

No. 14-770

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

BANK MARKAZI,
THE CENTRAL BANK OF IRAN,
Petitioner,

v.

DEBORAH D. PETERSON, *et al.*,
Respondents.

**On Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Second Circuit**

REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONER

DAVID M. LINDSEY
ANDREAS A. FRISCHKNECHT
CHAFFETZ LINDSEY LLP
1700 Broadway, 33rd Floor
New York, N.Y. 10019
(212) 257-6960

JEFFREY A. LAMKEN
Counsel of Record
ROBERT K. KRY
LAUREN M. WEINSTEIN
SARAH J. NEWMAN
MOLOLAMKEN LLP
The Watergate, Suite 660
600 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
(202) 556-2000
jlamken@mololamken.com

Counsel for Petitioner

WILSON-EPES PRINTING CO., INC. – (202) 789-0096 – WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Section 8772 Violates the Separation of Powers by Purporting To Change the Law for a Single Pending Case	2
A. Respondents Fail To Identify Any Historical Precedent for § 8772	2
B. Respondents' Reliance on This Court's Precedents Is Misplaced	7
C. Respondents' Remaining Arguments Fail.....	10
II. Section 8772 Is Unconstitutional Because It Effectively Dictates the Outcome of a Single Pending Case	14
A. Congress May Not Direct the Outcome of a Specific Case	14
B. Section 8772 Left No Meaningful Determinations to the Courts.....	16
III. Bank Markazi's Sovereign Status Does Not Alter the Separation-of-Powers Analysis.....	17
A. Section 8772 Is Not Public Rights Legislation.....	17
B. The Political Branches' Foreign Affairs Powers Do Not Justify § 8772's Intrusion into Judicial Authority	18
IV. This Court Should Not Address TRIA	20
Conclusion.....	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Baggs's Appeal</i> , 43 Pa. 512 (1862)	3
<i>Calder v. Bull</i> , 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 386 (1798).....	3
<i>Dames & Moore v. Regan</i> , 453 U.S. 654 (1981).....	19
<i>Evans v. Jordan</i> , 13 U.S. (9 Cranch) 199 (1815).....	4
<i>Free Enter. Fund v. Pub. Co. Accounting Oversight Bd.</i> , 561 U.S. 477 (2010)	11
<i>Heiser v. Islamic Republic of Iran</i> , 735 F.3d 934 (D.C. Cir. 2013)	20, 22
<i>Lebron v. Nat'l R.R. Passenger Corp.</i> , 513 U.S. 374 (1995).....	14
<i>Lewis v. Webb</i> , 3 Me. (3 Greenl.) 326 (1825).....	3
<i>Me. Cent. R.R. Co. v. Bhd. of Maint. of Way Emps.</i> , 835 F.2d 368 (1st Cir. 1987), cert. denied, 486 U.S. 1042 (1988).....	6
<i>MCM Portfolio LLC v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , No. 2015-1091, 2015 WL 7755665 (Fed. Cir. Dec. 2, 2015).....	5
<i>Medellín v. Texas</i> , 552 U.S. 491 (2008).....	19
<i>Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2120 (2014).....	20
<i>N.Y. State Nat'l Org. for Women v. Terry</i> , 159 F.3d 86 (2d Cir. 1998), cert. denied, 527 U.S. 1003 (1999).....	21
<i>Paramino Lumber Co. v. Marshall</i> , 309 U.S. 370 (1940).....	6, 11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>Pennsylvania v. Wheeling & Belmont Bridge Co.</i> , 59 U.S. (18 How.) 421 (1856).....	4, 5, 7, 8
<i>Plaut v. Spendthrift Farm, Inc.</i> , 514 U.S. 211 (1995).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Pope v. United States</i> , 323 U.S. 1 (1944)	8
<i>Precision Instrument Mfg. Co. v. Auto. Maint. Mach. Co.</i> , 324 U.S. 806 (1945).....	5
<i>Robertson v. Seattle Audubon Soc’y</i> , 503 U.S. 429 (1992).....	8, 9, 14, 15
<i>Stern v. Marshall</i> , 131 S. Ct. 2594 (2011)....	5, 17, 18
<i>United States v. Brown</i> , 381 U.S. 437 (1965).....	10
<i>United States v. Klein</i> , 80 U.S. (13 Wall.) 128 (1872).....	9, 14, 15, 16
<i>United States v. Schooner Peggy</i> , 5 U.S. (1 Cranch) 103 (1801)	11
<i>United States v. Sioux Nation of Indians</i> , 448 U.S. 371 (1980).....	8
<i>Wellness Int’l Network, Ltd. v. Sharif</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1932 (2015).....	5
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, STATUTES, AND RULES	
U.S. Const. art. I	1
U.S. Const. art. I, § 6	11
U.S. Const. art. I, § 9	10, 11
U.S. Const. art. III	<i>passim</i>
U.S. Const. art. VI	11
U.S. Const. amend. I	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
International Emergency Economic Powers Act, Pub. L. No. 95-223, tit. II, 91 Stat. 1625, 1626 (1977):	
50 U.S.C. §§ 1701 <i>et seq.</i>	19
50 U.S.C. § 1702(a)(1)(C)	20
Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000, Pub. L. No. 106-386, § 2002, 114 Stat. 1464, 1541	19
§ 2002(b)(1), 114 Stat. at 1543	19
§ 2002(b)(2), 114 Stat. at 1543	19
Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-297, 116 Stat. 2322	20, 21, 22
28 U.S.C. § 1610 note § 201(a)	20
Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, Pub. L. No. 112- 158, § 502, 126 Stat. 1214, 1258:	
22 U.S.C. § 8772	<i>passim</i>
22 U.S.C. § 8772(a)(2)	16
22 U.S.C. § 8772(a)(2)(A)	16
22 U.S.C. § 8772(a)(2)(B)	16
22 U.S.C. § 8772(b)	13
22 U.S.C. § 8772(c)(1)	6
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, H.R. 2029, div. O (enacted Dec. 18, 2015):	
§ 404(e)(2)(B)(iii)	18
§ 404(e)(5)	18
§ 404(f)(1)	18
25 U.S.C. § 1701(d)	6
25 U.S.C. § 1721	6
25 U.S.C. § 1741(4)	6
25 U.S.C. § 1751(d)	6

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.