

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION**

THE STATES OF MISSOURI, ALASKA,  
ARIZONA, ARKANSAS, INDIANA,  
KANSAS, MONTANA, NEBRASKA,  
OHIO, OKLAHOMA, SOUTH  
CAROLINA, TENNESSEE, and UTAH,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., et al.,

*Defendants.*

No. 4:21-CV-00287-AGF

**PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
A. Carbon Dioxide, Methane, and Nitrous Oxide Are Ubiquitous By-Products of Human Economic Activity, Especially Agriculture and Energy Production. ....	2
B. Executive Order 13990 Created an Interagency Working Group to Dictate Binding Values for the “Social Costs” of Carbon Dioxide, Methane, and Nitrous Oxide. ....	3
C. The Working Group Promulgates Binding Interim Values for the “Social Costs” of Carbon Dioxide, Methane, and Nitrous Oxide That Federal Agencies “Shall” Use. ....	4
D. The Interim Values Will Have Enormous Economic Impact and Justify Increased Regulation in Innumerable Aspects of Everyday Life. ....	10
ARGUMENT .....	12
I. The Plaintiff States Are Likely to Succeed on the Merits of Their Claims in Counts One and Three of the First Amended Complaint. ....	12
A. Plaintiffs’ Separation-of-Powers Claim Is Likely to Succeed. ....	13
1. Section 5 of Executive Order 13990 does not rest on the President’s constitutional powers or an Act of Congress. ....	14
2. Executive Order 13990, previous and current regulatory acts, and the nature of the Interim Values all demonstrate that Section 5 exercises legislative power. ....	16
3. Justice Jackson’s tripartite framework also confirms that the Executive exceeded his power. ....	27
4. The Executive Order and Interim Values harm Plaintiff States. ....	28
B. Plaintiffs Are Likely to Succeed on Their Claim that the Working Group Violated the APA’s Procedural Requirements When It Promulgated the Interim Values. ....	28
1. The Working Group is an “agency” because it operates with the sanction of the United States Government. ....	29
2. The Interim Values constitute final agency action and Plaintiffs lack an adequate remedy for their harm. ....	32

3. The Interim Values are a substantive rule that required the Working Group to follow the APA's procedural rules. ....	35
II. Absent a Preliminary Injunction, the Plaintiff States Will Suffer Irreparable Injury. ....	37
A. The Working Group unlawfully deprived the Plaintiff States of their ability to participate in notice-and-comment rulemaking regarding the adoption of the Interim Values. ....	37
B. The Working Group's promulgation of the Interim Values interferes with the Plaintiff States' ability to participate meaningfully in other federal agency proceedings.....	38
C. The Interim Values Directly Impact Plaintiff States' Sovereign Interests in Administering Cooperative-Federalism Programs in a Constitutional Manner. ....	40
D. Absent Injunctive Relief, the Interim Values Will Injure the States' Proprietary Interests by Inflicting Non-Recoverable Economic Costs.....	42
E. The States Are Uniquely Injured by the Violation of the Separation of Powers....	47
III. A Preliminary Injunction Requiring Compliance With the Constitution and the APA Will Impose No Cognizable Harm on Defendants.....	48
IV. The Public Interest Favors Preliminary Injunctive Relief.....	49
CONCLUSION.....	50
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE .....	54

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Anytime Fitness, LLC v. Roberts,</i> No. 12-CV-02913-SRN-JJG, <u>2013 WL 1760950</u> (D. Minn. Apr. 24, 2013) ....	49
<i>Bennet v. Spear,</i> <u>520 U.S. 154</u> (1997).....	33, 36
<i>Catholic Health Initiatives v. Sebelius,</i> <u>617 F.3d 490</u> (D.C. Cir. 2010).....	17, 35
<i>Chrysler Corp. v. Brown,</i> <u>441 U.S. 281</u> (1979).....	35, 37
<i>Citizens for Responsibility &amp; Ethics in Washington v. Office of Admin.,</i> <u>566 F.3d 219</u> (D.C. Cir. 2009).....	30
<i>Dataphase Sys., Inc. v. C.L. Sys., Inc.,</i> <u>640 F.2d 109</u> (8th Cir. 1981) (en banc).....	12, 37, 48
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharms., Inc.,</i> <u>509 U.S. 579</u> (1993).....	20
<i>Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal.,</i> <u>140 S. Ct. 1891</u> (2020).....	34
<i>E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump,</i> <u>932 F.3d 742</u> , (9th Cir. 2018) .....	34
<i>Entergy Corp. v. Riverkeeper, Inc.,</i> <u>556 U.S. 208</u> (2009).....	28
<i>EPA v. EME Homer City Generation, L.P.,</i> <u>572 U.S. 489</u> (2014).....	40
<i>Ferry-Morse Seed Co. v. Food Corn, Inc.,</i> <u>729 F.2d 589</u> (8th Cir. 1984) .....	49
<i>Fletcher v. Peck,</i> <u>10 U.S. (6 Cranch) 87</u> (1810).....	16
<i>Free Enter. Fund v. Pub. Co. Acct. Oversight Bd.,</i> <u>561 U.S. 477</u> (2010).....	13, 50

<i>Fruco Constr. Co. v. McClelland,</i> <u>192 F.2d 241</u> (8th Cir. 1951) .....	29
<i>Garcia v. San Antonio Metropolitan Transit Authority,</i> <u>469 U.S. 528</u> (1985).....	48
<i>Gundy v. United States,</i> <u>139 S. Ct. 2116</u> (2019).....	50
<i>Hawkes Co., v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</i> <u>782 F.3d 994</u> (8th Cir. 2015) .....	34
<i>Hoctor v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.,</i> <u>82 F.3d 165</u> (7th Cir. 1996) .....	17, 29, 36
<i>Hunter v. Underwood,</i> <u>362 F.3d 468</u> (8th Cir. 2004) .....	29
<i>I.N.S. v. Chadha,</i> <u>462 U.S. 919</u> (1983).....	16, 48
<i>Indep. Bankers Ass'n of Am. v. Nat'l Credit Union Admin.,</i> <u>936 F. Supp. 605</u> (W.D. Wis. 1996) .....	29
<i>Iowa League of Cities v. EPA,</i> <u>711 F.3d 844</u> (8th Cir. 2013) .....	35, 37
<i>Kingdomware Techs, Inc. v. United States,</i> <u>136 S. Ct. 1969</u> (2016).....	30
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife,</i> <u>504 U.S. 555</u> (1992).....	37, 38
<i>Massachusetts v. EPA,</i> <u>549 U.S. 497</u> (2007).....	15, 19, 28
<i>Meyer v. Bush,</i> <u>981 F.2d 1288</u> (D.C. Cir. 1993).....	32
<i>Morrison v. Olson,</i> <u>487 U.S. 654</u> (1988).....	1, 2, 3, 50
<i>Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of U.S., Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.,</i> <u>463 U.S. 29</u> (1983).....	28

# 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.