



1-1-2011

Coons v. Geithner - Plaintiff's Reply to U.S. Motion to stay Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgement

Nick Coons

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



Part of the [Health Law Commons](#)

Automated Citation

Coons, Nick, "Coons v. Geithner - Plaintiff's Reply to U.S. Motion to stay Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgement" (2011). *Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act Litigation*. Paper 289.
<http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/aca/289>

This Memorandum 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.

**Scharf-Norton Center for Constitutional Litigation at the
GOLDWATER INSTITUTE**

Clint Bolick (Arizona Bar No. 021684)
Diane S. Cohen (Arizona Bar No. 027791)
Christina M. Kohn (Arizona Bar No. 027983)
500 E. Coronado Rd., Phoenix, AZ 85004
(602) 462-5000
CBolick@GoldwaterInstitute.org
DCohen@GoldwaterInstitute.org
CKohn@GoldwaterInstitute.org
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

NICK COONS, et al.,)	
)	No. 2:10-cv-1714-GMS
Plaintiffs,)	
v.)	Plaintiffs’ Response to
)	Defendants’ Motion to Stay Plaintiffs’
)	Motion for Summary Judgment and
)	to Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion
TIMOTHY GEITHNER, et al.,)	to Treat Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss as one
)	for Summary Judgment
)	
Defendants.)	ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

INTRODUCTION

On June 23, 2011, Defendants filed a Motion to Stay Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment in Part, as well as opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Treat Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss as a Rule 56 Motion for Summary Judgment (Plaintiffs’ 12(d) Motion). In support of their Motion, Defendants advance three main arguments: First, they argue that in filing summary judgment before Defendants’ Rule 12(b)(1) Motion to Dismiss is resolved, Plaintiffs are asking this Court to exercise “hypothetical jurisdiction.” (Defs.’ Mem. Supp. Mot. Stay and

1 in Opp'n to Plffs.' Rule 12(d) Mot. (Mem.) 4-6.) Second, Defendants argue that that it would be
2 a waste of resources to address a summary judgment motion at this time. (Mem. 4.) Third,
3 Defendants claim if their (b)(1) Motion is denied, they "will wish to seek jurisdictional
4 discovery" into Plaintiff Coons' financial resources because it is "impossible" for them to
5 determine whether Coons will actually be subject to the minimum coverage provision when it
6 takes effect in 2014. (*Id.* at 6.) In opposition to Plaintiffs' 12(d) Motion, Defendants argue that
7 their citations to materials such as articles and statistics in support of their Motion to Dismiss
8 does not warrant treating it as one for summary judgment. (*Id.* at 7-8.)
9
10
11

12 Plaintiffs submit that proceeding with summary judgment on Plaintiffs' Second Amended
13 Complaint (Plaintiffs' Complaint) will require no additional time or resources that are not
14 already being expended on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss. To be sure, in a case like this that
15 involves purely legal issues with limited exception, Defendants' 12(b)(6) Motion is the
16 functional equivalent of a Rule 56 motion for summary judgment. That explains why
17 Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is essentially identical to the motions for summary judgment
18 Defendants filed in the *Florida* and *Virginia* cases, (*Florida ex rel. Bondi v. United States*, 2011
19 WL 285683, at *24 (N.D. Fla. March 3, 2011); *Virginia ex rel. Cuccinelli v. Sebelius*, 702 F.
20 Supp. 2d 598, 610 (E.D. Va. 2010)). Indeed, while Defendants argue that "requiring the parties
21 and the Court to address plaintiffs' summary judgment motion at this time, including
22 preparation of opposition papers and argument, would result in waste of time," (Mem. 4), they
23 failed to identify a single issue they would be required to address on summary judgment that
24 they have not already addressed in their Motion to Dismiss.
25
26
27
28

1 Defendants did not have to file a combined 12(b)(1) and (b)(6) Motion to Dismiss in this
2 case; instead, they could have chosen to file only a 12(b)(1) Motion seeking dismissal solely on
3 jurisdictional grounds, as they did for example in *Bellow v. HHS*, No. 1:10-cv-00165 (E.D. Tex.
4 Mar. 15, 2011). If they had proceeded in this manner, they would have eliminated
5 approximately 35 pages of briefing of the 12(b)(6) issues that, according to Defendants' own
6 argument, would not be necessary to address even if the Court were to dismiss this case on
7 jurisdictional grounds. Since Defendants do not dispute that their Motion to Dismiss is
8 essentially identical to their motions for summary judgment in the *Virginia* and *Florida* cases, it
9 is baffling that Defendants would persist in opposing moving forward with summary judgment
10 proceedings. In fact, the only matter ostensibly standing in the way of proceeding with
11 summary judgment is Defendants' contention that should this Court deny their Rule 12(b)(1)
12 motion, they will need to conduct "jurisdictional discovery" to confirm Plaintiff Coons is indeed
13 subject to the Individual Mandate. (Mem. 6.) However, even if such "discovery" were
14 warranted, it would require no significant expenditure of time, and thus would not warrant
15 staying summary judgment proceedings. Accordingly, Plaintiffs respectfully request that
16 Defendants' Motion for Stay be denied and Plaintiffs' Rule 12(d) Motion be granted.

22 **I. Common Sense, Not Hypothetical Jurisdiction, Is at Issue**

23 Defendants apparently would like this Court to believe that the only issue before the
24 Court is Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. (*See* Mem. 1.) Defendants
25 maintain that if their motion is granted in full, this case will never reach the merits; therefore, it
26 is in the interest of judicial economy to stay summary judgment consideration. (*Id.* at 1-2.) But
27
28

1 that might arguably have been convincing only if Defendants had not proceeded with their
2 broad-based Rule 12(b)(6) motion, which requires the parties to conduct briefing of summary
3 judgment scope. This is why it is disingenuous at best for Defendants to cast Plaintiffs'
4 summary judgment and 12(d) motions as ones that ask this Court to rule on the merits of
5 Plaintiffs' Complaint before resolving the jurisdictional issues. Indeed, Plaintiffs' motions do
6 not ask the Court to do this anymore than Defendants' Motion to Dismiss asks the Court to do.
7
8

9 Defendants cite a series of cases that address different jurisdictional issues, though none
10 are relevant or analogous to this case. For example, Defendants cite to *Ticor Title Ins. Co. v.*
11 *F.T.C.*, 625 F.Supp. 747, 750-751 (D.D.C. 1986), where the court stayed the case because
12 administrative remedies had not been exhausted. Defendants also cite to *Steel Co. v. Citizens for*
13 *a Better Environment*, where the Court rejected the doctrine of "hypothetical jurisdiction," under
14 which "several Courts of Appeals . . . found it proper to proceed immediately to the merits
15 question, despite jurisdictional objections." 523 U.S. 83, 1011-1016 (1998). To be clear,
16 Plaintiffs do not dispute that Article III jurisdiction is always an antecedent question the courts
17 must answer before passing judgment on the claims in a case. *Id.* at 1016.
18
19
20

21 Defendants also rely on another non-analogous case, *Ex Parte McArdle*, 74 U.S. 506
22 (1868), which held that when Congress repeals the Court's jurisdiction over the hearing of
23 certain appeals, including jurisdiction over a case that was currently before the Court, the Court
24 was "[w]ithout jurisdiction" and could not "proceed." *Id.* at 514. Likewise, *Public Citizen v.*
25 *Bomer*, 274 F.3d 212 (5th Cir. 2002), involved a plaintiff who tried to use summary judgment
26 "evidence" to defeat a motion to dismiss, while in *Hamrick v. Farmers Alliance Mutual Ins. Co.*,
27
28

1 No. 03-4202, 2004 WL 723649, *1 (D. Kansas March 11, 2004) (an unpublished case), the
2 district court ruled that in that particular case, under those particular circumstances, it was in the
3 interest of “judicial economy” to defer briefing on summary judgment.
4

5 Defendants also point to the proceedings in other cases challenging the Patient Protection
6 and Affordable Care Act (PPACA),¹ where summary judgment proceedings were stayed
7 pending jurisdictional rulings. However, in hindsight, the stays in those cases did little in terms
8 of conserving judicial economy. That is because the scope of Defendants’ motions to dismiss in
9 cases like *Virginia, Florida* and *Mead v. Holder*, No. 10-00950 (D.D.C. Sept. 8, 2010), required
10 the same investment of time and resources of the parties and the court as would have been
11 required on a motion for summary judgment.
12

13
14 Defendants argue that “even in *Virginia* and *Florida*, upon which plaintiffs’ rely upon
15 heavily, summary judgment motions were filed only after those courts had ruled on motions to
16 dismiss.” (Mem. 6.) However, we now know that in those two cases, which were the first filed
17 challenging PPACA, Defendants’ motions to dismiss and motions for summary judgment were
18 essentially identical. Indeed, the *Florida* plaintiffs foresaw that very outcome and proposed at
19 their Rule 16 conference combined briefing of the (b)(1) and Rule 56 issues, due to the
20 “overlapping arguments between what [the Government was] . . . arguing as a matter of law for
21 dismissal, and what [the plaintiffs were] . . . arguing as a matter of law for a judgment in [their]
22 favor as a matter of Summary Judgment under Rule 56.” *Florida*, 3:10-cv-00091-RV, *12 (Doc.
23
24
25

26
27 ¹Pub. L. No. 111-148, 124 Stat. 119 (2010), as amended by the Health Care and Education
28 Reconciliation Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-152, 124 Stat. 1029 (2010).

1 44) (May 26, 2010) (excerpts from Transcript attached as Exh. 1). In that case, like here,
2 Defendants had filed a “very broad-based Motion to Dismiss, not just on issues of justiciability
3 or ripeness or standing [as was the case in *Bellow v. HHS*²]. . . but also on the basis of whether
4 [their] causes of action state legal claims for which relief can be granted.” *Id.* at 25. Ultimately,
5 the *Florida* Court ordered sequential briefing; however, in setting the schedule in this manner,
6 the Court recognized that there was not a “good, full grasp of how the issues [were] going to
7 mesh” in terms of overlap. *Id.* at 28. We are now well-aware of how the issues relating to
8 Defendants’ 12(b)(6) Motion and those to be raised on summary judgment “mesh” and
9 “overlap.”³ Accordingly, there is no purpose served by engaging in multiple and sequential
10 briefing in this case.
11
12
13

14 **II. The Purported Need for Jurisdictional Discovery Does Not Support a Stay**

15 Thus, the sole issue ostensibly in the way of proceeding with summary judgment is
16 Defendants’ claim that should the Court deny their 12(b)(1) Motion to Dismiss, they will “wish
17 to take jurisdictional discovery” relating to whether “Coons will actually be subject to the
18 minimum coverage provision when it takes effect in 2014.” (Mem. 6.) Defendants claim they
19
20
21

22 ²Defendants cite *Bellow* for their proposition that courts must determine jurisdiction before they
23 can rule on the merits of those claims. (Mem. 5.) However, *Bellow* is distinguishable because
24 at the time plaintiff *Bellow* filed a motion for summary judgment, Defendants had only filed a
25 12(b)(1) motion, and thus had not put the entire case before the Court as a matter of law through
26 a 12(b)(6) Motion.

27 ³Defendants rely on *Mead*, No. 10-00950, EFC 20, for the proposition that “it would be a waste
28 of everyone’s time and resources to have concurrent briefing on both Motions.” (Mem. 6.)
However, Plaintiffs here are seeking one set of briefings, not “concurrent briefing.”
Furthermore, the *Mead* stay did not in reality stay anything because there, as here, Defendants
filed a broad based 12(b)(6) motion. See Exh. 2, *Mead* Table of Contents and Introduction.

1 will need facts such as “the nature of Coons’ current employment, a description of his ‘financial
2 resources,’ and his income and expenses.” *Id.* However, the plaintiffs’ declarations submitted
3 in the *Florida* case were substantially similar to Mr. Coons’ declaration, yet there is no
4 indication that Defendants sought any such “jurisdictional” discovery in that case. *See*
5 Declarations submitted in the *Florida*, Group Exh. 3.
6

7
8 Upon reviewing Defendants’ Motion for Stay, Plaintiffs contacted Defendants to inquire
9 about and attempt to address the discovery issue. Unfortunately, Plaintiffs’ efforts to address
10 this issue were to no avail, with Defendants declaring that they are “under no obligation” to
11 discuss this matter. (*See* Correspondence, Exh. 4.) Accordingly, it is unclear what discovery
12 Defendants claim they will need. For example, will they seek discovery that proves whether Mr.
13 Coons is a member of an Indian tribe, whether he is a veteran, incarcerated, or eligible for
14 Medicare or Medicaid? Would production of tax documents and a driver’s license for
15 Defendants’ inspection satisfy Defendants’ question as to whether Coons is subject to the
16 Mandate? In any event, this is not the type of issue that should require formal discovery or
17 create any disputed fact. Indeed, Plaintiff Coons is prepared to produce his tax documents for
18 inspection by Defendants (to show he is subject to the Mandate), and a copy of his driver’s
19 license for Defendants’ inspection (that shows his year of birth). While these are not documents
20 any plaintiff would wish to file in the public docket, certainly Defendants’ review of them
21 should be sufficient to confirm any reasonably calculated jurisdictional questions they may
22 have. Certainly, this is an issue that can be addressed swiftly, if Defendants are willing to work
23 cooperatively.
24
25
26
27
28

III. Plaintiffs' Rule 12(d) Motion Should be Granted

In opposing Plaintiffs' 12(d) Motion, Defendants cite a string of cases that discuss what a court may take into consideration when reviewing a Motion to Dismiss, without ever addressing the fact that their Motion to Dismiss is identical to their motions for summary judgment in the *Florida* and *Virginia* cases. (See Mem. 7-8.) Indeed, Plaintiffs do not dispute that matters attached to complaints or referenced therein, as well as public records of which a court can take judicial notice, *id.* at 8, can be considered in reviewing a motion to dismiss. However, the materials Defendants relied on in their Motion to Dismiss, which Plaintiffs refer to in their Rule 12(d) Motion, are neither materials that are attached to or cited in Plaintiffs' Complaint, nor are they materials of which the Court can take judicial notice.

Accordingly, while Defendants expended a great deal of space string-citing numerous cases that discuss judicial notice, they are of no consequence here. For example, in *Coit v. Biltmore Bank*, No. 2010 WL 20365663, *1 (D. Ariz, May 19, 2010), this Court held that it may take judicial notice of matters of public records from the Maricopa County Recorder's office. In *Anheuser-Busch, Inc. v. Schmoke*, 63 F.3d 1305, 1312 (4th Cir. 1995), the Fourth Circuit held that a court may take judicial notice of legislative history. *Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights*, 551 U.S. 308, 322 (2007), held that when ruling on a 12(b)(6) motion, the Courts "ordinarily examine . . . documents incorporated into the complaint by reference and matters of which a court may take judicial notice." *Id.* *Daniels-Hall v. National Educ. Ass'n*, 629 F.3d 992, 998-999 (9th Cir. 2010), held that a "prospectus" referred to in the complaint, as well as information displayed on government websites, could be taken into consideration. Likewise, in

1 *Lazy Ranch Ltd. v. Behrens*, 546 F.3d 580, 588 (9th Cir. 2008), the court noted that documents
2 referenced in the complaint may be considered; while in *Kanelos v. County of Mohave*, 2011
3 WL 587203, *2 (Snow, J.) (D. Ariz, February 9, 2011), this Court held it may consider
4 documents attached to the complaint or that are referenced extensively therein and accepted by
5 all parties as authentic.
6

7
8 Thus, Defendants miss the point by focusing on the legislative history and other public
9 records they relied on in their motion to dismiss, which Plaintiffs did not cite to in support of
10 their 12(d) Motion. Instead, the documents at issue are those listed in Defendants' Table of
11 Contents to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (pp. xii and xiii), which are numerous publications
12 and surveys containing argument, opinion and purported statistics. Nonetheless, the basis for
13 treating Defendants' Motion to Dismiss as one for summary judgment has less to do with the
14 fact that Defendants cited numerous documents in their Motion that are neither attached to nor
15 referenced in the Complaint, nor are public records of which the Court can take judicial notice,
16 and more to do with the fact that Defendants' 12(b)(6) Motion is for all intents and purposes the
17 functional equivalent of a motion for summary judgment.
18
19
20

21 **CONCLUSION**

22 Defendants fail to present a single good reason this case should not proceed to summary
23 judgment if Plaintiffs' standing is upheld. And it is entirely unclear as to why they would wish
24 to stay summary judgment and engage in redundant briefing.⁴ For the foregoing reasons,
25
26

27 ⁴Defendants appear to chide Plaintiffs for amending their Complaint on two occasions and for
28 withdrawing their injunction motion. (*See* Mem. 1-2.) Those steps were taken to promote

1 Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court deny Defendants' Motion for Stay of Plaintiffs'
2 Motion for Summary Judgment, and grant Plaintiffs' Motion to Treat Defendants' Rule 12(b)(6)
3 Motion as a Rule 56 Motion for Summary Judgment in Part.
4

5 **July 7, 2011**

6 **RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,**

7 s/Diane Cohen

8 Clint Bolick (Arizona Bar No. 021684)

9 Diane S. Cohen (Arizona Bar No. 027791)

10 Christina M. Kohn (Arizona Bar No. 027983)

11 GOLDWATER INSTITUTE

12 500 E. Coronado Rd.

13 Phoenix, AZ 85004

14 P: (602) 462-5000

15 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

16
17
18
19
20 expeditious consideration of this case and in response to Defendants' actions implementing
21 PPACA. Because PPACA's Medicaid mandates on Arizona were set to cripple the state's
22 budget, Arizona requested and was granted "permission" from the federal government to
23 discontinue coverage for a particular Medicaid population, something the state could not have
24 otherwise done without jeopardizing all Medicaid matching funds. As a result, the claims of the
25 twenty-nine state legislator-plaintiffs are not ripe, requiring their withdrawal and an amendment
26 of the Complaint. The injunction motion was withdrawn based on Defendants' interpretation of
27 certain provisions pertaining to the Independent Payment Advisory Board, which was set forth
28 in a stipulation and entered by this Court. Most certainly, neither the withdrawal of the motion
for preliminary injunction nor ensuing amendments to the Complaint are grounds for needlessly
delaying summary judgment consideration. In any event, it is in both parties' interests to pursue
the most expedient course for this litigation.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Diane Cohen, an attorney, hereby certify that on July 7, 2011, I electronically filed Plaintiffs' Response to Defendants Motion for Stay and Response to Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion to Treat Defendants' Motion to Dismiss as one for Summary Judgment, with the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court, District of Arizona by using the CM/ECF system.

I further certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the District Court's CM/ECF system.

s/ Diane S. Cohen