Minimizing the Cost of Judicial Review

Committee on Judicial Review

Proposed Recommendation for Committee | March 16 April 11, 2018

The typical, default judicial remedy for a legally invalid rule is to vacate the entire rule, despite the agency's best efforts to promulgate a valid rule.¹ This can lead to.² There are many instances in which this remedy is appropriate, particularly when the various parts of a rule are so interrelated that none can function independently. In other instances, an agency may draft a rule so that some provisions are severable and could survive independently if a court invalidates another part of the rule. This recommendation proposes techniques agencies can undertake to draft severable rules. It also recommends reforms to ensure that interested parties and parties to litigation adequately address the question of severability on judicial review.

Total vacatur of a rule can create costs for agencies, regulated entities, regulatory beneficiaries, and the public. Regulated entities may want valid provisions of a rule to go into effect even if other portions are stuck down, because they have invested significant time, money, and resources in preparing to comply with the rule. Striking down the entire rule, as opposed to only its invalid provisions, may adversely affect the reliance interests of those entities and create instability in regulated markets and the regulatory regime. Likewise, regulatory beneficiaries may be adversely affected by the loss of beneficial valid provisions of a rule. The agency that promulgated the rule and the public also may incur substantial costs because the agency must go back to the drawing board and redo much of its previous work, potentially resulting in wasted effort by the agency, given that it has likely invested an extraordinary amount of time.

money, and resources in compiling a rulemaking record and establishing a supporting
enforcement apparatus, among other things. This risk is taxpayer dollars. These risks are
particularly great in those instances where the legal, scientific, and economic bases for the
rule may not have been previously tested in court.

Agencies. Moreover, the question of the proper remedy when only a portion of a rule is
invalid raises fundamental issues of the proper relationship between agencies and reviewing
courts. Under the Chenery doctrine, a court should not promulgate a rule different from the rule
that the agency intended to adopt, as the rulemaking function is given to the agency and not the
courts by Congress.

An agency that would prefer for a court to strike down only those parts of a rule found to
be invalid can use various techniques before, during, or after promulgation to mitigate the
risk of courts striking down their rules. Employing these techniques may enable agencies to
minimize their costs and reduce the likelihood of any wasted effort. For instance,
agencies promulgating rules to assist courts as they consider whether it would be appropriate to
allow the valid provisions of a rule to remain in place. An agency can solicit input from
stakeholders on procedural issues and whether a rule’s provisions would appropriately function
independently and incorporate that feedback, as appropriate, into its rule. The agency can also
conduct litigation risk assessments early in the rule drafting process. They can, in which policy
experts and litigators work together early on to balance the perceived costs and benefits of
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various regulatory options, including the potential risk of a judicial ruling invalidating aspects of
the regulatory program.3

It may also be helpful for the agency to include a severability clause in the regulatory text
of a rule or, when appropriate, in the preamble, when it determines that the rule would be
logically divisible.9 Courts have generally made severability decisions de novo without regard to
the existence of severability clauses in their rules, which will minimize the costs of judicial
review insofar as they increase the probability that one part of a rule will survive. Agencies may
also wish to divide up their rules based on subject matter, which would further ensure that the
various aspects of a regulation are independent. Another approach is to ensure that a rule’s text
and structure reflect the logical and practical relationships between a rule’s provisions, even in
the absence of a severability clause. This may increase the likelihood that courts will cleave off
the offending portion of the rule, while leaving the rest intact, which will avoid many of the
costs of total vacatur because they may view them as throwaway language.10 However,
commentators have argued that courts should generally defer to agency views of which portions
of their rules are and are not severable rather than making this decision on their own.11 Courts
may be more inclined to defer to severability clauses if it appears that the agency has given

8 Some agencies already engage in this practice. Tyler & Elliott, supra note 5, at 23.

9 Whether an agency’s rule is severable depends on the agency’s intent. Davis Cnty. Solid Waste Mgmt. v. EPA, 108 F.3d 1454, 1459 (D.C. Cir. 1997). The courts consider whether the parts of the rule are intertwined or whether they operate independently. In making this determination, the courts examine the purpose of the agency’s rule and whether the remaining portion of the rule reasonably serves the goals for which it was designed without the severed portion.

10 Tyler & Elliott, supra note 5, at 13-14, 19; see also Charles W. Tyler, E. Donald Elliott, Administrative Severability Clauses, 124 Yale L. J. 2286 (2015).

11 Id.
careful consideration to how the various parts of the rule relate to one another and whether the
agency intends that some of them stand on their own.\textsuperscript{12} Of course, this does not mean that courts
should uphold the remaining portions of an agency rule if the court determines that the rule
without the severed portions is not supported by the record, is not a logical extension of the rule
as proposed, or suffers from some other legal defect. But similarly, courts should not reflexively
invalidate all parts of an agency’s rule simply because they have determined that portions of the
same rule are invalid.

Another way that agencies can mitigate the risk of incurring the costs of vacatur is to
include fallback provisions in their rules. For example, when the legality of an agency’s
preferred regulatory course is not well established, the agency may know what its preferred
second-best alternative would be, in the event that a reviewing court determines that its preferred
course is unlawful. The agency could approach this scenario by taking both courses of action
through the notice and comment process, then promulgating a rule that imposes its preferred
course of action and specifies that the second-best alternative will take effect if a reviewing court
holds its preferred action to be unlawful. Agencies could also promulgate smaller, less costly
rules as test cases in some instances, particularly where agencies wish to regulate in areas where
their authority to do so is not well established.

Once agencies promulgate their rules, they have additional ways to mitigate the risks of
courts striking them down. Where appropriate, agencies can proactively argue to courts that they
should issue a limited remedy, in the event that a court finds the rule to be invalid. Agencies

\textsuperscript{12} Another potential approach is for the agency to include fallback provisions in its rules. When the legality of an
agency’s preferred regulatory course is not well established, the agency may know what its preferred second-best
alternative would be were a reviewing court to determine that the agency’s preferred course is unlawful. The agency
could approach this scenario by taking both courses of action through the notice-and-comment process, then
promulgating a rule that imposes its preferred course of action and specifies that the second-best alternative will take
effect if a reviewing court holds its preferred action to be unlawful. Fallback provisions raise a number of novel legal
issues, such as how to distinguish between fallback provisions and severability clauses; whether a petitioner may lack
standing when challenging a rule with a valid fallback provision; how to perform a cost-benefit analysis of the fallback
provision; what is the effective date of the fallback provision; whether the provision would require an alternative CFR
section; and what constitutes the administrative record when reviewing fallback provisions. These issues require
further research and therefore the use of fallback provisions is beyond the scope of this recommendation.
could argue that the provisions of a rule should be severed; that an infirmity was harmless error; or that an agency promulgates its rules, it has other ways to aid courts as they consider whether valid provisions of a rule may remain in place. Courts may often benefit from briefing regarding appropriate remedies from both agencies and opposing parties.\textsuperscript{13} Input on whether the provisions of a rule should be severed; whether an infirmity was harmless error; or whether the rule should be remanded without vacatur may be particularly helpful to courts.\textsuperscript{14}

Agencies and other parties involved in litigation could benefit from a briefing policy that the court should remand the rule without vacating it.\textsuperscript{15} Agencies might also benefit from a briefing policy that allows them to submit briefing on remedies separately from briefing on the rule. Some agencies have reported that they are concerned that they will signal weakness to courts by raising the issue of remedies in their merits, thus ameliorating the fear that a judge will infer briefs.\textsuperscript{16} Other parties may also be wary of raising remedies in briefing, especially early in the litigation. A briefing policy that an agency is uncertain about its positions on the merits. The briefing policy could allow agencies to submit supplemental briefing on remedies in cases where courts believe they will likely hold a rule unlawful, or it could, alternatively, that would require agencies to submit all plausible arguments on, including those related to remedies, in their opening briefs on the merits, could alleviate these concerns and encourage parties to provide input on remedies to courts.

\textsuperscript{13} The courts may desire to solicit the parties’ views on remedies, as appropriate, to ensure that they decide the issue on the same grounds as intended by the agency. See Chenery Corp., 318 U.S. at 92-94.

\textsuperscript{14} It may be premature for parties to argue that a court should remand a rule without vacating it until the parties know what error the court has found in the rule—particularly when the rule is very complex. One of the factors that bears on a court’s decision on whether to remand a rule without vacating it is whether the error that the court has found is fixable. Recommendation 2013-6, supra note 1, at 26.27. An agency cannot brief that issue unless it knows which error, out of many possible ones, the court finds to be a problem for the rule. Only once the court identifies the error, can the parties argue whether the rule can be fixed.

\textsuperscript{15} Recommendation 2013-6, supra note 1.

\textsuperscript{16} Tyler & Elliott, supra note 5, at 25-26, 32.
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This recommendation offers best practices and factors for agencies to consider before and after promulgating rules as they seek to mitigate the risk of unintended consequences of a court striking down their rules. It is intended to suggest a menu of mechanisms when portions of available options are valid. Not every rule will lend itself to these sorts of mechanisms. Agencies should not deploy these mechanisms, such as severability clauses, techniques, but adopting them in a pro forma fashion, as a court may only heed agencies’ efforts to ensure separable rules if they reflect a conscious effort to divide the rules into conceptually distinct components. This recommendation also recognizes that all produce significant benefits for agencies are subject to unique programming and financial constraints, and that the distinctiveness of agencies’ respective, regulated entities, regulatory schemes limits the development of workable standardized practices. Agencies may not have the resources to employ the suggested options in every case. Nevertheless, to the extent agencies are required to expend additional resources in implementing this recommendation, any upfront costs incurred may be accompanied by offsetting benefits, beneficiaries, and the public.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Before Promulgation**

1. Agencies should solicit input from stakeholders on approaches to designing rules that are logically divisible into component parts, such that part of the rule can survive judicial review if another part is held invalid by a court.

**During Promulgation**

2. Where appropriate, policy experts, compliance experts, litigators in the Department of Justice (or in the agency itself, if it possesses independent litigating authority), and rule drafters should collaborate while the regulatory text is being drafted to assess litigation
risk. Agencies should then take this information into account in determining whether to deploy some mechanism for dividing the rule into conceptually distinct parts.

3. Agencies implement any of these recommendations, an agency should consider including severability clauses in their rules, particularly where the agency has determined that the rule’s provisions would function independently.

4. Agencies should consider whether it is appropriate to divide regulations into multiple rules. For example, it may prove useful to do so based on subject matter, particularly where the agency has determined that the rule’s provisions would function independently.

5. Agencies should consider whether it is appropriate to divide regulations into multiple rules. For example, it may prove useful to do so based on subject matter, particularly where the agency has determined that the rule’s provisions would function independently.

6.1 Agencies should consider including fallback provisions in their rules. This option is particularly useful when the legality of an agency’s preferred regulatory course is not well established, and the agency may know what its preferred second-best alternative would be. In the event that a reviewing court determines that its preferred course is unlawful, efforts to ensure separable rules if they reflect the agency’s intent about how to divide the rules into conceptually distinct components.

7. Agencies should consider whether it is appropriate to promulgate a narrower, less costly rule as a form of “test case”—i.e., a rule that will allow the agency to test its legal theory in court without incurring the large costs of a new regulatory program. This approach may be useful when an agency intends to regulate in areas where its authority to do so is not well established. In other cases, however, this approach may not be feasible because the amount of time that it takes for a “test case” to be promulgated and reach final
judgment in court may be too long for an agency to wait before rolling out its intended program.

**After Promulgation**

8. When appropriate, agencies involved in ongoing litigation should proactively seek remedies other than total vacatur for rules that may potentially be invalid.

**Briefing Policies and Local Rules on Remedies**

2. Early in the process of developing a rule, the agency should consider whether the rule is appropriately focused to achieve the agency’s goals and is logically divisible into segments that function independently. If the agency determines that portions of the rule are separable and that it intends for some parts to function even if other parts are struck down as legally invalid, it should draft the rule such that it is divisible into independent segments. It should also include a severability clause in the regulatory text of the proposed rule, or, when appropriate, in the preamble. The clause should identify which segments should survive if other portions are struck down and explain how they relate to other segments in the event a court holds the rule invalid.

3. If the agency believes a rule can and should be divided into independent segments, it should solicit public input concerning the divisibility of the rule into independent segments, the benefits and costs associated with those individual segments, the appropriate scope of a severability clause, and whether the rule appropriately focuses on the agency’s goals and on a manageable set of issues. This may entail seeking input from stakeholders prior to issuing a proposed rule and soliciting input from the general public in the notice of proposed rulemaking itself. Agencies also should consult with the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs concerning the economic effects of a proposed rule’s individual segments.

4. In view of the multiple considerations involved in severability decisions, parties involved in litigation should consider whether to address the issues of appropriate remedies in briefing if a court may find that only certain provisions of an agency’s rule are valid.
These issues include whether the provisions of a rule should be severed; whether an
infirmity was harmless error; or whether the court should remand the rule without
vacating it.

5. The courts may wish to solicit the parties’ views on remedies, as appropriate, to ensure
that they decide the issues of remedies on the same grounds as intended by the agency.

6. Pursuant to its general rulemaking authority in 28 U.S.C. § 331, the Judicial Conference
should recommend may wish to study a rules amendment to adopt a briefing policy that
would encourage or require agencies and parties involved in a challenge to submit rule
to address remedies in briefing on remedies,