ERIC FocusOn Call *King v. Burwell*

Anthony F. Shelley Miller & Chevalier Chartered

July 2, 2015



Miller & Chevalier Chartered

Agenda

- King v. Burwell
 - Brief background
 - The majority's decision
 - The dissent
 - Consequences and insights
- Gobeille v. Liberty Mutual
 - Question presented
 - Importance of the issue



King v. Burwell Background

- IRC § 36B makes ACA tax credits available to those enrolled in a health plan "through an Exchange established by the State under section 1311"
 - Section 1311 is the principal section of the ACA mandating that each state "shall" establish an Exchange
 - But ACA § 1321 says state may "elect" to establish an Exchange, and if not, "the Secretary [of HHS] shall establish and operate such exchange within the State"
- The issue is whether the IRS exceeded its authority by allowing tax credits where the state itself did not establish the Exchange – namely for coverage purchased on Federally-Facilitated Exchanges (FFEs)



King v. Burwell Background

- Pre-oral argument betting
 - Odds against the government
- Post-oral argument betting
 - Odds slightly favor the government
 - Kennedy seemed to be the key
 - Roberts nearly silent at oral argument
- Post-oral argument developments
 - New York Times article showing that language resulted from a drafting error
 - Actual intent vs. actual words



King v. Burwell Background: The Justices

Conservative------Liberal



















King v. Burwell: The Majority Opinion

- Chief Justice Roberts is the author
- Lawyerly, matter-of-fact tone
- Learned summary of ACA's policy underpinnings
- No Chevron deference
- Outline of statutory ambiguity
 - Language to be seen "in context"
- Resolution of the ambiguity in the government's favor
 - Statutory purposes
 - Statutory structure and the placement of the language
- Final nod to the superficial appeal of King's reading



King v. Burwell: Dissent

- Justice Scalia is the author
- Mocking tone, though the majority doesn't take the bait
 - Majority engages in "jiggery-pokery"
 - Majority's arguments are "pure applesauce"
 - Statute better referred to as "SCOTUScare"
- Real disagreement is over a court's role and interpreting text differently than its "natural" meaning
 - Too dangerous for courts to try to discern different intent than existing on face of statute
 - Make Congress fix its mistakes



King v. Burwell: Impact and Insights

- The opinion drafting
 - Differences in majority and dissent tone and style
 - Why reference *Utility Air* so much?
- Why did Chief Justice Roberts write the opinion?
 - Ramification of Roberts-Kennedy alliance
- The business community's amicus briefs mattered
- Vindication for Mitt Romney, but criticism for the IRS and Congress
- Chevron cloud: the biggest doctrinal development



King v. Burwell: Impact and Insights

- Oral arguments can give insights, to a point
 - No focus on constitutional "coercion" concern
- Any relationship to the Court's other year-end decisions?
 - How can Chief Justice Roberts be in the majority here, and then write the dissent he did in Obergefell?
- Key takeaways:
 - Major core challenges to the ACA are over, with the Supreme Court indicating it is the ACA's friend
 - This may be a practical Court, more than an ideological one



Gobeille

- Gobeille v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co., No 14-181 (U.S.)
 - Solicitor General recommended against certiorari, but the Court took the case anyway
 - Question presented: "Whether the Second Circuit in a two-to-one panel decision rejecting the DOL's position as *amicus* – erred in holding that ERISA preempts Vermont's health care database law as applied to the third-party administrator for a self-funded ERISA plan"
 - Major preemption guidance or even overhaul is potentially brewing at the Court, plus maybe a Chevron ruling too



Anthony F. Shelley Miller & Chevalier Chartered 655 Fifteenth Street, NW Suite 900 Washington, DC 20005 Phone: 202-626-5924 E-mail: ashelley@milchev.com

