

1 ROBERT W. FERGUSON  
*Attorney General*

2 RENE D. TOMISSER, WSBA #17509  
3 *Senior Counsel*  
4 JEFFREY T. SPRUNG, WSBA #23607  
5 ZACHARY P. JONES, WSBA #44557  
6 JOSHUA WEISSMAN, WSBA #42648  
7 PAUL M. CRISALLI, WSBA #40681  
8 NATHAN K. BAYS, WSBA #43025  
9 BRYAN M.S. OVENS, WSBA #32901  
*Assistant Attorneys General*  
8127 W. Klamath Court, Suite A  
Kennewick, WA 99336  
(509) 734-7285

9 *[Additional counsel on signature page]*

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

12 STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

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

17 Defendants.

NO. 4:19-cv-05210-RMP

PLAINTIFF STATES'  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION FOR EXPEDITED  
HEARING

NOTED FOR: November 8, 2019  
Without Oral Argument

18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants' one-paragraph motion to expedite (ECF No. 173) fails to cite the relevant standard and does not establish good cause for expedited treatment of Defendants' motion to stay this Court's October 11 Order. In addition to this Court, four other federal district courts have issued similar injunctions preventing the Rule from taking effect, with each court independently concluding the plaintiffs were likely to succeed on the merits and would suffer irreparable harm if the Rule were implemented. Although Defendants argue they will be irreparably harmed without expedited treatment, their argument is at odds with their failure to request similarly expedited treatment in other cases involving injunctions of the Rule. In light of the other injunctions, not only will Defendants not be irreparably harmed by denial of expedition, but expedition will not hasten any change in their ability to enforce the Rule. Further, Defendants' vague and superficial claim they will be irreparably harmed from being unable to implement a rule that never took effect in the first place fails to establish good cause. Defendants' request for expedited treatment is also undermined by their own two-week delay in filing a motion to stay and their still further delay in filing a one-paragraph motion for expedited treatment.

While Defendants' motion to stay lacks merit, it is nevertheless an important request that should be briefed and considered with care—indeed, it is important enough that Defendants requested additional pages to brief it. This

1 Court's ruling on the motion will become a part of the record on appeal, and it  
2 should not be artificially or needlessly rushed. Defendants' motion to expedite  
3 should be denied.

## 4 II. BACKGROUND

5 On October 11, this Court issued an Order Granting the Plaintiff States'  
6 Motion for Section 705 Stay and Preliminary Injunction. ECF No. 162. Two  
7 weeks later, on October 25, the Defendants filed a motion to stay the Court's  
8 order pending appeal. ECF No. 169. Defendants requested additional pages to  
9 brief the motion, a request which the Plaintiff States consented to and which the  
10 Court granted. ECF Nos. 168 and 171. Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7(i)(2)(A),  
11 Defendants noted their motion to stay for hearing on November 25. *Id.* Five days  
12 later, on October 30, Defendants filed a motion to expedite consideration of their  
13 motion to stay, requesting that the Court advance the hearing date for the motion  
14 to stay to November 8. ECF No. 173. Defendants claimed they would suffer  
15 irreparable harm if the Court's Order were not stayed "as soon as reasonably  
16 possible" "pending [their] appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals." *Id.* Later  
17 that same day, Defendants filed a Notice of Appeal. ECF No. 174.

18 In addition to this Court's Order, four other federal district courts have  
19 independently issued similar orders preventing the Rule from taking effect, with  
20 two courts issuing nationwide stays and injunctions and two courts issuing more  
21 limited injunctive relief. *See State of New York v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*,

22

1 Case No. 19-7777, Dkt. No. 110 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 11, 2019) (“[T]his Court grants  
2 a nationwide injunction, as well as a stay postponing the effective date of the  
3 Rule pending a final ruling on the merits, or further order of the Court.”); *Casa*  
4 *De Maryland, Inc. v. Trump*, Case No. 19-2715, Dkt. No. 65 (D. Md. Oct. 14,  
5 2019) (“DHS is enjoined from enforcing the Public Charge Rule and the effective  
6 date of the Rule is postponed on a nationwide basis during the pendency of this  
7 case.”); *California v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, Case No. 19-4975, Dkt. No.  
8 120 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2019) (enjoining the Rule from taking effect in  
9 “California, Oregon, the District of Columbia, Maine, [and] Pennsylvania); *Cook*  
10 *County v. McAleenan*, Case No. 19-6334, Dkt. No. 86 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 14, 2019)  
11 (holding plaintiffs had satisfied all requirements for a preliminary injunction and  
12 prohibiting Defendants from implementing the Rule “in the State of Illinois”). In  
13 each case, the courts found the respective plaintiffs were likely to succeed on the  
14 merits and would suffer irreparable harm if the Rule were allowed to take effect.

### 15 III. ARGUMENT

16 Local Civil Rule 7(i)(2)(C) provides that the Court may grant expedited  
17 hearing of a matter upon a showing of “good cause.” Here, the Court’s ruling on  
18 Defendants’ Motion to Stay will be made a part of the record on appeal, and  
19 Defendants have failed to demonstrate any good cause to justify artificially  
20 rushing that decision.

1     **A. Defendants Have Not Filed Requests to Expedite Consideration of**  
2     **Similar Motions to Stay in Related Cases**

3             Defendants argue their motion to stay must be considered on an expedited  
4     basis to avoid irreparable harm, but the argument is at odds with their failure to  
5     seek similarly expedited treatment in other cases where courts have issued  
6     injunctions and stays of the Rule. For example, in cases filed in the Northern  
7     District of California by a combination of states, cities, counties, and private  
8     parties, the presiding court granted the plaintiffs' requests to stay the Rule and  
9     enjoined Defendants from implementing it. *See California v. U.S. Dep't of*  
10    *Homeland Sec.*, Case No. 19-4975, Dkt. No. 120 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 11, 2019)  
11    (preventing the Rule from taking effect in "California, Oregon, the District of  
12    Columbia, Maine, [and] Pennsylvania"); *City & County of San Francisco v. U.S.*  
13    *Citizenship & Immigration Servs.*, Case No. 19-4717, Dkt. No. 115 (N.D. Cal.  
14    Oct. 11, 2019) (same). Defendants filed motions to stay those orders pending  
15    appeal, and the motions are currently set for hearing on December 4, 2019—more  
16    than a week *after* the current noting date for Defendants' motion in the instant  
17    case. *See California v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, Case No. 19-4975, Dkt. No.  
18    125 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 25, 2019) (Motion filed 10/25; Response due 11/8; Reply  
19    due 11/15; Hearing date 12/4); *City & County of San Francisco v. U.S.*  
20    *Citizenship & Immigration Servs.*, Case No. 19-4717, Dkt. No. 120 (N.D. Cal.  
21    Oct. 25, 2019) (same). As of today's date, however, Defendants have not filed  
22    any motions seeking expedited treatment for the motions to stay the injunctions

1 in those cases. *See id.*<sup>1</sup> Given their failure to seek expedited review of other  
2 injunctions also preventing the Rule from taking effect, Defendants’ assertions  
3 here of urgency and potentially irreparable harm are demonstrably false.

4 **B. Defendants Have Failed to Allege Any Potential Harm Justifying**  
5 **Expedited Treatment**

6 Defendants’ one-paragraph Motion to Expedite does not go into detail  
7 about the reasons why such treatment is necessary. Instead, Defendants simply  
8 refer to their Motion to Stay, in which they allege they will suffer irreparable  
9 harm if the injunction is not lifted “as soon as reasonably possible” because (1)  
10 they will have to continue processing applications for adjustment of status  
11 consistent with the longstanding, historical framework already in place for many  
12 years; and (2) they might later have to re-hire some unspecified number of  
13 contract employees to perform data entry tasks. *See* ECF No. 169 at 9–11. Neither  
14 allegation rises anywhere near the level of good cause, however, particularly  
15 where *five* separate federal district courts have now independently ruled the

16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 <sup>1</sup> *See also State of New York v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, Case No. 19-  
18 7777, Dkt. Nos. 111, 112 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 25, 2019) (under local rules, response  
19 to motion to stay due 11/8; reply due 11/15; no motion to shorten time or expedite  
20 filed); *Casa De Maryland v. Trump*, Case No. 19-2715, Dkt. Nos. 69, 73 (D. Ma.  
21 Oct. 25 and 30, 2019) (response to motion to stay due 11/8; reply due 11/15; no  
22 motion to shorten time or expedite filed).

1 Defendants are unlikely to prevail on the merits and that the plaintiffs in each  
2 case will suffer irreparable harm from the Rule's implementation. *See supra* at 2.

3 **IV. CONCLUSION**

4 For the foregoing reasons, the Plaintiff States respectfully request that  
5 Defendants' Motion to Expedite be denied.

6 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 6th day of November, 2019.

7 ROBERT W. FERGUSON  
8 Attorney General of Washington

9 */s/ Nathan K. Bays*

10 RENE D. TOMISSER, WSBA #17509  
Senior Counsel  
11 JEFFREY T. SPRUNG, WSBA #23607  
12 ZACHARY P. JONES, WSBA #44557  
13 JOSHUA WEISSMAN, WSBA #42648  
14 PAUL M. CRISALLI, WSBA #40681  
15 NATHAN K. BAYS, WSBA #43025  
16 BRYAN M.S. OVENS, WSBA #32901  
Assistant Attorneys General  
8127 W. Klamath Court, Suite A  
17 Kennewick, WA 99336  
18 (509) 734-7285  
Rene.Tomisser@atg.wa.gov  
Jeff.Sprung@atg.wa.gov  
19 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  
20 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Washington*  
21  
22

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

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  
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*

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

4  
5 /s/ Monica A. Horton  
MONICA A. HORTON, #5190  
Deputy Attorney General  
6 820 North French Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
7 Monica.horton@delaware.gov  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff the State of Delaware*

8  
9 KWAME RAOUL  
Attorney General State of Illinois

10  
11 /s/ Liza Roberson-Young  
LIZA ROBERSON-YOUNG, #6293643  
Public Interest Counsel  
12 Office of the Illinois Attorney General  
100 West Randolph Street, 11th Floor  
13 Chicago, IL 60601  
(312) 814-5028  
14 ERobersonYoung@atg.state.il.us  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Illinois*

15  
16 CLARE E. CONNORS  
Attorney General of Hawai‘i

17  
18 /s/ Lili A. Young  
LILI A. YOUNG, #5886  
Deputy Attorney General  
19 Department of the Attorney General  
425 Queen Street  
20 Honolulu, HI 96813  
(808) 587-3050  
21 Lili.A.Young@hawaii.gov  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Hawai‘i*

22

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

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*

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*

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

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*

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*

1 AARON D. FORD  
Attorney General of Nevada

2  
3 /s/ Heidi Parry Stern  
HEIDI PARRY STERN, #8873  
Solicitor General  
4 Office of the Nevada Attorney General  
555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900  
5 Las Vegas, NV 89101  
HStern@ag.nv.gov  
6 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Nevada*

7  
8 GURBIR SINGH GREWAL  
Attorney General of New Jersey

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

14  
15 HECTOR BALDERAS  
Attorney General of New Mexico

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

20  
21  
22

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

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](mailto: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 6th day of November, 2019, at Seattle, Washington.

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