

## **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.

- 48 for-profit cases are pending (including 4 cases that include both for- and non-profit plaintiffs), of a total of 50 cases that have been filed by for-profits. Two cases were dismissed, one of which was then re-filed in another court.
- 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.
- 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

---

<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each case as a unique case, even if the same parties filed an earlier challenge that was dismissed or voluntarily withdrawn.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 17.

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.

- We expect courts in the other pending for-profit cases to also reconsider them in light of *Hobby Lobby*, and to grant relief where the court finds that the businesses are similar to *Hobby Lobby* and *Conestoga Wood*.

### **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.

- 42 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 pending cases challenge the accommodation rule finalized by the Departments of Labor, Treasury, and Health and Human Services on June 28, 2013. 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.
- The Supreme Court’s *Hobby Lobby* decision will not have a direct effect on these cases, and these cases will continue to proceed through the courts.
- Two 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 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit in *Michigan Catholic Conference/Diocese of Nashville* and 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit in *University of Notre Dame*
- The D.C. Circuit heard oral argument in *Priests for Life/Archbishop of Washington* but has not yet issued a decision.
- 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 World 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, 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.

**Status of Other Cases:**

2 other cases are pending, including a case brought by an individual who objects to having insurance that includes coverage for birth control and a case 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 voluntarily dismissed. (See chart on page 33.)

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 (last updated August 18, 2014)</b>			
	<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 district court denied the government’s motion to stay the case pending the D.C. Circuit’s decision in <i>Gilardi</i>. 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, which granted an injunction pending the appeal.</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. The government has also filed a cert petition asking the Supreme Court to review the D.C. Circuit’s decision.</p> <p>The D.C. Circuit has ordered that the injunction pending appeal continue until the end of Supreme Court proceedings.</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</p>

			<p>consideration in light of <i>Hobby Lobby</i>. The Court also denied the government's cert petition.</p> <p>The D.C. Circuit remanded the case to the district court with instructions to enter a preliminary injunction for the Freshway companies and to reconsider the district court's denial of a preliminary injunction as to the individual owners in light of <i>Hobby Lobby</i>.</p>
3	<p><b>Johnson Welded Products v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 4/30/2013</p> <p>13-cv-609 (D.D.C.)</p>	<p>Johnson Welded Products is an Ohio-based manufacturer of reservoirs for air brake systems.</p>	<p>District court granted an unopposed motion for temporary injunctive relief and stayed the case.</p>
4	<p><b>Willis &amp; Willis PLC v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 7/24/2013</p> <p>13-cv-1124 (D.D.C.)</p>	<p>Willis &amp; Willis PLC is a Michigan-based law firm.</p>	<p>District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.</p>
5	<p><b>Trijicon, Inc. v. Sebelius</b> (also known as Bindon v. Sebelius)</p> <p>Filed 8/5/2013</p> <p>13-cv-1207 (D.D.C.)</p>	<p>Trijicon, Inc. is a Michigan-based maker of aiming systems for firearms.</p>	<p>District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.</p>
6	<p><b>Barron Industries v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 9/4/2013</p> <p>13-cv-1330 (D.D.C.)</p>	<p>Barron Industries, Inc. is a Michigan-based company that produces metal castings for various industries.</p>	<p>District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.</p>
7	<p><b>Midwest Fastener Corp. v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 9/5/2013</p> <p>13-cv-01337 (D.D.C.)</p>	<p>Midwest Fastener Corp. is a Michigan-based company that supplies fasteners to the hardware store, home center, and industrial markets.</p>	<p>District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.</p>

8	<b>Williams v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 10/30/2013  13-cv-01699 (D.D.C.)	The Williams own Electrolock Inc., an Ohio-based corporation that works in the electrical and thermal insulation industry. Other plaintiff companies include Stone River Management Co. and Dunstone Co.	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.
9	<b>C.W. Zumbiel, Co. v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 10/22/2013  13-cv-01611 (D.D.C.)	Zumbiel Packaging is a Kentucky-based manufacturer of paperboard packaging for consumer goods.	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.
10	<b>Stewart et al. v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 11/27/2013  13-cv-01879 (D.D.C.)	Encompass Develop, Design & Construct, LLC is a Kentucky-based architect, design and construction service of which John Stewart is the managing and sole member.	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case until the DC Circuit rules in <i>Gilardi</i> (pending the outcome of <i>Hobby Lobby/Conestoga Wood</i> ).
11	<b>Conestoga Wood Specialties Corporation v. Burwell</b>  Filed 12/4/2012  12-cv-6744 (E.D. Pa.)  13-1144 (3d. Cir.)  13-356 (SCOTUS)	Conestoga Wood Specialties Corporation is a Pennsylvania-based wood cabinet and specialty products manufacturer.	District court initially granted a temporary restraining order (TRO) but then 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.  Plaintiffs filed a cert petition with the Supreme Court, asking the Court to review the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Circuit's decision that a corporation is not a "person" under RFRA or the First Amendment.  The 3 <sup>rd</sup> Circuit denied plaintiffs' motion to stay the decision until the conclusion of plaintiffs' appeal to the Supreme Court.  Amicus brief filed in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 15 other national, regional, state and local organizations.  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><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 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, in light of Conestoga's amended motion for a preliminary injunction and in light of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> entered a preliminary injunction.</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>After the Supreme Court's <i>Hobby Lobby</i> decision, the district court entered a consent order granting plaintiff a preliminary injunction.</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, asking the Court to review the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit's decision that a corporation is not a "person" capable of religious exercise under RFRA or the First Amendment.</p> <p>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>

14	<p><b>Domino's Farms Corporation v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 12/14/2012</p> <p>12-cv-15488 (E.D. Mich.)</p> <p>13-1654 (6th Cir.)</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 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>The 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit decided to review the case without oral argument.</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 <i>Hobby Lobby</i> decision, the 6<sup>th</sup> Circuit granted plaintiffs' unopposed motion for an injunction pending appeal.</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>13-1677 (6th Cir.)</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 addressing the precedential impact of <i>Autocam</i>.</p>

	13-591 (SCOTUS)		<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 court then granted plaintiffs’ motion to stay the mandate to allow plaintiffs’ to file a cert petition and, if granted, until the Supreme Court makes a decision regarding the case.</p> <p>On November 12, 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>The Supreme Court granted petitioners’ motion and 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>
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.	District court heard oral argument on July 24, 2013 and subsequently denied plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction. The case is stayed pending the Supreme Court’s resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i> .
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>The Michigan district court granted the parties’ joint motion to stay pending the Supreme Court’s resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i>.</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.</p> <p>The Michigan district court granted the parties' joint motion to stay pending the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i>.</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 and asked for an injunction pending appeal. The Circuit Court granted the emergency motion for an injunction pending appeal and consolidated the case with <i>Grote Industries</i>.</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>, 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.</p> <p>The case is stayed pending the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i>.</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>
23	<p><b>Triune Health Group v. Sebelius</b> (also known as Yep v. Sebelius)</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 because it construed the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit decision in <i>Korte</i> as binding. The government appealed to the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit, asked the district court to stay proceedings pending appeal, and asked the Circuit Court to hold the case in abeyance pending <i>Korte</i>.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit ordered the parties to file status reports. The government has until September 3, 2014 to file its next report.</p>

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>	<p>Grote Industries is an Indiana-based, privately held business manufacturing vehicle safety systems.</p>	<p>District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit. The 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit consolidated the case with <i>Korte</i> and, applying its own analysis in <i>Korte</i> to this case, granted Grote Industries a temporary injunction pending appeal, over the strong dissent of one judge.</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>, 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.</p> <p>The case is stayed pending the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i>.</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.</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>	<p>Tonn and Black Construction, LLC, is an Indiana construction company.</p>	<p>District court granted an unopposed preliminary injunction. The court stayed the case and continued the preliminary injunction pending the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i>.</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>	<p>LR&amp;P is an Illinois-based law firm that primarily practices in insurance defense, insurance coverage, and appellate work.</p>	<p>District court granted a preliminary injunction and stayed the case. In January 2014, the court granted an unopposed extension of the preliminary injunction and the stay pending the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i>.</p>
27	<p><b>Hartenbower v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 3/26/2013</p> <p>13-cv-02253 (N.D. Ill.)</p>	<p>The Hartenbowers co-own Hart Electric LLC, an Illinois-based manufacturer of electrical components, and H.I. Cable.</p>	<p>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>. In January 2014 and again in August 2014, the court granted an unopposed extension of the preliminary injunction and the stay.</p>

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. On November 28, 2012, the 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit issued a stay pending the appeal. The 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit denied the motion to consolidate with <i>Annex Medical</i> .  The 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit heard oral argument on plaintiffs' appeal of the district court's decision (on the merits) granting the motion to dismiss on October 24, 2013.  <i>Amicus brief filed in the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC.</i>
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 in part because of the stay granted in <i>O'Brien</i> by the 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit. The government appealed the preliminary injunction to the 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit. Proceedings in the district court are stayed pending the appeal.  Following the government's request, the 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit agreed to hold the case in abeyance pending the <i>O'Brien</i> ruling.
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 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.	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, relying on the <i>O'Brien</i> order. The 8 <sup>th</sup> Circuit denied the motion to consolidate with <i>O'Brien</i> . It heard oral argument on October 24, 2013.  <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>

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 and a motion to stay all proceedings pending rulings in <i>O'Brien</i> and <i>Annex Medical</i> .
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. Parties agreed to stay the case and the enforcement of the benefit pending the rulings in <i>O'Brien</i> and <i>Annex Medical</i> .
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. Parties agreed to stay the case and the enforcement of the benefit pending the rulings in <i>O'Brien</i> and <i>Annex Medical</i> .
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> .
37	<b>Feltl &amp; Co., Inc. v. Sebelius</b>	Feltl & Co., Inc. is a Minnesota-based securities brokerage and investment	District court granted plaintiffs' unopposed motion for a preliminary injunction, stating that the injunction is in force until 30 days after a decision in

	Filed 9/25/2013 13-cv-2635 (D. Minn.)	banking company.	<i>O'Brien</i> or <i>Annex Medical</i> or until the Supreme Court issues a decision in a substantially similar case.
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 and the government's unopposed motion to stay proceedings.
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. The court stayed the case pending resolution of the appeal in either <i>O'Brien</i> or <i>Annex Medical</i> , or until the Supreme Court issues a ruling in a substantially similar case, whichever occurs first.
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> .
41	<b>Stinson Electric v. Sebelius</b> Filed 3/26/2014 14-cv-00830 (D. Minn.)	Stinson Electric, Inc. is a Minnesota electrical services company.	District court granted plaintiffs' unopposed motion for a preliminary injunction and stayed the case pending the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i> .
42	<b>Newland v. Burwell</b> Filed 4/30/2012 12-cv-01123 (D. Colo.) 12-1380 (10th Cir.)	Hercules Industries, Inc. is a Colorado corporation that manufactures heating, ventilation, and air conditioning products, owned by the Newlands and another plaintiff.	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.  The government filed a cert petition with the

	13-919 (U.S. Sup. Ct.)		Supreme Court, which the Court denied after its decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> .
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. While that appeal was pending, the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit denied separate injunctive relief. The plaintiffs appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court for the separate relief but the Supreme Court refused to hear the case.</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>After the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit's decision, the district court granted the plaintiffs' emergency motion for a temporary restraining order and 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.</p> <p>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 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 gave the government until September 5, 2014 to decide how it wishes to proceed in the case.</p>

44	<b>Briscoe v. Burwell</b>  Filed 2/4/2013  13-cv-285 (D. Colo.)  13-1461 (10th Cir.)	Continuum Health Partnership is a Colorado-based oxygen supply company. Conessione is an investment company.	District court denied a temporary restraining order. Following the district court's grant of a preliminary injunction in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and after submitting answers to additional questions the district court instructed them to answer, the court granted plaintiffs a preliminary injunction with respect to the contraceptive methods to which plaintiff objects.  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the 10 <sup>th</sup> Circuit granted the government's motion to hold the case in abeyance and gave the government until September 5, 2014 to decide how it wishes to proceed in the case.
45	<b>Armstrong v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 3/5/2013  13-cv-00563 (D. Colo.)  13-1218 (10th Cir.)	Cherry Creek Mortgage Co. is a Colorado-based full-service residential mortgage banking company.	District court denied the motion for a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 10 <sup>th</sup> Circuit. After the 10 <sup>th</sup> Circuit's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the plaintiffs filed a motion with the district court for an injunction pending appeal and requested a decision as soon as possible.  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.  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the 10 <sup>th</sup> Circuit granted the government's motion to hold the case in abeyance and gave the government until September 5, 2014 to decide how it wishes to proceed in the case.
46	<b>Beckwith Electric Co. v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 3/12/2013  13-cv-648 (M.D. Fla.)  13-13879 (11th Cir.)	Beckwith Electric Co. is a Florida-based provider of micro-processor-based technology.	District court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 11 <sup>th</sup> Circuit.  <i>Amicus brief filed in the 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 13 other national, regional, state and local organizations.</i>  The 11 <sup>th</sup> Circuit stayed the case pending issuance of the Supreme Court's decisions in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i> .

Cases that Include Both For- and Non-Profit Plaintiffs (last updated August 18, 2014)			
	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.</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.</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 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit is holding the for-profit appeal in abeyance as the Supreme Court considers the <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i> cases.</p> <p>The court consolidated for purposes of briefing the non-profit <i>Geneva College</i> challenge, <i>Perisco</i>, and <i>Zubik</i>.</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>12-cv-12061 (E.D. Mich.)</p> <p>13-1092, 13-1093, 14-1183 (6th Cir.)</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 individuals and professional organizations.</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 briefs addressing the effect of <i>Autocam</i> on this case.</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</p>

			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. On December 20, 2013, the district court granted a preliminary injunction to Legatus. The government has 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 held the case in abeyance pending resolution of the appeal in <i>Michigan Catholic Conference</i> and <i>Diocese of Nashville</i> .
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>The government appealed to the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit the preliminary injunction in effect for the non-profit plaintiffs.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit non-profit challenge by NWLC on behalf of 20 other national, regional, and state organizations.</i></p>
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 (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>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. District court also dismissed claims of plaintiff Catholic Insurance Company, finding that it lacked standing.</p> <p>District court then granted an emergency motion for a temporary restraining order for members of the CBA that joined CBA after the court granted a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>The government appealed to the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p>

Non-Profit Cases (last updated August 18, 2014)			
	Case	Location of Non-Profit	Status
1	<b>Belmont Abbey Coll. v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 11/10/2011  11-cv-01989 (D.D.C.)  12-5291 (D.C. Cir.)	North Carolina	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, 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 September 2, 2014.
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	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</i>

	12-cv-815 (D.D.C) 13-509 (D.C. Cir.)		<p><i>Abbey and Wheaton College</i>. The D.C. Circuit then dismissed as moot the appeal with respect to the initial contraceptive coverage regulations.</p> <p>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.</p>
5	<p><b>Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington v. Burwell</b></p> <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>	Washington, D.C.	<p>The district court granted summary judgment in part to the government and in part to the non-profit parties.</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>
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>Following the D.C. Circuit's decision in <i>Gilardi</i>, the district court asked the parties to address the impact of <i>Gilardi</i> on this case.</p> <p>Following the Supreme Court's announcement that it would review <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i>, the district court directed the parties to address the impact of the announcement.</p> <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</p>

			before judgment filed by the plaintiffs in which they asked the Court to review the case before the D.C. Circuit issued a decision.
7	<b>March for Life v. Burwell</b> Filed 7/7/2014 14-cv-01149 (D.D.C.)	Washington, D.C.	Complaint filed.
8	<b>Priests for Life v. Sebelius</b> Filed 2/15/2012 12-cv-00753 (E.D.N.Y.)	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	<b>Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York v. Sebelius</b> Filed 5/21/2012 12-cv-2542 (E.D.N.Y.) 14-427 (2d Cir.)	New York	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.  The district court granted summary judgment and an injunction to the non-diocesan plaintiffs. The government appealed to the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Circuit.  <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>
10	<b>Persico v. Sebelius</b> (also known as Diocese of Erie v. Sebelius or Trautman v. Sebelius) Filed 5/21/2012 12-cv-00123 (W.D. Pa.)	Pennsylvania	District court denied a preliminary injunction and granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
11	<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) Filed 10/8/2013 13-cv-303 (W.D. Pa.)	Pennsylvania	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.  The 3 <sup>rd</sup> Circuit consolidated for purposes of briefing the non-profit <i>Geneva College</i> challenge, <i>Perisco</i> , and <i>Zubik</i> .  <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>

	14-1376 (3d Cir.)		
12	<b>Zubik v. Sebelius</b> (also known as Diocese of Pittsburgh v. Sebelius)  Filed 5/21/2012  12-cv-676 (W.D. Pa.)	Pennsylvania	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 voluntarily dismissal of the appeal, which the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Circuit granted. Case is closed.
13	<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)  Filed 10/8/2013  13-cv-1459 (W.D. Pa.)  14-1377 (3d Cir.)	Pennsylvania	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.  The 3 <sup>rd</sup> Circuit consolidated for purposes of briefing the non-profit <i>Geneva College</i> challenge, <i>Perisco</i> , and <i>Zubik</i> .  <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>
14	<b>Brandt v. Burwell</b> (also known as Diocese of Greensburg v. Burwell)  Filed 5/27/2013  14-cv-00681 (W.D. Pa.)	Pennsylvania	District court granted preliminary injunction.
15	<b>Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, et al. v. Burwell</b>  Filed 6/2/2014  14-cv-03096 (E.D. Pa.)  14-3126 (3d Cir.)	Pennsylvania	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. The 3 <sup>rd</sup> Circuit then directed the parties to file responses as to whether the case should be remanded to the district court for reconsideration in light of the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and its order in <i>Wheaton College</i> .
16	<b>Valley Forge Christian College v. Burwell</b>  Filed 8/6/2014  14-cv-04622 (E.D. Pa.)	Pennsylvania	Complaint filed.

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> <p>On December 2, the Supreme Court denied Liberty University’s cert petition.</p>
18	<p><b>Louisiana College v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 2/18/2012</p> <p>12-cv-463 (W.D. La.)</p>	Louisiana	<p>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>.</p> <p>In August 2014, the district court granted plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment on its RFRA claim.</p>
19	<p><b>Roman Catholic Diocese of Dallas v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-1589 (N.D. Tex.)</p>	Texas	<p>District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.</p>
20	<p><b>Roman Catholic Diocese of</b></p>	Texas	<p>District court granted a preliminary injunction to plaintiff</p>

	<p><b>Fort Worth v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-00314 (N.D. Tex.)</p> <p>14-10241, 14-10661 (5th Cir.)</p>		<p>University of Dallas (<i>Univ. of Dallas</i>, 14-10241). The government appealed to the 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>District court later granted a preliminary injunction to the remaining plaintiffs. The government appealed to the 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit (14-10661).</p> <p>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>.</p>
21	<p><b>Roman Catholic Diocese of Biloxi v Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-158 (S.D. Miss.)</p>	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 is closed.
22	<p><b>Roman Catholic Diocese of Biloxi v Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 3/27/2014</p> <p>14-cv-146 (S.D. Miss.)</p>	Mississippi	Complaint filed. The district court set a briefing schedule.
23	<p><b>East Texas Baptist University v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 10/9/2012</p> <p>12-cv-3009 (E.D. Tex.)</p> <p>14-20112 (5th Cir.)</p>	Texas	<p>Plaintiffs submitted an amended complaint challenging the final birth control rule. Westminster Theological Seminary intervened as an additional plaintiff.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>.</p>
24	<p><b>Criswell College v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 11/1/2012</p> <p>12-cv-4409 (N.D. Tex.)</p>	Texas	The court dismissed the case on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
25	<p><b>American Family Association v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 2/20/2013</p> <p>13-cv-32 (N.D. Miss.)</p>	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> .
27	<b>Franciscan University of Steubenville v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 5/21/2012  12-cv-440 (S.D. Ohio)	Ohio	Court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
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.)	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.
30	<b>Right to Life of Michigan v. Sebelius</b>	Michigan	Complaint and motion for preliminary injunction filed. District court granted motion to stay.

	Filed 11/4/2013 13-cv-1202 (W.D. Mich.)		
31	<b>Michigan Catholic Conference v. Burwell</b> Filed 11/14/2013 13-cv-1247 (W.D. Mich.) 13-2723 (6th Cir.)	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> .  <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>  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.
32	<b>Ave Maria Foundation v. Sebelius</b> Filed 12/20/2013 13-cv-15198 (E.D. Mich.) 14-1310 (6th Cir.)	Michigan	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> and held the case in abeyance pending resolution of the appeal in <i>Michigan Catholic Conference</i> and <i>Diocese of Nashville</i> .
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, 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</b>	Indiana	District court denied motion for preliminary injunction.

	<p><b>v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 12/3/2013</p> <p>13-cv-1276 (N.D. Ind.)</p> <p>13-3853 (7th Cir.)</p>		<p>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 injunction pending appeal with the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>Following oral argument in the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit on February 12, 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.</p>
36	<p><b>Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, Inc. v. Sebelius</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.</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. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 8/23/2012</p>	Indiana	Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint challenging the final rule and motion for preliminary injunction. The district court granted a preliminary injunction. The

	12-cv-459 (N.D. Ind.) 14-1430 (7th Cir.)		government appealed to the 7 <sup>th</sup> Circuit.  The 7 <sup>th</sup> Circuit consolidated the appeal with <i>Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend</i> and set a briefing schedule.  <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>
40	<b>Wheaton College v. Burwell</b> Filed 12/13/2013 13-cv-8910 (N.D. Ill.) 14-2396 (7th Cir.) 13A1284 (SCOTUS)	Illinois	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.  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.
41	<b>CNS Ministries v. Sebelius</b> Filed 11/20/2012 12-cv-81 (E.D. Mo.)	Missouri	District court granted plaintiffs' request to dismiss the case without prejudice. Case is closed.
42	<b>Archdiocese of St. Louis v. Sebelius</b> Filed 5/21/2012 12-cv-924 (E.D. Mo.)	Missouri	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness and standing. Case is closed.
43	<b>Archdiocese of St. Louis v. Burwell</b> Filed 11/14/2013 13-cv-2300 (E.D. Mo.)	Missouri	District court granted preliminary injunction.
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.
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.
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.)	Colorado	District court granted a preliminary injunction and administratively closed the case.
49	<b>Southern Nazarene University v. Burwell</b>  Filed 9/20/2013  13-cv-1015 (W.D. Okla.)  14-6026 (10th Cir.)	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>  Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the parties submitted court-ordered supplemental briefs addressing the impact of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> on the issues raised in this case.
50	<b>Little Sisters of the Poor v.</b>	Colorado	District court denied plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary

	<p><b>Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 9/24/2013</p> <p>13-cv-02611 (D. Colo.)</p> <p>13-1540 (10th Cir.)</p> <p>13A691 (SCOTUS)</p>		<p>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 Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the parties submitted court-ordered supplemental briefs addressing the impact of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> on the issues raised in this case.</p>
51	<p><b>Reaching Souls International, Inc. v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 10/11/2013</p> <p>13-cv-01092 (W.D. Okla.)</p> <p>14-6028 (10th Cir.)</p>	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 Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>, the parties submitted court-ordered supplemental briefs addressing the impact of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> on the issues raised in this case.</p>
52	<p><b>Fellowship of Catholic University Students ("FOCUS") v. Sebelius</b></p> <p>Filed 12/3/2013</p> <p>13-cv-3263 (D. Colo.)</p>	Colorado	<p>District court granted preliminary injunction and stayed further rulings until 30 days after the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i>.</p>
53	<p><b>Dobson v. Burwell</b></p> <p>Filed 12/10/2013</p> <p>13-cv-3326 (D. Colo.)</p>	Colorado	<p>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>.</p>

	14-1233 (10th Cir.)		
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.
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 World 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.
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 13-cv-630 (M.D. Fla.)	Florida	Following the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> , the district court reopened the case and set a briefing schedule.
59	<b>Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Atlanta v. Sebelius</b> Filed 10/5/2012 12-cv-3489 (N.D. Ga.)	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.

	14-12890, 14-13239 (11th Cir.)		
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.)	Florida	Complaint filed and briefing schedule set.

<b>Other Cases</b> (last updated August 18, 2014)			
	<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 liberal bias in the media.	<p>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 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>
2	<b>Wieland v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 8/14/2013  13-cv-01577 (E.D. Mo.)  13-3528 (8th Cir.)	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 is scheduled for September 8, 2014.</p>
3	<b>State of Nebraska, et al. v. Sebelius</b>  Filed 2/23/2012  12-cv-03035 (D. Neb.)  12-2328 (8th Cir.)	The states of Nebraska, South Carolina, Michigan, Texas, Florida, Ohio, and Oklahoma	<p>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.</p>