

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

**WHALE AND DOLPHIN
CONSERVATION et al.,**

Plaintiffs,

V.

**NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES
SERVICE et al.,**

Defendants.

Case No. 21-cv-112 (APM)

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

I.

Plaintiffs¹ are organizations that have petitioned Defendants, the National Marine Fisheries Service (“NMFS” or “the agency”) and the Secretary of Commerce, to engage in rulemaking to protect North Atlantic right whales from vessel collisions, a leading cause of death for the critically endangered species. In 2008, the NMFS promulgated regulations targeting vessel collisions, including rules limiting speeds at which certain vessels may travel in particular areas along the right whale’s migratory route. *See* Compl. for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, ECF No. 1 [hereinafter Compl.], ¶ 12. In 2012, a subset of Plaintiffs filed a petition for rulemaking (“the 2012 Petition”) calling for an expansion of the vessel-speed rule. Compl. ¶ 14. Then, in August 2020, Plaintiffs filed another petition for rulemaking (“the 2020 Petition”), making similar requests. *Id.*

Five months after filing their second petition, Plaintiffs filed this action under the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”). *See* Compl. They allege unreasonable delay in

¹ Plaintiffs are Whale and Dolphin Conservation, Defenders of Wildlife, the Conservation Law Foundation, and the Center for Biological Diversity.

Defendants’ response to their petitions and ask the court for declaratory and injunctive relief, including orders “enjoining Defendants from further delay in responding substantively” to the petitions. Compl. at 31–32.

Defendants have moved to dismiss the Complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction on the ground of mootness. Defs.’ Mot. to Dismiss the Compl., ECF No. 10 [hereinafter Defs.’ Mot.]; Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1), (h)(3). For the reasons that follow, the motion is denied in part and granted in part.

II.

When deciding a motion under Rule 12(b)(1), a court must accept all well-pleaded factual allegations in the complaint as true. *See Jerome Stevens Pharm., Inc. v. FDA.*, 402 F.3d 1249, 1253 (D.C. Cir. 2005). Because the court has “an affirmative obligation to ensure that it is acting within the scope of its jurisdictional authority,” however, the factual allegations in the complaint “will bear closer scrutiny in resolving a 12(b)(1) motion than in resolving a 12(b)(6) motion for failure to state a claim.” *Grand Lodge of Fraternal Order of Police v. Ashcroft*, 185 F. Supp. 2d 9, 13–14 (D.D.C. 2001) (internal quotation marks omitted). To that end, the court may consider “such materials outside the pleadings as it deems appropriate to resolve the question whether it has jurisdiction to hear the case.” *Scolaro v. D.C. Bd. of Elections & Ethics*, 104 F. Supp. 2d 18, 22 (D.D.C. 2000); *see also Mykonos v. United States*, 59 F. Supp. 3d 100, 103–04 (D.D.C. 2014) (applying rule in mootness context). Thus, “where necessary, the court may consider the complaint supplemented by undisputed facts evidenced in the record, or the complaint supplemented by undisputed facts plus the court’s resolution of disputed facts.” *See Coal. for Underground Expansion v. Mineta*, 333 F.3d 193, 198 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Mootness is one ground for dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1). *Indian River Cty. v. Rogoff*, 254 F. Supp. 3d 15, 18 (D.D.C. 2017) (“A motion to dismiss for mootness is properly brought under Rule 12(b)(1) because mootness itself deprives the court of jurisdiction.”). “Federal courts lack jurisdiction to decide moot cases because their constitutional authority extends only to actual cases or controversies.” *Conservation Force, Inc. v. Jewell*, 733 F.3d 1200, 1204 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (internal quotation marks omitted). “A case is moot when the challenged conduct ceases such that there is no reasonable expectation that the wrong will be repeated in circumstances where it becomes impossible for the court to grant any effectual relief whatever to the prevailing party.” *United States v. Philip Morris USA, Inc.*, 566 F.3d 1095, 1135 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (internal quotation marks omitted). Stated differently, a case becomes moot when “the court can provide no effective remedy because a party has already obtained all the relief that it has sought.” *Conservation Force*, 733 F.3d at 1204 (alteration and internal quotation marks omitted). “The initial heavy burden of establishing mootness lies with the party asserting a case is moot, but the opposing party bears the burden of showing an exception applies[.]” *Honeywell Int’l, Inc. v. Nuclear Regul. Comm’n*, 628 F.3d 568, 576 (D.C. Cir. 2010) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted).

III.

The APA requires agencies to “give an interested person the right to petition for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of a rule.” 5 U.S.C. § 553(e). An agency must “proceed to conclude a matter presented to it,” including a petition requesting rulemaking, “within a reasonable time,” 5 U.S.C. § 555(b), and a court may “compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(1); see *Nat’l Parks Conservation Ass’n v. U.S. Dep’t of Interior*, 794 F. Supp. 2d 39, 44 (D.D.C. 2011) (“If the agency does not respond to a petition [for

rulemaking], a reviewing court may ‘compel agency action unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed.’” (quoting 5 U.S.C. § 706(1))).

Plaintiffs here ask the court to compel such allegedly “unreasonably delayed” action—long-awaited responses to their 2012 and 2020 Petitions for rulemaking to the NMFS. Compl. at 32. Defendants counter that the court cannot grant the requested relief because Plaintiffs asked only for a “response” to their petitions, and the agency sent a letter in March 2021 (two months after Plaintiffs initiated this action) responding to both petitions. Defs.’ Mot. at 1–2. Consequently, they contend, the case is moot. *See id.*

Defendants are of course correct that “[i]f . . . an agency does respond to a petition, even after a suit to compel a response is filed, such a suit is rendered moot,” unless an exception is shown to apply. *Nat’l Parks Conservation Ass’n*, 794 F. Supp. 2d at 44–45. The question is thus whether the March 2021 letter constitutes a “response” to Plaintiffs’ two petitions. The court finds that the March 2021 letter constitutes a “response” to the 2012 Petition but not the 2020 Petition. Plaintiffs’ APA action is therefore partially moot.

A.

With respect to their 2020 Petition, Plaintiffs seek as relief a declaration “that Defendants’ ongoing failure to act on the 2020 Petition constitutes agency action unreasonably delayed in violation of the APA” and “an order enjoining Defendants from further delay in responding substantively to the 2020 Petition and requiring a response to the 2020 Petition within 60 days[.]” Compl. at 32. It is ambiguous what Plaintiffs mean by a “substantive[.]” response. *See id.* However, viewing the request in the light most favorable to Plaintiffs, an order requiring a substantive response could include an order directing the agency to provide a *definitive* answer as to whether it will grant or deny the 2020 Petition. *See* Pls.’ Mem. of Law in Opp’n to Defs.’ Mot.,

ECF No. 11 [hereinafter Pls.’ Opp’n], at 23 (“NMFS’s ‘response’ to Plaintiffs’ 2020 Petition fails to provide a[n] . . . answer as to whether the agency intends to initiate . . . a rulemaking . . .”). That is relief the court could grant if the Plaintiffs were to succeed on the merits of their claim.

The APA requires an agency to “receive and respond to petitions for rulemaking.” *WWHT, Inc. v. FCC*, 656 F.2d 807, 813 (D.C. Cir. 1981). Congress did not intend to require an agency to engage in rulemaking merely because it receives a petition to do so. *See id.* The agency must, however, “fully and promptly” consider a rulemaking request, and it “may either grant the petition, undertake public rule making proceedings[,] or deny the petition.” *Id.* (alternation omitted) (quoting S. Rep. No. 752, 79th Cong., 1st Sess. (1945)); *see also Nat’l Parks Conservation Ass’n*, 794 F. Supp. 2d at 44 (stating that agencies are “required to at least definitively respond to a petition—that is, to either deny or grant the petition” (cleaned up)). Here, the agency did not either “grant . . . or deny the petition,” *WWHT*, 656 F.2d at 813, and it did not initiate rulemaking proceedings. Its response, such as it is, was limited to a few sentences in a two-page letter sent in March of this year. That letter pointed Plaintiffs to a January 2021 report prepared by the agency “evaluating the conservation value and economic and navigational safety impacts of the [vessel-]speed rule,” noting that “it makes a number of recommendations in line with [Plaintiffs’] petition.” Notice of Filing Joint Administrative R. App., ECF No. 13, Joint Administrative R. App., ECF No. 13-1 [hereinafter Admin. R.], at 197–98. The agency encouraged Plaintiffs to “provide any . . . comments [on the report] as part of the public comment process” and concluded by stating that the agency “awaits completion of public comment on the report and then will consider what actions may be appropriate at that time.” *Id.* at 198. The letter thus contained no “definitive decision” to grant or deny the 2020 petition. *Nat’l Parks Conservation Ass’n*,

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.