

1 ROBERT W. FERGUSON
Attorney General

2 RENE D. TOMISSER, WSBA #17509
Senior Counsel

3 JEFFREY T. SPRUNG, WSBA #23607

4 ZACHARY P. JONES, WSBA #44557

5 JOSHUA WEISSMAN, WSBA #42648

6 PAUL M. CRISALLI, WSBA #40681

NATHAN K. BAYS, WSBA #43025

7 BRYAN M.S. OVENS, WSBA #32901

Assistant Attorneys General

8127 W. Klamath Court, Suite A

Kennewick, WA 99336

(509) 734-7285

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**
AT SPOKANE

11 STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

NO. 4:19-cv-05210-RMP

12 Plaintiffs,

PLAINTIFF STATES’
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS’
MOTION TO STAY SECTION 705
STAY AND PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION

13 v.

14 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF HOMELAND SECURITY, a
15 federal agency, et al.

16 Defendants.

17

18

19

20

21

22

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants seek a stay of this Court’s Section 705 stay and preliminary injunction, claiming they will be harmed by not implementing a rule that was never in effect. Defendants’ motion, ECF No. 169 (Mot. to Stay), falls far short of the extraordinary showing necessary to obtain such relief, ignoring critical authority and rehashing the same arguments Defendants already raised unsuccessfully in their earlier briefing. As the Court’s Order made clear, *see* ECF No. 162 (PI Order), Defendants’ recycled arguments fail to establish *any* of the grounds necessary for a stay—much less all of them—as Defendants are unlikely to succeed on the merits; have failed to refute the Plaintiff States’ showing of irreparable harm; cannot demonstrate comparable harms of their own; and identify no equities supporting their request for such extraordinary relief.

Defendants add new details in support of some arguments, including that leaving the injunction and stay in place will purportedly cause them irreparable harm in the form of “uncertainty and administrative burdens.” For example, Defendants claim they will be harmed by having to continue to process noncitizens’ applications for adjustment of status under the longstanding framework historically governing such applications. Defendants also claim they will be harmed by possibly having to rehire at a later date some unknown number of contract employees to perform data entry. Defendants, however, have no valid interest in the enforcement of an unlawful rule, and their vague and speculative allegations of harm pale in comparison to the many severe and concrete injuries

1 identified in the briefing and the Court’s Order. Moreover, the significant flaws
2 in Defendants’ arguments are underscored by the fact that *every* court to have
3 considered similar challenges to the Rule—including district courts in New York,
4 Maryland, Illinois, and California—all independently ruled the plaintiffs were
5 likely to prevail on the merits and enjoined the Rule’s implementation, with two
6 courts issuing similar nationwide injunctions. The motion should be denied.

7 II. BACKGROUND

8 On August 14, DHS published the Rule at issue, *Inadmissibility on Public*
9 *Charge Grounds*, 84 Fed. Reg. 41,292 (Aug. 14, 2019), which was set to take
10 effect on October 15. On the same day DHS published the Rule, the Plaintiff
11 States filed a 176-page complaint opposing its implementation. ECF No. 1. On
12 September 6, the Plaintiff States filed a 60-page motion seeking a preliminary
13 injunction and Section 705 stay of the Rule. ECF No. 34 (PI Mot.). Defendants
14 then filed a 60-page opposition in response, *see* ECF No. 155 (PI Opp’n), and on
15 September 27, the Plaintiff States filed a 30-page reply. ECF No. 158 (PI Reply).

16 In support of their PI Motion, the Plaintiff States provided declarations
17 from a broad range of public officials, nonprofit leaders, and subject matter
18 experts attesting to the many severe harms likely to result from—and in some
19 cases already resulting from—Defendants’ planned implementation of the Rule.
20 *See* ECF Nos. 36 to 86. The Plaintiff States also submitted over 125 comments
21 DHS had received during the notice-and-comment period. ECF Nos. 35-1, 35-2,
22 35-3. Several amici curiae—including leading medical, educational, social

1 welfare, and civil rights organizations—filed briefs in support of the Plaintiff
2 States. ECF Nos. 109–111, 149–153. In addition to reviewing these voluminous
3 materials, the Court held nearly two hours of oral argument. ECF No. 161.

4 On October 11, the Court issued a comprehensive 59-page opinion
5 granting the Plaintiff States’ request for a stay and preliminary injunction. The
6 Court systematically addressed each of the relevant legal issues and the parties’
7 arguments. *First*, the Court addressed foundational issues, holding the Plaintiff
8 States had established standing and ripeness. PI Order at 11–30. *Second*, the
9 Court addressed the likelihood of success on the merits, holding the Plaintiff
10 States had shown the Rule likely violated the Administrative Procedure Act and
11 was both contrary to law and arbitrary and capricious. *Id.* at 34–50 (“[T]he
12 Plaintiff States have demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the
13 merits of at least two of their causes of action in this matter.”). *Third*, the Court
14 considered the balance of interests and irreparable harm. *Id.* at 51–55 (Defendants
15 “made no showing of hardship, injury to themselves, or damage to the public
16 interest from continuing to enforce the status quo,” whereas the Plaintiff States
17 “have shown a significant threat of irreparable injury”). *Finally*, the Court held
18 that staying or enjoining the Rule on anything less than a nationwide basis “would
19 not prevent [irreparable] harms to the Plaintiff States.” *Id.* at 56–58.

20 Several other district courts across the country considered similar
21 challenges to the Rule. *See New York v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, No. 19-
22 7777, 2019 WL 5100372 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 11, 2019); *City & County of San*

1 *Francisco v. U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Servs.*, No. 19-4717, 2019 WL
2 5100718 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2019); *Casa De Maryland, Inc. v. Trump*, No. PWG-
3 19-2715, 2019 WL 5190689 (D. Md. Oct. 14, 2019); *Cook County v. McAleenan*,
4 No. 19-6334, 2019 WL 5110267 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 14, 2019). Notably, every court
5 to consider such a challenge independently enjoined the Rule’s implementation,
6 holding the plaintiffs in each case were likely to prevail on the merits and would
7 suffer irreparable harm if the Rule were implemented, with two courts issuing
8 similar nationwide stays and injunctions. *See New York*, 2019 WL 5100372, at
9 *12 (“[T]his Court grants a nationwide injunction, as well as a stay postponing
10 the effective date of the Rule pending a final ruling on the merits, or further order
11 of the Court.”); *Casa De Maryland*, 2019 WL 5190689, at *1 (“DHS is enjoined
12 from enforcing the Public Charge Rule and the effective date of the Rule is
13 postponed on a nationwide basis during the pendency of this case.”); *see also*
14 *City & County of San Francisco*, 2019 WL 5100718, at *53 (enjoining the Rule
15 from taking effect in “California, Oregon, the District of Columbia, Maine, [and]
16 Pennsylvania”); *Cook County v. McAleenan*, 2019 WL 5110267, at *1 (finding
17 all requirements for preliminary injunction were met and prohibiting Defendants
18 from implementing the Rule “in the State of Illinois”).

19 On October 25, Defendants filed the instant Motion to Stay. ECF No. 169.
20 Notwithstanding this Court’s Order finding the Plaintiff States are likely to
21 succeed on the merits, Defendants now argue they are “likely to succeed on
22 appeal.” *Id.* at 5. Defendants also contend that delaying implementation of the

1 Rule will impose “significant administrative burdens on Defendants and needless
2 uncertainty on the aliens Plaintiffs claim to support.” *Id.* at 14. On October 30,
3 Defendants filed a Notice of Appeal. ECF No. 174.

4 III. ARGUMENT

5 Defendants briefly cite the relevant factors for a stay pending appeal, but
6 nowhere do they acknowledge the extraordinarily heavy burden they must carry
7 to obtain such relief. Courts have explained that such a stay is an “intrusion into
8 the ordinary processes of administration and judicial review” and “is not a matter
9 of right, even if irreparable injury might otherwise result.” *Nken v. Holder*, 556
10 U.S. 418, 427 (2009); *E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump*, 932 F.3d 742, 769
11 (9th Cir. 2018); *see also Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*, 463 U.S. 1315, 1316
12 (1983) (Blackmun, J., in chambers) (a stay pending appeal is available “only
13 under extraordinary circumstances”). A stay pending appeal is an “exercise of
14 judicial discretion,” and the party seeking it must show that the circumstances
15 justify an exercise of that discretion. *Nken*, 556 U.S. at 433–34. In this context, a
16 defendant’s burden “is a heavy one,” 11 Wright & Miller, *Federal Practice &*
17 *Procedure* § 2904 (3d ed. 2019), with courts considering the following factors:

18 (1) whether the stay applicant has made a ***strong showing*** that he
19 is likely to succeed on the merits; (2) whether the applicant will
20 be irreparably injured absent a stay; (3) whether issuance of
the stay will substantially injure the other parties interested in the
proceeding; and (4) where the public interest lies.

21 *E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, 932 F.3d at 769–70 (quoting *Nken*, 556 U.S. at 433–
22 34) (emphasis added). The first and second factors are “critical,” and the “mere

1 possibility” of success on the merits or irreparable harm does not satisfy them.
2 *Id.* Moreover, Defendants’ burden of making a “strong showing” of a likelihood
3 of success is rendered only more challenging by the “limited and deferential”
4 abuse-of-discretion standard of review applied to preliminary injunctions. *Cnty.*
5 *House, Inc. v. City of Boise*, 490 F.3d 1041, 1047 (9th Cir. 2007).

6 **A. This Court Has Already Held that the Plaintiff States—Not**
7 **Defendants—Are Likely to Prevail on the Merits**

8 Defendants take issue with the Court’s well-reasoned decision that the
9 Plaintiff States are likely to succeed on the merits, but their argument ignores
10 critical aspects of the Court’s ruling and fails to raise anything not already briefed
11 and argued at length. For example, Defendants claim they are likely to succeed
12 on appeal in showing the Plaintiff States lack standing, *see* Mot. to Stay at 6–9,
13 but their argument depends on a glaring omission: Defendants fail to even cite—
14 much less address—the Supreme Court’s recent decision in *Dep’t of Commerce*
15 *v. New York*, 139 S. Ct. 2551 (2019) (Roberts, C.J.). In that case, the Court held
16 the plaintiffs, including several states, had established standing based on “the
17 predictable effect of Government action on the decisions of third parties.” *Id.* at
18 2565. Here, although the Plaintiff States addressed the case extensively in
19 briefing and at oral argument, *see* PI Reply at 11–12, and the Court carefully
20 considered and even quoted from the decision in its Order, *see* PI Order at 24–
21 25, Defendants fail to mention the case at all in their 13-page Motion to Stay.
22 Defendants’ other arguments overlook similarly negative precedent in an attempt

1 to breathe new life into their already-rejected contentions.

2 It is thus unnecessary to conduct yet another exhaustive refutation of
3 Defendants’ other meritless arguments, as the issues have already been addressed
4 in the pleadings, declarations, amicus briefs, oral argument, and PI Order. *See* PI
5 Reply at 10–15, PI Order at 11–30 (jurisdictional issues); PI Reply at 15–22, PI
6 Order at 30–46 (congressional intent, meaning of the term, and agency authority);
7 PI Reply at 24–26, PI Order at 45–46 (Rehabilitation Act); PI Mot. at 54–65, PI
8 Reply at 27–32, PI Order at 48–50 (arbitrary and capricious); PI Mot. at 65–70,
9 PI Reply at 36–38, PI Order at 55–59 (scope of relief). Defendants’ reliance on
10 these rehashed arguments only underscores the Plaintiffs’ likelihood of success.

11 The other courts to consider challenges to the Rule reached similar
12 conclusions. For example, Judge Feinerman of the Northern District of Illinois
13 identified the Supreme Court’s opinion in *Gegiow v. Uhl*, 239 U.S. 3 (1915) as
14 critical evidence for interpreting the meaning of the term “public charge.” *See*
15 *Cook County v. DHS*, 2019 WL 5110267, at *8-12 (“Fortunately, the Supreme
16 Court told us just over a century ago what ‘public charge’ meant in the relevant
17 era, and thus what it means today . . . *Gegiow* teaches that ‘public charge’ does
18 not, as DHS maintains, encompass persons who receive benefits, whether modest
19 or substantial, due to being temporarily unable to support themselves entirely on
20 their own.”). As Judge Feinerman explained, Defendants’ “attempt to evade
21 *Gegiow*’s interpretation” was unsupported by the very evidence they relied on.
22 *Id.* For example, Judge Feinerman noted DHS had based its flawed argument in

1 that case—as it did here as well—in part on a 1929 treatise that badly misstated
2 the relevant precedent. *Id.* at *10 (“The treatise is wrong. It does not address
3 *Gegiow* in expressing its understanding of ‘public charge.’ And the sole authority
4 it cites . . . does not support its view.”). The other courts to consider such
5 challenges reached similar conclusions. *See New York*, 2019 WL 5100372, at *6
6 (explaining that “one thing is abundantly clear—‘public charge’ has *never* been
7 understood” to mean the definition set forth in the Rule (emphasis in original)).

8 **B. Defendants Fail to Show Irreparable Harm Pending Appeal**

9 Defendants have failed to identify any cognizable harm they will suffer
10 from staying the implementation of a Rule that was never in effect. Offering only
11 minimal harms present in virtually any injunction, Defendants’ argument
12 depends largely on speculation and a fundamental misinterpretation of precedent.

13 *First*, Defendants argue they are per se harmed by any delay preventing
14 them from implementing any rule. Mot. to Stay at 9. Here, Defendants incorrectly
15 rely on *Maryland v. King*, 567 U.S. 1301 (2012) (Roberts, C.J., in chambers) for
16 the proposition that the “federal government sustains irreparable injury whenever
17 it ‘is enjoined by a court from effectuating statutes enacted by representatives of
18 its people.’” *Id.* The Plaintiff States have addressed this point repeatedly
19 throughout the instant litigation, but it bears repeating: The Rule is *not* a statute
20 “enacted by representatives of [the] people”; rather, it is a new agency action
21 subject to judicial review pursuant to the APA (and in fact was twice *rejected* by
22 Congress). Further, Defendants have no valid interest in the enforcement of an

1 unlawful rule such as the one at issue here. *League of Women Voters of U.S. v.*
2 *Newby*, 838 F.3d 1, 12 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (“There is generally no public interest in
3 the perpetuation of unlawful agency action. To the contrary, there is a substantial
4 public interest in having governmental agencies abide by the federal laws that
5 govern their existence and operations.” (internal citations, quotations omitted)).

6 *Second*, Defendants fail to establish they will be harmed by having to
7 continue processing noncitizens’ applications for adjustment of status consistent
8 with the longstanding policy already governing the process for many years. *See,*
9 *e.g.*, 64 Fed. Reg. 28,689, 28,692 (Mar. 26, 1999) (1999 Field Guidance)
10 (underscoring that the public charge analysis will *not* consider noncitizens’ use
11 of “important health and nutrition benefits that they are legally entitled to
12 receive”). According to Defendants, continuing to approve such applications
13 consistent with their historical practice will irreparably harm them, as “DHS
14 currently has no practical means of revisiting these determinations made under
15 the prior guidance . . . if the injunction against the Rule is ultimately vacated.”
16 Mot. to Stay at 10. Defendants’ superficial claims of harm pale in comparison to
17 the severe injuries to the Plaintiff States, including in the event noncitizens
18 wrongly choose to disenroll from benefits because of the Rule’s unlawful effects.
19 *See* PI Mot. at 56–57 (explaining that even a slight decrease in vaccination rates
20 resulting from Medicaid disenrollment could give rise to a deadly outbreak); *see*
21 *also* 1999 Field Guidance (noncitizens’ reluctance to use important health and
22 nutritional benefits they are legally entitled to receive “has an adverse impact not

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 15th day of November 2019.

ROBERT W. FERGUSON
Attorney General of Washington

/s/ Nathan K. Bays

RENE D. TOMISSER, WSBA #17509

Senior Counsel

JEFFREY T. SPRUNG, WSBA #23607

ZACHARY P. JONES, WSBA #44557

JOSHUA WEISSMAN, WSBA #42648

PAUL M. CRISALLI, WSBA #40681

NATHAN K. BAYS, WSBA #43025

BRYAN M.S. OVENS, WSBA #32901

Assistant Attorneys General

8127 W. Klamath Court, Suite A

Kennewick, WA 99336

(509) 734-7285

Rene.Tomisser@atg.wa.gov

Jeff.Sprung@atg.wa.gov

Zach.Jones@atg.wa.gov

Joshua.Weissman@atg.wa.gov

Paul.Crisalli@atg.wa.gov

Nathan.Bays@atg.wa.gov

Bryan.Ovens@atg.wa.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Washington

MARK R. HERRING
Attorney General of Virginia

/s/ Michelle S. Kallen

MICHELLE S. KALLEN, VSB #93286

Deputy Solicitor General

RYAN SPREAGUE HARDY, VSB #78558

ALICE ANNE LLOYD, VSB #79105

MAMOONA H. SIDDIQUI, VSB #46455

Assistant Attorneys General

Office of the Attorney General

202 North Ninth Street

Richmond, Virginia 23219

(804) 786-7240

MKallen@oag.state.va.us

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

RHardy@oag.state.va.us
ALloyd@oag.state.va.us
MSiddiqui@oag.state.va.us
SolicitorGeneral@oag.state.va.us
Attorneys for Plaintiff Commonwealth of Virginia

PHIL WEISER
Attorney General of Colorado

/s/ Eric R. Olson
ERIC R. OLSON, #36414
Solicitor General
Office of the Attorney General
Colorado Department of Law
1300 Broadway, 10th Floor
Denver, CO 80203
(720) 508 6548
Eric.Olson@coag.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff the State of Colorado

KATHLEEN JENNINGS
Attorney General of Delaware
AARON R. GOLDSTEIN
State Solicitor
ILONA KIRSHON
Deputy State Solicitor

/s/ Monica A. Horton
MONICA A. HORTON, #5190
Deputy Attorney General
820 North French Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
Monica.horton@delaware.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff the State of Delaware

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

KWAME RAOUL
Attorney General State of Illinois

/s/ Liza Roberson-Young
LIZA ROBERSON-YOUNG, #6293643
Public Interest Counsel
Office of the Illinois Attorney General
100 West Randolph Street, 11th Floor
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 814-5028
ERobersonYoung@atg.state.il.us
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Illinois

CLARE E. CONNORS
Attorney General of Hawai‘i

/s/ Lili A. Young
LILI A. YOUNG, #5886
Deputy Attorney General
Department of the Attorney General
425 Queen Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
(808) 587-3050
Lili.A.Young@hawaii.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Hawai‘i

BRIAN E. FROSH
Attorney General of Maryland

/s/ Jeffrey P. Dunlap
JEFFREY P. DUNLAP
D. MD Bar #20846
MD State Bar #1812100004
Assistant Attorney General
200 St. Paul Place
Baltimore, MD 21202
T: (410) 576-6325
F: (410) 576-6955
JDunlap@oag.state.md.us
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Maryland

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

MAURA HEALEY
Attorney General of Commonwealth of
Massachusetts

/s/ Abigail B. Taylor
ABIGAIL B. TAYLOR, #670648
Chief, Civil Rights Division
DAVID UREÑA, #703076
Special Assistant Attorney General
ANGELA BROOKS, #663255
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Massachusetts Attorney General
One Ashburton Place
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 963-2232
abigail.taylor@mass.gov
david.urena@mass.gov
angela.brooks@mass.gov
*Attorneys for Plaintiff Commonwealth of
Massachusetts*

DANA NESSEL
Attorney General of Michigan

/s/Toni L. Harris
FADWA A. HAMMOUD, #P74185
Solicitor General
TONI L. HARRIS, #P63111
First Assistant Attorney General
Michigan Department of Attorney General
P.O. Box 30758
Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 335-7603 (main)
HarrisT19@michigan.gov
Hammoudf1@michigan.gov
Attorneys for the People of Michigan

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

KEITH ELLISON
Attorney General of Minnesota

/s/ R.J. Detrick
R.J. DETRICK, #0395336
Assistant Attorney General
Minnesota Attorney General’s Office
Bremer Tower, Suite 100
445 Minnesota Street
St. Paul, MN 55101-2128
(651) 757-1489
(651) 297-7206
Rj.detrick@ag.state.mn.us
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Minnesota

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General of Nevada

/s/ Heidi Parry Stern
HEIDI PARRY STERN, #8873
Solicitor General
Office of the Nevada Attorney General
555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900
Las Vegas, NV 89101
HStern@ag.nv.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Nevada

GURBIR SINGH GREWAL
Attorney General of New Jersey

/s/ Glenn J. Moramarco
GLENN J. MORAMARCO, #030471987
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex
25 Market Street, 1st Floor, West Wing
Trenton, NJ 08625-0080
(609) 376-3232
Glenn.Moramarco@law.njoag.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New Jersey

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

HECTOR BALDERAS
Attorney General of New Mexico

/s/ Tania Maestas
TANIA MAESTAS, #20345
Chief Deputy Attorney General
P.O. Drawer 1508
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-1508
tmaestas@nmag.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New Mexico

PETER F. NERONHA
Attorney General of Rhode Island

/s/ Lauren E. Hill
LAUREN E. HILL, #9830
Special Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
150 South Main Street
Providence, Rhode Island 02903
(401) 274-4400 x 2038
E-mail: lhill@riag.ri.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Rhode Island

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

I hereby declare that on this day I caused the foregoing document to be electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the Court’s CM/ECF System which will serve a copy of this document upon all counsel of record.

DATED this 15th day of November 2019, at Seattle, Washington.

/s/ Nathan K. Bays
NATHAN K. BAYS, WSBA #43025
Assistant Attorney General