



Kathleen R. Hartnett
T: +1 415 693 2071
khartnett@cooley.com

April 11, 2023

Patricia S. Connor
Clerk of Court
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit
1100 East Main Street, Suite 501
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Re: *B.P.J., by her next friend and mother; Heather Jackson v. West Virginia State Board of Education, et. al., No. 23-1078*

Dear Ms. Connor:

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(j) and Local Rule 28(e), Plaintiff-Appellant B.P.J., by and through her next friend and mother, respectfully submits the enclosed order of the United States Supreme Court, dated April 6, 2023, in *West Virginia, et al. v. B.P.J., by her next friend and mother, Heather Jackson*, No. 22A800, 598 U.S. ____ (2023) (attached hereto as Ex. A).

As noted in Plaintiff's opening brief filed on March 27, 2023 (ECF No. 52 at 6, 19), Defendants-Appellees and Intervenor-Appellees filed an emergency application with the Supreme Court seeking vacatur of this Court's interim order granting Plaintiff-Appellant B.P.J.'s Motion for Stay Pending Appeal and enjoining dissolution of the preliminary injunction (ECF No. 50). That application was pending at the time Plaintiff filed her opening brief but has now been resolved. The Supreme Court denied the application, leaving this Court's interim order in place, with two Justices noting their dissent.

Sincerely,

/s/ Kathleen R. Hartnett

Kathleen R. Hartnett

EXHIBIT A

Cite as: 598 U. S. ____ (2023)

1

ALITO, J., dissenting

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 22A800

WEST VIRGINIA, ET AL. *v.* B. P. J., BY HER NEXT FRIEND
AND MOTHER, HEATHER JACKSON

ON APPLICATION TO VACATE THE INJUNCTION

[April 6, 2023]

The application to vacate injunction presented to THE CHIEF JUSTICE and by him referred to the Court is denied.

JUSTICE ALITO, with whom JUSTICE THOMAS joins, dissenting from denial of application to vacate injunction.

This application concerns an important issue that this Court is likely to be required to address in the near future, namely, whether either Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 86 Stat. 373, 20 U. S. C. §1681 *et seq.*, or the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause prohibits a State from restricting participation in women's or girls' sports based on genes or physiological or anatomical characteristics. The West Virginia Legislature enacted such a law. The District Court here preliminarily enjoined the law's enforcement in July 2021, and the State did not appeal that injunction for the almost-18 months during which it was in effect. Ultimately, however, the District Court granted summary judgment for the State and dissolved the preliminary injunction. Respondent B. P. J. appealed, and a divided panel of the Fourth Circuit issued an order enjoining enforcement of the law against B. P. J. for the duration of the appeal. In doing so, the panel provided no explanation whatsoever for its decision.

West Virginia has asked this Court to stay or vacate that order, but this Court now denies that request. And like the Fourth Circuit, this Court has not explained its reasons for

ALITO, J., dissenting

that decision.

I would grant the State's application. Among other things, enforcement of the law at issue should not be forbidden by the federal courts without any explanation. It is true that West Virginia allowed the District Court's injunction to go unchallenged for nearly 18 months before seeking emergency relief from a second, identical injunction. And it is a wise rule in general that a litigant whose claim of urgency is belied by its own conduct should not expect discretionary emergency relief from a court. But in the circumstances present here—where a divided panel of a lower court has enjoined a duly enacted state law on an important subject without a word of explanation, notwithstanding that the District Court granted summary judgment to the State based on a fact-intensive record—the State is entitled to relief. If we put aside the issue of the State's delay in seeking emergency relief and if the District Court's analysis of the merits of this case is correct, the generally applicable stay factors plainly justify granting West Virginia's application.

For these reasons, I respectfully dissent.