

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

Over 100 lawsuits¹ 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.

For-profit companies are among those that are pushing for the courts to allow bosses to decide whether women will have access to insurance coverage of birth control. These cases have been filed by for-profit companies ranging from a mining company to the Hobby Lobby crafts store chain to an HVAC company. Non-profit organizations with religious objections to birth control have also brought challenges to the benefit. The challenges have been brought under the federal Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) and the First Amendment.

Supreme Court Review:

This term, the Supreme Court is reviewing 2 of the for-profit cases, *Hobby Lobby* and *Conestoga Wood Specialties*. Oral argument was heard on March 25, 2014. The Court is expected to issue a decision this term.

- In *Hobby Lobby* (a nationwide arts and crafts store chain with over 13,000 employees), the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals held in favor of the for-profit company, finding that it can exercise religious beliefs under RFRA and that the birth control requirement violated the company's rights under RFRA.
- In *Conestoga Wood Specialties* (a manufacturer of wood cabinet and specialty products with 950 employees), the 3rd Circuit Court of Appeals rejected both the for-profit corporation's and its owners' RFRA and First Amendment challenges to the birth control coverage requirement.
- It is expected that the Supreme Court will consider the threshold question of whether a for-profit corporation is capable of religious exercise, along with other RFRA and First Amendment issues, including:
 - Under RFRA: whether the birth control benefit substantially burdens religious exercise; if so, whether compelling government interests justify the burden and whether the benefit is the least restrictive means of furthering those interests.

¹ This number counts each case as a unique case, even if the same parties filed an earlier challenge that was dismissed or voluntarily withdrawn. Cases filed by both for- and non-profit employers are counted once, as for-profit cases.

- Under the First Amendment: whether the birth control coverage requirement is neutral and generally applicable; if not, whether compelling government interests justify the benefit.
- The National Women’s Law Center, joined by 68 other organizations, [filed an amicus brief](#) at the Supreme Court, focusing on the compelling government interests forwarded by the birth control coverage requirement.

Status of Cases in the Lower Federal Courts – For-Profits:

50 cases have been filed by for-profit companies, 48 of which are pending.

- To date, 7 panels of circuit courts of appeals have heard arguments in cases brought by for-profit companies, 6 of which have issued decisions.
- Three circuit court panels, the 3rd Circuit in *Conestoga* and the 6th Circuit in *Autocam* and *Eden Foods*, rejected the RFRA claims of the for-profit companies and their owners. The courts held that a for-profit corporation is not a “person” capable of religious exercise under RFRA and that the owners’ personal religious exercise is not affected by the birth control coverage requirement. The *Conestoga* court also rejected the First Amendment claims of the for-profit company and its owners.
- Three circuit court panels, the D.C. Circuit (*Gilardi*), 7th Circuit (in the consolidated *Korte* and *Grote* cases), and 10th Circuit (*Hobby Lobby*) have allowed the companies to refuse to cover birth control in their employees’ health insurance plans.
- An 8th Circuit panel has heard oral argument in 2 cases, *Annex Medical* and *O’Brien*, but has not yet issued a decision in either case.
- **4 cases include both for- and non-profit plaintiffs:** *Geneva College* (3rd Circuit), *Weingartz/Legatus* (6th Circuit); *Sharpe Holdings* (8th Circuit); and *Catholic Benefits Association* (W.D. Okla.) (See chart beginning on page 17).

Status of Cases in the Lower Federal Courts – Non-Profits:

57 cases have been brought by non-profit organizations, 34 of which are pending.

- Several of the non-profit cases were initially voluntarily withdrawn or dismissed as not being ripe or because plaintiffs lacked standing. This is because non-profits with religious objections to providing birth control coverage were given a delay in implementing the benefit and the Administration was undertaking rulemaking on an “accommodation” for non-profit organizations with religious objections to providing the benefit.
- The Administration finalized the accommodation rule on June 28. The rule allows a non-profit that holds itself out as religious and has religious objections to birth control to

refuse to cover it, while ensuring that the non-profit's employees receive the coverage without cost-sharing directly from the insurance company. So far, 34 non-profit cases have been filed by non-profits that are not satisfied with the accommodation. This includes 13 cases re-filed by non-profits that withdrew their initial challenges or whose challenges were dismissed.

Status of Cases in the Lower Federal Courts – Other:

2 cases have been brought by plaintiffs that are neither for-profit companies nor non-profit organizations.

- *Wieland* was brought by State Representative Paul Wieland, a member of the Missouri House of Representatives. This was the first challenge by an employee who receives insurance through an employer that is complying with the rule. A Missouri district court dismissed the case on the grounds that Representative Wieland did not have standing to bring the case. The plaintiffs have appealed to the 8th Circuit.
- *State of Nebraska* was brought by officials representing the states of Nebraska, South Carolina, Michigan, Texas, Florida, Ohio, and Oklahoma. Following the government's rulemaking on the accommodation, the 8th Circuit dismissed their case at the officials' request.

The attached chart details the cases brought by both for-profit companies, non-profit organizations, as well as other cases brought by plaintiffs that are neither not for-profit companies nor non-profit organizations. The first chart contains the for-profit cases; the second contains the non-profit cases; the third includes other 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 will be 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>.

For-Profit Cases (last updated April 28, 2014)			
	Case	Description and Location of For-Profit Company	Status
1	Tyndale House v. Sebelius Filed 10/2/2012 12-cv-1635 (D.D.C.) 13-5018 (D.C. Cir.)	Tyndale is an Illinois for-profit publishing company focusing on Christian books.	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. 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. In December 2013, the plaintiffs filed an amended complaint, adding the owners of Tyndale House Publishers as co-plaintiffs.
2	Gilardi v. Sebelius Filed 1/24/2013 13-cv-104 (D.D.C.) 13-5069 (D.C. Cir.) 13-915 (SCOTUS)	Freshway Foods is a fresh produce processor and packer. Freshway Logistics is a for-hire carrier of mainly refrigerated products. The companies are Ohio-based for-profits that serve 23 states.	District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the D.C. Circuit, which granted an injunction pending the appeal. <i>Amicus brief filed in the D.C. Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 14 other national, regional, state and local organizations.</i> 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. 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. The D.C. Circuit has ordered that the injunction pending appeal continue until the end of Supreme Court proceedings.
3	Johnson Welded	Johnson Welded Products is	District court granted an unopposed motion for

	Products v. Sebelius Filed 4/30/2013 13-cv-609 (D.D.C.)	an Ohio-based manufacturer of reservoirs for air brake systems.	temporary injunctive relief and stayed the case.
4	Willis & Willis PLC v. Sebelius Filed 7/24/2013 13-cv-1124 (D.D.C.)	Willis & Willis PLC is a Michigan-based law firm.	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.
5	Trijicon, Inc. v. Sebelius (also known as Bindon v. Sebelius) Filed 8/5/2013 13-cv-1207 (D.D.C.)	Trijicon, Inc. is a Michigan-based maker of aiming systems for firearms.	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.
6	Barron Industries v. Sebelius Filed 9/4/2013 13-cv-1330 (D.D.C.)	Barron Industries, Inc. is a Michigan-based company that produces metal castings for various industries.	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.
7	Midwest Fastener Corp. v. Sebelius Filed 9/5/2013 13-cv-01337 (D.D.C.)	Midwest Fastener Corp. is a Michigan-based company that supplies fasteners to the hardware store, home center, and industrial markets.	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.
8	Williams v. Sebelius 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	C.W. Zumbiel, Co. v. Sebelius	Zumbiel Packaging is a Kentucky-based	District court granted unopposed motions for a preliminary injunction and to stay the case.

	Filed 10/22/2013 13-cv-01611 (D.D.C.)	manufacturer of paperboard packaging for consumer goods.	
10	Stewart et al. v. Sebelius 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	Conestoga Wood Specialties Corporation v. Sebelius 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 rd Circuit, which affirmed the district court's denial of a preliminary injunction. The 3 rd 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 rd Circuit's decision that a corporation is not a "person" under RFRA or the First Amendment. The 3 rd Circuit denied plaintiffs' motion to stay the decision until the conclusion of plaintiffs' appeal to the Supreme Court. Amicus brief filed in the 3 rd Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 15 other national, regional, state and local organizations. On November 26, the Supreme Court granted the cert petitions in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga Wood Specialties</i> and consolidated the cases. <i>Amicus brief filed at the Supreme Court on behalf of NWLC and 68 other organizations.</i> The Supreme Court heard oral argument on March 25, 2014.
12	Holland et al v. Sebelius Filed 6/24/2013	Holland Chevrolet is a West Virginia-based corporation engaged in selling and servicing motor vehicles.	Plaintiffs have filed an amended complaint and the government submitted a motion to dismiss. The court has stayed the case pending the Supreme

	13-cv-15487 (S.D. W. Va.)		Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i> .
13	Autocam Corporation et al. v. Sebelius Filed 10/8/2012 12-cv-1096 (W.D. Mich.) 12-2673, 13-2316 (6th Cir.)	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.	District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 6 th Circuit. <i>Amicus brief filed in the 6th Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 22 other national, regional, and state organizations.</i> A three judge panel in the 6 th 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. The plaintiffs filed a cert petition with the Supreme Court, asking the Court to review the 6 th Circuit's decision that a corporation is not a "person" capable of religious exercise under RFRA or the First Amendment.
14	Domino's Farms Corporation v. Sebelius Filed 12/14/2012 12-cv-15488 (E.D. Mich.) 13-1654 (6th Cir.)	Domino's Farms is a Michigan-based property management company.	District court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 6 th Circuit. In light of the 6 th Circuit's <i>Autocam</i> decision, the government filed a motion with the 6 th Circuit to reverse the district court's grant of a preliminary injunction. <i>Amicus brief filed in the 6th Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 17 other national, regional, state, and local organizations.</i> 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. The 6 th Circuit decided to review the case without oral argument.
15	Infrastructure Alternatives Inc. v. Sebelius Filed 1/10/2013 13-cv-00031 (W.D.	Infrastructure Alternatives is a Michigan corporation. It is a contractor in the fields of environmental dredging, contaminated sediment remediation, geotextile tube installation, and water	In light of the 6 th Circuit's decision in <i>Autocam</i> , the district court ordered the parties to show why it should not apply the 6 th 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

	Mich.)	treatment operations.	object to the court's dismissal of their RFRA and First Amendment claims. The court then dismissed plaintiffs' claims. Case is closed.
16	Mersino Management Company v. Sebelius Filed 3/22/2013 13-cv-11296 (E.D. Mich.) 13-1944 (6th Cir.)	Mersino Management Co. is a Michigan-based management company and provides insurance for Mersino Enterprises, Mersino Dewatering, Global Pump Co., and Mersino South-West.	District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 6 th Circuit. In light of the 6 th Circuit's decision in <i>Autocam</i> , the government filed a motion seeking summary affirmance of the district court's denial of a preliminary injunction.
17	Eden Foods Inc. v. Sebelius Filed 3/20/2013 13-cv-11229 (E.D. Mich.) 13-1677 (6th Cir.) 13-591 (SCOTUS)	Eden Foods is a Michigan-based corporation that specializes in supplying macrobiotic, organic food.	District court denied plaintiffs' a preliminary injunction and plaintiffs appealed to the 6 th Circuit. In light of the 6 th Circuit's decision in <i>Autocam</i> , the government filed a motion with the 6 th 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> . <i>Amicus brief filed in the 6th Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 19 other national, regional, state, and local organizations.</i> On October 24, 2013, a three judge panel in the 6 th 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. On November 12, the plaintiffs filed a cert petition with the Supreme Court, asking the Court to review the 6 th Circuit's decision.
18	MK Chambers Company v. Sebelius Filed 3/28/2013	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> .

	13-cv-11379 (E.D. Mich.)		
19	<p>M&N Plastics v. Sebelius</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>Nagle v. Sebelius</i>).</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>M&N Plastics v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 5/8/2013</p> <p>13-cv-12036 (E.D. Mich.)</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&N Plastics v. Sebelius</i> (above) in the district court for D.C.
21	<p>Mersino Dewatering, Inc. v. Sebelius</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>	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>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>Korte & Luitjohan Contractors v. Sebelius</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>	Korte & Luitjohan Contractors, Inc., is an Illinois-based full-service construction contractor.	<p>District court denied a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>The plaintiffs appealed to the 7th 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 7th 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 7th Circuit reversed the lower court's denial of injunctive relief and returned the case to the district court with instructions to grant a preliminary</p>

			<p>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, asking the Court to review the 7th Circuit's decision.</p>
23	<p>Triune Health Group v. Sebelius (also known as <i>Yep v. Sebelius</i>)</p> <p>Filed 8/22/2012</p> <p>12-cv-6756 (N.D. Ill.)</p> <p>13-1478 (7th Cir.)</p>	<p>Triune is a Illinois corporation that specializes in facilitating the re-entry of injured workers into the workforce.</p>	<p>District court granted a preliminary injunction because it construed the 7th Circuit decision in <i>Korte</i> as binding. The government appealed to the 7th 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>. Both courts granted the government's request to temporarily suspend the proceedings.</p>
24	<p>Grote Industries v. Sebelius</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.</p> <p>The plaintiffs appealed to the 7th Circuit. The 7th 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 7th 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 7th 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 7th Circuit's decision.</p>
25	<p>Tonn and Blank Construction v. Sebelius</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>

	Filed 9/20/2012 12-cv-00325 (N.D. Ind.)		
26	Lindsay, Rappaport and Postel LLC v. Sebelius Filed 2/14/2013 13-cv-1210 (N.D. Ill.)	LR&P is an Illinois-based law firm that primarily practices in insurance defense, insurance coverage, and appellate work.	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> .
27	Hartenbower v. Sebelius Filed 3/26/2013 13-cv-02253 (N.D. Ill.)	The Hartenbowers co-own Hart Electric LLC, an Illinois-based manufacturer of electrical components, and H.I. Cable.	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, the court granted an unopposed extension of the preliminary injunction and the stay pending the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> .
28	Ozinga v. Sebelius 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 th Circuit's rulings in the consolidated cases of <i>Korte</i> and <i>Grote</i> .
29	O'Brien v. Sebelius 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 th Circuit. On November 28, 2012, the 8 th Circuit issued a stay pending the appeal. The 8 th Circuit denied the motion to consolidate with <i>Annex Medical</i> . The 8 th 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 8th Circuit on behalf of NWLC.</i>
30	American Pulverizer Co. v. Sebelius Filed 10/19/2012	Springfield Iron and Metal, LLC, American Pulverizer Company, Hustler Conveyor Company, and City Welding are four Missouri-based	District court granted a preliminary injunction in part because of the stay granted in <i>O'Brien</i> by the 8 th Circuit. The government appealed the preliminary injunction to the 8 th Circuit. Proceedings in the district court are stayed pending the appeal.

	12-cv-3459 (W.D. Mo.) 13-1395 (8th Cir.)	companies involved in the business of wholesale scrap metal recycling and manufacturing of related machines.	Following the government's request, the 8 th Circuit agreed to hold the case in abeyance pending the <i>O'Brien</i> ruling.
31	Annex Medical Inc. v. Sebelius 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 th Circuit. The 8 th Circuit granted an injunction pending appeal, relying on the <i>O'Brien</i> order. The 8 th 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 8th Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 18 other national, regional, state and local organizations.</i>
32	Sioux Chief MFG. Co., Inc. v. Sebelius 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	Hall v. Sebelius 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	Bick Holdings Inc. v. Sebelius Filed 3/13/2013 13-cv-00462 (E.D.	Bick Holdings Inc. is a Missouri-based holding company for operating companies Bick Group Inc., Bick Properties Inc., and SEALCO LLC. Through these	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> .

	Mo.)	subsidiaries BHI engages in data center consulting, design, maintenance, service, and cleaning.	
35	SMA LLC. v. Sebelius 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	Medford v. Sebelius (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	Feltl & Co., Inc. v. Sebelius Filed 9/25/2013 13-cv-2635 (D. Minn.)	Feltl & Co., Inc. is a Minnesota-based securities brokerage and investment banking company.	District court granted plaintiffs' unopposed motion for a preliminary injunction, stating that the injunction is in force until 30 days after a decision in <i>O'Brien</i> or <i>Annex Medical</i> or until the Supreme Court issues a decision in a substantially similar case.
38	Randy Reed Automotive v. Sebelius 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	Doboszinski & Sons, Inc. v. Sebelius 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	Hastings Automotive v. Sebelius 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	Stinson Electric v. Sebelius Filed 3/26/2014 14-cv-00830 (D. Minn.)	Stinson Electric, Inc. is a Minnesota electrical services company.	Complaint filed.
42	Newland v. Sebelius Filed 4/30/2012 12-cv-01123 (D. Colo.) 12-1380 (10th Cir.) 13-919 (U.S. Sup. Ct.)	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 th 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 Supreme Court asking it to hold the petition pending the disposition of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i> , and then to dispose of it as appropriate in light of the Court's decision in those cases.
43	Hobby Lobby Stores Inc., et al. v. Sebelius Filed 9/12/2012 12-cv-1000 (W.D. Okla.) 12-6294, 13-6215 (10th Cir.) 13-354 (SCOTUS)	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.	District court denied a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 10 th Circuit. While that appeal was pending, the 10 th 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. <i>Amicus brief filed in the 10th Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 25 other national, regional, state and local organizations.</i> A divided <i>en banc</i> panel of the 10 th 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>After the 10th 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 10th Circuit's <i>en banc</i> decision.</p> <p>On November 26, 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>The case is stayed pending the Supreme Court's decision in the case.</p>
44	<p>Briscoe v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 2/4/2013</p> <p>13-cv-285 (D. Colo.)</p> <p>13-1461 (10th Cir.)</p>	<p>Continuum Health Partnership is a Colorado-based oxygen supply company. Conessione is an Investment company.</p>	<p>District court 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.</p> <p>The case is stayed until 14 days after the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i>.</p>
45	<p>Armstrong v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 3/5/2013</p> <p>13-cv-00563 (D. Colo.)</p> <p>13-1218 (10th Cir.)</p>	<p>Cherry Creek Mortgage Co. is a Colorado-based full-service residential mortgage banking company.</p>	<p>District court denied the motion for a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>The plaintiffs appealed to the 10th Circuit. After the 10th 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.</p> <p>The 10th 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. The court stayed the case pending the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i>.</p>

46	<p>Beckwith Electric Co. v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 3/12/2013</p> <p>13-cv-648 (M.D. Fla.)</p> <p>13-13879 (11th Cir.)</p>	<p>Beckwith Electric Co. is a Florida-based provider of micro-processor-based technology.</p>	<p>District court granted a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>The government appealed to the 11th Circuit.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 11th Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 13 other national, regional, state and local organizations.</i></p> <p>The 11th Circuit stayed the case pending issuance of the Supreme Court's decisions in <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i>.</p>
----	---	---	---

Cases that Include Both For- and Non-Profit Plaintiffs (last updated April 28, 2014)			
	Case	Description and Location of Plaintiffs	Status
1	<p>Geneva College v. Sebelius</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 3rd 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 3rd 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 3rd Circuit.</p> <p>The 3rd Circuit is holding the for-profit appeal in abeyance as the Supreme Court considers the <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i> cases. The court consolidated for purposes of briefing the non-profit <i>Geneva College</i> challenge, <i>Perisco</i>, and <i>Zubik</i>.</p>
2	<p>Weingartz Supply Company v. Sebelius (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 6th Circuit. Following the 6th 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 6th Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 16 other national, regional, state and local organizations.</i></p> <p><u>The non-profit plaintiff, Legatus:</u> the plaintiffs cross-appealed the denial of a preliminary injunction to Legatus and then voluntarily dismissed that appeal (13-1093). After the government finalized the accommodation in the birth control coverage rule, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint and motion for injunctive relief. On December 20, 2013, the district court granted a preliminary injunction to Legatus.</p>

			The government has appealed to the 6 th Circuit (14-1183).
3	Sharpe Holdings Inc. v. Sebelius Filed 12/20/2012 12-cv-92 (E.D. Mo.) 14-1507 (8th Cir.)	Sharpe Holdings, Inc. is a Missouri corporation that is involved in the farming, dairy, creamery, and cheese-making industries. 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.	District court granted a preliminary injunction to the for-profit plaintiffs. 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. The government appealed to the 8th Circuit the preliminary injunction in effect for the non-profit plaintiffs.
4	Catholic Benefits Association v. Sebelius Filed 3/12/2014 14-cv-240 (W.D. Okla.)	For- and non-profit corporations including Good Will Publishers, the Catholic Benefits Association, and Catholic Insurance Company.	Complaint and motions for preliminary injunction and class certification filed.

Non-Profit Cases (last updated April 28, 2014)			
	Case	Location of Non-Profit	Status
1	<p>Belmont Abbey Coll. v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 11/10/2011</p> <p>11-cv-01989 (D.D.C.)</p> <p>12-5291 (D.C. Cir.)</p>	North Carolina	<p>District court dismissed on grounds of standing and ripeness. Plaintiffs appealed to the D.C. Circuit.</p> <p>D.C. Circuit had been holding the case until the government completed its rulemaking on the application of the contraceptive coverage benefit to non-profits with religious objections. On August 13, 2013, after considering the parties' joint motion to terminate the abeyance status and remand to the district court in light 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.</p>
2	<p>Belmont Abbey Coll. v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 11/20/2013</p> <p>13-cv-1831 (D.D.C.)</p>	North Carolina	District court stayed the case pending the D.C. Circuit's rulings in <i>Priests for Life</i> and <i>Archbishop of Washington</i> .
3	<p>Wheaton College v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 7/18/2012</p> <p>12-cv-01169 (D.D.C.)</p> <p>12-5273 (D.C. Cir.)</p>	Illinois	<p>District court dismissed on grounds of standing and ripeness. Plaintiffs appealed to the D.C. Circuit.</p> <p>D.C. Circuit had been holding the case until the government completed its rulemaking on the application of the contraceptive coverage benefit to non-profits with religious objections. On August 13, 2013, after considering the parties' joint motion to terminate the abeyance status and remand to the district court in light 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.</p>
4	Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington v. Sebelius	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

	<p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-815 (D.D.C)</p> <p>13-509 (D.C. Cir.)</p>		<p>reverse and ruled to hold the appeal in abeyance, pending a decision in the consolidated cases of <i>Belmont Abbey</i> and <i>Wheaton College</i>. The D.C. Circuit then dismissed as moot the appeal with respect to the initial contraceptive coverage regulations.</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>Roman Catholic Archbishop of Washington v. Sebelius</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>	<p>Washington, D.C.</p>	<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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the D.C. Circuit by the National Women's Law Center 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>Priests for Life v. Sebelius</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>	<p>New York</p>	<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.</p>

			<p><i>Amicus brief filed in the D.C. Circuit by the National Women's Law Center on behalf of 13 other national and state organizations.</i></p> <p>The Supreme Court denied a petition for certiorari before judgment filed by the plaintiffs in which they asked the Court to review the case before the D.C. Circuit issued a decision.</p>
7	<p>Priests for Life v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 2/15/2012</p> <p>12-cv-00753 (E.D.N.Y.)</p>	New York	<p>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.</p>
8	<p>Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-2542 (E.D.N.Y.)</p> <p>14-427 (2d Cir.)</p>	New York	<p>The district court granted the motion to dismiss for the Diocese and Catholic Charities because they lack standing, but denied it for the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York, the Catholic Health Care System and the Catholic Health Services of Long Island.</p> <p>The district court granted summary judgment and an injunction to the non-diocesan plaintiffs. The government appealed to the 2nd Circuit.</p>
9	<p>Persico v. Sebelius (also known as Diocese of Erie v. Sebelius or Trautman v. Sebelius)</p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-00123 (W.D. Pa.)</p>	Pennsylvania	<p>District court denied a preliminary injunction and granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.</p>
10	<p>Persico v. Sebelius (also known as Diocese of Erie v. Sebelius)</p> <p>Filed 10/8/2013</p> <p>13-cv-303 (W.D. Pa.)</p> <p>14-1376 (3d Cir.)</p>	Pennsylvania	<p>District court granted an expedited motion for a preliminary injunction which it then converted into a permanent injunction at plaintiffs' request. The government appealed to the 3rd Circuit.</p> <p>The 3rd Circuit consolidated for purposes of briefing the non-profit <i>Geneva College</i> challenge, <i>Perisco</i>, and <i>Zubik</i>.</p>

11	<p>Zubik v. Sebelius (also known as Diocese of Pittsburgh v. Sebelius)</p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-676 (W.D. Pa.)</p>	Pennsylvania	<p>District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of standing and ripeness. Plaintiffs appealed to the 3rd Circuit. After the government finalized the accommodation under the birth control coverage rule, the parties requested voluntary dismissal of the appeal, which the 3rd Circuit granted. Case is closed.</p>
12	<p>Zubik v. Sebelius (also known as Diocese of Pittsburgh v. Sebelius)</p> <p>Filed 10/8/2013</p> <p>13-cv-1459 (W.D. Pa.)</p> <p>14-1377 (3d Cir.)</p>	Pennsylvania	<p>District court granted an expedited motion for a preliminary injunction which it then converted into a permanent injunction at plaintiffs' request. The government appealed to the 3rd Circuit.</p> <p>The 3rd Circuit consolidated for purposes of briefing the non-profit <i>Geneva College</i> challenge, <i>Perisco</i>, and <i>Zubik</i>.</p>
13	<p>Liberty University v. Geithner</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 4th 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 4th 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 4th Circuit affirmed dismissal of challenges to the individual and employer responsibility provisions. The 4th Circuit declined to consider the challenge to the contraceptive coverage benefit. The 4th 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 4th Circuit's dismissal of its challenge to the individual and employer responsibility provisions. In addition, plaintiffs asked the Court to review the 4th Circuit's refusal to consider its challenge to the contraceptive coverage benefit, which plaintiffs characterize as part of the employer</p>

			responsibility provision “as fully defined.” On December 2, the Supreme Court denied Liberty University’s cert petition.
14	Louisiana College v. Sebelius Filed 2/18/2012 12-cv-463 (W.D. La.)	Louisiana	In September 2013, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint and filed a motion for a preliminary injunction. The government filed a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim or, in the alternative, for summary judgment. The plaintiffs have also filed a motion for summary judgment. 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> .
15	Roman Catholic Diocese of Dallas v. Sebelius Filed 5/21/2012 12-cv-1589 (N.D. Tex.)	Texas	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
16	Roman Catholic Diocese of Fort Worth v. Sebelius Filed 5/21/2012 12-cv-00314 (N.D. Tex.) 14-10241 (5th Cir.)	Texas	District court denied the motion to dismiss and the motion to stay. The plaintiffs submitted an amended complaint and filed a motion for an injunction. The government filed a motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, for summary judgment. The district court granted a preliminary injunction to plaintiff University of Dallas. The government appealed to the 5 th Circuit.
17	Roman Catholic Diocese of Biloxi v Sebelius Filed 5/21/2012 12-cv-158 (S.D. Miss.)	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.
18	Roman Catholic Diocese of Biloxi v Sebelius Filed 3/27/2014 14-cv-146 (S.D. Miss.)	Mississippi	Complaint filed.
19	East Texas Baptist University v. Sebelius	Texas	Plaintiffs submitted an amended complaint challenging the final birth control rule. Westminster Theological

	<p>Filed 10/9/2012</p> <p>12-cv-3009 (E.D. Tex.)</p> <p>14-20112 (5th Cir.)</p>		<p>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 5th Circuit.</p>
20	<p>Criswell College v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 11/1/2012</p> <p>12-cv-4409 (N.D. Tex.)</p>	Texas	<p>The court dismissed the case on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.</p>
21	<p>American Family Association v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 2/20/2013</p> <p>13-cv-32 (N.D. Miss.)</p>	Mississippi	<p>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.</p>
22	<p>Catholic Diocese of Beaumont v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 12/10/2013</p> <p>13-cv-00709 (E.D. Tex.)</p> <p>14-40212 (5th Cir.)</p>	Texas	<p>District court granted a permanent injunction. The government appealed to the 5th Circuit.</p>
23	<p>Franciscan University of Steubenville v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-440 (S.D. Ohio)</p>	Ohio	<p>Court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.</p>
24	<p>Catholic Diocese of Nashville v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 9/12/2012</p> <p>12-cv-934 (M.D. Tenn.)</p> <p>12-6590 (6th Cir.)</p>	Tennessee	<p>District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of standing and ripeness. Plaintiffs appealed to the 6th Circuit. On February 28, 2013, the 6th Circuit granted the plaintiff's request to dismiss the case without prejudice. Case is closed.</p>
25	<p>Catholic Diocese of Nashville v. Sebelius</p>	Tennessee	<p>District court denied plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 6th Circuit, which granted plaintiffs' motion for an injunction</p>

	<p>Filed 11/22/2013</p> <p>13-cv-1303 (M.D. Tenn.)</p> <p>13-6640 (6th Cir.)</p>		<p>pending appeal in a 2-1 decision. The 6th Circuit consolidated the appeal with <i>Michigan Catholic Conference</i> and set a briefing schedule.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed in the 6th Circuit by the National Women's Law Center on behalf of 21 other national, state, regional, and local organizations.</i></p> <p>The district court stayed its proceedings pending the 6th Circuit appeal.</p>
26	<p>Right to Life of Michigan v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 11/4/2013</p> <p>13-cv-1202 (W.D. Mich.)</p>	Michigan	<p>Complaint and motion for preliminary injunction filed. District court granted motion to stay.</p>
27	<p>Michigan Catholic Conference v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 11/14/2013</p> <p>13-cv-1247 (W.D. Mich.)</p> <p>13-2723 (6th Cir.)</p>	Michigan	<p>District court denied plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 6th Circuit, which granted plaintiffs' motion for an injunction pending appeal in a 2-1 decision. The 6th Circuit consolidated the appeal with <i>Diocese of Nashville</i> and set a briefing schedule.</p> <p><i>Amicus brief filed by in the 6th Circuit the National Women's Law Center on behalf of 21 other national, state, regional, and local organizations.</i></p> <p>The district court stayed its proceedings pending the 6th Circuit appeal.</p>
28	<p>Ave Maria Foundation v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 12/20/2013</p> <p>13-cv-15198 (E.D. Mich.)</p> <p>14-1310 (6th Cir.)</p>	Michigan	<p>District court granted preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 6th Circuit.</p>
29	<p>Union University v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 4/4/2014</p> <p>14-cv-1079 (W.D. Tenn.)</p>	Tennessee	<p>Complaint and motion for preliminary injunction filed.</p>
30	<p>University of Notre Dame</p>	Indiana	<p>District court granted the government's motion to</p>

	<p>v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 5/21/2012</p> <p>12-cv-253 (N.D. Ind.)</p> <p>13-1479 (7th Cir.)</p>		<p>dismiss on grounds of standing and ripeness. On March 1, 2013, the plaintiffs appealed to the 7th Circuit. After the government finalized the accommodation under the birth control coverage rule, the, the 7th Circuit dismissed the appeal pursuant to the parties' joint motion to voluntarily dismiss. Case is closed.</p>
31	<p>University of Notre Dame v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 12/3/2013</p> <p>13-cv-1276 (N.D. Ind.)</p> <p>13-3853 (7th Cir.)</p>	Indiana	<p>District court denied motion for preliminary injunction. The plaintiff then appealed to the 7th Circuit, which denied the emergency application for an injunction pending appeal.</p> <p>The 7th 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 7th Circuit.</p> <p>Following oral argument in the 7th Circuit on February 12, the court denied Notre Dame a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>Notre Dame has requested rehearing en banc.</p> <p>The district court stayed its proceedings pending the 7th Circuit appeal.</p>
32	<p>Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, Inc. v. Sebelius</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 7th Circuit.</p> <p>The 7th Circuit consolidated the appeal with <i>Grace Schools</i> and set a briefing schedule.</p>
33	<p>Catholic Diocese of Peoria v. Sebelius</p> <p>Filed 8/9/2012</p> <p>12-cv-1276 (C.D. Ill.)</p>	Illinois	<p>District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.</p>
34	<p>Conlon v. Sebelius</p>	Illinois	<p>District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness and standing. Case is closed.</p>

	Filed 5/21/2012 12-cv-3932 (N.D. Ill.)		
35	Grace Schools v. Sebelius Filed 8/23/2012 12-cv-459 (N.D. Ind.) 14-1430 (7th Cir.)	Indiana	Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint challenging the final rule and motion for preliminary injunction. The district court granted a preliminary injunction. The government appealed to the 7 th Circuit. The 7 th Circuit consolidated the appeal with <i>Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend</i> and set a briefing schedule.
36	Wheaton College v. Sebelius Filed 12/13/2013 13-cv-8910 (N.D. Ill.)	Illinois	Complaint filed. The government filed motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim.
37	CNS Ministries v. Sebelius 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.
38	Archdiocese of St. Louis v. Sebelius 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.
39	Archdiocese of St. Louis v. Sebelius Filed 11/14/2013 13-cv-2300 (E.D. Mo.)	Missouri	Complaint filed. The government filed motion to dismiss, or in the alternative, for summary judgment.
40	College of the Ozarks v. Sebelius 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.
41	The School of the Ozarks v. Sebelius	Missouri	The plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed their claims against RightChoice Managed Care, Healthy Alliance Life Insurance, and HMO Missouri.

	Filed 4/19/2013 13-cv-3157 (W.D. Mo.)		Amended complaint and motion for summary judgment filed.
42	Dordt College v. Sebelius Filed 10/23/2013 13-cv-4100 (N.D. Iowa)	Iowa	Complaint filed. The government filed motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim, or in the alternative, for summary judgment. Ruling on the motions is stayed pending the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i> .
43	Colorado Christian University v. Sebelius Filed 12/22/2011 11-cv-03350 (D. Colo.)	Colorado	District court granted the motion to dismiss on grounds of ripeness. Case is closed.
44	Colorado Christian University v. Sebelius Filed 8/7/2013 13-cv-2105 (D. Colo.)	Colorado	Complaint and motion for preliminary injunction filed.
45	Southern Nazarene University v. Sebelius 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 th Circuit.
46	Little Sisters of the Poor v. Sebelius Filed 9/24/2013 13-cv-02611 (D. Colo.) 13-1540 (10th Cir.) 13A691 (SCOTUS)	Colorado	District court denied plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. The plaintiffs appealed to the 10 th 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 th Circuit, granted temporary relief while the government responds to the emergency application. 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 an organizations that hold themselves out as

			religious and have religious objections to contraceptive coverage. <i>Amicus brief filed in the 10th Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 15 other national, regional, and state organizations.</i>
47	Reaching Souls International, Inc. v. Sebelius Filed 10/11/2013 13-cv-01092 (W.D. Okla.) 14-6028 (10th Cir.)	Oklahoma	District court granted plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction and denied plaintiffs' motion for class certification. The government appealed to the 10 th Circuit. <i>Amicus brief filed in the 10th Circuit on behalf of NWLC and 18 other national, regional, and state organizations.</i>
48	Fellowship of Catholic University Students ("FOCUS") v. Sebelius Filed 12/3/2013 13-cv-3263 (D. Colo.)	Colorado	District court granted preliminary injunction and stayed further rulings until 30 days after the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> .
49	Dobson v. Sebelius Filed 12/10/2013 13-cv-3326 (D. Colo.)	Colorado	District court granted preliminary injunction.
50	Diocese of Cheyenne v. Sebelius 1/30/2014 14-cv-21 (D. Wyo.)	Wyoming	Complaint and motion for preliminary injunction filed.
51	Eternal Word Television Network, Inc. v. Sebelius 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.
52	Eternal Word Television Network, Inc. v. Sebelius Filed 10/28/2013	Alabama	EWTN and the State of Alabama filed a motion for summary judgment against the final birth control rule.

	13-cv-521 (S.D. Ala.)		
53	Ave Maria University v. Sebelius 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.
54	Ave Maria University v. Sebelius Filed 8/29/2013 13-cv-630 (M.D. Fla.)	Florida	The court administratively stayed the case pending the Supreme Court's resolution of <i>Hobby Lobby</i> and <i>Conestoga</i> .
55	Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Atlanta v. Sebelius Filed 10/5/2012 12-cv-3489 (N.D. Ga.)	Georgia	District court granted a permanent injunction.
56	The Most Reverend Thomas Wenski v Sebelius (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.
57	Ave Maria School of Law v. Sebelius Filed 11/12/2013 13-cv-795 (M.D. Fla.)	Florida	Complaint filed and briefing schedule set.

Other Cases (last updated April 28, 2014)			
	Case	Description of Plaintiffs	Status
1	Wieland v. Sebelius 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.	District court granted government's motion to dismiss, finding that plaintiffs lacked standing to bring their challenge. The plaintiffs appealed to the 8 th Circuit and filed an emergency motion with the district court for a preliminary injunction pending appeal, which the court denied. The 8 th Circuit set a briefing schedule. The 8 th Circuit denied the plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction pending appeal.
2	State of Nebraska, et al. v. Sebelius 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	District court granted a motion to dismiss on grounds of standing and ripeness. The plaintiffs appealed to the 8 th Circuit, which granted plaintiffs' motion to voluntarily dismiss the case. The case is closed.