Case 1:12-cv-00744-EGS Document 1-2 Filed 05/09/12 Page 1 of 2 CIVIL COVER SHEET

(Rev. 2/11 DC)			1.1000				
I (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS				
ROTHE DEVELOPMENT, INC.			UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE UNITED STATES SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION				
			COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED DEFENDANT				
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED				
(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBER)			ATTORNEYS (IF KNOWN)				
David F. Barton Gardner Law 745 East Mulberry Avenue, Suite 500 San Antonio, TX 78212	1	United States Attorney for the District of Columbia United States Attorney General Department of Justice					
(210) 733-8191		i	1				
N. DACIS OF HIDISPICTION			III CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX				
(PLACE AN x IN ONE BOX ONLY)	1	FOR PLAINTIFF AND ONE BOX FOR DEFENDANT) FOR DIVERSITY CASES ONLY!					
1 U.S. Government O 3 Federal C	Duestion		PTF DFT	PTF DFT			
Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)				orporated or Principal Place 0 4 0 4 lusiness in This State			
2 U.S. Government O 4 Diversity Defendant (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in item III)		of Busine		orporated and Principal Place 0 5 0 5 business in Another State			
Fairies II		Citizen or Subj Foreign Count	_	eign Nation O 6 O 6			
T.,	CACE ACCI	TNIMENIT	T AND NATURE OF SU	TT			
(Place a X in one category, A-	CASE ASSIC N that hest renre	esents vour	cause of action and one in a	corresponding Nature of Suit)			
				O D. Temporary Restraining			
O A. Antitrust O B. Person			Administrative Agency	Order/Preliminary			
Malpra	ctice	_ P	Review	Injunction			
		151	l Medicare Act	Trijunction.			
410 Antitrust 310 Airplane Sec		Social S	aonritu.	Any nature of suit from any category may be selected for this category of case			
315 Airplane	Product Liability	Social Security: 861 HIA ((1395ff)		assignment.			
320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability		862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g) 864 SSID Title XVI		*(1f Antitrust, then A governs)*			
				"(II Antitiust, then A governs)			
350 Motor Ve	hicle	Others	865 RSI (405(g) Other Statutes 891 Agricultural Acts				
	hicle Product Liabilit						
360 Other Per		892 Economic Stabilization Act					
365 Product I			3 Environmental Matters 4 Energy Allocation Act				
368 Asbestos	Product Liability	890 Other Statutory Actions (If					
Administrative Agency is Involved)							
O E. General Civil (Other) OR O F. Pro Se General Civil							
Real Property	Bankruptcy 422 Appeal 28 1	USC 158	Forfeiture/Penalty 610 Agriculture	462 Naturalization Application			
		il 28 USC 157	620 Other Food &Drug	465 Other Immigration Actions			
230 Rent, Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land Prisoner Petition			625 Drug Related Seizur of Property 21 USC				
245 Tort Product Liability 535 Death Po			630 Liquor Laws	480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Satellite TV			
290 All Other Real Property 540 Mandan			640 RR & Truck 650 Airline Regs	810 Selective Service			
Personal Property 555 Prison C			660 Occupational	850 Securities/Commodities/			
370 Other Fraud			Safety/Health 690 Other	Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC			
371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage	Property Rights 820 Copyrights	s	La vo Otaci	3410			
385 Property Damage Product Liability	830 Patent		Other Statester	900 Appeal of fee determination under equal access to Justice			
840 Trad		ĸ	Other Statutes 400 State Reapportionme	nt 950 Constitutionality of State			
	Federal Tax Suits		430 Banks & Banking	Statutes 890 Other Statutory Actions (if			
	870 Taxes (US plaintiff or defendant		450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc.	not administrative agency			
	871 IRS-Third	Party 26	460 Deportation	review or Privacy Act			

	Case 1:	12-cy-00744-FGS Docum	ent 1-2 Filed 05/09/12 Pag	e 2 of 2 J. Student Loan		
O G. H	labeas Corpus/	12-cv-00744-EGS Docum O H. <i>Employment</i>	O I. FOLA/PRIVACY	J. Student Loan		
2.	255	Discrimination	ACT	152 Recovery of Defaulted		
510 M	abeas Corpus-General lotion/Vacate Sentence abeas Corpus - Alien etainee	442 Civil Rights-Employment (criteria: race, gender/sex, national origin, discrimination, disability age, religion, retaliation)	895 Freedom of Information Act 890 Other Statutory Actions (if Privacy Act)	Student Loans (excluding veterans)		
		(If pro se, select this deck)	*(If pro se, select this deck)*			
О К.	Labor/ERISA	O L. Other Civil Right	ts O M. Contract	O N. Three-Judge Court		
(1	non-employment)	(non-employment)	110 Insurance	441 Civil Rights-Voting		
720 L 730 L 730 L D 740 L	air Labor Standards Act abor/Mgmt. Relations abor/Mgmt. Reporting & bisclosure Act abor Railway Act Other Labor Litigation Cmpl. Ret. Inc. Security Ac	441 Voting (if not Voting Righ Act) 443 Housing/Accommodation 444 Welfare 440 Other Civil Rights 445 American w/Disabilities- Employment 446 Americans w/Disabilities Other	140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholder's Suits	(if Voting Rights Act)		
28 U.S.C.	Court SE OF ACTION (CIT. § 1331: U.S. Const. Amo	E THE U.S. CIVIL STATUTE UNDER M and. V & Arl. I § 1; 5 U.S.C. § 702; Facia CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS	(specify) VHICH YOU ARE FILING AND WRITE A B Il Constitutional challenge to a racial classification of the second control of the s	Check YES only if demanded in compla		
COMPLAINT ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: YES NO X						
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instruction) YES NO If yes, please complete related case form. IF ANY						
DATE 05/07/2012 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD CONTROL OF ATTORNEY OF A						
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET JS-44 Authority for Civil Cover Sheet						
law, except a	s provided by local rules of		eplaces nor supplements the filings and service of Conference of the United States in September 1974 sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each conthe Cover Sheet.			
I.	I. COUNTY OF RESIDENCE OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF/DEFENDANT (b) County of residence: Use 11001 to indicate plaintiff is resident of Washington, D.C.; 88888 if plaintiff is resident of the United States but not of Washington, D.C., and 99999 if plaintiff is outside the United States.					
11	20 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2					
v	IV. CASE ASSIGNMENT AND NATURE OF SUIT: The assignment of a judge to your case will depend on the category you select that best represents the primary cause of action found in your complaint. You may select only one category. You must also select one corresponding nature of suit found under the category of case.					

Because of the need for accurate and complete information, you should ensure the accuracy of the information provided prior to signing the form.

CAUSE OF ACTION: Cite the US Civil Statute under which you are filing and write a brief statement of the primary cause.

RELATED CASES, IF ANY: If you indicated that there is a related case, you must complete a related case form, which may be obtained from the Clerk's

VI.

VIII.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ROTHE DEVELOPMENT, INC., 4614 Sinclair Road)))
San Antonio, TX 78222)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) Civil Action No. 12-CV-744
)
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE)
1000 Defense Pentagon)
Washington, DC 20301-1000)
and)
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION)
409 3rd Street, SW)
Washington, DC 20416)
Defendants.)
)

ORIGINAL COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, ROTHE DEVELOPMENT, INC. ("ROTHE"), alleges the following against Defendants DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ("DoD"), and SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ("SBA") (jointly "Defendants"):

NATURE OF THE ACTION

- 1. ROTHE files this action to obtain a declaration that the racial classification of section 8(a) of the Small Business Act, defined herein, is facially unconstitutional.
- 2. The racial classification of section 8(a) prevents ROTHE from bidding on Defendants' contracts on an equal footing, in violation of the equal protection component of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution, in violation of Article I section 1 of the Constitution, and in violation of ROTHE's rights under same.

- 3. Therefore, as further relief, ROTHE also requests that the Court prospectively enjoin all uses of the racial classification of section 8(a) by Defendants that prevent ROTHE from bidding on Defendants' contracts on an equal footing.
- 4. ROTHE also requests its costs, attorneys fees, and expenses in this action under the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412.
- 5. ROTHE is not required to and does not seek to enjoin any specific solicitation or contract or pursue any as-applied challenge. It brings solely a facial constitutional challenge in this action.
- 6. ROTHE seeks no money damages.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, because this action arises under the Constitution and the laws of the United States.
- 8. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(1)(A) & (B). The official residence of all defendants for venue purposes is the District of Columbia. In addition, a substantial part of the unconstitutionality of the challenged racial classification arises from omissions that occurred in the District of Columbia.

PARTIES

- 9. Plaintiff ROTHE DEVELOPMENT, INC., 4614 Sinclair Road, San Antonio, Texas 78222, is a Texas corporation.
- Defendant DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, 1000 Defense Pentagon, Washington, DC20301-1000, is an Executive department of the United States.
- 11. Defendant SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, 409 3rd Street, SW, Washington, DC 20416 is an agency under the general direction and supervision of the President.

FACTS

Section 8(a)'s Racial Classification

- 12. SBA's 8(a) program was established through an amendment to the Small Business Act on October 24, 1978, Pub. L. No. 95-507, § 202, 92 Stat. 1757, 1761 (codified as amended at 15 U.S.C. § 637 (2006)).¹
- 13. The stated purposes of the 8(a) program include "promot[ing] the business development of small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals" and "clarify[ing] and expand[ing] the program for the procurement by the United States of articles, supplies, services, materials, and construction work from small business concerns owned by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals." 15 U.S.C. § 631(f)(2) (2006).
- 14. The statute defines socially disadvantaged individuals as "those who have been subjected to racial or ethnic prejudice or cultural bias because of their identity as a member of a group without regard to their individual qualities." *Id.* § 637(a)(5).
- 15. "Economically disadvantaged individuals are those socially disadvantaged individuals whose ability to compete in the free enterprise system has been impaired due to diminished capital and credit opportunities" and are thus a subset of the socially disadvantaged. *Id*. § 637(a)(6)(A).
- 16. According to the statute, "[t]he [g]overnment-wide goal for participation by small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals shall be established at not less than 5 percent of the total value of all prime contract and subcontract awards for each fiscal year." *Id.* § 644(g)(1).

All citations to the United States Code are to the 2006 code edition.

17. The statute provides:

It shall be the duty of the [Small Business] Administration and it is hereby empowered, whenever it determines such action is necessary or appropriate—

- (A) to enter into contracts with the United States Government and any department, agency, or officer thereof having procurement powers In any case in which the Administration certifies to any officer of the Government having procurement powers that the Administration is competent and responsible to perform any specific Government procurement contract to be let by any such officer, such officer shall be authorized in his discretion to let such procurement contract to the Administration upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon between the Administration and the procurement officer. . . . ;
- (B) to arrange for the performance of such procurement contracts by negotiating or otherwise letting subcontracts to socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns ;
- (C) to make an award to a small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals

Id. § 637(a)(1)(A)-(C).

- 18. The statute then provides that "[a] contract opportunity offered for award pursuant to this subsection shall be awarded on the basis of competition restricted to eligible [p]rogram [p]articipants" if certain criteria are met. *Id.* § 637(a)(1)(D).
- 19. "Eligible program participants" are those eligible to receive contracts under § 637(a). *Id*. § 636(j)(10).
- 20. The only "small business concerns" eligible to receive 8(a) contracts are:
 - those small business concerns that are "socially and economically disadvantaged," id. § 637(a)(1)(B), meaning those more than "51% owned by one or more socially and economically disadvantaged individuals," id. § 637(a)(4)(i)(I); or
 - those outright "owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals." *Id.* § 637(a)(1)(C).
- 21. The definition of the term "socially disadvantaged" contains a racial classification. *Id.* § 637(a)(5) (defining socially disadvantaged individuals as "those who have been subjected to

racial or ethnic prejudice or cultural bias because of their identity as a member of a group without regard to their individual qualities.").

- 22. The statute also contains an additional racial classification in a presumption that all individuals who are members of certain racial groups are socially disadvantaged. *Id.* § 631(f) ("such groups include, but are not limited to, Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans... Asian Pacific Americans... and other minorities").²
- 23. In addition to the racial groups presumed socially disadvantaged under the statutory presumption, the Small Business Administration has purported to designate additional racial groups as socially disadvantaged. 13 C.F.R. § 124.103(b).
- 24. Under the statute, benefits flow from the status conferred by the definition and presumption, through a statutory goal to award a certain percentage of prime- and sub-contracts to socially disadvantaged small business concerns. *Id.* §§ § 637(a)(1)(D) & 644(g)(1).

Denial of Equal Protection

25. The definition, the presumption, and the goal, taken together, comprise the "racial classification of section 8(a)" ("section 8(a)'s racial classification" or the "statutory racial

Congressional amendments in 1986 (Pub. L. No. 99-272, § 18015, 100 Stat. 370) and 1988 (Pub. L. No. 100-656, § 207, 102 Stat. 3861, as amended by Pub. L. No. 101-37, § 6, 103 Stat. 72) also added "Indian tribes" and "Native Hawaiian Organizations" to the races deemed presumptively socially disadvantaged by 15 U.S.C. § 631(f)(1). However, ROTHE does not challenge the classifications "Indian tribes" and "Native Hawaiian Organizations" in this action. ROTHE understands the distinction in law drawn between "Native American" as a racial classification, on one hand, and an entity the United States has treaty or trust obligations towards, such as an "Indian tribe" or a "Native Hawaiian Organization" on the other. *Cf. Morton v. Mancari*, 417 U.S. 535 (1974) (legislation that singles out federally recognized Indian tribes is Constitutional "where the preference is reasonable and rationally designed to further Indian self-government"). ROTHE is only challenging the *racial* classification of section 8(a), which by definition includes only those groups currently classified by law as being "racial" groups: Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Pacific Americans, and other minorities to be determined by the SBA (to date, Subcontinent Asian Americans).

classification") which denies ROTHE an equal footing to bid on Defendants' contracts and which ROTHE challenges as facially unconstitutional in this action.

- 26. Defendants did not, and do not, have a compelling governmental interest that justifies section 8(a)'s racial classification.
- 27. Assuming *arguendo* that Defendants had a legitimate compelling interest, the statutory racial classification is not narrowly tailored to meet any such compelling interest.
- 28. The Defendants cannot produce evidence that shows "the most exact connection between justification and classification," required by strict scrutiny; i.e., Defendants cannot show a relevant causal relationship between their alleged evidence and the racial classification of section 8(a), whether in terms of a "compelling interest" to enact the racial classification or "narrow tailoring" of its scope. Moreover, there is no causal relationship between the racial classification and any remedy for alleged discrimination.
- 29. Defendants cannot produce "a strong basis in evidence" to demonstrate the racial classification of section 8(a) is supported by a compelling interest, i.e., that it is supported by probative evidence that satisfies strict scrutiny.

Violation of Non-Delegation Doctrine

30. The racial classification of section 8(a), whether with the definition alone or with the definition and the presumption together or otherwise, is a facially unconstitutional delegation of Congressional power to SBA, to the extent it purports to delegate the authority to make or enact racial classifications for "those who have been subjected to racial or ethnic prejudice or cultural bias because of their identity as a member of a group without regard to their individual qualities" (definition, 15 U.S.C. § 637(a)) or "other minorities" (presumption, 15 U.S.C. § 631(f)).

Injury to Rothe

- 31. The facts that establish Rothe's standing are those set forth in the Affidavit of ROTHE Vice President and corporate representative Dale Patenaude and attachments 1-5 thereto, attached to this Original Complaint and cited and incorporated herein by reference.
- 32. Section 8(a)'s racial classification denies ROTHE the equal protection of the laws to the extent it prevents ROTHE from competing for Defendants contracts on an equal footing with members of racial groups that receive benefits under the racial classification. Aff. of Patenaude at 2.
- 33. The denial of equal protection includes the exclusion of ROTHE from contracting opportunities that ROTHE would otherwise, but is not permitted to compete for, because it cannot participate in and has no desire to participate in the section 8(a) program and thus is not a beneficiary of section 8(a)'s racial classification. *Id.* at 2 & 5.
- 34. The denial of equal protection includes the purported designation of additional racial groups as socially disadvantaged by the SBA, which prevents ROTHE from bidding on an equal footing with members of those designated racial group(s). *Id.* at 2.
- 35. The unconstitutional delegation of authority to SBA to designate additional racial groups as socially disadvantaged is also an independent injury to ROTHE, insofar as it confers *any* competitive benefits on the racial groups designated by SBA—regardless of whether those benefits, conferred through section 8(a)'s racial classification, are themselves unconstitutional as a denial of equal protection. *Id.* at 2.
- 36. ROTHE is a small business concern that satisfies the applicable SBA size requirements for its industry with respect to net worth and number of employees. *Id.* at 3.

- 37. ROTHE bids on small business contracts in its area of expertise, nationwide, including contracts with DoD. *Id.* at 3-4.
- 38. In terms of bid frequency, ROTHE has historically and will continue to bid annually on approximately \$100 million of contracts in its area of expertise, in order to yield approximately \$10 million of annual gross income. *Id.* at 3.
- 39. Approximately 85-90% of ROTHE's annual gross income is derived from contracts with DoD. *Id.* at 4.
- 40. Defendants have let numerous contracts in ROTHE's area of expertise that have been set aside under section 8(a) using the racial classification, and the number and dollar value of those contracts is increasing relative to similar contracts not set aside under section 8(a). *Id.* at 4-5.
- Data from the federal government's own procurement data system cited in the Affidavit of Dale Patenaude demonstrates that section 8(a)'s racial classification has foreclosed a not insignificant portion of ROTHE's potential business opportunities. *Id.* at 5-6.
- 42. Defendants have not stopped letting and are likely to continue to let contracts involving ROTHE's area of expertise that are set aside under section 8(a) using the racial classification. *Id.* at 4 & 6.
- Thus, sometime in the near future ROTHE will want to bid on another government contract that pertains to its area of expertise that Defendants will have set aside under section 8(a) using the racial classification. *Id.* at 4 & 6.
- 44. ROTHE is able and ready to bid on contracts and a discriminatory statutory racial classification prevents it from doing so on an equal basis. *Id.* at 6.

- 45. ROTHE would otherwise, but is not permitted to compete for such contracts against small businesses that benefit from the section 8(a)'s racial classification when the contracts are set aside. *Id.* at 5.
- 46. If Defendants are not enjoined, they will continue to violate ROTHE's Constitutional rights.

Identification of Causes of Action and Sources of Relief

- 47. The Constitution itself provides a cause of action for equal protection claims. *Bolling v. Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497 (1954); *Davis v. Passman*, 442 U.S. 228 (1979); U.S. Const. Amend. V. The Court may order the relief in 28 U.S.C. § 2201 and 2202.
- 48. The Constitution itself provides a cause of action for nondelegation claims. U.S. Const. Art. 1 § 1. The Court may order the relief in 28 U.S.C. § 2201 and 2202.
- 49. The Administrative Procedure Act provides a second cause of action for the same relief on the nondelegation claim. ROTHE has suffered legal wrong to the extent SBA has purported to exercise what power Congress has unconstitutionally delegated, and thus has a cause of action under 5 U.S.C. § 702, for the relief available pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(B) ("The reviewing court shall . . . hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be . . . contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity.")
- 50. All conditions precedent to the filing of this action have occurred.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Declaratory Judgment)

- 51. ROTHE hereby incorporates all preceding paragraphs.
- 52. The racial classification of section 8(a) prevents ROTHE from bidding on Defendants' contracts on an equal footing, in violation of the equal protection component of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution.

- 53. The racial classification of section 8(a) is also an unconstitutional delegation of legislative authority to Defendant SBA in violation of Article I section 1 of the Constitution, not only because it prevents ROTHE from bidding on Defendants' contracts on an equal footing, but because the mere act of racially classifying (and thus extending the benefits of the racial classification to the designated racial groups) is a legislative power that cannot be and was not lawfully delegated under Article I, section 1 of the Constitution.
- 54. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201 and 5 U.S.C. § 706(2), the Court is requested to adjudge, decree, declare, and hold the same unlawful and facially unconstitutional.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Injunctive Relief)

- 55. ROTHE hereby incorporates all preceding paragraphs.
- 56. ROTHE is directly injured by the unconstitutional racial classification of section 8(a), and will suffer additional irreparable harm if the racial classification of section 8(a) remains in effect.
- 57. ROTHE has no adequate remedy at law.
- 58. The balance of hardships and the public interest favor injunction of the unconstitutional racial classification of section 8(a).
- 59. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2202 and 5 U.S.C. § 706(2), the Court is requested to permanently enjoin Defendants' use of section 8(a)'s racial classification to the extent it prevents ROTHE from competing for Defendants' contracts on an equal footing, and set it aside as facially unconstitutional.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Costs, Attorneys Fees, and Expenses Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2412)

60. ROTHE hereby incorporates all preceding paragraphs.

- 61. ROTHE has been forced to retain attorneys to vindicate its constitutional rights and interests, and to vindicate its interests on a level playing field before Defendants generally.
- 62. ROTHE satisfies all party eligibility requirements under 28 U.S.C. § 2412. Affidavit of Dale Patenaude at 3.
- 63. The position of Defendants is not substantially justified. Any defense of this action by Defendants is vexatious, litigation-multiplying, in bad faith, for purposes of delay, and unconscionable.
- 64. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2412, the Court is requested to award costs and reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses in its discretion or as mandated by statute.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, PLAINTIFF ROTHE DEVELOPMENT, INC.
RESPECTFULLY REQUESTS THAT THIS COURT ISSUE A JUDGMENT TO:

- 1. Declare that section 8(a)'s racial classification is facially unconstitutional.
- 2. Permanently enjoin Defendants' use of section 8(a)'s racial classification to the extent it prevents ROTHE from competing for Defendants' contracts on an equal footing, and set it aside as facially unconstitutional.
- 3. Award Plaintiff its costs of this action and attorneys' fees and expenses; and
- 4. Grant such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated May 9, 2012.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ David F. Barton
David F. Barton
District Court Bar No. TX0096
Texas Bar No. 01853300
GARDNER LAW
745 E. Mulberry Avenue, Suite 500
San Antonio, Texas 78212-3149
Telephone: (210) 733-8191

Telecopier: (210) 733-5538 Email: dfbarton@gardner.sa.com