

No. 17-2879

---

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

---

FREDERICK W. HOPKINS, M.D., M.P.H.,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

v.

LARRY JEGLEY, PROSECUTING ATTORNEY FOR PULASKI COUNTY, AND SUCCESSORS  
IN OFFICE, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY, ET AL.,  
*Defendants-Appellants.*

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Arkansas  
Case No. 4:15-00784-KGB (Hon. Kristine Baker)

---

**BRIEF *AMICUS CURIAE* OF AMERICANS UNITED FOR LIFE  
SUPPORTING DEFENDANTS-APPELLANTS AND  
OPPOSING PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE'S PETITION FOR REHEARING  
AND FOR REHEARING EN BANC**

---

TIMOTHY BELZ  
CLAYTON PLAZA LAW GROUP, LC  
112 South Hanley Rd.  
Suite 200  
St. Louis, MO 63105  
tbelz@olblaw.com  
314-726-2800 Ext. 214

CATHERINE GLENN FOSTER  
STEVEN H. ADEN  
*Counsel of Record*  
KATIE GLENN  
NATALIE M. HEJRAN  
AMERICANS UNITED FOR LIFE  
1150 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Suite 500  
Washington, DC 22036  
Steven.Aden@aul.org  
Telephone: 202-741-4917

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

## **CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

*Amicus Curiae* Americans United for Life has no parent corporations or stock that a publicly held corporation can hold.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT .....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	2
Rehearing and En Banc Review Are Not Warranted Because the Eighth Circuit Panel Correctly Applied the <i>Casey</i> Standard in Vacating and Remanding the District Court’s Decision .....	2
CONCLUSION .....	5
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE .....	6
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE.....	7

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s):
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> , 428 U.S. 153 (1976).....	4
<i>Gonzales v. Carhart</i> , 550 U.S. 124 (2007).....	4
<i>Hopkins v. Jegley</i> , 267 F. Supp. 3d 1024 (E.D. Ark. 2017).....	4
<i>Hopkins v. Jegley</i> , 968 F.3d 912 (8th Cir. 2020).....	3, 4
<i>Hopkins v. Jegley</i> , No. 4:17-CV-00404-KGB, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 229062 (E.D. Ark. Aug. 2, 2017) .....	4
<i>June Med. Servs. L.L.C. v. Russo</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2103 (2020).....	2, 3, 4
<i>Marks v. United States</i> , 430 U.S. 188 (1977).....	3, 4
<i>New Jersey v. T.L.O.</i> , 469 U.S. 325 (1985).....	3
<i>Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey</i> , 505 U.S. 833 (1992).....	2, 3
<i>Roe v. Wade</i> , 410 U.S. 113 (1973).....	1
<i>Whole Woman’s Health v. Hellerstedt</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2292 (2016).....	2, 4

**Statutes**

Ark. Code Ann. § 12-18-108..... 1

**Other Authorities**

Ams. United for Life, DEFENDING LIFE 2020 (2020 ed.) ..... 1

## STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF *AMICUS CURIAE*<sup>1</sup>

Americans United for Life (AUL) is the nation's oldest and most active pro-life non-profit advocacy organization. Founded in 1971, before the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), AUL has dedicated nearly 50 years to advocating for comprehensive legal protections for human life from conception to natural death. AUL attorneys are highly-regarded experts on the Constitution and pro-life policy, and regularly evaluate various bills and amendments across the country. AUL has created comprehensive model legislation and works extensively with state legislators to enact constitutional pro-life laws, including model bills aimed at protecting the health and safety of women and girls who choose abortion. *See* Ams. United for Life, *DEFENDING LIFE 2020* (2020 ed.) (state policy guide providing model bills that protect women's health). Several of the Arkansas provisions at issue in this case are similar to AUL model legislation. *Cf.* Ark. Code Ann. § 12-18-108 *with* Child Protection Act, section 8, *in* *DEFENDING LIFE 2020*, at 325.

---

<sup>1</sup> No party's counsel authored any part of this brief. No person other than *Amicus* and its counsel contributed any money intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief. Counsel for all parties received timely notice. Defendants-Appellants have consented to the filing of this brief. Plaintiff-Appellee has not responded.

## ARGUMENT

### **Rehearing and En Banc Review Are Not Warranted Because the Eighth Circuit Panel Correctly Applied the *Casey* Standard in Vacating and Remanding the District Court’s Decision.**

At issue before the Court is whether the Eighth Circuit correctly vacated and remanded the lower court’s decision on the ground that it wrongly applied the cost-benefit test set out in *Whole Woman’s Health v. Hellerstedt*, 136 S. Ct. 2292 (2016), rather than the undue burden test reestablished in *June Medical Services L.L.C. v. Russo*, 140 S. Ct. 2103, 2113 (2020) (Roberts, C.J., concurring in the judgment). Because Chief Justice Robert’s concurring opinion in *June Medical* is controlling, the Eighth Circuit’s holding is correct.

Under *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey*, a regulation that has “the purpose or effect of placing a substantial obstacle in the path of a woman seeking an abortion of a nonviable fetus” is an “undue burden” and therefore an unconstitutional infringement on a woman’s fundamental right of privacy. 505 U.S. 833, 877 (1992). In *Hellerstedt*, the Court suggested that the *Casey* standard includes a cost-benefit analysis, which would require that “courts consider the burdens a law imposes on abortion access together with the benefits those laws confer.” *Hellerstedt*, 136 S. Ct. at 2309. But as the Eighth Circuit rightly held, *June Medical* reestablished the undue burden standard of *Casey* as the proper standard for

assessing the constitutionality of an abortion restriction. *Hopkins v. Jegley*, 968 F.3d 912, 915 (8th Cir. 2020) (per curiam) (citing *Casey*, 505 U.S. at 877).

In his concurrence in *June Medical*, Chief Justice Roberts provided the necessary fifth vote to affirm the Court’s judgment and hold Louisiana Act 620 unconstitutional. *June Med. Servs.*, 140 S. Ct. at 2134 (Roberts, C.J., concurring in the judgment). Chief Justice Roberts agreed with the plurality’s holding that Act 620 imposed a substantial obstacle to abortion, relying on the virtually identical language of Act 620 and the statute struck down in *Hellerstedt*, as well as the principle of *stare decisis*. *Id.* However, Chief Justice Roberts expressly *rejected* the plurality’s reliance on a cost-benefit analysis. *Id.* at 2135–2139. According to the Chief Justice, a cost-benefit analysis requires Justices to act as legislators with an “‘unanalyzed exercise of judicial will’ in the guise of a ‘neutral utilitarian calculus.’” *Id.* at 2136 (citing *New Jersey v. T.L.O.*, 469 U.S. 325, 369 (1985) (Brennan, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part)). In this regard, Chief Justice Roberts reaffirmed that a proper application of the *Casey* standard “look[s] to whether there was a substantial burden, not whether benefits outweighed burdens.” *Id.* at 2137.

Chief Justice Robert’s opinion in *June Medical* controls here. In *Marks v. United States*, 430 U.S. 188 (1977), the Supreme Court held that “[w]hen a fragmented Court decides a case and no single rationale explaining the result enjoys the assent of five Justices, ‘the holding of the Court may be viewed as that position



taken by those Members who concurred in the judgments on the narrowest grounds.” *Marks*, 430 U.S. at 193 (citing *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153, 169 n.15 (1976) (opinion of Stewart, Powell, and Stevens, JJ.)). Citing *Marks*, the Eighth Circuit correctly stated that “Chief Justice Robert’s vote was necessary in holding unconstitutional Louisiana’s admitting-privileges law, so his separate opinion is controlling.” *Hopkins*, 968 F.3d at 915.

Yet the district court, “without the benefit of Chief Justice Roberts’s separate opinion . . . applied the [*Hellerstedt*] cost-benefit standard to the challenged [Arkansas] laws.” *Id.* The district court also improperly relied on *Hellerstedt*’s “holding that the ‘statement that legislatures, and not courts, must resolve questions of medical uncertainty is . . . inconsistent with this Court’s case law.”” *See id.* (quoting *Hopkins v. Jegley*, 267 F. Supp. 3d 1024, 1058 (E.D. Ark. 2017), *amended*, No. 4:17-CV-00404-KGB, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 229062 (E.D. Ark. Aug. 2, 2017)) (quoting *Hellerstedt*, 136 S. Ct. at 2310). In *June Medical*, Chief Justice Roberts “emphasized the ‘wide discretion’ that courts must afford to legislatures in areas of medical uncertainty.” *Id.* (quoting *June Med. Servs.*, 140 S. Ct. 21 at 2136 (Roberts, C.J., concurring in the judgment)) (quoting *Gonzales v. Carhart*, 550 U.S. 124, 163 (2007)).

Therefore, because the proper test here is the undue burden test reestablished in *June Medical*, not the cost-benefit test utilized in *Hellerstedt*, the Eighth Circuit's decision to vacate and remand the lower court's decision was proper.

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, *Amici* respectfully urge the court to deny Plaintiffs-Appellees' Petition for Rehearing and for Rehearing En Banc.

Respectfully submitted,

STEVEN H. ADEN  
*Counsel of Record*  
CATHERINE GLENN FOSTER  
KATIE GLENN  
NATALIE M. HEJLAN  
AMERICANS UNITED FOR LIFE  
1150 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Suite 500  
Washington, DC 22036  
Steven.Aden@aul.org  
Telephone: 202-741-4917

TIMOTHY BELZ  
CLAYTON PLAZA LAW GROUP, LC  
112 South Hanley Rd.  
Suite 200  
St. Louis, MO 63105  
tbelz@olblaw.com  
314-726-2800 Ext. 214

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

October 14, 2020.

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

### Certificate of Compliance with Type-Volume Limit, Typeface Requirements, and Type-Style Requirements

1. I hereby certify, pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(g), that this brief complies with the type-volume limit of Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(5) because it contains 970 words, excluding the parts exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f).
2. I also certify that this brief complies with the typeface requirement of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because it has been prepared in a proportionally-spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2016 in 14-point Times New Roman.

I further certify that this PDF file was scanned for viruses, and no viruses were found on the file.

/s/ Steven H. Aden

STEVEN H. ADEN

*Counsel of Record*

AMERICANS UNITED FOR LIFE

1150 Connecticut Ave., N.W.

Suite 500

Washington, DC 22036

Steven.Aden@aul.org

(202) 741-4917

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*

October 14, 2020

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on October 14, 2020, I electronically filed the foregoing brief with the Clerk of Court throughout the CM/ECF system, which shall send notification of such filing to any CM/ECF participants.

/s/ Steven H. Aden

STEVEN H. ADEN

*Counsel of Record*

AMERICANS UNITED FOR LIFE

1150 Connecticut Ave., N.W.

Suite 500

Washington, DC 22036

Steven.Aden@aul.org

(202) 741-4917

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae*