

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION
SERVICES, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-04717-PJH

Case No. 19-cv-04975-PJH

Case No. 19-cv-04980-PJH

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR
LEAVE TO FILE AMICI BRIEFS**

Before the court are twenty motions for leave to file amici curiae briefs. See Case No. 19-cv-04717-PJH, Dkts. 70, 77, 86, 90, 99 & 100; Case No. 19-cv-04975-PJH, Dkts. 64, 70, 71, 80, 86, 98 & 99; Case No. 19-cv-04980-PJH, Dkts. 76, 85, 86, 96, 107, 109 & 110.

“The district court has broad discretion to appoint amici curiae.” Hoptowit v. Ray, 682 F.2d 1237, 1260 (9th Cir. 1982). “There are no strict prerequisites that must be established prior to qualifying for amicus status; an individual or entity seeking to appear as amicus must merely make a showing that his/its participation is useful to or otherwise desirable to the court.” In re Dynamic Random Access Memory (DRAM) Antitrust Litig., Case No. 02-md-01486-PJH, 2007 WL 2022026, at *1 (N.D. Cal. July 9, 2007). “District courts frequently welcome amicus briefs from non-parties concerning legal issues that have potential ramifications beyond the parties directly involved or if the amicus has ‘unique information or perspective that can help the court beyond the help that the lawyers for the parties are able to provide.’” NGV Gaming, Ltd. v. Upstream Point Molate, LLC, 355 F. Supp. 2d 1061, 1067 (N.D. Cal. 2005) (quoting Cobell v. Norton, 246

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1 F. Supp. 2d 59, 62 (D.D.C. 2003)).

2 The court hereby DENIES each of the above-identified motions for leave to file an
3 amicus curiae brief, prior to this court's order on the pending motions for preliminary
4 injunction. With respect to the motions for preliminary injunction, the proposed amici
5 briefs appear to be duplicative and cumulative of arguments advanced by the parties and
6 amici that have already filed briefs in these actions. Moreover, the court could not
7 conceivably attend to each of the newly-filed briefs prior the hearing date on plaintiffs'
8 motions for preliminary injunction, scheduled for October 2, 2019. This order does not
9 preclude movants from seeking leave to file amici briefs during later stages of litigation.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11 Dated: September 16, 2019



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28