

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

_____)	
GREATER-BIRMINGHAM ALLIANCE)	
TO STOP POLLUTION, et al.)	
)	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-04469-CRC
)	
DONALD TRUMP, President of the)	
United States, in his official capacity, et al.,)	
)	
<i>Defendants.</i>)	
_____)	

SUNCOKE ENERGY, INC.’S PARTIALLY UNOPPOSED MOTION TO INTERVENE

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 24 and Local Rule 7(j), SunCoke Energy, Inc. (“SunCoke”) hereby submits this Motion to Intervene. For the reasons stated in the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, SunCoke requests that this Court enter an order permitting SunCoke to intervene as a Defendant as a matter of right under Rule 24(a). In the alternative SunCoke moves for permissive intervention under Rule 24(b).

SunCoke is the largest independent producer of coke in the United States. SunCoke operates five coke production facilities that were granted an exemption from certain federal emissions standards through a presidential proclamation by President Donald J. Trump. That presidential proclamation, *Regulatory Relief for Certain Stationary Sources to Promote American Coke Oven Processing Security*, 90 Fed. Reg. 54517 (Nov. 26, 2025), is the subject of this lawsuit, and Plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief preventing EPA from implementing this proclamation. If Plaintiffs obtain such relief, SunCoke will be forced to invest significant resources to comply with the emissions standards in less than two years. Accordingly, SunCoke has a direct and substantial interest in this case and is entitled to intervene in these proceedings as a matter of

right. Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a). In the alternative, this Court should grant SunCoke leave to intervene permissively under Rule 24(b).

SunCoke also respectfully seeks leave to file its Answer or other responsive pleading pursuant to Federal Rule 24(c) and Local Rule 7(j) by the third business day following the Defendants' deadline or, alternatively, the same deadline as the Defendants. SunCoke's Motion to Intervene should be granted without an accompanying pleading because SunCoke's position is "apparent," no party will be prejudiced, and doing so will "secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding." *Wash. All. of Tech. Workers v. DHS*, 395 F. Supp. 3d 1, 21 n.4 (D.D.C. 2019). SunCoke respectfully requests that the Court grant its Motion to Intervene.

In accordance with Local Rule 7, in support of its Motion, SunCoke concurrently files its Statement of Points and Authorities, a proposed order, and a Local Rule 26.1 corporate disclosure statement. Pursuant to Local Rule 7(m), on February 4, 2026, SunCoke's counsel emailed counsel for Plaintiffs and counsel for proposed Intervenors seeking their positions on SunCoke's Motion. Plaintiffs' counsel responded on February 5 indicating that Plaintiffs take no position on the Motion. Counsel for proposed Intervenors has not yet responded to the email, and counsel for Defendants has not yet entered an appearance as of the date this Motion was filed. Accordingly, SunCoke's Motion is partially unopposed.

Dated: February 5, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP

By: /s/ Zachary P. Lundgren
Zachary P. Lundgren, Bar # 90012330
Matthew Z. Leopold*, Bar # 1657700
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
800 17th Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 469-5757
Email: matt.leopold@hklaw.com
Email: zachary.lundgren@hklaw.com
Counsel for SunCoke Energy, Inc.

**Pro Hac Vice Pending Readmission*