UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF PREPRESENTATIVES,	
Plaintiff,	
v.)	Civil Action No. 14-1967 (RMC)
SYLVIA MATTHEWS BURWELL in her official capacity as Secretary of the United States Department of Health and)	
Human Services, et al.,	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Several members of Congress have moved for leave to file a brief as amici curiae in support of Defendants in this case. *See* Mot. [Dkt. 56]. Local Civil Rule 7(o) governs the filing of such a motion, and requires that it "be filed in a timely manner such that it does not unduly delay the Court's ability to rule on any pending matter." For that reason, the amici's motion will be granted only in part.

The first half of the amici's brief concerns whether the House has standing to maintain this lawsuit. *See* Mem. [Dkt. 56-2] (Mem.) at 7-14. That issue was resolved more than three months ago. *See* Order [Dkt. 42]; Mem. Op. [Dkt. 41]. It was first briefed almost a year ago. *See* Mot. to Dismiss [Dkt. 20]. Amici are too late to offer their views on an Article III question that was fully and ably briefed by the Defendants they support.

The second half of the brief pertains to the question at hand: whether money was appropriated for cost-sharing reduction payments under Section 1402 of the Affordable Care

Act. Mem. at 15-25. The amici argue that 31 U.S.C. § 1324 provides a permanent

Case 1:14-cv-01967-RMC Document 62 Filed 12/16/15 Page 2 of 2

appropriations for those subsidies, and therefore that no Appropriations Clause violation has

occurred. That argument is germane to a current issue and therefore will be considered.

It is within the court's discretion to determine "the fact, extent, and manner" of

the amici's participation. Jin v. Ministry of State Sec., 557 F. Supp. 2d 131, 136 (D.D.C. 2008);

Cobell v. Norton, 246 F.Supp.2d 59, 62 (D.D.C. 2003)). In this case, the Court will consider the

second half of the proposed brief but not the first.

Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED that the amici's motion to for leave to file a brief [Dkt. 64] is

GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. The Court will consider Section II of their

proposed brief but not Section I.

Date: December 16, 2015

ROSEMARY M. COLLYER

United States District Judge

2