FILED

12/13/2019

Bowen Greenwood CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT STATE OF MONTANA

Case Number: DA 19-0510

TIMOTHY C. FOX
Montana Attorney General
MATTHEW T. COCHENOUR
Acting Solicitor General
JON BENNION
Deputy Attorney General
Justice Building
215 N. Sanders
P.O. Box 201401
Helena, MT 59620-1401

MARK W. MATTIOLI Bureau Chief CHUCK R. MUNSON Assistant Attorney General Office of Consumer Protection 555 Fuller Avenue P.O. Box 200151 Helena, MT 59620-0501 (406) 444-2026

ATTORNEYS FOR PROPOSED AMICUS CURIAE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

No. DA 19-0510

JAMES REAVIS,

(406) 444-2026

Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

PENNSYLVANIA HIGHER EDUCATION ASSISTANCE AGENCY, d/b/a FEDLOAN SERVICING

Defendant and Appellee.

UNOPPOSED MOTION OF MONTANA ATTORNEY GENERAL TIMOTHY C. FOX FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF SUPPORTING APPELLANT

Pursuant to Mont. R. App. P. 12(7), Montana Attorney General Timothy C. Fox moves for leave to file an amicus curiae brief supporting Appellant. The amicus brief would be filed on or before December 20, 2019. Counsel for Appellant and Appellee have been contacted and consent to the motion.

I. <u>INTEREST OF THE APPLICANT AND REASONS WHY AN AMICUS BRIEF IS DESIRABLE</u>:

Montana Attorney General Timothy C. Fox is the chief legal officer of the State and is authorized to prosecute or defend all causes in the Montana Supreme Court in which the State has an interest. Mont. Const. art. II, § 4; Mont. Code Ann. § 2-15-501(1).

The Attorney General has a significant interest in the outcome of this appeal concerning whether the Higher Education Act preempts Montana's generally applicable consumer protection laws because consumer protection is mandated by the Montana Constitution and falls within the State's historic police power. *See Aguayo v. U.S. Bank*, 653 F.3d 912, 917 (9th Cir. 2011) (observing that consumer protection claims "fall in an area that is traditionally within the state's police powers to protect its own citizens."); *see also*, Mont. Const, art. XIII, § 2 ("The legislature shall provide protection and education for the people against harmful and unfair practices by either foreign or domestic corporations, individuals, or associations.").

The Attorney General also has an interest in the correct application of preemption principles to state laws. The United States Constitution establishes a "system of dual sovereignty between the States and the Federal Government." *Gregory v. Ashcroft*, 501 U.S. 452, 457 (1991). As a sovereign, Montana has a strong interest in preserving the appropriate balance between federal and state authority.

An amicus brief from the Attorney General is desirable and would be helpful to the Court because of the Attorney General's unique role as the State's legal officer. Additionally, the Attorney General is responsible for enforcing the Montana Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Act. Mont. Code Ann. tit. 13, ch. 14. That is significant to this case because the district court's order dismissed claims brought under the Consumer Protection Act.

An amicus from the Attorney General would also be helpful to the Court because of the Attorney General's customary role in defending state statutes. This Court is well aware of the Attorney General's obligations to defend Montana's laws. See e.g., Western Tradition Partnership v. Attorney General of the State of Montana, 2012 MT 271, ¶ 17, 367 Mont. 112, 291 P.3d 545. And while this case does not present a constitutional challenge to a state law, the effect of the district court's preemption decision is that, for student loan borrowers, Montana's Consumer Protection Act is "without effect." See Cipollone v. Liggett Group, Inc.,

505 U.S. 504, 516 (1992) ("state law that conflicts with federal law is without effect"). Granting this motion would provide the Attorney General an opportunity to defend the Consumer Protection Act.

Moreover, ensuring the proper balance between federal and state authority is a recurring issue, and one on which the Attorney General has previously represented the State of Montana's interests. Notably, the Attorney General filed an amici brief on behalf of Montana and twenty other states in the United States Supreme Court defending state laws against claims of preemption. *See* Brief of Montana, *Coventry Health Care of Missouri, Inc. v. Nevils*, 137 S. Ct. 1190 (2017).¹

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, this Court should grant the Attorney General's motion to file an amicus brief on or before December 20, 2019.

Respectfully submitted this 13th day of December, 2019.

TIMOTHY C. FOX Montana Attorney General 215 North Sanders P.O. Box 201401 Helena, MT 59620-1401

By: /s/ Matthew T. Cochenour

MATTHEW T. COCHENOUR

Acting Solicitor General

4

¹ Available at: https://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/16-149_amicus_resp_montana.pdf

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Matthew Thompson Cochenour, hereby certify that I have served true and accurate copies of the foregoing Motion - Unopposed - Amicus - Leave to Participate to the following on 12-13-2019:

Kenneth K. Lay (Attorney) 900 North Last Chance Gulch, Suite 200 P.O. Box 797

Representing: Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency

Service Method: eService

Robert M. Farris-Olsen (Attorney)

P.O. Box 557 Helena MT 59624

Helena MT 59624

Representing: James Richard Reavis

Service Method: eService

Brett Patrick Clark (Attorney)

P.O. Box 797

Helena MT 59624-0797

Representing: Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency

Service Method: eService

Jonathan C. McDonald (Attorney)

P.O. Box 1570 Helena MT 59601

Representing: Montana Federation of Public Employees

Service Method: eService

David Kim Wilson (Attorney) 401 North Last Chance Gulch

Helena MT 59601

Representing: James Richard Reavis

Service Method: eService

Keif Alexander Storrar (Attorney)

PO Box 236

Helena MT 59624

Representing: Veterans Education Success

Service Method: eService

Electronically signed by Rochell Standish on behalf of Matthew Thompson Cochenour

Dated: 12-13-2019