



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

JOSH SHAPIRO
ATTORNEY GENERAL

1600 ARCH STREET
SUITE 300
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

May 3, 2019

Patricia S. Dodszuweit
Clerk of Court
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit
21400 U.S. Courthouse
601 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106-1790

By *CM/ECF*

Re: *Commonwealth of Pennsylvania & State of New Jersey v. President United States of America et al.*, Nos. 17-3752, 18-1253, 19-1129, 19-1189

Dear Ms. Dodszuweit:

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(j), Plaintiffs-Appellees Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and State of New Jersey respectfully submit this letter to advise the Court that the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit issued a decision yesterday reversing the dismissal, on standing grounds, of a challenge brought by Massachusetts to the exemption rules at issue in this case. *Massachusetts v. HHS*, 2019 WL 1950427 (1st Cir. May 2, 2019). Both appellate courts to address the question have now concluded, as the district court did here, that states have standing to challenge the rules. *Id.* at *9–13; *California v. Azar*, 911 F.3d 558, 571–72 (9th Cir. 2018).

Massachusetts alleged imminent fiscal injury from the “substantial risk that the rules will cause women in the Commonwealth to lose their contraceptive coverage” and “substantial likelihood that some of these women will then obtain state-funded contraceptive services or prenatal and postnatal care for unintended pregnancies.” *Massachusetts*, 2019 WL 1950427, at *9. The First Circuit held that Defendants’ own estimates of women who will lose coverage and Defendants’ own

assumptions that litigating and accommodated entities located in Massachusetts were likely to use the exemptions established “a substantial risk that *some* women in Massachusetts will lose coverage due to the regulations.” *Id.* at *10–11. The First Circuit further concluded that the existence of state-funded contraceptive services available to a portion of Massachusetts women, coupled with the undisputed public costs of unintended pregnancies, created a “substantial risk” that the rules would cause Massachusetts to incur costs. *Id.* at *12–13.

The States have made the same showing here. Resp. Br. 36–43. Defendants do not disclaim their own estimates of impacted women, Def. Br. 31–32, nor do they dispute that a number of litigating and accommodated entities operate in the States, Def. Br. 25–28; *see* J.A. 223, 350–90, 622. And Defendants do not dispute that the States fund contraceptive services that will be available to eligible women who will lose contraceptive coverage. Def. Br. 30–31; *see* Resp. Br. 36–38.

A copy of the decision is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

GURBIR S. GREWAL
Attorney General
State of New Jersey

JOSH SHAPIRO
Attorney General
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

/s/ Glenn J. Moramarco
GLENN J. MORAMARCO
Assistant Attorney General
ELSPETH HANS
Deputy Attorney General

/s/ Michael J. Fischer
MICHAEL J. FISCHER
Chief Deputy Attorney General
AIMEE D. THOMSON
Deputy Attorney General

Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex
25 Market Street, 8th Floor, West Wing
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0116
(609) 376-3235
Glenn.Moramarco@law.njoag.gov

Office of Attorney General
Strawberry Square
Harrisburg, PA 17120
(215) 560-2171
mfischer@attorneygeneral.gov

cc (by CM/ECF): Counsel of Record

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have caused the foregoing document, and any attachments thereto, to be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit by using the CM/ECF system. I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

Dated: May 3, 2019

/s/ Michael J. Fischer

MICHAEL J. FISCHER