

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

The State of Missouri and the State of
Louisiana,

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 4

I. For years, social media companies have sought to contain content on their platforms that they identify as “misinformation.” 4

II. Various executive branch officials under multiple administrations have spoken about the harmful effects of misinformation and sought to promote accurate information. 7

III. Officials from both political parties have explored potential reforms to § 230(c). 14

IV. The present action. 15

LEGAL STANDARD..... 18

ARGUMENT 19

I. The Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over the States’ claims..... 19

A. The States lack Article III standing to bring any of their claims. 19

i. The States do not identify an injury that satisfies Article III. 21

ii. The States cannot show any injury that is traceable to the conduct of Defendants, as opposed to third-party social media companies not before this Court..... 32

iii. The States’ alleged injuries are not redressable by any relief they seek... 41

B. The States do not identify a waiver of sovereign immunity for any of their claims against the HHS and DHS Defendants. 44

i. All claims against the HHS and DHS Defendants must be dismissed because the States do not identify any “discrete agency action” that would waive sovereign immunity..... 46

ii. The APA claims against HHS and DHS should be dismissed because the States do not identify a “final agency action.” 49

II. The States’ claims all fail on the merits..... 50

A. The States fail to state a plausible First Amendment claim against any of the Defendants. 50

i. The States fail to make a plausible allegation of coercion or a similar degree of encouragement. 52

ii. The States fail to allege that any Defendant specifically directed any social media company to take any specific action against a post by any resident of a Plaintiff State. 56

B. The States fail to state plausible “*ultra vires*” claims. 60

C. The States fail to state plausible APA claims against HHS or DHS. 61

III. The separation of powers doctrine independently requires dismissal of the President from this action. 63

CONCLUSION..... 65

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Cases**

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <i>Action for Children’s Television v. FCC</i> , 59 F.3d 1249 (D.C. Cir. 1995)..... | 32 |
| <i>Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas v. United States</i> , 757 F.3d 484 (5th Cir. 2014) | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico ex rel. Barez</i> , 458 U.S. 592 (1982) | 21, 22, 25, 29 |
| <i>Allen v. Wright</i> , 468 U.S. 737 (1984) | 20, 48 |
| <i>Am. Mfrs. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Sullivan</i> , 526 U.S. 40 (1999) | 52 |
| <i>Arizona v. Biden</i> , 31 F.4th 469 (6th Cir. 2022) | 24 |
| <i>Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Ctr., Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1378 (2015) | 63 |
| <i>ASARCO Inc. v. Kadish</i> , 490 U.S. 605 (1989) | 32, 41 |
| <i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009) | 18, 62 |
| <i>Ass’n of Am. Physicians & Surgeons v. Schiff</i> , 518 F. Supp. 3d 505 (D.D.C. 2021) | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Ass’n of Am. Physicians & Surgeons v. Schiff</i> , 23 F.4th 1028 (D.C. Cir. 2022)..... | 33, 34, 35, 38 |
| <i>Atkinson v. Meta Platforms, Inc.</i> , No. 20-17489, 2021 WL 5447022 (9th Cir. Nov. 22, 2021) | 35 |
| <i>Barnes v. Lehman</i> , 861 F.2d 1383 (5th Cir. 1988) | 51, 52, 56 |
| <i>Batterton v. Marshall</i> , 648 F.2d 694 (D.C. Cir. 1980) | 62 |
| <i>Bd. of Regents of Univ. of Wis. Sys. v. Southworth</i> , 529 U. S. 217 (2000) | 55 |
| <i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007) | 18, 35 |

| | |
|---|----------------|
| <i>Bennett v. Spear</i> , 520 U.S. 154 (1997) | 49 |
| <i>Biden v. Knight First Amend. Inst.</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1220 (2021) (mem.) | 31, 32 |
| <i>Blum v. Yaretsky</i> , 457 U.S. 991 (1982) | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Bantam Books, Inc. v. Sullivan</i> , 372 U.S. 58 (1963) | 32 |
| <i>Bowen v. Georgetown Univ. Hosp.</i> , 488 U.S. 204 (1988) | 62 |
| <i>Brackeen v. Haaland</i> , 994 F.3d 249 (5th Cir. 2021) (en banc) | 21, 22 |
| <i>California v. Texas</i> 141 S. Ct. 2104 (2021) | 41 |
| <i>Cambranis v. Blinken</i> , 994 F.3d 457 (5th Cir. 2021) | 46 |
| <i>Car Carriers, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 745 F.2d 1101 (7th Cir. 1984) | 28, 29 |
| <i>Changizi v. Dep't of Health & Human Servs.</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, No. 2:22-cv-1776, 2022 WL 1423176 (S.D. Ohio May 5, 2022), <i>appeal docketed</i> , No. 22-3573 (6th Cir. June 30, 2022)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Chi. & S. Air Lines, Inc. v. Waterman S. S. Corp.</i> , 333 U.S. 103 (1948) | 64 |
| <i>Children's Health Defense v. Facebook Inc.</i> , 546 F. Supp. 3d 909 (N.D. Cal. 2021) | 40, 51, 59, 60 |
| <i>Chrysler Corp. v. Brown</i> , 441 U.S. 281 (1979) | 62 |
| <i>City of Los Angeles v. Lyons</i> , 461 U.S. 95 (1983) | 19, 25 |
| <i>City of New York v. U.S. Dep't of Defense</i> , 913 F.3d 423 (4th Cir. 2019) | 47, 48 |
| <i>Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA</i> , 568 U.S. 398 (2013) | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>Mississippi v. Johnson</i> , 71 U.S. (4 Wall.) 475 (1866) | 63, 64 |

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.