

1 BRIAN M. BOYNTON  
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General

2 ERIC BECKENHAUER  
3 Assistant Branch Director  
4 Civil Division

5 STEVEN A. MYERS (NY Bar # 4823043)  
6 Senior Trial Counsel  
7 United States Department of Justice  
8 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
9 1100 L St. NW  
10 Washington, DC 20005  
11 Tel: (202) 305-8648  
12 Fax: (202) 616-8470  
13 E-mail: steven.a.myers@usdoj.gov

Samara Spence\* (DC Bar No. 1031191)  
Jeffrey B. Dubner\* (DC Bar No. 1013399)  
Sean A. Lev\* (DC Bar. No. 449936)  
Democracy Forward Foundation  
P.O. Box 34553  
Washington, DC 20043  
sspence@democracyforward.org  
jdubner@democracyforward.org  
slev@democracyforward.org  
(202) 701-1785  
(202) 448-9090

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

*Additional counsel listed on signature block*

*\* Admitted pro hac vice*

*Attorneys for Defendants*

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
14 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
15 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

16 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, *et al.*,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES, *et al.*,

20 Defendants.

) Case No. 5:21-cv-01655-BLF

) **JOINT STATUS REPORT AND STIPULATED**  
) **REQUEST FOR ORDER CONTINUING STAY**

21  
22 Pursuant to the Court’s Order of February 1, 2022, *see* ECF No. 41, the parties respectfully submit  
23 the following joint status report addressing further proceedings, together with a stipulated request for an  
24 order continuing the stay of this action through June 7, 2022.

25 1. This is an Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”) case in which Plaintiffs challenge a final  
26 rule promulgated by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) entitled *Securing*  
27 *Updated and Necessary Statutory Evaluations Timely*, 86 Fed. Reg. 5694 (Jan. 19, 2021) (the “SUNSET

1 Rule”). The SUNSET Rule provides, in essential part, that nearly all regulations issued by HHS in Titles  
2 21, 42, and 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations shall expire at the end of (1) five calendar years after  
3 the year that the SUNSET Rule first becomes effective, (2) ten calendar years after the year of the  
4 regulation’s promulgation, or (3) ten calendar years after the last year in which HHS assessed and, if  
5 required, reviewed the regulation, whichever is latest.

6 2. Plaintiffs filed their complaint challenging the SUNSET Rule on March 9, 2021. *See* ECF  
7 No. 1. Plaintiffs alleged that the SUNSET Rule is *ultra vires*, *see id.* ¶¶ 123-30; arbitrary and capricious,  
8 *see id.* ¶¶ 131-33; in violation of the APA’s notice-and-comment requirements, *see id.* ¶¶ 134-39; and in  
9 violation of HHS’s Tribal Consultation Policy, *see id.* ¶¶ 140-44. Plaintiffs further alleged that the  
10 SUNSET Rule threatens imminent and irreparable harm to them and the general public, including by  
11 creating regulatory confusion and uncertainty that will impede their ongoing operations, budgeting, and  
12 planning activities. *See, e.g., id.* ¶¶ 100-02; *see generally id.* ¶¶ 95-122.

13 3. As promulgated, the SUNSET Rule was scheduled to become effective on March 22, 2021.  
14 *See* 86 Fed. Reg. at 5694. Shortly before the SUNSET Rule became effective, HHS postponed its effective  
15 date for one year, to March 22, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 705. *See* 86 Fed. Reg. 15,404 (2021). While  
16 HHS did not concede liability, HHS stated that it “believes that the Court could find merit in some of  
17 Plaintiffs’ claims.” *Id.* at 15,405. In particular, HHS stated that, in contrast to its prior findings, it “now  
18 believes it is likely some regulations would expire without any additional process” and that this outcome  
19 raises legal questions about whether “regulations promulgated through notice and comment rulemaking  
20 can be terminated through an umbrella rule without individual consideration of the expiring regulations,  
21 including any reliance interests.” *Id.* at 15,406. HHS further stated that it “may have significantly  
22 underestimated the burden” of the rule and that the rule’s magnitude and timing “may have impeded the  
23 full and deliberate consideration of all the potential issues related to the SUNSET rule.” *Id.*

24 4. On October 28, 2021, HHS issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking proposing to withdraw  
25 or repeal the SUNSET Rule. *See* Dep’t of Health & Human Servs., Securing Updated and Necessary  
26 Statutory Evaluations Timely; Proposal to Withdraw or Repeal, 86 Fed. Reg. 59,906 (Oct. 29, 2021).  
27 HHS stated that it “reexamined the SUNSET final rule in light of the allegations in” this case, among other  
28

1 things. *Id.* at 59,908. The comment period closed on December 28, 2021, and HHS received  
2 approximately 80 comments. If the withdrawal rule were to issue as proposed, Plaintiffs' claims in this  
3 case may become moot.

4 5. Last week, HHS postponed the effective date of the SUNSET Rule for an additional six  
5 months, to September 22, 2022. *See* 87 Fed. Reg. 12,399. HHS does not concede liability, but it explained  
6 that the interests of justice warranted a further stay of the effective date through September 22 because  
7 "(1) A postponement will permit HHS to continue and complete its review of the SUNSET final rule in  
8 light of the claims raised in the litigation; (2) the resolution of the rulemaking will inform the government's  
9 position in this lawsuit; and (3) based on HHS's review of the Complaint, HHS believes that the Court  
10 may find that: (a) Some of Plaintiffs' claims have merit; (b) Plaintiffs' allegations of harm are credible;  
11 and (c) the balance of equities and the public interest warrant postponement of the effective date to  
12 preserve the status quo while the Court considers the challenge to the SUNSET final rule." *Id.* at 12,399.  
13 HHS's present expectation is that it will complete any rulemaking prior to the new effective date, and that  
14 further postponements will not issue.

15 6. The parties therefore jointly request that the Court continue the stay of this action through  
16 June 7, 2022, and direct the parties to file a joint status report proposing a schedule for further proceedings  
17 by that date.

18 Date: March 7, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

19 BRIAN M. BOYNTON  
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General

20 ERIC BECKENHAUER  
Assistant Branch Director  
Civil Division

21 */s/ Steven A. Myers*  
22 STEVEN A. MYERS (NY Bar # 4823043)  
Senior Trial Counsel  
23 United States Department of Justice  
24 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
25 1100 L St. NW  
26 Washington, DC 20005  
27 Tel: (202) 305-8648  
Fax: (202) 616-8470  
E-mail: [steven.a.myers@usdoj.gov](mailto:steven.a.myers@usdoj.gov)

28 *Attorneys for Defendants*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

/s/ Jeffrey B. Dubner  
Jeffrey B. Dubner\* (DC Bar No. 1013399)  
Samara Spence\* (DC Bar No. 1031191)  
Sean A. Lev\* (DC Bar. No. 449936)  
Democracy Forward Foundation  
P.O. Box 34553  
Washington, DC 20043  
sspence@democracyforward.org  
jdubner@democracyforward.org  
slev@democracyforward.org  
Telephone: (202) 448-9090

*Counsel for All Plaintiffs*

James R. Williams (CA Bar No. 271253)  
County Counsel  
Greta S. Hansen (CA Bar No. 251471)  
Douglas M. Press (CA Bar No. 168740)  
Laura S. Trice (CA Bar No. 284837)  
Office of the County Counsel  
County of Santa Clara  
70 West Hedding Street, East Wing, 9th Fl.  
San José, CA 95110-1770  
laura.trice@cco.sccgov.org  
Telephone: (408) 299-5900

*Counsel for the County of Santa Clara*

Lisa S. Mankofsky\* (DC Bar No. 411931)  
Matthew Simon\* (DC Bar No. 144727)  
Center for Science in the Public Interest  
1250 I Street, NW, Ste. 902  
Washington, DC 20005  
lmankofsky@cspinet.org  
msimon@cspinet.org  
Telephone: (202) 777-8381

*Counsel for Center for Science in the Public Interest*

Adeline S. Rolnick\*  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
1152 15th Street NW, Ste. 300  
Washington, DC 20005  
arolnick@nrdc.org  
Telephone: (202) 513-6240

*Counsel for Natural Resources Defense Council*

*\* Admitted pro hac vice*

**LOCAL RULE 5-1(i) ATTESTATION**

I attest that I have obtained Jeffrey Dubner's concurrence in the filing of this document.

*/s/ Steven A. Myers*  
Steven A. Myers

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED. The case shall remain STAYED through June 7, 2022, by which date the parties shall submit a joint status report proposing a schedule for further proceedings.

Dated: March 8, 2022

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
HON. BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28