

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**District of Minnesota**

---

Hastings Chrysler Center, Inc.,  
Douglas W. Erickson, and  
Hastings Automotive, Inc.

**JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE**

V.

Case Number: 14-cv-265 (PAM/HB)

Kathleen Sebelius, in her official capacity as  
Secretary of the United States Department of  
Health and Human Services; United States  
Department of Health and Human Services;  
Thomas Perez, in his official capacity as  
Secretary of the United States Department of  
Labor; United States Department of Labor;  
Jacob Lew, in his official capacity as Secretary  
of the United States Department of the  
Treasury;  
and United States Department of Treasury

☐ **Jury Verdict.** This action came before the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the jury has rendered its verdict.

☒ **Decision by Court.** This action came to trial or hearing before the Court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision has been rendered.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED THAT:

1. Defendants, their employees, agents, and successors in office are enjoined
  - a. from enforcing
    - i. the “June 30, 2014 Contraceptive Coverage Requirement,” defined here to include those provisions of federal law in existence on June 30, 2014, when the Supreme Court decided Hobby Lobby, that require plaintiff Hastings Automotive, Inc. to provide its employees with health coverage for contraceptive methods, sterilization procedures, and related patient education and counseling to which plaintiffs object on religious grounds, e.g., 26 C.F.R. § 54.9815-2713(a)(1)(iv); 29 C.F.R. § 2590.715-2713(a)(1)(iv); 45 C.F.R. § 147.130(a)(1)(iv); and
    - ii. any penalties, fines, or assessments for noncompliance with the June 30, 2014 Contraceptive

Coverage Requirement, including those found in 26 U.S.C. § 4980D, and 29 U.S.C. §§ 1132

and 1185d; and

b. from taking any other actions based on noncompliance with the June 30, 2014 Contraceptive

Coverage Requirement against plaintiff Hastings Automotive, Inc., its employee health plan(s),

the group health coverage provided in connection with such plan(s), and/or Hastings Automotive,

Inc.'s health insurance issuers and/or third-party administrators with respect to Hastings Automotive,

Inc.'s health plan(s);

2. Judgment is entered in favor of plaintiffs and against defendants on plaintiffs' claim under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000bb et seq.;

3. Any petition or motion by plaintiffs for attorneys' fees or costs shall be submitted on or before 45 days (or the next business day if that day falls on a weekend or court holiday) from the date this judgment is issued; and

4. This injunction and judgment does not apply with respect to any changes in statute or regulation that are enacted or promulgated after this date, and nothing herein prevents plaintiffs from filing a new civil action to challenge any such future changes.

December 11, 2014

Date

RICHARD D. SLETTEN, CLERK

s/L. Brennan

(By)

L. Brennan, Deputy Clerk



## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT District of Minnesota

Warren E. Burger Federal  
Building and U.S. Courthouse  
316 North Robert Street  
Suite 100  
St. Paul, MN 55101  
(651) 848-1100

U.S. Courthouse  
300 South Fourth Street  
Suite 202  
Minneapolis, MN 55415  
(612) 664-5000

Gerald W. Heaney Federal  
Building and U.S.  
Courthouse  
515 West First Street  
Suite 417  
Duluth, MN 55802  
(218) 529-3500

Edward J. Devitt U.S.  
Courthouse and Federal  
Building  
118 South Mill Street  
Suite 212  
Fergus Falls, MN 56537  
(218) 739-5758

### CIVIL NOTICE

**The appeal filing fee is \$505.00. If you are indigent, you can apply for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, ("IFP").**

The purpose of this notice is to summarize the time limits for filing with the District Court Clerk's Office a Notice of Appeal to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals from a final decision of the District Court in a civil case.

***This is a summary only. For specific information on the time limits for filing a Notice of Appeal, review the applicable federal civil and appellate procedure rules and statutes.***

Rule 4(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure (Fed. R. App. P.) requires that a Notice of Appeal be filed within:

1. Thirty days (60 days if the United States is a party) after the date of "entry of the judgment or order appealed from;" or
2. Thirty days (60 days if the United States is a party) after the date of entry of an order denying a timely motion for a new trial under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59; or
3. Thirty days (60 days if the United States is a party) after the date of entry of an order granting or denying a timely motion for judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(b), to amend or make additional findings of fact under Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(b), and/or to alter or amend the judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59; or
4. Fourteen days after the date on which a previously timely Notice of Appeal was filed.

If a Notice of Appeal is not timely filed, a party in a civil case can move the District Court pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(5) to extend the time for filing a Notice of Appeal. This motion must be filed no later than 30 days after the period for filing a Notice of Appeal expires. If the motion is filed after the period for filing a Notice of Appeal expires, the party bringing the motion must give the opposing parties notice of it. The District Court may grant the motion, but only if excusable neglect or good cause is shown for failing to file a timely Notice of Appeal.