



Bienert | Katzman
A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION

July 30, 2020

Via CM/ECF

Molly C. Dwyer, Clerk of Court
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
P.O. Box 193939
San Francisco, CA 94119

Re: *Consumer Financial Protection Bureau v. Seila Law LLC*, No. 17-56324

Dear Ms. Dwyer:

Seila Law, LLC writes in response to the letter filed by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (“CFPB”) on July 29, 2020, regarding the purported ratifications of the civil investigative demand (“CID”) at issue in this case. Dkt. 56.

On July 28, 2020, Seila Law filed a motion requesting further briefing and oral argument on the ratification issue that the Supreme Court expressly left open for this Court to consider on remand. Dkt. 55. Specifically, the Supreme Court wrote that “th[e] debate [concerning ratification] turns on case-specific factual and legal questions not addressed below and not briefed here.” Slip op. 31. The case was therefore remanded to this Court “to consider whether the civil investigative demand was validly ratified.” *Id.* at 36.

Seila Law believes that the CFPB’s purported ratifications—by former Acting Director Mulvaney and current Director Kraninger—are inadequate to cure the CID’s deficiencies. Seila Law seeks the opportunity to fully brief these legal issues so that they can be resolved by this Court consistent with the directive from the Supreme Court on remand.

Sincerely,

**PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND,
WHARTON & GARRISON LLP**
Kannon. K. Shanmugam

BIENERT | KATZMAN PC
/s/ Anthony R. Bisconti
Anthony R. Bisconti