

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

Defendants.

No. 4:21-CV-00287-AGF

**PLAINTIFFS' COMBINED REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
THEIR MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
AND OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 1

STANDARD OF REVIEW..... 6

ARGUMENT..... 7

 I. Plaintiff States have Article III standing..... 7

 A. Plaintiffs States have suffered a clear procedural injury..... 8

 B. Plaintiffs States have pleaded the Interim Values will cause injuries that are “certainly impending” and present a “substantial risk” of harm.....10

 C. Plaintiff States’ injury is fairly traceable to Defendants’ unlawful conduct..15

 D. The Court can provide Plaintiff States relief.....17

 E. Plaintiff States’ claims are ripe.....20

 II. Plaintiff States’ Claims Are Likely to Succeed on the Merits..... 22

 A. Plaintiff States have shown a likelihood of success on Count I..... 22

 B. Plaintiff States have alleged a plausible claim for Count II..... 25

 C. Plaintiff States have shown a likelihood of success on Count III and have alleged a plausible claim for Count IV..... 25

 III. Plaintiff States’ Preliminary Injunction should be granted because they suffer irreparable harm and the public interest favors the injunction..... 28

CONCLUSION..... 29

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE..... 32

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Air All. Houston v. Env’t Prot. Agency,
906 F.3d 1049 (D.C. Cir. 2018)..... 10

Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico, ex rel., Barez,
458 U.S. 592 10, 12

Allen v. Wright,
468 U.S. 737 (1984)..... 16

Am. Med. Ass’n v. Reno,
57 F.3d 1129 (D.C. Cir. 1995)..... 5

Am. Sch. of Magnetic Healing v. McAnnulty,
187 U.S. 94, (1902)..... 24

Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Center, Inc.,
575 U.S. 320 (2015)..... 24

Ashcroft v. Iqbal,
556 U.S. 662 (2009)..... 6

Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly,
550 U.S. 544 (2007)..... 6

Bennett v. Spear,
520 U.S. 154 (1997)..... 5, 25

Bldg. & Const. Trades Dep’t, AFL-CIO v. Allbaugh,
295 F.3d 28 (D.C. Cir. 2002)..... 24

Block v. Meese,
793 F.2d 1303 (D.C. Cir. 1986)..... 14

Brown v. Mortg. Elec. Registration Sys., Inc.,
738 F.3d 926 (8th Cir. 2013) 6

California v. Bernhardt,
472 F. Supp. 3d 573 (2020) 18

California v. Trump,
No. CV 19-960 (RDM), 2020 WL 1643858 (D.D.C. Apr. 2, 2020) 5, 14, 16, 18

Carlsen v. GameStop, Inc.,
833 F.3d 903 (8th Cir. 2016) 6

Chamber of Com. of U.S. v. Reich,
74 F.3d 1322 (D.C. Cir. 1996)..... 19, 24

City & Cty. of San Francisco v. Trump,
897 F.3d 1225 (9th Cir. 2018) 17

City of Los Angeles v. Barr,
929 F.3d 1163 (9th Cir. 2019) 2

Clapper v. Amnesty Int’l USA,
568 U.S. 398 (2013)..... 7, 14

Clinton v. Jones,
547 U.S. 417 (1998)..... 19

Collins v. Yellen, No. 19-422,
594 U.S. ___, slip op. (June 23, 2021)..... 16

Connecticut Light & Power,
673 F.2d 9

Couzens v. Donohue,
854 F.3d 508 (8th Cir. 2017) 6

Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Trump,
453 F. Supp. 3d 11 (D.D.C. 2020)..... 23, 25

Ctr. for Biological Diversity,
538 F.3d 1172 (9th 2008)..... 18

Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal.,
140 S. Ct. 1891 (2020)..... 3

Department of Commerce v. New York,
139 S. Ct. 2551 (2019)..... 3, 6, 7, 15, 16

FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.,
556 U.S. 502 (2009)..... 10

FEC v. Akins,
524 U.S. 11 (1998)..... 18

Franklin v. Massachusetts,
505 U.S. 788 (1992)..... 18, 19

Garcia v. San Antonio Metro. Transit Auth.,
469 U.S. 528 (1985)..... 13

Gardner v. Toilet Goods Ass’n,
387 U.S. 167 (1967)..... 20

High Country Conservation Advocs. v. U.S. Forest Serv.,
52 F. Supp. 3d 1174 (D. Colo. 2014)..... 18

Iowa ex rel. Miller v. Block,
771 F.2d 347 (8th Cir. 1985) 12

Johnson v. State of Missouri,
142 F.3d 1087 (8th Cir. 1998) 14

Kuhns v. Scottrade, Inc.,
868 F.3d 711 (8th Cir. 2017) 7

Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife,
504 U.S. 555 (1992)..... 7

Main St. Legal Servs., Inc. v. Nat’l Sec. Council,
962 F. Supp. 2d 472 (E.D.N.Y. 2013) 27

Main St. Legal Servs., Inc. v. Nat’l Sec. Council,
811 F.3d 542 (2d Cir. 2016)..... 27

Maryland v. King,
567 U.S. 1301 (2012)..... 28

Massachusetts v. EPA,
549 U.S. 497 (2007)..... 3, 4, 11, 12, 28

Massachusetts v. Mellon,
262 U.S. 447 (1923)..... 4, 12

Meyer v. Bush,
981 F.2d 1288 (D.C. Cir. 1993) 4, 26, 27

Michigan Corrections Organization v. Michigan Department of Corrections,
774 F.3d 895 (6th Cir. 2014) 24

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.