

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS DOCKETED FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

ANGEL McCLARY RAICH, DIANE MONSON, JOHN DOE NUMBER ONE, and JOHN DOE NUMBER TWO, Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

JOHN ASHCROFT, as United States Attorney General, and ASA HUTCHINSON, as Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, Defendants-Appellants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of California Case No. C 02-4872 MJJ.

REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

ROBERT A. RAICH 1970 Broadway, Suite 1200 Oakland, California 94612 Telephone: (510) 338-0700

DAVID M. MICHAEL
The DeMartini Historical Landmark Building
294 Page Street
San Francisco, California 94102
Telephone: (415) 621-4500

RANDY E. BARNETT Boston University School of Law Boston, Massachusetts 02215 Telephone: (617) 353-3099 Pursuant to Circuit Rule 3-3(c), Appellants Angel McClary Raich, Diane Monson, John Doe Number One, and John Doe Number Two, by and through their attorneys, hereby request that this Court hear oral argument in this expedited appeal.

Appellants make this request because this case raises significant legal issues of first impression involving the government's attempts to interfere with Appellant patients who require cannabis to treat their serious medical conditions. These issues include: (1) the constitutionality under the Commerce Clause of the application of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.) to Appellants' distinct class of activities, consisting of the completely intrastate noneconomic personal cultivation and possession of cannabis for medical purposes as recommended by patients' physicians pursuant to California State law (the Compassionate Use Act of 1996, Cal. Health & Safety Code § 11362.5); (2) the extent to which principles of federalism embodied in the Tenth Amendment protect Appellants' wholly intrastate activities of possessing and cultivating medical cannabis pursuant to State law, as an exercise of the sovereign powers reserved to the People and to the State of California, which is primarily responsible for securing the health and safety of citizens; (3) whether, under the Fifth and Ninth Amendments, Appellants may exercise their fundamental rights to prolong life, to ameliorate pain, to bodily integrity, and to the sanctity of the physician-patient

relationship free from interference by the government, absent any compelling justification by the government; and (4) whether the doctrine of Medical Necessity protects Appellants' activities.

In addition, the Commerce Clause issues enunciated in Supreme Court cases, including *United States v. Lopez*, 514 U.S. 549 (1995), and *United States v. Morrison*, 529 U.S. 598 (2000), were recently addressed by this Circuit in *United States v. McCoy*, No. 01-50495, 2003 U.S. App. LEXIS 5378 (9th Cir. March 20, 2003). Appellants believe that oral argument will assist the Court in analyzing the implications of this recent decision and its application to Appellants.

Because of the complexity of the legal issues and the importance of the constitutional questions present in this case, Appellants believe that oral argument is necessary to address these matters thoroughly. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the Court set this case for oral argument.

Dated: April 23, 2003

ROBERT A. RAICH DAVID M. MICHAEL RANDY E. BARNETT

Robert A. Raich

Attorneys for Appellants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

I am not a party to the within action and am over eighteen years of age. My business address is 1970 Broadway, Suite 1200, Oakland, California 94612. I hereby certify that on the date this certificate is signed, I caused the attached

REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

to be served on the following counsel by Federal Express for delivery the next business day:

Mark T. Quinlivan U.S. Department of Justice 20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Room 7128 Washington, D.C. 20530

Dated: April 23, 2003

Robert A. Raich