



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

KYLE D. HAWKINS  
Solicitor General

(512) 936-1700  
Kyle.Hawkins@oag.texas.gov

September 15, 2020

**Via E-File**

Honorable Scott S. Harris  
Clerk of the Court  
Supreme Court of the United States  
1 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20543

**Re: *California v. Texas*, No. 19-840; *Texas v. California*, No. 19-1019**

Dear Mr. Harris,

On August 25, petitioners submitted letters to this Court to express their opinions about the topics addressed in Texas's reply brief. As these letters are not motions and do not request relief, it is unclear whether a response is necessary.

Regardless, petitioners' contentions are meritless. In its April 2 Order, the Court directed Texas "to file a reply brief limited to Question 2 presented by the petition for certiorari in No. 19-1019." That question is: "Whether the district court properly declared the ACA invalid in its entirety and unenforceable anywhere."

The first section of Texas's reply brief is titled: "The District Court Properly Declared the ACA's Major and Minor Provisions Invalid." It addresses whether the district court properly declared the ACA invalid in its entirety. Reply Br. II, 3-11. The second is titled: "The District Court Properly Declared the ACA Unenforceable Anywhere." It addresses whether the district court properly declared the ACA unenforceable anywhere. *Id.* at II, 12-19.

Nothing about Texas's reply is improper, and petitioners' opinions should be disregarded.

Page 2

Regards,

/s/ Kyle D. Hawkins

Kyle D. Hawkins  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*

cc: Samuel P. Siegel (Counsel for State Petitioners)  
Douglas N. Letter (Counsel for House of Representatives)  
Jeffrey B. Wall (Counsel for Federal Respondents)  
Robert Henneke (Counsel for Individual Respondents)