

1 ROBERT W. FERGUSON
Attorney General

2
3 JEFFREY T. SPRUNG, WSBA #23607
4 SPENCER W. COATES, WSBA #49683
5 PAUL M. CRISALLI, WSBA #40681
6 NATHAN K. BAYS, WSBA #43025
7 BRYAN M.S. OVENS, WSBA #32901
Assistant Attorneys General
800 Fifth Ave., Ste. 2000
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 464-7744

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

10 STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

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

15 Defendants.

NO. 4:19-cv-05210-RMP

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO
COMPEL DOCUMENTS
WITHHELD UNDER
DELIBERATIVE PROCESS
PRIVILEGE

Noted for: November 13, 2020
Without Oral Argument

16
17
18
19
20
21
22

1 I. INTRODUCTION

2 Plaintiff States assert two independent challenges to Defendants’ Final Rule:
3 a statutory challenge under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), and a
4 constitutional challenge under the Constitution’s Equal Protection guarantee.
5 Recently, this Court permitted Plaintiffs to pursue discovery related to their Equal
6 Protection claim, and ordered Defendants to provide an adequate privilege log so the
7 Court could evaluate any claimed privilege. ECF No. 210.

8 Defendants have failed to comply. In response to Plaintiffs’ discovery
9 requests, Defendants have broadly asserted the deliberative process privilege.
10 Defendants’ invocation of the deliberative process privilege fails for two reasons.
11 First, the deliberative process privilege does not apply where, as here, the
12 government’s decision-making process is itself at issue. Second, even if the privilege
13 did apply, that privilege is qualified, and the factors outlined in *F.T.C. v. Warner*
14 *Comm’ns Inc.*, 742 F.2d 1156, 1161 (9th Cir. 1984), all support disclosure.
15 Accordingly, Plaintiffs request the Court order Defendants to produce the material
16 they have withheld pursuant to the deliberative process privilege.¹

17 _____
18 ¹ This motion addresses the threshold question of the applicability of the
19 deliberative process privilege to Plaintiff States’ Equal Protection claim. Plaintiffs
20 have identified additional deficiencies in Defendants’ privilege logs and are
21 negotiating with Defendants concerning these, and reserve the right to move to
22 compel regarding the adequacy of Defendants’ privilege logs. *See infra* n.2

II. BACKGROUND

1
2 Plaintiffs challenged a Final Rule published by the U.S. Department of
3 Homeland Security (DHS), *Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds*, 84 Fed. Reg.
4 41,292 (Aug. 14, 2019) (Public Charge Rule or Rule), alleging violations of the APA
5 and the Equal Protection Clause. ECF No. 31 at 161–71. As part of the Equal
6 Protection claim, Plaintiffs allege the Rule was motivated by discriminatory intent.
7 Am. Compl. (ECF No. 31) ¶ 430.

8 This Court stayed implementation of the Rule under 5 U.S.C. § 705 and also
9 preliminarily enjoined its implementation. ECF No. 162. Defendants appealed and
10 the Ninth Circuit issued a stay pending appeal on December 5, 2019. ECF No. 192
11 at 73. Meanwhile, DHS moved to dismiss Plaintiffs’ claims. ECF No. 223. On
12 September 14, 2020, the Court denied DHS’s motion with respect to three of four
13 counts, including the equal protection claim, finding that the alleged statements
14 “made by high-level officials in the Administration contemporaneous with” the
15 promulgation of the Rule “can be interpreted as supporting animus towards nonwhite
16 immigrants.” ECF No. 248 at 42–43. On September 15, 2020, the Ninth Circuit
17 Court of Appeals heard DHS’s appeal of the preliminary injunction; the parties await
18 a ruling. ECF No. 192 at 73.

19 Parallel to the appeal and the motion to dismiss, the parties met on
20 November 5, 2019 to develop a discovery plan. ECF No. 188. The parties disagreed
21 on the appropriate scope of discovery, and on April 17, 2020, the Court ordered the
22 Department to produce a privilege log in connection with documents withheld from

1 the administrative record and discovery regarding the States’ equal protection claim.
2 ECF No. 210 at 21. Given the “public-record evidence” of anti-immigrant animus
3 by officials like Kenneth Cuccinelli and Stephen Miller and the nature of the
4 “inquiry required to determine whether the relevant decisionmakers manifested a
5 discriminatory purpose,” the Court agreed that further discovery into the Equal
6 Protection claim was appropriate. *Id.* at 17, 20.

7 DHS moved to stay its obligation to produce a privilege log pending resolution
8 of a motion to dismiss. ECF No. 213. On May 13, 2020, the Court denied this
9 motion, but in the same Order directed DHS to produce the privilege log related to
10 the administrative record on a rolling basis every two weeks starting on June 12,
11 2020. ECF No. 219 at 6. The most current privilege log of documents withheld from
12 the administrative record contains 208 documents, all but one of which DHS has
13 marked as protected by the deliberative process privilege. *See* Declaration of
14 Jeffrey T. Sprung (Sprung Decl.), ¶ 2, Ex. A.

15 The States served their first requests for production (RFPs) on DHS on
16 July 14, 2020. Sprung Decl., ¶ 3 and Ex. B. The RFPs sought information relevant
17 to the States’ claim that the Public Charge Rule was motivated in part by the
18 Defendants’ animus and discriminatory intent towards non-European immigrants on
19 the basis of race, ethnicity, or national origin. *Id.* DHS agreed to produce documents
20 subject to various objections. *Id.*, ¶ 5 and Ex. C at 6, ¶ 1.

21 On August 28, DHS transmitted its first production, consisting of 76
22 documents, many of which are agency public relations department “news clips” that

1 summarize media articles, span over 100 pages, and offer no information regarding
2 the effects of the Public Charge Rule; the remaining documents are heavily redacted.
3 *Id.* at ¶ 6, Ex. D. On September 18, 2020, DHS produced a six-page partial privilege
4 log of documents withheld from equal protection discovery. *Id.* at ¶ 7, Ex. E. On
5 September 25, 2020, DHS made a second production of documents, consisting
6 almost entirely of irrelevant “news clips.” *See, e.g., id.* at ¶ 8, Ex. F. DHS updated
7 its partial privilege log of documents withheld from equal protection discovery on
8 October 2, 2020. *Id.* at ¶ 9, Ex. G. In total, of DHS’s 54 entries on the partial privilege
9 log, 37 of them assert the deliberative process privilege.

10 On September 27, 2020, Plaintiffs inquired whether Defendants intended to
11 revise their privilege logs and reconsider their invocation of the deliberative process
12 privilege. *Id.* at ¶ 10, Ex. H. Defendants responded that they disagreed with
13 Plaintiffs’ position that the deliberative process privilege does not apply. *Id.* at ¶ 11,
14 Ex. I. Plaintiffs now move for an order compelling Defendants to produce the
15 documents and information they have withheld under the privilege.

16 III. ARGUMENT

17 A. The Deliberative Process Privilege Does Not Apply to Discovery on 18 Plaintiff’s Constitutional Claim

19 The deliberative process privilege applies to documents that “reflect[]
20 advisory opinions, recommendations and deliberations comprising part of a process
21 by which governmental decisions and policies are formulated.” *NLRB v. Sears,*
22 *Roebuck & Co.*, 421 U.S. 132, 150 (1975). Courts in the Ninth Circuit and elsewhere,

1 | however, have held that the privilege does not apply to a challenge of an agency’s
2 | decision-making process, including its intent in taking certain actions. The D.C.
3 | Circuit, for instance, reasoned that the deliberative process privilege “evaporates”
4 | when “a plaintiff’s cause of action turns on the government’s intent”:

5 | The privilege was fashioned in cases where the governmental decision-
6 | making process is collateral to the plaintiff’s suit. **If the plaintiff’s**
7 | **cause of action is directed at the government’s intent, however, it**
8 | **makes no sense to permit the government to use the privilege as a**
9 | **shield.** For instance, it seems rather obvious to us that the privilege has
10 | no place in a Title VII action **or in a constitutional claim for**
11 | **discrimination** [I]f either the Constitution or a statute makes the
12 | nature of governmental officials’ deliberations the issue, the privilege
13 | is a non-sequitur. The central purpose of the privilege is to foster
14 | government decision-making by protecting it from the chill of
15 | potential disclosure. If Congress creates a cause of action that
16 | deliberatively exposes government decisionmaking to the light, the
17 | privilege’s *raison d’être* evaporates.

18 | *In re Subpoena Duces Tecum Served on the Office of the Comptroller of Currency,*
19 | 145 F.3d 1422, 1424 (D.C. Cir.), *on reh’g in part,* 156 F.3d 1279 (D.C. Cir. 1998)
20 | (emphasis added). Though the Ninth Circuit has yet to address *In re Subpoena*, other
21 | courts within this Circuit have echoed its reasoning. In *Jones v. Hernandez*, No. 16-
22 | CV-1986-W(WVG), 2017 WL 3020930 (S.D. Cal. July 14, 2017), for instance, the
23 | court cited *Subpoena* approvingly and explained that a court “may deny the
24 | protection of the deliberative process privilege, regardless of the balancing
25 | test . . . (1) when there is reason to believe that the documents sought may shed light
26 | on government misconduct, and (2) when the agency’s decision-making process is
27 | itself at issue.” *Jones*, 2017 WL 3020930, at *3 (citations omitted). Another court

1 found the reasoning of *Subpoena* “highly persuasive,” concluding that “the fact that
2 the decisionmaking process is at issue . . . weighs heavily against Respondent’s
3 assertion of privilege.” *Thomas v. Cate*, 715 F. Supp. 2d 1012, 1021 (E.D. Cal.
4 2010). Others in the Ninth Circuit have echoed the reasoning of *Subpoena* without
5 specifically invoking the case. *See, e.g., Greenpeace v. Nat’l Marine Fisheries Serv.*,
6 198 F.R.D. 540, 543 (W.D. Wash. 2000) (“the [deliberative process] privilege may
7 be inapplicable where the agency’s decision-making process is itself at issue”).

8 Many other courts across the country similarly hold the deliberative process
9 privilege inapplicable where plaintiffs’ claims involve the government’s intent or
10 decision-making process. *See, e.g., Burbar v. Inc. Vill. of Garden City*, 303 F.R.D.
11 9, 14 (E.D.N.Y. 2014) (deliberative process privilege “inapplicable” where the
12 “decision making process of the [government] Defendants are unquestionably at the
13 heart of these claims,” noting “when the decision-making process itself is the subject
14 of the litigation, the deliberative process privilege cannot be a bar to discovery and
15 the privilege evaporates.”); *Children First Found., Inc. v. Martinez*, No. 1:04-CV-
16 0927, 2007 WL 4344915, at *7 (N.D.N.Y. Dec. 10, 2007) (deliberative process
17 privilege must “disappear” when “the crux of the [plaintiffs’] case” was “the process
18 by which Defendants made their decision . . . [and their] subjective motives”);
19 *Qamhiyah v. Iowa State Univ. of Sci. & Tech.*, 245 F.R.D. 393, 397 (S.D. Iowa 2007)
20 (privilege did not apply where plaintiff alleged that the deliberative process itself
21 was “tainted with unlawful discrimination”); *Azon v. Long Island R.R.*, CIV-6031,
22 2001 WL 1658219, at *3 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 26, 2001) (“[W]hen the subject of the

1 litigation, as here, is the very nature of the decision-making process, the privilege
2 should not foreclose the production of critical information.”); *Burka v. New York*
3 *City Transit Auth.*, 110 F.R.D. 660, 667 (S.D.N.Y. 1986) (“Where the decision-
4 making process itself is the subject of the litigation, the deliberative privilege may
5 not be raised as a bar against disclosure of critical information.”).

6 Here, as this Court has already recognized, Defendants’ decision-making
7 process is central to Plaintiffs’ Equal Protection claim. Where, as here, “there is
8 reason to believe the documents sought may shed light on government misconduct,
9 the privilege is routinely denied, on the grounds that shielding internal government
10 deliberations in this context does not serve the public’s interest in honest, effective
11 government.” *In re Sealed Case*, 121 F.3d 729, 738 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (quotations
12 omitted). The deliberative process privilege is thus inapplicable, and Defendants
13 cannot use it to shield documents from discovery.

14 **B. Even if the Deliberative Process Privilege Applied, the *Warner* Factors**
15 **Favor Disclosure**

16 Even if the deliberative process privilege applied, it is qualified, not absolute.
17 *See Warner*, 742 F.2d at 1161. In deciding whether the qualified privilege should be
18 overcome, courts examine four factors: “1) the relevance of the evidence; 2) the
19 availability of other evidence; 3) the government’s role in the litigation; and 4) the
20 extent to which disclosure would hinder frank and independent discussion regarding
21 contemplated policies and decisions.” *Karnoski v. Trump*, 926 F.3d 1180, 1206 (9th
22 Cir. 2019) (quoting *Warner*, 742 F.2d at 1161). “[T]he deliberative process privilege

1 is narrowly construed” and Defendants bear the burden of establishing its
2 applicability. *Greenpeace*, 198 F.R.D. at 543 (citations omitted). “Blanket” privilege
3 assertions are “insufficient”; Defendants must provide “‘precise and certain’ reasons
4 for preserving the confidentiality of designated material.” *Id.*

5 Each of the *Warner* factors favor the Plaintiffs. First, records describing
6 Defendants’ deliberations would shed light on whether discriminatory animus
7 motivated their enactment of the Public Charge Rule. As such, the records are clearly
8 relevant to Plaintiffs’ Equal Protection Claims. *See N. Pacifica, LLC v. City of*
9 *Pacifica*, 274 F. Supp. 2d 1118, 1124 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (evidence of the “motive and
10 intent of City Council members” was “highly relevant to [plaintiff’s] equal
11 protection claim” because plaintiff must demonstrate “there was no rational basis for
12 the difference in treatment or the difference in treatment was motivated by animus”).
13 Moreover, this discovery is relevant to Plaintiffs’ constitutional claims and thus
14 enforcement of federal rights. *See, e.g., Surf & Sand, LLC v. City of Capitola*, No. C
15 09-05542, 2010 WL 4393886, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2010) (“First, the above-
16 captioned action involves federal constitutional claims, and the federal interest in the
17 enforcement of federal constitutional rights weighs in favor of disclosure.”).

18 Second, Plaintiffs are unable to access evidence of Defendants’ intent through
19 other mean, as the “evidence sought is primarily, if not exclusively, under [the
20 government’s] control, and the government . . . is a party to and the focus of the
21 litigation.” *Karnoski*, 926 F.3d at 1206. While the portions of the administrative
22 record that have been produced provide some details on Defendants’ decision-

1 making process, evidence of discriminatory intent “does not typically lay dormant
 2 in an administrative record.” *Newport Pac. Inc. v. Cty. of San Diego*, 200 F.R.D.
 3 628, 639 (S.D. Cal. 2001). Further, Defendants assert the deliberative process
 4 privilege repeatedly in withholding documents from the administrative record. And
 5 though there are indications of discriminatory animus based on public comments by
 6 Stephen Miller and others, only internal communications can truly provide direct
 7 evidence of how such animus motivated the policy change. *See Vill. of Arlington*
 8 *Heights v. Metro. Hous. Dev. Corp.*, 429 U.S. 252, 266 (1977) (determining whether
 9 invidious discriminatory purpose was a motivating factor “demands a sensitive
 10 inquiry into such circumstantial and direct evidence of intent as may be available.”).

11 Third, the government’s role in the litigation also weighs in favor of
 12 disclosure, as Plaintiffs allege that the government engaged in invidious
 13 discrimination in promulgating the Rule because it was motivated by racial animus
 14 against nonwhite immigrants. This Court rejected Defendants’ attempt to dismiss
 15 Plaintiffs’ Equal Protection claim, noting that public statements by Defendants
 16 raised an “inference that an ‘invidious discriminatory purpose was a motivating
 17 factor’” in finalizing the Public Charge Rule. ECF No. 248 at 30–43. That
 18 Defendants are the governmental actors, whose intent at issue goes to the heart of
 19 the Equal Protection claim, supports disclosure. *See All. for the Wild Rockies v.*
 20 *Pena*, No. 2:16-CV-294-RMP, 2017 WL 8778579, at *7 (E.D. Wash. Dec. 12, 2017)
 21 (“Because the Forest Service and its employees are defendants in this
 22 litigation . . . the third *Warner* factor regarding governmental involvement favors

1 disclosure”); *see also N. Pacifica*, 274 F. Supp. 2d at 1124 (government’s defendant
2 role favored disclosure because its “decision-making process [was] by no means
3 collateral to” plaintiff’s equal protection claim); *Newport*, 200 F.R.D. at 640 (noting
4 that the “role of the government in the litigation itself”—being sued for, *inter alia*,
5 violation of equal protection—“tip[s] the scales in favor of disclosure”).

6 Fourth, any risk that disclosure would hinder frank and independent
7 discussion regarding contemplated policies and decisions could be mitigated by the
8 existence of a protective order, which Plaintiffs have proposed. *See Rodriguez v.*
9 *City of Fontana*, No. EDCV 16-1903-JGB (KKX), 2017 WL 4676261, at *4 (C.D.
10 Cal. Oct. 17, 2017) (“[T]he Court finds disclosure of the information sought subject
11 to an appropriate protective order will not harm the generally asserted governmental
12 interest in confidentiality of performance evaluations.”).

13 Taken together, all of the *Warner* factors favor the Plaintiffs’ and public’s
14 interest in disclosure, and far outweigh any interest in nondisclosure. Defendants
15 failed to properly invoke or apply the Deliberative Process Privilege to the withheld
16 documents. These documents are critical to discovery on Plaintiffs’ Equal Protection
17 claim, and they must be produced without redactions.

18 IV. CONCLUSION

19 For the foregoing reasons Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel should be granted.
20 Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court order Defendants to produce the
21 material withheld pursuant to the deliberative process privilege without redactions.
22

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

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 14th day of October 2020.

ROBERT W. FERGUSON
Attorney General of Washington

s/ Spencer W. Coates

JEFFREY T. SPRUNG, WSBA #23607
SPENCER W. COATES, WSBA #49683
PAUL M. CRISALLI, WSBA #40681
NATHAN K. BAYS, WSBA #43025
BRYAN M.S. OVENS, WSBA #32901

Assistant Attorneys General

800 Fifth Ave., Ste. 2000

Seattle, WA 98104

(206) 464-7744

Jeff.Sprung@atg.wa.gov

Spencer.Coates@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, VA 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
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

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

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

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, NM 87504-1508
tmaestas@nmag.gov
Attorneys for Plaintiff State of New Mexico

PETER F. NERONHA
Attorney General of Rhode Island

s/ Lauren E. Hill
LAUREN E. HILL, #9830
Special Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
150 South Main Street
Providence, RI 02903
(401) 274-4400 x2038
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 14th day of October 2020, at Seattle, Washington.

s/ Spencer W. Coates

SPENCER W. COATES, WSBA #49683
Assistant Attorney General

1 ROBERT W. FERGUSON
Attorney General

2 JEFFREY T. SPRUNG, WSBA #23607
3 SPENCER W. COATES, WSBA #49683
4 PAUL M. CRISALLI, WSBA #40681
5 NATHAN K. BAYS, WSBA #43025
6 BRYAN M.S. OVENS, WSBA #32901
Assistant Attorneys General
800 Fifth Ave., Ste. 2000
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 464-7744

7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 **AT SPOKANE**

10 STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF HOMELAND SECURITY, et al.

14 Defendants.

NO. 4:19-cv-05210-RMP

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS’
MOTION TO COMPEL
DOCUMENTS WITHHELD
UNDER DELIBERATIVE
PROCESS PRIVILEGE

[PROPOSED]

NOTED FOR: November 13, 2020
Without Oral Argument

16
17 This matter came before the Court on Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel
18 Documents Withheld Under Deliberative Process Privilege. Having considered
19 Plaintiffs’ motion, Defendants’ opposition, and Plaintiffs’ reply, and the entire
20 record in the above-captioned matter, and being fully apprised of the matter, now,
21 therefore, it is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel Documents
22 Withheld Under Deliberative Process Privilege is GRANTED.

1 It is further ORDERED that Defendants shall produce all documents
2 withheld pursuant to the deliberative process privilege without redactions no later
3 than fourteen days from the date of this Order.

4 It is SO ORDERED.

5 ISSUED this _____ day of _____, 2020.

6
7
8 ROSANNA MALOUF PETERSON
United States District Judge

9 Presented by:

10 ROBERT W. FERGUSON
11 Attorney General of Washington

12 *s/ Spencer W. Coates*
JEFFREY T. SPRUNG, WSBA #23607
13 SPENCER W. COATES, WSBA #49683
PAUL M. CRISALLI, WSBA #40681
14 NATHAN K. BAYS, WSBA #43025
BRYAN M.S. OVENS, WSBA #32901
15 Assistant Attorneys General
800 Fifth Ave., Ste. 2000
16 Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 464-7744
17 Jeff.Sprung@atg.wa.gov
Joshua.Weissman@atg.wa.gov
18 Paul.Crisalli@atg.wa.gov
Nathan.Bays@atg.wa.gov
19 Bryan.Ovens@atg.wa.gov
Spencer.Coates@atg.wa.gov
20 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Washington*