

(ORDER LIST: 590 U.S.)

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 2020

CERTIORARI -- SUMMARY DISPOSITIONS

19-5133 BROWN, ANDREW A. V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the petition for a writ of certiorari are granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit for further consideration in light of the confession of error by the Solicitor General in his brief for the respondent filed on March 6, 2020.

19-6220 BRONSOZIAN, NERSES N. V. UNITED STATES

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and the petition for a writ of certiorari are granted. The judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit for further consideration in light of the pending application to vacate the judgment and dismiss the indictment.

ORDERS IN PENDING CASES

19M118 MURPHY, JULIUS J. V. DAVIS, DIR., TX DCJ

The motion to direct the Clerk to file a petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

19M128 MATTHEWS, ANTONIO R. V. BRAUN, WARDEN

The motion to direct the Clerk to file a petition for a writ of certiorari out of time is denied.

19M129 KANEKA CORP. V. XIAMEN KINGDOMWAY GROUP, ET AL.

The motion for leave to file a petition for a writ of certiorari with the supplemental appendix under seal is granted.

18-540 RUTLEDGE, ATT'Y GEN. OF AR V. PHARMACEUTICAL CARE MANAGEMENT

The motion of the Solicitor General for leave to participate in oral argument as *amicus curiae* and for divided argument is granted.

18-587) DEPT. OF HOMELAND, ET AL. V. REGENTS OF UNIV. OF CA, ET AL.

)
18-588) TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF U.S., ET AL. V. NAACP, ET AL.

)
18-589) WOLF, SEC. OF HOMELAND, ET AL. V. VIDAL, MARTIN J., ET AL.

The motion of respondents Martin Jonathan Batalla Vidal, et al. in No. 18-589 for leave to file a supplemental brief after oral argument is granted.

19-368) FORD MOTOR CO. V. MT EIGHTH DISTRICT COURT, ET AL.

)
19-369) FORD MOTOR CO. V. BANDEMER, ADAM

The motion of the Solicitor General for leave to participate in oral argument as *amicus curiae* and for divided argument is denied. The motion of Minnesota, et al. for leave to participate in oral argument as *amici curiae* and for divided argument is denied.

19-431) LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR V. PENNSYLVANIA, ET AL.

)
19-454) TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF U.S., ET AL. V. PENNSYLVANIA, ET AL.

The motion of the Solicitor General for divided argument is granted.

19-518 CO DEPT. OF STATE V. BACA, MICHEAL, ET AL.

19-5410 BORDEN, CHARLES V. UNITED STATES

The motions of petitioners to dispense with printing the joint appendices are granted.

19-6836 WIMBUSH, THERIAN V. MICKENS, WARDEN

19-7189 MOORE, KEVIN D. V. UNITED STATES

The motions of petitioners for reconsideration of orders denying leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* are denied.

19-7191 BAKER, JANICE V. MACY'S FLORIDA STORES, LLC

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied. Petitioner is allowed until May 11, 2020, within which to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a).

19-7200 ADAMS, BARRY W. V. CALHOUN COUNTY, MI, ET AL.

The motion of petitioner for reconsideration of order denying leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied.

19-7629 HILL-LOMAX, CAROLYN V. VITTETOE, DAVID, ET AL.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied. Petitioner is allowed until May 11, 2020, within which to pay the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a).

CERTIORARI GRANTED

19-783 VAN BUREN, NATHAN V. UNITED STATES

The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted.

CERTIORARI DENIED

19-506 W. M. V. C., ET AL. V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.

19-587 WHITE, JIMMIE E. V. UNITED STATES

19-611 BOUCHER, RENE A. V. UNITED STATES

19-643 HURRY, JOHN, ET AL. V. FINANCIAL INDUSTRY AUTH., ET AL.

19-672 RAMS FOOTBALL CO., ET AL. V. ST. LOUIS REGIONAL CONV., ET AL.

19-732 NATOFSKY, RICHARD V. CITY OF NEW YORK

19-794 MACIAS, DANIEL, ET AL. V. NICHOLS, RAYMOND, ET AL.

19-857 GPI DISTRIBUTORS, INC. V. NORTHEAST OH REGIONAL SEWER

19-878 GENTILE, GUY V. SEC

19-893 WARONKER, SHIMON V. HEMPSTEAD SCHOOL DIST., ET AL.
19-894 YAMASHITA, MICHAEL, ET AL. V. SCHOLASTIC INC.
19-967 WOOD, CRAIG M. V. MISSOURI
19-984 MAZIE SLATER KATZ & FREEMAN, LLC V. COMMON BENEFIT FEE & COST COMM.
19-993 ROSAS, IRMA V. AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCH., ET AL.
19-1004 JAFFE, ROBERT J. V. SHERMAN, BRAD
19-1013 HSU, DARRU K. V. UBS FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC.
19-1014 BERRY, TERESA V. DELAWARE CO. SHERIFF'S OFFICE
19-1016 KIRSCH, JEFFREY V. REDWOOD RECOVERY SERV., ET AL.
19-1024 POWE, WAYNE A., ET UX. V. DEUTSCHE BANK NATIONAL TRUST
19-1028 KORSUNSKA, ALINA V. WOLF, ACTING SEC. OF HOMELAND
19-1036 WATERS, TERESA A. V. PAXTON, ATT'Y GEN. OF TX, ET AL.
19-1043 PAUL G. V. MONTEREY SCHOOL DISTRICT, ET AL.
19-1086 GARCIA, ROBERT E. V. FALK, MICHAEL, ET AL.
19-1089 GINDI, LISA V. NYC DEPT. OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
19-1110 BD. OF REGENTS UNIV. SYS. OF TX V. BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION
19-1113 RUMBIN, PETER R. V. DeVOS, SEC. OF EDUCATION, ET AL.
19-1118 PALUMBO, JEFFREY T. V. CONNECTICUT
19-1120 SACCAMENO, MONETTE E. V. OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, ET AL.
19-1125 MENZIES, STEVEN V. SEYFARTH SHAW LLP, ET AL.
19-1127 NEFF, WHEELER K. V. UNITED STATES
19-1133 HODGES, MELVIN V. UNITED STATES
19-1136 YIM, CHONG, ET AL. V. SEATTLE, WA
19-1142 CARTER, KENDALL R. V. UNITED STATES
19-1146 CENTAUR, L.L.C. V. RIVER VENTURES, L.L.C.
19-1159 BOUCHARD, MICHAEL V. UNITED STATES
19-1162 THOMPSON, ADDISON V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.
19-1163 ROTTSCHAEFER, BERNARD V. UNITED STATES

19-6055 FLORES, EDWIN R. V. UNITED STATES
19-6413 LANGLEY, RICKY V. PRINCE, WARDEN
19-6609 STONER, CHAD M. V. UNITED STATES
19-6647 BAXTER, MICHAEL J. V. UNITED STATES
19-6696 MYERS-McNEIL, BARBARA V. NORTH CAROLINA
19-6927 FORD, TONY E. V. TEXAS
19-7001 BAGCHO, HAJI V. UNITED STATES
19-7003 WRIGHT, QUINTIN V. UNITED STATES
19-7073 THOMAS, ANTHONY V. KENMARK VENTURES, LLC
19-7182 LOPEZ, CIRILO M. V. UNITED STATES
19-7215 RHODES, JERRY J. V. UNITED STATES
19-7220 GUERRERO-SAUCEDO, FRANCISCO V. UNITED STATES
19-7236 DeBLASE, JOHN J. V. ALABAMA
19-7268 RUPAK, ACHARAYYA V. UNITED STATES
19-7314 DAWSON, JOHNNY L. V. UNITED STATES
19-7333 MARTINEZ-PAZ, EDUARDO L. V. UNITED STATES
19-7565 WRIGHT, TYREE V. ALVAREZ, S., ET AL.
19-7577 BROWN, JASON L. V. BROWN, LISA M.
19-7579 BARRY, PHILIP G. V. PERKINS, THOMAS, ET UX.
19-7592 McALLISTER, JOHN D. V. MALFITANO, TIMOTHY, ET AL.
19-7596 McDUFFY-JOHNSON, JULIA L. V. LANE, DANIEL A.
19-7601 GARRETT, CRAIG K. V. MADDER, JOSEPH, ET AL.
19-7611 JOHNSON, D'MARLO L. V. NORTH CAROLINA
19-7612 SIMS, SHA'RON A. V. WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., ET AL.
19-7615 VUKICH, WILLIAM E. V. JUDICIAL SYSTEM OF PA
19-7632 BOLEN, JOSHUA A. V. HOOKS, SEC., NC DPS
19-7641 GONG, YUSONG V. UNIV. OF MICHIGAN, ET AL.
19-7642 KARNOFEL, ANN V. SUPERIOR WATERPROOFING, INC.

19-7647 CASTILLO, WILLIAM P. V. NEVADA
19-7649 CARO, SOCORRO S. V. CALIFORNIA
19-7655 WORRELL, JOSEPH L. V. EMIGRANT MORTGAGE CO., ET AL.
19-7668 HERRAN, DARLENE K. V. INDIANA
19-7669 MATTISON, LAWRENCE E. V. WILLIS, JANIE, ET AL.
19-7673 BEY, TZEDKIYAH E. V. WEAVER, WILLIE, ET AL.
19-7678 BEY, TZEDKIYAH E. V. DOUGHTERY CTY. STATE CT., ET AL.
19-7680 HOWARD, SAMUEL V. NEVADA
19-7683 BLACHER, MARLON V. CALIFORNIA
19-7686 BUFORD, MAURICE V. LABORERS' INT'L UNION, ET AL.
19-7687 PLATA, MIGUEL P. V. DAVIS, DIR., TX DCJ
19-7692 R. A. S. V. MONTGOMERY CTY. CHILDREN
19-7700 McCAIN, EVANGLIN V. A.F. EVANS CO., INC., ET AL.
19-7703 LEE, TERRY A. V. KELLEY, DIR., AR DOC
19-7704 MASSENGALE, KEVIN V. ANCHORAGE, AK, ET AL.
19-7710 YOUNG, GEORGE R. V. JACKSON-MITCHELL, WARDEN
19-7712 JARAMILLO, LUIS R. V. DAVIS, DIR., TX DCJ
19-7717 WILSON, TARVIS M. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC
19-7724 BARKER, BYRON R. V. TEXAS
19-7725 CONRAD, WILLIAM D. V. UNITED STATES
19-7728 ENGLISH, WAYNE V. ENERGY FUTURE HOLDINGS, ET AL.
19-7736 WOODS, SILVESTER V. WMATA, ET AL.
19-7746 RUNNELS, WILLIAM A. V. TEXAS
19-7748 SOUFFRANT, KEVIN V. KAUFFMAN, SUPT., HUNTINGDON
19-7758 OUYANG, LIN V. ACHEM INDUSTRY AMERICA, INC.
19-7763 BERNIER, JEAN V. HOLLAND, WARDEN, ET AL.
19-7766 GARCIA, GUILLERMO V. LACEY, B. A., ET AL.
19-7767 ORETEGA, OCTAVIO V. FL ATT'Y GEN., ET AL.

19-7783 MARTIN, BILLY J. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC
19-7787 McNEAL, VERNON W. V. ERVIN, A., ET AL.
19-7795 FOSTER, ROBERT A. V. CHAPMAN, WARDEN
19-7801 BARSTAD, JAMES B. V. WA DOC, ET AL.
19-7809 WALTERS, CHRIS A. V. SAUL, ANDREW M.
19-7842 CLERVRAIN, MANETIRONY V. UNITED STATES, ET AL.
19-7846 VESELI, CEMALUDIN V. HACKER-AGNEW, WARDEN, ET AL.
19-7847 WATTS, LEE D. V. TENNESSEE
19-7852 PARSON, EDWIN F. V. USAF, ET AL.
19-7858 BALLARD, TODD D. V. CLARK, SUPT., ALBION, ET AL.
19-7868 TURNER, STEVEN B. V. KEMNA, MIKE
19-7878 SANTILLAN, JOSEPH R. V. UNITED STATES
19-7879 RIVERA-CARRASQUILLO, LUIS D. V. UNITED STATES
19-7908 PRUNTY, LARRY R. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC
19-7918 HARRIS, PATRICK V. UNITED STATES
19-7927 NEWCOMB, JAY A. V. INCH, SEC., FL DOC, ET AL.
19-7928 PRINCE, AL V. MOODY, ATT'Y GEN. OF FL, ET AL.
19-7930 PEARSON, RODERICK V. UNITED STATES
19-7931 LOPEZ, NANCY A. V. UNITED STATES
19-7933 BOGARD, LARRY D. V. UNITED STATES
19-7945 AGUEDO, ZACHARIAS A. V. UNITED STATES
19-7946 GREINEDER, DIRK V. MEDEIROS, SUPT., NORFOLK
19-7947 FLOYD, BOBBY J. V. UNITED STATES
19-7951 TAYLOR, RASHAD V. FLORIDA
19-7952 THOMPSON, MICHAEL D. V. UNITED STATES
19-7956 TSAI, MOLLY V. WILKIE, SEC. OF VA
19-7960 GREEN, REGINALD E. V. UNITED STATES
19-7985 HOOPER, CHARLES R. V. UNITED STATES

19-7986 HAMM, WESLEY S. V. UNITED STATES
19-7987 HAMBRIGHT, ASHLEY R. V. UNITED STATES
19-7993 SWAY, THOMAS V. V. UNITED STATES
19-7998 MONTANEZ, PAUL ANTHONY V. UNITED STATES
19-7999 PARKER, CHRISTOPHER V. UNITED STATES
19-8002 HERRERA, HUMBERTO V. UNITED STATES
19-8005 GARCIA, HARRISON V. UNITED STATES
19-8008 FONTANEZ, JEREMY V. COAKLEY, WARDEN
19-8010 CHHIM, JOSEPH V. HOUSTON, TX, ET AL.
19-8014 ARTIS, MICHAEL V. UNITED STATES
19-8015 CRUZ, GABRIEL V. UNITES STATES
19-8016 VEGA, JAIME V. UNITED STATES
19-8019 SIFUENTES, EFRAIN V. UNITED STATES
19-8020 JORDAN, WALTER F. V. UNITED STATES
19-8027 GOMEZ-CARRASQUILLO, JAVIER V. UNITED STATES
19-8030 BATEMAN, ROBBIE S. V. UNITED STATES
19-8031 GREGG, JAMES A. V. USDC SD
19-8034 ATKINSON, WHITNEY V. UNITED STATES
19-8036 JACKSON, ODIS L. V. UNITED STATES
19-8038 JAMES, JERMAINE V. UNITED STATES
19-8041 JAMISON, STANLEY E. V. UNITED STATES
19-8048 GOODMAN, COLLYER V. UNITED STATES
19-8049 RUFF, KENNETH M. V. UNITED STATES
19-8053 RODRIGUEZ, DANIEL V. UNITED STATES
19-8054 VINEYARD, NATHAN R. V. UNITED STATES
19-8055 JONES, COREY V. UNITED STATES
19-8056 MATALKA, BRIAN A. V. UNITED STATES
19-8065 VASQUEZ-RIVERA, REINALDO V. UNITED STATES

19-8066 LARA-CERVANTES, SILVESTRE V. UNITED STATES
19-8071 EARLEY, CURTIS D. V. UNITED STATES
19-8072 CERVANTES, SAUL V. BITER, WARDEN
19-8079 ELK SHOULDER, MARK S. V. UNITED STATES
19-8080 SOLORZANO, JULIO V. UNITED STATES
19-8082 WILLIX, ALTIUS V. UNITED STATES
19-8083 WASHINGTON, ANTWUNE V. MISSISSIPPI
19-8094 MOTUPALLI, CALEB S. V. IANCU, ANDREI
19-8097 REED, JAY E. V. UNITED STATES
19-8098 RODRIGUEZ, JUAN C. V. UNITED STATES
19-8100 RODRIGUEZ-LUCA, JORGE V. UNITED STATES

The petitions for writs of certiorari are denied.

18-1577 PENNSYLVANIA V. ADAMS, EDWARD

The motion of respondent for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted. The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

19-514 JENKINS, NIKKO A. V. NEBRASKA

The motion of The Promise of Justice Initiative, et al. for leave to file a brief as *amici curiae* is granted. The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

19-627 ISLAS-VELOZ, ANTONIO V. BARR, ATT'Y GEN.

The motion of Law Professors for leave to file a brief as *amici curiae* is granted. The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

19-739 BARBOUR, JULIUS, ET AL. V. HALLIBURTON CO., ET AL.

The motion of Patrick A. Juneau, in His Capacity as New Class Claims Administrator of the Punitive Damages Settlement Program for leave to file a brief as *amicus curiae* is granted.

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

19-7619 WIMBUSH, THERIAN C. V. CONWAY, R. L., ET AL.

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8.

19-7922 RENDELMAN, SCOTT L. V. TRUE, WARDEN

The motion of petitioner for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* is denied, and the petition for a writ of certiorari is dismissed. See Rule 39.8. As the petitioner has repeatedly abused this Court's process, the Clerk is directed not to accept any further petitions in noncriminal matters from petitioner unless the docketing fee required by Rule 38(a) is paid and the petition is submitted in compliance with Rule 33.1. See *Martin v. District of Columbia Court of Appeals*, 506 U. S. 1 (1992) (*per curiam*).

HABEAS CORPUS DENIED

19-8102 IN RE MARQUISE WHITE

The petition for a writ of habeas corpus is denied.

MANDAMUS DENIED

19-1090 IN RE BAHIG F. BISHAY

19-7691 IN RE WILBERT N. STARKS

19-7902 IN RE DARNELL W. MOON

The petitions for writs of mandamus are denied.

19-7658 IN RE ROBERT STRANGE

The petition for a writ of mandamus and/or prohibition is denied.

REHEARINGS DENIED

19-488 WALTNER, STEVEN T., ET UX. V. CIR

19-703 DAVIS, BARBARA N. V. MTGLQ INVESTORS, L.P.
19-713 NUNU, PAUL E. V. RISK, NANCY N., ET AL.
19-823 PEARSALL, SUSAN V. GUERNSEY, THOMAS C.
19-880 KEMP, YISRAEL M. V. GA STATE UNIV., ET AL.
19-5596 LATHAM, ERIC T. V. UNITED STATES
19-6590 WHITTEN, ANTWON V. ATYIA, ATIF, ET AL.
19-6630 HUNTER, DANNEZ W. V. MURDOCH, KEITH R., ET AL.
19-6695 RIGWAN, ILANA V. NEUS, JORDAN L.
19-6794 SMITH, LAKESHA V. ST. JOSEPH'S/CANDLER HEALTH
19-6980 WILLIAMSON, JOHN L. V. WICHITA, KS
19-7077 SANCHEZ, IMMANUEL F. V. CALIFORNIA, ET AL.
19-7166 KARNOFEL, ANN V. SUPERIOR WATERPROOFING, INC.
19-7275 BOYETT, CECIL V. NEW MEXICO

The petitions for rehearing are denied.

19-7119 BELL, LARRY V. RANSOM, SUPT., DALLAS, ET AL.

The petition for rehearing is denied. Justice Alito took no part in the consideration or decision of this petition.

THOMAS, J., dissenting

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ANTHONY ROBINSON *v.* DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION

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

No. 19–512. Decided April 20, 2020

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

JUSTICE THOMAS, with whom JUSTICE KAVANAUGH joins, dissenting from the denial of certiorari.

This petition presents the question whether the general civil enforcement provisions of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), 15 U. S. C. §§1681n–1681o, waive the Federal Government’s sovereign immunity for FCRA civil enforcement suits. Because this important question has divided the Courts of Appeals, I would grant review.

I

Petitioner claims to be the victim of identity theft. After he unsuccessfully sought to remove an allegedly fraudulent student loan from his credit history, he filed suit against the lender—the United States Department of Education—seeking damages for violations of the FCRA. Under the FCRA’s general civil enforcement provisions, “[a]ny person” who willfully or negligently fails “to comply with any requirement imposed under [§1681 *et seq.*] is liable to [the] consumer” for damages. §§1681n–1681o. The statute defines “person” to include “any . . . government or governmental subdivision or agency.” §1681a(b).

The Department of Education moved to dismiss petitioner’s complaint, asserting federal sovereign immunity. The District Court granted the motion, and the Fourth Circuit affirmed. Relying on the interpretive presumption that “‘person’ does not include the sovereign,” *Vermont Agency of Natural Resources v. United States ex rel. Stevens*, 529

THOMAS, J., dissenting

U. S. 765, 780 (2000), the Fourth Circuit concluded that, despite the statutory definition, it could plausibly read “person” to not include the Federal Government. Moreover, the court observed that the opposite interpretation would lead to absurdities in other FCRA enforcement provisions. For example, if the Federal Government were a “person,” it could be liable under the FCRA for federal criminal charges. See 917 F. 3d 799, 804 (CA4 2019) (contemplating “a court’s puzzlement upon seeing a criminal case captioned ‘*United States v. United States*’”). And the court noted that petitioner’s reading would render superfluous a more limited sovereign-immunity waiver in one of the FCRA’s specific civil enforcement provisions, §1681u(j), which makes “[a]ny agency or department of the United States . . . liable to [a] consumer” for damages when it unlawfully discloses that consumer’s credit information to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Comparing this express language and that of other sovereign-immunity waivers recognized by this Court with the language of §1681n and §1681o, the Fourth Circuit determined that the FCRA’s general civil enforcement provisions do not clearly waive the Federal Government’s sovereign immunity.

II

As both parties acknowledge, the Fourth Circuit’s decision in this case deepened a pre-existing Circuit split. While the Ninth Circuit agrees that the FCRA’s general civil enforcement provisions do not waive federal sovereign immunity, *Daniel v. National Park Serv.*, 891 F. 3d 762 (2018), the Seventh Circuit has reached the opposite conclusion, *Bormes v. United States*, 759 F. 3d 793 (2014). Thus, borrowers of federal loans in Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin have access to a cause of action against the Federal Government while borrowers with the same types of loans in 14 other States are barred from suit.

THOMAS, J., dissenting

Because of the Court’s inaction, this disparity will persist. Contrary to the Department’s speculation, this Circuit split shows no signs of resolving itself. In fact, the Seventh Circuit recently reaffirmed its position in *Meyers v. Oneida Tribe of Wis.*, 836 F. 3d 818 (2016). In holding that the FCRA’s general civil enforcement provisions do not abrogate *tribal* sovereign immunity, the court reaffirmed and distinguished its earlier decision in *Bormes*, which recognized a waiver of *federal* sovereign immunity. 836 F. 3d, at 826. In that court’s view, the ordinary meaning of “government,” as used in the FCRA’s definition of “person,” clearly encompasses the Federal Government but does not include Indian tribes. *Ibid.* Thus, absent intervention from this Court, or a majority of active judges on the Seventh Circuit, the Courts of Appeals will remain in conflict.

III

The question whether sovereign immunity has been waived is one of critical importance to any functioning government, but particularly to a democratic republic. This is especially true when it comes to suits for money damages, because “the allocation of scarce resources among competing needs and interests lies at the heart of the political process.” *Alden v. Maine*, 527 U. S. 706, 751 (1999). Were the Federal Government to be stripped of sovereign immunity without consent, “private suits for money damages would place unwarranted strain on the [Government’s] ability to govern in accordance with the will of [its] citizens.” *Id.*, at 750–751.

These ramifications are magnified here because the Federal Government’s potential liability under the FCRA is substantial. As the Nation’s primary student-loan lender, it is one of the largest furnishers of credit information in the country. According to petitioner, the Federal Government is responsible for 90 percent of student loans nationwide in a market that has tripled between 2007 and 2018,

THOMAS, J., dissenting

from \$500 billion to a staggering \$1.5 trillion. Pet. for Cert. 39. A waiver of sovereign immunity would thus have a significant impact on the public fisc.

* * *

“One of this Court’s primary functions is to resolve ‘important matter[s]’ on which the courts of appeals are ‘in conflict.’” *Gee v. Planned Parenthood of Gulf Coast, Inc.*, 586 U. S. ___, ___ (2018) (THOMAS, J., dissenting from denial of certiorari) (slip op., at 1) (quoting this Court’s Rule 10(a)). Because the question presented in this petition has divided the Circuits and concerns a matter of great importance, it warrants our review. I respectfully dissent from the denial of certiorari.