

No. 25-496

In the  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

LAWYERS FOR FAIR RECIPROCAL ADMISSION,  
*Petitioner,*

*v.*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.,  
*Respondents.*

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

**SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF  
PETITION FOR REHEARING**

Joseph Robert Giannini  
*Counsel of Record*

Law Office Joseph Robert Giannini  
12016 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 5  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(310) 804-1814  
j.r.giannini@verizon.net

*Counsel for Petitioner*

January 13, 2026

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
SUMMARY OF INTERVENING DEVELOPMENT.....	2
A. Congressional Amendment to SCRA.....	2
B. Department of Justice Enforcement Letter.....	2
1. Geographic licensing restrictions constitute illegal discrimination.....	3
2. State demands beyond SCRA requirements are illegal.....	3
3. Licensed professionals are not “new applicants”.....	3
4. Attorney licenses specifically included.....	4
ARGUMENT.....	4
I. CONGRESSIONAL PREEMPTION REQUIRES REHEARING.....	4
A. The SCRA Amendment Constitutes Express Federal Preemption of State-Based Geographic Attorney Licensing Restrictions.....	4
B. Federal Preemption of Attorney Licensing Demolishes the Ninth Circuit’s Rational Basis Analysis.....	5
1. Geographic restrictions are not rationally related to attorney competence .....	6

2. Merit-based licensing serves federal policy.....	6
C. If Geographic Restrictions Are Irrational for Military Spouses, They Are Irrational for All Attorneys.....	6
 II. THE SCRA AMENDMENT DEMONSTRATES THAT ATTORNEY LICENSING INVOLVES FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.....	8
A. Congress's Enactment of Mandatory Portability Recognizes First Amendment Implications.....	8
1. Freedom of Speech. ....	9
2. Freedom of Petition.....	9
3. Freedom of Association.....	9
B. The DOJ Letter Endorses Merit-Based Review Consistent with Strict Scrutiny.....	9
 III. THE SCRA AMENDMENT DEEPENS THE CIRCUIT SPLIT AND CONFLICTS WITH THE SOLICITOR GENERAL'S POSITION IN <i>CHILES</i> .....	10
A. Federal Preemption Creates New Legal Questions Warranting Review.....	10
1. Preemption scope. ....	10
2. Equal protection implications.....	11

3. Standard of review. ....	11
B. The DOJ Position Conflicts with the Ninth Circuit's Holding.....	11
CONCLUSION.....	12
APPENDIX – DOJ NOTIFICATION LETTER 12/22/2025	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Arizona v. United States</i> , 567 U.S. 387 (2012).....	4
<i>Bantam Books, Inc. v. Sullivan</i> , 372 U.S. 58 (1963) ..	9
<i>Chile v. Salazar</i> , Supreme Court docket 24-539..	12,13
<i>Lawyers For Fair Reciprocal Admission v. United States</i> , 141 F.4th 1056 (9th Cir. 2025).....	5
<i>NAACP v. Button</i> , 371 U.S. 415 (1963).....	9
<i>Romer v. Evans</i> , 517 U.S. 620 (1996).....	7

### Constitutional Provisions

U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2.....	4
First Amendment.....	9

### Statutes

Servicemember Quality of Life Improvement and National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2025, Pub. L. 118-159; 50 U.S.C. § 4025a.....	2,4
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

### Rules

Supreme Court Rule 15.6 .....	1
-------------------------------	---

### Executive Orders

Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity, January 21, 2025. .....	6
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

## INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 15.6, Petitioner respectfully submits this supplemental brief to inform the Court of a significant intervening development: on December 22, 2025, the Department of Justice issued an official notification letter announcing that Congress, effective December 23, 2024, amended the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA) to mandate professional license portability for all professions, *including attorney licenses*. This congressional action directly preempts state-based geographic licensing restrictions and fundamentally alters the legal landscape governing the issues presented in this petition.

This development requires rehearing because it establishes that Congress has determined that geographic restrictions on professional licenses—including law licenses—violate federal policy, are not supported by legitimate governmental interests, and cause substantial harm to national interests. The Department of Justice has declared that state licensing authorities demanding anything beyond SCRA’s requirements are acting *illegally*. This federal preemption directly contradicts the Ninth Circuit’s holding that geographic attorney licensing restrictions are subject only to rational basis review.

## SUMMARY OF INTERVENING DEVELOPMENT

### A. Congressional Amendment to SCRA

On December 23, 2024, Congress enacted the Servicemember Quality of Life Improvement and National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2025, which fundamentally rewrote 50 U.S.C. § 4025a governing professional license portability. The amendment made two critical changes directly relevant to this petition:

**First**, Congress removed the explicit exclusion for attorney licenses. Previously, law licenses were categorically exempt from SCRA portability protections. Under the updated statute,

*all professional licenses, including law licenses, are now eligible for portability.* See 50 U.S.C. § 4025a; Pub. L. 118-159.

**Second**, Congress eliminated the “active use” requirement. Previously, servicemembers or spouses had to demonstrate they actively used their license during the two years immediately preceding relocation. Under the updated law, there is no such requirement. If a servicemember or spouse holds a covered license in good standing, they qualify for portability regardless of whether they recently practiced.

### B. Department of Justice Enforcement Letter

On December 22, 2025, Assistant Attorney General Harmeet K. Dhillon issued an official notification letter to all state licensing authorities explaining the

amended SCRA and announcing federal enforcement. Petitioner's counsel first learned of this new DOJ policy on January 9, 2026, when it was published in the American Bar Association Weekly Newsletter. The letter makes several critical representations:

**1. Geographic licensing restrictions constitute illegal discrimination.** The DOJ explicitly states that requiring licensed professionals to meet first-time applicant requirements solely because they hold an out-of-state license violates federal law. The letter explains that "license portability remains a critical tool for our military spouses to be able to support their families in the manner of their choosing."

**2. State demands beyond SCRA requirements are illegal.** The DOJ warns: "As a reminder, following a State-mandated process for licensure does not ensure that you are in compliance with the SCRA. When a servicemember or spouse applies for SCRA license portability,

*anything demanded in excess of the requirements detailed in the SCRA is illegal.*  
(Emphasis added.)

**3. Licensed professionals are not "new applicants".** The DOJ emphasizes: "The goal of this provision is to recognize that an applicant servicemember or spouse is already fully licensed or certified by another licensing authority in the United States.

*They are not new applicants who have to meet the same requirements as first-time practitioners. (Emphasis added.)*

This directly contradicts treating experienced out-of-state attorneys as if they were law school graduates seeking initial admission.

**4. Attorney licenses specifically included.** The letter explicitly states: “Under the prior version of the law, licenses to practice law were explicitly excluded from portability under the SCRA.

*Under the updated law, all professional licenses and certificates, including law licenses, are eligible for portability.”*

## ARGUMENT

### I. CONGRESSIONAL PREEMPTION REQUIRES REHEARING

#### A. The SCRA Amendment Constitutes Express Federal Preemption of State-Based Geographic Attorney Licensing Restrictions

The Supremacy Clause mandates that federal law preempts conflicting state law. U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2. Congress may preempt state law expressly, through express language in a statute, or impliedly, when state law conflicts with federal law or when federal regulation is so pervasive that it leaves no room for supplementary state regulation.

*Arizona v. United States*, 567 U.S. 387, 399 (2012).

The SCRA amendment expressly preempts state-based geographic restrictions on attorney licensing.

The statute provides that when a servicemember or spouse satisfies the specified criteria, their out-of-state license

*shall be considered valid* for the scope of practice in the State of the new residence. 50 U.S.C. § 4025a(a) (emphasis added).

This mandatory language leaves no discretion for states to impose additional geographic requirements.

The DOJ's enforcement letter confirms the preemptive effect: "When a servicemember or spouse applies for SCRA license portability, anything demanded in excess of the requirements detailed in the SCRA is illegal." This is express preemption—Congress has occupied the field of attorney license portability for covered individuals, and state rules demanding bar examinations, local residency, or other geographic prerequisites are void as applied to SCRA-covered servicemembers and spouses.

### **B. Federal Preemption of Attorney Licensing Demolishes the Ninth Circuit's Rational Basis Analysis**

The Ninth Circuit held that "bar admission restrictions [are subject] to rational basis review."

*Lawyers For Fair Reciprocal Admission v. United States*, 141 F.4th 1056, 1063 (9th Cir. 2025). The panel reasoned that states have broad authority to regulate professional licensing and that geographic restrictions serve legitimate state interests in ensuring attorney competence and familiarity with local law.

Congress has now expressly rejected this reasoning. By enacting mandatory license portability for attorneys, Congress determined that:

**1. Geographic restrictions are not rationally related to attorney competence.** If requiring an out-of-state attorney to retake a bar examination were rationally related to protecting the public, Congress would not have mandated automatic license recognition for SCRA-covered attorneys. The statute's very existence demonstrates congressional judgment that an attorney licensed in California is competent to practice federal law in Nevada without retaking an entry-level examination.

**2. Merit-based licensing serves federal policy.** The SCRA amendment aligns with the January 21, 2025, Executive Order "Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity." Both federal actions reflect a coordinated policy judgment that professional licensing should be based on individual qualifications and experience, not arbitrary geographic classifications.

**C. If Geographic Restrictions Are Irrational for Military Spouses, They Are Irrational for All Attorneys**

The SCRA amendment creates a logical impossibility for the Ninth Circuit's rational basis analysis. The panel held that categorical exclusion of out-of-state attorneys is rationally related to legitimate state interests. But Congress has now mandated that *identical geographic restrictions cannot be applied to military spouses.*

Consider the situation in Nevada federal court:

**Scenario 1:** Jane Doe, a California-licensed attorney with 15 years of federal court experience, seeks admission to Nevada federal court. Under the challenged local rules, she is categorically excluded unless she retakes the Nevada bar examination. The Ninth Circuit held this categorical exclusion is rationally related to Nevada's interest in ensuring attorney competence.

**Scenario 2:** Jane Doe is married to an active duty servicemember who receives orders to Nevada. She holds the identical California license with the identical 15 years of experience. Under SCRA, Nevada *must* recognize her license without requiring any bar examination. The DOJ has declared that demanding a bar exam would be *illegal*.

This creates an impossible contradiction: the same geographic restriction cannot simultaneously be "rationally related to attorney competence" (Scenario 1) and "illegal discrimination that serves no legitimate purpose" (Scenario 2). The attorney is identical, the license is identical, the competence is identical. The only difference is marital status.

Congress's determination that geographic restrictions are unjustified for military spouses necessarily implies they are unjustified for all attorneys.

The rational basis test requires that classifications bear *some* relationship to a legitimate governmental interest. *Romer v. Evans*, 517 U.S. 620, 631 (1996). If a restriction is so irrational that Congress prohibits applying it to one subset of attorneys, it cannot be

rational when applied to others with identical qualifications.

**Scenario 3:** Peyton George, a petitioner member and director, is a retired Army Colonel and retired FBI agent licensed in several states. He submitted a declaration setting forth his facial and as applied injuries and certificates of good standing. The Ninth Circuit, like the District Judge, refused to consider his claims or allow oral argument. Other LFRA members are honorably discharged veterans decorated for meritorious service and heroism.

## **II. THE SCRA AMENDMENT DEMONSTRATES THAT ATTORNEY LICENSING INVOLVES FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS**

### **A. Congress's Enactment of Mandatory Portability Recognizes First Amendment**

#### **Implications**

Congress does not lightly override state professional licensing authority. The decision to mandate license portability for attorneys—a profession previously *explicitly excluded* from SCRA protections—signals congressional recognition that attorney licensing restrictions implicate fundamental constitutional concerns.

The DOJ letter confirms this understanding. The letter emphasizes that license portability “secures these educational investments and guards against punishing military families” for relocations “outside of their control.” This language mirrors First

Amendment principles protecting against prior restraints and content-based discrimination.

*See Bantam Books, Inc. v. Sullivan*, 372 U.S. 58, 70 (1963) (prior restraints subject to strict scrutiny).

Attorney licensing directly implicates three First Amendment freedoms identified in Petitioner's original briefs:

**1. Freedom of Speech.** An attorney's practice consists entirely of professional speech—oral argument, brief writing, client counseling, and legal analysis. Geographic restrictions operate as content-based discrimination, prohibiting speech about federal law based on the speaker's state of licensure.

**2. Freedom of Petition.** The Petition Clause textually guarantees the right to petition the government for redress of grievances. U.S. Const. amend. I. Restricting who may file federal court petitions based on geography operates as a prior restraint on this fundamental right.

**3. Freedom of Association.** The right to associate with counsel of one's choice is constitutionally protected. *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415, 428-29 (1963). Geographic restrictions deny clients the freedom to associate with qualified out-of-state counsel.

#### **B. The DOJ Letter Endorses Merit-Based Review Consistent with Strict Scrutiny**

The DOJ's characterization of license portability directly parallels strict scrutiny analysis. The letter explains that licensing authorities should evaluate

applicants based on individual qualifications, not categorical geographic exclusions:

“The goal of this provision is to recognize that an applicant servicemember or spouse is already fully licensed or certified by another licensing authority in the United States. They are not new applicants who have to meet the same requirements as first-time practitioners. The license portability provision of the SCRA provides its applicants with a unique pathway to continuing their career, different from someone who is relocating to a new State or jurisdiction voluntarily.”

This reasoning mirrors strict scrutiny’s requirement that restrictions be narrowly tailored to compelling interests. Rather than categorical geographic exclusions, the DOJ endorses individualized assessment based on qualifications, experience, and conduct—precisely the type of narrowly tailored review strict scrutiny requires.

### **III. THE SCRA AMENDMENT DEEPENS THE CIRCUIT SPLIT AND CONFLICTS WITH THE SOLICITOR GENERAL’S POSITION IN CHILES**

#### **A. Federal Preemption Creates New Legal Questions Warranting Review**

The SCRA amendment creates urgent new legal questions that did not exist when this Court denied certiorari:

**1. Preemption scope.** Does the SCRA preempt only state licensing boards, or does it also preempt

federal court local rules that impose the same geographic restrictions? The statute applies to “any” professional licensing authority, and the DOJ letter is addressed to “state licensing authorities,” but federal courts exercise analogous licensing authority through admission rules.

**2. Equal protection implications.** If geographic restrictions violate federal law as applied to military spouses but remain permissible for other attorneys, does this create an equal protection problem? The Ninth Circuit’s rational basis approach cannot explain why identical restrictions are simultaneously illegal discrimination (for military spouses) and legitimate state regulation (for others).

**3. Standard of review.** Congress’s determination that geographic attorney licensing restrictions cause constitutional harm and serve no legitimate governmental interest directly contradicts the Ninth Circuit’s holding that such restrictions deserve rational basis deference.

## **B. The DOJ Position Conflicts with the Ninth Circuit’s Holding**

The DOJ enforcement letter represents the official position of the United States government on attorney license portability. The letter declares that geographic restrictions on attorney licensing:

- (1) Constitute “illegal discrimination”;
- (2) “Punish” professionals for circumstances beyond their control;
- (3) Harm critical federal interests in military readiness; and

(4) Serve no legitimate governmental purpose.

This official position directly contradicts the Ninth Circuit’s holding that geographic attorney licensing restrictions are subject to rational basis review and serve legitimate state interests in ensuring competence and familiarity with local law.

Moreover, as detailed in Petitioner’s November 7, 2025, letter to Solicitor General Sauer, this case presents the identical professional speech issue the Solicitor General argued in *Chiles v. Salazar*, No. 24-539. In *Chiles*, the Solicitor General argued that content-based professional speech restrictions require strict scrutiny, not rational basis review. The SCRA amendment and DOJ letter now provide additional support for that position in the attorney licensing context.

## CONCLUSION

The SCRA amendment and DOJ enforcement letter constitute significant intervening developments that fundamentally alter the legal landscape governing this petition. Congress has determined that geographic attorney licensing restrictions:

- (1) Are not rationally related to attorney competence;
- (2) Constitute illegal discrimination;
- (3) Harm important federal interests; and
- (4) Should be replaced with merit-based qualification assessment.

These congressional determinations directly contradict the Ninth Circuit’s holding that geographic restrictions on attorney practice are

subject to rational basis review. The panel's analysis cannot survive congressional preemption establishing that the same restrictions are unconstitutional when applied to military spouses.

The Court should grant rehearing, vacate its order denying certiorari, and grant review to address:

- (1) Whether the SCRA amendment preempts federal court local rules imposing geographic attorney licensing restrictions;
- (2) Whether Congress's determination that geographic restrictions are unconstitutional for military spouses establishes they are unconstitutional for all attorneys;
- (3) Whether attorney licensing restrictions that categorically exclude qualified practitioners based on geography implicate First Amendment rights to speech, petition, and association requiring strict scrutiny; and
- (4) How to reconcile the circuit split on professional speech restrictions in light of congressional preemption demonstrating such restrictions cause constitutional harm.

Alternatively, the Court should grant review and hold in light of the pending decision in *Chiles* or call for the views of the Solicitor General to obtain the United States' position on these critical federal preemption questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Robert Giannini  
*Counsel of Record*  
Law Office Joseph Robert Giannini  
12016 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 5  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(310) 804-1814  
[j.r.giannini@verizon.net](mailto:j.r.giannini@verizon.net)

*Counsel for Petitioner*

## **APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**Appendix A:** U.S. Department of Justice,  
Notification Letter, December 22, 2025 . . . . . 1a

## APPENDIX A

[LETTERHEAD]  
**U.S. Department of Justice**  
Civil Rights Division  
Office of the Assistant Attorney General  
*Washington, D.C. 20530*

### NOTIFICATION LETTER

ATTENTION: State Licensing Authorities  
DATE: December 22, 2025  
SUBJECT: Update to Professional License  
Portability for Servicemembers  
and Their Spouses

The Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division is issuing this letter to notify State Licensing Authorities of recent updates to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (SCRA). On December 23, 2024, Congress made significant changes to the SCRA provision that allows servicemembers and their spouses to have their professional licenses and certificates recognized in different jurisdictions when they must relocate due to military orders.<sup>1</sup> We request

---

<sup>1</sup> On December 23, 2024, the Servicemember Quality of Life Improvement and National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2025 (H.R. 5009) became law. This law rewrote the section of the SCRA on the portability of professional licenses, including by removing the exception for attorneys. *See* 50 U.S.C. § 4025a; Pub. L. 118-159.

that you carefully review the changes described in this letter, evaluate your practices to ensure compliance with this updated federal law, and help us tackle the issue of military spousal unemployment.<sup>2</sup>

### ***Introduction***

Military families continue to face challenges with frequent moves, child-care, and interruptions or barriers to employment. They often relocate through a process known as “Permanent Change of Station” (PCS) moves. It can be hard to remain employed while constantly and, at times, suddenly moving. According to the 2024 Department of Defense Survey of Active Duty Spouses, the unemployment rate for military spouses who made a PCS move was about 33% higher than spouses who had not made any PCS moves.<sup>3</sup> The unemployment rate for military spouses remains around 20%, far higher than the national average of 4.4%.<sup>4</sup> Spousal unemployment is a leading cause of

---

<sup>2</sup> This notification letter is intended to inform State Licensing Authorities about the enactment of updates to the SCRA. The contents of this document do not have the force and effect of law and are not meant to bind the public or State Licensing Authorities in any way or to create any enforceable legal rights. This notification letter does not determine the outcome in any particular case or set of facts. In any investigation under the SCRA, the Civil Rights Division makes enforcement decisions based on the facts of that particular case.

<sup>3</sup> 2024 Active Duty Spouse Survey (ADSS).

<sup>4</sup> Bureau of Labor Statistics, September 2025 Chart on Civilian Unemployment Rate.

servicemembers leaving military service and is a significant readiness and retention issue.

License portability is one of the ways that the SCRA works to support military families suffering a loss of economic potential while they serve the country. It takes significant time and money to secure a professional license or certificate. The license portability provision in the SCRA helps secure these educational investments and guards against punishing military families, particularly working spouses, for frequent moves that are outside of their control. With the persistence of military spousal unemployment, license portability remains a critical tool for our military spouses to be able to support their families in the manner of their choosing.

### ***Overview of the Updated Law on Professional License Portability***

The updated SCRA provision allows servicemembers and their spouses to use their professional licenses and certificates in certain circumstances when they must relocate due to military orders. For a license to be considered valid in a new location, a servicemember or their spouse must satisfy the following criteria:

1. Have a covered license;
2. move to another State due to military orders; and
3. submit an application to the licensing

authority of the new State.<sup>5</sup>

If these three criteria are met, the servicemember or their spouse's covered license or certificate "***shall be considered valid*** for the scope of practice in the State of the new residence."<sup>6</sup>

The following sections break down the specifics of some of these requirements:

*What is a covered license?*

"The term 'covered license' means a professional license that, with respect to a scope of practice—

- (A) is in good standing with the licensing authority that issued such license;
- (B) has not been revoked or had discipline imposed by any State;
- (C) does not have an investigation relating to unprofessional conduct pending in any State relating to it; and
- (D) has not been voluntarily surrendered while under investigation for unprofessional conduct in any

---

<sup>5</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 4025a(a).

<sup>6</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 4025a(a) (emphasis added).

State.”<sup>7</sup>

*What is a State?*

“State” is a broad term defined in the SCRA to include a commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States and the District of Columbia.<sup>8</sup>

*What is an application?*

A submission by a servicemember or spouse to the new licensing authority that includes the following:

- “(1) Proof of military orders ...;
- (2) If the applicant is the spouse of a servicemember, a copy of the marriage certificate;
- (3) A notarized affidavit affirming, under the penalty of law, that—
  - (A) the applicant is the person described and identified in the application;
  - (B) all statements made in the application are true and correct and complete;
  - (C) the applicant has read and understands the requirements to receive a license, and the

---

<sup>7</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 4025a(f).

<sup>8</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 3911(6).

scope of practice, of the State of the licensing authority;

- (D) the applicant certifies that the applicant meets and shall comply with requirements described in subparagraph (C); and
- (E) the applicant is in good standing in all States in which the applicant holds or has held a license.”<sup>9</sup>

*What are military orders?*

The term "military orders", with respect to a servicemember, means official military orders (including orders for separation or retirement), or any notification, certification, or verification from the servicemember's commanding officer, with respect to the servicemember's current or future military duty status.<sup>10</sup>

Under the updated law, a letter or any written communication from the servicemember's commanding officer indicating a change in the servicemember's duty status satisfies the requirement for proof of military orders. Because the issuance of official military orders can be delayed, a notice from a commanding officer provides a military family with the head start needed to accomplish the myriad tasks that accompany a PCS

---

<sup>9</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 4025a(c).

<sup>10</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 4025a(f)(4); 50 U.S.C. § 3955(i)(1).

– from moving to pursuing license portability.

#### *Scope of practice*

The term "scope of practice" means the defined parameters of various duties or services that may be provided by an individual under a license.<sup>11</sup> Under the updated law, a covered servicemember or spouse's out-of-state license must be considered valid for the scope of practice in the state of the new residence.

#### ***The Updated Law's Impact on Interstate Licensure Compacts***

Some States are members of interstate licensure compacts, which allow licensed practitioners to work in other compact-member States without needing a new license or certificate. Under the prior version of the law, servicemembers or spouses that held a license to operate in multiple States pursuant to an interstate licensure compact were able to use SCRA license portability if they were moving to a State that was not covered by their compact.

Under the updated law, servicemembers or spouses who hold a covered license to operate in multiple States pursuant to an interstate compact are subject to the requirements of the compact or the applicable provisions of law in the new State and are

---

<sup>11</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 4025a(f)(5).

no longer eligible for portability under the SCRA.<sup>12</sup>

### ***Effective Date of the Updated Law***

The SCRA's updated license portability provision, "Portability of Professional Licenses of Servicemembers and their Spouses," went into effect on December 23, 2024. Servicemembers and their spouses who, due to military orders, are in jurisdictions outside the State of the licensing authority that issued their covered license can now apply for portability.

### ***Enforcement Authority for the Updated Law***

Congress has provided the Attorney General with enforcement authority under the SCRA, which includes the provision regarding the portability of professional licenses and certificates. Specifically, this authority has been delegated to the Civil Rights Division, and authorizes lawsuits in federal district court against those who engage in (1) a pattern or practice of violations; or (2) violations that raise issues of significant public importance.<sup>13</sup>

The Civil Rights Division is proud of its work enforcing the SCRA and supporting servicemembers and their families. Since 2011, the Justice Department has obtained over \$483 million in monetary relief for

---

<sup>12</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 4025a(e).

<sup>13</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 4041(a).

over 148,000 servicemembers using the SCRA to address improper lease terminations, foreclosures, vehicle repossessions, interest rates, default judgments, and more.

Our Servicemembers and Veterans Initiative and our SCRA enforcement team engage regularly with State and local officials on the SCRA and other statutory protections afforded our servicemembers and their families. We welcome your continued engagement. We also appreciate your efforts to comply with this law and its recent changes, keeping in focus the goal of supporting our military families.

### ***Other Significant Updates***

#### *Background checks*

A licensing authority that receives an application for portability under the SCRA may conduct a background check of the applicant before recognizing a covered license as valid or issuing a temporary license.<sup>14</sup>

#### *Temporary licenses*

If a licensing authority is required to consider a covered license valid under the SCRA but cannot carry out such requirement during the 30 days after receiving an application from a servicemember or spouse, the licensing authority may issue to the

---

<sup>14</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 4025a(d).

applicant a temporary license that confers the same rights, privileges, and responsibilities as a permanent license.<sup>15</sup>

*Are any licenses excluded?*

The term "license" means any license, certificate, or other evidence of qualification that an individual is required to obtain before the individual may engage in, or represent himself or herself to be a member of, a particular profession.<sup>16</sup> Under the prior version of the law, licenses to practice law were explicitly excluded from portability under the SCRA. Under the updated law, all professional licenses and certificates, including law licenses, are eligible for portability.

*Active use requirement*

Under the prior version of the law, there was a requirement that the servicemember or spouse have actively used the covered license during the two years immediately preceding the move in order to be eligible for portability. Under the updated law, there is no longer any requirement that the license have been actively used.<sup>17</sup> If the servicemember or spouse meets the requirements as detailed earlier in this letter, they qualify for portability under the SCRA.

---

<sup>15</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 4025a(b).

<sup>16</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 4025a(f)(2).

<sup>17</sup> See 50 U.S.C. § 4025a.

## ***Initial Conversations with Licensing Authorities***

In our initial conversations with licensing authorities, we uncovered a few concerning trends. We strongly encourage you to train your public-facing staff about the SCRA. Servicemembers and their spouses report that they are deterred from applying for license portability because they are misdirected by frontline staff. Too often these applicants are sent to a generic renewal or application portal that does not include a pathway for SCRA license portability. We have found that, even in cases where applicants ask explicitly about SCRA portability, they have been told that no such pathway exists.

As a reminder, following a State-mandated process for licensure does not ensure that you are in compliance with the SCRA. When a servicemember or spouse applies for SCRA license portability, anything demanded in excess of the requirements detailed in the SCRA is illegal. For example, the law does not permit requesting transcripts or test scores or meeting active use requirements. The goal of this provision is to recognize that an applicant servicemember or spouse is already fully licensed or certified by another licensing authority in the United States. They are not new applicants who have to meet the same requirements as first-time practitioners. The license portability provision of the SCRA provides its applicants with a unique pathway to continuing their career, different from someone who is relocating to a new State or jurisdiction voluntarily.

As a best practice, we recommend that state

licensing authorities issue a new license to the servicemember or spouse who has applied for portability. In the alternative, the State licensing authority should provide the servicemember or spouse with documentation showing that their existing license is valid in the new jurisdiction. This proof of valid licensure can be electronic. This can help ease concerns from insurance providers or employers as the spouses seek employment in your State.

In the fight against military spouse unemployment, speedy processing of a SCRA license portability application can make a huge difference. We strongly encourage you to update your websites, portals, and public-facing materials to help applicants seeking a new license or recognition of their existing license or certificate under the SCRA.

### ***Additional Resources***

You can find additional information about the SCRA, professional licensure, and interstate licensure compacts through the following links:

- *Justice Department's Servicemembers & Veterans Initiative* – [www.servicemembers.gov](http://www.servicemembers.gov)
- *Resource on Licenses Sponsored by the Department of Labor* – License Finder | CareerOneStop
- *Department of Defense Resource on Interstate Licensure Compacts & Other Issues* – About

Defense-State Liaison Office | Military State Policy (militaryonesource.mil)

In addition, you can refer servicemembers and their families seeking information about their rights under this updated law (or any section of the SCRA) to the following resources:

- *Justice Department's Servicemembers & Veterans Initiative* – [www.servicemembers.gov](http://www.servicemembers.gov)
- *Military Legal Assistance* – <http://legalassistance.law.af.mil/>

If servicemembers or their spouses are not eligible for military legal assistance services, they may request that the Justice Department review their claim by submitting a complaint through <https://civilrights.justice.gov/link/4025A>.

### ***Conclusion***

The SCRA provides important legal protections for our military families who do so much for our country. We remain committed to easing the burdens that our military families face and hope that you will join us in the fight against military spouse unemployment. We greatly appreciate your assistance in safeguarding the rights of our Nation's servicemembers and their families.

Sincerely,

/s/

Harmeet K. Dhillon  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Rights Division  
U.S. Department of Justice