

demonstrate irreparable injury is itself sufficient reason to deny the extraordinary relief he seeks in this Court. Indeed, applicant does not challenge the court of appeals' determinations that applicant will suffer no meaningful harm from the limited stay, App. A at 27-28; that the government would have been irreparably injured absent a stay, id. at 23-27; and that the public interest favors a stay, id. at 28-29. As the court explained, "allowing the special master and [applicant's] counsel to examine the classified records" would irreparably injure the government because "for reasons 'too obvious to call for enlarged discussion, the protection of classified information must be committed to the broad discretion of the agency responsible, and this must include broad discretion to determine who may have access to it.'" Id. at 27 (quoting Department of the Navy v. Egan, 484 U.S. 518, 529 (1988)).

In addition, applicant has not shown that the court of appeals erred -- much less "clearly and demonstrably erred" -- in issuing a partial stay. Planned Parenthood v. Abbott, 571 U.S. 1061, 1061 (2013) (Scalia, J., concurring in denial of application to vacate stay) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). The district court appointed the special master to review claims of privilege and for the return of personal property, see App. B at 23, but applicant has no plausible claim of privilege in or ownership of government records bearing classification markings. As the court of appeals recognized, applicant thus has no basis to demand