

ORAL ARGUMENT HELD MARCH 16, 2018

DECISION ISSUED AUGUST 17, 2018

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

AIR ALLIANCE, et al.,	)	
	)	
Petitioners,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL	)	Nos. 17-1155; 17-1181
PROTECTION AGENCY, et al.,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	
	)	

**INDUSTRY INTERVENORS’ MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION OF THE COURT’S DECISION TO GRANT  
PETITIONERS’ JOINT MOTION FOR EXPEDITED ISSUANCE  
OF THE MANDATE AND FOR RECALL OF THE MANDATE**

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27 and Circuit Rule 27, Industry Intervenors<sup>1</sup> submit this Motion for Reconsideration Of The Court’s Decision To Grant Petitioners’ Joint Motion For Expedited Issuance Of The Mandate and for recall of the mandate. *See* August 31, 2018 Order (Doc. No. 1748554) (the “Order”).

---

<sup>1</sup> Industry Intervenors are comprised of the American Chemistry Council, the American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, the American Petroleum Institute, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, and the Chemical Safety Advocacy Group.

## ORAL ARGUMENT HELD MARCH 16, 2018

DECISION ISSUED AUGUST 17, 2018

**INTRODUCTION**

The Court granted Petitioners' motion before giving Industry Intervenors (or EPA and the State Intervenors) the time to respond provided by the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and this Court's Rules. The Court should rescind its Order and recall its mandate.

**ARGUMENT**

Rule 27 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure provides that “[a]ny party may file a response to a motion ... [t]he response must be filed within 10 days after service of the motion unless the court shortens or extends the time.” Fed. R. App. P. 27(a)(3)(A). Motions “authorized by Rule[] 41,” however, “may be granted before the 10-day period runs *only if* the court gives reasonable notice to the parties that it intends to act sooner.” Fed. R. App. P. 27(a)(3)(A) (emphasis added). Here, the Court granted Petitioners' motion to expedite issuance of the mandate without affording EPA or Intervenors notice or an opportunity to respond.

The Court issued its judgment on August 17, 2018 and provided that its mandate would issue 7 days following the disposition of any rehearing petition. August 17, 2018 Order (Doc. No. 1746107). On

## ORAL ARGUMENT HELD MARCH 16, 2018

DECISION ISSUED AUGUST 17, 2018

August 24, 2018, Petitioners filed a motion to expedite the mandate, citing Circuit Rule 41(a)(1) and Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 41(b). Petitioners requested that the mandate issue on September 7, 2018, which would allow the Court to “consider any response (if filed) pursuant to Fed. R. App. 27(a)(3) and D.C. Cir. R. 27.” Pet. Mot. 12.

Industry Intervenors have been preparing a response in opposition to Petitioners’ motion and were planning to file that response on Tuesday, September 4, 2018, which is within the 10-day period afforded by Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. However, the Court never gave Industry Intervenors notice of its decision to grant Petitioners’ motion before the running of this 10-day period and thereby violated Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(a)(3)(A). The Court should accordingly rescind the Order and recall its mandate to give Industry Intervenors the opportunity to exercise their right to respond.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> We have requested the position of the parties, but due to the exigency of the circumstances, we have heard from only Petitioner United Steel Workers, which opposes the motion.

ORAL ARGUMENT HELD MARCH 16, 2018

DECISION ISSUED AUGUST 17, 2018

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should rescind the Order and recall its mandate.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ SHANNON S. BROOME

SHANNON S. BROOME  
CHARLES H. KNAUSS  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20007  
(202) 955-1500  
sbroome@hunton.com

*Counsel for Chemical Safety  
Advocacy Group*

LESLIE A. HULSE  
AMERICAN CHEMISTRY COUNCIL  
700 2ND STREET, N.E.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20002  
(202) 249-6131

*Counsel for the American  
Chemistry Council*

/s/ RYAN C. MORRIS

C. FREDERICK BECKNER III  
JUSTIN A. SAVAGE  
RYAN C. MORRIS  
KURT A. JOHNSON  
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 736-8000  
rmorris@sidley.com

*Counsel for RMP Coalition*

PETER TOLSDORF  
AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE  
1220 L Street, N.W.  
Washington DC, 20005  
(202) 682-8000

*Counsel for the American  
Petroleum Institute*

ORAL ARGUMENT HELD MARCH 16, 2018

DECISION ISSUED AUGUST 17, 2018

RICHARD S. MOSKOWITZ  
TAYLOR HOVERMAN  
AMERICAN FUEL &  
PETROCHEMICAL  
MANUFACTURERS  
1667 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 457-0480

*Counsel for American Fuel &  
Petrochemical Manufacturers*

STEVEN P. LEHOTSKY  
MICHAEL B. SCHON  
U.S. CHAMBER LITIGATION CENTER  
1615 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20062

*Counsel for the Chamber of  
Commerce of the United States of  
America*

August 31, 2018

ORAL ARGUMENT HELD MARCH 16, 2018

DECISION ISSUED AUGUST 17, 2018

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 32(g)(1) and 27(d)(2)(A), I certify that the foregoing Motion contains 460 words as counted by Microsoft Word and thus complies with the 5,200 word limit.

Further, this document complies with the typeface and type-style requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(a)(5) and (a)(6) because it has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2016 using size 14 Century Schoolbook font.

/s/ RYAN C. MORRIS  
RYAN C. MORRIS

ORAL ARGUMENT HELD MARCH 16, 2018

DECISION ISSUED AUGUST 17, 2018

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on August 31, 2018, I will cause the foregoing document to be electronically filed through this Court's CM/ECF system. Participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the CM/ECF system.

/s/ RYAN C. MORRIS  
RYAN C. MORRIS