

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

The State of Missouri, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

President Joseph R. Biden, Jr., in his official
capacity as President of the United States of
America, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 22-cv-1213

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
THE SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR LACK OF SUBJECT-MATTER
JURISDICTION AND FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 1

BACKGROUND..... 5

I. Factual Background..... 5

 A. Social media companies have long sought to address “misinformation” on their platforms. 5

 B. Executive branch officials under the past two administrations have communicated with social media companies about promoting accurate information and the harms of misinformation online. 7

 C. The Biden Administration has encouraged social media companies to exercise their discretion to take action against misinformation on their platforms..... 9

 D. Officials from both political parties have explored potential reforms to § 230(c). 10

II. The Present Lawsuit..... 12

LEGAL STANDARD 15

ARGUMENT..... 16

I. The Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs’ claims. 16

 A. Plaintiffs lack Article III standing to bring any of their claims. 16

 i. Plaintiffs do not identify an injury to the States that satisfies Article III. 18

 a. Parens Patriae standing is unavailable against the Federal Government. 18

 b. The States fail to allege any direct injury to their interests as States..... 22

 ii. Plaintiffs do not identify an injury to the individual Plaintiffs that satisfies Article III. 31

 iii. Plaintiffs do not allege any injury that is traceable to the conduct of Defendants as opposed to third-party social media companies not before this Court..... 32

 iv. Plaintiffs do not allege injuries that would be redressed by the sweeping injunctive relief they seek..... 39

B.	Plaintiffs do not identify a waiver of sovereign immunity for any of their claims against the Agency Defendants.....	43
i.	All claims against the Agency Defendants must be dismissed because Plaintiffs do not identify any “agency action” that would waive sovereign immunity.....	45
ii.	The APA claims against the Agency Defendants should be dismissed because Plaintiffs do not identify a “final agency action.”	48
II.	Plaintiffs’ claims all fail on the merits.....	49
A.	Plaintiffs fail to state a plausible First Amendment claim against any of the Defendants.....	49
i.	Plaintiffs fail to make a plausible allegation of coercion or a similar degree of encouragement.....	51
a.	Plaintiffs fail to plausibly allege that statements by federal officials in email correspondence with social media companies are coercive.....	53
b.	No Defendant is plausibly alleged to have made an enforceable threat, regulatory or otherwise, based on a platform’s content moderation choice.....	58
c.	The government speech doctrine requires rejection of Plaintiffs’ coercion theory based on public policy statements.....	63
ii.	Plaintiffs fail to allege that any Defendant specifically directed any social media company to take any specific action against a post by any Plaintiff or resident of a Plaintiff State.....	64
iii.	The labels Plaintiffs attach to Defendants’ alleged conduct are also inadequate to plausibly allege joint “state action.”.....	70
iv.	Mere discussion of misinformation between federal agencies, or with social media companies, does not constitute “coercion” or “joint action” amounting to state action.....	72
B.	Plaintiffs fail to state plausible “ultra vires” claims.....	72
C.	Plaintiffs fail to state plausible APA claims against the Agency Defendants.	73
III.	The separation of powers doctrine independently requires dismissal of the President from this action.....	75
	CONCLUSION.....	76

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Action for Children’s Television v. FCC,
59 F.3d 1249 (D.C. Cir. 1995)..... 59

Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Tex. v. United States,
757 F.3d 484 (5th Cir. 2014)..... *passim*

Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico ex rel. Barez,
458 U.S. 592 (1982)..... *passim*

Allen v. Wright,
468 U.S. 737 (1984), *abrogated on other grounds by*
Lexmark Int’l, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc., 572 U.S. 118 (2014)..... 17, 48

Am. Mfrs. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Sullivan,
526 U.S. 40 (1999)..... *passim*

Arizona v. Biden,
40 F.4th 375 (6th Cir. 2022)..... 29, 30

Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Ctr., Inc.,
575 U.S. 320 (2015)..... 74

ASARCO Inc. v. Kadish,
490 U.S. 605 (1989)..... 22, 40

Ashcroft v. Iqbal,
556 U.S. 662 (2009)..... *passim*

Ass’n of Am. Physicians & Surgeons v. Schiff,
518 F. Supp. 3d 505 (D.D.C. 2021), *aff’d* 23 F.4th 1028 (D.C. Cir. 2022)..... 26, 35, 36, 41

Ass’n of Am. Physicians & Surgeons v. Schiff,
23 F.4th 1028 (D.C. Cir. 2022)..... 26, 35, 36, 38

Atkinson v. Meta Platforms, Inc.,
No. 20-17489, 2021 WL 5447022 (9th Cir. Nov. 22, 2021)..... 67

Bantam Books, Inc. v. Sullivan,
372 U.S. 58 (1963)..... 58, 59

Barnes v. Lehman,
861 F.2d 1383 (5th Cir. 1988) 52, 64

Baur v. Veneman,
352 F.3d 625 (2d Cir. 2003)..... 26

<i>Bd. of Regents of Univ. of Wis. Sys. v. Southworth</i> , 529 U. S. 217 (2000).....	62
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	16, 38, 67
<i>Bennett v. Spear</i> , 520 U.S. 154 (1997).....	33, 48
<i>Biden v. Knight First Amend. Inst. of Columbia Univ.</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1220 (2021), <i>remanded</i> , 2021 WL 5548367 (2d Cir. May 26, 2021).....	27
<i>Blum v. Yaretsky</i> , 457 U.S. 991 (1982).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Brackeen v. Haaland</i> , 994 F.3d 249 (5th Cir. 2021), <i>cert. granted</i> , 142 S. Ct. 1205 (2022).....	17, 19
<i>California v. Texas</i> , 141 S. Ct. 2104 (2021).....	30, 40
<i>Cambranis v. Blinken</i> , 994 F.3d 457 (5th Cir. 2021).....	45
<i>Changizi v. Dep't of Health & Hum. Servs.</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2022 WL 1423176 (S.D. Ohio May 5, 2022), <i>appeal filed</i> , No. 22-3573 (6th Cir. June 30, 2022).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Chapman v. Tristar Prods., Inc.</i> , 940 F.3d 299 (6th Cir. 2019).....	21
<i>Chi. & S. Air Lines, Inc. v. Waterman S. S. Corp.</i> , 333 U.S. 103 (1948).....	75
<i>Children's Health Def. v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 546 F. Supp. 3d 909 (N.D. Cal. 2021), <i>appeal filed sub nom.</i> , <i>Children's Health Def. v. Meta Platforms, Inc.</i> , No. 21-16210 (9th Cir. July 21, 2021)...	51, 68
<i>City of L.A. v. Lyons</i> , 461 U.S. 95 (1983).....	17, 32
<i>City of N.Y. v. U.S. Dep't of Def.</i> , 913 F.3d 423 (4th Cir. 2019).....	47
<i>Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA</i> , 568 U.S. 398 (2013).....	<i>passim</i>

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.