JONES DAY

3161 MICHELSON DRIVE • SUITE 800 • IRVINE, CA 92612 TELEPHONE: (949) 851-3939 • FACSIMILE: (949) 553-7539

December 26, 2013

VIA CM / ECF FILING

Ms. Molly C. Dwyer, Clerk of the Court United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit The James R. Browning Courthouse 95 7th Street San Francisco, California 94103

Re: Courthouse News Service v. Planet

Case No. 11-57187 Argued May 8, 2013

Circuit Judges Noonan, Wardlaw and Murguia

Dear Ms. Dwyer:

Appellee Michael Planet responds to Appellant Courthouse News's December 20, 2013 Rule 28(j) letter regarding *Sprint Communications, Inc. v. Jacobs*, 2013 U.S. LEXIS 9019 (Dec. 10, 2013).

Sprint Communications explains that the Younger v. Harris abstention doctrine bars federal-court interference with three discrete types of ongoing state proceedings. *Id.*, 2013 U.S. LEXIS 9019 at * 16-17 & * 23. However, Justice Ginsburg's opinion is inapposite, because it does not discuss the two very different abstention doctrines at issue in this case.

In particular, *Sprint Communications* does not discuss, define or limit the obligation of federal courts to abstain from hearing federal lawsuits whose determination is dependent upon resolution of unsettled questions of state law. *See Railroad Comm'n of Texas v. Pullman Co.*, 312 U.S. 496 (1941); *Courtney v. Goltz*, 2013 U.S. App. LEXIS 23943 (9th Cir. Dec. 2, 2013) (*Pullman* abstention is appropriate when "(1) the case touches on a sensitive area of social policy upon which the federal courts ought not enter unless no alternative to its adjudication is open, (2) constitutional adjudication plainly can be avoided if a definite ruling on the state issue would terminate the controversy, and (3) the possible determinative issue of state law is uncertain").

Similarly, *Sprint Communications* does not discuss, define or limit the doctrine of equitable abstention, which applies *in the absence of* pending state proceedings, when a federal lawsuit "would entail heavy federal interference in such sensitive state activities as administration of the judicial system." *E.T. v. Cantil-Sakauye*, 682 F.3d 1121, 1123-1124 (9th

Ms. Molly C. Dwyer December 26, 2013 Page 2

Cir. 2012) (quoting Los Angeles County Bar Ass'n v. Eu, 979 F.2d 697, 703 (9th Cir. 1992)); see generally, O'Shea v. Littleton, 414 U.S. 488 (1974); Vasquez v. Rackauckas, 734 F.3d 1025, 1038 n.8 (9th Cir. 2013) (noting that, "In E.T., the dispositive ground for abstention was the specter of federal supervision of state judicial proceedings").

ery truly yours,

Robert A. Naeve

9th Circuit Case Number(s)	11-57187
NOTE: To secure your input, yo	ou should print the filled-in form to PDF (File > Print > PDF Printer/Creator).
*********	***************************************
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
When All Case Partici	pants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System
2 2	ls for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system
Dec 26, 2013	
I certify that all participants i accomplished by the appellat	n the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be e CM/ECF system.
Signature (use "s/" format)	s/ Robert A. Naeve
********	*******************
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
When Not All Case Parti	cipants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System
	nically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the als for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system.
Participants in the case who a CM/ECF system.	are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the appellate
have mailed the foregoing do	the participants in the case are not registered CM/ECF users. I cument by First-Class Mail, postage prepaid, or have dispatched it arrier for delivery within 3 calendar days to the following
Signature (use "s/" format)	