

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA  
MONROE DIVISION**

THE STATE OF LOUISIANA,  
By and through its Attorney General,  
JEFF LANDRY, et al.,

PLAINTIFFS,

v.

XAVIER BECERRA, in his official  
capacity as Secretary of Health and  
Human Services, et al.;

DEFENDANTS.

Civil Action No. 3:21-cv-03970

District Judge Terry A. Doughty

Magistrate Judge Kayla D. McClusky

**RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

## INTRODUCTION

The Supreme Court has effectively resolved the *appeal of the preliminary injunction*, but not this case itself, a distinction that makes Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss—and their attempted sleight of hand in conflating the two—inappropriate at this time. Additionally, Defendants (collectively “CMS”) have used the time while the Fifth Circuit has retained jurisdiction over the case via the appeal—and Plaintiffs (the “States”) have thus been unable to amend their pleadings—to *expand* the scope of the vaccine mandate by issuing additional guidance documents but shielding them from review, further implicating the States’ interests.

## BACKGROUND

This Court issued a preliminary injunction against the CMS Interim Final Rule (“IFR”) creating a COVID-19 Vaccine Mandate based on specific factors it listed in its opinion, but specifically stated that it did *not* do so based on the States’ Anti-Commandeering claims. Order, Dkt. 28 at PageID# 661. Defendants appealed that decision, and ultimately the Supreme Court ruled to stay it. *Biden v. Missouri*, 142 S. Ct. 647 (2022). In the wake of the Supreme Court’s decision, Defendants expanded the reach of the IFR with the January 25 and February 9 Guidance documents and began enforcement based via avenues they previously represented to courts that they would not pursue. CMS, QSO-22-10-ALL, *Vaccination Expectations for Surveyors Performing Federal Oversight*, <https://go.cms.gov/34pQK3G> (“January 25 Guidance”); CMS QSO-22-12-ALL, *State Obligations to Survey to the Entirety of Medicare and Medicaid Health and Safety Requirements under the 1864 Agreement* (Feb. 9, 2022), <https://go.cms.gov/34PVy24>,

(“February 9 Guidance”). Plaintiffs attempted to raise issues regarding the January 25 Guidance with a Second Amended, Supplemental, and Restated Complaint (“Second Amended Complaint”) but this Court issued an Indicative Ruling stating that it would accept the filing but it may not currently have jurisdiction to do so during the pendency of the appeal.<sup>1</sup> The merits of that appeal are now fully briefed and awaiting the Fifth Circuit’s judgment. Defendants filed their Motion to Dismiss in the intermediate time between their own new actions giving rise to the Second Amended Complaint and the end of the Fifth Circuit’s jurisdictional hold on the appeal, while the district court litigation has been unable to evolve because the States’ and this Court’s hands are still *temporarily* tied.

## ARGUMENT

### **I. Dismissing the First Amended Complaint is Not Appropriate as it Contains Live Claims to be Litigated, Including Counts Not Included in the Appeal.**

The States’ First Amended Complaint contains live claims that have not been settled by the Supreme Court decision in *Missouri v. Biden* and that meet the standard to survive a motion to dismiss. To survive CMS’s 12(b)(6) motion, the States need only “plead enough facts ‘to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Harvey v. Preload, LLC*, 2:21-CV-00401, 2022 WL 495174, at \*3 (W.D. La. Feb. 17, 2022) (quoting *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009)). The States have done so to a sufficient extent not only to survive this motion to dismiss, but for this Court to previously find that the States were likely to succeed on the merits

---

<sup>1</sup> The February 9 Guidance was issued after the States requested leave to file the Second Amended Complaint but the States have included it in their emergency pleadings before the Fifth Circuit.

and thus issue a preliminary injunction against CMS. Preliminary Injunction Memorandum Opinion and Order, Dkt. 28 and 29. And appellate jurisdiction is limited to prohibit the appellate court from considering “the correctness of the plaintiff’s version of the facts.” *Good v. Curtis*, 601 F.3d 393, 397 (5th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Club Retro, L.L.C. v. Hilton*, 568 F.3d 181, 194 (5th Cir.2009)). This Court could not have made the factual findings necessary to issue that order without a properly pled complaint. CMS’s motion to dismiss here is thus based solely on the legal impact of the Supreme Court’s decision in *Missouri*, but that opinion is limited to the issues before it on appeal and does not encompass all the counts brought in the States’ First Amended Complaint. For this reason, the First Amended Complaint survives CMS’s blanket motion to dismiss.

**A. Defendants’ Appeal of the Preliminary Injunction is Limited in Scope so the Anti-Commandeering Claims and Issues Arising from Defendants’ Subsequent Policymaking are Proper and Live Before This Court.**

In addition to being prohibited from reviewing this Court’s factual findings, the appeals court’s jurisdiction is limited “only to those parts of an interlocutory order that relate to the grant of an injunction.” *Ass’n of Co-op. Members, Inc. v. Farmland Indus., Inc.*, 684 F.2d 1134, 1138 (5th Cir. 1982). Therefore, the appeal of the preliminary injunction to the Fifth Circuit and then the Supreme Court would be limited to only those determinations on which this Court relied in order to reach its decision to grant an injunction. *Auto Parts Mfg. Mississippi, Inc. v. King Const. of Houston, L.L.C.*, 782 F.3d 186, 191 (5th Cir. 2015) (first identifying the determinations “the district court relied on” to reach its injunction before

proceeding to review). The Complaint, and by incorporation the First Amended Complaint, included as Count IX that “The Vaccine Mandate Violates the Anti-Commandeering Doctrine.” Compl., Dkt. 1 at PageID# 45-46; First A. Compl., Dkt. 11. But this Court expressly stated that it could not base its injunction on the Anti-Commandeering Doctrine claims because “this Court is unable to tell (at this point) whether and/or how many of the providers and suppliers are run by states,” and so it could not find sufficient evidence to prove the violation. Order, Dkt. 28 at PageID# 661.

As this Court did not base its preliminary injunction on the States’ Anti-Commandeering Doctrine claims, Count IX was outside of the jurisdiction for CMS’s appeal and therefore has not been resolved as a matter of law. Importantly, Count IX does clear the motion to dismiss pleading standard despite the lack of evidence to satisfy the higher standard for preliminary injunction purposes because the Complaint specifies that there are “state-run hospitals” that are impacted by the mandate; no evidence beyond that pleading is required to determine that “a claim to relief that is plausible on its face,” as required by *Iqbal*. Dkt. 1 at ¶ 193; 129 S.Ct. at 1949.

The additional claims Plaintiffs wish to bring, should they be allowed to amend their complaint, are likewise not precluded by the Supreme Court’s *Missouri* decision as they pertain to the January 25 Guidance and February 9 Guidance, which affect implementation of the IFR but were issued only after *Missouri*. And as the Complaint survives at least through Count IX, Plaintiffs should be given the

opportunity to amend their complaint when the Fifth Circuit returns jurisdiction over the case to this Court.

**B. This Court’s Jurisdiction of Remaining Claims will Resume in full after Resolution of the Fifth Circuit Appeal.**

As this Court noted in its Memorandum Ruling of February 9, 2022, jurisdiction over this case resides with the Fifth Circuit as the appeal of the preliminary injunction is still pending before it. Dkt. 59 at PageID# 917. But once that appeal—which is now fully briefed on the merits—is resolved, this Court will not have to consider whether “an amendment ... could affect the pending appeal.” *Id.* Therefore, it is likely this Court will soon have the case returned to it and it may grant the States’ motion to amend their complaint as indicated in the Indicative Ruling. *Id.* The timing of CMS’s motion to dismiss in the window during which the parties are merely waiting for the Fifth Circuit’s merits decision should not deny the States the ability to continue with their case as they would be able to should that decision have already been issued.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should deny Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint.

Dated: April 8, 2022

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/Elizabeth B. Murrill

AUSTIN KNUDSEN  
Montana Attorney General  
David Dewhirst\*  
Solicitor General  
Kathleen L. Smithgall  
Assistant Solicitor General  
215 North Sanders Street

ELIZABETH B. MURRILL (La #20685)  
Solicitor General  
J. SCOTT ST. JOHN (La #36682)  
Deputy Solicitor General  
MORGAN BRUNGARD\*  
Assistant Solicitor General  
LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Helena, MT 59601  
[David.Dewhirst@mt.gov](mailto:David.Dewhirst@mt.gov)  
[Kathleen.Smithgall@mt.gov](mailto:Kathleen.Smithgall@mt.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Montana*

MARK BRNOVICH  
Arizona Attorney General  
Anthony R. Napolitano\*  
Robert J. Makar\*  
Assistant Attorneys General  
2005 North Central Avenue  
Phoenix, AZ 85004  
[Anthony.Napolitano@azag.gov](mailto:Anthony.Napolitano@azag.gov)  
[Robert.Makar@azag.gov](mailto:Robert.Makar@azag.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Arizona*

STATE OF ALABAMA  
Office of the Attorney General Steve  
Marshall  
Edmund G. LaCour Jr.\*  
Solicitor General  
Thomas A. Wilson\*  
Deputy Solicitor General  
Office of the Attorney General  
501 Washington Ave.  
Montgomery, AL 36130  
Tel.: (334) 353-2196  
Fax: (334) 353-8400  
[Edmund.LaCour@AlabamaAG.gov](mailto:Edmund.LaCour@AlabamaAG.gov)  
[Thomas.Wilson@AlabamaAG.gov](mailto:Thomas.Wilson@AlabamaAG.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Alabama*

CHRISTOPHER M. CARR  
Georgia Attorney General  
Stephen J. Petrany  
Solicitor General  
Drew F. Waldbeser\*  
Deputy Solicitor General  
Ross W. Bergethon  
Deputy Solicitor General  
Office of the Attorney General  
40 Capitol Square, S.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334  
[spetrany@law.ga.gov](mailto:spetrany@law.ga.gov)  
[dwaldbeser@law.ga.gov](mailto:dwaldbeser@law.ga.gov)

1885 N. Third Street  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804  
Tel: (225) 326-6766  
[murrille@ag.louisiana.gov](mailto:murrille@ag.louisiana.gov)  
[stjohnj@ag.louisiana.gov](mailto:stjohnj@ag.louisiana.gov)  
[brungardm@ag.louisiana.gov](mailto:brungardm@ag.louisiana.gov)

JIMMY R. FAIRCLOTH, JR. (La. #20645)  
[jfaircloth@fairclothlaw.com](mailto:jfaircloth@fairclothlaw.com)  
MARY KATHERINE PRICE (La. #38576)  
[kprice@fairclothlaw.com](mailto:kprice@fairclothlaw.com)  
Faircloth Melton Sobel & Bash, LLC  
105 Yorktown Drive  
Alexandria, Louisiana 71303  
Telephone: (318) 619-7755  
Facsimile: (318) 619-7744

*Counsel for the State of Louisiana*

*Counsel for the State of Georgia*

LAWRENCE G. WASDEN  
Idaho Attorney General  
Brian Kane\*  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
Leslie M. Hayes  
Megan A. Larrondo  
Deputy Attorneys General  
700 W. Jefferson Street, Ste. 210  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, Idaho 83720-0010  
Telephone: 208-334-2400  
Facsimile: 208-854-8071  
[brian.kane@ag.idaho.gov](mailto:brian.kane@ag.idaho.gov)  
[leslie.hayes@ag.idaho.gov](mailto:leslie.hayes@ag.idaho.gov)  
[megan.larrondo@ag.idaho.gov](mailto:megan.larrondo@ag.idaho.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Idaho*

THEODORE M. ROKITA  
Indiana Attorney General  
Thomas M. Fisher  
Solicitor General  
Indiana Government Center South 302 W.  
Washington St., 5th Floor Indianapolis, IN  
46204  
[Tom.fisher@atg.in.gov](mailto:Tom.fisher@atg.in.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Indiana*

DANIEL CAMERON  
Kentucky Attorney General  
Marc Manley  
Assistant Attorney General  
700 Capital Avenue, Suite 118  
Frankfort, KY 40601  
[Marc.Manley@ky.gov](mailto:Marc.Manley@ky.gov)

*Counsel for the Commonwealth of Kentucky*

LYNN FITCH  
Attorney General of Mississippi  
Whitney H. Lipscomb\*  
Deputy Attorney General  
John V. Coghlan\*  
Deputy Solicitor General  
State of Mississippi



Office of the Attorney General  
550 High Street  
Jackson, MS 39201  
Tel: (601) 359-3680

*Counsel for the State of Mississippi*

DAVE YOST  
Ohio Attorney General  
May Davis\*  
Deputy Solicitor General  
615 W. Superior Ave., 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, OH 44113  
[May.Davis@OhioAGO.gov](mailto:May.Davis@OhioAGO.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Ohio*

JOHN M. O'CONNOR  
Attorney General of Oklahoma  
Mithun Mansinghani\*  
Solicitor General  
313 NE 21st Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
(405) 521-3921

*Counsel for the State of Oklahoma*

ALAN WILSON  
South Carolina Attorney General  
Thomas T. Hydrick  
Assistant Deputy Solicitor General  
Office of the Attorney General  
Post Office Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
[thomashydrick@scag.gov](mailto:thomashydrick@scag.gov)

*Counsel for the State of South Carolina*

SEAN D. REYES  
Utah Attorney General  
Melissa A. Holyoak\*  
Solicitor General  
350 N. State Street, Suite 230  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114  
[melissaholyoak@agutah.gov](mailto:melissaholyoak@agutah.gov)

*Counsel for the State of Utah*

PATRICK MORRISEY  
West Virginia Attorney General  
Lindsay S. See  
Solicitor General  
State Capitol, Bldg 1, Room E-26  
Charleston, WV 25305  
[Lindsay.s.see@wvago.gov](mailto:Lindsay.s.see@wvago.gov)

*Counsel for the State of West Virginia*

*\* Pro Hac Vice Forthcoming*

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I presented the above and foregoing for filing and uploading to the CM/ECF system which will send electronic notification of such filing to all counsel of record.

Dated: April 8, 2022

*/s/Elizabeth B. Murrill*  
Elizabeth B. Murrill  
Solicitor General