

No. 18A-815  
CAPITAL CASE  
**EMERGENCY PETITION; EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION REQUESTED**

---

---

**In the SUPREME COURT of the UNITED STATES**

---

---

*In re:* COMMISSIONER, Alabama Department of Corrections

DOMINEQUE HAKIM MARCELLE RAY,

Plaintiff–Appellant,

v.

COMMISSIONER, Alabama Department of Corrections

Defendant–Appellee.

---

---

**STATE’S RESPONSE TO OPPOSITION TO EMERGENCY MOTION  
AND APPLICATION TO VACATE STAY OF EXECUTION**

---

---

Steve Marshall  
*Attorney General*

Richard D. Anderson  
*Assistant Attorney General*  
Counsel of Record \*

Office of the Attorney General  
501 Washington Avenue  
Montgomery, Alabama 36130-0152  
randerson@ago.state.al.us  
(334) 353-3637 Fax  
(334) 242-7300

February 7, 2019

**EXECUTION SCHEDULED THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 6:00 P.M. C.S.T.**

Counsel for Domineque Ray having filed their opposition to the State’s emergency motion and application to vacate the Eleventh Circuit’s stay of Ray’s execution, currently scheduled for 6 p.m. this evening, the State offers a brief response.

**I. The affidavit of Jefferson S. Dunn should be considered as a matter of equity.**

Ray argues that the affidavit of Commissioner Jefferson S. Dunn should not be considered by this Court in evaluating the State’s motion to lift the stay of execution imposed by the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals.<sup>1</sup> But as the State explained in its initial motion and explains further below, the Eleventh Circuit’s last-minute stay should be vacated, regardless whether this Court also considers Commissioner Dunn’s affidavit. Ray never satisfied his initial burden as to Claims 1 and 2 of his petition, which were that RLIUPA required the State to (1) exclude the Holman chaplain (an ADOC employee) from the execution chamber and (2) allow Ray to bring his own non-ADOC-employee spiritual adviser into the execution chamber. And Ray’s third claim—that the Establishment Clause requires the State to exclude the Holman chaplain from the execution chamber—was mooted before the Eleventh Circuit ever granted its stay because the State has agreed to exclude the Holman chaplain from the execution chamber.

---

1. Opposition to State’s Emergency Motion at 2–3.

In any event, the Court has the discretion and should consider Commissioner Dunn's affidavit. Stays of execution are matters of equity, and as shown in the State's motion, the Eleventh Circuit improperly held the State to an evidentiary burden not imposed on the Petitioner when it determined that Ray was "substantially likely to succeed on the merits" of his claims. As argued in the State's motion, the State's inability to offer the full evidentiary basis for its compelling governmental interests in maintaining the safety and security of execution proceedings was dictated by Ray's delay raising what is, in effect, a challenge to the procedures surrounding his execution.

Further, because this Court is making an equitable determination when evaluating the propriety of the stay imposed by the Eleventh Circuit and the State's motion to lift that stay, it is not improper for this Court to consider the certain fact that had Ray's action been brought in a timely manner, the State would have been able to offer substantial evidence supporting the necessity of strictly regulating access to the one place in Holman Prison where the State's most solemn, serious, and sensitive duties are carried out. During the initial motions hearing in district court, held less than seventy-two hours after the State received service of Ray's RLUIPA action, the district court noted the "strong equitable presumption that arises when you wait to raise a substantial issue in an execution case that cannot be resolved

without a full hearing prior to the execution.”<sup>2</sup> Ray’s late filing deprived the State of a reasonable opportunity to present the district court with the present affidavit just as it deprived the State of a reasonable opportunity for “a full hearing and a full trial.”<sup>3</sup> In weighing the equities in this matter, there is no impropriety in this Court considering the affidavit, if not for its substance then for the purpose of determining whether the State would have been able to offer the requisite evidentiary support absent the urgency created by Ray’s delay in bringing this action.

Moreover, to the extent that Ray relies on *Cullen v. Pinholster*<sup>4</sup> for the proposition that this Court should not consider the State’s affidavit, his reliance is misplaced. In *Cullen*, this Court was reviewing a state court’s merits determination; pursuant to AEDPA and this Court’s precedent, review “under § 2254(d)(1) focuses on what a state court knew and did.”<sup>5</sup> Thus, in *Cullen*, it made perfect sense to restrict the federal court’s review to matters that were placed before the state courts. But that is not the case here. Here, this Court is called on to review not a finding of fact by a state court, but rather an equitable determination by a federal court. Moreover, in granting equitable relief in the present case, the Eleventh Circuit improperly held the State to an evidentiary standard that it did not apply to Ray. Finally, Ray’s RLUIPA

---

2. Hearing Transcript at 8, *Ray v. Dunn*, 2:19-cv-00088-WKW-CSC (M.D. Ala. Jan. 31, 2019).

3. *Id.* at 21.

4. 563 U.S. 170, 182 (2011).

5. *Id.*

action was delayed until the last moment, impairing the State’s ability to respond with an affidavit, or any other evidentiary showing, in district court. This Court has condemned “last-minute attempts to manipulate the judicial process” and held that “[a] court may consider the last-minute nature of an application to stay execution in deciding whether to grant equitable relief.”<sup>6</sup> Under the present circumstances, this Court’s consideration of the State’s affidavit, if only as an indication of what the State would have been able to show in district court absent the eleventh-hour nature of this action, is not improper.

## **II. The Eleventh Circuit improperly shifted the burden to the State.**

Ray fails to address the State’s argument that the Eleventh Circuit improperly shifted the burdens in this matter. Pursuant to RLUIPA, Ray’s initial burden was to demonstrate that the ADOC’s policy of restricting access to the execution chamber resulted in a “substantial burden” on his religious exercise. In the district court, Ray offered nothing beyond mere assertions that this was so. Perhaps more importantly, the Eleventh Circuit also shifted Ray’s burden onto the State by effectively requiring the State to show that it was substantially likely to succeed on the merits of Ray’s RLUIPA claim. Instead of holding Ray to his burden, the Eleventh Circuit mistakenly applied the State’s burden to disprove a substantive claim at an

---

6. *Gomez v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for N. Dist. of Cal.*, 503 U.S. 653, 654 (1992).

# 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.