

1 JOSEPH H. HUNT
 Assistant Attorney General
 2 WILLIAM D. HYSLOP
 United States Attorney
 3 ALEXANDER K. HAAS
 Branch Director
 4 ERIC J. SOSKIN
 Senior Trial Counsel
 5 KERI L. BERMAN
 KUNTAL V. CHOLERA
 6 JOSHUA M. KOLSKY, DC Bar No. 993430
 Trial Attorneys
 7 United States Department of Justice
 8 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch

9 *Attorneys for Defendants*

10
 11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
 12 **AT RICHLAND**

13 STATE OF WASHINGTON, *et al.*,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
 17 HOMELAND SECURITY, *et al.*,

18 Defendants

No. 4:19-cv-5210-RMP

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF
 SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY

19
 20
 21
 22
 RESP. TO NOTICE OF SUPPL. AUTHORITY

1 Defendants hereby respond to Plaintiffs’ Notice of Supplemental Authority in
2 Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel, in which Plaintiffs attach the order in *California*
3 *v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security*, No. 19-4975, and *La Clinica de La Raza v.*
4 *Donald J. Trump*, No. 19-4980 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 1, 2020). ECF No. 208.

5 First, the plaintiffs in the Northern District of California litigation had sought an
6 order requiring the government to include in the administrative record, *inter alia*, all
7 communications related to the public charge rule, and to provide a privilege log of all
8 documents allegedly “withheld” from the record on the basis of privilege. Notice, Ex. 1,
9 at 14. The court denied that request in large part, ordering the government to include
10 only “inter-agency communications submitted to DHS and under DHS’s control, relating
11 to the Rule, and not involving the mental processes of individual agency members.” *Id.*
12 at 20. The court emphasized that, under Ninth Circuit authority, “it would not be
13 permissible for the court to consider ‘the internal deliberative processes of the agency
14 [or] the mental processes of individual agency members.’” *Id.* And the court clarified
15 that the types of documents that “would be appropriate for defendants to provide” were
16 “items such as studies, data, and official memoranda,” but not “communications
17 codifying the internal deliberative processes of individual agency members.” *Id.* Also,
18 the court did not order Defendants to provide a privilege log.
19
20

21 Second, Plaintiffs claim that the court “held that plaintiffs are entitled to take
22 discovery on constitutional claims of the very same nature as the Equal Protection claim

1 Plaintiffs have asserted here.” Notice at 2. The court, however, did not conclusively
2 permit supplemental discovery on the equal protection claim. To the contrary, although
3 the court provisionally allowed for this discovery, it immediately stayed its own ruling,
4 concluding that it would not “permit[] discovery prior to assessing [the] viability of
5 plaintiffs’ claims and directly addressing the appropriate standard of review and the
6 implications of that standard.” *Id.*, Ex. 1, at 31. The court thus clarified that it could
7 ultimately conclude “that discovery may not be appropriate” on that claim. *Id.* at 30. The
8 court cited to the District of Maryland’s decision in the public charge case *Mayor and*
9 *City Council of Baltimore v. Trump*, which found that, under the highly deferential
10 standard of review applicable to equal protection challenges to immigration rules, the
11 plaintiff was “*not* entitled to discovery as to its equal protection claims” and must rely
12 instead on the “administrative record.” 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 219262, at *32 (Dec. 19,
13 2019) (emphasis in original).
14
15

16 Dated: April 14, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

17 JOSEPH H. HUNT
18 Assistant Attorney General

19 WILLIAM D. HYSLOP
20 United States Attorney

21 ALEXANDER K. HAAS
22 Branch Director

s/ Joshua Kolsky

RESP. TO NOTICE OF SUPPL. AUTHORITY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

1 ERIC J. SOSKIN
Senior Trial Counsel
2 KERI L. BERMAN
KUNTAL V. CHOLERA
3 JOSHUA M. KOLSKY, DC Bar No. 993430
Trial Attorneys
4 United States Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
5 1100 L Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
6 Tel: (202) 35-0533
7 Fax: (202) 616-8470
eric.soskin@usdoj.gov

8 Attorneys for Defendants
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that on April 14, 2020, I electronically filed the foregoing with
3 the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such
4 filing to all users receiving ECF notices for this case.

5 /s/ Joshua Kolsky

6 United States Department of Justice
7 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
8 1100 L Street, NW
9 Washington, D.C. 20005

10 Attorney for Defendants