

(ORDER LIST: 606 U.S.)

THURSDAY, JULY 3, 2025

ORDERS IN PENDING CASES

23-1209 M & K EMPLOYEE SOLUTIONS, ET AL. V. TRUSTEES OF THE IAM PENSION

The order granting the petition for a writ of certiorari is amended as follows. The petition for a writ of certiorari is granted limited to the following question: Whether 29 U. S. C. §1391's instruction to compute withdrawal liability "as of the end of the plan year" requires the plan to base the computation on the actuarial assumptions most recently adopted before the end of the year, or allows the plan to use different actuarial assumptions that were adopted after, but based on information available as of, the end of the year.

24-808 CONEY ISLAND AUTO PARTS, INC. V. BURTON, JEANNE A.

The motion of petitioner to dispense with printing the joint appendix is granted.

CERTIORARI GRANTED

24-38 LITTLE, GOV. OF ID, ET AL. V. HECOX, LINDSAY, ET AL.

24-43 WEST VIRGINIA, ET AL. V. B. P. J.

24-993 OLIVIER, GABRIEL V. BRANDON, MS, ET AL.

The petitions for writs of certiorari are granted.

24-1021) GALETTE, CEDRIC V. NJ TRANSIT CORP.

)

24-1113) NJ TRANSIT CORP., ET AL. V. COLT, JEFFREY, ET AL.

The petitions for writs of certiorari are granted, limited to the following question: Whether the New Jersey Transit Corporation is an arm of the State of New Jersey for interstate

sovereign immunity purposes. The cases are consolidated, and a total of one hour is allotted for oral argument.

Statement of ALITO, J.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

MONTANA, ET AL. *v.* PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF
MONTANA, ET AL.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME
COURT OF MONTANA

No. 24–745. Decided July 3, 2025

The petition for a writ of certiorari is denied.

Statement of JUSTICE ALITO, with whom JUSTICE
THOMAS joins, respecting the denial of certiorari.

Montana’s Parental Consent for Abortion Act generally requires physicians to obtain consent from parents before performing an abortion on a minor. See Mont. Code Ann. §§50–20–501 to 50–20–511 (2023). Planned Parenthood of Montana filed a lawsuit in Montana state court, seeking to enjoin enforcement of the law. It asserted that the law was inconsistent with Montana’s State constitution. In the proceedings below, the State of Montana argued that the law satisfied state constitutional standards because, among other things, it promoted the right of parents to make decisions concerning the care, custody, and control of their children. See Appellants’ Opening Brief in No. DA 23–0272, pp. 36–37. The State cited a decision of this Court on the rights of parents as support for its argument based on state law, but it did not expressly argue that a holding against it on the state constitutional question would infringe the federal constitutional rights of parents. *Ibid.* Similarly, the Supreme Court of Montana, while citing our decision in *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U. S. 57 (2000), did not expressly hold that the rights of minors under Montana law took precedence over the federal constitutional rights of parents. See 417 Mont. 457, 485–486, 554 P.3d 153, 171 (2024).

After the State Supreme Court struck down the parental consent requirement, the State filed a petition for certiorari

Statement of ALITO, J.

in which it asked us to decide “[w]hether a parent’s fundamental right to direct the care and custody of his or her children includes a right to know and participate in decisions concerning their minor child’s medical care, including a minor’s decision to seek an abortion.” Pet. for Cert. i. But because of the way this case was litigated below, it provides a poor vehicle for deciding that question. It is therefore especially important that the denial of review is not read by interested parties or other courts as a rejection of the argument that the petition asks us to decide.