



1-1-2011

Florida v. HHS - Amicus Brief of Professors of Federal Jurisdiction

F. Paul Bland Jr.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/aca>



Part of the [Health Law Commons](#)

Automated Citation

Bland, F. Paul Jr., "Florida v. HHS - Amicus Brief of Professors of Federal Jurisdiction" (2011). *Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act Litigation*. Paper 155.

<http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/aca/155>

This Amicus Brief is brought to you for free and open access by the Research Projects and Empirical Data at Santa Clara Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act Litigation by an authorized administrator of Santa Clara Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact sculawlibrarian@gmail.com.

11-11021HH (11-11067HH)

IN THE
United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

STATE OF FLORIDA, by and through Pam Bondi Attorney General, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, by and through Alan Wilson Attorney General, STATE OF NEBRASKA, by and through Jon Bruning Attorney General, STATE OF TEXAS, by and through Greg Abbott Attorney General, STATE OF UTAH, by and through Mark L. Shurtleff Attorney General, et. al.,

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

—v.—

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, KATHLEEN SEBELIUS, in her official capacity as the Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, TIMOTHY F. GEITHNER, in his Official Capacity as the Secretary of the United States Department of Treasury, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, HILDA SOLIS,

Defendants-Appellants.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

**BRIEF OF PROFESSORS OF FEDERAL JURISDICTION
AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS-APPELLANTS**

STEPHEN I. VLADECK
4801 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.,
Room 386
Washington, D.C. 20016
(202) 274-4241

F. PAUL BLAND, JR.
Counsel of Record
CHAVEZ & GERTLER
1825 K Street, N.W., Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 797-8600

Attorneys for Amici Curiae Professors of Federal Jurisdiction

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

State of Florida, et al.,

v.

U.S. Dep't of Health & Human Servs., et al.

Nos. 11-11021 & 11-11067

**CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS
AND CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Pursuant to 11th Cir. R. 26.1–1, the undersigned counsel certifies that, to the best of his knowledge, the following persons, firms, and associations are the only ones (in addition to those parties already identified by the Defendants-Appellants) that may have an interest in the outcome of this case:

(F) Amici Curiae

Alexander, Janet Cooper

Allen, Michael P.

Chemerinsky, Erwin

Copeland, Charlton

Elliott, Heather

Frost, Amanda

Hessick, Andy

State of Florida, et al., v.
U.S. Dep't of Health & Human Servs., et al.,
Nos. 11-11021 & 11-1067

Kalb, Johanna

Mulligan, Lumen N.

Purcell, Jr., Edward A.,

Roberts, Caprice L.

Vladeck, Stephen I.

Wasserman, Howard M.

Wells, Michael L.

(G) Attorneys for Amici

Bland, Jr., F. Paul

/s/ F. Paul Bland, Jr.

F. PAUL BLAND, JR.

Counsel for Amici Curiae

APRIL 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS AND
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT C-1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*..... 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT..... 2

ARGUMENT..... 6

I. THE RULE THAT STATES LACK STANDING TO SUE
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS *PARENS PATRIAE* REFLECTS
FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW..... 6

II. STATE LAW CANNOT CREATE STANDING MERELY BY
PURPORTING TO EXEMPT STATE CITIZENS FROM FEDERAL LAW..... 17

III. THE DISTRICT COURT’S HOLDING THAT IDAHO AND
UTAH HAVE STANDING WOULD HAVE GRAVE
IMPLICATIONS FOR JUSTICIABILITY DOCTRINE 23

CONCLUSION 33

APPENDIX 34

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Alaska v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.,
868 F.2d 441 (D.C. Cir. 1989)..... 26

**Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico ex rel. Barez*,
458 U.S. 592 (1982)..... passim

Barnes v. Kline,
759 F.2d 21 (D.C. Cir. 1984)..... 14

Chiles v. Thornburgh,
865 F.2d 1197 (11th Cir. 1989)..... 2, 11

Connecticut v. Health Net, Inc.,
383 F.3d 1258 (11th Cir. 2004)..... 26

Florida ex rel. Bondi v. U.S. Dep’t of Health & Hum. Servs.,
No. 3:10-cv-91-RV/EM, 2011 WL 285683
(N.D. Fla. Jan. 31, 2011) 2, 18, 22, 25

Florida v. Mellon,
273 U.S. 12 (1927)..... 9, 10, 13

Franchise Tax Bd. of Cal. v. Constr. Laborers Vacation Trust,
463 U.S. 1 (1983)..... 23

**Georgia v. Pa. R.R. Co.*,
324 U.S. 439 (1945)..... passim

Georgia v. Tenn. Copper Co.,
206 U.S. 230 (1907)..... 18

Ill. Dep’t of Transp. v. Hinson,
122 F.3d 370 (7th Cir. 1997)..... 22

* Authorities chiefly relied upon are marked by asterisk

<i>Maryland People’s Counsel v. FERC</i> , 760 F.2d 318 (D.C. Cir. 1985).....	15
* <i>Massachusetts v. EPA</i> , 549 U.S. 497 (2007).....	3, 16, 17, 25
* <i>Massachusetts v. Mellon</i> , 262 U.S. 447 (1923).....	passim
<i>Mondou v. N.Y., New Haven, & Hartford R.R. Co.</i> , 223 U.S. 1 (1912).....	20
<i>New Jersey v. Sargent</i> , 269 U.S. 328 (1926).....	9, 10, 13
<i>New York v. United States</i> , 505 U.S. 144 (1992).....	12, 14
<i>Ohio ex rel. Celebrezze v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.</i> , 766 F.2d 228 (6th Cir. 1985).....	26
<i>Oregon v. Mitchell</i> , 400 U.S. 112 (1970).....	13
<i>Pennsylvania v. New Jersey</i> , 426 U.S. 660 (1976) (per curiam)	2, 8
<i>Raines v. Byrd</i> , 521 U.S. 811 (1997).....	6, 7, 29
<i>Sierra Club v. Morton</i> , 405 U.S. 727 (1972).....	7
<i>South Carolina v. Katzenbach</i> , 383 U.S. 301 (1966).....	12

Tenn. Elec. Power Co. v. Tenn. Valley Auth.,
306 U.S. 118 (1939)..... 14

Texas v. ICC,
258 U.S. 158 (1922)..... 8, 9, 13, 21

United States v. Bond,
581 F.3d 128 (3d Cir. 2009),
cert. granted, 131 S. Ct. 455 (2010) (No. 09-1227)..... 14

United States v. Lopez,
514 U.S. 549 (1995)..... 3, 12

United States v. Richardson,
418 U.S. 166 (1974)..... 7

United States v. Rutherford,
442 U.S. 544 (1979)..... 7

Virginia ex rel. Cuccinelli v. Sebelius,
702 F. Supp. 2d 598 (E.D. Va. 2010)..... 22, 26, 28

Wyeth v. Levine,
129 S. Ct. 1187 (2009)..... 28

Wyoming ex rel. Crank v. United States,
539 F.3d 1236 (10th Cir. 2008)..... 22, 25

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

U.S. CONST. art. I, § 8, cl. 1 9

U.S. CONST. art. I, § 8, cl. 3 10

*U.S. CONST. art. III passim

U.S. CONST. art. VI, cl. 2..... 20, 32

FEDERAL STATUTES

*Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA),
Pub. L. No. 111-148, 124 Stat. 119 (2010) passim

Revenue Act of 1926,
ch. 27, 44 Stat. 9 9

Sheppard-Towner (or Maternity) Act of 1921,
ch. 135, 42 Stat. 224 9

Transportation Act of 1920,
ch. 91, 41 Stat. 456 9

STATE STATUTES

Idaho Health Freedom Act,
IDAHO CODE § 39-9003(1) (2010) 24

UTAH CODE ANN. § 63M-1-2505.5 (2010) 24

OTHER AUTHORITIES

*Alexander M. Bickel,
The Voting Rights Cases, 1966 SUP. CT. REV. 79..... passim

RICHARD H. FALLON, JR. ET AL.,
HART & WECHSLER’S THE FEDERAL COURTS AND
THE FEDERAL SYSTEM (6th ed. 2009) 17

Michael W. McConnell,
Federalism: Evaluating the Founders’ Design,
54 U. CHI. L. REV. 1484, 1498 (1987) (book review) 30

Kevin C. Walsh,
The Ghost That Slew the Mandate,
64 STAN. L. REV. (forthcoming 2011)..... 23

THOMAS E. WOODS, JR.,
 NULLIFICATION: HOW TO RESIST FEDERAL TYRANNY
 IN THE 21ST CENTURY (2010) 30

*Ann Woolhandler & Michael G. Collins,
State Standing, 81 VA. L. REV. 387 (1995)..... passim

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE¹

Amici curiae listed in the Appendix are professors of federal jurisdiction who teach and write about the justiciability doctrines informed by Article III’s case-or-controversy requirement, especially the law governing standing to sue. *Amici* hold diverse views concerning the appropriate contours of the Supreme Court’s standing jurisprudence, and therefore express no view on whether any of the private plaintiffs have standing to pursue this suit. *Amici* also take no position here on the merits of the constitutional challenge to the “individual mandate” created by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), Pub. L. No. 111-148, § 1501, 124 Stat. 119, 242–49 (2010).

Instead, *amici* come together in this case to emphasize two points on which we have common cause: *First*, none of the state plaintiffs have standing to pursue the instant suit. *Second*, the district court’s holding to the contrary, *see Florida ex rel. Bondi v. U.S. Dep’t of Health & Hum.*

1. Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 29(a), the parties have consented to the filing of this brief. No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no counsel for a party (nor a party itself) made a monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief. No person other than *amici* or their counsel made a monetary contribution to its preparation or submission.

Servs., No. 3:10-cv-91-RV/EM, 2011 WL 285683, at *9–10 (N.D. Fla. Jan. 31, 2011), cannot be reconciled with extant jurisprudence, and would, if affirmed, likely wreak substantial havoc on standing doctrine — if not on the appropriate role of the federal courts more generally.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

It is a settled proposition that states do not have standing to sue the federal government as *parens patriae* of their citizens. *See, e.g., Pennsylvania v. New Jersey*, 426 U.S. 660, 665 (1976) (per curiam). This rule results from the logical and legal reality that, where federal rights are concerned, “it is the United States, and not the state, which represents [citizens] as *parens patriae*.” *Massachusetts v. Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447, 486 (1923); *see also Chiles v. Thornburgh*, 865 F.2d 1197, 1208–09 (11th Cir. 1989).

The *Mellon* rule is not just an infrequently revisited footnote to the Court’s modern standing jurisprudence; rather, its *ratio decidendi* reflects a specific variation on a familiar (and fundamental) constitutional theme, *i.e.*, that the Constitution’s structural guarantees exist to protect individuals, and not the sovereignty of the states as such. *See, e.g., United States v. Lopez*, 514 U.S. 549, 575–77 (1995)

(Kennedy, J., concurring). To that end, and as a long line of post-*Mellon* cases reinforce, states suffer no freestanding injury simply because Congress has allegedly exceeded its Article I powers.

Even as the Supreme Court has identified additional circumstances in which states might have a “quasi-sovereign” interest in suing private entities or other states on behalf of their citizens, it has never recognized a “quasi-sovereign” interest sufficient to justify suits challenging the constitutional scope of federal regulation. Instead, it has repeatedly reaffirmed the “critical difference between allowing a State ‘to protect her citizens from the operation of federal statutes’ (which is what *Mellon* prohibits) and allowing a State to assert *its* rights under federal law (which it has standing to do).” *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497, 520 n.17 (2007) (quoting *Georgia v. Pa. R.R. Co.*, 324 U.S. 439, 447 (1945)) (emphasis added).

Nor is there anything to the argument that these settled precedents can be distinguished because of the conflict between the individual mandate and the Idaho and Utah state laws relied upon by the district court. To be sure, the Supreme Court has recognized a state’s *sovereign* (not “quasi-sovereign”) interest in “the exercise of

sovereign power over individuals and entities within the relevant jurisdiction,” which “involves the power to create and enforce a legal code, both civil and criminal.” *Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico ex rel. Barez*, 458 U.S. 592, 601 (1982). But this interest goes only to a state’s power to ensure that its (valid) laws are followed by those who are bound to comply. Manufacturing a conflict with federal law cannot of itself create an interest sufficient to support standing, since the state law creating the conflict will have no bearing whatsoever on the constitutional validity of the federal regulation.

Because the district court rested the standing of the state parties on the mere existence of a conflict between federal and state law, and identified no freestanding injury to any other quasi-sovereign or proprietary interest, its holding allows for no principled distinction between this suit and any other in which states would use preemption as the basis for standing, even where the objection sounded purely in the applicability — rather than the constitutionality — of federal law.

Instead, such a holding would provide an all-too-effective end-run around *Mellon*, since it would reduce the Supreme Court’s bar on *parens patriae* suits against the federal government to cases in which there is

no state law with which the challenged federal action could be in tension. In addition, to the extent that *Mellon* reflects deeper principles about Article III standing, including the bar on generalized grievances and the requirement that the plaintiff suffer a concrete, particularized injury, a rule that allows states to sue the federal government whenever there is a conflict between state and federal law would risk vitiating those requirements altogether in any instance in which a conflict is alleged to exist. Finally, and perhaps counterintuitively, allowing states to sue in any instance of conflict with federal law would both interfere with the ability of individuals to vindicate their rights and short-circuit the principal means through which majorities have traditionally exercised control over the scope of federal power — at the ballot box.

To affirm the district court's conclusion that the Idaho and Utah statutes invoked by the state parties suffice to confer standing would reward these states' effort to nullify federal law, incentivize future such endeavors by any state that believes itself to be similarly aggrieved, and thereby involve the federal courts in an enterprise that Article III's case-or-controversy requirement was specifically intended (and has long been interpreted) to keep them out of. As Professor Bickel warned, "It

would make a mockery . . . of the constitutional requirement of case or controversy . . . to countenance automatic litigation — and automatic it would surely become — by states situated no differently” than Idaho and Utah are here. Alexander M. Bickel, *The Voting Rights Cases*, 1966 SUP. CT. REV. 79, 89–90.

ARGUMENT

I. THE RULE THAT STATES LACK STANDING TO SUE THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS *PARENS PATRIAE* REFLECTS FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

Just as members of Congress are not the appropriate parties to enforce the separation of powers, *see, e.g., Raines v. Byrd*, 521 U.S. 811 (1997), so too the states are not the appropriate parties to challenge the constitutional scope of federal regulation, *see, e.g., Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447. This is true “not because the interests asserted are unreal or inadequately particular to the state, but because by hypothesis they should not, in such circumstances, suffice to invoke judicial action.” Bickel, *supra*, at 88. Indeed,

There would be nothing irrational about a system that granted standing in these cases; some European constitutional courts operate under one or another variant of such a regime. But it is obviously not the regime that has obtained under our Constitution to date. Our regime contemplates a more restricted role for Article III courts

Raines, 521 U.S. at 828 (citations omitted). Such a “more restricted” role “lies in the protection [judicial review] has afforded the constitutional rights and liberties of individual citizens and minority groups against oppressive or discriminatory government action.” *United States v. Richardson*, 418 U.S. 166, 192 (1974) (Powell, J., concurring). Critically, “[i]t is *this* role, not some amorphous general supervision of the operations of government, that has maintained public esteem for the federal courts and has permitted the peaceful coexistence of the countermajoritarian implications of judicial review and the democratic principles upon which our Federal Government in the final analysis rests.” *Id.*

This conception of the role of the federal courts in turn depends upon litigation in which parties sue to protect their concrete, particularized interests. *See, e.g., Sierra Club v. Morton*, 405 U.S. 727, 739–40 (1972) (“[I]f any group with a bona fide ‘special interest’ could initiate such litigation, it is difficult to perceive why any individual citizen with the same bona fide special interest would not also be entitled to do so.”); *see also United States v. Rutherford*, 442 U.S. 544, 555 (1979) (“Under our constitutional framework, federal courts do not

sit as councils of revision, empowered to rewrite legislation in accord with their own conceptions of prudent public policy.”).

a. It is Settled Precedent that States May Not Sue the Federal Government to Vindicate Their Citizens’ Rights

One manifestation of these background principles is the venerable rule that states may not sue the federal government merely to vindicate the individual rights of their citizens. *See, e.g., Pennsylvania*, 426 U.S. at 665 (“It has . . . become settled doctrine that a State has standing to sue only when its sovereign or quasi-sovereign interests are implicated and it is not merely litigating as a volunteer the personal claims of its citizens . . .”). As Justice Sutherland explained in *Mellon*,

It cannot be conceded that a state, as *parens patriae*, may institute judicial proceedings to protect citizens of the United States from the operation of the statutes thereof. While the state, under some circumstances, may sue in that capacity for the protection of its citizens, it is no part of its duty or power to enforce their rights in respect of their relations with the federal government. In that field it is the United States, and not the state, which represents them as *parens patriae*, when such representation becomes appropriate; and to the former, and not to the latter, they must look for such protective measures as flow from that status.

262 U.S. at 485–86 (citation omitted); *see Texas v. ICC*, 258 U.S. 158, 162 (1922) (holding that Texas’s claim that Congress exceeded its Article I power “does not present a case or controversy within the range

of the judicial power as defined by the Constitution”); *see also Florida v. Mellon*, 273 U.S. 12 (1927); *New Jersey v. Sargent*, 269 U.S. 328 (1926).

Thus, *Massachusetts v. Mellon* rejected Massachusetts’ standing to challenge the constitutionality of the Sheppard-Towner (or Maternity) Act of 1921, which provided matching federal funds for private programs designed “to reduce maternal and infant mortality,” 262 U.S. at 478–79, on the ground that the Act interfered with state regulation in violation of the Tenth Amendment. *See id.* at 479.

Similarly, in *Texas v. ICC*, Texas sought to challenge key provisions of the Transportation Act of 1920, on the ground that they exceeded Congress’s powers to regulate interstate commerce, *see* 258 U.S. at 160. Again, the Court rejected the state’s standing to proceed absent a showing of a more concrete and direct injury to Texas’s sovereign interests. *See id.* at 162.

Comparable claims were made — and dismissed — in *Florida v. Mellon* and *New Jersey v. Sargent*. In the former case, Florida sought to enjoin the Secretary of the Treasury from collecting certain taxes imposed by section 301 of the Revenue Act of 1926, on the ground that the taxes exceeded Congress’s powers under Article I, Section 8. The

Court rejected Florida's standing, citing *Massachusetts v. Mellon* for the proposition that "there is no substance in the contention that the state has sustained, or is immediately in danger of sustaining, any direct injury as the result of the enforcement of the act in question." 273 U.S. at 18. And *Sargent*, like *Texas v. ICC* before it, held that challenges to the scope of federal regulation under the Commerce Clause were not properly brought by states absent some showing that some unique *state* interest was implicated. *See* 269 U.S. at 337–39.

The origins of the rule for which these cases stand can easily be found in nineteenth-century doctrine, in which "states could not (in federal court) ordinarily litigate against the federal government or other states conflicting claims to regulate, nor could they seek to enforce their own legislation or to vindicate their extrastatutory interests in protecting their citizenry." Ann Woolhandler & Michael G. Collins, *State Standing*, 81 VA. L. REV. 387, 393 (1995). And although *Massachusetts v. Mellon* itself arose in the context of the Supreme Court's original jurisdiction, in which special considerations might enter into play, *see Snapp*, 458 U.S. at 603 n.12; *see also id.* at 610–12 (Brennan, J., concurring), it is now well-settled that its constraints

apply just as much to suits — such as this one — initially filed in the lower federal courts. *See* Woolhandler & Collins, *supra*, at 490–91; *see also* Snapp, 458 U.S. at 610 n.16; *Chiles*, 865 F.2d at 1208–09.

b. Fundamental Constitutional Principles Mandate that the Federal Government Acts as *Parens Patriae* Where Federal Law is Implicated

As the Court emphasized in *Massachusetts v. Mellon*, the impetus behind the bar on state standing in these circumstances is the practical and legal reality that it is the federal government, and not the states, which acts as *parens patriae* where federal rights are concerned. *See, e.g., Mellon*, 262 U.S. at 485–86; *accord. Georgia*, 324 U.S. at 446.²

Moreover, as Professors Woolhandler and Collins have explained,

The Court’s acceptance of an individual’s ability to raise structural constitutional issues in contests with governments may be due at least in part to the nonrecognition of a sovereign’s right to litigate such questions. This preference for having individuals rather than government police even structural guaranties expresses that individuals are the intended beneficiaries of those guaranties.

Woolhandler & Collins, *supra*, at 440 (footnote omitted). So understood, *Massachusetts v. Mellon* is not just an infrequently revisited footnote to

2. Thus, there is no analogous bar on suits by the federal government to enforce federal law against *any* defendant.

the Court’s modern standing jurisprudence; rather, its *ratio decidendi* reflects a specific variation on a fundamental constitutional theme:

The Constitution does not protect the sovereignty of States for the benefit of the States or state governments as abstract political entities, or even for the benefit of the public officials governing the States. To the contrary, the Constitution divides authority between federal and state governments for the protection of individuals. State sovereignty is not just an end in itself: Rather, federalism secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of sovereign power.

New York v. United States, 505 U.S. 144, 181 (1992) (internal quotation marks omitted); *see also Lopez*, 514 U.S. at 575–77 (Kennedy, J., concurring).

a. *Mellon* Confirms that States Do Not Suffer a Freestanding Injury Whenever Congress Exceeds its Article I Powers

Inasmuch as *Mellon* and its successors reflect the principle that individuals are the intended beneficiaries of the Constitution’s structural guarantees, they also stand for the related but distinct proposition that states do not suffer a freestanding legally cognizable injury whenever Congress exceeds its Article I powers.³ In *Mellon* itself,

3. Thus, in *South Carolina v. Katzenbach*, 383 U.S. 301 (1966), the Supreme Court upheld South Carolina’s standing to contest whether Congress had the power under the Fifteenth Amendment to impose “preclearance” requirements on particular jurisdictions for future

“the complaint of the plaintiff state is brought to the naked contention that Congress has usurped the reserved powers of the several states by the mere enactment of the statute.” 262 U.S. at 483; *see id.* (“[I]t is plain that that question . . . is political, and not judicial in character, and therefore is not a matter which admits of the exercise of the judicial power.”). Nor did it matter to the Court that Massachusetts alleged that “the ulterior purpose of Congress thereby was to induce the states to yield a portion of their sovereign rights.” *Id.* at 482. So too, in *Texas v. ICC*, *Florida v. Mellon*, *New Jersey v. Sargent*, and a host of other, similar cases. In short, “For purposes of litigation with the United

changes to local and state election laws, but rejected the state’s standing to challenge the Voting Rights Act on due process and bill of attainder grounds. As the Court explained, South Carolina could raise the Fifteenth Amendment claim entirely because that constitutional provision (unlike the others invoked by South Carolina) directly and uniquely governed the federal government’s relationship with the states *as such*. *See id.* at 324; *see also* Woolhandler & Collins, *supra*, at 492 (“Presumably the state sought to litigate its own liberty interest in setting voter qualifications, as provided by specific provisions of the Constitution that expressly contemplate state power to set such qualifications.”); *accord. Oregon v. Mitchell*, 400 U.S. 112, 119–25 (1970) (Black, J.) (explaining why the Constitution creates a concrete interest on the part of the states in the allocation of control over election procedures). And even on those hyper-narrow terms (which wouldn’t support standing here), such analysis has still been harshly criticized. *See, e.g., Bickel, supra*, at 88–90.

States (through the officers charged with execution of federal laws), a state should have no recognizable interest in ensuring the fidelity of Congress to constitutional restraints.” Bickel, *supra*, at 88.⁴

Although it would be some decades after *Massachusetts v. Mellon* before the Court articulated the modern guideposts for Article III standing, Justice Sutherland’s analysis on this point might best be understood as going to the existence *vel non* of a sufficiently particularized injury in fact to satisfy the case-or-controversy requirement. Put another way, “[t]he Court’s refusal to allow states to litigate their Governing Interests also reinforced the constitutional requirement, grounded in the separation of powers, that federal courts hear only cases and controversies.” Woolhandler & Collins, *supra*, at 440; *see also Barnes v. Kline*, 759 F.2d 21, 48 (D.C. Cir. 1984) (Bork, J.,

4. States may well have an interest — and suffer a particularized and concrete injury — when Congress improperly *compels* them to act, as was true in *New York v. United States*, 505 U.S. 144 (striking down a federal law on Tenth Amendment commandeering grounds). But those cases only prove the point, for the injury there is suffered *directly* by the state, and is not a generalized injury that the state seeks to litigate on its citizens’ behalf. Indeed, whether or not a criminal *defendant* may rely upon the Tenth Amendment, *see, e.g., United States v. Bond*, 581 F.3d 128 (3d Cir. 2009), *cert. granted*, 131 S. Ct. 455 (2010) (No. 09-1227), it is settled the private plaintiffs may not. *See, e.g., Tenn. Elec. Power Co. v. Tenn. Valley Auth.*, 306 U.S. 118, 143–44 (1939).

dissenting) (“The Supreme Court’s decisions about suits over “generalized grievances” are closely related to *Massachusetts v. Mellon*”).⁵

c. Even as the Supreme Court’s Approach to State Standing Has Liberalized in Suits Against Private Parties and Other States, the *Mellon* Rule Has Remained Sacrosanct

Finally, although the Court has since recognized broader circumstances in which states *can* act as *parens patriae* of their citizens in suits against private entities or other states, *see, e.g., Georgia*, 324 U.S. at 447, it has consistently reaffirmed the bar on *parens patriae* suits against the federal government, *see, e.g., id.* at 446. Nowhere is this distinction more apparent than the Supreme Court’s 1982 decision in *Snapp*, which recognized Puerto Rico’s standing to sue Virginia apple growers on a claim that the defendants had violated federal law by

5. Thus, even when then-Judge Scalia suggested in *Maryland People’s Counsel v. FERC*, 760 F.2d 318 (D.C. Cir. 1985), that Congress in some circumstances should be able to confer *parens patriae* standing upon the states in suits against the federal government, his self-described “narrow” opinion emphasized the extent to which the separation of powers both (1) barred such suits *without* federal legislation; and (2) might in some instances bar such legislation, as well. *See id.* at 321–22. Needless to say, no federal statute authorizes the states to sue in this case.

refusing to honor a preference for U.S. workers over temporary foreign workers. *See* 458 U.S. 592. Treating Puerto Rico as a “state,” *see id.* at 608 n.15, the 8-0 Court concluded that it had standing to proceed, even as it expressly distinguished suits against the federal government, *see id.* at 610 n.16 (“Here, . . . the Commonwealth is seeking to secure the federally created interests of its residents against private defendants.”).

A similar distinction was central to the Supreme Court’s decision in *Massachusetts v. EPA*. Although the Court there recognized a state’s standing to challenge federal administrative action (or, more precisely, the lack thereof), Justice Stevens’s opinion emphasized the “critical difference between allowing a State ‘to protect her citizens from the operation of federal statutes’ (which is what *Mellon* prohibits) and allowing a State to assert *its* rights under federal law (which it has standing to do).” 549 U.S. at 520 n.17 (quoting *Georgia*, 324 U.S. at 447) (emphasis added); *see also id.* (“Massachusetts does not here dispute that the Clean Air Act *applies* to its citizens; it rather seeks to assert its rights under the Act.”).⁶ Indeed, the linchpin of the Court’s standing

6. The Court’s analysis may also have reflected the view that Congress had specifically *authorized* Massachusetts’ suit. *See Massachusetts*, 549 U.S. at 514 n.16.

analysis was that rising sea levels would directly injure Massachusetts' *proprietary* interests as a coastal property owner. *See id.* at 522–23; *see also* RICHARD H. FALLON, JR. ET AL., HART & WECHSLER'S THE FEDERAL COURTS AND THE FEDERAL SYSTEM 265 (6th ed. 2009).

In short, even as the Supreme Court has greatly increased the ability of states to sue both other states and private parties to vindicate “quasi-sovereign interests,” and even as it has allowed suits against the federal government to vindicate states' statutory interests created by Congress, it has held fast to the *Mellon* rule as a categorical bar on pure *parens patriae* suits against the federal government. States simply do not have a sovereign interest sufficient to confer standing anytime the federal government is alleged to have exceeded its constitutional power.

II. STATE LAW CANNOT CREATE STANDING MERELY BY PURPORTING TO EXEMPT STATE CITIZENS FROM FEDERAL LAW

Conceding the continuing force of the *Mellon* bar, the states contend — and the district court held — that they nevertheless have a sufficient interest to support standing because of the conflict between the individual mandate and state laws purporting to exempt state citizens from complying with the PPACA. The argument, in short, is that the states are not proceeding as *parens patriae*, but are rather

seeking to vindicate their unique interest in enforcing the (otherwise preempted) state laws. *See, e.g., Bondi*, 2011 WL 285683, at *9. As cases identifying *valid* sovereign and quasi-sovereign interests show, however, this distinction is without a difference.

a. Quasi-Sovereign Interests Only Include Protecting the Health and Well-Being of Citizens and Preventing Discriminatory Treatment Within the Federal System

As noted above, the Supreme Court since *Massachusetts v. Mellon* has to some degree relaxed the constraints on the ability of states to sue in some circumstances. Further to that end, the Court has articulated criteria pursuant to which states might have a “quasi-sovereign” interest sufficient to satisfy both Article III and prudential standing considerations, at least in suits against private parties or other states. *See, e.g., Georgia v. Tenn. Copper Co.*, 206 U.S. 230, 237 (1907) (“In that capacity the State has an interest independent of and behind the titles of its citizens, in all the earth and air within its domain. It has the last word as to whether its mountains shall be stripped of their forests and its inhabitants shall breathe pure air.”).

Tellingly, though, in none of these cases did the Supreme Court *ever* suggest that a state could use such a “quasi-sovereign” interest to

sue the federal government; quite to the contrary. *See, e.g., Snapp*, 458 U.S. at 610 n.16. Nor has any case suggested that a state could create such a “quasi-sovereign” interest merely by exempting its citizens from compliance with applicable federal law, and for good reason. Absent circumstances such as those identified in cases like *Georgia v. Pennsylvania Railroad* and *Snapp*, “the State is only a nominal party without a real interest of its own,” *id.* at 600, and allowing standing would be tantamount to allowing the exact suit that *Mellon* forbids. *See id.* at 602 (“A quasi-sovereign interest must be sufficiently concrete to create an actual controversy between the State and the defendant.”).

Thus, even in suits against *non-federal* defendants, *Snapp* identified only two sets of circumstances in which states may in fact have a “quasi-sovereign” interest sufficient to confer standing: “First, a State has a quasi-sovereign interest in the health and well-being — both physical and economic — of its residents in general. Second, a State has a quasi-sovereign interest in not being discriminatorily denied its rightful status within the federal system.” *Id.* at 607.

b. A State Does Not Have an Independent Interest in Seeking to Protect Its Citizens from Federal Law

Nothing in *Snapp*, or in any other Supreme Court decision before or since, suggests that states have a similar interest in protecting their citizens *from* federal law, especially in suits against federal defendants. After all, states cannot have an interest in protecting their citizens from *valid* federal laws, since those laws are “the supreme Law of the Land . . . any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.” U.S. CONST. art. VI, cl. 2; *see also Mondou v. N.Y., New Haven, & Hartford R.R. Co.*, 223 U.S. 1, 57 (1912) (“When Congress . . . adopted that act, it spoke for all the people and all the states, and thereby established a policy for all. That policy is as much the policy of [a state] as if the act had emanated from its own legislature, and should be respected accordingly . . .”).

It necessarily follows that, even if a quasi-sovereign interest *could* support standing in a suit against the federal government, a state cannot claim a quasi-sovereign interest in protecting its citizens from allegedly invalid federal laws. *See, e.g., Georgia v. Pa. R.R. Co.*, 324 U.S. at 446–47 (explaining that quasi-sovereign interests do *not* extend to suits “where a State sought to protect her citizens from the operation of federal statutes”). A contrary conclusion would be patently

irreconcilable with *Mellon, Texas v. ICC*, and the litany of additional cases in which the Supreme Court rejected the argument that states may sue the federal government on claims that the latter exceeded its constitutional authority in its regulation of individuals.

c. States Cannot Create a Quasi-Sovereign Interest by Purporting to Exempt State Citizens from Federal Law

Nor is the above analysis altered by the suggestion that a state might have a quasi-sovereign interest in defending the applicability of *state* law as against an allegedly invalid federal law. To be sure, *Snapp* reiterated the state's *sovereign* (not "quasi-sovereign") interest in "the exercise of sovereign power over individuals and entities within the relevant jurisdiction," which "involves the power to create and enforce a legal code, both civil and criminal." 458 U.S. at 601. But that (by then well-established) interest goes only to a state's power to ensure that its laws are followed by those who are bound to comply. *See, e.g., Woolhandler & Collins, supra*, at 422–23. The state's interest in enforcing its laws must *necessarily* give way to federal law whenever a conflict arises, all the more so because the existence of a conflict in no way bears upon the underlying constitutionality of the federal law.

To that end, no part of the Court's analysis in *Snapp* or any other case can fairly be read to suggest that a state could create a quasi-sovereign interest simply by creating a conflict. "A state cannot by creating an agency for the purpose of making life better in the state obtain a legal interest in every transaction to which an entity within the state is a party." *Ill. Dep't of Transp. v. Hinson*, 122 F.3d 370, 373 (7th Cir. 1997) (Posner, C.J.).

It is therefore bootstrapping to conclude, as the district court did in the Virginia case, that "Federal regulatory action that preempts state law creates a sufficient injury-in-fact to satisfy [*Snapp*]." *Virginia ex rel. Cuccinelli v. Sebelius*, 702 F. Supp. 2d 598, 607 (E.D. Va. 2010) (quoting *Wyoming ex rel. Crank v. United States*, 539 F.3d 1236, 1242 (10th Cir. 2008)), cited in *Bondi*, 2011 WL 285683, at *9. It is not the *fact* of preemption that might inflict a sufficiently concrete injury upon the state to confer standing, but the unique nature of the state interest with which the federal law arguably interferes.⁷ Absent some more

7. This conclusion may help to explain the Supreme Court's observation in *Franchise Tax Board* that "[t]here are good reasons why the federal courts should not entertain suits by the States to declare the validity of their regulations despite possibly conflicting federal law. States are not significantly prejudiced by an inability to come to federal

specific quasi-sovereign, proprietary, or private interest arising out of the application of federal law, states may not sue the federal government simply to protect their citizens from allegedly unconstitutional laws.

III. THE DISTRICT COURT'S HOLDING THAT IDAHO AND UTAH HAVE STANDING WOULD HAVE GRAVE IMPLICATIONS FOR JUSTICIABILITY DOCTRINE

a. The District Court Rested the States' Standing Solely on the Conflict Between State and Federal Law

As noted above, the district court concluded that at least two states (Idaho and Utah) have standing because of the conflict between the individual mandate and those states' laws. For example, the Idaho Health Freedom Act provides that:

The power to require or regulate a person's choice in the mode of securing health care services, or to impose a penalty related thereto, is not found in the Constitution of the United States of America, and is therefore a power reserved to the people pursuant to the Ninth Amendment, and to the several states pursuant to the Tenth Amendment.

court for a declaratory judgment in advance of a possible injunctive suit by a person subject to federal regulation.” *Franchise Tax Bd. of Cal. v. Constr. Laborers Vacation Trust*, 463 U.S. 1, 21 (1983); see also Kevin C. Walsh, *The Ghost That Slew the Mandate*, 64 STAN. L. REV. (forthcoming 2011) (arguing that *Franchise Tax Board* precludes federal jurisdiction where, as here, states seek a declaratory judgment that state law is not preempted because the conflicting federal law is unconstitutional).

The state of Idaho hereby exercises its sovereign power to declare the public policy of the state of Idaho regarding the right of all persons residing in the state of Idaho in choosing the mode of securing health care services free from the imposition of penalties, or the threat thereof, by the federal government of the United States of America relating thereto.

IDAHO CODE § 39-9003(1) (2010). To similar effect, Utah law provides that “An individual in this state may not be required to obtain or maintain health insurance . . . , regardless of whether the individual has or is eligible for health insurance coverage under any policy or program provided by or through the individual’s employer or a plan sponsored by the state or federal government.” UTAH CODE ANN. § 63M-1-2505.5(4)(a) (2010).

What should be clear from the text of these statutes is that neither is a criminal provision of that state’s code, nor a law that reflects Utah’s or Idaho’s quasi-sovereign interest in either “the health and well-being — both physical and economic — of its residents in general” or “in not being discriminatorily denied its rightful status within the federal system.” *Snapp*, 458 U.S. at 607. The laws create no penalties, nor do they impose any obligations on (or barriers to conduct *by*) private citizens, who remain free to privately contract for health insurance. Instead, the law exempts state citizens from a requirement

that, practically, could *only* be imposed by the federal government. Put simply, the statutes serve no sovereign or quasi-sovereign interest *other* than to provoke a conflict with federal law.

Nevertheless, the district court concluded that the existence of a conflict between the individual mandate and the Idaho and Utah state laws is sufficient to confer standing upon the state parties. *See Bondi*, 2011 WL 285683, at *9–10. Relying entirely on the district court’s reasoning in *Virginia ex rel. Cuccinelli v. Sebelius*, *see id.* at *9, the court concluded that Idaho and Utah, through their Attorneys General, satisfy the standing requirements of Article III.

As the above analysis suggests, however, the mere fact of preemption is not — and cannot be — sufficient to create a sovereign or quasi-sovereign interest supporting the states’ standing to challenge the constitutionality of federal regulation. And although the district court in *Sebelius* heavily relied upon it, the Tenth Circuit’s decision in *Wyoming* is not to the contrary. As was true in *Massachusetts v. EPA*, Wyoming’s suit was specifically authorized by the APA. *See* 539 F.3d at 1242–44. The question presented to the Tenth Circuit was only whether the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms had acted arbitrarily and

capriciously in interpreting a federal statute; like Massachusetts before it, Wyoming was asserting its statutory rights under federal law.⁸ *Cf. Connecticut v. Health Net, Inc.*, 383 F.3d 1258, 1262 (11th Cir. 2004) (“When a state sues in *parens patriae* to enforce a federal statute, it must demonstrate that, in enacting the statute, Congress clearly intended that the states be able to bring actions in that capacity.”).

In that regard, it is telling that the district court in this case (like the district court in *Sebelius*) provided no additional analysis of, or explanation for, how the individual mandate affects the states’ sovereign interests as distinct from the interests of their citizens; the standing analysis in both cases rises and falls on the simple but incorrect conclusion that a claim of preemption will always suffice to confer upon the state an interest sufficient to challenge the constitutionality of the conflicting federal law.

b. Such Reasoning Would “Make a Mockery” of the Case-or-Controversy Requirement

8. To similar effect, the two circuit decisions on which the *Wyoming* court relied (in holding that preemption is sufficient to confer standing) *also* involved situations where states were suing federal agencies for failing to comply with federal statutes. *See Alaska v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, 868 F.2d 441, 444 (D.C. Cir. 1989); *Ohio ex rel. Celebrezze v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, 766 F.2d 228, 233 (6th Cir. 1985).

Because the district court rested the states' standing on the mere existence of a conflict between federal and state law, and identified no freestanding injury to any other quasi-sovereign or proprietary interest, its holding allows for no principled distinction between this suit and any other in which states would use preemption as the basis for standing to bring a constitutional challenge to federal law. Nor is there any logical distinction between such a suit and one in which the states' objection sounded purely in the *applicability* of a federal statute — not that the conflicting federal statute was unconstitutional, but merely that it did not actually preempt state law. Such overbroad and cursory analysis, if allowed to stand, would create three distinct problems for contemporary standing doctrine.

First, allowing states to challenge the constitutionality of federal laws by creating a statutory conflict with state law would provide an all-too-effective end-run around *Mellon*, since it would reduce the Supreme Court's bar on *parens patriae* suits against the federal

government to cases in which there is no positive state law with which the challenged federal action is in tension.⁹

Second, to the extent that *Mellon* reflects deeper principles about Article III standing, including the bar on generalized grievances and the requirement that the plaintiff suffer a concrete, particularized injury, a rule that allows states to sue the federal government whenever there is a conflict between state and federal law would risk vitiating those requirements altogether in any instance in which a conflict is alleged to exist. Indeed, if a putative conflict between state and federal law itself sufficed to satisfy the injury-in-fact prong of standing analysis, *see Sebelius*, 702 F. Supp. 2d at 607, there would be no way of ensuring that the challenged federal law actually injured an individual party; the existence of standing would be governed simply by the abstract — and quite possibly hypothetical — conflict between state and federal law. *See, e.g., Bickel, supra*, at 90 (“Time and again, precisely like a council of revision, the Court would be pronouncing the

9. Even this distinction might prove illusory; federal law in most relevant cases will displace at least *some* state law, such as state tort law in the case of federal law governing the manufacture of medical devices. *See, e.g., Wyeth v. Levine*, 129 S. Ct. 1187 (2009).

abstraction that some law generally like the one before it would or would not generally be constitutional in the generality of its applications.”).

In addition to prematurely (and perhaps unnecessarily) involving the courts in a political dispute, such a result would also fly in the face of the Court’s repeated admonition that “we must carefully inquire as to whether [plaintiffs] have met their burden of establishing that their claimed injury is personal, particularized, concrete, and otherwise judicially cognizable.” *Raines*, 521 U.S. at 820.

Third, and perhaps counterintuitively, “expansive state standing has a serious potential to undermine rather than complement individual standing in constitutional cases,” *Woolhandler & Collins*, *supra*, at 396; *see also id.* at 504 (“[I]ncreased state standing could potentially undermine individual standing to litigate individual and structural constitutional guaranties.”), both because it would prioritize claims by states over those of individuals and because of the likelihood that it would be “majority reinforcing,” placing into tension “[t]he freedom of government” and “the freedom from government.” *See id.* at 483. In other words, allowing states to sue in any instance of conflict

with federal law would short-circuit the principal means through which majorities have traditionally exercised control over the scope of federal power — at the ballot box — and come at the expense of those who historically have been left to the courts to vindicate their rights.

c. Preemption-Based Standing Would Also Incentivize State Attempts to Impermissibly Nullify Federal Laws

Finally, it bears noting that the Idaho and Utah laws at issue here are hardly unique. Indeed, the Idaho statute on which the district court premised its standing has been expressly invoked as a model for future state attempts to nullify allegedly unconstitutional federal laws. *See* THOMAS E. WOODS, JR., NULLIFICATION: HOW TO RESIST FEDERAL TYRANNY IN THE 21ST CENTURY 122–23 (2010). In one sense, these efforts may reflect “the political reality that a smaller unit of government is more likely to have a population with preferences that depart from the majority’s. It is, therefore, more likely to try an approach that could not command a national majority.” Michael W. McConnell, *Federalism: Evaluating the Founders’ Design*, 54 U. CHI. L. REV. 1484, 1498 (1987) (book review). But that only further undermines the argument that such conflicts should create standing, for it would inevitably lead to multifarious efforts to challenge federal legislation

from every direction, and by every constituency.¹⁰ As Professor Bickel warned, “It would make a mockery . . . of the constitutional requirement of case or controversy . . . to countenance automatic litigation — and automatic it would surely become — by states situated no differently” than Idaho or Utah are here. Bickel, *supra*, at 89–90.

The state laws at issue here do not expressly claim to “nullify” federal law. But they were enacted to invite the same result, albeit via judicial invalidation rather than outright nullification. To allow standing based solely on the existence of such statutes is to take up such an invitation, and to involve the courts in an enterprise that Article III’s case-or-controversy requirement was specifically intended (and has long been interpreted) to keep them out of.

10. In February 2011, for example, the Arizona Senate passed S.B. 1178 (the “Intrastate Commerce Act”), which provides that all services performed within Arizona, and all goods grown or made in the state for consumption within the state, “are not subject to the authority of Congress under its constitutional power to regulate commerce among the several states.” The bill also imposes substantial fines for state or federal officers who attempt to enforce federal laws that are inconsistent with those proscriptions.

*

*

*

If the individual mandate is constitutional, then these state laws will all fall under the Supremacy Clause. If the individual mandate is *not* constitutional, then *it* will fall regardless of whether it conflicts with any state laws. Even at its broadest, standing doctrine has never encompassed such an undifferentiated, unspecific, and ultimately irrelevant injury to state law. To nevertheless allow the states to proceed as plaintiffs would be to sanction a practice that the text, purpose, and history of the Constitution expressly forbid, and

would be a fundamental denial of perhaps the most innovating principle of the Constitution: the principle that the federal government is a sovereign coexisting in the same territory with the states and acting, not through them, like some international organization, but directly upon the citizenry, which is its own as well as theirs.

Bickel, *supra*, at 89.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, *amici curiae* respectfully submit that the state parties lack standing, and that the district court's conclusion to the contrary should not be allowed to stand.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ F. Paul Bland, Jr.

Stephen I. Vladeck
4801 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20016
(202) 274-4241

F. Paul Bland, Jr.
Chavez & Gertler
1825 K Street, N.W., Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 797-8600

Counsel for Amici Curiae Professors of Federal Jurisdiction

April 8, 2011

APPENDIX

List of *Amici Curiae*
Professors of Federal Jurisdiction*

Janet Cooper Alexander

Frederick I. Richman Professor of Law
Stanford Law School

Michael P. Allen

Professor of Law
Stetson University College of Law

Erwin Chemerinsky

Founding Dean
University of California-Irvine School of Law

Charlton Copeland

Associate Professor of Law
University of Miami School of Law

Heather Elliott

Associate Professor
University of Alabama School of Law

Amanda Frost

Professor of Law
American University Washington College of Law

Andy Hessick

Associate Professor of Law
Arizona State University Sandra Day O'Connor College of Law

* Affiliations are provided for identification purposes only.

Johanna Kalb

Assistant Professor

Loyola University New Orleans College of Law

Lumen N. Mulligan

Professor of Law

University of Kansas School of Law

Edward A. Purcell, Jr.

Joseph Solomon Distinguished Professor of Law

New York Law School

Caprice L. Roberts

Visiting Professor, Catholic University Columbus School of Law

Professor of Law, University of West Virginia School of Law

Stephen I. Vladeck

Professor of Law

American University Washington College of Law

Howard M. Wasserman

Associate Professor

FIU College of Law

Michael L. Wells

Marion and W. Colquitt Carter Chair in Tort and Insurance Law

University of Georgia School of Law

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

This brief complies with the type-volume limitation of Rule 32(a)(7)(B) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure because it contains 6,996 words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Rule 32(a)(7)(B)(iii).

This brief complies with the typeface requirements of Rule 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Rule 32(a)(6) because it has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word in Century Schoolbook 14-point font.

Dated: April 8, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen I. Vladeck
4801 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20016
(202) 274-4241

/s/ F. Paul Bland Jr.
F. Paul Bland, Jr.
Chavez & Gertler
1825 K Street, N.W., Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 797-8600

Counsel for Amici Curiae Professors of Federal Jurisdiction

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

11-11021HH (11-11067HH)

STATE OF FLORIDA V. US DEPT. OF HEALTH

I hereby certify that one copy of this Brief of Professors of Federal Jurisdiction as *Amici Curiae* in Support of Defendants-Appellants was sent by Regular First Class Mail to:

Neal Kumar Katyal
Acting Solicitor General
Office of the Solicitor General
950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
(202) 514-2203

Tony West
Assistant Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania, NW
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 514-2000

Pamela C. Marsh
United States Attorney
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania, NW
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 514-2000

Beth S. Brinkman
Deputy Assistant Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania, NW
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 514-2000

Carlos Ramos-Mrosovsky
Baker & Hostetler LLP
45 Rockefeller Plaza, 11th floor
New York, New York 10111

Larry James Obhof, Jr.
Baker & Hostetler LLP
1900 E. 9th Street, Suite 3200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Blaine H. Winship
Scott Douglas Makar
Timothy David Osterhaus
Office of the Attorney General, Florida
The Capitol, Suite PL-01
400 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Katherine Jean Spohn
Office of the Attorney General, Nebraska
2115 State Capitol
Lincoln, Nebraska 68509

William James Cobb III
Office of the Attorney General, Texas
209 W. 14th Street
Austin, Texas 78711

Gregory Katsas
Jones Day
51 Louisiana Ave NW
Washington, DC 20001-2105

Mark B. Stern
Thomas M. Bondy
Alisa B. Klein
Samantha L. Chaifetz
Dana Kaersvang
Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
(202) 514-5089

David Boris Rivkin, Jr.
Lee Alfred Casey
Andrew Grossman
Baker & Hostetler LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20036

I also certify that the original and six copies of this Brief of Professors of Federal Jurisdiction as *Amici Curiae* in Support of Defendants-Appellants were also shipped via Federal Express Next Business Day Delivery to:

Clerk of Court
United States Court of Appeals, Eleventh Circuit
United States Courthouse
56 Forsyth Street, NW
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 335-6100

on this 8th day of April 2011.

/s/ Nadia R. Oswald-Hamid
Nadia Oswald-Hamid