UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Hastings Chrysler Center, Inc., Douglas W. Erickson, and Hastings Automotive, Inc.,

Case No. 14-cv-265 (PAM/HB)

Plaintiffs,

v. ORDER

Kathleen Sebelius, in her official capacity as Secretary of the United States
Department of Health and Human
Services; United States Department of
Health and Human Services; Thomas Perez,
in his official capacity as Secretary of the
United States Department of Labor; United
States Department of Labor; Jacob Lew, in
his official capacity as Secretary of the
United States Department of the Treasury;
and United States Department of Treasury,

D	etend	lants.		

This matter is before the Court on the parties' Stipulation for Entry of Judgment (Docket No. 37). In light of the Supreme Court's decision in <u>Burwell v. Hobby Lobby</u> Stores, Inc., 134 S. Ct. 2751 (2014), **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

- 1. Defendants, their employees, agents, and successors in office are enjoined
 - a. from enforcing
 - i. the "June 30, 2014 Contraceptive Coverage Requirement," defined here to include those provisions of federal law in existence on June 30, 2014, when the Supreme Court decided Hobby Lobby, that require plaintiff Hastings Automotive,

Inc. to provide its employees with health coverage for contraceptive methods, sterilization procedures, and related patient education and counseling to which plaintiffs object on religious grounds, e.g., 26 C.F.R. § 54.9815-2713(a)(1)(iv); 29 C.F.R. § 2590.715-2713(a)(1)(iv); 45 C.F.R. § 147.130(a)(1)(iv); and

- ii. any penalties, fines, or assessments for noncompliance with the June 30, 2014 Contraceptive Coverage Requirement, including those found in 26 U.S.C. § 4980D, and 29 U.S.C. §§ 1132 and 1185d; and
- b. from taking any other actions based on noncompliance with the June 30, 2014 Contraceptive Coverage Requirement against plaintiff Hastings Automotive, Inc., its employee health plan(s), the group health coverage provided in connection with such plan(s), and/or Hastings Automotive, Inc.'s health insurance issuers and/or third-party administrators with respect to Hastings Automotive, Inc.'s health plan(s);
- Judgment is entered in favor of plaintiffs and against defendants on plaintiffs' claim under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000bb et seq.;

CASE 0:14-cv-00265-PAM-HB Document 38 Filed 12/11/14 Page 3 of 3

3. Any petition or motion by plaintiffs for attorneys' fees or costs shall be

submitted on or before 45 days (or the next business day if that day falls on

a weekend or court holiday) from the date this judgment is issued; and

4. This injunction and judgment does not apply with respect to any changes in

statute or regulation that are enacted or promulgated after this date, and

nothing herein prevents plaintiffs from filing a new civil action to challenge

any such future changes.

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.

Dated: December 10, 2014 s/Paul A. Magnuson

Paul A. Magnuson

United States District Court Judge

3