### [ORAL ARGUMENT HEARD JANUARY 11, 2010]

No. 09-5099

# IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

PRIME TIME INTERNATIONAL COMPANY,
FORMERLY KNOWN AS SINGLE STICK, INC.,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

THOMAS J. VILSACK, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, Defendants-Appellees.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

APPELLEES' PETITION FOR PANEL REHEARING

TONY WEST Assistant Attorney General

RONALD C. MACHEN, JR. United States Attorney

MARK B. STERN
(202) 514-5089
SYDNEY FOSTER
(202) 616-5374
Attorneys, Appellate Staff
Civil Division, Room 7258
Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

For the following reasons, the Government respectfully requests that the panel amend its opinion to clarify that the Court did not decide whether the Information Quality Act ("IQA") creates judicially enforceable rights.

1. Among other claims, plaintiff asserted claims under the Information Quality Act, 44 U.S.C. § 3516 note. See Panel Op. 2 (attached as Exhibit A). The Government opposed these claims on two alternative grounds. The first, and narrower, ground was that the IQA does not apply to information distributed in the context of adjudicative processes. See Gov. Br. 26-28. The second ground — accepted by the district court — was that even when information has been "disseminated" and is thus covered by the statute, the IQA does not create any judicially enforceable rights. *Id.* at 29-33. Relying in part on the Fourth Circuit's decision in Salt Institute v. Leavitt, 440 F.3d 156 (4th Cir. 2006), the Government explained that the IQA simply "orders the Office of Management and Budget to draft guidelines concerning information quality and specifies what those guidelines should contain." Gov. Br. 29 (quoting *Salt*, 440 F.3d at 159).

2. This Court accepted the Government's first argument and held that the information at issue here is not covered by the IQA. See Panel. Op. 12-16. Accordingly, this Court did not reach the broader ground accepted by the district court and by the Fourth Circuit in Salt. That broader issue is presented in a case now pending before the Ninth Circuit. See Americans for Safe Access v. HHS, No. C 07-01049, 2007 WL 4168511, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2007) ("This order agrees that the IQA and OMB guidelines do not create a duty to perform legally required actions that are judicially reviewable."), appeal pending, No. 07-17388 (9th Cir.).

3. Although this Court's opinion did not address the Government's broader argument or the *Salt* decision, the Center for Regulatory Effectiveness ("CRE") has urged that this Court implicitly rejected the Government's position on its second argument. The CRE website declares: "D.C. Circuit Beats 9th Circuit to the Punch: The Data (Information) Quality Act is Subject to Judicial Review" and argues that this holding is implicit in this Court's decision. The CRE article is attached as Exhibit B to this petition and is available at

http://www.thecre.com/.

4. In our view, it is clear that this Court did not reach the broader issue of IQA enforcement or create an implicit conflict with *Salt*.

Nonetheless, in an abundance of caution, we respectfully request that the Court amend its opinion to clarify that it did not reach the question whether the IQA creates judicially enforceable rights.

Respectfully submitted.

TONY WEST Assistant Attorney General

RONALD C. MACHEN, JR. United States Attorney

MARK B. STERN
(202) 514-5089
SYDNEY FOSTER s/Sydney Foster
(202) 616-5374
Attorneys, Appellate Staff
Civil Division, Room 7258
Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

APRIL 2010

EXHIBIT B



1601 Connecticut Avenue. N.W. Suite 500 Washington, DC 20009 (202) 265-2383

ABOUT CRE

ADVISORY BOARD

NPR & IPD

SPARCH

LINKS

ADVOCACY

COMMENTS

#### Featured Items on TheCRE.com

#### The Nixon Forum

#### National Archives Interview: Centralized Regulatory Review

REGweek : **CRE's Regulatory Action**  **Reg History** 



of the Week

#### D.C. Circuit Beats 9th Circuit to the Punch: The Data (Information) Quality Act is Subject to **Judicial Review**

In an opinion issued March 26, 2010, in Prime Time Int'l Co. v. Vilsack, the D.C. Circuit stated that the OMB guidelines issued under the IQA are "binding." The court stated: "[B]ecause Congress delegated to OMB authority to develop binding guidelines implementing the IQA, we defer to OMB's construction of the statute. See United States v. Mead, 533 U.S., 218, 226-27 (2001)." At 14. The opinion is not yet published, and a pdf copy is attached below.

The citation of *Mead* at those particular pages is significant. The only statement by the Supreme Court in Mead that overlaps those two pages is the following: "We hold that administrative implementation of a particular statutory provision qualifies for Chevron deference when it appears that Congress delegated authority to the agency generally to make rules carrying the force of law, and that the agency interpretation claiming deference was promulgated in the exercise of that authority." (Emphasis added)

Therefore if you connect the dots, the fact that the Court opined that OMB:s regulations are legally binding with the Court's link of this finding to Mead, you readily conclude that the DQA (IQA) is judicially reviewable.

Prime Time had filed an IQA petition with USDA, but USDA failed to respond, and Prime Time filed an APA claim for judicial review. The District Court dismissed the claim on the basis that the IQA did not create any legal right to a correction, relying on the 2006 opinion by the 4th Circuit in the Salt Institute



Interactive Public Docket: Ocean Zoning



### FACA **Under Fire**



Interactive Public Docket: Marine Mammals

Drawa Quanto **P**ERMINER ر کیالیالیان (شر از ال

DotaQualityAct.US

Cyber Secure

#### Issue Sections

### REGweek®

Data Access

Data Quality

Regulation by Litigation

Regulation by Information

Regulation by Appropriation

Special Projects

CRE Watch List

Emerging Regulatory Issues

Litigation

OMB Papers

Abstracts and Reviews of New Papers

Guest Column

#### Services

Regulatory Advocacy

Voluntary Standards Program

CRE Report Card

Public Docket Preparation

Interactive Public Docket

Electronic Regulatory Forum

Consumer Response Service

Page: 26 Page 2 of 4



#### NTERACTIVE Public Docket

Visit the IPD to participate in TheCRE.com's ongoing interactive discussion forums. Click here to post your views and read the opinions of other users.

#### SUPPORT CRE

LET THE CRE PREPARE A REPORT CARD ON YOUR REGULATION!

#### Newsletter

Enter your email address and click "Sign-Up" to join CRE's electronic newsletter.

sign-up

#### Consumer Response Service

CRE's innovative new service provides consumers with a constructive method of provoking positive change in corporate practices.

Go to CRS

LET THE CRE PREPARE A PUBLIC DOCKET ON YOUR ISSUE

case and the District Court opinion in Americans for Safe Access v. HHS ("ASA"). The ASA case is currently on appeal in the 9th Circuit, with oral argument having taken place a year ago.

In Prime Time, the D.C. Circuit ignored the District Court opinion's reasoning and embraced a new Government argument that the substantive USDA action at issue was an "adjudication," and therefore specifically exempt from the IQA under the OMB guidelines.

The issue of whether the IQA guidelines and the IQA itself create legal rights that make agency actions subject to judicial review is at issue in the ASA case.

The D.C. Circuit's opinion is definitive and puts to rest the 4th Circuit's unexplained IQA decision in the Salt Institute case and will presumably have to be taken into account by the 9th Circuit.

It should be noted that the DC Circuit Court decision will not result in an avalanche of litigation for a number of reasons. The plaintiff must demonstrate standing which includes a demonstration of injury and redressability...

With respect to standing, claiming the contents of one report, when there might be many others in existence which address the same topics, is a cause of injury will constitute a challenge. With respect to redressability the plaintiff will have to identify an action the court can take to address its injury resulting from a report subsequent to its publicationboth of these tasks presents a significant challenge.

However, given that Tozzi v HHS expands the potential plaintiff base to include harm caused indirectly by third-parties, the potential for a wide range of injury claims will be considered by the courts. Nonetheless the standing arguments presented above will place a damper on legal actions unless the underlying DQA petitions comply with the letter of the law.

CRE believes that the Federal agencies have done an exemplary job in publishing their DQA guidelines and responding to the resultant requests for corrections. The Prime Time decision is definitive-in those few instances when federal agencies do not give an objective consideration to a well reasoned request for correction, the courts will.

Click here to read court opinion

#### Information Collection Request of the Week

• The Forest Service Seeks Customer Feedback On **PA's Grey Tower** 

The Department of Agriculture is seeking information

The OMB.US

Vater Deg

CyberActivist.US

Regulations.Gov

**Federal Agency** Websites

Regulatory Alerts

> Regulatory Think Tanks

Regulations Under Development by Agency

Website

aht Truck 0.00005

Tite Called Tolling

## United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 09-5099

September Term 2009

1:06-cv-01077

**Filed On:** May 10, 2010

Prime Time International Company, formerly known as Single Stick, Inc.,

**Appellant** 

٧.

Thomas J. Vilsack, Secretary of Agriculture and United States Department of Agriculture,

**Appellees** 

**BEFORE:** Rogers and Griffith, Circuit Judges, and Edwards, Senior Circuit

Judge

#### ORDER

Upon consideration of appellees' petition for rehearing filed April 30, 2010, it is **ORDERED** that the petition be denied.

#### **Per Curiam**

FOR THE COURT:

Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/

Laura Chipley Deputy Clerk