DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR RELIEF FILED BY NON-PARTY, JAMES E. PIETRANGELO

28

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE CIVIL DIVISION, FEDERAL PROGRAMS BRANCH P.O. Box 883, Ben Franklin Station Washington, D.C. 20044 (202) 353-0543 Doc. 297

Non-party James E. Pietrangelo, II, requests the Court to extend the declaratory judgment set forth in the Court's October 12, 2010 order (Doc. 284) to him, and that he be additionally entitled to reinstatement into the military and an award of damages based upon defendants' purported failure to comply with the Court's order. The Court should summarily reject Mr. Pietrangelo's motion.

The Ninth Circuit has stayed any enforcement of the Court's October 12, 2010 judgment and permanent injunction pending appeal. *See* Doc. 284 (recognizing, *inter alia*, that balance of hardships tilts in favor of requested stay where Executive Branch is enjoined from implementing duly enacted statute, particularly in the military context where judicial deference is at its apogee); attached November 12, 2010 Supreme Court order denying request to vacate stay.

And even if the Court's October 12, 2010 order were in effect, nothing in the Court's injunction required the reinstatement of service members who were previously discharged—or the award of money damages. The requested relief and the resulting order include only prospective equitable relief. *See* Doc. 252. Mr. Pietrangelo's repeated assertion that he is entitled to additional relief because defendants have violated the Court's order (*see* Doc. 295 at 4:12-27) ignores the current stay entered by the Court of Appeals and left undisturbed by the Supreme Court.

Since the entry of the Court's October 12, 2010 Order, Congress enacted the Don't Ask, Don't Tell (DADT) Repeal Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-321 (Repeal Act). Section 2(f) of the Repeal Act provides that, upon the effective date established by Section 2(b), the DADT statute (10 U.S.C. § 654) shall be stricken from the Code. And Section 2(b) states that the repeal shall take effect 60 days after the date on which the President transmits to Congress a certification by the President, Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that the requirements for a successful and orderly repeal have been met. Mr.

Pietrangelo will be afforded the opportunity to reapply to the military after repeal occurs.

Lastly, at bottom, Mr. Pietrangelo's motion is merely an attempt to litigate anew claims that he presented and were rejected in Cook v. Gates, 528 F.3d 42 (1st Cir. 2008). There, Mr. Pietrangelo and the other named plaintiffs challenged 10 U.S.C. § 654, claiming that the statute violates due process and equal protection, as well as the First Amendment. 528 F.3d at 45, 47. The First Circuit rejected each of these claims and upheld the Act. See id. at 65. Mr. Pietrangelo's attempt to relitigate these claims here is barred by the doctrine of res judicata.

Res judicata consists of two related concepts, claim preclusion and issue preclusion. Migra v. Warren City School Dist. Bd. of Educ., 465 U.S. 75, 77 n. 1, 104 S. Ct. 892, 894 n. 1, 79 L. Ed. 2d 56 (1984). "The doctrine of claim preclusion treats a judgment, once rendered, as the full measure of relief to be accorded the same parties on the same claim or cause of action . . . [T]he effect of a judgment extends to the litigation of all issues relevant to the same claim between the parties, whether or not raised at trial." Haphey v. Linn Ctv., 924 F.2d 1512, 1515 (9th Cir. 1991) (quoting 18 C. Wright, A. Miller, & E. Cooper, Federal Practice and Procedure § 4402 (1981)(internal quotations omitted). Issue preclusion, meanwhile, "recognizes that suits addressed to particular claims may present issues relevant to suits on other claims [This doctrine] bars the relitigation of issues actually adjudicated, and essential to the judgment, in a prior litigation between the same parties." Id. Regardless of how the doctrine is viewed here however, the First Circuit's Cook ruling completely disposed of whatever constitutional challenges Mr. Pietrangelo had to Section 654.

25

26

27

28

	1 1 1
For any one of these reasons, Mr. Pietrangelo's motion should be	denied.
2 D. A. M. M. 21 2011 TONY WEST	
3 Date: March 21, 2011 TONY WEST Assistant Attorney General	
ANDRÉ BIROTTE, JR United States Attorney	
JOSEPH H. HUNT Director	
7 VINCENT M. GARVEY	
8 Deputy Branch Director	
9 /s/ Paul G. Freeborne PAUL G. FREEBORNE	
Senior Trial Counsel U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division	,
Federal Programs Branch	T 7
II ROOM 61UX	
Washington, D.C. 20044 Telephone: (202) 353-0543 Facsimile: (202) 616-8202 paul.freeborne@usdoj.gov	
Facsimile: (202) 616-8202 paul.freeborne@usdoj.gov	
15 Attorneys for Defendants U States of America and Secre	nited
Defense	etary of
17	
18 19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23

24

25

26

27

28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury that on this 21st day of March, 2011, I caused to be placed in the United States mail (first-class mail, postage paid) a copy of the foregoing addressed as follows:

> James E. Pietrangelo, II P.O. Box 548 Avon, OH 44011 Tel. (802) 338-0501

/s/Paul G. Freeborne PAUL G. FREEBORNE Senior Trial Counsel

U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division

Federal Programs Branch 20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.

Room 6108

Washington, D.C. 20044 Telephone: (202) 353-0543 Facsimile: (202) 616-8202

paul.freeborne@usdoj.gov