....	3
<i>DaimlerChrysler Corp. v. Cuno</i> , 547 U.S. 332 (2006).....	4
<i>Diamond v. Charles</i> , 476 U.S. 54 (1986).....	1, 5, 6, 16
<i>Duke Power Co. v. Carolina Env’tl. Study Grp., Inc.</i> , 438 U.S. 59 (1978).....	6
<i>Fisher v. Univ. of Texas at Austin</i> , 570 U.S. 297 (2013).....	10
<i>Heap v. Carter</i> , 112 F. Supp. 3d 402 (E.D. Va. 2015)	14
<i>Hollingsworth v. Perry</i> , 570 U.S. 693 (2013).....	passim
<i>Hunt v. Wash. State Apple Advert. Comm’n</i> , 432 U.S. 333 (1977).....	11, 12, 13
<i>Ill. Dep’t of Transp. v. Hinson</i> , 122 F.3d 370 (7th Cir. 1997).....	5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page(s)
<i>Kowalski v. Tesmer</i> , 543 U.S. 125 (2004).....	6, 7
<i>Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	4, 5, 6, 9
<i>Massachusetts v. Mellon</i> , 262 U.S. 447 (1923).....	6
<i>NAACP v. Alabama ex rel. Patterson</i> , 357 U.S. 449 (1958).....	12
<i>Powers v. Ohio</i> , 499 U.S. 400 (1991).....	7
<i>Schlesinger v. Reservists Comm. to Stop the War</i> , 418 U.S. 208 (1974).....	3, 4, 6
<i>Simon v. E. Ky. Welfare Rights Org.</i> , 426 U.S. 26 (1976).....	3
<i>Singleton v. Wulff</i> , 428 U.S. 106 (1976).....	7
<i>Sorenson Communications, LLC v. Federal Communications Commission</i> , 897 F.3d 214 (D.C. Cir. 2018).....	13
<i>Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't</i> , 523 U.S. 83 (1998).....	5
<i>Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President & Fellows of Harvard Coll.</i> , 261 F. Supp. 3d 99 (D. Mass. 2017).....	11
<i>United States v. SCRAP</i> , 412 U.S. 669 (1973).....	6
<i>Valley Forge Christian Coll. v. Americans United for Separation of Church and State, Inc.</i> , 454 U.S. 464 (1982).....	4, 6, 15

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.