

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
BACKGROUND.....	3
1. <u>Newdow I.</u>	3
2. <u>Newdow II.</u>	7
3. Plans for the 2009 Inauguration.....	10
ARGUMENT.....	11
I. PLAINTIFFS LACK STANDING.	11
A. Plaintiffs Do Not Allege Concrete And Particularized Injuries Sufficient To Qualify As Injuries In Fact.	12
B. Plaintiffs Lack Standing Because Their Claims for Relief Are Not Redressable.	17
1. Plaintiffs’ Alleged “Inaugural Prayer” Injury Is Not Redressable.	18
2. Plaintiffs’ Alleged “Oath of Office” Injury Is Not Redressable..	20
II. PLAINTIFFS ARE NOT ENTITLED TO A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION.	21
A. Plaintiffs Fail to Demonstrate a Substantial Likelihood of Success on the Merits..	22
1. Plaintiffs’ Establishment Clause Challenge to Inaugural Prayer Is Foreclosed by the Supreme Court’s decision in <u>Marsh v. Chambers</u> and this Court’s decision in <u>Newdow II.</u>	22
a. <u>Marsh</u> Forecloses Plaintiffs’ Challenge To Inaugural Prayer. ...	23
(1) Our Nation’s Tradition of Legislative and Inaugural Prayer Dates Back to the Founding.	23
(2) Inaugural Prayer Cannot Reasonably Be Understood To Proselytize.	27

b.	<u>Marsh</u> , Not <u>Lee v. Weisman</u> or <u>Santa Fe</u> , Controls This Case.	30
c.	Inaugural Prayer Survives the <u>Lemon</u> Test, Were It Applicable.	32
2.	Plaintiffs’ Establishment Clause Challenge to Concluding the Presidential Oath with the Traditional Phrase “So Help Me God” Is Meritless.	35
3.	Plaintiff’s “Free Exercise” Claim Under The Religious Freedom Restoration Act Is Without Merit.	39
B.	Irreparable Harm to Plaintiffs.	41
C.	The Requested Injunction Would Substantially Injure Other Interested Parties.	42
D.	The Requested Injunction Would Not Serve The Public Interest.	44
	CONCLUSION.	45