

No. 84483-6

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

CITY OF SEATTLE, a municipal corporation,

Petitioner,

v.

ROBERT M. MCKENNA, Attorney General, Washington State,

Respondent.

PETITIONER'S ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

PETER S. HOLMES, WSBA #15787
Seattle City Attorney

LAURA WISHIK, WSBA, #16682
Assistant City Attorney

Seattle City Attorney's Office
600 - 4th Avenue, 4th Floor
P.O. Box 94769
Seattle, Washington 98124-4769
(206) 684-8200

RECEIVED
SUPREME COURT
STATE OF WASHINGTON

10 JUN 28 PM 1:17

BY RONALD R. CARPENTER

CLERK

ORIGINAL


FILED AS
ATTACHMENT TO EMAIL

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The Judge hearing the Florida case has denied the motion filed by several Governors, including the Governor of Washington State, to file amicus briefs. 6/25/2010 Order (copy attached).

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 28th day of June, 2010.

Peter S. Holmes
Seattle City Attorney

By: 
Peter S. Holmes, WSBA #15787
Seattle City Attorney

Laura Wishik, WSBA #16682
Seattle City Attorney's Office
600 – 4th Ave., 4th Floor
PO Box 94769
Seattle, WA 98124-4769
(206)684-8200
Attorneys for Petitioner

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
PENSACOLA DIVISION**

STATE OF FLORIDA, by and
through Bill McCollum, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Case No.: 3:10-cv-91-RV/EMT

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

On June 14, 2010, I entered an order noting that the court had received numerous inquires from "organizations and individuals" expressing an interest in filing amicus curiae briefs in this important case. After acknowledging that there might conceivably be helpful contributions from amici, I set forth an orderly procedure for providing an opportunity to do so. But, I concluded that amicus briefs would not be allowed at the motion to dismiss stage. Now pending before the court are motions from three state Attorneys General (doc. 57), and four state governors (doc. 59), all of whom seek to participate as "state amici" and file briefs in support of the defendants' motion to dismiss.¹

After reading their motions, it appears that the proposed state amici might have positions and arguments that may be helpful to the court during the merits-phase of this case. However, it does not appear that they have anything especially

¹ In addition to seeking leave to file their brief, the Attorneys General seek clarification as to whether such state actors fall under the phrase "organizations and individuals." They do.

useful to add at the motion to dismiss stage, which is concerned primarily with discrete legal issues such as standing and ripeness.

Accordingly, these motions (docs. 57 and 59) are both DENIED, but with leave to renew them if the case survives dismissal.

DONE and ORDERED this 25th day of June, 2010.

/s/ Roger Vinson
ROGER VINSON
Senior United States District Judge