

1 XAVIER BECERRA
 Attorney General of California
 2 KATHLEEN BOERGERS, State Bar No. 213530
 NELI N. PALMA, State Bar No. 203374
 3 KARLI EISENBERG, State Bar No. 281923
 STEPHANIE T. YU, State Bar No. 294405
 4 1300 I Street, Suite 125, P.O. Box 944255
 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
 5 Tel: (916) 210-7522; Fax: (916) 322-8288
 E-mail: Neli.Palma@doj.ca.gov
 6 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of California, by
 and through Attorney General Xavier Becerra*

7 JAMES R. WILLIAMS, State Bar No. 271253
 County Counsel
 8 GRETA S. HANSEN, State Bar No. 251471
 LAURA S. TRICE, State Bar No. 284837
 9 MARY E. HANNA-WEIR, State Bar No. 320011
 SUSAN P. GREENBERG, State Bar No. 318055
 10 H. LUKE EDWARDS, State Bar No. 313756
 Office of the County Counsel, Cty. of Santa Clara
 11 70 West Hedding Street, East Wing, 9th Fl.
 San José, CA 95110-1770
 12 Tel: (408) 299-5900; Fax: (408) 292-7240
 Email: mary.hanna-weir@cco.sccgov.org
 13 *Attorneys for Plaintiff County of Santa Clara*

DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar No. 139669
 City Attorney
 JESSE C. SMITH, State Bar No. 122517
 Chief Assistant City Attorney
 RONALD P. FLYNN, State Bar No. 184186
 Chief Deputy City Attorney
 YVONNE R. MERÉ, State Bar No. 173594
 SARA J. EISENBERG, State Bar No. 269303
 JAIME M. HULING DELAYE, State Bar No. 270784
 Deputy City Attorneys
 City Hall, Rm 234, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
 San Francisco, CA 94102-4602
 Tel: (415) 554-4633, Fax: (415) 554-4715
 E-Mail: Sara.Eisenberg@sfcityatty.org
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City and County of San
 Francisco*

LEE H. RUBIN, State Bar No. 141331
 Mayer Brown LLP
 3000 El Camino Real, Suite 300,
 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112
 Tel: (650) 331-2000, Fax: (650) 331-2060
 Email: lrubin@mayerbrown.com
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs County of Santa Clara, et
 al.*

**Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Pages*

14 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 15 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
 Plaintiff,
 18 vs.
 19 ALEX M. AZAR II, et al.,
 Defendants.

20 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, by and through
 21 ATTORNEY GENERAL XAVIER BECERRA,
 Plaintiff,
 22 vs.
 23 ALEX M. AZAR, et al.,
 Defendants.

24 COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA, et al.
 25 Plaintiffs,
 26 vs.
 27 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND
 HUMAN SERVICES, et al.,
 28 Defendants.

No. C 19-02405 WHA
 No. C 19-02769 WHA
 No. C 19-02916 WHA

**PLAINTIFFS’ RESPONSE TO ORDER
 RE USE OF TERM “ENTITY”**

Date: October 30, 2019
 Time: 8:00 AM
 Courtroom: 12
 Judge: Hon. William H. Alsup
 Action Filed: 5/2/2019

1 **I. THE 2019 RULE’S DEFINITION OF “ENTITY” INCLUDES “HEALTH CARE ENTITIES”**

2 The answer to the question posed in the Court’s November 8, 2019 Order is yes. Church
 3 does not use the term “health care entity,” only “entity.” The Rule, however, defines the term
 4 “entity” to include essentially anyone, including all health care entities. It defines “entity” as:
 5 a ‘person’ as defined in 1 U.S.C. 1; the Department; a State, political subdivision of
 6 any State, instrumentality of any State or political subdivision thereof; any public
 7 agency, public institution, public organization, or other public entity in any State or
 8 political subdivision of any State; or, as applicable, a foreign government, foreign
 9 nongovernmental organization, or intergovernmental organization
 10 84 Fed. Reg. 23,263 (Section 88.2). In turn, Section 1 of the U.S. Code defines “person” to
 11 “include corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock
 12 companies, as well as individuals.” In other words, HHS’s “entity” definition includes—without
 13 limitation—any corporation, company, individual, government, or public agency.¹ The subset of
 14 corporations, companies, individuals, and public entities that also qualify as “health care entities”
 15 under the Rule *necessarily* fall within this capacious definition of “entity.”

16 The regulatory history of the terms “entity” and “health care entity” supports this
 17 conclusion. The 2019 Rule seeks to “generally reinstate” HHS’s 2008 rule.² 84 Fed. Reg. 23,179.
 18 In that earlier rule, HHS subsumed the term “entity” as used in Church under the definition of
 19 “health care entity” as used in Weldon and Coats-Snowe. *See* 73 Fed. Reg. 78,072, 78,076 (Dec.
 20 19, 2008) (“[T]he Department thought it would be beneficial to provide a clear and consistent
 21 definition that it would apply when implementing any of the three statutes.”); *id.* at 78,091
 22 (Church “does not define the term ‘entity,’ and does not use the term ‘health care entity.’ In
 23 keeping with the definitions in PHS Act § 245 and the Weldon Amendment, the Department
 24 proposed to define ‘health care entity’ to include the specifically mentioned types of individuals

25 ¹ HHS has argued that although there is no limiting principle within the definition of “entity”
 26 itself, “[f]or some statutes . . . , the Applicability paragraph [of the Rule] by its own terms may
 27 only implicate certain types of entities or only entities receiving certain types of funding.” 84 Fed.
 28 Reg. 23,170. While the Applicability paragraph concerning the Church Amendment indicates that
 it applies only to entities that receive certain funding, nothing in that paragraph limits the types of
 entities covered. *Id.* at 23,264-65 (Section 88.3(a)(1)).

² The 2008 rule never meaningfully went into effect. *See New York v. U.S. Dep’t of Health &*
Human Servs., 2019 WL 5781789, at *8–*9 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 6, 2019). It became effective on
 January 20, 2009 without the certification requirements and was rescinded by the 2011 rule on
 February 23, 2011. During that period, it appears it was not enforced. *Id.* at *8.

1 and organizations from the two statutes, as well as other types of entities referenced in the Church
 2 Amendments.”). While the 2008 rule used identical definitions for the terms “entity” and “health
 3 care entity,” *id.* at 78,097, the 2019 Rule is even broader, going beyond the definitions covered by
 4 the 2008 Rule. 84 Fed. Reg. 23,179, 23,263.³

5 Defendants may argue that the 2019 Rule attempts to limit “health care entity”—contending
 6 that it applies only to instances specific to Weldon, Coats-Snowe, and ACA Section 1553. But the
 7 2019 Rule makes clear that “health care entity” applies broadly to *any* circumstance in which a
 8 conscience objection may be made. *Id.* at 23,184 (“If the Department becomes aware that a State
 9 or local government or a health care entity may have undertaken activities that may violate *any*
 10 statutory conscience protection...” (emphasis added); 23,194–96 (“health care entity”
 11 encompasses a non-exclusive list that may vary case-by-case).⁴ This renders unavailing any
 12 argument by HHS that the 2019 Rule applies the term “health care entity” only to statutes that
 13 include that term—namely, Weldon, Coats-Snowe, and ACA Section 1553.

14 **II. HHS’S DEFINITION OF “ENTITY” CONFLICTS WITH CHURCH**

15 HHS’s definition of the term “entity” conflicts with Church. As an initial matter, the
 16 language, context, and legislative history of Church establish that it was intended to apply to
 17 those with a close nexus to the procedure, like doctors and nurses, as well as religious hospitals.
 18 By defining entity broadly enough to sweep in countless others, HHS has contravened Congress’s
 19 will. Moreover, both Coats-Snowe and Weldon define “health care entity” to include both
 20 individuals and certain institutions. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 238n(c)(2); 132 Stat. 2981, 3118. But Church
 21 carefully distinguishes between an “entity” and an “individual,” with some provisions applying to
 22 entities, some applying to individuals, and some applying to both. *See, e.g.*, 42 U.S.C. § 300a-
 23 7(b) (“The receipt of any grant, contract, loan, or loan guarantee under [the covered Acts] by any

24 _____
 25 ³ In 2011, HHS rescinded the 2008 definitions, stating that the 2008 Rule had “caused confusion
 26 regarding the scope of the federal health care provider conscience protection statutes” and might
 27 “negatively affect the ability of patients to access care if interpreted broadly.” 76 Fed. Reg. at
 28 9973–74; *see also New York*, 2019 WL 5781789, at *9. HHS’s failure even to acknowledge that
 the 2011 rule rescinded the previous definition for fear of creating confusion is arbitrary and
 capricious. *New York*, 2019 WL 5781789, at *46.

⁴ *See also* <https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/final-conscience-rule-factsheet.pdf> (combining
 conscience protections of various provisions as protecting “health care entities and employees”).

1 *individual or entity* does not authorize any court or any public official or other public authority to
2 require -- (1) such *individual* to [take certain actions], or (2) such *entity* to [take certain actions]”);
3 *id.* § 300a-7(c) (imposing requirements on “entit[ies]”); *id.* § 300a-7(d) (granting certain
4 protections to an “individual”). It is clear from this language that the term “entity,” as used in
5 Church, was intended to exclude individual persons. *See S.E.C. v. McCarthy*, 322 F.3d 650, 656
6 (9th Cir. 2003) (“It is a well-established canon of statutory interpretation that the use of different
7 words or terms within a statute demonstrates that Congress intended to convey a different
8 meaning for those words.”). Therefore, the term “entity” as used in Church cannot encompass the
9 term “health care entity” as used in either Coats-Snowe or Weldon, because the phrase as defined
10 in those provisions includes specified categories of individuals.

11 **III. THE SUBSTANTIVE EXPANSION OF THE CHALLENGED DEFINITIONS REQUIRES** 12 **VACATUR**

13 The Rule’s expansion of the definition of “entity” is but one of numerous ways that the
14 Rule exceeds the scope of HHS’s authority, making vacatur the appropriate remedy. *New York* ,
15 2019 WL 5781789, at *24, *29, *66 (vacating the Rule because, *inter alia*, HHS lacked authority
16 to substantively alter statutory definitions). Indeed, this Court need look no further than the
17 definitions of the terms “assist in the performance,” “refer,” “healthcare entity,” and
18 “discrimination” to vacate the Rule, as those definitions go to the heart of the Rule and create a
19 new system for refusals and accommodation. Congress did not grant HHS the authority to
20 construe Church to cover such a broad range of funding recipients—imposing substantive
21 obligations and creating refusal rights and enforcement powers never contemplated in the statute.
22 *New York*, 2019 WL 5781789, at *29, *33, *66-67 (“With respect to the Church, Coats-Snowe,
23 and Weldon Amendments, HHS was never delegated and did not have substantive rule-making
24 authority”); Pls.’ Mot. 27-30; Pls.’ Reply 3-7. Based on these and several other independent
25 violations of the APA demonstrated by Plaintiffs, as well as the Rule’s constitutional infirmities,
26 vacatur of the Rule is warranted. *New York*, 2019 WL 5781789, at *67-72 (citations omitted);
27 Pls.’ Mot. 30-35, 54-55; Pls.’ Reply 3-7, 20.

1 Respectfully Submitted,

2 Dated: November 12, 2019

3 XAVIER BECERRA
4 Attorney General of California
5 KATHLEEN BOERGERS
6 Supervising Deputy Attorney General
7 /s/ Neli N. Palma

8 NELI N. PALMA
9 KARLI EISENBERG
10 STEPHANIE T. YU
11 Deputy Attorneys General
12 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of California, by
13 and through Attorney General Xavier Becerra*

11 Dated: November 12, 2019

12 By: /s/ Lee H. Rubin

13 LEE H. RUBIN
14 *lrubin@mayerbrown.com*
15 Mayer Brown LLP
16 Two Palo Alto Square, Suite 300
17 3000 El Camino Real
18 Palo Alto, California 94306-2112
19 Tel: (650) 331-2000

20 MIRIAM R. NEMETZ*
21 *mnemetz@mayerbrown.com*
22 NICOLE SAHARSKY*
23 *nsaharsky@mayerbrown.com*
24 ANDREW TAUBER*
25 Mayer Brown LLP
26 1999 K Street, Northwest
27 Washington, DC 2006-1101
28 Tel: (202) 263-3000
*Counsel for Plaintiffs County of Santa Clara,
Trust Women Seattle, Los Angeles LGBT
Center, Whitman-Walker Clinic, Inc. d/b/a
Whitman-Walker Health, Bradbury Sullivan
LGBT Community Center, Center on Halsted,
Hartford Gyn Center, Mazzone Center,
Medical Students For Choice, AGLP: The
Association of LGBT+Psychiatrists,
American Association of Physicians For
Human Rights d/b/a GLMA: Health
Professionals Advancing LGBT Equality,
Colleen McNicholas, Robert Bolan, Ward
Carpenter, Sarah Henn, and Randy Pumphrey*

Dated: November 12, 2019

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney
JESSE C. SMITH
RONALD P. FLYNN
YVONNE R. MERÉ
SARA J. EISENBERG
JAIME M. HULING DELAYE
Deputy City Attorneys

By: /s/ Sara J. Eisenberg

SARA J. EISENBERG
Deputy City Attorney
*Attorneys for Plaintiff City and
County of San Francisco*

Dated: November 12, 2019

By: /s/ Mary E. Hanna-Weir

JAMES R. WILLIAMS
County Counsel
GRETA S. HANSEN
Chief Assistant County Counsel
LAURA S. TRICE
Lead Deputy County Counsel
MARY E. HANNA-WEIR
SUSAN P. GREENBERG
H. LUKE EDWARDS
Deputy County Counsels
mary.hanna-weir@cco.sccgov.org
Office of the County Counsel,
County of Santa Clara
70 West Hedding Street, East Wing, 9th Floor
San José, California 95110-1770
Tel: (408) 299-5900
Counsel for Plaintiff County of Santa Clara

1 Dated: November 12, 2019

2 By: /s/ Richard B. Katskee

3 RICHARD B. KATSKEE*
4 *katskee@au.org*
5 KENNETH D. UPTON, JR.*
6 *upton@au.org*
7 Americans United for Separation
8 of Church and State
9 1310 L Street NW, Suite 200
10 Washington, DC 20005
11 Tel: (202) 466-3234
12 *Counsel for Plaintiffs Trust Women Seattle,*
13 *Los Angeles LGBT Center, Whitman-Walker*
14 *Clinic, Inc. d/b/a Whitman-Walker Health,*
15 *Bradbury Sullivan LGBT Community Center,*
16 *Center on Halsted, Hartford Gyn Center,*
17 *Mazzoni Center, Medical Students For*
18 *Choice, AGLP: The Association of*
19 *LGBT+Psychiatrists, American Association*
20 *of Physicians For Human Rights d/b/a*
21 *GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing*
22 *LGBT Equality, Colleen McNicholas, Robert*
23 *Bolan, Ward Carpenter, Sarah Henn, and*
24 *Randy Pumphrey*

15 Dated: November 12, 2019

16 By: /s/ Genevieve Scott

17 GENEVIEVE SCOTT*
18 *gscott@reprorights.org*
19 RABIA MUQADDAM*
20 *rmuqaddam@reprorights.org*
21 Center for Reproductive Rights
22 199 Water Street, 22nd Floor
23 New York, NY 10038
24 Tel: (917) 637-3605
25 *Counsel for Plaintiffs Trust Women Seattle,*
26 *Los Angeles LGBT Center, Whitman-Walker*
27 *Clinic, Inc. d/b/a Whitman-Walker Health,*
28 *Bradbury Sullivan LGBT Community Center,*
Center on Halsted, Hartford Gyn Center,
Mazzoni Center, Medical Students For
Choice, AGLP: The Association of
LGBT+Psychiatrists, American Association
of Physicians For Human Rights d/b/a
GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing
LGBT Equality, Colleen McNicholas, Robert
Bolan, Ward Carpenter, Sarah Henn, and
Randy Pumphrey

Dated: November 12, 2019

By: /s/ Jamie A. Gliksberg

JAMIE A. GLIKSBERG*
jgliksberg@lambdalegal.org
CAMILLA B. TAYLOR*
ctaylor@lambdalegal.org
Lambda Legal Defense and
Education Fund, Inc.
105 West Adams, 26th Floor
Chicago, IL 60603-6208
Tel: (312) 663-4413

OMAR GONZALEZ-PAGAN*
ogonzalez-pagan@lambdalegal.org
Lambda Legal Defense and
Education Fund, Inc.
120 Wall Street, 19th Floor
New York, NY 10005-3919
Tel: (212) 809-8585

PUNEET CHEEMA*
pcheema@lambdalegal.org
Lambda Legal Defense and
Education Fund, Inc.
1776 K Street NW, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 804-6245, ext. 596
Counsel for Plaintiffs Trust Women Seattle,
Los Angeles LGBT Center, Whitman-Walker
Clinic, Inc. d/b/a Whitman-Walker Health,
Bradbury Sullivan LGBT Community Center,
Center on Halsted, Hartford Gyn Center,
Mazzoni Center, Medical Students For
Choice, AGLP: The Association of
LGBT+Psychiatrists, American Association
of Physicians For Human Rights d/b/a
GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing
LGBT Equality, Colleen McNicholas, Robert
Bolan, Ward Carpenter, Sarah Henn, and
Randy Pumphrey

* Admitted pro hac vice

SA2019501805 // Response to 11819 Order 11.12.19.KE edits.docx

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Case Name: State of California v. Alex M. Azar, et al. No. 3:19-cv-02769-WHA

I hereby certify that on November 12, 2019, I electronically filed the following documents with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system:

PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO ORDER RE USE OF TERM "ENTITY"

I certify that **all** participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on November 12, 2019, at Sacramento, California.

Ashley Harrison

Declarant

/s/ Ashley Harrison

Signature