

1 Douglas N. Letter, *General Counsel* (D.C. Bar No. 253492)
 2 Todd B. Tatelman, *Deputy General Counsel* (VA Bar No. 66008)
 3 Megan Barbero, *Associate General Counsel* (MA Bar No. 668854)
 4 Kristin A. Shapiro, *Assistant General Counsel* (D.C. Bar No. 1007010)
 Brooks M. Hanner, *Assistant General Counsel* (D.C. Bar No. 1005346)
 Sarah E. Clouse, *Attorney* (MA Bar No. 688187)

5 OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL
 6 U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 7 219 Cannon House Office Building
 Washington, D.C. 20515
 8 (202) 225-9700 (telephone)
 (202) 226-1360 (facsimile)
 douglas.letter@mail.house.gov

9 *Counsel for Amicus Curiae the United States House of Representatives*

10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 11 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
OAKLAND DIVISION

12 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, *et al.*,
 13
 14 *Plaintiffs,*
 15
 16 v.
 17 DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the United
 States, in his official capacity, *et al.*,
 18 *Defendants.*

Case No. 4:19-cv-00872-HSG

P.I. Hearing Date: May 17, 2019
 Time: 10:00 AM

**CONSENT MOTION FOR LEAVE
 TO FILE MEMORANDUM OF
 THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF
 REPRESENTATIVES AS AMICUS
 CURIAE**

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

2 The U.S. House of Representatives respectfully moves for leave to file the attached
3 memorandum as *amicus curiae* in the above-captioned matter.¹ Plaintiffs and defendants consent
4 to the House’s motion. A copy of the House’s proposed *amicus curiae* brief and a proposed order
5 are attached.

6 **STATEMENT OF INTEREST**

7 The House’s motion for leave to file as *amicus curiae* should be granted because the
8 House has a compelling institutional interest in this case, which involves the Executive Branch
9 defendants’ unconstitutional expenditure of funds to build a wall along the southern border of the
10 United States without a valid Congressional appropriation. The House respectfully submits that
11 its *amicus* brief will aid the Court’s understanding of the Congressional appropriations issues
12 presented here. This case arises out of defendants’ flagrant disregard for the bedrock
13 constitutional principle that “[n]o Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence
14 of Appropriations made by Law.” U.S. Const. art. I, § 9, cl. 7. The Appropriations Clause vests
15 Congress with “exclusive power over the federal purse,” *U.S. Dep’t of the Navy v. FLRA*, 665
16 F.3d 1339, 1346 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (quotation marks omitted), and it “was one of the most
17 important authorities allocated to Congress in the Constitution’s ‘necessary partition of power
18 among the several departments,’” *id.* (quoting *The Federalist* No. 51 (James Madison)). The
19 Framers vested appropriations authority in Congress to provide it with “the most complete and
20 effectual weapon with which any constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the
21 people.” *The Federalist* No. 58 (James Madison).

22 Defendants’ trespass on Congress’s appropriations authority therefore inflicts a serious
23 injury upon the House as an institution. “Congress . . . is the only body empowered by the

24 ¹ The Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group (which consists of the Speaker, the Majority
25 Leader, the Majority Whip, the Republican Leader, and the Republican Whip) authorized the
26 filing of this brief on behalf of the House. This group “speaks for, and articulates the institutional
27 position of, the House in all litigation matters.” Rule II.8(b) of the U.S. House of Representatives
28 (116th Cong.). The Republican Leader and the Republican Whip decline to support this filing for
institutional reasons, as the appropriate recourse provided under Article I of the U.S. Constitution
is to pass legislation.

1 Constitution to adopt laws directing monies to be spent from the U.S. Treasury,” and “this
2 constitutional structure would collapse, and the role of the House would be meaningless, if the
3 Executive could circumvent the appropriations process and spend funds however it pleases.” *U.S.*
4 *House of Representatives v. Burwell*, 130 F. Supp. 3d 53, 71 (D.D.C. 2015). On April 5, 2019,
5 the House filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to seek redress for
6 defendants’ unconstitutional actions. *See U.S. House of Representatives v. Mnuchin*, No. 1:19-
7 cv-00969 (D.D.C.) The House seeks to participate as *amicus curiae* in this case in further defense
8 of its constitutional authority.²

9 ARGUMENT

10 This Court may in its discretion allow the participation of *amicus curiae*, and does not
11 impose “strict prerequisites that must be established prior to qualifying for amicus status.” *In re*
12

13 ² The House regularly appears as *amicus curiae* in cases in which its institutional powers
14 are implicated. *See, e.g.*, Br. of the House as Amicus Curiae Supporting Resp’ts, *Patchak v.*
15 *Zinke*, 138 S. Ct. 897 (2018) (No. 16-498); Br. of the House as Amicus Curiae Supporting
16 Certiorari, *Sokolow v. Palestinian Liberation Org.*, No. 16-1071 (S. Ct. Apr. 6, 2017); Br. of
17 Amici Curiae the [House] & 225 Individual Members of the U.S. House of Representatives in
18 Supp. of Resp’ts, *Bank Markazi v. Peterson*, 136 S. Ct. 1310 (2016) (No. 14-770); Br. of Amicus
19 Curiae the [House] in Supp. of Pet’r, *Renzi v. United States*, No. 11-557 (S. Ct. Dec. 2, 2011); Br.
20 of the House as Amicus Curiae Supporting Affirmance, *Land of Lincoln Mut. Health Ins. Co. v.*
21 *United States*, 892 F.3d 1184 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (No. 2017-1224); Br. of the [House] as Amicus
22 Curiae Supporting Affirmance, *Council of the Dist. of Columbia v. Gray*, 42 F. Supp. 3d 134
23 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (No. 14-7067); Br. of the [House] as Amicus Curiae, *United States v. Renzi*, 769
24 F.3d 731 (9th Cir. 2014) (No. 13-10588); Br. of the [House] as Amicus Curiae Supporting
25 Affirmance, *Cause of Action v. Nat’l Archives & Records Admin.*, 753 F.3d 210 (D.C. Cir. 2014)
26 (No. 13-5127); Br. of the [House] as Amicus Curiae Supporting Affirmance of District Court
27 Order, *United States v. Verrusio*, 762 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir., 2013) (No. 11-3080); Br. of Amicus
28 Curiae the [House] in Supp. of Appellant, *United States v. Rainey*, 757 F.3d 234 (5th Cir. 2013)
(No. 13-3070); Br. of House as Amicus Curiae, *United States v. Collins*, No. 1:18-cr-00567
(S.D.N.Y. Apr. 4, 2019); Br. of House as Amicus Curiae, *California v. Trump*, 267 F. Supp. 3d
1119 (N.D. Cal. 2017) (No. 3:17-cv-05895); Mem. of the [House] as Amicus Curiae, *Council of*
the Dist. of Columbia v. Gray, 42 F. Supp. 3d 134 (D.D.C. 2014) (No. 1:14-cv-00655); *In re*
Search of The Rayburn House Office Bldg. Room No. 2113, 432 F. Supp. 2d 100, 104-05 (D.D.C.
2006); *Byrd v. Raines*, 956 F. Supp. 25, 27 (D.D.C. 1997); *United States v. Rose*, 790 F. Supp.
340, 340 (D.D.C. 1992); *United States v. Eichman*, 731 F. Supp. 1123, 1127 n.6 (D.D.C. 1990);
Webster v. Sun Co., 561 F. Supp. 1184, 1185-86 (D.D.C. 1983); *see also Atkins v. United States*,
556 F.2d 1028, 240-41 (Ct. Cl. 1977) (noting participation of Speaker of the House as *amicus*
curiae at the invitation of the court, after DOJ conceded the unconstitutionality of the statute at
issue).

1 *Dynamic Random Access Memory Antitrust Litigation*, No. M-02-1486-PJH, 2007 WL 2022026,
2 at *1 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2007). Rather, “an individual or entity seeking to appear as amicus must
3 merely make a showing that his/its participation is useful to or otherwise desirable to the court.”
4 *Id.* “The touchstone is whether the amicus is ‘helpful,’ and there is no requirement ‘that amici
5 must be totally disinterested.’” *California v. U.S. Dep’t of Labor*, No. 2:13-cv-02069-KJM-
6 DAD, 2014 WL 12691095, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2014) (quoting *Hoptowit v. Ray*, 682 F.2d
7 1237, 1260 (9th Cir. 1982), *abrogation on other grounds recognized by Montijo v. Swaney*, 754
8 F. App’x 522 (9th Cir. 2018)).

9 Here, this Court would benefit from briefing by the House because the questions
10 presented in this litigation involve matters that go to the heart of the separation of powers:
11 Congress’s power of the purse, and the restraints imposed on the Executive Branch by the
12 Appropriations Clause, which expressly precludes expenditures of federal funds absent
13 Congressional authorization. The House is well-positioned to provide this Court with unique
14 insight into the appropriations process. As part of the Legislative Branch, the House offers a
15 perspective distinct from the parties, which is particularly important given the separation-of-
16 powers concerns implicated by this action. By addressing the Congressional appropriations
17 process, and specifically the Congressional limitations on appropriations for the construction of a
18 wall along the southern border, the House’s participation will provide the Court with an important
19 perspective in this case. Accordingly, the House should be granted leave to participate as *amicus*
20 *curiae*.

21 CONCLUSION

22 For the foregoing reasons, the House’s motion for leave to file the attached memorandum
23 as *amicus curiae* should be granted.

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

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Douglas N. Letter

DOUGLAS N. LETTER (D.C. Bar No. 253492)

General Counsel

TODD B. TATELMAN (VA Bar No. 66008)

Deputy General Counsel

MEGAN BARBERO (MA Bar No. 668854)

Associate General Counsel

KRISTIN A. SHAPIRO (D.C. Bar No. 1007010)

Assistant General Counsel

BROOKS M. HANNER (D.C. Bar No. 1005346)

Assistant General Counsel

SARAH E. CLOUSE (MA Bar No. 688187)

Attorney

OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL*
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
219 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515
(202) 225-9700 (telephone)
(202) 226-1360 (facsimile)
douglas.letter@mail.house.gov

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae the United States House
of Representatives*

* Attorneys for the Office of General Counsel for the U.S. House of Representatives are “entitled, for the purpose of performing the counsel’s functions, to enter an appearance in any proceeding before any court of the United States or of any State or political subdivision thereof without compliance with any requirements for admission to practice before such court.” 2 U.S.C. § 5571.

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 that on April 12, 2019, I caused the foregoing document to be filed via the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California’s CM/ECF system, which I understand caused service on all registered parties.

/s/ Douglas N. Letter
Douglas N. Letter