

No. \_\_\_\_\_

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

**CNJ RAIL CORPORATION AND  
ERIC STROHMEYER**

**Petitioners**

**v.**

**SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD; and**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**Respondents**

---

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI,  
WITH MOTION,  
TO THE THIRD CIRCUIT**

---

Eric Strohmeyer, *pro se*  
Petitioner  
81 Century Lane  
Watchung, NJ 07069  
(908) 361-2435  
December 14, 2018

## 1. QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- A. Was it clear error for the Third Circuit to **fail to address** the issue of whether the Surface Transportation Board (“**STB**”) **had the jurisdiction to render a decision** in the underlying proceeding? (**Even if** the court determines that Petitioner does not have standing.)
- B. Were the allegations in Petitioner’s Affidavit sufficient to defeat Respondents’ Motion to Dismiss for lack of standing?

## **2. PARTIES**

The parties before the Third Circuit in Case No. 16-4435 are:

Petitioners CNJ Rail Corporation and Eric Strohmeyer.

Respondents Surface Transportation Board and the United States of America.

Intervenors Norfolk Southern Railway Company and James Riffin

## **3. PETITIONERS' DISCLOSURE OF AFFILIATIONS AND FINANCIAL INTEREST**

Your Petitioners are not publicly held entities, nor do they have a parent corporation. They have a 100 % ownership interest. No other publicly held corporation or other publicly held entity has a direct financial interest in the outcome of this litigation. Your Petitioners are not a trade association. This case did not arise out of a bankruptcy proceeding.

## **4. TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Page</b>	
1. Questions Presented:	i
2. Parties:	ii
3. Disclosure of Affiliations and Financial Interest:	ii
4. Table of Contents:	ii
5. Table of Authorities:	iii
Cases:	iii
Statutes:	iv
6. Opinions Below:	1
7. Jurisdiction:	1
8. Statutes Involved:	1

9. When federal questions were raised:	1
10. Statement of the Case:	2
11. Argument – Standing, and Need to Address Jurisdictional Issue:	6
12. Relief prayed for:	6
13. Additional Relief prayed for:	7

#### **APPENDIX:**

14. Third Circuit Panel Decision (April 27, 2018):	A-1
15. Third Circuit Panel Decision and en banc Decision, denying rehearing / en banc (July 3, 2018):	A-6
16. Consolidated Petition for Panel Rehearing and Petition for en banc Review:	A-7

### **5. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

#### **TABLE OF CASES CITED**

<i>Arizonians for Official English v. Arizona</i> , 520 U.S. 43 (1997):	1,5,7
<i>Bender v. Williamsport Area School Dist.</i> , 475 U.S. 534 (1986):	1,5
<i>Iron Arrow Soc. v Heckler</i> , 464 U.S. 67 (1983):	1
<i>Juidice v. Vail</i> , 430 U.S. 327 (1977):	5
<i>Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992):	1
<i>Mitchel v. Maurer</i> , 293 U.S. 237 (1934):	5
<i>U.S. Bancorp Mortgage Co.</i> , 513 U.S. 18 (1994):	1
<i>U.S. v. Corrick</i> , 298 U.S. 435 (1936):	6
<i>U.S. v. SCRAP</i> , 412 U.S. 669 (1973):	1

## TABLE OF STATUTES CITED

Article III, U.S. Constitution:	1
5 U.S.C. 706(2)(C):	1
45 U.S.C. 719(e)(2):	1
49 U.S.C. 10906:	2
49 U.S.C. 11323 - 25:	1

## **6. OPINIONS BELOW**

1. The Third Circuit Panel Opinion that is the subject of this Petition for Writ of Certiorari (Third Circuit Case No. 16-4435), was rendered on **April 27, 2018**.

2. The Third Circuit Panel and En Banc Opinions that are the subject of this Petition for Writ of Certiorari (Third Circuit Case No. 16-4435), were rendered on **July 3, 2018**.

## **7. JURISDICTION**

3. Jurisdiction is proper in this Court, for the Third Circuit's decisions are contrary to multiple decisions of this Court.

4. On the issue of the Third Circuit's failure to address the STB's lack of jurisdiction, the decisions of the Third Circuit are contrary to the dictates of this Court, as expressed in *Arizonians for Official English v. Arizona*, 520 U.S. 43 (1997) (to wit: 520 U.S. at 73); *Bender v. Williamsport Area School Dist.*, 475 U.S. 534, at 541 (1986), and the cases cited in *Bender*; *Iron Arrow Soc. v Heckler*, 464 U.S. 67, at 72-73 (1983); and *U.S. Bancorp Mortgage Co.*, 513 U.S. 18, at 21 (1994).

5. On the issue of 'standing,' the Third Circuit's decisions are contrary to the dictates of this Court, as expressed in *Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555 (1992), and its progeny, and *U.S. v. SCRAP*, 412 U.S. 669, at 683 - 690 (1973).

## **8. STATUTES INVOLVED**

6. 49 U.S.C. 11323 - 25; 45 U.S.C. 719(e)(2); 5 U.S.C. 706(2)(C); Article III, U.S. Constitution.

## **9. WHEN FEDERAL QUESTIONS WERE RAISED**

7. The issue of the STB's lack of jurisdiction, was raised very early in the FD 35873 proceeding before the STB.

8. The issue of Petitioners' 'standing,' was first raised in the Third Circuit (when the STB moved to dismiss Petitioners' appeal for 'lack of standing').

## 10. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

9. Norfolk Southern Railway ("NS") desires to purchase 282 miles of Delaware and Hudson Railway ("D&H") line of railroad ("Line"). To effect this purchase, the D&H must **simultaneously** abandon its right to operate over this 282 miles of railroad line.

10. In two separate decisions, the STB granted authority for NS to purchase the 282 miles of D&H Line, (see **STB Docket No. 35873**), and granted the D&H authority to abandon its rights over the 282 miles of Line (plus the right to abandon an additional 600+ miles of D&H lines of railroad.) [See **STB Docket No. AB 156 (sub no. 27X)**].

11. Petitioners appealed both decisions to the Third Circuit. [The **NS appeal** was docketed Case No. 16-4435 in the Third Circuit. The **D&H appeal** was docketed Case No. 16-4362 in the Third Circuit.) Petitioners argued:

- A. The NS decision is dependent upon the D&H being granted **simultaneous** authority to abandon some 900 miles of D&H lines of railroad.
- B. For the STB to grant abandonment authority, the STB must first determine the nature of the tracks being abandoned: Are the tracks "lines of railroad," or 49 U.S.C. 10906 "excepted" track (spur, yard, etc.

tracks)? If “lines of railroad,” does the carrier have “full operating rights” (the right to provide both local and overhead rail service), or more limited “trackage rights.” (Typically **either** local service rights OR overhead rights.)

- C. Petitioners argued (before the STB and the Third Circuit) that the STB **does not have the jurisdiction** to determine the “nature” of the 900 miles of D&H tracks: The tracks were conveyed to the D&H via the Special Court. (A special bankruptcy court created to deal with the bankruptcies of multiple railroads / to convey to Conrail the bankrupt railroads’ rights.) The Special Court has **exclusive** jurisdiction to determine the nature of what it conveyed to the D&H.
- D. Since the “nature” of the tracks that the D&H desires to abandon must be determined before abandonment authority can be granted; and since the STB does not have the jurisdiction to determine the “nature” of the D&H’s tracks, the STB’s decision granting the D&H authority to abandon 900 miles of its tracks, is infirm, and must be set aside.
- E. And if the STB’s D&H decision is set aside, then the STB’s NS decision must likewise be set aside, since the NS decision is dependent upon the D&H being granted authority to abandon, and to simultaneously abandon, some 900 miles of D&H tracks.
- F. Petitioners argued / continue to argue, that because the NS decision is dependent upon the D&H decision not being set aside, the NS decision and D&H decision, must be consolidated / affirmed (or set aside), simultaneously.



12. Ultimately, the Petitioners desire this Court / the Third Circuit, to address the issue of the STB's **lack of jurisdiction to determine the nature of the operating rights the D&H desires to abandon.**

13. However, before that can occur, it first must be determined whether the Petitioners have Article III standing.

14. The STB filed a Motion to Dismiss, wherein the STB argued that the Petitioners do not have Article III standing.

15. The Petitioners argued before the Third Circuit, that Petitioners did in fact have Article III standing, citing numerous 'interests' that the Petitioners have.

16. The Third Circuit Panel looked at **only one** (of the many) 'interests' that the Petitioners cited: Petitioners' efforts to provide Allegro Sanitation with rail service.

17. The STB argued that Allegro had failed to provide a verified statement that Allegro wanted 'immediate' rail service. And due to this lack of a verified statement, Allegro's desire for rail service was 'speculative.'

18. The Third Circuit decided that Allegro's desire for rail service was 'speculative,' and **based on that evidence alone**, held that Petitioners lacked Constitutional Article III standing.

19. Having decided that Petitioners lacked Article III standing, the Third Circuit held that all other issues were moot. (Such as whether Petitioners had 'prudential' standing; whether the STB had the jurisdiction to determine the nature of the operating rights that the D&H desired to abandon.)

20. Petitioners filed a Petition for Rehearing / Petition for en banc review. In their Petition for Rehearing, Petitioners cited

the many ‘interests’ that Petitioners had identified in Petitioner’s Petition for Review, in further support of Petitioners’ argument that Petitioners had Article III standing.

21. In addition, Petitioners argued that when the jurisdiction of the underlying tribunal is questioned, the Third Circuit **must address** the jurisdictional issue – **even if the Petitioner does not have Article III standing**. See: *Arizonians for Official English*, at 520 U.S. 43 at 73, where this Court made the following statements:

“Even if we were to rule definitively that AOE and Park **lack standing**, we would **have an obligation** essentially to search the pleadings on core matters of federal-court adjudicatory authority – to inquire not only into this Court’s authority to decide the questions petitioners present, **but to consider, also, the authority of the lower courts to proceed**. As explained in *Bender v. Williamsport Area School Dist.*, 475 U.S. 534, 541 (1986):<sup>1</sup>

**[E]very federal appellate court has a special obligation to satisfy itself not only of its own jurisdiction, but also that of the lower courts in a cause under review,**’ even though the parties are prepared to concede it. *Mitchel v. Maurer*, 293 U.S. 237, 244 (1934). See *Juidice v. Vail*, 430 U.S. 327, 331-332 (1977) (standing). **‘And if the record discloses that the lower court was without jurisdiction this court will notice the defect, although the parties make no contention concerning it. [When the lower federal court lack[s] jurisdiction, we have jurisdiction on appeal, not of the merits but merely for the purpose**

---

4. A 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit case.

of correcting the error of the lower court in entertaining the suit.’ *U.S. v. Corrick*, 298 U.S. 435, 440 (1936).”

See also *Iron Arrow Honor Soc. v. Heckler*, 464 U.S. 67, 72-73 (1983) (*per curiam*) (vacating judgment below where Court of Appeals had ruled on the merits although case had become moot). In short, we have authority to ‘make such disposition of the whole case as justice may require.’ *U.S. Bancorp Mortgage Co.*, 513 U.S. 18, at 21 (1994).” Bold added.

22. The Third Circuit Panel denied Petitioners’ Petition for Panel Rehearing, and the Third Circuit, sitting en banc, denied Petitioners’ Petition for en banc review.

#### **11. ARGUMENT – STANDING, AND NEED TO ADDRESS JURISDICTIONAL ISSUE**

23. Petitioners adopt by reference, their Consolidated Petition for Panel Rehearing, and Petition for en banc Review, as if fully reproduced herein. See Petitioners’ Appendix at A-7 to A-23.

#### **12. RELIEF PRAYED FOR**

24. Petitioners ask this Court to determine, from the facts and argument presented in Petitioners’ Petition for Panel Rehearing / en banc Review, whether Petitioners have presented sufficient facts / argument, to overcome the STB’s Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Article III Standing. (Constitutional Standing, as opposed to Prudential Standing, since the Third Circuit did not address the issue of whether Petitioners have Prudential Standing.)

25. Petitioners further ask this Court to determine whether

the Third Circuit is **required to address** the issue of whether the STB had the jurisdiction to determine the nature of the D&H's operating rights. **Even if**, after a more thorough review of Petitioners' Standing, the Third Circuit were to determine that Petitioners still lack Constitutional and Prudential standing. (Does the *Arizonians*' statement<sup>2</sup> apply to the Third Circuit? To the facts in this proceeding?)

### 13. ADDITIONAL RELIEF PRAYED FOR

26. Petitioners filed two separate appeals in the Third Circuit. The Third Circuit consolidated the two appeals for briefing purposes. The Third Circuit affirmed one appeal. It has not ruled on the second appeal.

27. The two appeals are related. The underlying decisions are dependent upon one another.

28. Petitioners seek to preserve their right to file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, for the appeal that has been decided. (And to file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari for the appeal that has yet to be decided, if the Third Circuit affirms that underlying proceeding.)

29. Petitioners desire to ask this Court to determine whether the NS decision is so dependent upon the D&H decision, that were the D&H decision to be vacated, the NS decision would

---

2. "Even if we were to rule definitively that AOE and Park **lack standing**, we would **have an obligation** essentially to search the pleadings on core matters of federal-court adjudicatory authority – to inquire not only into this Court's authority to decide the questions petitioners present, **but to consider, also, the authority of the lower courts to proceed.**"

likewise have to be vacated.

30. However, since the Third Circuit has yet to rule on the D&H decision, it would be premature for this Court to address this issue of whether the NS decision must be vacated if the D&H decision is vacated.

31. This Petition for Writ of Certiorari is being filed in an attempt to preserve Petitioners right to file a Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, once the Third Circuit renders its D&H decision.

32. With the above in mind, Petitioners would further pray that this Court **HOLD this Petition for Writ of Certiorari in abeyance, until such time that the Third Circuit renders a decision in the D&H Proceeding.** (Third Circuit Case No. 16-4362.)

33. Petitioners pray that the Court:

A. Accept (or hold in abeyance its ruling on whether to accept) Petitioners' Petition for a Writ of Certiorari, until such time that the Third Circuit rules on the second / D&H appeal; and

B. For such other relief as would be appropriate.

34. I HEREBY CERTIFY, under the penalties of perjury, that the foregoing is true and correct.

Respectfully,

*Eric S. Strohmeyer*

Eric S. Strohmeyer, Individually, and as  
the COO of CNJ Rail Corporation