

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

---

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

XAVIER BECERRA, Secretary of U.S.  
Department of Health and Human Services; et  
al.,<sup>1</sup>

Defendants-Appellants.

---

No. 20-15398

COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA; et al.,

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES; and XAVIER BECERRA,  
in his official capacity as Secretary of Health and  
Human Services,

Defendants-Appellants.

---

No. 20-15399

---

<sup>1</sup> Secretary Becerra has been automatically substituted for Acting Secretary Norris Cochran pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 43(c)(2). Secretary Becerra is recused from this litigation.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

XAVIER BECERRA, in his official capacity as  
Secretary of the U.S Department of Health &  
Human Services, and U.S. DEPARTMENT OF  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Defendants-Appellants.

No. 20-16045

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

XAVIER BECERRA and U.S. DEPARTMENT  
OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Defendants-Appellants.

No. 20-35044

**STATUS REPORT PURSUANT TO THE COURT'S  
ORDER OF MARCH 31, 2021**

1. These consolidated appeals concern the validity of a final rule that the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) promulgated in 2019. The rule, entitled Protecting Statutory Conscience Rights in Health Care, 84 Fed. Reg. 23,170 (May 21, 2019), implicates various federal statutes that protect individuals and other entities with religious or moral objections to providing certain health-care-related

services in connection with government-provided or government-funded health care programs. In these appeals, the federal government sought review of decisions in which two district courts—one in the Eastern District of Washington and one in the Northern District of California—vacated the rule.

2. After the consolidated appeals were fully briefed, the Court scheduled oral argument for February 8, 2021. On January 28, 2021, the parties to the appeals filed a joint motion to remove the appeals from the oral argument calendar and place the appeals in abeyance, explaining that new leadership at HHS planned to reassess the issues that the cases present.

3. On January 29, 2021, the Court issued an order granting the parties' joint motion. The Court removed the cases from the February 8 argument calendar and directed the parties to "provide the Court within sixty days a status report as to whether the appeal will continue to be prosecuted." The government subsequently filed a status report on March 30, 2021, requesting that the appeal continue to be held in abeyance. This Court granted that motion, directing the parties to provide another status report regarding whether the appeal will continue to be prosecuted by June 1.

4. HHS remains in the process of reassessing the issues that these cases present. New leadership is still in the process of arriving at the agency, and the agency continues to need additional time to review the rule in question and the multiple legal issues that are involved in these consolidated appeals, to consult with all interested federal agencies and offices, and to determine the appropriate course going

forward. We therefore respectfully ask that the appeal remain in abeyance and that appellants be permitted to file another status report within 60 days after the filing of this report, by August 2, 2021.<sup>2</sup>

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL RAAB  
LOWELL V. STURGILL  
SARAH CARROLL

/s/ Leif Overvold  
LEIF OVERVOLD  
Attorneys, Appellate Staff  
Civil Division, Room 7226  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
(202) 532-4631  
leif.overvold2@usdoj.gov

JUNE 2021

---

<sup>2</sup> July 31, 2021 is 60 days after today's date, but July 31 is a Saturday. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 26(a)(1)(C).