

Nos. 19-431 & 19-454

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR SAINTS PETER AND PAUL
HOME,
Petitioner,

v.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ET AL.,
Respondents.

DONALD J. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
ET AL.,
Petitioners,

v.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, ET AL.,
Respondents.

**On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court
of Appeals for the Third Circuit**

**BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE FOUNDATION
FOR MORAL LAW IN SUPPORT OF
PETITIONERS**

MATTHEW J. CLARK
FOUNDATION FOR MORAL LAW
One Dexter Avenue
Montgomery, AL 36104
matt@morallaw.org
334-262-1245

Counsel for *Amicus Curiae*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE.....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	1
ARGUMENT	3
I. The Third Circuit’s decision violates not only the Religious Freedom Restoration Act but also the Free Exercise Clause.....	3
A. This Court may consider the Free Exercise issue because it is inextricably linked with the issues raised by the parties.....	4
B. Free Exercise of Religion is an unalienable right given by God and secured by the First Amendment.....	5
C. The Free Exercise Clause authorizes the exemptions that the Trump administration created and the Little Sisters claimed in this case.....	7
II. Nationwide injunctions violate the doctrine of separation of powers	11
A. Nationwide injunctions overlook a fundamental difference between	

legislative power and judicial power.....12

B. The separation-of-powers violation is even worse when trial judges issue nationwide injunctions that contradict each other13

C. If this Court approves nationwide injunctions, then the abuse-of-discretion standard will insulate those injunctions from meaningful appellate review.....14

D. Nationwide injunctions exceed a trial court’s geographical boundaries.....16

E. This Court should address whether nationwide injunctions are unconstitutional, not just whether the injunction in this case was unconstitutional.....17

F. Adopting *Amicus’s* view of judicial power will not strip this Court of the power to have the final say in cases arising under the Constitution.....19

CONCLUSION21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>Auer v. Robbins</i> , 519 U.S. 452 (1997)	15
<i>Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.</i> , 467 U.S. 837 (1984).....	15
<i>City of Arlington v. Federal Commc'ns Comm'n</i> , 569 U.S. 290 (2013)	15
<i>City of Boerne v. Flores</i> , 521 U.S. 507 (1997)	4
<i>City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation of N.Y.</i> , 544 U.S. 197 (2005).....	4
<i>Department of Homeland Security v. New York</i> , No. 19A785 (Jan. 27, 2020)	11, 13
<i>Employment Division v. Smith</i> , 494 U.S. 872 (1990)	4-5, 8
<i>Flemming v. Nestor</i> , 363 U.S. 603 (1960)	9
<i>Gamble v. United States</i> , 139 S.Ct. 1960 (2019)	20
<i>Johnson v. Williams</i> , 133 S.Ct. 1088 (2013).....	19, 21
<i>Kennedy v. Bremerton Sch. Dist.</i> , 139 S.Ct. 634 (2019)	5
<i>Kisor v. Wilkie</i> , 139 S.Ct. 2400 (2019)	15

<i>Michigan v. Environmental Protection Agency</i> , 135 S.Ct. 2699 (2015)	15
<i>Muskrat v. United States</i> , 219 U.S. 346 (1911)	12, 21
<i>Pennsylvania v. Trump</i> , 930 F.3d 543 (3d Cir. 2019)	3
<i>PHH Corp. v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau</i> , 881 F.3d 75 (D.C. Cir. 2018)	18
<i>Pierce v. Underwood</i> , 487 U.S. 552 (1988)	14
<i>Seila Law, LLC v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau</i> , No. 19-7 (U.S. Oct. 18, 2019) (mem.)	2, 16, 19
<i>Sherbert v. Verner</i> , 374 U.S. 398 (1963)	4-5
<i>Trump v. Hawaii</i> , 138 S.Ct. 2392 (2018)	11
<i>United States ex rel. Lawrence v. Woods</i> , 432 F.2d 1072, 1075 (7th Cir. 1970)	21
Constitutions, Statutes, and Regulations	
12 U.S.C. § 5491	17
42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1	9
U.S. Const. amend. I	<i>passim</i>
U.S. Const. art. III	2, 22

Other Authority

- Brett Kavanaugh, *Two Challenges for the Judge as an Umpire*, 92 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1907, 1919 (2017)9
- Bryan Garner et al., *The Law of Judicial Precedent* (2016)19
- James Madison, *Memorial and Remonstrance Against Religious Assessments* (June 20, 1785) 5-7
- Joseph Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States* (1833)10
- Letter from James Madison to Edward Livingston (July 10, 1822)7
- Letter from Thomas Jefferson to William Charles Jarvis (Sept. 28, 1820).....13
- Michael McConnell, *The Origins and Historical Understanding of Free Exercise of Religion*, 103 Harvard L. Rev. 1409 (1989) 5, 7-8
- Petition for Writ of Certiorari at, *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia* (No. 19-123)5
- Petition for Writ of Certiorari, *Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter & Paul Home v. Pennsylvania* (No. 19-431)4
- Petition for Writ of Certiorari, *Trump v. Pennsylvania* (No. 19-454)4, 11

<i>The Declaration of Independence</i> (U.S. 1776).....	7, 15
<i>The Federalist</i> No. 47 (James Madison)	12
<i>The Federalist</i> No. 78 (Alexander Hamilton)	12
<i>The Writings of James Madison</i> (G. Hunt ed. 1901)	7
William Barr, Remarks to the American Law Institute on Nationwide Injunctions (May 21, 2019)	16

INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE¹

The Foundation for Moral Law (hereinafter “the Foundation”) is an Alabama-based-legal organization dedicated to defending religious liberty and promoting a strict reading of the Constitution as intended by its Framers. The Foundation believes that religious liberty is the God-given right of all people claimed in the Declaration of Independence and protected by the First Amendment. The Foundation also believes that the Framers intended for the judicial branch to be the least dangerous of all three branches. The Foundation has an interest in this case because it believes the Framers’ intent for the Free Exercise Clause was to grant religious accommodations to people from generally applicable laws, except under very limited circumstances that are not present in this case. The Foundation also believes that separation of powers and the rule of law are threatened when federal district courts grant nationwide injunctions.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

The religious freedom issues in this case are governed not only by the Religious Freedom

¹ Pursuant to Rule 37.3, all parties have consented to the filing of this brief. Pursuant to Rule 37.6, no party or party’s counsel authored this brief in whole or in part, or contributed money that was intended to fund its preparation or submission; and no person other than the *amicus curiae*, its members, or its counsel, contributed money that was intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief.

Restoration Act but also by the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment. Because Congress passed the RFRA in response to this Court's free exercise jurisprudence, it is appropriate in this case to consider the Free Exercise Clause in addition to RFRA. The Framers of the First Amendment viewed religious freedom as an unalienable, God-given right. Consequently, the Free Exercise Clause demands even more rigorous protection for religious freedom than RFRA provides. Under an originalist view of the Free Exercise Clause, it was completely proper for the government to create religious and moral exceptions for Obamacare's contraceptive mandate, and the Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter and Paul Home (hereinafter "the Little Sisters") were entitled to the kinds of religious accommodations that the Trump administration tried to create.

In addition, the practice of nationwide injunctions violates the doctrine of separation of powers. Legislative power binds every person within the legislature's jurisdiction, but judicial power binds only the parties in the case before the court. When a federal district judge issues a nationwide injunction, the judge binds not only the parties in the case but also, in effect, the entire nation. Thus, nationwide injunctions are inherently legislative in nature instead of judicial, exceeding the limits placed on the judicial branch by Article III of the United States Constitution and violating the doctrine of separation of powers. This Court recently granted certiorari in *Seila Law, LLC v. Consumer Financial Protection*

Bureau (No. 19-7) to address the question of whether concentrating so much power in one largely unaccountable individual violates the separation of powers. But federal district judges can abuse their power through the practice of nationwide injunctions even more than the Director of the CFPB can. The Court should therefore take this opportunity to address the objections to nationwide injunctions that Justices Thomas and Gorsuch have raised in the last two years and hold that nationwide injunctions are unconstitutional.

ARGUMENT

I. The Third Circuit’s decision violates not only the Religious Freedom Restoration Act but also the Free Exercise Clause.

In its opinion below, the Third Circuit failed to give religious freedom the respect it deserved. First, the Third Circuit questioned whether federal law permits a federal agency to create religious and moral exemptions from Obamacare’s contraception mandate. *Pennsylvania v. Trump*, 930 F.3d 543, 572 (3d Cir. 2019). Second, it concluded that the Obama administration’s accommodation was good enough for religious adherents with objections to the contraceptive mandate. *Id.* at 573. Third, it concluded that the Trump administration’s IFR’s imposed an “undue burden” on female employees who would lose contraceptive coverage. *Id.* at 574.

The Solicitor General and the Little Sisters have argued thoroughly that the Third Circuit’s analysis

of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was incorrect. Petition for Writ of Certiorari at 20-31, *Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter & Paul Home v. Pennsylvania* (No. 19-431); Petition for Writ of Certiorari at 20-26, *Trump v. Pennsylvania* (No. 19-454). *Amicus* argues that there is an even more fundamental religious-freedom law that addresses this issue: the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment.

A. This Court may consider the Free Exercise issue because it is inextricably linked with the issues raised by the parties.

Although the parties have based their arguments on the Religious Freedom Restoration Act instead of the Free Exercise Clause, this Court has held that it may consider issues that are “inextricably linked” with those raised by the parties. *City of Sherrill v. Oneida Indian Nation of N.Y.*, 544 U.S. 197, 214 n.8 (2005). As this Court has recognized, Congress’s intent for the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was to restore the standard of review for religious liberty cases to that announced in *Sherbert v. Verner*, 374 U.S. 398 (1963), which was altered by *Employment Division v. Smith*, 494 U.S. 872 (1990). *City of Boerne v. Flores*, 521 U.S. 507, 515 (1997).

Since Congress passed RFRA in an attempt to be faithful to the Free Exercise Clause, it is incredibly difficult to argue that the two laws can be separated. Even within the last year, Justices Alito, Thomas,

Gorsuch, and Kavanaugh suggested that *Smith* should be reconsidered. *Kennedy v. Bremerton Sch. Dist.*, 139 S.Ct. 634, 637 (2019) (statement of Alito, J., respecting denial of certiorari). Moreover, this Court just granted certiorari in *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, in which one of the questions presented is whether this Court should overrule *Smith*. Petition for Writ of Certiorari at i, *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia* (No. 19-123). Presumably, overruling *Smith* would return us to the *Sherbert* standard—which is exactly what RFRA was intended to do. Thus, the two issues are inextricably linked.

B. Free Exercise of Religion is an unalienable right given by God and secured by the First Amendment.

But unlike *Sherbert* and even RFRA, *Amicus* believes that the Free Exercise Clause gives freedom of religion even more protection than the strict-scrutiny test affords. Such protection is warranted for this reason: religious liberty is not a product of political compromise, but it is the gift of God. Consequently, it is an unalienable right.

James Madison, the principal architect of the First Amendment, said in his Memorial and Remonstrance,

“[W]e hold it for a fundamental and undeniable truth, ‘that Religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or

violence.' The Religion then of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right. It is unalienable, because the opinions of men, depending only on the evidence contemplated by their own minds cannot follow the dictates of other men: It is unalienable also, because what is here a right towards men, is a duty towards the Creator. It is the duty of every man to render to the Creator such homage, and such only, as he believes to be acceptable to him. This duty is precedent both in order of time and degree of obligation, to the claims of Civil Society. Before any man can be considered as a member of Civil Society, he must be considered as a subject of the Governor of the Universe: And if a member of Civil Society, who enters into any subordinate Association, must always do it with a reservation of his duty to the general authority; much more must every man who becomes a member of any particular Civil Society, do it with a saving of his allegiance to the Universal Sovereign. We maintain therefore that in matters of Religion, no man's right is abridged by the institution of Civil Society, and that Religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance."

James Madison, *A Memorial and Remonstrance* (June 20, 1785).

Madison’s argument reflects the logic of the Declaration of Independence: our Creator gave us rights that pre-exist the State, and people form governments in order to secure those rights. *See The Declaration of Independence* para. 2 (U.S. 1776). Consequently, the government may not take away the rights that it was created to secure in the first place—one of which is free exercise of religion.

C. The Free Exercise Clause authorizes the exemptions that the Trump administration created and the Little Sisters claimed in this case.

It should be no surprise then that Madison believed that “the free exercise right should prevail ‘in every case where it does not trespass on private rights or the public peace.’” Michael McConnell, *The Origins and Historical Understanding of Free Exercise of Religion*, 103 *Harvard L. Rev.* 1409, 1464 (1989) (quoting Letter from James Madison to Edward Livingston (July 10, 1822), in 9 *The Writings of James Madison* 98, 100 (G. Hunt ed. 1901)). After engaging in a thorough analysis of Madison’s view of religious liberty, Professor Michael McConnell concluded,

“If the scope of religious liberty is defined by religious duty (man must render to God ‘such homage as he believes to be acceptable...to him’), and if the claims of civil

society are subordinate to the claims of religious freedom, it would seem to follow that the dictates of religious faith must take precedence over the laws of the state, even if they are secular and generally applicable.”

McConnell, *supra*, at 1453.

Consequently, religious exemptions from neutral laws of general applicability, except under extremely limited circumstances, are probably what the Founders had in mind. *See id.* at 1511-13. *Smith* falls short of this standard.

Moreover, under Madison’s view, the Free Exercise Clause’s requirements appear to be even more robust than the RFRA’s. For instance, the RFRA requires a court to assess whether a religious practice is “substantially burdened.” *See* 42 U.S.C. § 2000 bb-1. Such an evaluation necessarily requires a court to distinguish between religious doctrines that are *substantially* important and those that are *less* important. Even theologians within the same denominations disagree on those questions. Instead of making courts the arbiters of theological questions, Madison’s analysis was simpler: if you believe you owe a duty to your Creator and the State stands in your way, then you get an exemption unless you are trampling the private rights of another or breaching the public peace.

In this case, one cannot seriously contend that the President and the Little Sisters are breaching the public peace. Moreover, this Court has rejected the

argument that people accrue private rights as beneficiaries of programs where changes are frequent and flexibility is required. *See Flemming v. Nestor*, 363 U.S. 603 (1960) (rejecting the argument that people accrue rights under the Social Security Act). Such is the case here. Frequent changes to healthcare laws and programs make it difficult for any “right” to accrue. Moreover, even if any such right accrued, it is not an unalienable right like religious freedom. Any clash between the two must be resolved in favor of religious liberty.

Furthermore, RFRA’s strict-scrutiny test will uphold governmental action as long as there is a compelling state interest and the government’s action is the least restrictive alternative. 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb-1(b). This framework necessarily requires the judiciary to decide which governmental interest is “legitimate,” which is “substantial,” and which is “compelling.” This is more of a philosophical exercise rather than disciplined constitutional analysis. The same holds true for the least-restrictive-means prong. Well-intended as the strict-scrutiny test may be, it is still a malleable standard. *See* Brett Kavanaugh, *Two Challenges for the Judge as an Umpire*, 92 Notre Dame L. Rev. 1907, 1919 (2017) (“My concern is that these vague and amorphous tests can at times be antithetical to impartial judging and to the vision of the judge as an umpire.”). The Founders wanted more certainty to safeguard the unalienable right of religious freedom than “vague and amorphous tests” provide. Thus, *Amicus* believes

that the Free Exercise Clause is even more demanding than the Religious Freedom Restoration Act in its protection of religious liberty.

Viewed in that light, there is no question that the Third Circuit erred gravely. Even if the Religious Freedom Restoration Act does not permit the Executive Branch to create religious exemptions, the Free Exercise Clause requires that a generally applicable law not be enforced as to a person with sincere religious objections. It is also not for the government to make theological evaluations as to whether a person's religious beliefs should be satisfied or not.² Furthermore, the limits of the Free Exercise Clause should not be evaluated by whether there is an *undue burden* on another person, as the Third Circuit did. Rather, the inquiry should focus on whether an exemption would violate the *private rights* of a third person or breach the *public peace*. If the answers to these questions are "no," then the right to free exercise of religion prevails.

The government complied with the demands of the Free Exercise Clause by creating exemptions for

² As Justice Story wrote, "The rights of conscience are, indeed, beyond the just reach of any human power. They are given by God, and cannot be encroached upon by human authority, with a criminal disobedience to the precepts of natural, as well as of revealed, religion." ³ Joseph Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States* § 1870 (1833).

those like the Little Sisters, who had religious objections to Obamacare's contraception mandate. The Little Sisters were constitutionally exempt from having to comply with the Obama administration's accommodations. The Third Circuit's decision to the contrary is due to be reversed.

II. Nationwide injunctions violate the doctrine of separation of powers.

In 2018, Justice Thomas issued a masterful concurrence casting severe doubt on the constitutionality of nationwide injunctions and urging the Court to consider the issue. *Trump v. Hawaii*, 138 S.Ct. 2392, 2424 (2018) (Thomas, J., concurring). Justice Gorsuch likewise recently wrote an excellent and well-reasoned concurrence expressing similar concerns. *Department of Homeland Security v. New York*, No. 19A785 (Jan. 27, 2020) (Gorsuch, J., concurring). The Solicitor General argues (quite well) that the nationwide injunction in this case was inappropriate and suggests that he is willing to discuss the constitutionality of nationwide injunctions altogether. Petition for Writ of Certiorari at 32-35, *Trump v. Pennsylvania* (No. 19-454). *Amicus* urges the Court to take this opportunity to consider the constitutionality of nationwide injunctions because they appear to violate the doctrine of separation of powers.

A. Nationwide injunctions overlook a fundamental difference between legislative power and judicial power.

One of the fundamental distinctions between legislative power and judicial power is this: the legislature has the power to bind every person within its jurisdiction, but the judiciary has the power to bind only the people in the case before it. Alexander Hamilton described legislative power this way: “The legislature ... prescribes the rules by which the duties and rights of *every citizen* are to be regulated.” *The Federalist* No. 78 (Alexander Hamilton) (emphasis added). In contrast, this Court has defined “judicial power” as “the power of a court to decide and pronounce a judgment and carry it into effect *between persons and parties who bring a case before it for decision.*” *Muskrat v. United States*, 219 U.S. 346, 356 (1911) (citations and quotation marks omitted) (emphasis added). Quoting Montesquieu, James Madison warned, “Were the power of judging joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control, for THE JUDGE would then be THE LEGISLATOR.” *The Federalist* No. 47 (James Madison).

If a judge has the power to grant nationwide injunctions, then he or she can bind not only the parties in a particular case, but the entire nation as well. In the present case, the dispute was supposedly between several states and the federal government. However, by prohibiting the federal government from implementing the IFR’s anywhere in the nation, one

unelected federal judge decided a matter between the federal government and the People of the United States.

Thomas Jefferson warned that considering judges “as the ultimate arbiters of constitutional questions ... would place us under the despotism of an Oligarchy.” Letter from Thomas Jefferson to William Charles Jarvis (Sept. 28, 1820), *available at* <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/98-01-02-1540>. If Jefferson was concerned that one *branch* of government could become despotic if it could determine the final meaning of the Constitution, then he would have been even more shocked at the notion that one *judge* within the judicial branch could bind the entire country with a decision at the trial level. Vesting such legislative power in one person resembles more of a dictatorship than an oligarchy.

B. The separation-of-powers violation is even worse when trial judges issue nationwide injunctions that contradict each other.

As Justice Gorsuch observed in *Department of Homeland Security*, it becomes even more confusing when different trial courts issue contradictory universal injunctions. *Department of Homeland Security*, slip op. at 2. Suddenly, the government and the country find themselves placed in the impossible position of discerning which order to obey and which to disregard, being faced with the penalty of

contempt of court if they do not comply. The answer to such a complicated conundrum is simple: trial courts have the power to bind only the parties before them. To hold that trial judges can issue nationwide injunctions would make each trial judge a national dictator. What happens when these dictators go to war with each other by contradictory nationwide injunctions? Nothing can result except chaos and disorder. The Constitution provides a way for the people who actually have the authority to bind the entire country to come to a final decision: a vote in the legislature. But there is no such mechanism for resolving dueling nationwide injunctions, unless this Court wishes to resolve every case in which trial judges have issued contradictory nationwide injunctions. That is the fate to which this Court will be bound unless it holds that trial judges lack the authority to issue nationwide injunctions at all.

C. If this Court approves nationwide injunctions, then the abuse-of-discretion standard will insulate those injunctions from meaningful appellate review.

There is another issue that arises if this Court believes that appeals on a case-by-case basis are the way to resolve issues arising from nationwide injunctions. Appellate courts often employ the abuse-of-discretion standard of review to matters in which trial courts have discretion, such as injunctions. *Pierce v. Underwood*, 487 U.S. 552, 558 (1988). If this Court fails to hold that trial courts lack the power to bind the entire nation, then nationwide injunctions

will have a level of insulation similar to what decisions of administrative agencies have now. Several Justices of this Court have expressed concerns about that issue in recent years. *See, e.g., Kisor v. Wilkie*, 139 S.Ct. 2400, 2425 (2019) (Gorsuch, J., concurring in part and concurring in judgment) (criticizing *Auer* deference); *Michigan v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 135 S.Ct. 2699, 2712 (2015) (Thomas, J., concurring) (questioning the constitutionality of *Chevron* deference); *City of Arlington v. Federal Commc'ns Comm'n*, 569 U.S. 290, 312 (2013) (Roberts, C.J., dissenting) (warning of the separation-of-powers violations that follow with granting too much deference to the administrative state).

The same concern is present in this case. As our Declaration of Independence states that to secure our God-given rights, “[g]overnments are instituted among Men, *deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.*” *The Declaration of Independence* para. 2 (U.S. 1776) (emphasis added). Nationwide injunctions are incompatible with this principle. A decree that binds every person within a jurisdiction must come from the People’s representatives in that jurisdiction. In contrast, the judges that issue nationwide injunctions are unelected, giving the People no voice in a decree that will bind all of them.

D. Nationwide injunctions exceed a trial court's geographical boundaries.

Moreover, as Attorney General Barr has observed, “Congress set clear geographic limits on lower-court jurisdiction,” but nationwide injunctions give “a single judge the unprecedented power to render irrelevant the decisions of every other judge in the country.” William Barr, Remarks to the American Law Institute on Nationwide Injunctions (May 21, 2019). In other words, by issuing nationwide injunctions, federal judges not only exclude the people within their geographic limits from having a voice, but they also impose their decrees on people living outside their geographic limits. One person wielding this much power is not adjudication. It is tyranny.

E. This Court should address whether nationwide injunctions are unconstitutional, not just whether the injunction in this case was unconstitutional.

Earlier in this term, this Court granted certiorari to answer the question of whether the vesting of substantial executive authority in a single director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (hereinafter “CFPB”) violates the doctrine of separation of powers. *Seila Law LLC v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau*, No. 19-7 (U.S. Oct. 18, 2019) (mem.). The CFPB is controlled by one director, who is appointed by the President and confirmed by

the Senate. 12 U.S.C. 5491(b)(1)-(2). The Director serves for a term of five years but cannot be fired by the President except for “inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.” 12 U.S.C. 5491(c)(3). As Justice Kavanaugh observed while a judge on the D.C. Circuit:

“The Director of the CFPB wields enormous power over American businesses, American consumers, and the overall U.S. economy. The Director unilaterally implements and enforces 19 federal consumer protection statutes, covering everything from home finance to student loans to credit cards to banking practices.

The Director *alone* may decide what rules to issue. The Director *alone* may decide how to enforce, when to enforce, and against whom to enforce the law. The Director *alone* may decide whether an individual or entity has violated the law. The Director *alone* may decide what sanctions and penalties to impose on violators of the law.

Because the CFPB is an independent agency headed by a single Director and not by a multi-member commission, the Director of the CFPB possesses more unilateral authority—that is, authority to take action on one’s own, subject to no check—than any single commissioner or board member in any other independent agency in the U.S.

Government. Indeed, other than the President, the Director enjoys more unilateral authority than any other official in any of the three branches of the U.S. Government.

That combination—power that is massive in scope, concentrated in a single person, and unaccountable to the President—triggers the important constitutional question at issue in this case.”

PHH Corp. v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, 881 F.3d 75 (D.C. Cir. 2018) (Kavanaugh, J., dissenting).

If the Court is concerned that concentrating this much power in one individual may constitute a separation-of-powers violation, then it should have no trouble concluding that the same problem exists when one federal judge *alone* may bind the entire nation with a stroke a pen. Like the CFPB Director, a federal district judge is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate and then becomes unaccountable to the People. Congress’s ability to remove a federal district judge is even more limited than the ability to remove the CFPB Director, since judges are appointed for life for good behavior and require two thirds of the Senate to concur for removal. The CFPB Director has the power to bind nearly all American *businesses* on the subject of the economy, but a federal district judge through a nationwide injunction can bind all the American *People* on any subject arising under federal law.

Thus, if the Court was concerned enough in *Seila Law* to address whether the CFPB was completely unconstitutional, then it should be even more concerned about the constitutionality of nationwide injunctions as a whole in this case. The importance of this issue is so grave that the Court should not stop the analysis at whether a nationwide injunction was improper in *this* case. Rather, it should proceed to hold that the practice of nationwide injunctions is altogether unconstitutional.

F. Adopting *Amicus's* view of judicial power will not strip this Court of the power to have the final say in cases arising under the Constitution.

Reading the foregoing, the Court may wonder whether *Amicus Curiae* has adopted too limited of a view of judicial power. After all, if judicial power is merely the power to bind the parties in a case, and if legislative power is the power to bind everyone within a jurisdiction, then one might have to ask how that principle would apply to the appellate courts—and even to this Court.

This Court has already rejected the notion that the decisions of federal appellate courts bind state courts within the same jurisdiction. “[T]he views of the federal courts of appeals do not bind the [state court of last resort] when it decides a federal constitutional question, and disagreeing with the lower federal courts is not the same as ignoring federal law.” *Johnson v. Williams*, 133 S.Ct. 1088, 1098 (2013); *see also* Bryan Garner et al., *The Law of Judicial Precedent* 691 (2016). Thus, it would appear

that neither the decisions of federal trial courts or federal appellate courts bind every person within their jurisdiction, but only the parties in the case.

What then of the United States Supreme Court? Does the Judicial Power Clause give this Court the power to bind every American, even though the same Clause does not give the lower federal courts the ability to do the same? The answer, of course, is no. However, this Court's reviewing authority over the federal courts of appeal and state supreme courts on matters of federal law ensure that the Court's decisions will be followed. Thus, this Court does not need to fear that limiting judicial power to bind the parties in the case before it will open Pandora's Box of lower courts disregarding higher-court precedent whenever they feel like it. The threat of being overruled is enough to keep the lower courts in line.

Last year, Justice Thomas argued that the Constitution requires judges to disregard precedents when they are plainly unconstitutional, but he made no judgment as to whether that applied to lower courts disregarding Supreme Court precedent. *Gamble v. United States*, 139 S.Ct. 1960, 1981 (2019) (Thomas, J., concurring). Justice Thomas's well-reasoned opinion in *Gamble* merits consideration of that question in a future case. But *Amicus's* point in this brief is that this Court should not fear for its own power in holding that judicial power is only the power to bind the parties in a particular case, because Constitution gives this Court final appellate jurisdiction over any case arising under federal law.

In contrast, if this Court fails to hold that courts have only the power to bind the parties in the case before them, then worse results will ensue. If the Court places no limits on nationwide injunctions, then the current chaos of forum-shopping for a trial court that will give a plaintiff a favorable nationwide injunction will continue, along with the chaos of nationwide injunctions that contradict each other. On the other hand, if the Court places limits on nationwide injunctions, then it will have to articulate the basis for those limits. If the basis for limiting nationwide injunctions is not the scope the Judicial Power Clause, then what is it? Is it the court's geographical limits? If so, then the decisions of lower federal judges will be the final word within their jurisdictions, which would overrule *Johnson sub silentio*. In other words, granting federal judges this much authority within their jurisdictions would not only make federal judges *de facto* legislators, but it would also destroy the system of federalism that creates "a parallelism but not paramountcy" between state and federal courts. *United States ex rel. Lawrence v. Woods*, 432 F.2d 1072, 1075 (7th Cir. 1970).

All of these problems can be solved by simply holding what the Founders believed and this Court affirmed in *Muskraat*: judicial power is the power to bind the parties in the case before a court and nothing more.

CONCLUSION

Free exercise of religion is an unalienable right given ultimately by our Creator. The Free Exercise

Clause requires the federal government to find a solution like the Trump administration's IFR's, and protects the Little Sisters' right to an exemption from the contraception mandate.

Moreover, when a federal district judge issues a nationwide injunction, he becomes a one-man Congress. Article III vests a court branch with the power to bind the parties in the case before it—not the entire nation. That power rests with the legislative branch alone.

This Court should reverse the decision of the Third Circuit to defend religious freedom and the separation of powers.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW J. CLARK
FOUNDATION FOR MORAL LAW
One Dexter Avenue
Montgomery, AL 36104
334-262-1245
matt@morallaw.org

Counsel for *Amicus Curiae*