Supreme Court of the United States Office of the Clerk Washington, DC 20543-0001

May 23, 2016

Scott S. Harris Clerk of the Court (202) 479-3011

Clerk United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit 524 Potter Stewart Courthouse

May 26, 2016 DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

FILED

524 Potter Stewart Courthouse 100 East Fifth Street Cincinnati, OH 45202

> Re: Michigan Catholic Conference, et al. v. Sylvia Burwell, Secretary of Health and Human Services, et al. No. 15-1131 (Your No. 13-2723, 13-6640)

Dear Clerk:

The Court today entered the following order in the above-entitled case:

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in light of Zubik v. Burwell, 578 U.S. (2016). Nothing in the Zubik opinion, or in the opinions or orders of the courts below, is to affect the ability of the Government to ensure that women covered by petitioners' health plans "obtain, without cost, the full range of FDA approved contraceptives." Wheaton College v. Burwell, 573 U. S. ____, (2014) (slip op., at 1). Through this litigation, petitioners have made the Government aware of their view that they meet "the requirements for exemption from the contraceptive coverage requirement on religious grounds." Id., at (slip op., at 2). Nothing in the Zubik opinion, or in the opinions or orders of the courts below, "precludes the Government from relying on this notice, to the extent it considers it necessary, to facilitate the provision of full contraceptive coverage" going forward. Ibid. Because the Government may rely on this notice, the Government may not impose taxes or penalties on petitioners for failure to provide the relevant notice.

Justice Sotomayor, with whom Justice Ginsburg joins, concurs in the decision to grant, vacate, and remand in this case for the reasons expressed in Zubik v. Burwell, 578 U. S. ___ (2016) (Sotomayor, J., concurring).

The judgment or mandate of this Court will not issue for at least twenty-five days pursuant to Rule 45. Should a petition for rehearing be filed timely, the judgment or mandate will be further stayed pending this Court's action on the petition for rehearing.

Sincerely,

Scott S. Harris, Clerk

Sutt S. Hans