IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

_____

No. 23-997

KARYN D. STANLEY, PETITIONER

v.

CITY OF SANFORD, FLORIDA

_____

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

_____

MOTION OF THE UNITED STATES FOR LEAVE TO PARTICIPATE IN ORAL ARGUMENT AS AMICUS CURIAE AND FOR DIVIDED ARGUMENT

_____

Pursuant to Rules 28.4 and 28.7 of the Rules of this Court, the Solicitor General, on behalf of the United States, respectfully moves for leave to participate in the oral argument in this case as amicus curiae supporting petitioner and requests that the United States be allowed ten minutes of argument time. Petitioner has agreed to cede ten minutes of argument time to the United States and consents to this motion. Accordingly, if this motion were granted, the argument time would be divided as follows: 20 minutes for petitioner, 10 minutes for the United States, and 30 minutes for respondent.

This case concerns whether and under what circumstances a former employee can challenge an employer's allegedly discriminatory post-employment benefits policy under Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), 42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq. The United States has filed a brief as amicus curiae supporting petitioner, contending that the court of appeals erred in holding that petitioner cannot challenge her employer's allegedly discriminatory post-employment benefits policy because the benefits were paid after she was no longer employed.

The United States has a substantial interest in the proper interpretation of Title I. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission enforces Title I against private employers, and the Attorney General enforces Title I against state- and local-government employers. See 42 U.S.C. 12117(a) (incorporating 42 U.S.C. 2000e-5(f)(1)). The United States participated in the court of appeals as amicus curiae supporting petitioner.

The United States has frequently participated in oral argument as amicus curiae in cases concerning the scope or application of the ADA. See, e.g., Acheson Hotels, LLC v. Laufer, 601 U.S. 1 (2023); Raytheon Co. v. Hernandez, 540 U.S. 44 (2003); Toyota Motor Mfg., Ky., Inc. v. Williams, 524 U.S. 185 (2002); PGA Tour, Inc. v. Martin, 532 U.S. 661 (2001); Olmstead v. L.C. ex rel. Zimring, 527 U.S. 581 (1999); Murphy v. United Parcel Serv., Inc., 527 U.S. 516 (1999); Sutton v. United Air Lines, Inc., 527 U.S. 471 (1999); Bragdon v. Abbott, 524 U.S. 624 (1998). We therefore believe that

the United States' participation in oral argument would be of material assistance to the Court.

Respectfully submitted.

ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record

NOVEMBER 2024