



GRAY REED

ATTORNEYS & COUNSELORS

GREG WHITE
TELEPHONE: 254.342.3003
GWHITE@GRAYREED.COM

DALLAS | HOUSTON | WACO

April 1, 2020

Scott S. Harris, Clerk of Court
Supreme Court of the United States
1 First Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20543

Re: No. 19-631; *William P Barr, et al v. American Association of Political Consultants, Inc., et al*

Dear Mr. Harris:

I am writing on behalf of the Association of Credit and Collection Professionals (ACA).¹ ACA International is a not-for-profit corporation based in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Founded in 1939, ACA represents nearly 3,700 members, including credit grantors, collection agencies, attorneys, asset buyers and vendor affiliates. ACA produces a wide variety of products, services, and publications, including educational and compliance-related information; and articulates the value of the credit-and-collection industry to businesses, policymakers, and consumers.

ACA company members range in size from small businesses with a few employees to large publicly held corporations. ACA company members collect rightfully owed debts on behalf of other small and local businesses. ACA members include businesses that operate within a single town, city, or state and large national corporations that do business in every state.

ACA members are an extension of every community's businesses. ACA members work with these businesses, large and small, to obtain payment for the goods and services already received by consumers. In years past, the combined effort of ACA members has resulted in the annual recovery of billions of dollars—dollars that are returned to and reinvested and that would otherwise constitute losses to member businesses. Without an effective collection process, the economic viability of these businesses—and, by extension,

¹ No Party's counsel authored this letter in whole or in part. No Party or Party's counsel contributed money intended to fund preparation or submission of this letter. No person - other than Amicus Curiae ACA International, its members, and its counsel - contributed money to fund preparation or submission of this letter.

the American economy in general—is threatened. Recovering rightfully owed consumer debt preserves business; helps prevent job losses; and reduces the need for tax increases to cover governmental budget shortfalls.

ACA supported the Respondent’s position in this case in another case where a Petition for Writ of Certiorari was filed. In that case, No. 19-511, styled *Facebook, Inc. v. Noah Duguid, et al* (in which the Government was an Intervenor, and espoused the same position as it does in this case), the Petition for Certiorari remains pending, and concerns the same issues present in this case. ACA’s position is set out in full in that Amicus Brief, and applies just as strongly in this case.

Given that ACA has already expressed its position on the issues in this case, it is appropriate to refer the Court to that previously filed Brief as opposed to filing a separate brief in this case expressing the same position a second time. In addition, ACA’s counsel has reviewed the brief filed by the Respondent, as well as briefs filed by six separate organizations in support of the Respondents. These briefs, and in particular the briefs of the amici supporting the Respondent, voice many of the same concerns that ACA would express in an amicus brief. ACA believes that adding another amicus brief in support of the Respondent would add a burden to the Court and its staff that would not add substantially to the careful discussion of the merits already on record.

For this reason, we ask that the Court take note of ACA’s support of the Respondent for the reasons reflected in its *Facebook* filing, and for the reasons already expressed on the Respondent’s side in briefs already on file.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Greg White

Greg White