

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

No. 17-1077

FRANCIS V. LORENZO, PETITIONER

v.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

---

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PRESENT ORAL ARGUMENT PRO HAC VICE

---

Pursuant to Rule 6 of the Rules of this Court, I request that Christopher G. Michel, a member of my staff, be authorized to argue this case for the government in the event that the Court schedules oral argument before December 9, 2018 -- the date on which Mr. Michel will be eligible for admission to the Bar of this Court.

Mr. Michel graduated from Yale Law School in 2013. After graduation he served for one year as a law clerk to Judge Brett M. Kavanaugh of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, and for one year as a law clerk to Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr. He then practiced as an associate with law firms in Washington, D.C., before joining the staff of the Office of the Solicitor General in September 2017.

Mr. Michel is a member of the Virginia State Bar, to which he was admitted in October 2015. The Virginia State Bar is separate from the Bar of the Supreme Court of Virginia, to which Mr. Michel

was admitted on December 9, 2015. Under Rule 5 of the Rules of this Court, Mr. Michel will be eligible for admission to the Bar of this Court on December 9, 2018. The Court allowed Mr. Michel to present oral argument pro hac vice for the government last Term in Digital Realty Trust, Inc. v. Somers, No. 16-1276.\*

Mr. Michel is thoroughly familiar with the facts and issues in this case, having participated in the preparation of the government's brief on the merits. Because of his knowledge of the case and his legal ability, Mr. Michel is especially qualified to present oral argument for the government.

Respectfully submitted.

NOEL J. FRANCISCO  
Solicitor General  
Counsel of Record

OCTOBER 2018

---

\* This Court has authorized pro hac vice argument by members of the Office of the Solicitor General on a number of other occasions. See, e.g., United States ex rel. Eisenstein v. City of New York, 556 U.S. 1163 (2009); Comm'r v. Banks, 542 U.S. 964 (2004); Sattazahn v. Pennsylvania, 537 U.S. 807 (2002).