Morgan Lewis



environmental lawflash

March 22, 2012

Clean Water Act Orders Subject to Pre-Enforcement Review

Supreme Court decision determines that the Clean Water Act's statutory scheme does not preclude judicial review of EPA's jurisdiction in enforcement cases.

In a much-anticipated decision, *Sackett v. EPA*, 566 U.S. _____ (2012), the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously decided yesterday that a party may seek judicial review of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) jurisdiction to issue an administrative compliance order under the Clean Water Act before EPA enforces the order. The decision is significant because parties subject to an enforcement order under the Clean Water Act may now be able to challenge an EPA order without the risk of incurring additional daily penalties and further enforcement. Previously, EPA maintained that its order could only be challenged by waiting for enforcement to occur.

The plaintiffs in *Sackett* were property owners who filled in part of their residential lot, which EPA considered regulated wetlands, with dirt and rocks in preparation for constructing a home. EPA issued a compliance order to the Sacketts under the Clean Water Act, finding that the Sacketts discharged materials into wetlands without a permit and requiring that the Sacketts restore the site, provide EPA with access to the site, and provide EPA with access to all records relating to the site. Noncompliance with the order was subject to penalties that potentially accrued at a rate of \$75,000 per day. The Sacketts contended that their property was not a regulated wetlands subject to EPA's jurisdiction.

The Administrative Procedures Act (APA) provides a mechanism for judicial review of final agency actions. Judicial review, however, is prohibited by Section 701 of the APA to the extent that the subject statute precludes judicial review. The Court found that nothing in the Clean Water Act expressly precludes judicial review under the APA. The Court also rejected the government's arguments that allowing pre-enforcement review would compromise EPA's enforcement powers. The Court's opinion noted that "there is no reason to think that the Clean Water Act was uniquely designed to enable the strong-arming of regulated parties into 'voluntary compliance' without the opportunity for judicial review." The Court concluded that the compliance order issued to the Sacketts was a final agency action for which there was no other adequate review other than under the APA, and that the Clean Water Act did not preclude such review.

The case provides parties subject to Clean Water Act compliance orders with the ability to seek pre-enforcement judicial review of the question of whether they are subject to EPA's jurisdiction. Moreover, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's concurring opinion raises whether pre-enforcement judicial review also is available to contest the terms and conditions of such compliance orders—a question the full Court did not reach. This decision may also open the door for pre-enforcement review of orders under other environmental statutes that do not expressly preclude judicial review, such as "imminent hazard" orders issued under Section 7003 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

Contacts

If you have any questions or would like more information on the issues discussed in this LawFlash, please contact any of the following Morgan Lewis attorneys:

Washington, D.C.

Ronald Tenpas 202.739.5435 <u>rtenpas@morganlewis.com</u>
Michael Steinberg 202.739.5141 <u>msteinberg@morganlewis.com</u>

Morgan Lewis

Princeton

Christopher J. McAuliffe 609.919.6619 cmcauliffe@morganlewis.com

Dallas

Allyson N. Ho 214.466.4180 <u>aho@morganlewis.com</u>

Houston

R. (Ted) Edward Cruz 713.890.5137 <u>tcruz@morganlewis.com</u>

Now Available: Environmental eDeskbook

This eDeskbook is designed to be an up-to-date reference tool for people encountering environmental issues and the regulatory framework established to protect the environment. The eDeskbook provides quick access to current contact information, articles, environmental regulations, noteworthy calendar items, and other environmental resource materials. View the *Environmental eDeskbook* at environmentaldeskbook.morganlewis.com.

About Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

With 22 offices in the United States, Europe, and Asia, Morgan Lewis provides comprehensive transactional, litigation, labor and employment, regulatory, and intellectual property legal services to clients of all sizes—from global Fortune 100 companies to just-conceived start-ups—across all major industries. Our international team of attorneys, patent agents, employee benefits advisors, regulatory scientists, and other specialists—nearly 3,000 professionals total—serves clients from locations in Beijing, Boston, Brussels, Chicago, Dallas, Frankfurt, Harrisburg, Houston, Irvine, London, Los Angeles, Miami, New York, Palo Alto, Paris, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Princeton, San Francisco, Tokyo, Washington, D.C., and Wilmington. For more information about Morgan Lewis or its practices, please visit us online at www.morganlewis.com.

This LawFlash is provided as a general informational service to clients and friends of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP. It should not be construed as, and does not constitute, legal advice on any specific matter, nor does this message create an attorney-client relationship. These materials may be considered **Attorney Advertising** in some states. Please note that the prior results discussed in the material do not guarantee similar outcomes. Links provided from outside sources are subject to expiration or change. © 2012 Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP. All Rights Reserved