Honorable Scott S. Harris
Clerk
Supreme Court of the United States
Washington, D.C. 20543


Dear Mr. Harris:

In its motion for divided argument in this case, the United States explained that it had filed a brief as amicus curiae supporting petitioners on the merits, but that it had not yet reached a position on mootness. In light of the Court's denial of respondents' Suggestion of Mootness, its order that the parties be prepared to discuss mootness at oral argument, and its grant of the United States' motion for divided argument, the United States has now reached a position on mootness. In the United States' view, respondents have not established that this case is moot. The United States will be prepared to address mootness at argument, as well as in a supplemental brief if the Court so desires.

We would appreciate your circulating this letter to Members of the Court.

Sincerely,

Noel J. Francisco
Solicitor General
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