

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

MARTÍN JONATHAN BATALLA
VIDAL, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CHAD F. WOLF, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 16-cv-4756 (NGG) (VMS)

STATE OF NEW YORK, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DONALD TRUMP, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 17-cv-5228 (NGG) (VMS)

JOINT STATUS REPORT

Pursuant to the Court's December 4, 2020 order in the above-captioned matters, *Batalla Vidal* ECF No. 354, the parties, having conferred, jointly submit the following status report. As explained more detail below, the parties agree in part and disagree in part on the scope of any appropriate additional remedies in these matters.

The Parties' Agreements

Before and after the Court's December 4, 2020 Order, the parties have been negotiating and conferring on the subject of the appropriate remedies in light of the current status of this litigation. In addition to the various forms of relief that the Court has already ordered—that is, (1) vacatur of the Wolf Memorandum; (2) prominent notice of the Court's order and Defendants'

immediate changes to the DACA policy on government websites, *see Batalla Vidal* ECF No. 355; and (3) a January 4, 2021 deadline for a status report from Defendants including a variety of statistical information—the parties have now reached the following additional agreements¹:

1. Defendants will send individualized paper notice to all relevant class members that their current period of deferred action under DACA has now been extended from one year to two years.
2. Defendants will send individualized paper notice to all relevant class members that their existing one-year employment authorization documents (EADs) have now been extended by DHS/USCIS to two years. These notices could be presented to an employer as definitive evidence of the extension of the validity period of the EADs. These notices would also be specific to each individual, and also specifically note that they are to be accepted for I-9 verification.
3. Defendants will send individualized paper notice to all relevant class members whose first-time requests for consideration of deferred action under DACA were received at a USCIS lockbox on or after June 30, 2020, and were rejected pursuant to the Wolf Memorandum.
4. Defendants will send individualized paper notice to all relevant class members whose DACA-based applications for an advance parole document were received at a USCIS lockbox on or after June 30, 2020, and were rejected pursuant to the Wolf Memorandum.
5. Defendants will publish and distribute guidance—available to the general public, state and federal agencies, and employers—about the significance of these changes, including instructions to employers for completing Form I-9, Employment Eligibility Verification, when presented with these automatically extended EADs. This guidance will also make clear that these automatically extended EADs should be treated as having a two-year expiration date for all purposes for which such EADs are considered, including when verifying eligibility for state services or benefits.

¹ As set forth in greater detail below, despite their best efforts to reach a full negotiated resolution of these matters, the parties disagree with respect to the appropriate timing of these remedial tasks.

Should any additional remedial disputes arise in the future, the parties will first meet and confer in an attempt to resolve them without the need for judicial involvement. Notwithstanding these agreements, however, all parties reserve their right to seek any appropriate relief in the future. In particular, Defendants reserve their right to seek appellate relief and an accompanying stay, if appropriate. And Plaintiffs reserve their right to request “further remedies if they become necessary,” given that the Court has “retain[ed] jurisdiction of this matter for purposes of construction, modification, and enforcement of” the Court’s December 4, 2020 remedial order. *Batalla Vidal* ECF No. 354.

In addition, the parties set forth the following additional subjects on which, despite their best efforts, they were unable to reach agreement.²

Plaintiffs’ Position

The parties disagree regarding three points related to the agreed relief identified in this joint status report: the timing for Defendants to provide the notices described above; Plaintiffs’ ability to review and comment on those documents before they are finalized; and whether Defendants should mail new EADs to class members before the current EADs expire. As described below, Plaintiffs believe that as to these three points, the additional relief they seek is necessary and narrowly tailored to cure Defendants’ unlawful conduct, effectuate the Court’s prior orders, and put class members in the same position they would have been in had their EADs been lawfully issued with the correct two-year term in the first place. Plaintiffs look forward to discussing these points with the Court and Defendants’ counsel at the status conference tomorrow.

1. Defendants should send notices to class members by December 31, 2020. The parties disagree about the meaning of the Court’s December 4, 2020 order stating that “[t]he government is DIRECTED to prepare to provide mailed notice to all class members by December 31, 2020.”

² See Ex. 1, Meet-and-Confer Email Chain.

Plaintiffs' position is that the Court's order requires that notices be mailed by December 31, 2020, rather than merely taking steps to mail a notice at a future date.

2. Content of the notices for class members. Plaintiffs request that the Court order the parties to meet and confer on the text of the notice(s) to be sent by Defendants to class members as required by the Court's December 4 Order and parties agreements in paragraphs 1-4 above. If the parties are unable to reach agreement, they should advise the court of their positions on the content of the notice(s) by December 21, 2020. Moreover, in the experience of undersigned counsel, it is common for the federal government to negotiate with class counsel about the content of the notices it will provide to affected class members. *See, e.g., Darweesh v. Trump*, No.17 -cv-480-CBA-LB (E.D.N.Y Sept. 1, 2017), ECF No. 218-1.

3. New EADs and Notices are Necessary to Make Class Members whole.

In order to make whole the class members who received a one-year EAD rather than a two-year EAD and in the position they would have been absent Defendants' unlawful issuance of the Wolf Memo, Plaintiffs need two things: (a) proof within a short time frame that their EADs have been extended from one year to two, and (b) physical EAD cards reflecting the extension of their EAD validity period to two years. As Plaintiffs noted in their previous submissions, "EADs are the primary form of government identification for DACA recipients," and are used for a variety of purposes, from showing work authorization, to demonstrating that a drivers' license remains valid in certain states, and other critical employment and governmental purposes. Plaintiffs' Joint Reply Mot. for Partial Summary J., Dkt. 353 (Dec. 4, 2020). A paper notice that does not have a photo ID and other hallmarks of an official ID simply does not replace the value a physical EAD card. Plaintiffs recognize that provision of physical EAD cards will take some time. Thus, Plaintiffs believe that more immediate provision of proof that an individuals' EAD has been extended from one year to two is critical. *See e.g., Suppl. Decl. Batalla Vidal*, Dkt. 309-5, Ex. D. Plaintiffs proposed several potential options with the aim of satisfying class members' need for timely proof that their EADs are valid for two years and for physical EAD cards while ameliorating the

government's concerns about fraud, but the parties were unable to reach agreement by the time of filing.

For these reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court (1) adopt the parties' agreement, set forth above; (2) direct Defendants to issue a notice that EADs were extended from one year to two years and to issue a physical EAD card valid for the extended year; (3) clarify that the deadline for Defendants to send the notice(s), pursuant to the Court's December 4 Order, is December 31, 2020; and (4) order the parties to meet and confer on the text of the notice(s) to be sent by Defendants to class members as required by the Court's December 4 Order and, if unable to reach agreement, to notify the court of their positions by December 21, 2020.

Defendants' Position

Despite significant logistical challenges, and despite the settled principle that there is no legal obligation to provide *any* form of individualized notice to members of a class certified under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(2), *see Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, 564 U.S. 338, 362 (2011), Defendants have agreed, nearly verbatim, to nearly all of Plaintiffs' requests—and certainly to all of the most significant ones. What Defendants have already agreed to above would provide complete relief (and more) to members of the class, and Defendants believe it could be accomplished—albeit through significant burden and expense—no later than 30 days from today. The Court should therefore accept the parties' proposal above, set a deadline of January 8, 2021, and reject Plaintiffs' remaining proposals. Defendants address each area of disagreement in greater detail below, and will be prepared to discuss these topics at tomorrow's status conference.

1. Timing. With respect to the precise timing of the five remedial steps outlined above, on which the parties have otherwise reached full agreement, Defendants regret that it has become necessary to present the Court with a dispute over whether such notice and guidance be issued within 30 days (*i.e.*, by January 8), rather than issued within 22 days (*i.e.*, by December 31). Plaintiffs originally proposed a 30-day deadline for notice to be provided to class members whose initial DACA requests or applications for advance parole had been rejected pursuant to the Wolf

Memorandum—only to change course on filing day, and propose that *all* notice-related tasks be accomplished by December 31. *See* Ex. 1. Thirty days is already an extraordinarily short timeline to send individualized, hard-copy paper notice through the U.S. mail to tens of thousands of individuals, and Defendants have grave concerns about their actual ability to accomplish all of these tasks before December 31. Defendants, however, believe that they *can* do so by January 8, absent any unexpected challenges. Accordingly, Defendants respectfully request that the Court set January 8 as the deadline for the agreed-upon tasks above, rather than December 31.³

2. Sharing deliberative drafts with opposing counsel. Plaintiffs' counsel have requested an opportunity to review Defendants' draft notices in advance of finalizing and sending them through the mail. There is no legal basis for this request, and it raises significant institutional concerns for Defendants. Among other reasons, such drafts are likely to be subject to one or more privileges. For obvious reasons, as a general matter, neither the Department of Justice nor the Department of Homeland Security would typically share deliberative drafts outside the federal government, and this case presents no compelling reason for an exception to that reasonable position. Defendants have already agreed to the content of the notices (as detailed above), so Plaintiffs already know, in substance, what these notices are going to say. In the (presumably unlikely) event that Plaintiffs are dissatisfied with the final form of the notice language, they can raise any issues with the Government, and present any irreconcilable disputes to the Court, in the normal course.

In addition, Plaintiffs' proposal would necessarily create additional delay. Defendants' proposed 30-day timeline assumes that the notice language is finalized immediately. Defendants have *already* prepared a draft, in order to expedite this process as greatly as possible. If Defendants were ordered to share that draft with Plaintiffs, and solicit comments and feedback from Plaintiffs,

³ Although the Court referenced December 31, 2020 in its December 4, 2020 Order—which was issued without the benefit of the parties' positions on this timing nuance, and before the parties reached the significant agreements set forth above—Defendants do not read that language as actually setting a deadline of December 31, 2020. And for the reasons stated in this document, January 8, 2021 is a more appropriate deadline.

it will necessarily slow this process down, with little or no corresponding benefit, and further jeopardize Defendants' ability to complete these logistically challenging tasks by January 8 (let alone by December 31).

3. Issuing multiple forms of Employment Authorization Document (EAD) extension documents to the same individual. Defendants have agreed that within 30 days, they will send individualized notice to every relevant class member that their 1-year EADs have been extended to 2-year durations. Per the parties' agreement, this notice "could be presented to an employer as definitive evidence of the extension of the validity period of the EADs," "would also be specific to each individual," and would "specifically note that they are to be accepted for I-9 verification." With respect to their authorization to work in this country—and to provide definitive evidence of that authorization to current or future employers or prospective employers—this agreement provides Plaintiffs with complete relief.

Nevertheless, Plaintiffs also ask that Defendants take the additional step of sending those same class members actual updated EAD cards, reflecting the two-year duration (that is, in *addition* to the individualized notice that their existing 1-year authorization has now been extended to two years). For the reasons above, that step is unnecessary, as a legal matter—it would accomplish nothing beyond the proposal to which Defendants have already agreed. And Defendants' agreement—originally proposed by Defendants—that the agency will also publish and distribute guidance regarding the validity of these extended EADs addresses any concern that other entities (such as private employers, or state agencies) will behave improperly by failing to treat the extended EADs as they should be treated.

In addition, and perhaps most importantly, Plaintiffs' proposal creates a significant risk of fraud. DHS and USCIS, whenever possible, avoid issuing multiple identity or verification documents to the same individual that are valid for the same (or partially overlapping) periods, because doing so necessarily creates a significant risk of fraud. Issuing the same person (1) an individualized notice that their existing one-year EAD has been extended to two years, and (2) an updated EAD card that is also valid for two years, creates an opportunity for security and fraud

risks that Defendants are not willing to accept—particularly where, as here, that risk is entirely unnecessary.⁴

* * *

For these reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court (1) adopt the parties' agreement, set forth above; (2) set the deadline for Defendants to complete these tasks as January 8, 2021, rather than December 31, 2020; and (3) reject Plaintiffs' remaining requests for relief.

⁴ In the event that the Court does order Defendants to provide updated EAD cards in addition to the individualized notices it has already agreed to, it should set the deadline for doing so no earlier than nine months into their current validity periods. Such documents would only be beneficial to Plaintiffs (if ever) when the original one-year terms expired.

Dated: December 9, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFREY BOSSERT CLARK
Acting Assistant Attorney General

SETH D. DUCHARME
Acting United States Attorney

BRAD P. ROSENBERG
Assistant Branch Director

/s/ Stephen M. Pezzi
GALEN N. THORP
Senior Trial Counsel
STEPHEN M. PEZZI
RACHAEL L. WESTMORELAND
Trial Attorneys
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
1100 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 305-8576
Fax: (202) 616-8470
Email: stephen.pezzi@usdoj.gov

JOSEPH A. MARUTOLLO
Assistant U.S. Attorney
United States Attorney's Office
Eastern District of New York
271-A Cadman Plaza East, 7th Floor
Brooklyn, NY 11201
Phone: (718) 254-6288
Fax: (718) 254-7489
Email: joseph.marutollo@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendants

/s/ Mayra B. Joachin

Camila Bustos, Law Student Intern*
Armando Ghinaglia, Law Student Intern
Angie Liao, Law Student Intern*
Edgar A. Melgar, Law Student Intern*
Medha Swaminathan, Law Student Intern*
Ramis Wadood, Law Student Intern
Muneer I. Ahmad, Esq. (MA 9360)
Marisol Orihuela, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)
Michael J. Wishnie, Esq. (MW 1952)
JEROME N. FRANK LEGAL SERVICES ORG.
P.O. Box 209090
New Haven, CT 06520
(203) 432-4800

Mayra B. Joachin, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)
Araceli Martínez-Olguín, Esq. (AM 2927)
NATIONAL IMMIGRATION LAW CENTER
3450 Wilshire Blvd. #108-62
Los Angeles, CA 90010
(213) 639-3900
joachin@nilc.org

Trudy S. Rebert, Esq. (TR 6959)
NATIONAL IMMIGRATION LAW CENTER
P.O. Box 721361
Jackson Heights, NY 11372
(646) 867-8793

Karen C. Tumlin, Esq. (*pro hac vice*)
Cooperating Attorney
JEROME N. FRANK LEGAL SERVICES ORG.
P.O. Box 209090
New Haven, CT 06520
(323) 316-0944

Paige Austin, Esq. (PA 9075)
MAKE THE ROAD NEW YORK
301 Grove Street
Brooklyn, NY 11237
(718) 418-7690

* Motion for law student appearance
forthcoming

Attorneys for Batalla Vidal, et al., Plaintiffs

LETITIA JAMES

Attorney General of the State of New York

By: /s/ Matthew Colangelo

Matthew Colangelo,

Chief Counsel for Federal Initiatives

Sania Khan, Assistant Attorney General

Joseph Wardenski, Senior Trial Counsel

Office of the New York State Attorney

General

28 Liberty Street

New York, NY 10005

Matthew.Colangelo@ag.ny.gov

Tel. (212) 416-6057

Fax (212) 416-6007

Attorneys for State of New York Plaintiffs

Pezzi, Stephen (CIV)

From: Pezzi, Stephen (CIV)
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2020 3:05 PM
To: Araceli Martínez-Olguín
Cc: 'Colangelo, Matthew'; Karen Tumlin
Subject: RE: EDNY DACA - Draft Joint Status Report

Thanks very much for the call. To confirm, per our call, we have agreed that Defendants will not be preparing a Federal Register notice on these subjects, and thus neither side will address that issue in our respective drafts.

Stephen M. Pezzi

Trial Attorney
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division - Federal Programs Branch
1100 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 305-8576 | stephen.pezzi@usdoj.gov

From: Pezzi, Stephen (CIV)
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2020 2:56 PM
To: Araceli Martínez-Olguín <martinez-olguin@nilc.org>
Subject: RE: EDNY DACA - Draft Joint Status Report

Araceli – could you call me quickly at the number below? Just wanted to clarify something briefly.

Stephen M. Pezzi

Trial Attorney
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division - Federal Programs Branch
1100 L Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 305-8576 | stephen.pezzi@usdoj.gov

From: Araceli Martínez-Olguín <martinez-olguin@nilc.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2020 12:49 PM
To: Pezzi, Stephen (CIV) <spezzi@CIV.USDOJ.GOV>; 'Colangelo, Matthew' <Matthew.Colangelo@ag.ny.gov>; 'Muneer Ahmad' <muneer.ahmad@ylsclinics.org>; karen.tumlin@justiceactioncenter.org; 'Khan, Sania' <Sania.Khan@ag.ny.gov>; 'Wardenski, Joseph' <Joseph.Wardenski@ag.ny.gov>; 'Finkelstein, Alex' <Alex.Finkelstein@ag.ny.gov>; 'Dasgupta, Anisha' <Anisha.Dasgupta@ag.ny.gov>; batallavidal_Iso@mailman.yale.edu; 'Parker, Joshua' <Joshua.Parker@ag.ny.gov>; 'Jessica Young' <jessica.young@maketheroadny.org>; Mayra Joachin <Joachin@nilc.org>; Trudy Rebert <rebert@nilc.org>; Batalla <Batalla@nilc.org>; batalla@maketheroadny.org
Cc: Rosenberg, Brad (CIV) <BRosenbe@civ.usdoj.gov>; Westmoreland, Rachael (CIV) <rwestmor@CIV.USDOJ.GOV>; Thorp, Galen (CIV) <GThorp@civ.usdoj.gov>; Marutollo, Joseph (USANYE) <JMarutollo@usa.doj.gov>; Early, Cormac A. (CIV) <cearly@CIV.USDOJ.GOV>
Subject: RE: EDNY DACA - Draft Joint Status Report

Yes, we are happy to speak at 1:30pm, and we can use this conference line.

(267) 930-4000,,274923685#

Araceli Martínez-Olguín | Supervising Attorney

(pronouns: she/hers/ella)

National Immigration Law Center

t: 213.797.7420 | f: 213.639.3911 | e: martinez-olguin@nilc.org

From: Pezzi, Stephen (CIV) <Stephen.Pezzi@usdoj.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, December 9, 2020 9:38 AM

To: Araceli Martínez-Olguín <martinez-olguin@nilc.org>; 'Colangelo, Matthew' <Matthew.Colangelo@ag.ny.gov>; 'Muneer Ahmad' <muneer.ahmad@ylsclinics.org>; karen.tumlin@justiceactioncenter.org; 'Khan, Sania' <Sania.Khan@ag.ny.gov>; 'Wardenski, Joseph' <Joseph.Wardenski@ag.ny.gov>; 'Finkelstein, Alex' <Alex.Finkelstein@ag.ny.gov>; 'Dasgupta, Anisha' <Anisha.Dasgupta@ag.ny.gov>; batallavidal_Iso@mailman.yale.edu; 'Parker, Joshua' <Joshua.Parker@ag.ny.gov>; 'Jessica Young' <jessica.young@maketheroadny.org>; Mayra Joachin <Joachin@nilc.org>; Trudy Rebert <rebert@nilc.org>; Batalla <Batalla@nilc.org>; batalla@maketheroadny.org

Cc: Rosenberg, Brad (CIV) <Brad.Rosenberg@usdoj.gov>; Westmoreland, Rachael (CIV) <Rachael.Westmoreland@usdoj.gov>; Thorp, Galen (CIV) <Galen.Thorp@usdoj.gov>; Marutollo, Joseph (USANYE) <Joseph.Marutollo@usdoj.gov>; Early, Cormac A. (CIV) <Cormac.A.Early@usdoj.gov>

Subject: RE: EDNY DACA - Draft Joint Status Report

Are you available at 1:30 PM to discuss further? If so, can you please circulate a dial in?

Stephen M. Pezzi

Trial Attorney

United States Department of Justice

Civil Division - Federal Programs Branch

1100 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20005

(202) 305-8576 | stephen.pezzi@usdoj.gov

From: Araceli Martínez-Olguín <martinez-olguin@nilc.org>

Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2020 11:59 AM

To: Pezzi, Stephen (CIV) <spezzi@CIV.USDOJ.GOV>; 'Colangelo, Matthew' <Matthew.Colangelo@ag.ny.gov>; 'Muneer Ahmad' <muneer.ahmad@ylsclinics.org>; karen.tumlin@justiceactioncenter.org; 'Khan, Sania' <Sania.Khan@ag.ny.gov>; 'Wardenski, Joseph' <Joseph.Wardenski@ag.ny.gov>; 'Finkelstein, Alex' <Alex.Finkelstein@ag.ny.gov>; 'Dasgupta, Anisha' <Anisha.Dasgupta@ag.ny.gov>; batallavidal_Iso@mailman.yale.edu; 'Parker, Joshua' <Joshua.Parker@ag.ny.gov>; 'Jessica Young' <jessica.young@maketheroadny.org>; Mayra Joachin <Joachin@nilc.org>; Trudy Rebert <rebert@nilc.org>; Batalla <Batalla@nilc.org>; batalla@maketheroadny.org

Cc: Rosenberg, Brad (CIV) <BRosenbe@civ.usdoj.gov>; Westmoreland, Rachael (CIV) <rwestmor@CIV.USDOJ.GOV>; Thorp, Galen (CIV) <GThorp@civ.usdoj.gov>; Marutollo, Joseph (USANYE) <JMarutollo@usa.doj.gov>; Early, Cormac A. (CIV) <cearly@CIV.USDOJ.GOV>

Subject: RE: EDNY DACA - Draft Joint Status Report

Counsel,

Thank you for this email and draft of the joint status report. We think this is a good start but would benefit from discussion regarding a few open issues – we can talk any time before 3pm and look forward to resolving these issues with you.

1. We appreciate that paras. 2 and 5 of your draft would provide near-term notice to class members that their one-year EADs have now been extended to two years, as well as public guidance regarding the validity of these extended EADs. But as we have indicated on our prior calls, it is essential for affected class members that they also be issued new

EADs; a one-year EAD plus a slip of paper from DHS is an appropriate near-term solution to the unlawful issuance of one-year EADs, but does not put class members in the same position as if the EADs had been lawfully issued with the proper two-year term at the outset. We are mindful of your fraud concerns and therefore propose that the second EAD be valid from a date one day after expiration of the current EAD. We also note that is consistent with agency practice to issue second DACA EADs for overlapping periods of time to individuals adjusting status. The following language to be added to the joint status report would address this issue:

<< No later than one month before the expiration of their current EADs, all relevant class members will be issued and mailed new EADs which are valid from the day after their current EAD expires and valid for the duration of their current EAD. >>

2. You originally proposed that notice of the extension of one-year EADs be accomplished by publication in the Federal Register, but later advised us that you would not agree to proceed by Federal Register notice. We note that in today's Federal Register, DHS in fact published a notice automatically extending the validity of certain TPS documentation, including EADs. See 85 Fed. Reg. 79,208 (Dec. 9, 2020), at <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2020-12-09/pdf/2020-27154.pdf>. In light of the agency's decision to proceed by Federal Register notice just today on what appears to be a similar issue, we'd like to revisit proceeding by Federal Register notice in this case. Doing so would provide more appropriate relief to the class, could replace paras. 2 and 5 in your draft joint status report, and does not seem to present any practical problems to the agency.

3. We would like an opportunity to review the documents Defendants would be required to draft pursuant to paras. 1 to 4 in your draft joint status report, and propose to include the following language: << No later than December 18, 2020, Defendants will produce to class counsel the proposed notice(s) referenced in agreements 1-4. Class counsel will provide Defendants their feedback within two days of receiving the proposed notice(s). >>

4. Paragraph 5 in your draft requires Defendants to prepare guidance "informing the general public and employers about the significance of these changes, and employers' legal obligations as to respecting the validity of these extended EADs." As we have discussed with you, EADs are also used by class members for purposes other than I-9 verification, including to apply for driver licenses or non-driver identification cards. We propose that para. 5 be revised to indicate that Defendants' guidance (or the Federal Register notice) will also make clear that extended EADs should be treated as valid two-year EADs for all purposes for which EADs are used, including when verifying eligibility for state services or benefits.

5. Your draft proposes that Defendants send notice to class members by January 8, 2021. As we discussed on our meet-and-confer, we read the Court's Dec. 4 Order as directing Defendants to be prepared "to provide mailed notice to all class members by December 31, 2020." Given that the Court has already considered the timing question, and given the importance of providing class members with appropriate notice as soon as possible, we are not in position to agree to extend the Court-ordered deadline by eight days.

As noted, we can make ourselves available at any time before 3pm to discuss.

Thank you,
Araceli

Araceli Martínez-Olguín | Supervising Attorney

(pronouns: she/hers/ella)

National Immigration Law Center

t: 213.797.7420 | f: 213.639.3911 | e: martinez-olguin@nilc.org

From: Pezzi, Stephen (CIV) <Stephen.Pezzi@usdoj.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, December 8, 2020 2:46 PM

To: Araceli Martínez-Olguín <martinez-olguin@nilc.org>; 'Colangelo, Matthew' <Matthew.Colangelo@ag.ny.gov>;

'Muneer Ahmad' <muneer.ahmad@ylsclinics.org>; karen.tumlin@justiceactioncenter.org; 'Khan, Sania' <Sania.Khan@ag.ny.gov>; 'Wardenski, Joseph' <Joseph.Wardenski@ag.ny.gov>; 'Finkelstein, Alex' <Alex.Finkelstein@ag.ny.gov>; 'Dasgupta, Anisha' <Anisha.Dasgupta@ag.ny.gov>; batallavidal_Iso@mailman.yale.edu; 'Parker, Joshua' <Joshua.Parker@ag.ny.gov>; 'Jessica Young' <jessica.young@maketheroadny.org>; Mayra Joachin <Joachin@nilc.org>; Trudy Rebert <rebert@nilc.org>; Batalla <Batalla@nilc.org>; batalla@maketheroadny.org
Cc: Rosenberg, Brad (CIV) <Brad.Rosenberg@usdoj.gov>; Westmoreland, Rachael (CIV) <Rachael.Westmoreland@usdoj.gov>; Thorp, Galen (CIV) <Galen.Thorp@usdoj.gov>; Marutollo, Joseph (USANYE) <Joseph.Marutollo@usdoj.gov>; Early, Cormac A. (CIV) <Cormac.A.Early@usdoj.gov>
Subject: EDNY DACA - Draft Joint Status Report

Counsel,

Per our phone conversation yesterday morning, as promised, attached is a draft of a joint status report in the above-captioned matters. As you know, this is due tomorrow at 5 PM. (I have a conflict starting tomorrow at 4 PM, so I am hopeful that we can wrap this up well before 4 PM tomorrow, if at all possible.)

I am pleased to report that Defendants have agreed to the vast majority of Plaintiffs' proposals, as well as Plaintiffs' proposed timelines (30 days). This was no small task, particularly given the timing. To be clear, this includes not only the subject of extending the validity of 1-year DACA/EADs to two years, but also sending notice to other members of the class, who had their first-time requests for DACA (or requests for advance parole) rejected, pursuant to the Wolf Memorandum, on or after June 30, 2020. We have also proposed new language about the agency's willingness to publish and distribute guidance to the general public and to employers specifically, to ensure that everyone is aware of these changes, and in particular to ensure that employers are aware of their obligations to respect the validity of these documents.

My understanding is that the only subject on which we have not fully agreed to your latest round of proposals is the subject of actually clawing back and replacing the existing, physical copies of 1-year EAD documents with new 2-year EAD documents (rather than mailing notice that the validity of each existing 1-year EAD has been extended, in a manner that could be presented to employers as definitive and formal proof of the extension). For some of the reasons already discussed, as well as additional reasons I am happy to discuss further if you would like, the agency continues to have significant concerns about that proposal—not just because of cost and burden, but also because of unavoidable fraud and security risks necessarily created by the existence of multiple EAD documents for a single individual being out there in the world. In addition, and perhaps most importantly, the agency's proposal, as reflected in this draft, would provide complete relief, and would (to my knowledge) accomplish everything that actually issuing new EADs would accomplish (without the added risk of fraud, burden, and expense). For those reasons, we are hopeful that this proposal will meet everyone's goals, and we very much look forward to hearing from you about it.

Please see the document itself for additional detail, and a more definitive and comprehensive description of our proposed agreement. To the extent you perceive any daylight between this email summary and the actual draft language attached to this email, you should rely on the actual draft. (To be clear, no such daylight is intended.)

I look forward to hearing from you as soon as possible. I am hopeful we can file this (or something very similar to this) tomorrow, without much further ado, but if there are lingering areas of disagreement, please let me know as soon as you can, so we can (hopefully) resolve them before tomorrow afternoon (or decide that we cannot resolve them, such that some separate drafting is necessary). As you'll also see in the draft, our proposed language also leaves open the possibility that, if necessary, Plaintiffs could seek additional relief later. So even if there are some lingering concerns, perhaps we can agree to disagree on those for now, get this on file, and then defer those conversations to another day.

In any case, I am available to discuss at your earliest convenience. You have my phone number (below), which forwards to my cell phone. Don't hesitate to reach out at any time in the next 24 hours, including late tonight or early tomorrow morning.

Best regards,

Stephen M. Pezzi

Trial Attorney

United States Department of Justice

Civil Division - Federal Programs Branch

1100 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20005

(202) 305-8576 | stephen.pezzi@usdoj.gov