Case: 14-3057 Document: 104-1 Filed: 06/16/2014 Page: 1 (1 of 8)

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

Filed: June 16, 2014

Mr. Byron Jeffords Babione Alliance Defending Freedom 15100 N. 90th Street Scottsdale, AZ 85260

Mr. Carmine D. Boccuzzi Jr. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton One Liberty Plaza New York, NY 10006

Ms. Jennifer L. Branch Gerhardstein & Branch 432 Walnut Street Suite 400 Cincinnati, OH 45202

Ms. Bridget Carty Coontz Ohio Attorney General's Office 30 E. Broad Street 16th Floor Columbus, OH 43215

Mr. Drew Sebastian Dennis ACLU of Ohio 4506 Chester Avenue Cleveland, OH 44103

Ms. Felicia H. Ellsworth Wilmer Hale 60 State Street Boston, MA 02109

Mr. James D. Esseks

Case: 14-3057 Document: 104-1 Filed: 06/16/2014 Page: 2 (2 of 8)

ACLU 125 Broad Street New York, NY 10004

Mr. Mark Christopher Fleming Wilmer Hale 60 State Street Boston, MA 02109

Mr. Alphonse A. Gerhardstein Gerhardstein & Branch 432 Walnut Street Suite 400 Cincinnati, OH 45202

Ms. Marcia D. Greenberger National Women's Law Center 11 Dupont Circle, N.W. Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036

Mr. Jacob Harris Hupart Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison 1285 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10019

Ms. Jaren Janghorbani Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison 1285 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10019

Mr. Lawrence J. Joseph Law Office 1250 Connecticut Avenue Suite 200 Washington, DC 20036

Ms. Roberta A. Kaplan Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison 1285 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10019

Mr. Joshua David Kaye Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison 1285 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10019 Case: 14-3057 Document: 104-1 Filed: 06/16/2014 Page: 3 (3 of 8)

Mr. Zachery P. Keller Ohio Attorney General Constitutional Offices Section 30 E. Broad Street 16th Floor Columbus, OH 43215

Ms. Emily J. Martin National Women's Law Center 11 Dupont Circle, N.W. Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036

Ms. Jacklyn Gonzales Martin Gerhardstein & Branch 432 Walnut Street Suite 400 Cincinnati, OH 45202

Ms. Lisa Talmadge Meeks Newman & Meeks 215 E. Ninth Street Suite 650 Cincinnati, OH 45202

Mr. Shannon Price Minter National Center for Lesbian Rights 870 Market Street Suite 370 San Francisco, CA 94102

Ms. Dina Bernick Mishra Wilmer Hale 1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20006

Mr. Alan B. Morrison George Washington University Law School 2000 H Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20052

Mr. Michael Edward Mumford Baker & Hostetler 1900 E. Ninth Street Suite 3200 Case: 14-3057 Document: 104-1 Filed: 06/16/2014 Page: 4 (4 of 8)

Cleveland, OH 44114

Mr. Eric E. Murphy Office of the Ohio Attorney General 30 E. Broad Street 17th Floor Columbus, OH 43215

Mr. Gregory R. Nevins Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund Southern Regional Office 730 Peachtree Street, N.E. Suite 1070 Atlanta, GA 30308-1210

Ms. Ryan Lynn Richardson Office of the Ohio Attorney General 30 E. Broad Street 16th Floor Columbus, OH 43215

Mr. Alan Evan Schoenfeld Wilmer Hale 250 Greenwich Street 7 World Trade Center New York, NY 10007

Mr. Benjamin G. Shatz Manatt, Phelps & Phillips 11355 W. Olympic Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90064

Mr. Paul March Smith Jenner & Block 1099 New York Avenue, N.W. Suite 900 Washington, DC 20001

Ms. Susan L. Sommer Lambda Legal 120 Wall Street 19th Floor New York, NY 10005

Mr. Christopher F. Stoll National Center for Lesbian Rights Case: 14-3057 Document: 104-1 Filed: 06/16/2014 Page: 5

(5 of 8)

870 Market Street Suite 370 San Francisco, CA 94102

Mr. Chase Strangio ACLU 125 Broad Street New York, NY 10004

Ms. Camilla B. Taylor Lambda Legal Defense and Education Fund 11 E. Adams Street Suite 1008 Chicago, IL 60603

Mr. Jeffrey S. Trachtman Kramer, Levin, Naftalis & Frankel 1177 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036

Mr. Thomas D. Warren Baker & Hostetler 1900 E. Ninth Street Suite 3200 Cleveland, OH 44114

Mr. Paul R.Q. Wolfson Wilmer Hale 1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20006

Re: Case No. 14-3057, *James Obergefell, et al v. Lance D. Himes, et al* Originating Case No.: 1:13-cv-00501

Dear Sir or Madam,

The Court issued the enclosed Order today in this case.

Sincerely yours,

s/Cheryl Borkowski Case Manager Direct Dial No. 513-564-7035 Case: 14-3057 Document: 104-1 Filed: 06/16/2014 Page: 6 (6 of 8)

Enclosure

No. 14-3057

FILED
Jun 16, 2014
DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

JAMES OBERGEFELL, et al.,)	
Plaintiffs-Appellees,)	
)	ODDED
V.)	<u>O R D E R</u>
LANCE D. HIMES, In his official capacity as the)	
Interim Director of the Ohio Department of Health,)	
)	
Defendant-Appellant,)	
)	
CAMILLE JONES,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

Lance D. Himes, in his official capacity as the Interim Director of the Ohio Department of Health, appeals the district court's judgment declaring that the State of Ohio must recognize valid out-of-state marriages between same-sex couples on Ohio death certificates and permanently enjoining the enforcement of the Ohio constitutional and statutory provisions barring such recognition against the plaintiffs. Equality Ohio, the Equality Ohio Education Fund, and four unmarried same-sex couples (collectively, "the Intervenors") move to intervene on appeal and to participate in oral argument either as a matter of right or a matter of discretion. Himes and the plaintiffs oppose intervention, and the Intervenors reply.

We may grant a motion to intervene as a matter of right, Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a), or as a matter of discretion, Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b). Under either subsection, the motion for intervention

(8 of 8)

No. 14-3057

-2-

must be timely. *Blount-Hill v. Zelman*, 636 F.3d 278, 283 & 287 (6th Cir. 2011). In evaluating timeliness, we consider: (1) the point to which the suit has progressed; (2) for what purpose intervention is sought; (3) the length of time preceding the motion during which the Intervenors knew or reasonably should have known of their interest in the case; (4) the prejudice to the original parties due to the Intervenors' failure to seek intervention sooner after recognizing their interest was implicated; and (5) any unusual circumstances weighing for or against intervention.

See id. at 284.

Having reviewed these factors, we conclude that the Intervenors' motion is untimely. The Intervenors knew or should reasonably have known of their interest in this case well before this appeal was filed, and whether we review the appeal *en banc* as an initial matter is not a sufficient reason for delaying their intervention. The appeal is now fully briefed, and granting intervention at this stage would necessitate supplemental briefing by the parties.

The motion to intervene is **DENIED**, and the motion to participate in oral argument is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT

Deborah S. Hunt, Clerk