

1 MAYER BROWN LLP
 2 Matthew H. Marmolejo (CA Bar No. 242964)
 3 *mmarmolejo@mayerbrown.com*
 350 S. Grand Avenue
 25th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90071-1503
 4 Ori Lev (DC Bar No. 452565)
 (*pro hac vice*)
 5 *olev@mayerbrown.com*
 Stephen M. Medlock (VA Bar No. 78819)
 6 (*pro hac vice*)
smedlock@mayerbrown.com
 7 1999 K Street, N.W.
 Washington, DC 20006
 8 Telephone: +1.202.263.3000
 Facsimile: +1.202.263.3300

9
 10 SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER
 Melissa Crow (DC Bar No. 453487)
 (*pro hac vice*)
 11 *melissa.crow@splcenter.org*
 1101 17th Street, N.W., Suite 705
 12 Washington, DC 20036
 Telephone: +1.202.355.4471
 13 Facsimile: +1.404.221.5857

14 *Additional counsel listed on next page*
 15 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 17 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

18 Al Otro Lado, Inc., *et al.*,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 Chad F. Wolf,¹ *et al.*,

22 Defendants.

Case No.: 17-cv-02366-BAS-KSC

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
 AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
 TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
 ORDER**

Hearing Date: February 15, 2021

**NO ORAL ARGUMENT UNLESS
 REQUESTED BY THE COURT**

27 ¹ Acting Secretary Wolf is automatically substituted for former Acting Secretary
 28 McAleenan pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d).

1 CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

2 Baher Azmy (NY Bar No. 2860740) (*pro hac vice*)
3 *bazmy@ccrjustice.org*

4 Angelo Guisado (NY Bar No. 5182688) (*pro hac vice*)
5 *aguisado@ccrjustice.org*

6 666 Broadway, 7th Floor
New York, NY 10012
Telephone: +1.212.614.6464
Facsimile: +1.212.614.6499

7 SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER

8 Sarah Rich (GA Bar No. 281985) (*pro hac vice*)
9 *sarah.rich@splcenter.org*

10 Rebecca Cassler (MN Bar No. 0398309) (*pro hac vice*)
11 *rebecca.cassler@splcenter.org*

12 150 E. Ponce de Leon Ave., Suite 340
Decatur, GA 30030
Telephone: +1.404.521.6700
Facsimile: +1.404.221.5857

13 AMERICAN IMMIGRATION COUNCIL

14 Karolina Walters (DC Bar No. 1049113) (*pro hac vice*)
15 *kwalters@immcouncil.org*

16 1331 G St. NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: +1.202.507.7523
Facsimile: +1.202.742.5619

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	3
I. The First Asylum Ban and the Preliminary Injunction.....	3
II. Discovery Showed that Metering is Illegal.....	5
III. The Second Asylum Ban	6
ARGUMENT.....	7
I. Because The Second Asylum Ban Directly Contravenes A Binding Order Of This Court, The Court Can Enjoin Its Application To PI Class Members Based On Its Inherent Equitable Authority And The All Writs Act.....	7
A. The Executive Branch Has No Authority to Implement a Regulation that Contravenes a Judicial Order Binding Upon It.....	8
B. The Court is Authorized to Modify Its Prior Injunction to Expressly Cover the Second Ban	10
1. The Court Has Authority to Modify its Injunction to Cover the Substantively Identical Second Asylum Ban.....	10
2. The Court Has Power Under the AWA to Preserve its Jurisdiction.....	11
II. Alternatively, this court should issue a TRO.....	13
A. Plaintiffs are Likely to Succeed on the Merits of Their Claims.....	13
B. The Remaining Factors Decisively Favor Entering a TRO.....	15
CONCLUSION.....	19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Page(s)

Cases

A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.,
284 F.3d 1091 (9th Cir. 2002)..... 11

Al Otro Lado, Inc. v. McAleenan,
394 F. Supp. 3d 1168 (S.D. Cal. 2019) 2, 7

Al Otro Lado, Inc. v. Wolf,
952 F.3d 999 (9th Cir. 2020).....*passim*

All. for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell,
632 F.3d 1127 (9th Cir. 2011)..... 13

Auer v. Robbins,
519 U.S. 452 (1945) 9

Berger v. Heckler,
771 F.2d 1556 (2d Cir. 1985)..... 11

Boardman v. Pac. Seafood Grp.,
822 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 2016)..... 16

Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.,
467 U.S. 837 (1984) 8

Drakes Bay Oyster Co. v. Jewell,
747 F.3d 1073 (9th Cir. 2014)..... 13

E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump,
349 F. Supp. 3d 838 (N.D. Cal. 2018) 17

E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump,
932 F.3d 742 (9th Cir. 2018)..... 19

F.T.C. v. Dean Foods Co.,
384 U.S. 597 (1966) 11

1 *Freeman v. Pitts*,
 2 503 U.S. 467 (1992) 10
 3 *FTC v. Americans for Financial Reform*,
 4 720 Fed. App’x 380 (9th Cir. 2017)..... 12
 5 *Hutto v. Finney*,
 6 437 U.S. 678 (1979) 10
 7 *Kirwa v. U.S. Dep’t of Defense*,
 8 285 F. Supp. 3d 21 (D.D.C. 2007) 17
 9 *Kisor v. Wilkie*,
 10 139 S. Ct. 2400 (2019) 9
 11 *Klay v. United Healthgroup, Inc.*,
 12 376 F.3d 1092 (11th Cir. 2004)..... 12
 13 *Leiva-Perez v. Holder*,
 14 640 F.3d 962 (9th Cir. 2011)..... 17
 15 *Marbury v. Madison*,
 16 5 U.S. 137 (1803) 7
 17 *Nat’l Org. for Reform of Marijuana Laws v. Mullen*,
 18 828 F.2d 536 (9th Cir. 1987)..... 12
 19 *Nken v. Holder*,
 20 556 U.S. 418 (2009) 19
 21 *P.J.E.S. v. Wolf*,
 22 2020 WL 6770508 (D.D.C. Nov. 18, 2020)..... 9
 23 *Salehpour v. INS*,
 24 761 F.2d 1442 (9th Cir. 1985)..... 8, 9
 25 *Saravia for A.H. v. Sessions*,
 26 905 F.3d 1137 (9th Cir. 2018)..... 13
 27 *Sharp v. Weston*,
 28 233 F.3d 1166 (9th Cir. 2000)..... 11
Sierra On-Line, Inc. v. Phoenix Software, Inc.,
 739 F.2d 1415 (9th Cir. 1984)..... 16

1 *Singleton v. Kernan,*
 2 2017 WL 4922849 (S.D. Cal. 2017) 16

3 *Small v. Avanti Health Sys., LLC,*
 4 661 F.3d 1180 (9th Cir. 2011)..... 19

5 *State v. Trump,*
 6 871 F.3d 646 (9th Cir. 2017)..... 11

7 *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ.,*
 8 402 U.S. 1 (1971) 10

9 *Synopsys, Inc. v. AzurEngine Techs., Inc.,*
 10 401 F. Supp. 3d 1068 (S.D. Cal. 2019) 13

11 *Textile Unlimited, Inc. v. A. BMH & Co., Inc.,*
 12 240 F.3d 781 (9th Cir. 2001)..... 13

13 *United States v. De-Jesus,*
 14 2020 WL 1149911 (E.D. Wash. 2020)..... 9

15 *United States v. N.Y. Tel. Co.,*
 16 434 U.S. 159 (1977) 12

17 *United States v. Washington,*
 18 853 F.3d 946 (9th Cir. 2017)..... 11

19 *Villanueva-Bustillos v. Marin,*
 20 370 F. Supp. 3d 1083 (C.D. Cal. 2018)..... 17

21 *Walker v. City of Birmingham,*
 22 388 U.S. 307 (1967) 10

23 *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.,*
 24 555 U.S. 7 (2008) 13, 16, 18

25 *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer,*
 26 343 U.S. 579 (1952) (Jackson, J., concurring)..... 3

27 **Statutes**

28 5 U.S.C. § 706(1)..... 15

5 U.S.C. § 706(2)..... 15

1 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1) 15
 2 8 U.S.C. § 1225..... 4
 3 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1) 15
 4 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3) 14, 15
 5 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii)..... 14, 15
 6 28 U.S.C. § 1651..... 4
 7
 8 **Other Authorities**
 9 8 C.F.R. § 208.13(c)(4)..... 14, 17, 18
 10 8 C.F.R. § 1208.13(c)(4)..... 17
 11 84 Fed. Reg. 33,829, 33,844 (July 16, 2019), *codified at* 8 C.F.R. §§
 12 208.13(c)(4), 1208.13(c)(4).....*passim*
 13 85 Fed. Reg. 82,260 (Dec. 17, 2020)..... 1
 14 Rule 30(b)(6) 5, 7, 15
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

INTRODUCTION

1
2 In its dying days, the Trump administration is attempting to explicitly override
3 this Court’s November 19, 2019 preliminary injunction via a new agency rule. *See*
4 Asylum Eligibility and Procedural Modification, 85 Fed. Reg. 82,260 (Dec. 17,
5 2020) (“Second Asylum Ban” or “SAB”). The Second Asylum Ban is preposterous.
6 This Court *already* held that the government cannot apply a prior, identical rule to a
7 provisional class consisting of “all-non Mexican asylum-seekers who were unable
8 to make a direct asylum claim at a U.S. POE [port of entry] before July 16, 2019
9 because of the Government’s metering policy, and who continue to seek access to
10 the U.S. asylum process” (“PI class”). Dkt. 330 at 36. This Court enjoined the
11 government from applying to the PI class an asylum ineligibility rule which provided
12 that, with narrow exceptions, “any alien who enters, attempts to enter, or arrives in
13 the United States across the southern land border on or after July 16, 2019, after
14 transiting through at least one [third] country . . . en route to the United States, shall
15 be found ineligible for asylum.” *See* Asylum Eligibility and Procedural
16 Modifications, 84 Fed. Reg. 33,829, 33,844 (July 16, 2019), *codified at* 8 C.F.R.
17 §§ 208.13(c)(4), 1208.13(c)(4) (“First Asylum Ban”); Dkt. 330 at 36.

18 The November 19, 2019 preliminary injunction turned on the extensive
19 statutory construction analysis in this Court’s prior motion to dismiss opinion, in
20 which this Court rejected the Defendants’ proposed bright-line territorial rule and
21 found that the PI class members who were metered were “in the process of arriving
22 in the United States through a POE,” and therefore were “arriv[ing] in” the United
23 States prior to July 16, 2019. Dkt. 330 at 31-32. This Court also found that the First
24 Asylum Ban was “quintessentially inequitable.” *Id.* at 34. A Ninth Circuit motions
25 panel agreed with both of this Court’s conclusions, finding that this Court’s statutory
26 analysis “has considerable force” and is “likely correct.” *Al Otro Lado, Inc. v. Wolf*,
27 952 F.3d 999, 1013 (9th Cir. 2020).

28 The Second Asylum Ban will give this Court a serious case of déjà vu. The

1 rule purports to “adopt[] as final” the exact asylum ineligibility provisions of the
2 First Asylum Ban. SAB at 82,289. Yet, in promulgating the Second Asylum Ban,
3 the agencies explain: “For clarity, . . . this rule applies to . . . aliens who may have
4 approached the U.S. border but were subject to metering by DHS at a land border
5 port of entry and did not physically cross the border into the United States before
6 July 16, 2019.” *Id.* at 82,268. But this new interpretation is not formally recognized
7 through any change to the operative language of the regulations. Indeed, the Second
8 Asylum Ban makes no changes to the operative language, tinkering only with one
9 of the exceptions and making other minor technical edits. *See* SAB at 82,262 (“this
10 final rule makes no additional changes to the IFR beyond the changes described
11 below”)

12 This Court might be asking itself: didn’t I already enjoin this rule? In fact, it
13 did. *See* Dkt. 330 at 29-36. Because this Court has already enjoined application of
14 the First Asylum Ban to the PI class, and the Second Asylum Ban employs the exact
15 same operative regulatory language purporting to render PI class members ineligible
16 for asylum, Plaintiffs sought confirmation from Defendants that the preliminary
17 injunction applies with equal force to the Second Asylum Ban. Defendants indicated
18 that they believe that the Second Asylum Ban will operate as a mandatory bar to
19 asylum for members of the PI class.

20 The government fundamentally misunderstands the limits of its authority in a
21 system of separation of powers.² Courts say what the law is; not executive branch
22 agencies. An agency cannot override this Court’s a binding order, even if it
23 disagrees with this Court’s interpretation of the law. That can be done only by the
24 Ninth Circuit (which has agreed with this Court’s statutory interpretation), the
25 Supreme Court, or an act of Congress. As a result, this Court’s prior preliminary

26
27 ² In a footnote, the government insinuates that it can simply ignore this Court’s
28 preliminary injunction because it disagrees with it. SAB at 82,268 n.22 (“The
Departments note that this result is different from the district court’s reasoning in
granting a preliminary injunction in . . . *Al Otro Lado, Inc. v. McAleenan*”).

1 injunction analysis applies to the Second Asylum Ban with particular force.
2 Moreover, the discovery record developed since this Court’s preliminary injunction
3 opinion leads to one inevitable conclusion: metering is illegal, and Plaintiffs are
4 likely to succeed on the merits of that claim as well.

5 The only question left for this Court is one of remedy. This Court can issue a
6 temporary restraining order enjoining the Second Asylum Ban and clarifying that its
7 November 19, 2019 preliminary injunction opinion, as well as all orders
8 subsequently clarifying or enforcing that opinion, apply to the now-purportedly final
9 regulatory language of the Second Asylum Ban. Alternatively, this Court can amend
10 its November 19, 2019 preliminary injunction opinion to apply expressly to the
11 Second Asylum Ban. Either way, in light of the government’s failure to comply with
12 the original injunction, the Court should make clear that enjoining the application of
13 the Second Asylum Ban to the class includes all of the relief granted in the
14 preliminary injunction as well as the Court’s October 30, 2020 order clarifying the
15 preliminary injunction (Dkt. 605).

16 The executive branch’s relentless assault on asylum seekers and the rule of
17 law—of which this attempted executive fiat forms a natural part—is, mercifully,
18 coming to an end. Yet, ensuring the executive’s compliance with judicial decrees
19 remains as important as ever. “[O]urs is a government of laws, not of men, and . . .
20 we submit ourselves to rulers only if under rules.” *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v.*
21 *Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 646 (1952) (Jackson, J., concurring). The Second Asylum
22 Ban should be enjoined.

23 **BACKGROUND**

24 **I. THE FIRST ASYLUM BAN AND THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

25 On July 16, 2019, the government issued the First Asylum Ban. Dkt. 330 at
26 5. On November 19, 2019, this Court issued a preliminary injunction prohibiting the
27 government from applying the First Asylum Ban to members of the PI class and
28 ordering the government to “return to the pre-Asylum Ban practices for processing

1 the asylum applications of members of the [provisional] class.” *Id.* at 36.

2 Importantly, the district court found that none of the jurisdictional bars in 8
3 U.S.C. § 1225 prohibited this Court from issuing a preliminary injunction. Dkt. 330
4 at 9-18. This Court also concluded that the it had separate authority under the All
5 Writs Act (“AWA”), 28 U.S.C. § 1651, to issue an injunction to preserve the Court’s
6 jurisdiction and prevent Plaintiffs’ claims from being “prematurely extinguished” by
7 application of the Ban to the PI class. *Id.* at 19-21.

8 The Court also found that each prong of the traditional four-part preliminary
9 injunction test favored entering a preliminary injunction. *See* Dkt. 330 at 30-36. The
10 Court explicitly drew upon on its extensive analysis of the statutory text of the
11 Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) at the motion to dismiss stage, *see* Dkt.
12 280, in which this Court rejected the Defendants’ proposed bright-line territorial
13 interpretation of Sections 1158 and 1225 of the INA, as the terms “arriving in” the
14 United States contemplate those in the process of arriving to the border to seek
15 asylum. Accordingly, in issuing the injunction, this Court found that asylum seekers
16 who were subject to metering prior to July 16, 2019 were in the process of arriving
17 in the United States and should have been inspected and processed under the asylum
18 rules that existed prior to the issuance of the First Asylum Ban. Dkt. 330 at 30-32;
19 *see also* Dkt. 280 at 35-47. Critically, the Court concluded that “by its express
20 terms” the First Asylum Ban “does not apply” to those individuals. Dkt. 330 at 31.
21 Next, this Court found that failing to return the provisional class members to the pre-
22 Ban regime for asylum processing would irreparably harm them. Dkt. 330 at 33-34.
23 Finally, the district court found that the balance of the equities and the public interest
24 also weighed in Plaintiffs’ favor because “[t]his situation, at its core, is
25 quintessentially inequitable.” *Id.* at 34.

26 On appeal, a motions panel of the Ninth Circuit found that this Court’s
27 “linguistic and contextual analysis” of the INA “has considerable force” and “is
28 likely correct.” *Al Otro Lado*, 952 F.3d at 1013. The panel also agreed with this

1 Court’s analysis that the First Asylum Ban created a “quintessentially inequitable”
2 situation. *Id.* at 1015 (quotation marks omitted).

3 **II. DISCOVERY SHOWED THAT METERING IS ILLEGAL**

4 After losing the preliminary injunction, things got worse for the government
5 in discovery. Mariza Marin, a Rule 30(b)(6) witness designated to testify regarding
6 the government’s “practice of metering,” testified that asylum-seekers who are at
7 standing near the border at a port of entry are attempting to enter the United States.
8 *See* Ex. 1 at 24:14-25:8; *see also* Ex. 2 at Topic 2.³

9 Q. Okay. In your experience[], are asylum seekers who are at the
10 border between the United States and Mexico attempting to enter
11 the United States at a port of entry?

12 . . .

13 A. Yes.

14 Ex. 1 at 201:22-202:3 (objection omitted).

15 That was just the tip of the iceberg. Discovery also showed that:

- 16 • U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) officers lied to asylum
17 seekers about POE capacity in order to turn them back to Mexico;
- 18 • CBP officials privately told union representatives that they knew that
19 turning back asylum seekers violated the law;
- 20 • CBP leadership knew that turning back asylum seekers would create a
21 local humanitarian crisis in Mexican border towns, but went ahead with
22 implementing the policy anyway; and
- 23 • The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) Secretary was
24 specifically told that implementing the metering policy would result in
25 hundreds of asylum seekers being turned back to Mexico every day, but
26 she approved the policy anyway.

27 _____
28 ³ “Ex.” refers to exhibits to the declaration of Stephen M. Medlock, which is filed
concurrently with this motion.

1 See Dkt. 535-3 at 98:22-101:6; Dkt. 535-4 at 132; Dkt. 610 at 1-3; Dkt. 610-2 at 6.

2 Finally, the DHS Inspector General concluded that the government turned
3 back asylum seekers despite having the capacity to inspect and process them. See
4 Dkt. 610-2 at 10, 15. And the government’s principal explanation for its conduct—
5 that it was simply making inspection and processing of asylum seekers a lower-level
6 priority—is itself a violation of the Homeland Security Act. See Dkt. 585 at 1-4.

7 **III. THE SECOND ASYLUM BAN**

8 In December 2020, the Trump Administration embarked on a last-minute
9 effort to deport as many asylum seekers as possible before President-Elect Biden
10 takes office. For many asylum seekers, the government had one impediment to
11 deportation—this Court’s preliminary injunction. So, on December 17, 2020, DHS
12 and the Executive Office of Immigration Review (“EOIR”) issued the Second
13 Asylum Ban. See SAB at 82,260.

14 The Second Asylum Ban is nothing more than a slapdash effort to overturn
15 this Court’s preliminary injunction ruling via agency rulemaking. It contains
16 *precisely* the same third-country transit ban on eligibility for asylum. See SAB at
17 82,289-90. The Second Asylum Ban does nothing to comply with this Court’s
18 preliminary injunction or even work around it. It simply “note[s]” that its “result is
19 different than the district court’s reasoning in granting [the] preliminary injunction.”
20 *Id.* at 82,268 n.22. The government claims that it can overturn the preliminary
21 injunction because “[t]he district court’s interpretation is contrary to the
22 Departments’ intent.” *Id.* This intent is based on the government’s interpretation
23 that “[a]liens whom [CBP] encounter [sic] at the physical border line of the United
24 States and Mexico, who have not crossed the border line at the time of the encounter,
25 have . . . not attempted to enter [the United States].” *Id.* at 82,269. For that reason,
26 and in spite of a binding court order directly to the contrary, the government
27 “reiterate[s] that ‘entry,’ ‘attempted entry,’ and ‘arrival’ require the alien to be
28 physically present in the United States.” *Id.*

1 But that “rationale” is little more than a new variation of the government’s
2 failed arguments in opposition to the preliminary injunction. *Compare* SAB at
3 82,269, *with* Dkt. 307 at 17 (“But aliens standing in Mexico are simply not
4 ‘applicants for admission,’ nor are they ‘seeking admission’ in the manner that
5 would trigger CBP’s duties.”). And the Second Asylum Ban entirely ignores the fact
6 that a Rule 30(b)(6) witness’ testimony in this case directly contradicts the
7 government’s purported statutory construction.

8 **ARGUMENT**

9 **I. BECAUSE THE SECOND ASYLUM BAN DIRECTLY**
10 **CONTRAVENES A BINDING ORDER OF THIS COURT, THE**
11 **COURT CAN ENJOIN ITS APPLICATION TO PI CLASS MEMBERS**
12 **BASED ON ITS INHERENT EQUITABLE AUTHORITY AND THE**
13 **ALL WRITS ACT.**

14 This Court previously enjoined application of the First Asylum Ban to PI class
15 members, Dkt. 330, based upon its prior opinion that had thoroughly considered and
16 rejected Defendants’ proposed interpretation of sections 1158 and 1225 of the INA.
17 *Al Otro Lado, Inc. v. McAleenan*, 394 F. Supp. 3d 1168, 1199-1205 (S.D. Cal. 2019).
18 The Court recognized that these provisions do not, as Defendants then and now
19 contend, create a bright-line territorial rule that would exclude from mandatory
20 screening requirements those asylum seekers otherwise in the process of “arriving
21 in” the United States or who are “at ports of entry.” *Id.* Yet Defendants—who are
22 still subject to that injunction—now wish to undertake the same prohibited conduct
23 against PI class members under the guise of a new “final” regulation. This is a
24 clumsy sleight of hand; but all can see that Defendants seek to evade this Court’s
25 mandate by blithely redeploying in regulations an interpretation of the governing
26 statutory provisions that the Court already rejected. This arrogant attempt to invert
27 the separation of powers would undo our most elementary constitutional
28 commitment, namely that “[i]t is emphatically the province and duty of the judiciary
to say what the law is.” *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, 177 (1803).

1 **A. The Executive Branch Has No Authority to Implement a**
2 **Regulation that Contravenes a Judicial Order Binding Upon It.**

3 This Court ruled (1) that the First Asylum Ban, “by its express terms, does not
4 apply to [the certified subclass in this case],” Dkt. 330 at 31, precisely because of
5 (2) the Court’s prior ruling, which held that those “who may not yet be in the United
6 States, but who [are] in the process of arriving in the United States through a POE[,]”
7 are “arriving in the United States” such that the INA’s asylum protections apply to
8 them. *See Al Otro Lado*, 394 F. Supp. 3d at 1199–1205. The agencies seek to evade
9 the constraints of (1), the injunction barring application of the substantive terms of
10 the (First or Second) Asylum Ban to PI class members by simply substituting its own
11 preferred reading of (2), the Court’s interpretation of relevant statutory terms. Yet
12 the principle that the executive cannot contravene a court order is as basic as the
13 commitment to the rule of law itself. The agencies cannot treat the law like a shell
14 game, disappearing critical judicially-imposed constraints in order to achieve their
15 desired executive outcomes.

16 While *Chevron* deference may apply when a court is considering, *ex ante*, an
17 agency’s proposed interpretation of a statute that has not been previously interpreted
18 by the judiciary, *see Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S.
19 837, 838 (1984), no administrative or constitutional law principle permits an agency
20 to simply disregard a court’s duly considered *rejection* of the agency’s preferred
21 interpretation of the statute the next time it wants to act. *See Salehpour v. INS*, 761
22 F.2d 1442, 1445 (9th Cir. 1985) (emphasizing that “[t]he courts,” and not agencies,
23 “are the final authorities on statutory construction”). This Court’s prior injunction—
24 premised as it was on the Court’s rejection of the agencies’ proposed interpretation
25 of the relevant INA provisions, §§ 1158 and 1225—is binding on the agencies in
26 this case, and forecloses any agency attempt to apply the terms of the Second Asylum
27
28

1 Ban to PI class members.⁴ *Cf. P.J.E.S. v. Wolf*, 2020 WL 6770508, *36 (D.D.C.
2 2020) (adopting report and recommendation that found preliminary injunction to
3 cover Title 42 expulsions after finding “no relevant material difference” between
4 authority under Final Rule and Interim Final Rule).

5 Nor does *Auer*⁵ deference save the government here. Setting to one side the
6 illegality of ignoring the binding judicial interpretation of the statutory terms the new
7 regulation seeks to override, the agencies cannot claim that the regulatory terms at
8 issue are sufficiently ambiguous to authorize deference to their interpretation.
9 *Compare* Dkt. 330 at 32 (concluding that the regulation’s “unambiguous” terms
10 exclude PI class members), *with Kisor v. Wilkie*, 139 S. Ct. 2400, 2414 (2019)
11 (limiting *Auer* deference to regulations that are “genuinely ambiguous, even after a
12 court has resorted to all the standard tools of interpretation”). This is particularly
13 warranted where, as here, a court’s prior judicial construction of a regulation follows
14 from its “unambiguous terms.” *United States v. De-Jesus*, 2020 WL 1149911, at *4
15 (E.D. Wash. 2020) (citing *Brand X Internet Servs.*, 545 U.S. 967, 982 (2005)).⁶

16 Under our constitutional system of governance, Defendants’ remedy for their
17 disagreement with this Court’s prior rulings was an appeal as of right. Having
18 elicited an unfavorable opinion from the Ninth Circuit on that appeal, the

19
20 ⁴ As before, Plaintiffs do not seek to enjoin application of the Second Asylum Ban
21 across the board. They seek to ensure that the Second Asylum Ban—like the First
22 Asylum Ban—does not apply to PI class members and that the government is
therefore foreclosed for the same reasons from applying the categorical ineligibility
standards from either Ban to PI class members.

23 ⁵ *Auer v. Robbins*, 519 U.S. 452 (1945).

24 ⁶ Nor can the government manufacture ambiguity by issuing a *post-hoc*
25 interpretation that runs counter to the interpretation of this Court. Where the
26 “objective criteria of [the] regulation are clearly met,” based on this Court’s statutory
27 construction analysis of what it means to “arrive in” the United States, “there is no
28 room for an agency to interpret [the] regulation so as to add another requirement,”
such as physical presence. *Salehpour*, 761 F.2d at 1447. Even assuming that the
original regulation is ambiguous and needs clarification—which Plaintiffs do not
concede—the government cannot simply issue a new rule with the exact same
language and say it means something entirely different. After all, “*Auer* deference .
. . . serves to ensure consistency in federal regulatory law, for everyone who needs to
know what it requires.” *Kisor*, 139 S. Ct. at 2414.

1 government now seeks to dispense with the process of law. But mere disagreement
2 does not justify avoidance of the terms of an existing injunction out of, at a
3 minimum, “respect for judicial process.” *Walker v. City of Birmingham*, 388 U.S.
4 307, 321 (1967). Accordingly, any action by the government to apply the Second
5 Asylum Ban to PI class members would contravene this Court’s prior order.

6 **B. The Court is Authorized to Modify Its Prior Injunction to**
7 **Expressly Cover the Second Ban**

8 Defendants cannot evade the force of the Court’s prior rulings by
9 formalistically labeling substantive rules “Final” and claiming they are not bound by
10 rulings governing identical “Interim” rules. Rulemaking does not permit an agency
11 to play Whack-a-Mole with the judicial branch. Any affirmative action by
12 Defendants to subject PI class members to the identical substantive provisions of the
13 Second Asylum Ban would contravene this Court’s injunction. The law does not
14 bend to such manipulative formalisms. The Court retains the power to issue orders
15 to protect and enforce a prior injunction as well as power to preserve its jurisdiction
16 under the AWA.

17 **1. The Court Has Authority to Modify its Injunction to Cover**
18 **the Substantively Identical Second Asylum Ban.**

19 Where “a right and a violation have been shown, the scope of a district court’s
20 equitable powers to remedy past wrongs is broad, for breadth and flexibility are
21 inherent in equitable remedies.” *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ.*, 402
22 U.S. 1, 15 (1971). This includes, by necessity, broad equitable power and discretion
23 to ensure compliance with a court’s orders. *Hutto v. Finney*, 437 U.S. 678, 687, 690
24 (1979) (“[F]ederal courts are not reduced to issuing injunctions against state officers
25 and hoping for compliance. Once issued, an injunction may be enforced.”); *see also*
26 *Freeman v. Pitts*, 503 U.S. 467, 487 (1992) (courts have “inherent capacity to adjust
27 remedies in a feasible and practical way to eliminate the conditions or redress the
28 injuries caused by unlawful action.”).

1 This Court is thus empowered “to supervise compliance with an injunction
2 and to ‘modify a preliminary injunction in consideration of new facts.’” *State v.*
3 *Trump*, 871 F.3d 646, 654 (9th Cir. 2017) (quoting *A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster,*
4 *Inc.*, 284 F.3d 1091, 1098 (9th Cir. 2002)); *see also United States v. Washington,*
5 853 F.3d 946, 979 (9th Cir. 2017) (permitting modification of a preliminary
6 injunction based on changed circumstances); *A&M Records*, 284 F.3d at 1098
7 (power to modify an injunction based on changed circumstances or new facts).
8 “Ensuring compliance with a prior order is an equitable goal which a court is
9 empowered to pursue even absent a finding of contempt.” *Berger v. Heckler*, 771
10 F.2d 1556, 1569 (2d Cir. 1985). While the party requesting a modification of an
11 injunction “bears the burden of establishing that a significant change in facts . . .
12 warrants revision . . . of the injunction,” *Sharp v. Weston*, 233 F.3d 1166, 1170 (9th
13 Cir. 2000), a significant change plainly exists here. The government is attempting
14 to overturn this Court’s preliminary injunction via the Second Asylum Ban.

15 Accordingly, the Court can modify the scope of its prior injunction to make
16 clear that it covers the substantively identical provisions of the Second Asylum Ban
17 and continues to apply to the enjoined regulations notwithstanding their “adopt[ion]
18 as final.” SAB at 82,289.

19 **2. The Court Has Power Under the AWA to Preserve its**
20 **Jurisdiction.**

21 This Court enjoined the application of the First Asylum Ban to the provisional
22 class pursuant to its power under the AWA to “issue injunctive relief to preserve its
23 jurisdiction in the underlying action.” Dkt. 330 at 19; *see id.* (observing that the
24 AWA allows a court “to preserve [its] jurisdiction or maintain the status quo by
25 injunction pending review of an agency’s action through the prescribed statutory
26 channels.”) (quoting *F.T.C. v. Dean Foods Co.*, 384 U.S. 597, 604 (1966)). As this
27 Court found, “the improper application of the [First] Asylum Ban affects this Court’s
28 jurisdiction because it would effectively moot Plaintiffs’ request for relief in the

1 underlying action by extinguishing their asylum claims.” Dkt. 330 at 20.

2 The Court’s holding applies precisely the same way here. Just as the improper
3 application of the First Asylum Ban would destroy the court’s jurisdiction over
4 pending claims (which by now are ripe for disposition via pending summary
5 judgment motions), the improper application of the Second Asylum Ban would do
6 precisely the same and thus merits an AWA injunction.

7 Indeed, the authority to enjoin the Second Asylum Ban under the AWA is
8 even stronger here. Not only would application of the Second Asylum Ban to PI
9 class members deprive the court of jurisdiction over pending claims, but also
10 allowing the Second Asylum Ban to go into force with respect to PI class members
11 would undermine the force of a prior court order—the preliminary injunction. *See*
12 *United States v. N.Y. Tel. Co.*, 434 U.S. 159, 172 (1977) (injunctions under the AWA
13 are authorized “as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate and prevent the
14 frustration of orders it has previously issued in its exercise of jurisdiction”); *FTC v.*
15 *Americans for Financial Reform*, 720 Fed. App’x 380, 383 (9th Cir. 2017) (AWA
16 authorized district court order enforcing preliminary injunction); *Nat’l Org. for*
17 *Reform of Marijuana Laws v. Mullen*, 828 F.2d 536, 544 (9th Cir. 1987) (“One of
18 the recognized applications of the All Writs Act is the issuance of orders necessary
19 to ensure the integrity of orders previously issued.”); *Klay v. United Healthgroup,*
20 *Inc.*, 376 F.3d 1092, 1100 (11th Cir. 2004) (an injunction under the AWA “must
21 simply point to some ongoing proceeding, or some past order or judgment, the
22 integrity of which is being threatened by someone else’s action or behavior.”).

23 * * *

24 The Court is thus fully authorized to clarify or modify the injunction to cover
25 the Second Asylum Ban and ensure it does not apply to PI class members in the same
26 way the First Asylum Ban does not, and the Court can do so based on its inherent
27 authority—without a finding on the traditional preliminary injunction factors.

28

1 **II. ALTERNATIVELY, THIS COURT SHOULD ISSUE A TRO**

2 Alternatively, this Court should issue a temporary restraining order to
3 preserve the status quo and prevent the provisional class members’ “irreparable loss
4 of rights” before a final judgment on the merits. *Textile Unlimited, Inc. v. A. BMH*
5 *& Co., Inc.*, 240 F.3d 781, 786 (9th Cir. 2001). Specifically, because Plaintiffs are
6 likely to succeed on their claim that metering is unlawful, and because application
7 of the Asylum Ban to individuals subject to this unlawful practice would be
8 outrageous, this Court should issue an order prohibiting the government from
9 applying the Second Asylum Ban to provisional class members at any stage of their
10 immigration proceedings and returning the provisional class members to the pre-Ban
11 rules for processing their asylum applications.

12 “The standard for obtaining a temporary restraining order is identical to the
13 standard for obtaining a preliminary injunction.” *Synopsys, Inc. v. AzurEngine*
14 *Techs., Inc.*, 401 F. Supp. 3d 1068, 1072 (S.D. Cal. 2019). A plaintiff “must
15 establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer
16 irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips
17 in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.” *Saravia for A.H. v.*
18 *Sessions*, 905 F.3d 1137, 1142 (9th Cir. 2018) (quoting *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def.*
19 *Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)). “When the government is a party, these last
20 two factors merge.” *Drakes Bay Oyster Co. v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d 1073, 1092 (9th Cir.
21 2014). Therefore, preliminary injunctive relief should be ordered where the plaintiff
22 raises “serious questions going to the merits . . . and the balance of hardships tips
23 sharply in . . . plaintiff’s favor.” *All. for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127,
24 1135 (9th Cir. 2011) (internal quotation marks omitted). As they did with respect to
25 the First Asylum Ban, Plaintiffs easily satisfy each of these requirements with
26 respect to the Second Asylum Ban.

27 **A. Plaintiffs are Likely to Succeed on the Merits of Their Claims.**

28 This Court correctly held that the First Asylum Ban, which applies only to a

1 noncitizen who “enters, attempts to enter, or arrives in the United States ... on or
2 after July 16, 2019,” 8 C.F.R. § 208.13(c)(4), facially does not apply to provisional
3 class members, who “attempted to enter or arrived at the southern border *before* July
4 16, 2019 to seek asylum but were prevented from making a direct claim at a POE
5 pursuant to the metering policy.” Dkt. 330 at 31. Given the identical language of the
6 Second Asylum Ban, the same reasoning applies here.

7 And, as described above, the Court has already rejected all of the Defendants’
8 proffered bright-line interpretation of the relevant INA provisions, which they
9 impermissibly seek to resuscitate by fiat. As part of the Second Asylum Ban, the
10 government tries to resurrect its failed argument that even if individuals metered
11 prior to July 16, 2019 were exempt from the Final Asylum Ban, they would still
12 become subject to the Ban upon any subsequent entry into the United States. But
13 this would create a glaring loophole in the INA. If class members arrived before July
14 16, 2019 under the INA, then the government’s absolute, nondiscretionary
15 obligations to inspect class members and process them for asylum were already
16 triggered. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3), (b)(1)(A)(ii). The government’s interpretation
17 of the Ban would negate the compulsory nature of the INA’s inspection and
18 processing provisions, since it would let the government avoid its statutory duties
19 toward class members simply by metering them. In this context, the Final Asylum
20 Ban’s reference to noncitizens who enter the United States after July 16, 2019 is
21 properly understood not to include people who had begun the process of entering—
22 by virtue of “arriving” in the United States—prior to the Ban’s effective date but
23 were prevented from doing so by the government’s own conduct. The Ban must
24 cover only noncitizens to whom the government’s duty of inspection and processing
25 did not yet attach.

26 This Court has even more support to reach the same conclusion regarding its
27 statutory interpretation here. Since the preliminary injunction ruling, a motions
28 panel of the Ninth Circuit has concluded that this Court’s statutory exegesis was

1 forceful and “likely correct.” *Al Otro Lado*, 952 F.3d at 1013. In addition, a Rule
2 30(b)(6) witness has agreed that asylum seekers standing at the U.S.-Mexico border
3 are attempting to enter the United States. *See supra* at 5.

4 Finally, Plaintiffs are likely to succeed on the merits because the pending
5 summary judgment briefing in this case clearly shows that the government’s
6 metering policy is illegal. *See supra* at 5; Dkt. 535-3 at 98:22-101:6; Dkt. 535-4 at
7 132; Dkt. 610 at 1-3; Dkt. 610-2 at 6. In brief, the reasons that Plaintiffs will prevail
8 are these. First, each individual “turnback”—or failure of the government to carry
9 out its mandatory inspection and processing duties—of an arriving asylum seeker
10 violates the INA and section 706(1) of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), and
11 the government’s capacity excuse is pretextual. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1158(a)(1),
12 1225(a)(1), 1225(a)(3), 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii). *See* Dkt. 535-1 at 21-23. Second, the
13 government’s metering policy violates the INA and Administrative Procedure Act
14 (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. § 706(2), because it contravenes the statutory scheme Congress
15 created to ensure access to the asylum process at POEs and exceeds the
16 government’s statutory authority. *Id.* at 24-25. It is also arbitrary, capricious, and
17 an abuse of discretion because Defendants’ stated justification is based on pretext,
18 the real reasons for the policy are unlawful, and the policy is at odds with
19 congressional intent. *Id.* at 26-31. Finally, because class members have statutory
20 rights under the INA and APA §§ 706(1) and 706(2), they cannot be deprived of
21 those rights without due process. Because metering is unlawful, a prohibitory
22 injunction restoring provisional class members to the position they would have been
23 in but for that unlawfulness, *i.e.* preserving the status quo *ante*, is justified.

24 Therefore, for reasons that this Court articulated over a year ago and those
25 explained in Plaintiffs’ summary judgment briefing, Plaintiffs are likely to succeed
26 on the merits.

27 **B. The Remaining Factors Decisively Favor Entering a TRO.**

28 Irreparable harm is “[p]erhaps the single most important prerequisite for the

1 issuance of a preliminary injunction.” *Singleton v. Kernan*, 2017 WL 4922849, at
2 *3 (S.D. Cal. 2017) (quoting 11A Wright & Miller, *Fed. Prac. & Proc.* § 2948.1 (3d
3 ed.)). “A threat of irreparable harm is sufficiently immediate to warrant preliminary
4 injunctive relief if the plaintiff ‘is likely to suffer irreparable harm before a decision
5 on the merits can be rendered.’” *Boardman v. Pac. Seafood Grp.*, 822 F.3d 1011,
6 1023 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 22). Through issuance of the
7 Second Asylum Ban, the government would rip the protections of the preliminary
8 injunction from PI class members and subject them to removal through application
9 of the Asylum Ban just as they face the prospect of judgment on their underlying
10 challenge to metering. This is clearly irreparable harm. Dkt. 330 at 32-34; *see Sierra*
11 *On-Line, Inc. v. Phoenix Software, Inc.*, 739 F.2d 1415, 1422 (9th Cir. 1984) (finding
12 that injunctive relief is “a device for preserving the status quo and preventing the
13 irreparable loss of rights before judgment.”).

14 On October 30, 2020, the parties completed summary judgment briefing on
15 the merits of the government’s policy and practice of metering. If this Court finds
16 for the Plaintiffs, appropriate injunctive relief would include an order directing that
17 those class members who would have crossed the southern border prior to July 16,
18 2019, but for the government’s illegal conduct should have their asylum claims
19 adjudicated based on the law that was then in place—the relief currently afforded to
20 PI class members under the terms of the PI. Such an order would be necessary to
21 place those individuals in the same position they would have been in had the
22 government not engaged in metering. But the Second Asylum Ban undermines the
23 government’s obligations under the PI. Under the Second Asylum Ban, the
24 government would continue applying precisely the same enjoined rule to PI class
25 members, even where that application would lead to the removal of such class
26 members—without having their claims for asylum considered on the merits—to
27 countries where they risk persecution, torture and death. *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 607 at 9-11,
28 15 (granting emergency stay of removal for individual determined to be PI class

1 member who had the Asylum Ban applied in her case and ordering a determination
2 of her asylum claim on the merits). This constitutes irreparable harm. *See E. Bay*
3 *Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump*, 349 F. Supp. 3d 838, 864 (N.D. Cal. 2018) (loss of
4 the right to seek asylum constitutes irreparable harm); *Kirwa v. U.S. Dep’t of*
5 *Defense*, 285 F. Supp. 3d 21, 43 (D.D.C. 2007) (irreparable harm where government
6 “block[s] access to an existing legal avenue for avoiding removal” after making
7 representations that such an avenue would be available). The persecution, torture
8 and death PI class members face upon such removal also constitutes irreparable
9 harm. *See Leiva-Perez v. Holder*, 640 F.3d 962, 970-71 (9th Cir. 2011) (holding
10 that persecution on account of political opinion, in the form of extortion and
11 beatings, “would certainly constitute irreparable harm”); *see also Villanueva-*
12 *Bustillos v. Marin*, 370 F. Supp. 3d 1083, 1090 (C.D. Cal. 2018) (torture and death
13 are irreparable harm). Only preservation of the status quo—that is, an injunction
14 prohibiting the application of 8 C.F.R. § 208.13(c)(4) and § 1208.13(c)(4) to PI class
15 members—would obviate these irreparable injuries.

16 This Court previously determined that injunctive relief was warranted because
17 “Plaintiffs are simply seeking an opportunity to have their asylum claims heard,”
18 and the “[f]ailure to grant [the preliminary injunction] and return Plaintiffs to the
19 status quo before the Asylum Ban went into effect . . . would therefore lead Plaintiffs
20 to suffer irreparable harm.” Dkt. 330 at 34. On the other hand, the preliminary
21 injunction enjoining the application of 8 C.F.R. § 208.13(c)(4) and § 1208.13(c)(4)
22 to provisional class members now has been in effect for over nine months. *See Al*
23 *Otro Lado*, 952 F.3d at 1016 (denying motion to stay the preliminary injunction
24 pending appeal). Continuing to enjoin the application of those regulations to PI class
25 members would not cause the government any harm beyond that which this Court
26 already determined to be outweighed by the harm facing Plaintiffs in issuing the
27 preliminary injunction.

28 In evaluating the final preliminary injunction factors—the balance of the

1 equities and the public interest—a court “must balance the competing claims of
2 injury and must consider the effect on each party of the granting or withholding of
3 the request for relief,” and “should pay particular regard for the public consequences
4 in employing the extraordinary remedy of injunction.” *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 24
5 (internal quotations omitted). Both this Court and the Ninth Circuit already have
6 determined that Defendants’ conduct is “quintessentially inequitable” because PI
7 class members face ineligibility for asylum through application of 8 C.F.R. §
8 208.13(c)(4) or § 1208.13(c)(4) only because they relied on the government’s
9 representations regarding metering. *See* Dkt. 330 at 34; *Al Otro Lado*, 952 F.3d at
10 1015. Nothing has changed with the issuance of the Second Asylum Ban, which
11 does not change the operative language of the regulations, to alter this determination
12 on the equities.

13 Moreover, this Court previously found that “[t]he fact that the Government is
14 now so broadly interpreting a regulation that could have, but did not, include those
15 who were metered, also leads the Court to [con]clude that the balance of equities
16 tips in favor of Plaintiffs.” Dkt. 330 at 35. Therefore, as this Court previously
17 instructed, if Defendants wanted the Second Asylum Ban to apply to those who had
18 been metered prior to July 16, 2019, “the regulation could simply have said so.” *Id.*
19 But, as explained *supra*, the Second Asylum Ban does not change the operative
20 language of 8 C.F.R. § 208.13(c)(4) or § 1208.13(c)(4), but rather purports to change
21 the interpretation of the INA and the regulations to avoid the obligations of this
22 Court’s order. The fact that despite the prior warning, yet again the government
23 seeks merely to “so broadly interpret[] a regulation that could have, but did not,
24 include those who were metered” should tip the balance of the equities heavily in
25 favor of Plaintiffs. Dkt. 330 at 35.

26 Finally, it is in the public interest to “ensur[e] that ‘statutes enacted by [their]
27 representatives’ are not imperiled by executive fiat,” or a combination of fiats, as in
28 this case. *E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump*, 932 F.3d 742, 779 (9th Cir. 2018)

1 (citation omitted). To the extent the government’s metering policy forecloses access
2 to the statutorily guaranteed asylum process through newly determined ineligibility
3 criteria that affect PI class members, the public interest is served by issuing
4 additional injunctive relief that preserves PI class members’ eligibility for asylum
5 pending a determination on the merits of metering. This is particularly true where a
6 federal court—this Court—already has determined that such injunctive relief is
7 appropriate. *See Small v. Avanti Health Sys., LLC*, 661 F.3d 1180, 1197 (9th Cir.
8 2011) (“[T]he public interest favors applying federal law correctly.”). In addition,
9 “preventing [noncitizens] from being wrongfully removed, particularly to countries
10 where they are likely to face substantial harm,” clearly is in the public interest. *Nken*
11 *v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 436 (2009). Thus, all of the factors for injunctive relief
12 strongly favor granting relief to PI class members.

13 **CONCLUSION**

14 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs’ motion for a temporary restraining order
15 should be granted.

16 Dated: January 6, 2021

MAYER BROWN LLP
Matthew H. Marmolejo
Ori Lev
Stephen M. Medlock

SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW
CENTER
Melissa Crow
Sarah Rich
Rebecca Cassler

CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL
RIGHTS
Baher Azmy
Angelo Guisado

AMERICAN IMMIGRATION
COUNCIL
Karolina Walters

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

By: /s/ Stephen M. Medlock
Stephen M. Medlock
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I caused a copy of the foregoing document to be served on all counsel via the Court’s CM/ECF system.

Dated: January 6, 2021

MAYER BROWN LLP

By /s/ Stephen M. Medlock