



1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 700  
Arlington, VA 22209  
703.243.9423  
www.consvoymccarthy.com

March 17, 2022

Via ECF  
Honorable Mae A. D'Agostino  
United States District Court  
Northern District of New York  
James T. Foley U.S. Courthouse  
445 Broadway, Room 509  
Albany, NY 12207-2924

Re: *Jacobson v. Bassett*, 22-cv-33 (MAD)(ML)

Dear Judge D'Agostino:

On March 16, 2022, Defendant filed a letter notifying the Court of a decision from the Eastern District of New York in *Roberts v. Bassett*, 22-cv-710 (E.D.N.Y.). That decision was wrong and should not be followed here.

First, *Roberts* wrongly concluded that the Policy is merely “guidance” that is “nonbinding” on healthcare providers. Op. 10, 12, 15, 17, 19. As explained, Reply 6-7, the Policy speaks in mandatory terms. It orders providers and facilities to “adhere” to its prioritization criteria and states that antivirals are “authorized” only for those who “meet all the [identified] criteria.” Policy 1-2. No provider would feel free to violate the Policy. Reply Br. 7. Tellingly, *Roberts* never addresses the plain language of the Policy itself. Moreover, courts have long rejected government actors’ excuses that they merely “recommend[ed]” that “third parties” engage in racial discrimination. *See Baldwin v. Morgan*, 287 F.2d 750, 753-54 (5th Cir. 1961) (holding that an Alabama railroad could not “invite[]” racial segregation among passengers—even if that segregation was not “coercively compelled”—because “[w]hat is forbidden is the state action in which color (i.e., race) is the determinant”); *see* Reply 6-7. *Roberts* never addresses this line of cases either.

Second, *Roberts* improperly held that the plaintiff lacked standing. *See* Reply 2-6. Indeed, *Roberts* never even cites the key case on standing—*Baur v. Veneman*, 352 F.3d 625 (2d Cir. 2003). There, the Second Circuit “recognized that threatened harm in the form of an increased risk of future injury may serve as injury-in-fact for Article III standing purposes.” *Id.* at 633. Because downed cattle “may transmit . . . a deadly disease with no known cure or treatment,” the Court found that “even a moderate increase in the risk of disease may be sufficient to confer standing.” *Id.* at 637. *Baur* is directly on point

here. Because COVID-19 is a “deadly disease,” “even a moderate increase in the risk” caused by the Policy is sufficient to confer standing. *Id.* at 637. *Roberts*’s failure to grapple with *Baur* and similar cases, *see* Reply 4-5, fundamentally undermines its analysis.

*Roberts* is not persuasive and, of course, is not binding on this Court. The Court should not rely on it here.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michael Connolly

Gene P. Hamilton\*  
Virginia Bar No. 80434  
Vice-President and General Counsel  
America First Legal Foundation  
300 Independence Avenue SE  
Washington, DC 20003  
(202) 964-3721  
gene.hamilton@aflegal.org

Jonathan F. Mitchell\*  
Texas Bar No. 24075463  
Mitchell Law PLLC  
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 400  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(512) 686-3940 (phone)  
(512) 686-3941 (fax)  
jonathan@mitchell.law

Adam K. Mortara\*  
Illinois Bar No. 6282005  
Lawfair LLC  
125 South Wacker Drive Suite 300  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(773) 750-7154  
adam@mortalalaw.com

Jeffrey Harris\*  
Michael Connolly\*  
James Hasson\*  
Consovoy McCarthy PLLC  
1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 700  
(703) 243-9423  
jeff@consovoymccarthy.com  
mike@consovoymccarthy.com  
james@consovoymccarthy.com

James P. Trainor  
New York Bar No. 505767  
Trainor Law PLLC  
2452 U.S. Route 9  
Malta, New York 12020  
518-899-9200 (phone)  
jamest@trainor-lawfirm.com

\* *admitted pro hac vice*

*Counsel for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class*