

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

NEW MEXICO CATTLE GROWERS'  
ASSOCIATION,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL  
PROTECTION AGENCY; et al.,

Defendants.

---

)  
) Case No. 1:19-cv-00988-RB-SCY  
)  
)

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION.....	1
I.    Introduction.....	1
II.   Legal Background: Decades of Dubious EPA and Army Regulation of Non-Navigable Features Under the Clean Water Act .....	3
ARGUMENT .....	9
I.    Cattle Growers Has Standing Because the Intermittent Tributary and Non-Abutting Adjacent Wetland Provisions Require Them to Get the Army’s Permission to Work Their Own Land.....	9
II.   The Court Should Preliminarily Enjoin the Intermittent Tributary and Non-Abutting Wetland Provisions.....	11
A.  Cattle Growers Will Prevail on the Merits .....	12
1.  The Judgment Against the Government in <i>Rapanos</i> Controls in This Case Under Issue Preclusion.....	12
2.  The Scope of the Preliminary Injunction Depends on Which <i>Rapanos</i> Opinion Is the Holding.....	14
a.  The Supreme Court Has Established That the Plurality Is the Holding of <i>Rapanos</i> .....	14
b.  Under <i>Marks v. United States</i> , the Plurality Is the Holding of <i>Rapanos</i> .....	17
(1)  The Plurality Opinion Is the Holding of <i>Rapanos</i> , so the Injunction Should Extend to All Intermittent Streams and Non-Abutting Wetlands .....	22
(2)  If Justice Kennedy’s Concurrence Is the Holding, Then the Injunction Should Extend to All Intermittent Tributaries and Non-Abutting Wetlands Except Those Shown to Have a Significant Nexus.....	22
(3)  If <i>Marks</i> Cannot Be Applied, Then the Injunction Should Extend to All Non-Navigable Tributaries and Adjacent Wetlands .....	23
B.  Ranchers Will Suffer Irreparable Harm Absent an Injunction, Because Their Injury Is Constitutional, and Because They Cannot Feasibly Obtain Army Permits on the Necessary Timetable and Cannot Recover the Costs of Obtaining Them .....	24
C.  The Balance of Equities and the Public Interest Both Favor an Injunction .....	28

III. No Bond Is Necessary In This Case .....29  
CONCLUSION.....30  
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE .....31

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Abramski v. United States</i> , 573 U.S. 169 (2014) .....	16
<i>Alabama Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama</i> , 575 U.S. 254 (2015) .....	16
<i>Ashe v. Swenson</i> , 397 U.S. 436 (1970) .....	12
<i>Associated Gen. Contractors of Am. v. Metro. Water Dist. of S. California</i> , 159 F.3d 1178 (9th Cir. 1998) .....	10-11
<i>Atl. Coast Demolition &amp; Recycling, Inc. v. Bd. of Chosen Freeholders of Atl. Cty.</i> , 893 F. Supp. 301 (D.N.J. 1995) .....	24
<i>Canal Authority of State of Florida v. Callaway</i> , 489 F.2d 567 (5th Cir. 1974) .....	25
<i>Citicorp Services, Inc. v. Gillespie</i> , 712 F. Supp. 749 (N.D. Cal. 1989) .....	24
<i>Cont'l Oil Co. v. Frontier Refining Co.</i> , 338 F.2d 780 (10th Cir. 1964) .....	29
<i>County of Maui, Hawaii v. Hawaii Wildlife Fund</i> , 140 S. Ct. 1462 (2020) .....	14-15
<i>Davis v. Mineta</i> , 302 F.3d 1104 (10th Cir. 2002) .....	12
<i>Exxon Shipping v. Baker</i> , 554 U.S. 471 (2008) .....	16
<i>Fish v. Kobach</i> , 840 F.3d 710 (10th Cir. 2016) .....	24
<i>Garcia v. San Antonio Metro. Transit Auth.</i> , 469 U.S. 528 (1985) .....	25
<i>Georgia v. Pruitt</i> , 326 F. Supp. 3d 1356 (S.D. Ga. 2018) .....	26, 29
<i>Georgia v. Wheeler</i> , 418 F. Supp. 3d 1336 (S.D. Ga. 2019) .....	6
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> , 428 U.S. 153 (1976) .....	17
<i>Gwaltney of Smithfield, Ltd. v. Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Inc.</i> , 484 U.S. 49 (1987) .....	3
<i>Hamdan v. Rumsfeld</i> , 548 U.S. 557 (2006) .....	15
<i>Hawkes Co., Inc. v. United States Army Corps of Engineers</i> , 782 F.3d 994 (8th Cir. 2015) .....	3, 11
<i>Hunt v. Washington State Apple Advert. Comm'n</i> , 432 U.S. 333 (1977) .....	9-10
<i>In re EPA</i> , 803 F.3d 804 (6th Cir. 2015) .....	28
<i>Kansas Health Care Ass'n, Inc. v. Kansas Dep't of Social and Rehabilitation Services</i> , 31 F.3d 1536 (10th Cir. 1994) .....	28
<i>King v. Palmer</i> , 950 F.2d 771 (D.C. Cir. 1991) .....	17
<i>Kucana v. Holder</i> , 558 U.S. 233 (2010) .....	16
<i>Large v. Fremont Cty., Wyo.</i> , 670 F.3d 1133 (10th Cir. 2012) .....	17, 23
<i>Marks v. United States</i> , 430 U.S. 188 (1977) .....	17-18

<i>Memoirs v. Massachusetts</i> , 383 U.S. 413 (1966) .....	18
<i>Michigan v. United States Army Corps of Engineers</i> , 667 F.3d 765 (7th Cir. 2011) .....	25
<i>N. Mariana Islands v. United States</i> , 686 F. Supp. 2d 7 (D.D.C. 2009).....	29
<i>National Ass’n of Mfrs. v. Department of Defense</i> , 138 S. Ct. 617 (2018) .....	16
<i>Navajo Health Foundation-Sage Mem’l Hosp., Inc. v. Burwell</i> , 100 F. Supp. 3d 1122 (D.N.M. 2015) .....	29
<i>NCAA v. Califano</i> , 622 F.2d 1382 (10th Cir. 1980) .....	10
<i>New York v. United States</i> , 505 U.S. 144 (1992).....	25
<i>North Dakota v. EPA</i> , 127 F. Supp. 3d 1047 (D.N.D. 2015).....	6
<i>Park Lake Resources Ltd. Liability v. U.S. Dep’t of Agric.</i> , 378 F.3d 1132 (10th Cir. 2004).....	12
<i>Parklane Hosiery Co., Inc. v. Shore</i> , 439 U.S. 322 (1979).....	13
<i>PPL Montana, LLC v. Montana</i> , 565 U.S. 576 (2012).....	16
<i>R.I.L-R v. Johnson</i> , 80 F. Supp. 3d 164 (D.D.C. 2015) .....	28-29
<i>Rapanos v. United States</i> , 547 U.S. 715 (2006).....	2-5, 12-13, 15-16, 18-22, 24, 26
<i>Rappa v. New Castle Cty.</i> , 18 F.3d 1043 (3d Cir. 1994) .....	17
<i>Rodriguez v. Robbins</i> , 715 F.3d 1127 (9th Cir. 2013) .....	29
<i>Sackett v. EPA</i> , 566 U.S. 120 (2012) .....	16
<i>Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. United States Army Corps of Engineers</i> , 531 U.S. 159 (2001).....	4
<i>Sunshine Anthracite Coal Co. v. Adkins</i> , 310 U.S. 381 (1940) .....	13
<i>Texas Food Indus. Ass’n v. U.S. Dep’t of Agriculture</i> , 842 F. Supp. 254 (W.D. Tex. 1993).....	29
<i>Texas v. United States Environmental Protection Agency</i> , No. 3:15-CV-00162, 2018 WL 4518230 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 12, 2018) .....	29
<i>United States Army Corps of Engr’s v. Hawkes Co., Inc.</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1807 (2016).....	11, 16
<i>United States v. Bailey</i> , 571 F.3d 791 (8th Cir. 2009).....	23
<i>United States v. Carrizales-Toledo</i> , 454 F.3d 1142 (10th Cir. 2006).....	17, 23
<i>United States v. Donovan</i> , 661 F.3d 174 (3d Cir. 2011).....	23
<i>United States v. Johnson</i> , 467 F.3d 56 (1st Cir. 2006) .....	23
<i>United States v. Mendoza</i> , 464 U.S. 154 (1984).....	13-14
<i>United States v. Riverside Bayview Homes, Inc.</i> , 474 U.S. 121 (1985).....	3-4
<i>United States v. W.T. Grant Co.</i> , 345 U.S. 629 (1953).....	25

# 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.