

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

CASA DE MARYLAND, INC., *et al.*

Plaintiffs,

v.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, in his official capacity as  
President of the United States, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 8:19-cv-2715-PWG

CITY OF GAITHERSBURG, MARYLAND,  
*et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

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

Defendants.

No. 8:19-cv-2851-PWG

**NOTICE**

On February 19, 2021, Defendants noted that “Defendant U.S. Department of Homeland Security [(“DHS”)] [was] reviewing the regulation that is the subject of this lawsuit.” Joint Status Rep. 2, ECF No. 137. The Parties proposed another joint status report by April 9, 2021, and reserved their rights to file intervening status reports. *Id.*

Accordingly, Defendants hereby notify the Court that, yesterday (March 9, 2021), DHS released a statement indicating that (i) it “has determined that continuing to defend the final rule, Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds . . . is neither in the public interest nor an efficient use of limited government resources,” (ii) the Department of Justice is no longer “pursu[ing] appellate review of judicial decisions invalidating or enjoining enforcement of the 2019 Rule,” and (iii) “[o]nce the previously entered judicial invalidation of the 2019 Rule becomes final, the 1999

interim field guidance on the public charge inadmissibility provision (i.e., the policy that was in place before the 2019 Rule) will apply.” *See* Ex. A.

Consistent with DHS’s statement, Defendants filed a motion to dismiss voluntarily its appeal of this Court’s preliminary injunction, ECF No. 68. *See* Unopposed Motion to Voluntarily Dismiss, No. 19-2222, ECF No. 210 (4th Cir. Mar. 9, 2021). Defendants filed a similar motion in the Seventh Circuit, which promptly granted the motion and dismissed the appeal in that court.

DHS then issued another statement, confirming that “[f]ollowing the Seventh Circuit dismissal,” the “final judgment from the Northern District of Illinois, which vacated the 2019 public charge rule, went into effect” and, “[a]s a result, the 1999 interim field guidance on the public charge inadmissibility provision (i.e., the policy that was in place before the 2019 public charge rule) is now in effect.” *See* Ex. B.

Dated: March 10, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN M. BOYNTON  
Acting Assistant Attorney General

BRIGHAM BOWEN  
Assistant Branch Director

/s/ Jason C. Lynch  
JASON C. LYNCH (D.C. Bar. No. 1016319)  
KERI L. BERMAN  
KUNTAL V. CHOLERA  
JOSHUA M. KOLSKY  
Trial Attorneys  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
Tel: (202) 514-1359 / Fax: (202) 616-8460  
Email: Jason.Lynch@usdoj.gov

*Attorneys for Defendants*

# **Exhibit A**



U.S. Department of  
Homeland Security

# DHS Statement on Litigation Related to the Public Charge Ground of Inadmissibility

**Release Date:** March 9, 2021

On February 2, 2021, the President issued Executive Order 14,012, directing the Secretary of Homeland Security to review the actions of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS or Department) related to the implementation of the public charge ground of inadmissibility. Consistent with the Executive Order, DHS has begun its review, as well as its consultation with other relevant agencies.

As part of its review, DHS has determined that continuing to defend the final rule, Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds, 84 Fed. Reg. 41,292 (Aug. 14, 2019) (2019 Rule), is neither in the public interest nor an efficient use of limited government resources. Consistent with that decision, the Department of Justice will no longer pursue appellate review of judicial decisions invalidating or enjoining enforcement of the 2019 Rule.

Once the previously entered judicial invalidation of the 2019 Rule becomes final, the 1999 interim field guidance (<https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/1999/05/26/99-13202/field-guidance-on-deportability-and-inadmissibility-on-public-charge-grounds>) on the public charge inadmissibility provision (i.e., the policy that was in place before the 2019 Rule) will apply. Under the 1999 interim field guidance, DHS will not consider a person's receipt of Medicaid (except for Medicaid for long-term institutionalization), public housing, or Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits as part of the public charge inadmissibility determination. In addition, medical treatment or preventive services for COVID-19, including vaccines, will not be considered for public charge purposes.

DHS and USCIS will provide additional updates regarding the administration of the public charge ground of inadmissibility, including announcing when DHS will cease applying the 2019 Rule.

For more information on equal access to vaccines and vaccine distribution sites specifically, please see DHS's February 1 statement (<https://www.dhs.gov/news/2021/02/01/dhs-statement-equal-access-covid-19-vaccines-and-vaccine-distribution-sites>) on that subject.

Keywords: Immigration Reform (</keywords/immigration-reform>).

Last Published Date: March 9, 2021

# **Exhibit B**



U.S. Department of  
Homeland Security

# DHS Secretary Statement on the 2019 Public Charge Rule

**Release Date:** March 9, 2021

Today, DHS Secretary Alejandro N. Mayorkas announced that the government will no longer defend the 2019 public charge rule as doing so is neither in the public interest nor an efficient use of limited government resources.

“The 2019 public charge rule was not in keeping with our nation’s values. It penalized those who access health benefits and other government services available to them,” said Secretary of Homeland Security Alejandro N. Mayorkas. “Consistent with the President’s vision, we will continue to implement reforms that improve our legal immigration system.”

President Biden’s Executive Order on Restoring Faith in Our Legal Immigration Systems and Strengthening Integration and Inclusion Efforts for New Americans called for an immediate review of agency actions on public charge inadmissibility and deportability. DHS’s review, in consultation with the Departments of Justice and State and the federal benefits-granting agencies, is ongoing.

As discussed in DHS’s [litigation statement \(http://www.dhs.gov/news/2021/03/09/dhs-statement-litigation-related-public-charge-ground-inadmissibility\)](http://www.dhs.gov/news/2021/03/09/dhs-statement-litigation-related-public-charge-ground-inadmissibility), and consistent with the government’s decision not to defend the rule, the Department of Justice is no longer pursuing appellate review of judicial decisions invalidating or enjoining enforcement of the 2019 public charge rule. Today, the Department of Justice dismissed its pending appeals in the Supreme Court and Seventh Circuit, and is in the process of doing so in the Fourth Circuit. Following the Seventh Circuit dismissal this afternoon, the final judgment from the Northern District of Illinois, which vacated the 2019 public charge rule, went into effect. As a result, the 1999 interim field guidance on the public charge inadmissibility provision (i.e., the policy that was in place before the 2019 public charge rule) is now in effect.

Topics: [Citizenship and Immigration Services \(/topics/immigration-and-citizenship-services\)](/topics/immigration-and-citizenship-services), [Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman \(/topics/citizenship-and-immigration-services-ombudsman\)](/topics/citizenship-and-immigration-services-ombudsman), [Homeland Security Enterprise](#)

[\(/topics/homeland-security-enterprise\)](#), [Secretary of Homeland Security \(/topics/secretary-homeland-security\)](#).

Keywords: [Immigration \(/keywords/immigration\)](#).

Last Published Date: March 9, 2021