

1 ROBERT W. FERGUSON  
*Attorney General*

2 JEFFREY T. SPRUNG, WSBA #23607  
3 ZACHARY P. JONES, WSBA #44557  
4 JOSHUA WEISSMAN, WSBA #42648  
5 PAUL M. CRISALLI, WSBA #40681  
6 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

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

11 STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

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

15 Defendants.

NO. 4:19-cv-05210-RMP

NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL  
AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF  
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO  
COMPEL

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 Plaintiff States (Plaintiffs) respectfully submit the recently issued  
2 discovery order in related litigation, *California v. U.S. Department of Homeland*  
3 *Security* and *La Clinica de La Raza v. Donald J. Trump*, No. 19-cv-04975-PJH  
4 and No. 19-cv-04980-PJH (N.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2020), as supplemental authority in  
5 support of their pending Motion to Compel (ECF No. 195). The order is attached  
6 hereto as Exhibit 1 and also reported at 2020 WL 1557424.

7 The consolidated cases in California challenge the same Final Rule—  
8 *Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds*—that Plaintiffs challenge in this  
9 action. In the attached order, the California court granted the plaintiffs’ motion  
10 to compel discovery and granted in part their motion to complete the  
11 administrative record. The court’s analysis weighs in favor of granting Plaintiffs’  
12 pending motion in this case for at least two reasons.

13 *First*, the California court concluded that privilege logs are appropriate in  
14 APA cases as to potentially deliberative materials—in that case, as here, intra-  
15 and inter-agency materials. “Reading the Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit’s  
16 opinions together, a court may order a privilege log . . . after providing the federal  
17 government the opportunity to argue the issue.” 2020 WL 1557424, at \*9. Indeed,  
18 the court went further and ordered DHS “to complete the record with regard to  
19 inter-agency communications submitted to DHS and under DHS’s control,  
20 relating to the Rule, and not involving the mental processes of individual agency  
21 members,” similar to relevant inter-agency communications the federal  
22

1 government already had disclosed under the Freedom of Information Act. *Id.* at  
2 \*10-11. This included “any White House communications in DHS’s possession  
3 and meeting the court’s criteria discussed above.” *Id.*

4 *Second*, the court held that plaintiffs are entitled to take discovery on  
5 constitutional claims of the very same nature as the Equal Protection claim  
6 Plaintiffs have asserted here. *Id.* at 16. The court rejected the same arguments  
7 that Defendants have advanced in this case, namely: (1) that constitutional claims  
8 are limited to the administrative record under the APA (*see* ECF No. 198 at 3–  
9 9); and (2) that discovery is not warranted where rational basis review may apply  
10 (*see id.* at 9–10). Because the plaintiffs “are alleging *different* factual allegations  
11 between the APA claims and the constitutional claims,” the court explained, “the  
12 claims do not fundamentally overlap.” 2020 WL 1557424, at \*15. The same is  
13 true here.

14 The California court’s decision therefore supports both forms of relief  
15 Plaintiffs have requested in their Motion to Compel. Plaintiffs respectfully  
16 request that the Court consider that order as supplemental authority in support of  
17 their Motion.

18 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 3rd day of April 2020.  
19  
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

ROBERT W. FERGUSON  
Attorney General of Washington

*/s/ Jeffrey T. Sprung*

---

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

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*

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  
JESSICA MERRY SAMUELS, VSB #89537  
Assistant 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  
JSamuels@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  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

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*

KWAME RAOUL  
Attorney General 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  
*Attorney 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*

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, #1812100004  
Assistant Attorney General  
200 St. Paul Place  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
T: (410) 576-7906  
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  
Hammoudfl@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  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

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 S. 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*

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*

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  
*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 3rd day of April 2020, at Seattle, Washington.

/s/ Jeffrey T. Sprung  
JEFFREY T. SPRUNG, WSBA #23607  
Assistant Attorney General

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

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND  
SECURITY, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-04975-PJH  
Case No. 19-cv-04980-PJH

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART MOTIONS TO  
COMPLETE THE RECORD AND  
GRANTING MOTIONS TO COMPEL  
DISCOVERY**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 149 (No. 19-cv-04975-  
PJH), 150 (No. 19-cv-04980-PJH)

LA CLINICA DE LA RAZA, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, et al.,  
Defendants.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

Plaintiffs the State of California, State of Oregon, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,  
and District of Columbia’s (the “State plaintiffs”) and La Clínica de La Raza, African  
Communities Together, California Primary Care Association, Central American Resource  
Center, Farmworker Justice, Council on American-Islamic Relations-California, Korean  
Resource Center, Maternal and Child Health Access, and Legal Aid Society of San  
Mateo County’s (the “organization plaintiffs” and together with the State plaintiffs, the

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 “plaintiffs”<sup>1</sup> motions to complete the administrative record and compel discovery came on  
2 for hearing before this court on March 4, 2020. State plaintiffs appeared through their  
3 counsel, Julia Mass and Anna Rich, and organization plaintiffs appears through their  
4 counsel, Mayra Joachin, Nicholas Espiritu, Tanya Broder, and Alvaro Harris. Defendants  
5 U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”), Department of Homeland Security  
6 (“DHS” or the “Agency”), President Donald J. Trump, Chad Wolf,<sup>2</sup> as Acting Secretary of  
7 DHS, and Kenneth T. Cuccinelli as Acting Director of USCIS appeared through their  
8 counsel, Joshua Kolsky. Having read the papers filed by the parties and carefully  
9 considered their arguments and the relevant legal authority, and good cause appearing,  
10 the court hereby rules as follows.

11 **BACKGROUND**

12 On August 16, 2019, the State plaintiffs filed a complaint (“Compl.”) to enjoin  
13 enactment of regulations promulgated by DHS entitled Inadmissibility on Public Charge  
14 Grounds (the “Public Charge Rule” or “Rule”), 84 Fed. Reg. 41,292 (Aug. 14, 2019). The  
15 Agency published the final rule in the Federal Register on August 14, 2019 with an  
16 effective date of October 15, 2019. *Id.* at 41,292. State plaintiffs’ complaint asserts six  
17 causes of action: (1) Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C.  
18 § 706—Contrary to Law, the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) and the Illegal  
19 Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (“IIRIRA”); (2) Violation of APA, 5  
20 U.S.C. § 706—Contrary to Law, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act; (3) Violation of  
21 APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706—Contrary to Law, State Healthcare Discretion; (4) Violation of APA,  
22 5 U.S.C. § 706—Arbitrary and Capricious; (5) Violation of the Fifth Amendment’s Due  
23

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs the City and County of San Francisco and County of Santa Clara (the “County  
26 plaintiffs”) in the related case City and County of San Francisco v. U.S. Citizenship and  
27 Immigration Services, No. 19-cv-04717-PJH, have not filed a motion to compel and have  
28 not joined in either the State plaintiffs or organization plaintiffs’ motions.

<sup>2</sup> This action was originally brought against Kevin McAleenan in his official capacity as  
Acting Secretary of Homeland Security. Compl. ¶ 27. As of November 13, 2019, Chad  
Wolf is the acting secretary of DHS ([see](https://www.dhs.gov/person/chad-f-wolf) <https://www.dhs.gov/person/chad-f-wolf>) and,  
pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d), an officer’s successor is automatically  
substituted as a party.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 Process clause requiring Equal Protection based on race; (6) Violation of the Fifth  
2 Amendment's Due Process clause, based on a violation of Equal Protection principles  
3 based on unconstitutional animus. Dkt. 1.<sup>3</sup> The organization plaintiffs' complaint, also  
4 filed August 16, 2019, asserts four causes of action: (1) Violation of APA, 5 U.S.C.  
5 § 706—Contrary to the Statutory Scheme; (2) Violation of APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706—  
6 Arbitrary, Capricious, or otherwise not in accordance with law; (3) Violation of the Fifth  
7 Amendment based on Equal Protection for discriminating against non-white immigrants;  
8 (4) under the Declaratory Judgment Act, seeking a determination that the Rule is invalid  
9 because it was issued by an unlawfully-appointed agency director. No. 19-cv-04980-  
10 PJH, Dkt. 1.

11 On August 26, 2019, plaintiffs (including the County plaintiffs) filed motions for  
12 preliminary injunction (Dkt. 17), for which the court heard argument on October 2, 2019,  
13 (Dkt. 109). On October 11, 2019, the court entered a preliminary injunction enjoining  
14 defendants from applying the Rule to any person residing in the City and County of San  
15 Francisco, Santa Clara County, the States of California, Oregon, or Maine, the  
16 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or the District of Columbia. Dkt. 120, at 92. The court  
17 also denied the organization plaintiffs' motion on the basis that they do not fall within the  
18 challenged statute's zone of interest such that they do not have prudential standing to  
19 bring an APA claim. Id. at 72, 92. The court did not rule on plaintiffs' constitutional  
20 claims as it was not within the scope of plaintiffs' motion. Id. at 12 n.5.

21 Defendants appealed the preliminary injunction on October 30, 2019. Dkt. 129. A  
22 three-judge panel of the Ninth Circuit stayed the preliminary injunctions issued within this  
23 circuit on December 5, 2019.<sup>4</sup> Dkt. 141; see City & Cty. of San Francisco v. USCIS, 944  
24

25 <sup>3</sup> Unless otherwise specified, references to the docket are to State of California v. U.S.  
26 Department of Homeland Security, Case No. 19-cv-04975-PJH.

27 <sup>4</sup> The panel consolidated the three related cases before this court with a similar case from  
28 the Eastern District of Washington. That court issued a nationwide injunction of the Rule  
on the same day as this court's geographically limited preliminary injunction order.  
Washington v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Security, 408 F. Supp. 3d 1191, 1224 (E.D.  
Wash. 2019).

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 F.3d 773 (9th Cir. 2019). Two district courts outside the Ninth Circuit also enjoined  
2 implementation of the Rule—a nationwide injunction and an injunction limited to the State  
3 of Illinois. New York v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Security, 408 F. Supp. 3d 334 (S.D.N.Y.  
4 2019); Cook Cty., Illinois v. McAleenan, 417 F. Supp. 3d 1008 (N.D. Ill. 2019). On  
5 January 27, 2020, the Supreme Court granted the federal government’s application for a  
6 stay pending appeal of the nationwide injunction of the Public Charge Rule issued by the  
7 District Court for the Southern District of New York. Dep’t of Homeland Security v. New  
8 York, 140 S. Ct. 599 (2020). On February 18, 2020, the Ninth Circuit panel voted to deny  
9 plaintiffs-appellees’ motions for reconsideration and motions for rehearing en banc. Dkt.  
10 153. Finally, on February 21, 2020, the Supreme Court granted an application from the  
11 federal government for a stay of the injunction issued by the District Court for the  
12 Northern District of Illinois. Wolf v. Cook Cty., Illinois, 140 S. Ct. 681 (2020).

13 As relevant to the current motions, on November 25, 2019, defendants served the  
14 administrative record on plaintiffs via an online portal. After several attempts to meet and  
15 confer to resolve their differences concerning the administrative record, plaintiffs contend  
16 the record remains incomplete, resulting in the current motions. They also seek  
17 discovery on their constitutional claims.

18 **DISCUSSION**

19 **A. Legal Standard**

20 The APA provides that a court’s arbitrary and capricious review shall be based on  
21 “the whole record or those parts of it cited by a party.” 5 U.S.C. § 706. The whole  
22 administrative record “includes everything that was before the agency pertaining to the  
23 merits of its decision.” Portland Audubon Soc’y v. Endangered Species Comm., 984 F.2d  
24 1534, 1548 (9th Cir. 1993). Further, the whole record “consists of all documents and  
25 materials directly or indirectly considered by agency decision-makers and includes  
26 evidence contrary to the agency’s position.” Thompson v. U.S. Dep’t of Labor, 885 F.2d  
27 551, 555 (9th Cir. 1989) (citing Exxon Corp. v. U.S. Dep’t of Energy, 91 F.R.D. 26, 33  
28 (N.D. Tex. 1981)).

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1           The administrative record submitted by the federal government is entitled to a  
2 presumption of completeness, which is rebutted by clear evidence. Id. A court may only  
3 consider extra-record materials in the following circumstances: “(1) if necessary to  
4 determine ‘whether the agency has considered all relevant factors and has explained its  
5 decision,’ (2) ‘when the agency has relied on documents not in the record,’ or (3) ‘when  
6 supplementing the record is necessary to explain technical terms or complex subject  
7 matter.’” Sw. Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Forest Serv., 100 F.3d 1443, 1450 (9th  
8 Cir. 1996) (quoting Inland Empire Public Lands Council v. Glickman, 88 F.3d 697, 703–  
9 04 (9th Cir. 1996)). The Ninth Circuit also permits extra-record documents when a  
10 plaintiff demonstrates bad faith by the agency. Id. (citing Nat’l Audubon Soc. v. U.S.  
11 Forest Serv., 46 F.3d 1437, 1447 n.9 (9th Cir. 1993)). These exceptions are narrowly  
12 construed and applied. Lands Council v. Powell, 395 F.3d 1019, 1030 (9th Cir. 2005)  
13 (citations omitted).

14 **B. Analysis**

15 **1. Motions to Complete the Administrative Record**

16           Generally, plaintiffs identify the following categories of missing documents for  
17 which they seek the court to order defendants to produce as part of the administrative  
18 record: (a) complete, unredacted copies of all policies, procedures, forms and guidance  
19 related to the application of the public charge ground of inadmissibility or any other  
20 aspect of the Rule or previous drafts of the Rule; (b) the USCIS article, “Public Charge  
21 Provisions of Immigration Law: A Brief Historical Background,” dated August 14, 2019,  
22 and all data the article references, including Immigration and Naturalization Service,  
23 DHS, and Department of State consular processing statistics related to public charge  
24 determinations; (c) inter- and intra-agency communications and Agency communications  
25 with outside organizations related to the Rule, including records related to the Agency’s  
26 development of forms related to public charge determinations and estimates regarding  
27 the burdensomeness of forms; (d) White House communications to the Agency related to  
28



United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 the Rule; and (e) missing comments from the public.<sup>5</sup> The court addresses each  
2 category in turn.

3 **a. Policy and Guidance Documents**

4 Plaintiffs argue that defendants did not provide policies, procedures, forms and  
5 guidance that were considered either directly or indirectly by the Agency during the  
6 rulemaking process, but not included in the record. Mtn. at 5. Alternatively, plaintiffs  
7 contend that these policies are relevant background information. Defendants respond  
8 that plaintiffs have not demonstrated that the policies in question were considered by the  
9 relevant decision-maker. Opp. at 5–6. Defendants also contend that adding document  
10 as background material is only appropriate for explanation or clarification of technical  
11 terms or subject matter. Id. at 7.

12 As an initial matter, defendants have agreed to produce a few policy documents as  
13 part of the record and some of plaintiffs’ requests are now moot. In their motion, plaintiffs  
14 seek inclusion of portions of the USCIS’s Adjudicator’s Field Manual (“AFM”) and  
15 Volumes 7 and 8 of the USCIS Policy Manual (the “Policy Manual”). Mtn. at 5–6. In their  
16 opposition, defendants agree to add the full version of the following portions of the Policy  
17 Manual: Volume 7, Part B and Volume 8, Part B, Chapter 3. Opp. at 7. Defendants also  
18 agree to add Chapter 10.8 of the AFM. Finally, defendants agree to add internal versions  
19 of those sections of the USCIS Policy Manual and the AFM that they have already  
20 provided for the record, with the exception of Volume 8, Part B, Chapter 3 of the Policy  
21 Manual because the Rule cited the public version of the document. Id.

22

---

23 <sup>5</sup> Plaintiffs also identified two additional categories of missing materials: (i) information  
24 and data related to legal permanent residents who may undergo a public charge  
25 inadmissibility determination upon return from trips abroad and (ii) correct,  
26 contemporaneous copies of websites included in the record. Mtn. at 3. In a footnote,  
27 plaintiffs explain that, with respect to data on legal permanent residents, defendants  
28 informed them that such data was not before the Agency during the decision-making  
process. Id. at 4 n.1. Plaintiffs also state that they are not moving for corrected copies of  
webpages referenced in the Rule but reserve the right to do so. Id. at 4 n.2. Because  
plaintiffs do not specify these categories in any further detail and do not advance an  
argument as to why these categories should be included in the administrative record, the  
court does not address these issues.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1           Despite these concessions, plaintiffs respond that there are other portions of the  
2 policy manual to which they still require access. Specifically, they seek: USCIS Policy  
3 Manual Vol. 2, Part A, chapter 42; USCIS Policy Manual Vol. 7, Part A, chapters 1, 4, 5,  
4 6, and 10; USCIS Policy Manual Vol. 7, Part R; USCIS Policy Manual Vol. 8, Parts A, G,  
5 and L; the remainder of USCIS Policy Manual Vol. 8, Part B; USCIS Policy Manual Vol.  
6 12, Part D, chapter 2; AFM, chapter 61.2; Chapter 12 of the Deportation Officer’s Field  
7 Manual; Chapter 45 of the Inspector’s Field Manual; and Standard Operating Procedures,  
8 Adjudicative Templates, and Appendices referenced in the above-listed policy documents  
9 and in the policy documents Defendants disclosed on February 12, 2020. Reply at 5–6.

10           Plaintiffs contend that the policy manuals should be considered under either the  
11 second or third Inland Empire exceptions, i.e., whether the agency considered  
12 documents not in the record or whether the policy manuals constitute relevant  
13 background information.

14                           **i.           Whether the Agency Considered Documents Not in the**  
15                           **Record**

16           The second Inland Empire exception applies when an agency relied directly or  
17 indirectly on documents not in the record. To meet this exception, the moving party must  
18 “identify reasonable, non-speculative grounds for its belief that the documents were  
19 considered by the agency and not included in the record.” Pac. Shores Subdivision, Cal.  
20 Water Dist. v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng’rs, 448 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2006) (citation  
21 omitted). The moving party “must do more than imply that the documents at issue were  
22 in the agency’s possession.” Safari Club Int’l v. Jewell, No. CV-16094-TUC-JGZ, 2016  
23 WL 7785452, at \*2 (D. Ariz. July 7, 2016) (citing Sara Lee Corp. v. Am. Bakers Ass’n,  
24 252 F.R.D. 31, 34 (D.D.C. 2008)). The question is whether plaintiffs have demonstrated  
25 that the document in question “was so heavily relied on in the recommendations [of  
26 subordinates] that the decision maker constructively considered it’ . . . even if there is no  
27 evidence that the decision maker read the [document].” Sharks Sports & Entm’t LLC v.  
28 Fed. Transit Admin., No. 18-cv-04060-LHK, 2020 WL 511998, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 31,

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 2020 (first alteration in original) (quoting Wildearth Guardians v. U.S. Forest Serv., 713 F.  
2 Supp. 2d 1243, 1256 (D. Colo. 2010)).

3 Plaintiffs argue that the Agency relied on knowledge of its policies in order to draft  
4 the Rule and that even materials that were indirectly considered should be included in the  
5 record. Mtn. at 6. Defendants contend that they should not be required to produce  
6 policies that are related to the general subject matter of the Rule and in the Agency’s  
7 possession but were not considered by the Agency’s decision-makers. Opp. at 5.

8 After reviewing the Rule and the Cisneros Declaration, the court finds that plaintiffs  
9 have not carried their burden to demonstrate that the policy documents were “so heavily  
10 relied on” by the agency’s decision makers. Plaintiffs attempt to draw comparisons  
11 between excerpts from the Rule and a corresponding policy manual section or chapter  
12 that implicates, at a high level, the same topic as the excerpt. For example, the Rule  
13 states that the Agency “reject[s] the assertion that the rule shifts emphasis away from the  
14 affidavit of support.” 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,439. Plaintiffs contend that this sentence  
15 implicates Volume 7, Part A, which covers adjustment of status policies and procedures,  
16 including affidavits of support. Cisneros Decl. ¶ 27. As a second example, the Rule  
17 states that it applies to legal permanent residents returning from a trip abroad that has  
18 lasted for more than sixth months. See 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,326. Plaintiffs argue this  
19 reference implicates Volume 7, Part R, which addresses legal permanent residents who  
20 have been abroad for an extended period of time. Cisneros Decl. ¶ 37. As a final  
21 example, the introduction to the Rule creates a new public charge bond process. 84 Fed.  
22 Reg. at 41,295 (“This rule also revises DHS regulations governing the discretion . . . to  
23 accept a public charge bond . . . .”). Plaintiffs suggest that this reference to the public  
24 charge bond process implicates AFM, chapter 61, as well as chapters cross-referenced  
25 in chapter 61, all of which deal with public charge bonds. Cisneros Decl. ¶ 62.

26 The inquiry here is necessarily one of degree. On one end of the spectrum are  
27 documents that were not explicitly cited in the Rule but were so heavily relied on in the  
28 Rule that the underlying document was constructively considered by the decision maker.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 On the other end of the spectrum are documents that the Agency has in its possession  
2 but were not heavily relied upon or considered in the Rule. The excerpts and references  
3 cited by plaintiffs are not indicative of documents upon which a decision maker heavily  
4 relied. Rather, the topics expressed in the excerpts and references are stated at a high  
5 level of generality such that comparing those excerpts and references to equally high-  
6 level policy manuals does not demonstrate the manuals were heavily relied upon.

7 Plaintiffs also contend that the policies are relevant to understanding the scope  
8 and impact of the Rule's policy changes. Mtn. at 6. In the supplemental Cisneros  
9 Declaration, plaintiffs explain that on February 5, 2020, USCIS issued a "Policy Alert,"  
10 which announced USCIS's changes to portions of its Policy Manual to implement the  
11 Rule. Dkt. 152-1, ¶ 31. According to plaintiffs, they evaluated the new versions of  
12 Volume 7, Part A, chapters 4 and 6 of the Policy Manual against the prior version of the  
13 policy manuals and determined that USCIS and DHS changed the policy manuals as a  
14 result of the Rule. Plaintiffs renew their request to add the prior versions of the policy  
15 manuals in order to evaluate whether defendants' stated basis for departing from these  
16 policies is sufficient as a matter of law. Reply at 3.

17 While it is permissible for plaintiffs to argue that defendants have departed from  
18 prior policies without reasonable explanation (see, e.g., Fed. Commc'ns Comm'n v. Fox  
19 Television Stations, Inc., 556 U.S. 502, 515 (2009)), they have not demonstrated that the  
20 policy manuals are the appropriate prior policies by which to evaluate whether the Rule  
21 departed from those prior policies. Generally, the "prior policies" in question are not the  
22 policy manuals, but the prior public charge regulations. Thus, this case is distinguishable  
23 from Grace v. Whittaker, 344 F. Supp. 3d 96, 113 (D.D.C. 2018), where the district court  
24 permitted the plaintiffs to submit "government training manuals, memoranda, and a  
25 governmental brief" as extra-record evidence. This evidence of past policies was directly  
26 relevant to whether an Attorney General's opinion and interim guidance implementing the  
27 opinion departed from past policies. Here, because plaintiffs do not demonstrate that the  
28 Agency directly or indirectly relied on the policy manuals, they have not demonstrated

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 that those policies are the relevant past policies that the court should consider.

2 To reiterate a critical point, plaintiffs have the burden to rebut, with “clear  
3 evidence,” the presumption of completeness and, further, the exception is narrowly  
4 construed and applied. Lands Council, 395 F.3d at 1030. Several decades ago, in  
5 Action for Children’s Television v. FCC, 564 F.2d 458, 477 (D.C. Cir. 1977), the D.C.  
6 Circuit discussed whether “every informational input that may have entered into the  
7 decisionmaker’s deliberative process” should be produced in the administrative record.

8 The court opined

9 why not go further to require the decisionmaker to summarize  
10 and make available for public comment every status inquiry  
11 from a Congressman or any germane material say a  
12 newspaper editorial that he or she reads or their evening-hour  
13 ruminations? In the end, why not administer a lie-detector test  
14 to ascertain whether the required summary is an accurate and  
15 complete one? The problem is obviously a matter of degree,  
16 and the appropriate line must be drawn somewhere.

14 Id. (citation omitted). Similar considerations are present here; the court must draw a line  
15 somewhere. The record does not include “every scrap of paper that could or might have  
16 been created” relating to the Rule. Golden Gate Salmon Ass’n v. Ross, No. 17-cv-01172  
17 LJO-EPG, 2018 WL 3129849, at \*4 (E.D. Cal. Jun 22, 2018) (quoting TOMAC v. Norton,  
18 193 F. Supp. 2d 182, 195 (D.D.C. 2002)). In sum, plaintiffs have not met their burden to  
19 demonstrate that the Agency relied on documents, here policy manuals, not in the record.

20 **ii. Whether the Policies Constitute Relevant Background**  
21 **Information**

22 The third Inland Empire exception applies to policies that may be produced as  
23 relevant background information. This exception pertains to cases “in which  
24 supplementation of the record through discovery is necessary to permit explanation or  
25 clarification of technical terms or subject matter involving the agency action under  
26 review.” Public Power Council v. Johnson, 674 F.2d 791, 794 (9th Cir. 1982). Plaintiffs  
27 contend that the policy manuals are also relevant background materials. Mtn. at 6. The  
28 parties disagree whether it is appropriate to consider non-technical, non-scientific

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 background information as extra-record evidence. Opp. at 7; Reply at 2.

2 Generally, the appropriate basis to permit background material in the  
3 administrative record is to illuminate and explain technical subject matter. Thus, the  
4 Ninth Circuit in Love v. Thomas stated that a “court may consider, particularly in highly  
5 technical areas, substantive evidence going to the merits of the agency’s action where  
6 such evidence is necessary as background to determine the sufficiency of the agency’s  
7 consideration.” 858 F.2d 1347, 1356 (9th Cir. 1988) (citing Asarco, Inc. v. U.S. Env’tl.  
8 Prot. Agency, 616 F.2d 1153, 1160 (9th Cir. 1980)). Likewise, in Bunker Hill Co. v. EPA,  
9 572 F.2d 1286, 1292 (9th Cir. 1977), cited by plaintiffs, the background information in that  
10 case dealt with sulfur dioxide emissions. The court there characterized the background  
11 information as “clarification in dealing with a technical subject with respect to which [the  
12 court was] not expert[.]” Id. (emphasis added). Thus, the court permitted such  
13 background material because “courts are not straightjacketed to the original record in  
14 trying to make sense of complex technical testimony.” Id.; see also San Luis & Delta  
15 Mendota Water Authority v. U.S. Dep’t of the Interior, 984 F. Supp. 2d 1048, 1060 (E.D.  
16 Cal. 2013) (discussing Bunker Hill and other relevant Ninth Circuit case law and  
17 concluding that the cases all involve challenges to EPA regulatory actions that involved  
18 scientific and technical determinations).

19 Plaintiffs also cite Tenneco Oil Co. v. Department of Energy, 475 F. Supp. 299,  
20 317 (D. Del. 1979), where the district court stated that it “strain[ed] the Court’s  
21 imagination to assume that the administrative decision-makers reached their conclusions  
22 without reference to a variety of internal memoranda, guidelines, directives, and manuals,  
23 and without considering how arguments similar to [the plaintiff’s] were evaluated in prior  
24 decisions by the agency.” The Tenneco Oil court’s reasoning does not support plaintiffs’  
25 argument that internal policy manuals should be considered for background purposes.  
26 Rather, this case speaks to the second Inland Empire exception concerning whether the  
27 decision maker directly or indirectly considered a document. For the reasons explained  
28 above, (supra section B.1.a.i), plaintiffs have not demonstrated a sufficient basis for the



United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 court to apply reasoning similar to Tenneco Oil.

2 Permitting background information is most appropriate when there are technical or  
3 scientific matters without which the court cannot determine whether the Agency  
4 considered all relevant factors. Asarco, 616 F.2d at 1160. The Public Charge Rule and  
5 immigration law generally does not deal with a highly technical area such that policy  
6 manuals are needed to inform nonexpert judges. While there may be extenuating  
7 circumstances where non-technical background material is proper to add to the  
8 administrative record, plaintiffs have not demonstrated by clear evidence that such  
9 information is needed in this case.

10 **iii. Materials Related to Development of Forms**

11 In passing, plaintiffs request defendants to produce documents related to the  
12 development of forms, specifically those related to Form I-944. Mtn. at 9 n.8.  
13 Defendants take the position that they do not need to produce any further documents  
14 relating to the forms because the complaint does not raise any claims concerning Agency  
15 forms or the Paperwork Reduction Act. Further, it is unclear what additional documents  
16 plaintiffs request. Opp. at 8. Plaintiffs respond that their general arguments regarding  
17 the scope and impact of the Rule subsumes their arguments concerning any forms.  
18 Reply at 9–10. They seek inclusion of records related to the development of Form I-944.  
19 Id. at 10.

20 Plaintiffs first raised the argument concerning calculations of administrative burden  
21 as part of their motion for preliminary injunction. Dkt. 17 at 27–29. They put forward this  
22 argument under the broader thesis that the Rule is arbitrary and capricious. Id. at 19.  
23 While plaintiffs did not list the administrative burden of forms as part of the complaint,  
24 their arbitrary and capricious argument is broad enough to encompass arguments related  
25 to these forms.

26 However, the only document that the plaintiffs identify with any particularity is the  
27 supporting statement submitted by DHS to OMB to justify the collection of information for  
28 Form I-944 (assuming such a document exists). See Reply 9–10; Dkt. 152-1, ¶¶ 57–59.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 Accordingly, the appropriate relief must be tailored to plaintiffs’ specific request. If such  
2 document (or documents) constituting a supporting statement for Form I-944 exists, then  
3 defendants must provide that as part of the record.

4 For the foregoing reasons, the court GRANTS plaintiffs’ motions with respect to  
5 the policies that defendants do not oppose (and have agreed to provide) and the  
6 supporting statement for Form I-944. The court DENIES plaintiffs’ motions with respect  
7 to those policy manuals that they have requested beyond those policy manuals that  
8 defendants have agreed to provide.

9 **b. Studies and Data Regarding Inadmissibility Decisions**

10 Next, plaintiffs request an article titled “Public Charge Provisions of Immigration  
11 Law: A Brief Historical Background,” which was published by the Agency the same day  
12 as the Rule. Cisneros Decl. ¶ 67, Ex. 29. Plaintiffs also ask for studies and data  
13 regarding inadmissibility decisions on public charge grounds that were referenced in the  
14 article. Mtn. at 7. In their opposition brief, defendants agree to provide the article and the  
15 materials cited by the article. Opp. at 8. They take issue with providing any sources that  
16 plaintiffs think were omitted from the article but should have been included.

17 After the hearing, the parties filed a joint status report in which they report that  
18 defendants have provided the article, sources cited in the article, including excerpts of  
19 books and immigration data cited in the article. Dkt. 157 at 2. Plaintiffs state that the  
20 article cites immigration data, but defendants did not produce data for the years 1920–65,  
21 1981–82, 1988, 1990, and 2018. Defendants respond that USCIS did not consider such  
22 data with respect to the Rule or the article. Id. Plaintiffs make a similar request for  
23 Department of State visa approval data for fiscal years 1920–2018. Id. at 3.

24 As previously noted, the administrative record “consists of all documents and  
25 materials directly or indirectly considered by agency decision-makers and includes  
26 evidence contrary to the agency’s position.” Thompson, 885 F.2d at 555 (emphasis and  
27 citation omitted). The statistical data plaintiffs request not only was not cited in the Rule  
28 itself but was not cited in an article published the same day as the Rule. This line of



United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 reasoning is too attenuated to demonstrate by clear evidence that defendants indirectly  
2 considered the requested statistical data when drafting the Rule.

3 Because defendants do not oppose this request and have already provided much  
4 of the relevant material, the court GRANTS plaintiffs' motions with respect to the article  
5 and materials directly cited in the article; however, defendants are not required to provide  
6 materials that are not directly cited in the article. Further, defendants are not required to  
7 produce any book in its entirety unless such book is not publicly available.

8 **c. Intra- and Inter-Agency Communications**

9 Plaintiffs request various pre-decisional, deliberative materials including intra- and  
10 inter-agency communications, White House communications or agency communications  
11 with non-government third parties. Mtn. at 9. While plaintiffs have identified limited  
12 material from FOIA requests (primarily relating to U.S. Department of Agriculture  
13 comments submitted to the Agency pertaining to the Rule), they generally do not put  
14 forward a specific list of documents for defendants to provide. Thus, they also request a  
15 privilege log in order to determine which communications, if any, should be added to the  
16 record. *Id.* at 11. For their part, defendants attempt to cut this line of argument off, ex  
17 ante, by arguing that deliberative communications should not be considered in APA  
18 cases. Opp. at 9.

19 **i. Whether the Court Can Consider Any Deliberative**  
20 **Material**

21 Generally, judicial review under the APA is based on an agency's stated reasons  
22 and an "inquiry into mental processes of administrative decisionmakers is usually to be  
23 avoided." Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe, 401 U.S. 402, 420 (1971)  
24 (citing United States v. Morgan, 313 U.S. 409, 422 (1941)), abrogated on other grounds  
25 by Califano v. Sanders, 430 U.S. 99, 105 (1977). Yet, there is an inherent tension  
26 between avoiding examination of a decisionmaker's pre-decisional deliberative  
27 communications and the court's duty to "consider whether the decision was based on a  
28 consideration of the relevant factors." *Id.* at 417. As the Ninth Circuit has instructed, the

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 administrative record consists “of all documents and materials directly or indirectly  
2 considered by agency decision-makers.” Thompson, 885 F.2d at 555–56.

3 Reflecting the tension between the deliberative process and reviewing the “whole  
4 record,” district courts in the Ninth Circuit (as well as across the country) are divided over  
5 whether deliberative communications should be permitted at any time to complete the  
6 administrative record. There is a clear trend in district courts of the Northern District  
7 permitting deliberative communications so long as plaintiffs rebut the presumption of  
8 completeness. See, e.g., Ctr. for Env’tl Health v. Perdue, No. 18-cv-01763-RS, 2019 WL  
9 6114513, at \*2–3 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2019); Sierra Club v. Zinke, No. 17-cv-07187-WHO,  
10 2018 WL 3126401, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. June 26, 2018); Desert Survivors v. U.S. Dep’t of the  
11 Interior, 231 F. Supp. 3d 368, 381 (N.D. Cal. 2017); Inst. for Fisheries Res. v. Burwell,  
12 No. 16-CV-01574-VC, 2017 WL 89003, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2017).

13 Conversely, there are cases in other districts such as ASSE International, Inc. v.  
14 Kerry, No. SACV 14-00534-CJC(JPRx), 2018 WL 3326687, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 3,  
15 2018), where the court found that “privileged materials are not part of the administrative  
16 record in the first instance.” See also Comprehensive Cmty. Dev. Corp. v. Sebelius, 890  
17 F. Supp. 2d 305, 312 (S.D.N.Y. 2012) (“[C]ourts have consistently recognized that, for the  
18 purpose of judicial review of agency action, deliberative materials antecedent to the  
19 agency’s decision fall outside the administrative record.”). There are two reasons cited  
20 for this standard. First, a court’s APA review must be based on the agency’s stated  
21 reasons for the agency action, absent a showing of bad faith or improper behavior. In re  
22 Subpoena Duces Tecum Served on Office of Comptroller of Currency, 156 F.3d 1279,  
23 1279 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (citations omitted). Because a reviewing court should limit its  
24 review the agency’s stated behavior, then courts such as ASSE International interpret  
25 that rule as precluding any review of deliberative materials. See also Nat’l Ass’n of Chain  
26 Drug Stores v. U.S. Dep’t of Health & Human Servs., 631 F. Supp. 2d 23, 27 (D.D.C.  
27 2009) (“[I]nternal deliberative materials are not part of the administrative record.”).  
28 Second, “excluding deliberative materials ‘prevent[s] injury to the quality of agency

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 decisions' by encouraging uninhibited and frank discussion of legal and policy matters."  
2 Tafas v. Dudas, 530 F. Supp. 2d 786, 794 (E.D. Va. 2008) (alteration in original) (quoting  
3 NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 421 U.S. 132, 150–52 (1975)).

4 The Ninth Circuit has not directly addressed whether the federal government must  
5 produce a privilege log or whether the government may exclude deliberative documents  
6 from the administrative record altogether in an APA case. In re United States, 875 F.3d  
7 1200, 1210 (9th Cir.), vacated by 138 S. Ct. 443, 445 (2017) (per curiam). The Ninth  
8 Circuit indirectly addressed this issue in In re United States, which came before the court  
9 on a writ of mandamus petition filed by the federal government. Id. at 1204. In the  
10 mandamus context, the court reviewed for clear error a district court's order requiring the  
11 government to produce a privilege log with in camera review of deliberative material. Id.  
12 at 1210. The In re United States court cited the several district court opinions requiring a  
13 privilege log and in camera analysis of deliberative materials in APA cases. Id. (citing,  
14 e.g., Ctr. for Food Safety v. Vilsack, No. 15-cv-01590, 2017 WL 1709318, at \*5 (N.D. Cal.  
15 May 3, 2017)). Because of the absence of controlling precedent and the deliberative  
16 materials did not involve the mental processes of individual agency members, the court  
17 found that the district court's order was not clearly erroneous. Id.

18 The Supreme Court vacated the Ninth Circuit's opinion in part because portions of  
19 the district court's order were overly broad. The Court noted that the district court did not  
20 resolve threshold arguments going to whether the agency action was committed to  
21 agency discretion or whether the INA deprived the court of jurisdiction. In re United  
22 States, 138 S. Ct. at 445. The Court, therefore, admonished the district court not to  
23 "compel the Government to disclose any document that the Government believes is  
24 privileged without first providing the Government with the opportunity to argue the issue."  
25 Id.

26 Reading the Supreme Court and Ninth Circuit's opinions together, a court may  
27 order a privilege log and include non-privileged deliberative documents in the record but  
28 only after providing the federal government the opportunity to argue the issue. See

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 Sierra Club, 2018 WL 3126401, at \*3 (noting that the Supreme Court’s decision in In re  
2 United States “require[es] the resolution of facial challenges before addressing the  
3 administrative record”). Further, such relief is only appropriate after plaintiffs rebut the  
4 presumption of completeness. S.F. Bay Conservation & Dev. Comm’n v. U.S. Army  
5 Corps of Eng’rs, No. 16-cv-05420-RS, 2018 WL 3846002, at \*7 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2018)  
6 (“Decisions from this district have consistently held that parties that intend to withhold  
7 documents based on the deliberative process privilege must produce a privilege log, at  
8 least where the presumption of completeness has been rebutted . . . .”). In the absence  
9 of controlling Supreme Court or Ninth Circuit law to the contrary, the court is inclined to  
10 compel the inclusion extra-record pre-decisional deliberative documents, but only to the  
11 extent plaintiffs are able to rebut the presumption of completeness.<sup>6</sup>

12 **ii. Whether Plaintiffs Rebut the Presumption of**  
13 **Completeness**

14 The predicate step before applying the deliberative process privilege is for  
15 plaintiffs to meet their burden to overcome the presumption of completeness. See  
16 People of State of Cal. ex rel. Lockyer v. U.S. Dep’t of Agric., No. C05-03508 EDL, 2006  
17 WL 708914, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2006) (“Plaintiffs rebutted the presumption of  
18 completeness with a strong showing that the Senate Report and the supporting  
19 documents were at a minimum indirectly considered by the Forest Service in its decision-  
20 making process for the [Rule at issue].”).

21 Sierra Club v. Zinke is helpful to understand what showing is required to  
22 demonstrate clear evidence in this context. In Sierra Club, the plaintiffs sought to add to  
23 the administrative record documents produced by the federal government in response to  
24 the plaintiffs’ Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) requests. 2018 WL 3126401, at \*4.  
25 The court had previously determined that the plaintiffs challenged the rule on the ground  
26

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>6</sup> The court notes that defendants have not advanced a facial challenge to judicial review similar to the arguments before the Supreme Court, i.e., that the Rule was committed to the Agency’s discretion or that the INA strips the court of jurisdiction to review the Rule.

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 that “its stated rationales [were] not legitimate and its justifications [were] inconsistent  
2 with and not supported by the evidentiary record.” Id. (citation omitted). The court  
3 examined each FOIA document to determine whether they pertained to the plaintiffs’  
4 basis to challenge the rule. The FOIA documents were relevant to whether the rule was  
5 supported by good reasoning and, thus, rebutted the presumption of completeness. Id.

6 Here, as the result of a FOIA request, plaintiffs produce several email  
7 conversations from officials at the U.S. Department of Agriculture (“USDA”) in response  
8 to requests from the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) for comments to the  
9 Rule. Cisneros Decl. ¶ 86. One email, dated April 12, 2018, indicates that USDA  
10 officials sent OMB officials some comments concerning the Rule, which had been  
11 requested by OMB officials as part of a broader request to federal agencies. Id. ¶ 87, Ex.  
12 37. USDA’s comment was not included in the administrative record, nor were comments  
13 from other agencies. See id., Ex. 1. If OMB requested comments from various agencies  
14 for this particular Rule and those agencies then provided those comments, the Agency  
15 either directly or indirectly considered these comments. Thus, it is reasonable to assume  
16 that if USDA submitted comments, then other agencies did so as well. This situation is  
17 similar to Sierra Club, where plaintiffs used the FOIA process to identify potential  
18 documents not in the administrative record and the court determined that the documents  
19 identified through FOIA rebutted the presumption of completeness.

20 **iii. The Remedy to Which Plaintiffs Are Entitled**

21 While the court has determined that plaintiffs have rebutted the presumption of  
22 completeness, this is not license for a broad mandate to sweep in any and every  
23 document, email, or memoranda that is conceivably related to the Rule. The court’s  
24 finding is limited to the category of documents that plaintiffs were able to present clear  
25 evidence to rebut the presumption, i.e., inter-agency communications providing  
26 comments to DHS, and in DHS’s possession, concerning the Rule. The district court in  
27 Golden Gate Salmon Association v. Ross, 2018 WL 3129849, at \*4, aptly summarized  
28 the appropriate relief:

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 Plaintiffs assert that the presumption is “lost” when a plaintiff  
2 identifies wrongly omitted materials with specificity, and  
3 provides reasonable grounds for the belief that those  
4 documents were considered by the agency. This is true as to  
5 the wrongly omitted materials, but to the extent Plaintiffs  
6 suggest that rebutting the presumption as to one document (or  
7 even an entire category of materials) changes how the Court  
8 must review other materials . . . the Court does not agree.

6 Other courts have taken a similar category-by-category or document-by-document  
7 approach to reviewing whether documents rebut the presumption of completeness. See,  
8 e.g., Sharks Sports & Entm’t LLC v. Fed. Transit Admin., 2020 WL 511998, at \*3;  
9 California v. Bureau of Land Mgmt., No. 18-cv-00521-HSG, 2019 WL 1455335, at\*3 (N.D.  
10 Cal. Apr. 2, 2019); Sierra Club, 2018 WL 3126401, at \*4, Desert Survivors, 231 F. Supp.  
11 3d at 372. Because plaintiffs have only rebutted the presumption of completeness with  
12 respect to inter-agency communications received by DHS relating to the Rule, the  
13 appropriate relief is to complete the record only with respect to those types of documents.

14 Defendants contend that the deliberative process privilege shields from public  
15 disclosure confidential inter-agency memoranda on matters of law or policy. Opp. at 16.  
16 The question before the court is not whether the deliberative process privilege applies,  
17 but whether plaintiffs have rebutted the presumption of completeness with clear  
18 evidence. The cases cited by defendants stand for the proposition that the deliberative  
19 process privilege can be asserted by the government in the context of inter-agency  
20 documents. In National Wildlife Federation v. U.S. Forest Service, 861 F.2d 1114, 1116  
21 (9th Cir. 1988), the Ninth Circuit noted, in the context of a FOIA exemption review, that  
22 the “‘deliberative process’ privilege . . . shields from public disclosure confidential inter-  
23 agency memoranda on matters of law or policy.” However, the ultimate issue was  
24 whether the district court erred in determining whether certain documents, after an in  
25 camera review, should be released. Similarly, Hunton & Williams LLP v. U.S.  
26 Environmental Protection Agency, 248 F. Supp. 3d 220, 247 (D.D.C. 2017), the district  
27 court, also while reviewing a FOIA exemption request, noted that the deliberative process  
28 privilege can apply between two agencies. Whether the privilege can or does apply to



United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 any particular document are properly considered when the government produces the  
2 document and claims the privilege.

3 Finally, the court notes that there are certain types of communications that are not  
4 appropriate to consider, even if they fall within the category of documents that defendants  
5 must produce. The Ninth Circuit has held that it would not be permissible for the court to  
6 consider “the internal deliberative processes of the agency [or] the mental processes of  
7 individual agency members.” Portland Audubon Soc., 984 F.2d at 1549; see also  
8 Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe, 401 U.S. 402, 420 (1971) (“[S]uch  
9 inquiry into the mental processes of administrative decisionmakers is usually to be  
10 avoided.” (citation omitted)). Thus, while it would be appropriate for defendants to  
11 provide items such as studies, data, and official memoranda, it would not be appropriate  
12 to include communications codifying the internal deliberative processes of individual  
13 agency members. See In re United States, 875 F.3d at 1210 (“Where . . . an agency is  
14 headed by a multi-member board, the deliberations among those members are  
15 analogous to the internal mental processes of the sole head of an agency, and thus are  
16 generally not within the scope of the administrative record.” (citing Portland Audubon, 984  
17 F.2d at 1549)). Thus, defendants are not required to submit the deliberative  
18 communications of individual agency members. This limiting instruction reduces the  
19 burden on defendants while also recognizing plaintiffs have met their burden in a specific  
20 category of documents.

21 For the foregoing reasons, the court GRANTS plaintiffs’ motions to complete the  
22 record with regard to inter-agency communications submitted to DHS and under DHS’s  
23 control, relating to the Rule, and not involving the mental processes of individual agency  
24 members.

25 **d. White House Communications**

26 Defendants take issue with disclosing any communications related to the White  
27 House. Opp. at 14. They contend that White House communications raise “special  
28 considerations” due to the “Executive Branch’s interest in maintaining the autonomy of its

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 office.” Cheney v. U.S. Dist. Court for Dist. of Columbia, 542 U.S. 367, 385. Plaintiffs  
2 reply that Cheney does not apply because they do not request discovery against the  
3 President or Vice President. Reply at 11 n.12.

4 As an initial matter, it is not clear the extent to which White House communications  
5 is an issue requiring the court’s adjudication. Plaintiffs have not directed the court to any  
6 specific White House communications that rebut the presumption of completeness. It is  
7 conceivable, however, that the court’s finding regarding inter-agency communications  
8 could include communications from White House staff to DHS. For this narrow category  
9 of documents, the court examines whether defendants must produce any White House  
10 communications that meet the relief outlined above.

11 The parties cite Cheney v. U.S. District Court as the leading case on this question.  
12 Cheney involved whether a court of appeals could exercise the writ of mandamus to  
13 modify or dissolve discovery orders directing the Vice President and other senior  
14 Executive Branch officials to produce information about a task force. 542 U.S. at 372.  
15 The Supreme Court cited long-standing separation-of-powers considerations why such a  
16 mandamus petition involving the President or Vice President would be treated differently  
17 than other individuals. See id. at 381–82. The Court noted that the discovery order was  
18 directed to the “Vice President and other senior Government officials who served on the  
19 [panel] to give advice and make recommendations to the President.” Id. at 385. The  
20 Court then stated that it has held on more than one occasion that, “[t]he high respect that  
21 is owed to the office of the Chief Executive . . . is a matter that should inform the conduct  
22 of the entire proceeding, including the timing and scope of discovery.” Id. (alterations in  
23 original) (quoting Clinton v. Jones, 520 U.S. 681, 707 (1997)).

24 Thus, some deference in this area is certainly owed to the office of the Chief  
25 Executive. Yet, several mitigating considerations are also relevant. First, Cheney’s  
26 separation-of-power considerations were largely motivated by the inclusion of the Vice  
27 President in the discovery order. Id. at 382 (“These separation-of-powers considerations  
28 should inform a court of appeals’ evaluation of a mandamus petition involving the



United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 President or Vice President.”). That consideration is not present here. Additionally,  
2 Cheney did not involve the APA’s requirements to provide a complete administrative  
3 record and, though the opinion was vacated on other grounds, In re United States  
4 interpreted Cheney as not “imposing a categorical bar against requiring DHS to either  
5 include White House documents in a properly-defined administrative record or assert  
6 privilege individually as to those documents.” 875 F.3d at 1209. The final consideration  
7 is that the remedy identified by the court is not to order the White House to produce  
8 documents; rather, it is to order DHS to produce any communications meeting the court’s  
9 criteria that DHS has in its possession. This solution is in accord with the Ninth Circuit’s  
10 dicta in In re United States finding no clear error for a district court to require DHS to  
11 produce White House documents considered by the DHS Secretary. Id. For the  
12 foregoing reasons, the court GRANTS plaintiffs’ motions with respect to any White House  
13 communications in DHS’s possession and meeting the court’s criteria discussed above,  
14 supra, section B.1.c.

15 **e. Missing Comments from the Public**

16 In their reply brief, plaintiffs discuss the parties’ inability to resolve a discrepancy  
17 between the number of public comments submitted during the rulemaking process and  
18 the number of comments produced in the administrative record. Reply at 6. The  
19 government’s website for comments, Regulations.gov, states that over 260,000  
20 comments were submitted, but the administrative record includes only 213,959 separate  
21 documents. Id. Plaintiffs ask the court to order defendants to provide accurate  
22 accounting of the discrepancy. Defendants state in their opposition brief, “[t]he parties  
23 are continuing to confer about public comments included in the administrative record to  
24 ensure that all 266,077 public comments are included.” Opp. at 3 n.2. At the hearing,  
25 defendants acknowledged the requirement to account for all comments and explained  
26 that multiple comments may be included in one document.

27 Because defendants do not oppose this request, the court GRANTS plaintiffs’  
28 motions with regard to the public comments. Defendants are to account for any

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 discrepancies between the comments submitted on the government’s website and those  
2 provided in the administrative record.

3 **2. Discovery on Constitutional Claims**

4 Plaintiffs request discovery on their constitutional claims. They contend that  
5 constitutional claims are reviewed independently of APA claims and, therefore, some civil  
6 discovery is appropriate. Mtn. at 15. Defendants argue that constitutional claims are  
7 subject to the terms and limitations of the APA and plaintiffs are entitled to nothing more  
8 than the administrative record. Opp. at 16.

9 **a. Whether the APA Governs Plaintiffs’ Constitutional Claims**

10 In addressing whether the APA governs plaintiffs’ discovery request, the court  
11 considers two predicate questions. First, may plaintiffs bring an equitable cause of action  
12 for violation of the Constitution against any agency action? Second, if they have a cause  
13 of action for a constitutional claim, is that claim necessarily governed by the APA? The  
14 Ninth Circuit’s opinion in Sierra Club v. Trump, 929 F.3d 670 (9th Cir. 2019), is controlling  
15 on both questions. Sierra Club dealt with a challenge to the Department of Defense’s  
16 use of funds that the President repurposed by proclamation to construct a border wall on  
17 the southern border of the United States. Id. at 677–83. The plaintiffs brought both a  
18 constitutional claim, alleging a violation of the Appropriations Clause, and an APA claim.  
19 The federal government argued that the plaintiffs did not have a cause of action for either  
20 claim. The court examined whether the plaintiffs could bring “an equitable action to  
21 enjoin unconstitutional official conduct, or under the judicial review provisions of the . . .  
22 APA, as a challenge to a final agency decision that is alleged to violate the Constitution,  
23 or both.” Id. at 694 (citation omitted).

24 First, the court determined whether the plaintiffs could assert an equitable cause of  
25 action against federal officers for violations of the Appropriations Clause. Beginning with  
26 the constitutional claim, the court recognized that “‘federal courts may in some  
27 circumstances grant injunctive relief against’ federal officials violating federal law.” Id. at  
28 694 (quoting Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Ctr., Inc., 575 U.S. 320, 326 (2015)).

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 However, the court noted that Congress may revoke a federal court’s ability to enjoin  
2 federal officials where a statutory provision expressly provides a method of enforcing a  
3 substantive right or lacked a judicially administrable standard. Id. (citing Armstrong, 575  
4 U.S. at 328). Barring clear and convincing evidence of congressional intent, the judicial  
5 review of administrative action is the rule. See City of Chicago v. Int’l Coll. of Surgeons,  
6 522 U.S. 156, 183 (1997) (Ginsburg, J., dissenting) (citing Califano v. Sanders, 430 U.S.  
7 99, 106–06 (1977)). In Sierra Club, the court applied this rule to determine that Congress  
8 had not intended to foreclose equitable relief for violations of the Appropriations Clause.  
9 929 F.3d at 697.

10 Second, the court reviewed whether the plaintiffs had an APA cause of action,  
11 stating that 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(B) permits a federal court to “hold unlawful and set aside  
12 agency action . . . found to be . . . contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or  
13 immunity. Id. at 698. The court held that the plaintiffs could assert a cause of action  
14 under the APA so long as Congress had not limited review through other statutes or  
15 committed the administrative decision to agency discretion. Id. (citing 5 U.S.C.  
16 §§ 701(a), 704, 706; and Bennett v. Spear, 520 U.S. 154, 175 (1997)). Neither applied to  
17 the Sierra Club plaintiffs and they could bring a challenge under 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(C).

18 Third, the Sierra Club court then dealt with the issue whether “the availability of an  
19 APA cause of action precludes Plaintiffs’ equitable claim.” Id. at 699. The court noted  
20 that there is a basic presumption that APA provides for judicial review of agency action,  
21 but “this does not mean the APA forecloses other causes of action.” Id. (citing  
22 Weyerhaeuser Co. v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Serv., 139 S. Ct. 361, 370 (2018)). In Navajo  
23 Nation, 876 F.3d at 1170 (citation omitted), the Ninth Circuit explained that “a court is  
24 foreclosed by [APA section] 704 from entertaining claims brought under the APA seeking  
25 review of non-final agency action (and not otherwise permitted by law),” but “no such  
26 limitation applies to other types of claims (like constitutional claims . . .).” In  
27 Presbyterian Church v. United States, allowed constitutional claims to proceed without  
28 even deciding whether an APA cause of action was available. Sierra Club, 929 F.3d at

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 699 (citing Presbyterian Church, 870 F.2d 518 (9th Cir. 1989)). Considering these two  
2 cases together, Sierra Club held that Navajo Nation and Presbyterian Church “clearly  
3 contemplate that claims challenging agency actions—particularly constitutional claims—  
4 may exist wholly apart from the APA.” Id. One other district court in this circuit has cited  
5 Sierra Club’s holding and then concluded that review of the plaintiffs’ “constitutional  
6 claims, independently of their APA claims, is appropriate.” Al Otro Lado, Inc. v.  
7 McAleenan, 394 F. Supp. 3d 1168, 1217 (S.D. Cal. 2019).

8 Applying Sierra Club here, to determine whether plaintiffs have a cause of action,  
9 the court examines whether Congress intended to displace an equitable constitutional  
10 claim against an agency action. Plaintiffs bring causes of action for violations of the Due  
11 Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, which the Supreme Court has interpreted to  
12 prohibit the federal government from denying equal protection of the laws. Bolling v.  
13 Sharpe, 347 U.S. 497, 500 (1954). In Davis v. Passman, the Supreme Court explained  
14 that

15 “it is established practice for this Court to sustain the jurisdiction  
16 of federal courts to issue injunctions to protect rights  
17 safeguarded by the Constitution and to restrain individual state  
18 officers from doing what the 14th Amendment forbids the State  
19 to do.” Indeed, this Court has already settled that a cause of  
20 action may be implied directly under the equal protection  
21 component of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment  
22 in favor of those who seek to enforce this constitutional right.

23 442 U.S. 228, 242 (1979) (citations omitted). Thus, an equitable cause of action exists  
24 for equal protection violations of the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause.

25 This final agency action is not committed to DHS’s discretion and plaintiffs may  
26 also bring a cause of action under the APA against agency actions that are contrary to  
27 constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(C). Because  
28 plaintiffs may bring either an equitable cause of action or an APA claim, Sierra Club’s  
holding controls whether the cause of action is necessarily governed by the APA.  
Plaintiffs’ claim “may exist wholly apart from the APA.” 929 F.3d at 699. It follows,  
therefore, that if plaintiffs have a constitutional claim that exists outside of the APA, then

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 the APA’s administrative record requirement does not govern the availability of discovery.

2 **b. District Courts Decline to Draw a Bright Line Rule**

3 Defendants cite several cases for the proposition that courts routinely reject  
4 attempts by plaintiffs to obtain discovery for constitutional claims against the government.  
5 In reality, district courts have struggled to coalesce around a categorical rule and instead  
6 apply a fact-specific inquiry to reach outcomes that have rejected discovery for  
7 constitutional claims in some instances and permitted discovery in others. Further, the  
8 cases cited by defendants presumed that the APA governed and did not have the benefit  
9 of controlling circuit law on the issue of whether a constitutional claim may be brought  
10 independent of the APA.

11 There are few appellate cases discussing this issue. In Harkness v. Secretary of  
12 Navy, 858 F.3d 437, 451 & n.9 (6th Cir. 2017), the Sixth Circuit rejected an argument that  
13 discovery was necessary because constitutional issues could not be decided on the  
14 administrative record for two reasons. First, the court noted that 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(B)  
15 permits review of constitutional claims under the APA using the administrative record.  
16 Second, the plaintiff’s Establishment Clause claim was not a standalone claim because  
17 10 U.S.C. § 14502 provided a particular mechanism to challenge constitutional error in  
18 promotion boards. Id. at 446 n.6. Harkness does not require a different outcome than  
19 Sierra Club; both cases examined whether the plaintiff(s) could bring a standalone  
20 constitutional claim. The statutory scheme in Harkness precluded an Establishment  
21 Clause claim; the Appropriations Clause permitted a standalone challenge in Sierra Club.

22 Several district courts have determined that constitutional claims are governed by  
23 the APA and, therefore, constitutional claims should be decided on the administrative  
24 record without further discovery. See, e.g., Bellion Spirits, LLC v. United States, 335 F.  
25 Supp. 3d 32, 43 (D.D.C. 2018); Chiayu Chang v. U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Servs.,  
26 254 F. Supp. 3d 160, 161 (D.D.C. 2017) (collecting cases). Those cases have noted the  
27 lack of applicable circuit law. For example, in Northern Arapaho Tribe v. Ashe, 92 F.  
28 Supp. 3d 1160, 1171 (D. Wyo. 2015), the district court noted that “[w]hether a district

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 court must limit its constitutional review of agency action to the administrative record is [a]  
2 question that has not been definitively answered by the Tenth Circuit or the Supreme  
3 Court.”

4 On the other hand, several courts recognize that discovery may be appropriate for  
5 a constitutional claim involving agency action. Mayor & City Council of Baltimore v.  
6 Trump, —F. Supp. 3d—, No. CV ELH-18-3636, 2019 WL 6970631, at \*7 (D. Md. Dec. 19,  
7 2019) (collecting cases); New York v. U.S. Dep’t of Commerce, 345 F. Supp. 3d 444,  
8 451–52 (S.D.N.Y. 2018); Grill v. Quinn, No. 10-cv-0757 GEB GGH PS, 2013 WL  
9 3146803, at \*6 n.8 (E.D. Cal. June 18, 2013). As the district court in Baltimore pointed  
10 out, cases permitting discovery on constitutional claims are in accord “with the  
11 foundational tenet of constitutional adjudication that ‘where constitutional rights are in  
12 issue,’ courts must ensure that ‘the controlling legal principles [are] applied to the actual  
13 facts of the case.” 2019 WL 6970631, at \*7 (alteration in original) (quoting Pickering v.  
14 Bd. of Ed. of Twp. of High Sch. Dist. 205, Will Cty., 391 U.S. 563, 578 n.2 (1968)  
15 (Douglas, J., concurring)).

16 The broad spectrum of opinions demonstrates a tension and broad disagreement  
17 in the reasoning and outcomes in these types of cases. This is exacerbated by the lack  
18 of controlling authority and usually results in a case-by-case approach to discovery. Most  
19 courts decline to draw a bright line or categorical rule and instead examine the particular  
20 facts of the claims involved and the discovery requested. See, e.g., Almaklani v. Trump,  
21 —F. Supp. 3d—, No. 18-CV-398 (NGG) (CLP), 2020 WL 1282920, at \*7 (E.D.N.Y. Mar.  
22 17, 2020) (agreeing “that there may be circumstances in which discovery to supplement  
23 the record may be necessary,” but declining to permit “broad ranging discovery under  
24 Rule 26”); Jiahao Kuang v. U.S. Dep’t of Def., No. 8-cv-03698-JST, 2019 WL 293379, at  
25 \*2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2019) (“[T]he welter of cases underlines the need for a flexible  
26 approach, tailored to the facts and claims of the case.”); Bellion Spirits, 335 F. Supp. 3d  
27 at 43 (“Given the dearth of caselaw on point in this circuit, the Court declines to adopt any  
28 bright line or categorical rule.”). Given the lack of controlling authority, this approach is



United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 sensible and appropriately focuses on the facts and claims of individual cases.

2 **c. Facts and Claims of Plaintiffs’ Complaints**

3 Accordingly, the court turns to an analysis of the particular facts and claims at  
4 issue here. A few district courts faced with both APA and constitutional claims  
5 determined that the constitutional claims “fundamentally overlap” with the APA claims  
6 and thus discovery was unnecessary. Ala.-Tombigbee Rivers Coal. v. Norton, No. CV  
7 01-S-0194-S, 2002 WL 227032, at \*3-6 (N.D. Ala. Jan. 29, 2002); see also Bellion Spirits,  
8 335 F. Supp. 3d at 43-44; Chiayu Chang, 254 F. Supp. 3d at 162 (finding that the  
9 “plaintiffs’ constitutional claims here are fundamentally similar to their APA claims” and  
10 denying discovery). Alternatively, some courts have permitted some discovery when the  
11 APA and constitutional claims diverge in some meaningful way. For example, in Manker  
12 v. Spencer, No. 18-cv-372, 2019 WL 5846828, at \*19 (D. Conn. Nov. 7, 2019), the district  
13 court permitted discovery where the plaintiffs challenged the general course of conduct of  
14 the Naval Discharge Review Board, but the agency sought to limit review to the  
15 administrative record pertaining only to the plaintiffs. Thus, the court reasoned “[w]here  
16 a plaintiff challenges an agency’s general course of conduct rather than a discrete  
17 adjudication, limited discovery . . . may be necessary where the administrative record  
18 does not contain evidence of the challenged action.” Id.

19 In Vidal v. Duke, No. 16-cv-4756, 2017 WL 8773110, at \*3 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 17,  
20 2017), the plaintiffs sought discovery in an action challenging the government’s decision  
21 to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (“DACA”) program and also challenging  
22 collateral decisions affecting DACA beneficiaries on constitutional grounds. The  
23 collateral decisions included a due process claim for failure to provide individualized  
24 notice to DACA recipients who were eligible to renew their deferred action and equitable  
25 estoppel claims against the government’s use of information from DACA applications for  
26 immigration enforcement purposes. Id. at \*2. The court noted that the constitutional  
27 claim and equitable estoppel claims “do not challenge the decision to end the DACA  
28 program, but instead challenge how Defendants communicated that decision to DACA

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 beneficiaries.” Id. The court then permitted discovery on the grounds that the  
2 administrative record was limited to the decision to end the DACA program and “sheds  
3 no light on why the Government allegedly made these collateral decisions.” Id.

4 This case falls somewhere in between cases like Vidal and Manker that permitted  
5 discovery due to the divergence of APA and constitutional claims and cases such as  
6 Alabama-Tombigbee Rivers Coalition and Chiayu Chang where the APA and  
7 constitutional claims fundamentally overlapped. Reviewing plaintiffs’ complaints  
8 demonstrates that they are alleging different factual allegations between the APA claims  
9 and the constitutional claims. While plaintiffs’ APA and constitutional claims challenge  
10 the same Rule and request the same relief (thus, this case is not squarely in line with  
11 Vidal and Manker), the claims do not fundamentally overlap.

12 In the State plaintiffs’ complaint, paragraphs 111 through 126 discuss the State  
13 plaintiffs’ claims that the Rule is contrary to law and paragraphs 127 through 141 discuss  
14 the State plaintiffs’ claims that the Rule fails to offer adequate justification. Beginning  
15 with paragraph 281, the State plaintiffs’ complaint<sup>7</sup> sets forward allegations that the Rule  
16 is motivated by racial and ethnic animus toward non-white, non-European immigrants.  
17 These allegations include numerous statements and actions by the President that  
18 purportedly demonstrate improper racial animus. See, e.g., Compl. ¶ 292. The  
19 allegations also involve senior administration leadership, including Acting USCIS Director  
20 Cuccinelli. Id. ¶ 299. The complaint also alleges that the White House, in particular  
21 senior advisor Stephen Miller, improperly manipulated the agency process. Id. ¶¶ 302,  
22 306. Similarly, the organization plaintiffs allege that “L. Francis Cissna was directed to  
23 step down as director of USCIS, in part because Stephen Miller had been ‘agitating for  
24 Mr. Cissna’s removal for months’ due to Mr. Miller’s stance that Mr. Cissna was ‘moving  
25 too slowly in implementing’ the Regulation.” No. 19-cv-04980-PJH, Dkt. 1, ¶ 126 (citation  
26 omitted). These allegations are different than plaintiffs’ APA allegations that the Agency

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>7</sup> The organization plaintiffs’ complaint contains similar allegations in paragraphs 119  
through 127. No. 19-cv-04980-PJH, Dkt. 1.



United States District Court  
Northern District of California

1 promulgated a rule that was contrary to law or the procedure followed by the Agency was  
2 flawed. Ultimately, these allegations demonstrate that the administrative record is limited  
3 to the Agency’s rulemaking process and sheds no light on actions taken by senior  
4 administration officials.

5 Defendants, relying on Trump v. Hawaii, 138 S. Ct. 2392 (2018), also contend that  
6 the court should apply highly deferential constitutional standard of review and under a  
7 rational basis standard, discovery is inappropriate. Opp. at 18–19. Plaintiffs, citing  
8 Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Development Corporation, 429 U.S.  
9 252 (1977), argue that the court should apply a more searching standard of review and  
10 accompanying sensitive inquiry into circumstantial and direct evidence of potential  
11 unconstitutional behavior. Mtn. at 13. It is entirely understandable why each party seeks  
12 to establish a foothold regarding the appropriate constitutional standard of review in this  
13 case. See Saget v. Trump, 375 F. Supp. 3d 280, 366–67 (E.D.N.Y. 2019) (discussing  
14 applicability of Hawaii and Arlington Heights to Equal Protection claims against agency  
15 action). Yet, the court declines to determine such a standard in the context of a motion to  
16 compel where the parties have not fully briefed this issue. Cf. Baltimore, 2019 WL  
17 6970631, at \*9–12 (determining applicable standard of review and declining to permit  
18 discovery based on rational basis review). Moreover, defendants have not cited any  
19 controlling case that prohibits discovery even in cases governed by rational basis review.  
20 The court does not foreclose the possibility that discovery may not be appropriate if  
21 rational basis review applies to this case, but simply notes that it is premature to make  
22 such a finding at this stage when the court has not addressed the applicable standard of  
23 review. Accordingly, plaintiffs’ motions to take discovery on their constitutional claims is  
24 GRANTED.

25 This brings the court to the appropriate remedy. Plaintiffs oppose a stay pending  
26 defendants’ forthcoming motion to dismiss because they bring “a straightforward claim  
27 that Defendants were motivated by racial animus when advancing the Rule.” Mtn. at 19.  
28 Defendants contend that the court should defer discovery until resolution of defendants’

1 forthcoming motion to dismiss that may be dispositive of the complaint. Opp. at 20. The  
2 court agrees with defendants; permitting discovery prior to assessing viability of plaintiffs'  
3 claims and directly addressing the appropriate standard of review and the implications of  
4 that standard would be premature. As noted by a different court, "even where plaintiffs  
5 have asserted constitutional claims, 'wide-ranging discovery is not blindly authorized at a  
6 stage in which such an administrative record is being reviewed.'" Tafas, 530 F. Supp. 2d  
7 at 802 (quoting P.R. Public Housing Admin. v. U.S. Dep't of Housing & Urban Dev., 59 F.  
8 Supp. 2d 310, 327 (D.P.R. 1999)).

9 **CONCLUSION**

10 For the foregoing reasons, the court GRANTS IN PART and DENIES IN PART  
11 plaintiffs' motions to complete the record and GRANTS plaintiffs' motions to compel  
12 discovery. However, the court STAYS discovery until resolution of defendants'  
13 forthcoming motion to dismiss. Should defendants choose not to file a motion to dismiss,  
14 the parties may file an appropriate request to resolve the stay.

15 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

16 Dated: April 1, 2020

17 /s/ Phyllis J. Hamilton  
18 PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON  
United States District Judge

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28