agency—not a membership organization at all—had associational standing to "asser[t] the claims of the Washington apple growers and dealers who form its constituency." *Hunt*, 432 U. S., at 344.

Despite its continued reliance on associational standing, the Court has yet to explain how the doctrine comports with Article III. When once asked to "reconsider and reject the principles of associational standing" in favor of the class-action mechanism, the Court justified the doctrine solely by reference to its "special features, advantageous both to the individuals represented and to the judicial system as a whole." *Automobile Workers*, 477 U. S., at 288–289. Those "special features" included an association's "pre-existing reservoir of expertise and capital," and the fact that people often join an association "to create an effective vehicle for vindicating interests that they share with others." *Id.*, at 289–290. But, considerations of practical judicial policy cannot overcome the Constitution's mandates. The lack of any identifiable justification further suggests that the Court should reconsider its associational-standing doctrine.

* * *

No party challenges our associational-standing doctrine today. That is understandable; the Court consistently applies the doctrine, discussing only the finer points of its operation. See, *e.g.*, *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc.* v. *President and Fellows of Harvard College*, 600 U. S. 181, 199–201 (2023). In this suit, rejecting our associational-standing doctrine is not necessary to conclude that the plaintiffs lack standing. In an appropriate case, however, the Court should address whether associational standing can be squared with Article III's requirement that courts respect the bounds of their judicial power.