IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

|) |
|-----------------------------|
|) No. 4:04-cv-00848-TCK-TLW |
|) |
|) |
|) |
| |

RESPONSE BY UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., ATTORNEY GENERAL, TO PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM REGARDING THE EFFECT OF UNITED STATES V. WINDSOR

The United States of America and Eric H. Holder, Jr., in his official capacity as Attorney General of the United States (collectively, "United States"), by their undersigned counsel, respond as follows to Plaintiffs' Supplemental Memorandum Addressing Effect of *United States v. Windsor* Upon Pending Motions and Cross Motions for Summary Judgment (Doc. 262).

1. In light of the Supreme Court's decision in *United States v. Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. 2675 (2013), the only federal claim remaining in this action is plaintiffs' challenge to Section 2 of the Defense of Marriage Act ("DOMA"). As the United States has demonstrated in prior filings, the plaintiffs lack standing to challenge Section 2, given that the injury of which they complain (inability to marry) is not "fairly traceable" to actions of the United States, nor redressable in an action against the United States. *See Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't*, 523 U.S. 83, 102-04 (1998). Plaintiffs' claims regarding Section 2 should be dismissed on this basis.

¹ "Plaintiffs" as used herein refers to Susan Barton and Gay Phillips.

2. In their supplemental memorandum on the effect of the *Windsor* decision, plaintiffs argue that the unconstitutionality of Section 3 of DOMA, established in *Windsor*, necessarily requires holding that Section 2 is also unconstitutional (Doc. 262 at 9-10).² This argument does not, however, respond to the United States' motion to dismiss, as the constitutionality of Section 3 does not affect plaintiffs' standing to challenge Section 2. *See Warth v. Seldin*, 422 U.S. 490, 500 (1975) (stating that standing "in no way depends on the merits" of a claim). A plaintiff must establish standing before the Court can reach the merits. *See, e.g., Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, 515 U.S. 200, 210 (1995) ("Before reaching the merits of Adarand's challenge, we must consider whether Adarand has standing); *In re C.W. Mining Co.*, 636 F.3d 1257, 1260 n.5 (10th Cir. 2011) ("We may not assume that C.W. has Article III standing in order to reach the merits"). Thus, the Court should dismiss plaintiffs' Section 2 claims for lack of standing without reaching plaintiffs' argument regarding the effect of *Windsor* on those claims.

Dated this 23rd day of August, 2013.

Respectfully submitted,

STUART F. DELERY Assistant Attorney General

DANNY C. WILLIAMS, SR. United States Attorney

ARTHUR R. GOLDBERG Assistant Director

s/ W. Scott Simpson

W. SCOTT SIMPSON
Senior Trial Counsel

² Plaintiffs have made the same argument previously in this case, before the Supreme Court issued its decision in *Windsor* (Doc. 228 at 7-8).

Attorneys, Department of Justice Civil Division, Room 7210 Post Office Box 883 Washington, D.C. 20044

Telephone: (202) 514-3495 Facsimile: (202) 616-8470

E-mail: scott.simpson@usdoj.gov

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ERIC H. HOLDER, JR., ATTORNEY GENERAL

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 23, 2013, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the Clerk of Court using the ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:

Byron J. Babione Phillip Craig Bailey James A. Campbell Holly L. Carmichael Laura Lea Eakens Don G. Holladay Kerry W. Kircher Martha Ruth Kulmacz John David Luton Austin R. Nimocks Brently C. Olsson Brian W. Raum Sandra D. Rinehart Dale Michael Schowengerdt Kevin Hayden Theriot Roy Duane Tucker James E. Warner

s/ W. Scott Simpson
W. SCOTT SIMPSON