

## **Status of the Lawsuits Challenging the Affordable Care Act's Birth Control Coverage Benefit**

Over 100 lawsuits<sup>1</sup> have been filed in federal court challenging the Affordable Care Act's birth control coverage benefit. The benefit requires new health plans to include coverage for the full range of FDA-approved methods of birth control, sterilization, and related education and counseling at no cost-sharing.

Both for-profit companies and non-profit organizations have challenged the birth control coverage requirement.

### **Status of For-Profit Cases:**

For-profit companies ranging from a mining company to the Hobby Lobby crafts store chain to an HVAC company have objected to including coverage of birth control in their health insurance plans.

- 50 cases have been filed by for-profit companies (including 4 cases that include both for- and non-profit plaintiffs). Two cases were dismissed, one of which was then re-filed in another court. Following the Supreme Court's decision in *Hobby Lobby*, the government has been permanently enjoined enforcement of the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiffs in 32 cases.
- On June 30, 2014, the Supreme Court in a 5-4 decision held that the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) allows some for-profit corporations to get out of complying with the birth control coverage requirement if they have religious beliefs against providing it.

The Court held:

- Closely-held corporations owned by families like Hobby Lobby and Conestoga Wood Specialties can bring claims under RFRA;
- The contraceptive coverage benefit imposes a substantial burden on the religious exercise of Hobby Lobby and Conestoga Wood; and
- Requiring birth control coverage through the employer's health insurance plan is not the least restrictive means of furthering the government's compelling interests—which the majority assumed the government had—and the government could otherwise ensure women receive coverage and will not be harmed.

---

<sup>1</sup> This number counts each case as a unique case, even if the same parties filed an earlier challenge that was dismissed or voluntarily withdrawn. Four cases have been filed by that include both for- and non-profit employers. These cases are counted as both for-profit and non-profit cases. For ease of reference, we have listed these cases in a separate chart starting on page 19.

- After issuing its decision in *Hobby Lobby*, the Supreme Court vacated the rulings in three cases where plaintiffs had asked for Supreme Court review, sending the cases back to the lower courts for further consideration in light of *Hobby Lobby*. *Eden Foods* and *Autocam* returned to the 6th Circuit. *Gilardi* returned to the D.C. Circuit.
- On August 22, 2014, in response to the Supreme Court's decision, the Administration issued a rule proposing to expand the "accommodation" in place for non-profit organizations with religious objections to contraceptive coverage to closely-held for-profit companies. The proposed rule aims to ensure that women receive contraceptive coverage with no cost-sharing as guaranteed by the ACA while being consistent with the Supreme Court's decision in *Hobby Lobby*.

### **Status of Non-Profit Cases:**

Non-profit organizations are objecting to the "accommodation" under the birth control coverage requirement, which allows objecting non-profits to refuse coverage in their health insurance plans but ensures women receive the coverage directly from the insurance company.

- 40 non-profit cases are pending (including 4 cases that include both for- and non-profit plaintiffs), of a total of 65 cases that have been filed by non-profit organizations. Several cases were initially dismissed on procedural grounds; some of these cases were then re-filed after the accommodation rule was finalized. The accommodation rule allows a non-profit that holds itself out as religious and has religious objections to birth control to refuse to provide health insurance coverage of it, while ensuring that the non-profit's employees receive the coverage without cost-sharing directly from the insurance company.
- Three circuit courts of appeals have rejected the RFRA claims of the non-profits, finding that the "accommodation" did not impose a substantial burden on their religious exercise: the 6th Circuit in *Michigan Catholic Conference/Diocese of Nashville*, 7th Circuit in *University of Notre Dame*, and the DC Circuit in *Priests for Life/Archbishop of Washington*.
- Three circuit courts of appeals have issued temporary relief: the 3d Circuit in *Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia* granted a temporary injunction pending further order of the court; the 11th Circuit in *Eternal Word Television Network* granted an injunction pending appeal; and the 10th Circuit in *Diocese of Cheyenne* granted an injunction pending appeal (on the condition that plaintiffs file notice with HHS that they are organizations that hold themselves out as religious and have religious objections to contraceptive coverage).

- On January 24, 2014, the Supreme Court issued an emergency injunction pending appeal in *Little Sisters* on the condition that the petitioners in that case file notice with HHS that they are organizations that hold themselves out as religious and have religious objections to contraceptive coverage. On July 3, a majority of the Court issued a similar order in *Wheaton College*. Justice Sotomayor wrote a lengthy dissent, joined by Justices Ginsburg and Kagan. In both cases, the order emphasized that it should not be construed as the Court's views on the merits of the non-profits' claims.
- On August 22, 2014, in response to the Supreme Court's order in *Wheaton College*, the Administration issued an interim final rule modifying the accommodation for non-profit organizations with religious objections to contraceptive coverage. The rule provides an alternative process by which an organization may provide notice of its religious objections to contraceptive coverage, while still preserving women's access to such coverage with no cost-sharing. Under the rule, non-profit organizations may notify the Department of Health and Human Services instead of their insurance company or third party administrator (TPA).

***Status of Other Cases:***

There have been several other challenges filed involving the contraceptive coverage provision. One case, which is still pending, was brought by an individual who objects to having health insurance that includes coverage for birth control. Another case, which was voluntarily dismissed, was brought by a non-profit seeking confirmation from the court that it is eligible for the accommodation. One other case, brought by eight states, was also voluntarily dismissed. (See chart on page 36.)

The attached charts detail these cases. The first chart contains the for-profit cases; the second contains challenges that include both for- and non-profits; the third contains the non-profit cases; and the fourth contains other related cases. Each chart is organized by the region of the country in which the case was filed, according to the boundaries of the courts of appeals. The cases that have been heard by the Supreme Court are highlighted in yellow. Closed cases are highlighted in grey. The chart can also be found online at <http://www.nwlc.org/overview-lawsuits-challenging-affordable-care-act's-no-cost-sharing-contraceptive-coverage-benefit>.

For more information about the health care law's birth control coverage benefit and the legal claims at issue in the cases, please visit: <http://www.nwlc.org/preventive-services-including-contraceptive-coverage-under-health-care-law>.

<b>For-Profit Cases</b> (last updated January 30, 2015)			
	<b>Case</b>	<b>Description and Location of For-Profit Company</b>	<b>Status</b>
1	<p><b>Tyndale House v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 10/2/2012</p> <p>12-cv-1635 (D.D.C.)</p> <p>13-5018 (D.C. Cir.)</p>	<p>Tyndale is an Illinois for-profit publishing company focusing on Christian books.</p>	<p>District court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the D.C. Circuit and then moved to voluntarily dismiss the appeal, which the D.C. Circuit granted.</p> <p>The plaintiffs and the government are both seeking summary judgment.</p> <p>In December 2013, the plaintiffs filed an amended complaint, adding the owners of Tyndale House Publishers as co-plaintiffs.</p>
2	<p><b>Gilardi v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 1/24/2013</p> <p>13-cv-104 (D.D.C.)</p> <p>13-5069 (D.C. Cir.)</p> <p>13-915 (SCOTUS)</p>	<p>Freshway Foods is a fresh produce processor and packer.</p> <p>Freshway Logistics is a for-hire carrier of mainly refrigerated products. The companies are Ohio-based for-profits that serve 23 states.</p>	<p>District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the D.C. Circuit.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the D.C. Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 14 other national, regional, state and local organizations.</i></p> <p>A divided D.C. Circuit reversed the district court's denial of a preliminary injunction, finding that while for-profit corporations cannot exercise religion under RFRA or the First Amendment, the individual owners here successfully asserted a claim against the contraceptive coverage requirement. It returned the case to the district court to reconsider whether to grant a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>Despite a victory in the D.C. Circuit, the for-profit companies asked the Supreme Court to review the part of the D.C. Circuit's decision that held that a for-profit corporation is not a "person" capable of religious exercise.</p> <p>The Supreme Court granted the petitioners' cert petition, vacated the D.C. Circuit's ruling, and remanded the case to that court for further consideration in light of <i>Hobby Lobby</i>.</p> <p>The D.C. Circuit remanded the case to the district court with instructions to enter a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>The district court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing</p>

			contraceptive coverage provision against the plaintiff Freshway Companies.
3	<b>Johnson Welded Products v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 4/30/2013  13-cv-609 (D.D.C.)	Johnson Welded Products is an Ohio-based manufacturer of reservoirs for air brake systems.	District court granted an unopposed motion for temporary injunctive relief and stayed the case.  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against the plaintiffs.
4	<b>Willis &amp; Willis PLC v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 7/24/2013  13-cv-1124 (D.D.C.)	Willis & Willis PLC is a Michigan-based law firm.	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against the plaintiff Willis Law.
5	<b>Trijicon, Inc. v. Sebelius</b> (also known as Bindon v. Sebelius)  Filed 8/5/2013  13-cv-1207 (D.D.C.)	Trijicon, Inc. is a Michigan-based maker of aiming systems for firearms.	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case. Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the parties submitted a joint status report on October 8, 2014. In the report both parties agreed to a judgment in favor of the plaintiffs and a permanent injunction. However, the parties disagree about the language and scope of the injunction. Parties submitted briefs on the issue.
6	<b>Barron Industries v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 9/4/2013  13-cv-1330 (D.D.C.)	Barron Industries, Inc. is a Michigan-based company that produces metal castings for various industries.	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case. Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against Barron Industries Inc.
7	<b>Midwest Fastener Corp. v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 9/5/2013  13-cv-01337 (D.D.C.)	Midwest Fastener Corp. is a Michigan-based company that supplies fasteners to the hardware store, home center, and industrial markets.	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case. Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against the plaintiffs.
8	<b>Williams v. Sebelius</b>	The Williams own Electrolock Inc., an Ohio-	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.

	<p>Filed 10/30/2013</p> <p>13-cv-01699 (D.D.C.)</p>	<p>based corporation that works in the electrical and thermal insulation industry. Other plaintiff companies include Stone River Management Co. and Dunstone Co.</p>	<p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiffs Electrolock Inc., Stone River Mgmt Co., and Dunstone Co.</p>
9	<p><b>C.W. Zumbiel, Co. v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 10/22/2013</p> <p>13-cv-01611 (D.D.C.)</p>	<p>Zumbiel Packaging is a Kentucky-based manufacturer of paperboard packaging for consumer goods.</p>	<p>District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the parties submitted a joint motion for judgment, and the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiff Zumbiel Co.</p>
10	<p><b>Stewart et al. v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 11/27/2013</p> <p>13-cv-01879 (D.D.C.)</p>	<p>Encompass Develop, Design &amp; Construct, LLC is a Kentucky-based architect, design and construction service of which John Stewart is the managing and sole member.</p>	<p>District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against the plaintiffs.</p>
11	<p><b>Conestoga Wood Specialties Corporation v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 12/4/2012</p> <p>12-cv-6744 (E.D. Pa.)</p> <p>13-1144 (3d. Cir.)</p> <p>13-356 (SCOTUS)</p>	<p>Conestoga Wood Specialties Corporation is a Pennsylvania-based wood cabinet and specialty products manufacturer.</p>	<p>District court dismissed a motion for a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit, which affirmed the district court's denial of a preliminary injunction. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit denied plaintiffs' request for <i>en banc</i> review.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 15 other national, regional, state and local organizations.</i></p> <p>Plaintiffs filed a cert petition with the Supreme Court. On November 26, 2013, the Supreme Court granted the cert petitions in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga Wood Specialties</i> and consolidated the cases.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed at the Supreme Court on behalf of NWLC and 68 other organizations.</i></p> <p>On June 30, 2014, the Supreme Court held that closely-held corporations like Conestoga Wood Specialties can refuse to include in their employee insurance plans coverage for birth control to which they have religious objections. The Court reversed</p>

			<p>the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit's decision and remanded the case to that court for further proceedings in light of the Supreme Court's decision.</p> <p>The 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit remanded the case to the district court which permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against the plaintiffs.</p>
12	<p><b>Holland et al v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 6/24/2013</p> <p>13-cv-15487 (S.D. W. Va.)</p>	<p>Holland Chevrolet is a West Virginia-based corporation engaged in selling and servicing motor vehicles.</p>	<p>Following the Supreme Court's <i>Hobby Lobby</i> decision, the district court entered a consent order granting plaintiff a preliminary injunction. The parties submitted a joint motion for a permanent injunction and final judgment.</p>
13	<p><b>Autocam Corporation et al. v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 10/8/2012</p> <p>12-cv-1096 (W.D. Mich.)</p> <p>12-2673, 13-2316 (6th Cir.)</p>	<p>Autocam Automotive makes parts for transportation while Autocam Medical makes medical equipment. These are West-Michigan-based manufacturing companies that operate across the United States.</p>	<p>District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 22 other national, regional, and state organizations.</i></p> <p>A three judge panel in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit issued a unanimous decision holding that Autocam is not a "person" under RFRA and therefore does not have standing to bring a RFRA challenge to the contraceptive coverage rule.</p> <p>The plaintiffs filed a cert petition with the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court granted petitioners' cert petition, vacated the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit's ruling, and remanded the case to that court for further consideration in light of <i>Hobby Lobby</i>.</p> <p>Motion filed September 12, 2014 to dismiss Autocam Corp. as party to the appeal. (Plaintiff John Kennedy sold Autocam Corp. in Summer 2014, but he is continuing the case as owner of Autocam Medical.)</p> <p>The Circuit Court remanded to the district court for entry of a permanent injunction. The district court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiff Autocam Medical, LLC.</p>
14	<p><b>Domino's Farms Corporation v. Sebelius</b></p>	<p>Domino's Farms is a Michigan-based property management company.</p>	<p>District court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit. In light of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit's <i>Autocam</i> decision, the government filed a</p>

	<p>Filed 12/14/2012</p> <p>12-cv-15488 (E.D. Mich.)</p> <p>13-1654 (6th Cir.)</p>		<p>motion with the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit to reverse the district court's grant of a preliminary injunction.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 17 other national, regional, state, and local organizations.</i></p> <p>The district court denied plaintiffs' motion in the district court to reopen the case and lift the stay for the limited purpose of adding several non-profit organizations.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the government filed a motion to dismiss appeal and the appeal was dismissed. The district court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiff Domino's Farms Corporation.</p>
15	<p><b>Infrastructure Alternatives Inc. v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 1/10/2013</p> <p>13-cv-00031 (W.D. Mich.)</p>	<p>Infrastructure Alternatives is a Michigan corporation. It is a contractor in the fields of environmental dredging, contaminated sediment remediation, geotextile tube installation, and water treatment operations.</p>	<p>In light of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit's decision in <i>Autocam</i>, the district court ordered the parties to show why it should not apply the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit's reasoning in <i>Autocam</i> and dismiss the claims of the individual and corporate plaintiffs. Plaintiffs stated that they do not agree with the <i>Autocam</i> decision but recognize the district court is bound to follow it and so do not object to the court's dismissal of their RFRA and First Amendment claims. The court then dismissed plaintiffs' claims. Case is closed.</p>
16	<p><b>Mersino Management Company v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 3/22/2013</p> <p>13-cv-11296 (E.D. Mich.)</p> <p>13-1944 (6th Cir.)</p>	<p>Mersino Management Co. is a Michigan-based management company and provides insurance for Mersino Enterprises, Mersino Dewatering, Global Pump Co., and Mersino South-West.</p>	<p>District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the Circuit Court reversed the district court's denial of a preliminary injunction and remanded the case to the district court.</p>
17	<p><b>Eden Foods Inc. v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 3/20/2013</p> <p>13-cv-11229 (E.D. Mich.)</p>	<p>Eden Foods is a Michigan-based corporation that specializes in supplying macrobiotic, organic food.</p>	<p>District court denied plaintiffs' a preliminary injunction and plaintiffs appealed to the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit. In light of the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit's decision in <i>Autocam</i>, the government filed a motion with the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit to summarily affirm the district court's denial of a preliminary injunction, which the court denied. The court then asked the parties to submit briefs</p>



	13-1677 (6th Cir.) 13-591 (SCOTUS)		<p>addressing the precedential impact of <i>Autocam</i>.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 19 other national, regional, state, and local organizations.</i></p> <p>On October 24, 2013, a three judge panel in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit issued a unanimous decision holding that Eden Foods is not a “person” under RFRA and therefore does not have standing to bring a RFRA challenge to the contraceptive coverage rule. The plaintiffs filed a cert petition with the Supreme Court, asking the Court to review the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit’s decision.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court’s decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the Supreme Court granted petitioners’ motion, vacated the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit’s ruling, and remanded the case to that court for further consideration. The Circuit Court remanded to the district court and ordered that court to issue a permanent injunction.</p>
18	<p><b>MK Chambers Company v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 3/28/2013</p> <p>13-cv-11379 (E.D. Mich.)</p>	MK Chambers Company is a Michigan-based supplier of specialty machining.	<p>District court heard oral argument on July 24, 2013 and subsequently denied plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court’s decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against M.K. Chambers Co.</p>
19	<p><b>M&amp;N Plastics v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 5/31/2013, 13-cv-00819 (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Transferred 11/18/2013 13-cv-14754 (E.D. Mich.)</p>	M&N Plastics is a Michigan-based supplier of custom injection molding products.	<p>D.C. district court granted the government’s motion to transfer the case back to Michigan, where the plaintiffs originally filed a case (<i>M&amp;N Plastics v. Sebelius</i>, below).</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court’s decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against M&amp;N Plastics.</p>
20	<p><b>M&amp;N Plastics v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 5/8/2013</p> <p>13-cv-12036 (E.D.</p>	Christopher Nagle is an owner and CFO of M&N Plastics, a Michigan-based supplier of custom injection molding products.	District court granted plaintiffs’ request to dismiss the case without prejudice. Case is closed. The Nagles then filed a second case, <i>M&amp;N Plastics v. Sebelius</i> (above) in the district court for D.C.

	Mich.)		
21	<p><b>Mersino Dewatering, Inc. v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 9/3/2013 13-cv-01329 (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Transferred 11/26/2013 13-cv-15079 (E.D. Mich.)</p>	<p>Mersino Dewatering, Inc. is a Michigan-based company that provides dewatering (water removal) services. It has branches in Michigan, Florida, North Carolina, Nebraska, and Pennsylvania</p>	<p>D.C. district court granted the government's motion to transfer the case to Michigan district court. The Michigan district court granted the parties' joint motion to stay the case.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the parties filed a joint motion to re-open the case and jointly proposed language for a permanent injunction.</p>
22	<p><b>Korte &amp; Luitjohan Contractors v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 10/9/2012</p> <p>12-cv-1072 (S.D. Ill.)</p> <p>12-3841 (7th Cir.)</p> <p>13-937 (SCOTUS)</p>	<p>Korte &amp; Luitjohan Contractors, Inc., is an Illinois-based full-service construction contractor.</p>	<p>District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit. <i>Amicus brief filed in the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 13 other national organizations.</i></p> <p>In the consolidated cases of <i>Korte</i> and <i>Grote</i>, a divided 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit reversed the lower court's denial of injunctive relief and returned the case to the district court with instructions to grant a preliminary injunction, which the district court did. The government filed a cert petition with the Supreme Court, which the Court denied after its decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against the plaintiff Korte &amp; Luitjohan Contractors, Inc.</p>
23	<p><b>Triune Health Group v. Sebelius</b> (also known as <i>Yep v. Sebelius</i>)</p> <p>Filed 8/22/2012</p> <p>12-cv-6756 (N.D. Ill.)</p> <p>13-1478 (7th Cir.)</p>	<p>Triune is a Illinois corporation that specializes in facilitating the re-entry of injured workers into the workforce.</p>	<p>District court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the government voluntarily dismissed the appeal.</p> <p>Because of the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and HHS's proposed rulemaking for expanding the accommodation to certain closely-held corporations (issued Aug. 27, 2014), the district court stated it will issue a permanent injunction and final judgment in the case. The government submitted a status report with proposed language for the permanent injunction. The court declined the</p>

			government's proposed language.
24	<p><b>Grote Industries v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 10/29/2012</p> <p>12-cv-00134 (S.D. Ind.)</p> <p>13-1077 (7th Cir.)</p> <p>13-937 (SCOTUS)</p>	Grote Industries is an Indiana-based, privately held business manufacturing vehicle safety systems.	<p>District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 13 other national organizations.</i></p> <p>In the consolidated cases of <i>Korte</i> and <i>Grote</i>, the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit reversed the lower court's denial of injunctive relief and returned the case to the district court with instructions to grant a preliminary injunction, which the district court did.</p> <p>The government filed a cert petition with the Supreme Court, asking the Court to review the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit's decision which the Court denied after the decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the district court has reopened the case. The parties submitted a joint status report agreeing that a permanent injunction and judgment in favor of the plaintiffs should be filed. However, the parties disagree about the language and scope of the injunction.</p>
25	<p><b>Tonn and Blank Construction v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 9/20/2012</p> <p>12-cv-00325 (N.D. Ind.)</p>	Tonn and Black Construction, LLC, is an Indiana construction company.	<p>District court granted an unopposed preliminary injunction. Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the court continued the stay and preliminary injunction.</p> <p>The court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against the plaintiff Tonn and Blank Construction, LLC.</p>
26	<p><b>Lindsay, Rappaport and Postel LLC v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 2/14/2013</p> <p>13-cv-1210 (N.D. Ill.)</p>	LR&P is an Illinois-based law firm that primarily practices in insurance defense, insurance coverage, and appellate work.	<p>District court granted a preliminary injunction and stayed the case.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiff LR&amp;P.</p>
27	<p><b>Hartenbower v. Sebelius</b></p>	The Hartenbowers co-own Hart Electric LLC, an Illinois-based manufacturer of	District court granted an unopposed motion for a preliminary injunction and stayed the case pending rulings in the consolidated cases of <i>Korte</i> and <i>Grote</i> .

	Filed 3/26/2013 13-cv-02253 (N.D. Ill.)	electrical components, and H.I. Cable.	Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , The court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiffs Hart Companies.
28	<b>Ozinga v. Sebelius</b> Filed 5/1/2013 13-cv-03292 (N.D. Ill.)	The Ozingas are owners and senior managers of Ozinga Bros. Inc., an Illinois-based producer of ready-made concrete.	District court granted an unopposed motion for a preliminary injunction and stayed the case pending the 7 <sup>th</sup> Circuit's rulings in the consolidated cases of <i>Korte</i> and <i>Grote</i> .
29	<b>O'Brien v. Sebelius</b> Filed 3/15/2012 12-cv-00476 (E.D. Mo.) 12-3357 (8th Cir.)	O'Brien Industrial Holding is a Missouri company engaged in the exploration, mining, processing, manufacturing, and distribution of refractory and ceramic raw materials.	District court granted the government's motion to dismiss. The plaintiffs appealed to the 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit, which issued a stay pending the appeal.  <i>Amicus brief filed in the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC.</i>  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit reversed and remanded to the district court for further proceedings consistent with <i>Hobby Lobby</i> . The court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiff O'Brien Industrial Holdings, LLC.
30	<b>American Pulverizer Co. v. Sebelius</b> Filed 10/19/2012 12-cv-3459 (W.D. Mo.) 13-1395 (8th Cir.)	Springfield Iron and Metal, LLC, American Pulverizer Company, Hustler Conveyor Company, and City Welding are four Missouri-based companies involved in the business of wholesale scrap metal recycling and manufacturing of related machines.	District court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed the preliminary injunction to the 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit.  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the government voluntarily dismissed the appeal.  The district court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against the Springfield Iron Companies.
31	<b>Annex Medical Inc. v. Sebelius</b> Filed 11/2/2012 12-cv-02804 (D. Minn.) 13-1118 (8th Cir.)	Annex Medical and Sacred Heart Medical are companies that design, manufacture, and sell medical devices. They are owned by Stuart Lind. Tom Janas is an additional plaintiff who is an entrepreneur who has	District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit. The 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit granted an injunction pending appeal.  <i>Amicus brief filed in the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 18 other national, regional, state and local organizations.</i>  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby</i>

		owned several dairy businesses in the past and intends to purchase another in 2013. He currently operates Habile Holdings and Venture North Properties, companies that lease commercial properties but currently have no employees.	<i>Lobby</i> , the 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit vacated the district court's denial of a preliminary injunction to Annex and remanded the case back to that court. The 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit also dismissed Janas' appeal, finding that he lacked standing to appeal. The 8th Circuit granted plaintiffs' re-hearing request, and vacated its earlier decision to remand the case. In an opinion issued on October 6, 2014, the 8th Circuit again remanded the case to the district court (and again dismissed Janas's appeal), noting the complicated standing issue presented in the case.
32	<b>Sioux Chief MFG. Co., Inc. v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 1/14/2013  13-cv-0036 (W.D. Mo.)	Sioux Chief MFG. Co, Inc. is a Missouri Corporation that manufactures plumbing products.	District court granted a preliminary injunction. Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiff Sioux Chief Mfg. Co. Inc.
33	<b>Hall v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 2/5/2013  13-cv-00295 (D. Minn.)	Reverend Gregory Hall is a Catholic Deacon who owns American Mfg Company, a Minnesota-based company that manufactures and markets mining equipment, mud pumps, and parts for global distribution.	District court granted an unopposed motion for a preliminary injunction and stayed the case pending rulings in <i>O'Brien</i> and <i>Annex Medical</i> .
34	<b>Bick Holdings Inc. v. United States Department of Health &amp; Human Services et al.</b>  Filed 3/13/2013  13-cv-00462 (E.D. Mo.)	Bick Holdings Inc. is a Missouri-based holding company for operating companies Bick Group Inc., Bick Properties Inc., and SEALCO LLC. Through these subsidiaries BHI engages in data center consulting, design, maintenance, service, and cleaning.	District court granted an unopposed motion for a preliminary injunction.  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against the plaintiff Bick Companies.
35	<b>SMA LLC. v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 6/6/2013  13-cv-01375 (D. Minn.)	SMA LLC is a Minnesota based agricultural/industrial construction company.	District court granted an unopposed motion for a preliminary injunction. Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against SMA, LLC.

36	<b>Medford v. Sebelius</b> (also known as QC Group v. Sebelius)  Filed 7/2/2013  13-cv-1726 (D. Minn.)	The QC Group Inc is a Minnesota-based corporation, owned by Daniel Medford and David DeVowe, which provides quality control services.	District court granted an unopposed motion for a preliminary injunction and stayed the case until 30 days after a decision in <i>O'Brien</i> or <i>Annex Medical</i> .  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against The QC Group, Inc.
37	<b>Felt &amp; Co., Inc. v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 9/25/2013  13-cv-2635 (D. Minn.)	Felt & Co., Inc. is a Minnesota-based securities brokerage and investment banking company.	District court granted plaintiffs' unopposed motion for a preliminary injunction and stayed the case.  After the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the parties agreed that judgment should be entered in favor of plaintiff and submitted a joint proposed permanent injunction.
38	<b>Randy Reed Automotive v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 10/8/2013  13-cv-6117 (W.D. Mo.)	Randy Reed Automotive, Randy Reed Buick GMC, Randy Reed Nissan, and Randy Reed Chevrolet are Missouri-based car dealerships.	District court granted plaintiffs' unopposed motion for preliminary injunction.  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiffs Randy Reed Companies.
39	<b>Doboszinski &amp; Sons, Inc. v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 11/14/2013  13-cv-03148 (D. Minn.)	Doboszinski & Sons is a Minnesota-based company that provides services for excavation, demolition, and street construction and reconstruction.	District court granted plaintiffs' unopposed motion for preliminary injunction.  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiff Doboszinski & Sons Inc.
40	<b>Hastings Automotive v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 1/29/2014  14-cv-00265 (D. Minn.)	Hastings Automotive, Inc. (known as Hastings Ford) and Hastings Chrysler Center are Minnesota car dealerships.	District court denied unopposed motion for preliminary injunction because government agreed not to enforce birth control coverage benefit until 30 days following Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i> .  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiff Hastings Automotive, Inc.
41	<b>Stinson Electric v.</b>	Stinson Electric, Inc. is a	District court granted plaintiffs' unopposed motion

	<p><b>Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 3/26/2014</p> <p>14-cv-00830 (D. Minn.)</p>	<p>Minnesota electrical services company.</p>	<p>for a preliminary injunction and stayed the case pending the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i>.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against plaintiff Stinson Electric, Inc.</p>
42	<p><b>Newland v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 4/30/2012</p> <p>12-cv-01123 (D. Colo.)</p> <p>12-1380 (10th Cir.)</p> <p>13-919 (U.S. Sup. Ct.)</p>	<p>Hercules Industries, Inc. is a Colorado corporation that manufactures heating, ventilation, and air conditioning products, owned by the Newlands and another plaintiff.</p>	<p>District court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit, which affirmed the district court's preliminary injunction order. The court remanded the case to the district court with instructions to abate further proceedings pending the Supreme Court's consideration of the <i>Hobby Lobby</i> case.</p> <p>The government filed a cert petition with the Supreme Court, which the Court denied after its decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>.</p> <p>The parties submitted a joint status report to the district court agreeing that judgment should be entered in favor of the plaintiff; however, the parties disagree on the language and scope of the injunction.</p>
43	<p><b>Hobby Lobby Stores Inc., et al. v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 9/12/2012</p> <p>12-cv-1000 (W.D. Okla.)</p> <p>12-6294, 13-6215 (10th Cir.)</p> <p>13-354 (SCOTUS)</p>	<p>Hobby Lobby is a national craft supply chain with headquarters in Oklahoma. Mardel (another plaintiff) is a privately held bookstore and education company specializing in Christian books and religious texts.</p>	<p>District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 25 other national, regional, state and local organizations.</i></p> <p>A divided <i>en banc</i> panel of the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit reversed the lower court's denial of injunctive relief and returned the case to the district court to reconsider whether to grant a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>The government filed a cert petition with the Supreme Court asking it to review the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit's <i>en banc</i> decision. On November 26, 2013, the Supreme Court granted the cert petitions in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga Wood Specialties</i> and consolidated the cases.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed at the Supreme Court on behalf of NWLC and 68 other organizations.</i></p> <p>The Supreme Court heard oral argument on March</p>

			<p>25, 2014.</p> <p>On June 30, 2014, the Supreme Court affirmed the 10th Circuit's decision and held that closely-held corporations like Hobby Lobby can refuse to include in their employee insurance plans coverage for birth control to which they have religious objections.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision, the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit held the case in abeyance and the government voluntarily dismissed the appeal.</p> <p>The district court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the contraceptive coverage provision against Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc. and Mardel, Inc.</p>
44	<p><b>Briscoe v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 2/4/2013</p> <p>13-cv-285 (D. Colo.)</p> <p>13-1461 (10th Cir.)</p>	<p>Continuum Health Partnership is a Colorado-based oxygen supply company. Conessione is an investment company.</p>	<p>District court granted plaintiffs a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the district court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against for-profit plaintiffs Continuum Health Partnerships, Inc.; Continuum Health Management, LLC., and Mountain States Health Properties, LLC.</p>
45	<p><b>Armstrong v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 3/5/2013</p> <p>13-cv-00563 (D. Colo.)</p> <p>13-1218 (10th Cir.)</p>	<p>Cherry Creek Mortgage Co. is a Colorado-based full-service residential mortgage banking company.</p>	<p>District court denied the motion for a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>The 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit vacated the district court's denial of the preliminary injunction and remanded the case to the district court to proceed in light of its <i>en banc</i> decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>. The district court then granted plaintiffs a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, plaintiff moved for summary judgment. The district court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the contraceptive coverage provision "as described in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>" against Cherry Creek Mortgage Co. and the individual plaintiffs.</p>
46	<p><b>Beckwith Electric Co. v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 3/12/2013</p>	<p>Beckwith Electric Co. is a Florida-based provider of micro-processor-based technology.</p>	<p>District court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of</i></p>



	<p>13-cv-648 (M.D. Fla.)</p> <p>13-13879 (11th Cir.)</p>		<p><i>NWLC and 13 other national, regional, state and local organizations.</i></p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the government voluntarily dismissed the appeal.</p>
--	--	--	--

Cases that Include Both For- and Non-Profit Plaintiffs (last updated January 30, 2015)			
	Case	Description and Location of Plaintiffs	Status
1	<p><b>Geneva College v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 2/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-00207 (W.D. Pa.)</p> <p>13-2814, 13-3536, 14-1374 (3d. Cir.)</p>	<p>The Pennsylvania-based for-profit plaintiffs are Seneca Hardwood, a lumber business, and WLH Enterprises, a sawmill.</p> <p>Geneva College is a Pennsylvania-based non-profit.</p>	<p><u>The for-profit plaintiff, Seneca Hardwood (13-2814):</u> The district court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit. Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the government voluntarily dismissed the appeal regarding the for-profit plaintiff, Seneca Hardwood. The district court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against Seneca Hardwood.</p> <p><u>The non-profit plaintiff, Geneva College's student health plan (13-3536):</u> The district court initially dismissed the non-profit plaintiff, Geneva College, on grounds of ripeness. The district court then granted Geneva College's motion for reconsideration, stating that some of Geneva College's claims were ripe and granted a preliminary injunction. The government is appealing this decision to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit. Parties submitted supplemental briefing regarding the interim final rules issued by HHS. Oral argument held November 19, 2014.</p> <p><u>The non-profit plaintiff, Geneva College's employee health plan (14-1374):</u> The district court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>The court consolidated for purposes of briefing the non-profit <i>Geneva College</i> challenge, <i>Persico</i>, and <i>Zubik</i>. Parties submitted supplemental briefing regarding the interim final rules issues by HHS. Oral argument held November 19, 2014.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit by the NWLC on behalf of 20 other national, state, and local organizations.</i></p>
2	<p><b>Weingartz Supply Company v. Sebelius</b> (also known as Legatus v. Sebelius)</p> <p>Filed 5/7/2012</p>	<p>Weingartz Supply Company is a Michigan company that sells outdoor power equipment. Legatus is a non-profit organization comprising more than 4000 members including</p>	<p>District court initially granted a preliminary injunction for plaintiff Daniel Weingartz and Weingartz Supply Company, but not the non-profit plaintiff Legatus.</p> <p><u>The for-profit plaintiff, Weingartz (13-1092):</u> the government appealed to the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit. Following the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit decision in <i>Autocam</i>, parties submitted</p>

	<p>12-cv-12061 (E.D. Mich.)</p> <p>13-1092, 13-1093, 14-1183 (6th Cir.)</p>	<p>individuals and professional organizations.</p>	<p>briefs addressing the effect of <i>Autocam</i> on this case. Following the Supreme Court decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the government voluntarily dismissed the appeal regarding the for-profit plaintiff, Weingartz Supply Company. The district court permanently enjoined the government from enforcing the existing contraceptive coverage provision against Weingartz Supply Company.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 16 other national, regional, state and local organizations.</i></p> <p><u>The non-profit plaintiff, Legatus:</u> the plaintiffs cross-appealed the denial of a preliminary injunction to Legatus and then voluntarily dismissed that appeal (13-1093). After the government finalized the accommodation in the birth control coverage rule, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint and motion for injunctive relief. The district court granted a preliminary injunction to Legatus. The government appealed to the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit (14-1183). The 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit consolidated the appeal with <i>Ave Maria Foundation</i>, and the parties submitted briefs discussing the impact of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Wheaton College</i>.</p>
3	<p><b>Sharpe Holdings Inc. v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 12/20/2012</p> <p>12-cv-92 (E.D. Mo.)</p> <p>14-1507 (8th Cir.)</p>	<p>Sharpe Holdings, Inc. is a Missouri corporation that is involved in the farming, dairy, creamery, and cheese-making industries.</p> <p>Ozark National Life Insurance Company is a Missouri insurance corporation; N.I.S. Financial Services is a Missouri mutual fund broker, and CNS Corporation is the Missouri-based holding company for Ozark, N.I.S. and Sharpe Holdings.</p>	<p>District court granted a preliminary injunction to the for-profit plaintiffs.</p> <p>The plaintiffs filed a second amended complaint adding two non-profit plaintiffs: CNS International Ministries, Inc. and Heartland Christian College. The district court extended to the non-profit plaintiffs the preliminary injunction and stay that is currently in effect for the for-profit plaintiffs.</p> <p><u>The for-profit plaintiff:</u> The government filed a brief in support of a final judgment in favor of the plaintiffs and with proposed language for a permanent injunction. Plaintiffs filed a response opposing the government's proposed language.</p> <p><u>The non-profit plaintiff:</u> The government appealed to the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit the preliminary injunction in effect for the non-profit plaintiffs. The parties filed supplemental briefs regarding the interim final rules. Oral argument held December 10, 2014.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit non-profit challenge by NWLC on behalf of 20 other national,</i></p>

			<i>regional, and state organizations.</i>
4	<p><b>Catholic Benefits Association v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 3/12/2014</p> <p>14-cv-240, 14-cv-00685 (W.D. Okla.)</p> <p>14-6163, 14-6171 (10th Cir.)</p>	<p>For- and non-profit corporations including Good Will Publishers (a North Carolina for-profit corporation), the Catholic Benefits Association, and Catholic Insurance Company.</p>	<p>In June 2014, the district court granted a preliminary injunction with respect to non-profit plaintiffs (member employers of the Catholic Benefits Association [CBA]) and for-profit plaintiff (Good Will Publishers), but denied a preliminary injunction for the plaintiffs exempt from the contraceptive coverage rule. The district court also dismissed claims of plaintiff Catholic Insurance Company, finding that it lacked standing.</p> <p>The government appealed to the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit, and plaintiffs cross-appealed asking the Circuit Court for a preliminary injunction with respect to the plaintiffs denied such relief at the district court level because they were exempted under the regulations.</p> <p>The Circuit Court abated the case pending resolution of <i>Little Sisters of the Poor</i>, <u><i>Southern Nazarene University</i></u>, or <u><i>Reaching Souls International</i></u>.</p> <p>On December 29, 2014, the district court extended the preliminary injunction to include members of CBA that had joined since the June 2014 preliminary injunction. This group of members includes both for-profit members and non-profit members. As to the non-profit members, the district court enjoined the government from enforcing the accommodation as amended by the August 2014 interim final rule issued by HHS.</p>

<b>Non-Profit Cases</b> (last updated January 30, 2015)			
	<b>Case</b>	<b>Location of Non-Profit</b>	<b>Status</b>
1	<p><b>Belmont Abbey Coll. v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 11/10/2011</p> <p>11-cv-01989 (D.D.C.)</p> <p>12-5291 (D.C. Cir.)</p>	North Carolina	<p>District court dismissed on grounds of standing and ripeness. Plaintiffs appealed to the D.C. Circuit.</p> <p>D.C. Circuit had been holding the case until the government completed its rulemaking on the application of the contraceptive coverage benefit to non-profits with religious objections. On August 13, 2013, after considering the parties' joint motion to terminate the abeyance status and remand to the district court in light</p>

			of the final contraceptive coverage rules, the D.C. Circuit ordered that the consolidated cases of <i>Belmont Abbey</i> and <i>Wheaton College</i> be sent back to the district court, instructing the district court to vacate its judgments and dismiss the complaints as moot. The district court vacated its judgment and dismissed the complaints as moot.
2	<b>Belmont Abbey Coll. v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 11/20/2013  13-cv-1831 (D.D.C.)	North Carolina	District court stayed the case until October 15, 2014.  Plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed the case without prejudice.
3	<b>Wheaton College v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 7/18/2012  12-cv-01169 (D.D.C.)  12-5273 (D.C. Cir.)	Illinois	District court dismissed on grounds of standing and ripeness. Plaintiffs appealed to the D.C. Circuit.  D.C. Circuit had been holding the case until the government completed its rulemaking on the application of the contraceptive coverage benefit to non-profits with religious objections. On August 13, 2013, after considering the parties' joint motion to terminate the abeyance status and remand to the district court in light of the final contraceptive coverage rules, the D.C. Circuit ordered that the consolidated cases of <i>Belmont Abbey</i> and <i>Wheaton College</i> be sent back to the district court to vacate its judgments and dismiss the complaints as moot. The district court vacated its judgment and dismissed the complaints as moot.
4	<b>Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 5/21/2012  12-cv-815 (D.D.C.)  13-509 (D.C. Cir.)	Washington, D.C.	The district court dismissed the case on grounds of ripeness. The plaintiffs appealed to the D.C. Circuit. The D.C. Circuit denied plaintiffs' motion to summarily reverse and ruled to hold the appeal in abeyance, pending a decision in the consolidated cases of <i>Belmont Abbey</i> and <i>Wheaton College</i> . The D.C. Circuit then dismissed as moot the appeal with respect to the initial contraceptive coverage regulations.  Following the D.C. Circuit's decision in <i>Wheaton</i> , plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction against the final contraceptive coverage rule in the D.C. Circuit, which the court denied, stating that such relief should first be sought in the district court. Case is closed.
5	<b>Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington v. Burwell</b>	Washington, D.C.	The district court granted summary judgment in part to the government and in part to the non-profit parties.

	<p>Filed 9/20/2013</p> <p>13-cv-01441 (D.D.C.)</p> <p>13-5371, 14-5021 (D.C. Cir.)</p> <p>13-829 (SCOTUS)</p>		<p>The plaintiffs appealed to the D.C. Circuit, which consolidated the case with <i>Priests for Life</i>. In a 2-1 decision, the D.C. Circuit granted an emergency injunction pending appeal. The government appealed the district court's partial summary judgment with the D.C. Circuit. The D.C. Circuit consolidated the cross-appeals and set a briefing schedule. The court heard oral argument on May 8, 2014.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the D.C. Circuit by the NWLC on behalf of 13 other national and state organizations.</i></p> <p>The Supreme Court denied a petition for certiorari filed by the plaintiffs in which they asked the Court to review the case before the D.C. Circuit issued a decision.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the Court's order in <i>Wheaton College</i>, and the government issuing interim final rules for non-profits, the parties filed supplemental briefs addressing the impact of these developments on the court's analysis. A D.C. Circuit panel issued a unanimous decision holding that the accommodation does not impose a substantial burden on plaintiffs' religious exercise, the regulations advance compelling government interests, and that the regulations are the least restrictive means for advancing those interests. The court also rejected plaintiffs' other claims, including the constitutional claims.</p> <p>Plaintiffs petitioned for a re-hearing <i>en banc</i>.</p>
6	<p><b>Priests for Life v. HHS</b></p> <p>Filed 8/19/2013</p> <p>13-cv-01261 (D.D.C.)</p> <p>13-5368 (D.C. Cir.)</p> <p>13-891 (SCOTUS)</p>	New York	<p>The district court granted the government's motion to dismiss. The plaintiffs appealed to the D.C. Circuit, which consolidated the case with <i>Archbishop of Washington</i>. In a 2-1 decision, the D.C. Circuit granted an emergency injunction pending appeal. The court then set a briefing schedule. The court heard oral argument on May 8, 2014.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the D.C. Circuit by the NWLC on behalf of 13 other national and state organizations.</i></p> <p>The Supreme Court denied a petition for certiorari before judgment filed by the plaintiffs in which they asked the Court to review the case before the D.C. Circuit issued a decision.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the Court's order in <i>Wheaton College</i>, and the government issuing interim final rules for non-profits,</p>

			<p>the parties filed supplemental briefs addressing the impact of these developments.</p> <p>A D.C. Circuit panel issued a unanimous decision holding that the accommodation does not impose a substantial burden on plaintiffs' religious exercise, the regulations advance compelling government interests, and that the regulations are the least restrictive means for advancing those interests. The court also rejected plaintiffs' other claims, including the constitutional claims.</p> <p>Plaintiffs petitioned for a re-hearing <i>en banc</i>.</p>
7	<p><b>March for Life v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 7/7/2014</p> <p>14-cv-01149 (D.D.C.)</p>	Washington, D.C.	Plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment and a preliminary injunction. The government filed a motion in opposition.
8	<p><b>Priests for Life v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 2/15/2012</p> <p>12-cv-00753 (E.D.N.Y.)</p>	New York	On January 8, 2013, the district court deemed the Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order moot based on the government's agreement that Plaintiffs qualify for the delay in compliance. On April 12, 2013, the court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
9	<p><b>Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-2542 (E.D.N.Y.)</p> <p>14-427 (2d Cir.)</p>	New York	<p>The district court granted the motion to dismiss for the Diocese and Catholic Charities because they lack standing, but denied it for the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York, the Catholic Health Care System and the Catholic Health Services of Long Island.</p> <p>The district court granted summary judgment and an injunction to the non-diocesan plaintiffs. The government appealed to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit by the NWLC on behalf of 24 other national, regional, and state organizations.</i></p> <p>Oral argument held January 22, 2015.</p>
10	<p><b>Persico v. Sebelius</b> (also known as Diocese of Erie v. Sebelius or Trautman v. Sebelius)</p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-00123 (W.D. Pa.)</p>	Pennsylvania	District court denied a preliminary injunction and granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.

11	<p><b>Persico v. Secretary of Dep't of Health and Human Services</b> (also known as Diocese of Erie v. Secretary of Dep't of Health and Human Services)</p> <p>Filed 10/8/2013</p> <p>13-cv-303 (W.D. Pa.)</p> <p>14-1376 (3d Cir.)</p>	Pennsylvania	<p>District court granted an expedited motion for a preliminary injunction which it then converted into a permanent injunction at plaintiffs' request. The government appealed to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>The 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit consolidated for purposes of briefing the non-profit <i>Geneva College</i> challenge, <i>Persico</i>, and <i>Zubik</i>. Parties submitted supplemental briefing regarding the interim final rules issues by HHS. Oral argument held November 19, 2014.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit by the NWLC on behalf of 20 other national, state, and local organizations.</i></p>
12	<p><b>Zubik v. Sebelius</b> (also known as Diocese of Pittsburgh v. Sebelius)</p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-676 (W.D. Pa.)</p>	Pennsylvania	<p>District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of standing and ripeness. Plaintiffs appealed to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit. After the government finalized the accommodation under the birth control coverage rule, the parties requested voluntary dismissal of the appeal, which the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit granted. Case is closed.</p>
13	<p><b>Zubik v. Secretary of Dep't of Health and Human Services</b> (also known as Diocese of Pittsburgh v. Secretary of Dep't of Health and Human Services)</p> <p>Filed 10/8/2013</p> <p>13-cv-1459 (W.D. Pa.)</p> <p>14-1377 (3d Cir.)</p>	Pennsylvania	<p>District court granted an expedited motion for a preliminary injunction which it then converted into a permanent injunction at plaintiffs' request. The government appealed to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>The 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit consolidated for purposes of briefing the non-profit <i>Geneva College</i> challenge, <i>Persico</i>, and <i>Zubik</i>. Parties submitted supplemental briefing regarding the interim final rules issues by HHS. Oral argument held November 19, 2014.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit by the NWLC on behalf of 20 other national, state, and local organizations.</i></p>
14	<p><b>Brandt v. Burwell</b> (also known as Diocese of Greensburg v. Burwell)</p> <p>Filed 5/27/2013</p> <p>14-cv-00681 (W.D. Pa.)</p> <p>14-3663, 14-4087 (3d Cir.)</p>	Pennsylvania	<p>District court granted a permanent injunction. The government appealed to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>Briefing schedule set. The case is held in abeyance pending resolution of the consolidated appeal in <i>Geneva College</i>, <i>Persico</i>, and <i>Zubik</i>.</p>
15	<p><b>Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, et al. v.</b></p>	Pennsylvania	<p>District court denied preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit, which granted a temporary injunction pending further order of the court.</p>



	<p><b>Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 6/2/2014</p> <p>14-cv-03096 (E.D. Pa.)</p> <p>14-3126 (3d Cir.)</p>		<p>Following the Supreme Court’s decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and its order in <i>Wheaton College</i>, the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit vacated the district court decision and remanded the case back to that court for reconsideration. The 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit also granted a temporary injunction, pending the district court’s decision on reconsideration.</p> <p>Several of the plaintiffs filed an unopposed motion to be voluntarily dismissed from the case. The case will continue on behalf of the remaining plaintiffs.</p>
16	<p><b>Valley Forge Christian College v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 8/6/2014</p> <p>14-cv-04622 (E.D. Pa.)</p>	Pennsylvania	<p>Complaint filed. The parties have stipulated to a voluntary dismissal of the case.</p>
17	<p><b>Liberty University v. Geithner</b></p> <p>Filed 3/23/2010</p> <p>10-cv-15 (W.D. Va.)</p> <p>10-2347 (4th Cir.)</p> <p>11-438 (SCOTUS)</p>	Virginia	<p>Revised complaint filed with the 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit on February 27, 2013, to include a challenge to the contraceptive coverage benefit, in addition to challenges against the employer and individual responsibility provisions.</p> <p>The original complaint – which did not include a challenge to the contraceptive coverage requirement – was filed March 23, 2010. It has a complicated history in the courts, including being vacated and dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. But on November 26, 2012, the U.S. Supreme Court remanded the case to the 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit for further consideration in light of the Supreme Court’s decision in <i>National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius</i> (upholding the Affordable Care Act).</p> <p>The 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit affirmed dismissal of challenges to the individual and employer responsibility provisions. The 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit declined to consider the challenge to the contraceptive coverage benefit. The 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit then denied the plaintiffs’ motion to stay pending determination of the cert petition they were preparing to file at the Supreme Court.</p> <p>Plaintiffs filed a cert petition with the U.S. Supreme Court, asking the Court to review the 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit’s dismissal of its challenge to the individual and employer responsibility provisions. In addition, plaintiffs asked the Court to review the 4<sup>th</sup> Circuit’s refusal to consider its challenge to the contraceptive coverage benefit, which plaintiffs characterize as part of the employer responsibility provision “as fully defined.”</p>

			On December 2, the Supreme Court denied Liberty University's cert petition.
18	<b>Louisiana College v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 2/18/2012  12-cv-00463 (W.D. La.)  14-31167 (5th Cir.)	Louisiana	In January 2014, Louisiana College withdrew its motion for a preliminary injunction, stating that it was protected by a preliminary injunction granted by an Oklahoma district court in <i>Reaching Souls International</i> .  In August 2014, the district court granted plaintiff's motion for summary judgment on its RFRA claim. The government appealed to the 5th Circuit. The case is held in abeyance pending a resolution in the consolidated cases of <i>Roman Catholic Diocese of Fort Worth, East Texas Baptist Univ, Univ. of Dallas, and Diocese of Beaumont</i> .
19	<b>Roman Catholic Diocese of Dallas v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 5/21/2012  12-cv-1589 (N.D. Tex.)	Texas	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
20	<b>Roman Catholic Diocese of Fort Worth v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 5/21/2012  12-cv-00314 (N.D. Tex.)  14-10241, 14-10661 (5th Cir.)	Texas	District court granted a preliminary injunction to plaintiff University of Dallas ( <i>Univ. of Dallas</i> , 14-10241). The government appealed to the 5 <sup>th</sup> Circuit.  District court later granted a preliminary injunction to the remaining plaintiffs. The government appealed to the 5 <sup>th</sup> Circuit (14-10661).  The 5 <sup>th</sup> Circuit consolidated appellate briefing in <i>East Texas, Univ. of Dallas, Diocese of Fort Worth, and Diocese of Beaumont</i> .  Two of the plaintiffs, Roman Catholic Diocese and Our Lady Victory Catholic School, filed an unopposed motion for a dismissal as to their claims because they qualify for full exemption from the contraceptive coverage mandate. The motion was granted. The government appeals regarding the two remaining plaintiffs, University of Dallas and Catholic Charities, remain pending (as do the other consolidated appeals noted above).  Oral argument scheduled for April 6, 2015.
21	<b>Roman Catholic Diocese of Biloxi v Sebelius</b>	Mississippi	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. The plaintiffs filed a motion to amend/alter the judgment, which the district court also denied. Case

	Filed 5/21/2012 12-cv-158 (S.D. Miss.)		is closed.
22	<b>Roman Catholic Diocese of Biloxi v Sebelius</b> Filed 3/27/2014 14-cv-146 (S.D. Miss.)	Mississippi	Complaint filed. The district court set a briefing schedule. The case is stayed until the 5th Circuit makes a decision in the consolidated cases of <i>East Texas Baptist Univ., Univ. of Dallas, Catholic Diocese of Beaumont, and Diocese of Fort Worth</i> .
23	<b>East Texas Baptist University v. Sebelius</b> Filed 10/9/2012 12-cv-3009 (E.D. Tex.) 14-20112 (5th Cir.)	Texas	Plaintiffs submitted an amended complaint challenging the final birth control rule. Westminster Theological Seminary intervened as an additional plaintiff.  The district court granted plaintiffs a preliminary injunction which it then converted into a permanent injunction. The government appealed to the 5 <sup>th</sup> Circuit.  The 5 <sup>th</sup> Circuit consolidated appellate briefing in <i>East Texas, Univ. of Dallas, Diocese of Fort Worth, and Diocese of Beaumont</i> .  Oral argument scheduled for April 6, 2015.
24	<b>Criswell College v. Sebelius</b> Filed 11/1/2012 12-cv-4409 (N.D. Tex.)	Texas	The court dismissed the case on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
25	<b>American Family Association v. Sebelius</b> Filed 2/20/2013 13-cv-32 (N.D. Miss.)	Mississippi	Complaint and motion for preliminary injunction filed in response to the government's proposed rule on the application of the contraceptive coverage benefit to religiously-affiliated non-profits that was issued February 1, 2013. Government filed a motion to dismiss. After the rule was finalized, plaintiffs submitted notice to voluntarily dismiss the case. Case is closed.
26	<b>Catholic Diocese of Beaumont v. Sebelius</b> Filed 12/10/2013 13-cv-00709 (E.D. Tex.) 14-40212 (5th Cir.)	Texas	District court granted a permanent injunction. The government appealed to the 5 <sup>th</sup> Circuit.  The 5 <sup>th</sup> Circuit consolidated appellate briefing in <i>East Texas, Univ. of Dallas, Diocese of Fort Worth, and Diocese of Beaumont</i> .  Oral argument scheduled for April 6, 2015.
27	<b>Franciscan University of Steubenville v. Sebelius</b>	Ohio	Court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.

	Filed 5/21/2012 12-cv-440 (S.D. Ohio)		
28	<b>Catholic Diocese of Nashville v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 9/12/2012 12-cv-934 (M.D. Tenn.) 12-6590 (6th Cir.)	Tennessee	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of standing and ripeness. Plaintiffs appealed to the 6 <sup>th</sup> Circuit. On February 28, 2013, the 6 <sup>th</sup> Circuit granted the plaintiff's request to dismiss the case without prejudice. Case is closed.
29	<b>Catholic Diocese of Nashville v. Burwell</b>  Filed 11/22/2013 13-cv-1303 (M.D. Tenn.) 13-6640 (6th Cir.) 14-701 (SCOTUS)	Tennessee	District court denied plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 6 <sup>th</sup> Circuit, which granted plaintiffs' motion for an injunction pending appeal in a 2-1 decision. The 6 <sup>th</sup> Circuit consolidated the appeal with <i>Michigan Catholic Conference</i>  <i>Amicus brief filed in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit by the National Women's Law Center on behalf of 21 other national, state, regional, and local organizations.</i>  Following oral argument, a unanimous 6 <sup>th</sup> Circuit panel denied plaintiffs a preliminary injunction.  The district court stayed its proceedings pending the 6 <sup>th</sup> Circuit appeal.  The plaintiffs filed a petition for an <i>en banc</i> rehearing in the 6 <sup>th</sup> Circuit and the government filed a response in opposition. The motion was denied. Plaintiffs filed a petition for writ of certiorari from the Supreme Court Dec. 18, 2014.
30	<b>Right to Life of Michigan v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 11/4/2013 13-cv-1202 (W.D. Mich.)	Michigan	Complaint and motion for preliminary injunction filed. District court granted motion to stay.
31	<b>Michigan Catholic Conference v. Burwell</b>  Filed 11/14/2013	Michigan	District court denied plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 6 <sup>th</sup> Circuit, which granted plaintiffs' motion for an injunction pending appeal in a 2-1 decision. The 6 <sup>th</sup> Circuit consolidated the appeal with <i>Diocese of Nashville</i> .

	13-cv-1247 (W.D. Mich.) 13-2723 (6th Cir.) 14-701 (SCOTUS)		<p><i>Amicus brief filed by in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit the National Women's Law Center on behalf of 21 other national, state, regional, and local organizations.</i></p> <p>Following oral argument, a unanimous 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit panel denied plaintiffs a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>The plaintiffs filed a petition for an <i>en banc</i> rehearing in the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit and the government filed a response in opposition. The motion was denied. Plaintiffs filed a petition for writ of certiorari from the Supreme Court Dec. 18, 2014.</p>
32	<b>Ave Maria Foundation v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 12/20/2013 13-cv-15198 (E.D. Mich.) 14-1310 (6th Cir.)	Michigan	<p>District court granted preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit. The 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit consolidated the appeal with <i>Legatus</i>.</p> <p>The parties filed supplemental briefs to the 6th Circuit addressing the impact of <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, <i>Wheaton College</i>, and <i>Michigan Catholic Conference</i> (6th Cir.) on the court's analysis.</p>
33	<b>Union University v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 4/4/2014 14-cv-1079 (W.D. Tenn.)	Tennessee	District court granted unopposed motion for a preliminary injunction and stayed the case pending the 6 <sup>th</sup> Circuit's resolution of the appeal in <i>Michigan Catholic Conference</i> and <i>Diocese of Nashville</i> .
34	<b>University of Notre Dame v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 5/21/2012 12-cv-253 (N.D. Ind.) 13-1479 (7th Cir.)	Indiana	District court granted the government's motion to dismiss on grounds of standing and ripeness. On March 1, 2013, the plaintiffs appealed to the 7 <sup>th</sup> Circuit. After the government finalized the accommodation under the birth control coverage rule, the 7 <sup>th</sup> Circuit dismissed the appeal pursuant to the parties' joint motion to voluntarily dismiss. Case is closed.
35	<b>University of Notre Dame v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 12/3/2013 13-cv-1276 (N.D. Ind.) 13-3853 (7th Cir.) 14-392 (SCOTUS)	Indiana	<p>District court denied motion for preliminary injunction. The plaintiff then appealed to the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit, which denied the emergency application for an injunction pending appeal.</p> <p>The 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit allowed three female students to intervene and denied a female employee's motion to be added as an intervenor.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's grant of temporary relief in <i>Little Sisters</i>, Notre Dame renewed its motion for an</p>

			<p>injunction pending appeal with the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>Following oral argument in the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit, the court denied Notre Dame a preliminary injunction. The court denied the plaintiffs' request for a rehearing <i>en banc</i>.</p> <p>The district court's stay in the proceedings remains in place following the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit decision. Plaintiffs filed a petition for writ of certiorari from the Supreme Court on October 3, 2014. The petition is a GVR (grant, vacate, and remand) which, rather than asking for a full hearing before the Court, asks the Supreme Court to vacate the previous decisions and require the lower courts to reconsider the case in light of <i>Hobby Lobby</i>. The Supreme Court scheduled consideration of the GVR petition for Feb. 20, 2015.</p>
36	<p><b>Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, Inc. v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-159 (N.D. Ind.)</p> <p>14-1431 (7th Cir.)</p>	Indiana	<p>Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint challenging the final birth control coverage rule and motion for preliminary injunction. The district court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>The 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit consolidated the appeal with <i>Grace Schools</i> and set a briefing schedule. Oral argument held December 3, 2014.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit by the National Women's Law Center on behalf of 18 other national and state organizations.</i></p>
37	<p><b>Catholic Diocese of Peoria v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 8/9/2012</p> <p>12-cv-1276 (C.D. Ill.)</p>	Illinois	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
38	<p><b>Conlon v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-3932 (N.D. Ill.)</p>	Illinois	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness and standing. Case is closed.
39	<p><b>Grace Schools v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 8/23/2012</p> <p>12-cv-459 (N.D. Ind.)</p>	Indiana	Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint challenging the final rule and motion for preliminary injunction. The district court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 7 <sup>th</sup> Circuit.

	14-1430 (7th Cir.)		<p>The 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit consolidated the appeal with <i>Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend</i> and set a briefing schedule. Oral argument held December 3, 2014.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit by the National Women's Law Center on behalf of 18 other national and state organizations.</i></p>
40	<p><b>Wheaton College v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 12/13/2013</p> <p>13-cv-8910 (N.D. Ill.)</p> <p>14-2396 (7th Cir.)</p> <p>13A1284 (SCOTUS)</p>	Illinois	<p>District court denied preliminary injunction and denied plaintiff's motion for reconsideration. Wheaton appealed to the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit, which denied an injunction pending appeal. Wheaton then filed an emergency application for an injunction pending appeal with the Supreme Court.</p> <p>On July 3, the Supreme Court granted Wheaton's emergency application for an injunction pending appeal on the condition that it file notice with HHS it is an organization that holds itself out as religious and has religious objections to contraceptive coverage. Justices Sotomayor, Ginsburg, and Kagan dissented.</p> <p>The case is held in abeyance. The court has asked the parties to submit briefs in order to determine whether the appeal is moot and should be dismissed.</p>
41	<p><b>CNS Ministries v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 11/20/2012</p> <p>12-cv-81 (E.D. Mo.)</p>	Missouri	District court granted plaintiffs' request to dismiss the case without prejudice. Case is closed.
42	<p><b>Archdiocese of St. Louis v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-924 (E.D. Mo.)</p>	Missouri	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness and standing. Case is closed.
43	<p><b>Archdiocese of St. Louis v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 11/14/2013</p> <p>13-cv-2300 (E.D. Mo.)</p> <p>14-3016 (8th Cir.)</p>	Missouri	<p>District court granted preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>Briefing schedule set. Case held in abeyance until a decision has been made in <i>Dordt College</i> and <i>Sharpe Holdings</i>. However, the briefing schedule will continue.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit by the National Women's Law Center on behalf of 19 other national and state organizations.</i></p>

44	<b>College of the Ozarks v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 9/17/2012  12-cv-3428 (W.D. Mo.)	Missouri	District court granted plaintiffs' request to dismiss the case without prejudice. Case is closed.
45	<b>The School of the Ozarks v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 4/19/2013  13-cv-3157 (W.D. Mo.)	Missouri	The plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed their claims against RightChoice Managed Care, Healthy Alliance Life Insurance, and HMO Missouri.  Amended complaint and motion for summary judgment filed. The district court denied plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and dismissed the case.
46	<b>Dordt College v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 10/23/2013  13-cv-4100 (N.D. Iowa)  14-2726 (8th Cir.)	Iowa	District court granted preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit and the court set a briefing schedule.  Oral argument held December 10, 2014.
47	<b>Colorado Christian University v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 12/22/2011  11-cv-03350 (D. Colo.)	Colorado	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
48	<b>Colorado Christian University v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 8/7/2013  13-cv-2105 (D. Colo.)  14-1329 (10th Cir.)	Colorado	District court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 10 <sup>th</sup> Circuit.  Case is held in abeyance until resolution of <i>Little Sisters of the Poor, Southern Nazarene Univ., or Reaching Souls Int'l.</i>
49	<b>Southern Nazarene University v. Burwell</b>  Filed 9/20/2013  13-cv-1015 (W.D. Okla.)	Oklahoma	District court granted plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction and then stayed proceedings until March 1, 2014. The government appealed to the 10 <sup>th</sup> Circuit.  <i>Amicus brief filed in the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 20 other national, regional, and state organizations.</i>



	14-6026 (10th Cir.)		Following the government's issuance of interim final rules amending the accommodation for non-profits, the parties filed supplemental briefs addressing the impact of the rules on the case. Oral arguments held December 8, 2014.
50	<b>Little Sisters of the Poor v. Burwell</b> Filed 9/24/2013 13-cv-02611 (D. Colo.) 13-1540 (10th Cir.) 13A691 (SCOTUS)	Colorado	<p>District court denied plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit, which denied their emergency application for an injunction pending appeal. The plaintiffs then filed an emergency application for an injunction pending appeal with the Supreme Court. Justice Sotomayor, the Circuit Justice for the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit, granted temporary relief while the government responded to the emergency application.</p> <p>On January 24, the Supreme Court granted plaintiffs' emergency application for an injunction pending appeal on the condition that they file notice with HHS that they are organizations that hold themselves out as religious and have religious objections to contraceptive coverage.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 15 other national, regional, and state organizations.</i></p> <p>Following the government's issuance of interim final rules amending the accommodation for non-profits, the parties filed supplemental addressing the impact of those rules on the case. Oral arguments held December 8, 2014.</p>
51	<b>Reaching Souls International, Inc. v. Burwell</b> Filed 10/11/2013 13-cv-01092 (W.D. Okla.) 14-6028 (10th Cir.)	Oklahoma	<p>District court granted plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction and denied plaintiffs' motion for class certification. The government appealed to the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 18 other national, regional, and state organizations.</i></p> <p>Following the government's issuance of interim final rules amending the accommodation for non-profits, the parties filed supplemental briefs addressing the impact of those rules on the cases. Oral arguments held December 8, 2014.</p>
52	<b>Fellowship of Catholic University Students ("FOCUS") v. Sebelius</b>	Colorado	District court granted preliminary injunction and stayed further rulings until 30 days after the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> .

	Filed 12/3/2013 13-cv-3263 (D. Colo.)		Plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment and a motion to dismiss. Court denied both motions and ordered plaintiffs to file a second amended complaint.
53	<b>Dobson v. Burwell</b> Filed 12/10/2013 13-cv-3326 (D. Colo.) 14-1233 (10th Cir.)	Colorado	District court granted preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 10 <sup>th</sup> Circuit and the court held the appeal in abeyance pending resolution of appeals in <i>Southern Nazarene University</i> and <i>Little Sisters</i> .
54	<b>Diocese of Cheyenne v. Burwell</b> 1/30/2014 14-cv-21 (D. Wyo.) 14-8040 (10th Cir.)	Wyoming	District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 10 <sup>th</sup> Circuit and requested an injunction pending appeal, which the court granted on the condition that they file notice with HHS that they are organizations that hold themselves out as religious and have religious objections to contraceptive coverage. The court then held the case in abeyance pending the resolution of similar appeals.
55	<b>Eternal Word Television Network, Inc. v. Sebelius</b> Filed 2/9/2012 12-cv-501 (N.D. Ala.)	Alabama	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
56	<b>Eternal Word Television Network, Inc. v. Burwell</b> Filed 10/28/2013 13-cv-521 (S.D. Ala.) 14-12696 (11th Cir.)	Alabama	District court denied plaintiffs' motions for summary judgment, finding that their RFRA and First Amendment claims fail and dismissed several other of plaintiffs' claims. Additionally, the district court granted in part the government's motion for summary judgment, but denied dismissing plaintiffs' Administrative Procedure Act claims. The plaintiffs appealed to the 11 <sup>th</sup> Circuit, which granted an injunction pending appeal and set a briefing schedule. Oral argument scheduled for February 4, 2015.
57	<b>Ave Maria University v. Sebelius</b> Filed 2/21/2012 12-cv-00088 (M.D. Fla.)	Florida	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
58	<b>Ave Maria University v. Sebelius</b> Filed 8/29/2013	Florida	Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the district court reopened the case and set a briefing schedule. The district court granted plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. Government appealed to

	13-cv-630 (M.D. Fla.) 14-15780 (11th Cir.)		the 11th Circuit. The case is held in abeyance pending resolution of <i>Eternal Word News Television</i> .
59	<b>Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Atlanta v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 10/5/2012  12-cv-3489 (N.D. Ga.)  14-12890, 14-13239 (11th Cir.)	Georgia	District court granted a permanent injunction. On the government's motion for reconsideration, the court dismissed the claims of the diocesan plaintiffs. The government appealed to the 11 <sup>th</sup> Circuit. Oral argument scheduled for February 4, 2015.  <i>Amicus brief filed in the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit by the National Women's Law Center on behalf of 10 other national and state organizations.</i>
60	<b>The Most Reverend Thomas Wenski v Sebelius</b> (also known as Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Miami v. Sebelius)  Filed 10/19/2012  12-cv-23820 (S.D. Fla.)	Florida	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
61	<b>Ave Maria School of Law v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 11/12/2013  13-cv-795 (M.D. Fla.)  14-15777 (11th Cir.)	Florida	Complaint filed and briefing schedule set. Plaintiffs filed motion for preliminary injunction. The district court granted plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction. Government appealed to the 11th Circuit. The case is held in abeyance pending resolution of <i>Eternal Word News Television</i> .

<b>Other Cases</b> (last updated January 30, 2015)			
	<b>Case</b>	<b>Description of Plaintiffs</b>	<b>Status</b>
1	<b>Media Research Center v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 4/11/14  14-cv-00379 (E.D. Va.)	The Media Research Center is a non-profit organization that states its mission is to critique	The non-profit organization asserts that (1) it is eligible to opt out of providing contraceptive coverage through the accommodation and seeks a declaratory judgment from the court that it meets the requirements for the accommodation and (2) challenges the contraceptive coverage benefit, the exemption for religious employers

		liberal bias in the media.	<p>like churches, and the accommodation for eligible non-profit organizations as a violation of the Establishment Clause and seeks a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>The court denied plaintiff's motion for a declaratory judgment as to count (1) and then dismissed it without prejudice because the court lacked jurisdiction to consider it. As to count (2), the court denied plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction. The court then granted a motion to stay.</p> <p>Plaintiffs filed a motion to dismiss without prejudice.</p>
2	<p><b>Wieland v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 8/14/2013</p> <p>13-cv-01577 (E.D. Mo.)</p> <p>13-3528 (8th Cir.)</p>	Paul Wieland is a member of the Missouri House of Representatives.	<p>District court granted government's motion to dismiss, finding that plaintiffs lacked standing to bring their challenge.</p> <p>The plaintiffs appealed to the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit and filed an emergency motion with the district court for a preliminary injunction pending appeal, which the court denied. The 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit set a briefing schedule. The court then denied the plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction pending appeal. Oral argument held September 8, 2014.</p>
3	<p><b>State of Nebraska, et al. v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 2/23/2012</p> <p>12-cv-03035 (D. Neb.)</p> <p>12-2328 (8th Cir.)</p>	The states of Nebraska, South Carolina, Michigan, Texas, Florida, Ohio, and Oklahoma	District court granted a motion to dismiss on grounds of standing and ripeness. The plaintiffs appealed to the 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit, which granted plaintiffs' motion to voluntarily dismiss the case. The case is closed.