

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

Deborah S. Hunt  
Clerk

100 EAST FIFTH STREET, ROOM 540  
POTTER STEWART U.S. COURTHOUSE  
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202-3988

Tel. (513) 564-7000  
[www.ca6.uscourts.gov](http://www.ca6.uscourts.gov)

Filed: December 31, 2013

Ms. Jennifer Brinkman Flannery  
Mr. Adam C. Jed  
Mr. Matthew A. Kairis  
Ms. Alisa B. Klein  
Mr. Jacek Pruski  
Mr. Mark B. Stern  
Ms. Paula Batt Wilson

Re: Case No. 13-2723, *Michigan Catholic Conference, et al v. Kathleen Sebelius, et al*  
Originating Case No. : 1:13-cv-01247

Dear Sir or Madam,

The Court issued the enclosed Order today in this case.

Sincerely yours,

s/Yvonne Henderson  
Case Manager  
Direct Dial No. 513-564-7031

Enclosure

No. 13-2723

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MICHIGAN CATHOLIC CONFERENCE, in its )  
own name and, obo Michigan Catholic Conference )  
Second Amended And Restated Group Health )  
Benefit Plan for Employees; CATHOLIC FAMILY )  
SERVICES, dba Catholic Charities Diocese of )  
Kalamazoo, )

Plaintiffs-Appellants, )

v. )

KATHLEEN SEBELIUS, in her official capacity )  
as Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and )  
Human Services; THOMAS E. PEREZ, in his )  
official capacity as Secretary of the U.S. )  
Department of Labor; JACOB J. LEW, in his )  
official capacity as Secretary of the U.S. )  
Department of Treasury; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF )  
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; U.S. )  
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR; U.S. )  
DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY )

Defendants-Appellees. )

**FILED**  
Dec 31, 2013  
DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

ORDER

Before: BATCHELDER, Chief Judge; SILER and STRANCH, Circuit Judges.

The plaintiffs appeal the denial of their motion to preliminarily enjoin the defendants from enforcing requirements under the Affordable Care Act that result in the provision of cost-free coverage for contraceptive services to their employees. The plaintiffs move for an injunction pending appeal, alleging that the provision violates their rights under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (“RFRA”), 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb, *et seq.* The defendants oppose an injunction, and the plaintiffs reply.

No. 13-2723

- 2 -

Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 8(a)(2) authorizes us to grant an injunction pending appeal. “In granting such an injunction, the Court is to engage in the same analysis that it does in reviewing the grant or denial of a motion for a preliminary injunction.” *Overstreet v. Lexington-Fayette Urban Cnty. Gov’t*, 305 F.3d 566, 572 (6th Cir. 2002). The relevant factors are: “(1) whether the movant has shown a strong likelihood of success on the merits; (2) whether the movant will suffer irreparable harm if the injunction is not issued; (3) whether the issuance of the injunction would cause substantial harm to others; and (4) whether the public interest would be served by issuing the injunction.” *Id.* at 573; *see also Baker v. Adams Cnty./Ohio Valley Sch. Bd.*, 310 F.3d 927, 928 (6th Cir. 2002).

To demonstrate a likelihood of success on appeal, “[i]t is not enough that the chance of success on the merits be better than negligible.” *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 434 (2009) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Instead, “[m]ore than a mere possibility of relief is required.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). The Supreme Court has never considered similar RFRA claims. No circuit court has considered these claims on the merits. The district courts that have considered whether to grant a preliminary injunction on similar claims have issued conflicting decisions. *Compare, e.g., Mich. Catholic Conference v. Sebelius*, No. 1:13-CV-1247, 2013 WL 6838707 (W.D. Mich. Dec. 27, 2013); *Univ. of Notre Dame v. Sebelius*, No. 3:13-cv-01276-PPS, 2013 WL 6804773 (N.D. Ind. Dec. 20, 2013); *Priests for Life v. U.S. Dep’t of Health & Human Servs.*, No. 13-1261, 2013 WL 6672400, at \*5–10 (D.D.C. Dec. 19, 2013), *with S. Nazarene Univ. v. Sebelius*, No. CIV-13-1015-F, 2013 WL 6804265, at \*8–9 (W.D. Okla. Dec. 23, 2013); *Reaching Souls Int’l, Inc. v. Sebelius*, No. CIV-13-1092-D, 2013 WL 6804259 (W.D. Okla. Dec. 20, 2013); *Legatus v. Sebelius*, No. 12-12061, 2013 WL 6768607 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 20, 2013); *Roman Catholic Archdiocese of NY v. Sebelius*, No. 12 CIV. 2542 BMC, 2013 WL 6579764 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 16, 2013); *Zubik v. Sebelius*, Nos. 13cv1459/0303, 2013 WL 6118696 (W.D. Pa. Nov. 21, 2013). The

No. 13-2723

- 3 -

divergence of opinion by the district courts establishes more than a mere possibility of success on the merits.

Congress passed the RFRA “to restore the compelling interest test for free-exercise cases . . . and to provide a claim or defense to persons whose religious exercise is substantially burdened by government.” *Autocam Corp. v. Sebelius*, 730 F.3d 618, 625 (6th Cir. 2013) (internal quotations omitted), *pet. for cert. filed*, 82 U.S.L.W. 3245 (Oct. 15, 2013) (No. 13-482). The denial of an injunction can “cause irreparable harm if the claim is based upon a violation of the plaintiff’s constitutional rights.” *Overstreet*, 305 F.3d at 578; *see also Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 373 (1976) (“The loss of First Amendment freedoms, for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.”); *cf. McNeilly v. Land*, 684 F.3d 611, 620–21 (6th Cir. 2012) (“Once a probability of success on the merits was shown, irreparable harm followed . . . [b]ecause [the plaintiff] does not have a likelihood of success on the merits, . . . his argument that he is irreparably harmed by the deprivation of his First Amendment rights also fails.”). Given the divergence of opinions and the arguable merit of both the plaintiffs’ and the government’s position, it is not clear that the accommodation violates the RFRA. But the possibility that the plaintiffs’ constitutional rights may be violated weighs heavily in our decision, particularly given that there does not appear to be a substantial harm to others. The entities here presently have insurance plans that do not provide contraceptive services to their employees. The contraceptive mandate itself does not apply to three groups, all of which are large in number—employers with less than fifty employees, religious employers, and employees subject to grandfathered plans. Moreover, the government has already delayed implementation of the contraceptive mandate to the plaintiffs, and other entities similarly situated, during the safe harbor. Therefore, at this juncture, we believe that the factors weigh in support of an injunction pending appeal.

Finally, this appeal focuses on legal issues that have already been briefed below. The district court’s decision on appeal, as well as the district court’s decision in *Catholic Diocese of Nashville*

No. 13-2723

- 4 -

*v. Sebelius*, No. 3:13-01303, 2013 WL 6834375 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 26, 2013), conflict with another district court's decision in this circuit. *See Legatus v. Sebelius*, No. 12-12061, 2013 WL 6768607 (E.D. Mich. Dec. 20, 2013). Therefore, it is prudent to expedite consideration of the issues on appeal.

The motion for an injunction pending appeal is **GRANTED**. The government is hereby **ENJOINED** from enforcing the provision in question against the plaintiffs pending the disposition of this appeal. The appeal shall be expedited for briefing and submission, and no extensions of time of the briefing schedule will be granted absent extraordinary circumstances.

Stranch, Circuit Judge, Dissents. The reasons for my dissent will be submitted in a separate writing at a future time.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT



---

Clerk