UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FORT WORTH DIVISION

U.S. NAVY SEALS 1-3; on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated; U.S. NAVY EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL TECHNICIAN 1, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated; U.S. NAVY SEALS 4-26; U.S. NAVY SPECIAL WARFARE COMBATANT CRAFT CREWMEN 1-5; and U.S. NAVY DIVERS 1-3,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LLOYD J. AUSTIN, III, in his official capacity as United States Secretary of Defense; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE; CARLOS DEL TORO, in his official capacity as United States Secretary of the Navy,

Defendants.

Case No. 4:21-cv-01236-O

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY DEFENDANTS SHOULD NOT BE HELD IN CONTEMPT

On January 3, 2022, this Court issued a clear and unambiguous Order enjoining Defendants from applying four of Defendants' policies and enjoining Defendants from taking any adverse action against Plaintiffs on the basis of Plaintiffs' requests for religious accommodation. Dkt. 66. Defendants are disregarding and willfully violating that Order by continuing to apply the same policies and continuing to impose the same injuries on Plaintiffs that initially warranted injunctive relief, effectively granting themselves the stay of the injunction they are asking the Court for.¹

¹ See Dkt. 85; see also forthcoming Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Stay Injunction Pending Appeal.

Plaintiffs therefore respectfully request that the Court set a hearing on this matter and order the Defendants to show cause as to why they should not be held in contempt on the following grounds:

- Failure to comply with the Court's preliminary injunction enjoining Defendants from applying NAVADMIN 225/21, NAVADMIN 256/21, MANMED § 15-105(4)(n)(9),² and Trident Order #12 to Plaintiffs;
- Failure to comply with the Court's preliminary injunction enjoining Defendants from "taking any adverse action against Plaintiffs on the basis of Plaintiffs' requests for religious accommodation."

This motion is made and based on these grounds, the pleadings, papers, records, and files in this action, court minutes, and evidence and testimony to be presented at the hearing of this motion. Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter an order directing Defendants to show cause as to why they should not be held in contempt for failing to comply with the Court's January 3, 2022, Order, as described above.

2

² Plaintiffs' complaint and motion for preliminary injunction, as well as the preliminary-injunction order, referred to MANMED § 15-105(3)(n)(9), but that is a scrivener's error. The correct citation is MANMED § 15-105(4)(n)(9).

Respectfully submitted this 31st day of January, 2022.

Kelly J. Shackelford Texas Bar No. 18070950 Jeffrey C. Mateer Texas Bar No. 13185320 Hiram S. Sasser, III Texas Bar No. 24039157 David J. Hacker Texas Bar No. 24103323 Michael D. Berry Texas Bar No. 24085835 Justin Butterfield Texas Bar No. 24062642 Danielle A. Runyan * New Jersey Bar No. 027232004 Holly M. Randall * Oklahoma Bar No. 34763 FIRST LIBERTY INSTITUTE 2001 W. Plano Pkwy., Ste. 1600 Plano, Texas 75075 Tel: (972) 941-4444 imateer@firstliberty.org hsasser@firstliberty.org dhacker@firstliberty.org mberry@firstliberty.org jbutterfield@firstliberty.org drunyan@firstliberty.org hrandall@firstliberty.org

/s/ Heather Gebelin Hacker
Heather Gebelin Hacker
Texas Bar No. 24103325
Andrew B. Stephens
Texas Bar No. 24079396
HACKER STEPHENS LLP
108 Wild Basin Road South, Suite 250
Austin, Texas 78746
Tel.: (512) 399-3022
heather@hackerstephens.com
andrew@hackerstephens.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Jordan E. Pratt
Florida Bar No. 100958* **
FIRST LIBERTY INSTITUTE
227 Pennsylvania Ave., SE
Washington, DC 20003
Tel: (972) 941-4444
jpratt@firstliberty.org

* Admitted pro hac vice

** Not yet admitted to the D.C. Bar, but admitted to practice law in Florida. Practicing law in D.C. pursuant to D.C. Court of Appeals Rule 49(c)(8) under the supervision of an attorney admitted to the D.C. Bar.

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

Before filing this motion, on January 31, 2021, I conferred by email with Defendants' counsel "to determine whether the motion is opposed." L.R. 7(a). Defendants' counsel said that he could not state whether Defendants are opposed to this motion until he is made aware of what the allegations are and has investigated them.

Defendants' counsel later stated that he wanted Plaintiffs to include the following as Defendants' position on this motion for order to show cause:

Defendants' counsel asked Plaintiffs' counsel to explain how Defendants are allegedly violating the Court's Preliminary Injunction. Plaintiffs' counsel declined to provide any information regarding their allegations. Defendants' counsel explained that the factual allegations are needed before the Navy can look into the issue, and with the facts, the parties could attempt to resolve or at least narrow any issues without litigation. Plaintiffs' counsel still declined to provide any information regarding their allegations. Since Plaintiffs have not provided any details regarding the basis of their motion, Defendants cannot provide a position.

Defendants are already on notice of most of these issues, as they were discussed in the preliminary-injunction briefing, the preliminary-injunction order, and Defendants' motion to stay the injunction pending appeal. Plaintiffs also fear continued retaliation without intervention from the Court, and because this motion is related to Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendants' motion to stay (which is due today), Plaintiffs decline to delay filing the instant motion pending investigation by Defendants, especially when it is obvious that Defendants oppose the motion. *See* L.R. 7(a).

/s/Heather Gebelin Hacker
HEATHER GEBELIN HACKER

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 31, 2021, I electronically filed the foregoing document through the Court's ECF system, which automatically notifies counsel of record for each party.

/s/Heather Gebelin Hacker HEATHER GEBELIN HACKER