



Civil Division

Washington, D.C. 20530

Mark T. Quinlivan (202) 514-3346

December 5, 2003

VIA OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

Cathy Catterson
Clerk, United States Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit
P.O. Box 193939
San Francisco, CA 94119-3939

Re:

Raich v. Ashcroft, No. 03-15481

Submitted:

October 7, 2003

Before:

Judges Pregerson, Beam and Paez

Dear Ms. Catterson:

Pursuant to Rule 28(j) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, the United States responds to the Rule 28(j) letter submitted by appellants, which directs attention to the decision in <u>United States</u> v. <u>Stewart</u>, No. 02-10318 (9th Cir. Nov. 13, 2003), in which this Court held that 18 U.S.C. § 922(o), exceeds Congress' authority under the Commerce Clause as applied to the intrastate possession of a homemade machinegun.

The decision in Stewart did not address the constitutionality of the Controlled Substances Act. Thus, for example, the panel in Stewart perhaps believed it to be significant that Congress "failed to make any legislative findings when it enacted [section 922(o)]." Slip op. at 16071. In contrast, as this Court has previously recognized, the Controlled Substances Act "contains express legislative findings regarding the relationship between purely intrastate activities and interstate commerce." United States v. McCoy, 323 F.3d 1114, 1128 n.24 (9th Cir. 2003) (citing 21 U.S.C. §§ 801(4) & (6)). Stewart therefore does not undermine this Court's line of decisions holding that 21 U.S.C. § 841(a) "is constitutional and that no proof of an interstate nexus is required in order to establish jurisdiction of the subject matter." United States v. Visman, 919 F.2d 1390, 1392-93 (9th Cir.1990), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 969 (1991) (quoting United States v. Montes-Zarate, 552 F.2d 1330, 1331 (9th Cir.1977), cert. denied, 435 U.S. 947 (1978)). Accord United States v. Kim, 94 F.3d 1247, 1250 (9th Cir.

1996) (reaffirming <u>Visman</u>). This argument is consistent with the arguments set forth at pages 17-36 of the Brief for Appellee, and the argument made by counsel during oral argument.

The Stewart panel also stated, in dicta, that "whether a given statute can constitutionally be applied to a claimant is an inquiry that occurs in every constitutional case." Slip op. at 16077. This statement is incompatible with this Court's en banc decision in United States v. Sacco, 491 F.2d 995 (9th Cir. 1974), which holds that "Congress can declare that an entire class of activities affects interstate commerce," and that, "[i]f the class of activities is within the reach of the federal power and the regulation imposed is reasonable, a court's investigation is concluded. There is no need for inquiry on a case-by-case basis or proof that a particular activity had an effect on commerce." Id. at 999 (citing, e.g., Perez v. United States, 402 U.S. 146 (1971), and United States v. Darby, 312 U.S. 100 (1941)).

Respectfully submitted;

MARK T. QUINLIVAN
Senior Trial Counsel

Civil Division

Counsel for United States of America

Enclosures

cc:

David M. Michael

The DeMartini Historical Landmark Bldg.

294 Page Street

San Francisco, CA 94102

(By Federal Express)

Robert A. Raich

1970 Broadway, Suite 1200

Oakland, CA 94612

(By Federal Express)

Randy E. Barnett Boston University School of Law 765 Commonwealth Ave.

Boston, MA 02138

(By Federal Express)

Frederick L. Goss

Law Offices of Frederick L. Goss

1 Kaiser Plaza, Suite 1750

Oakland, CA 94612

(By U.S. Mail)

David A. Handro Julie M. Carpenter

Robin M. Meriweather

Jenner & Block, LLC

601 13th St., N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

(By U.S. Mail)