

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

---

No. 24-813

CHEVRON USA INCORPORATED, ET AL., PETITIONERS

v.

PLAQUEMINES PARISH, LOUISIANA, ET AL.

---

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

---

MOTION OF THE UNITED STATES FOR LEAVE TO  
PARTICIPATE IN ORAL ARGUMENT AS AMICUS CURIAE  
AND FOR DIVIDED ARGUMENT

---

Pursuant to Rules 21, 28.4, and 28.7 of the Rules of this Court, the Solicitor General, on behalf of the United States, respectfully moves for leave to participate in the oral argument in this case as amicus curiae supporting petitioners and requests that the United States be allowed ten minutes of argument time. Petitioners consent to this motion and have agreed to cede ten minutes of argument time to the United States. Accordingly, if this motion were granted, the argument time would be divided as follows: 20 minutes for petitioners, 10 minutes for the United States, and 30 minutes for respondents.

This case involves the application of the federal-officer-removal statute, 28 U.S.C. 1442(a)(1), to companies that had federal contracts during World War II. The United States has a substantial interest in the proper interpretation of that statute. The federal-officer-removal statute governs removal by federal officers themselves, as well as by the United States and its agencies. And the statute's "'basic' purpose," this Court has observed, is to protect the federal government from state-court "interference with its 'operations.'" Watson v. Philip Morris Cos., 551 U.S. 142, 150 (2007) (quoting Willingham v. Morgan, 395 U.S. 402, 406 (1969)). The United States has filed a brief as amicus curiae supporting petitioners in this case.

The United States has previously presented oral argument as amicus curiae or as a party in cases concerning the proper interpretation of the federal-officer-removal statute. See, e.g., Watson, supra; Jefferson County v. Acker, 527 U.S. 423 (1999); International Primate Protection League v. Administrators of the Tulane Educ. Fund, 500 U.S. 72 (1991); Mesa v. California, 489 U.S. 121 (1989); Colorado v. Symes, 286 U.S. 510 (1932). The United States' participation in oral argument in this case accordingly may be of material assistance to the Court.

Respectfully submitted.

D. JOHN SAUER  
Solicitor General  
Counsel of Record

NOVEMBER 2025