

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 21-5200**September Term, 2021****1:21-cv-00100-EGS****Filed On:** September 30, 2021

Nancy Gimena Huisha-Huisha, and her minor
child, et al.,

Appellees

v.

Alejandro N. Mayorkas, Secretary of
Homeland Security, in his official capacity, et
al.,

Appellants

BEFORE: Rogers, Millett, and Katsas, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the motion for stay pending appeal and for an administrative stay pending disposition of the stay motion, the opposition thereto, the reply, the request for an administrative stay of no less than seven days in the event that a stay pending appeal is denied, the motions for leave to file amicus briefs in opposition to a stay, and the lodged amicus briefs, it is

ORDERED that the motions for leave to file amicus briefs in opposition to a stay be denied. However, these movants may file briefs as amicus curiae at the merits stage. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for stay pending appeal be granted. Appellants have satisfied the stringent requirements for a stay pending appeal. See Nken v. Holder, 556 U.S. 418, 434 (2009); D.C. Circuit Handbook of Practice and Internal Procedures 33 (2021). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion and request for administrative stays be dismissed as moot. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the following briefing schedule will apply in this case:

Brief of Appellants

October 21, 2021

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 21-5200**September Term, 2021**

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Appendix | October 21, 2021 |
| Briefs of Amici Curiae Supporting Appellants, if any | October 28, 2021 |
| Brief of Appellees | November 12, 2021 |
| Briefs of Amici Curiae Supporting Appellees, if any | November 19, 2021 |
| Reply Brief of Appellants | November 29, 2021 |

The Clerk is directed to calendar this case for argument in January 2022. The parties will be informed later of the date of oral argument and the composition of the merits panel.

All issues and arguments must be raised by appellants in the opening brief. The court ordinarily will not consider issues and arguments raised for the first time in the reply brief.

To enhance the clarity of their briefs, the parties are urged to limit the use of abbreviations, including acronyms. While acronyms may be used for entities and statutes with widely recognized initials, briefs should not contain acronyms that are not widely known. See D.C. Circuit Handbook of Practice and Internal Procedures 43 (2021); Notice Regarding Use of Acronyms (D.C. Cir. Jan. 26, 2010).

Parties are strongly encouraged to hand deliver the paper copies of their briefs to the Clerk's office on the date due. Filing by mail may delay the processing of the brief. Additionally, counsel are reminded that if filing by mail, they must use a class of mail that is at least as expeditious as first-class mail. See Fed. R. App. P. 25(a). All briefs and appendices must contain the date that the case is scheduled for oral argument at the top of the cover. See D.C. Cir. Rule 28(a)(8).

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:
Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/
Laura Chipley
Deputy Clerk

United States Court of Appeals

District of Columbia Circuit
Washington, D.C. 20001-2866

Mark J. Langer
Clerk

(202) 216-7300

Dear Counsel:

The court's policy on the use of acronyms is stated in the Circuit's Handbook of Practice and Procedures, § IX.A.8(d), and the public notice issued January 26, 2010, which is posted on the court's web site. Parties are expected to limit the use of acronyms and to avoid using acronyms that are not widely known.

Upon review of the brief(s) recently filed in this case, the Clerk's Office has found that the text contains numerous acronyms and other abbreviations. Therefore, you are advised to reexamine the brief(s) to ensure conformity with the court's policy. Within 7 days of the docketing of this letter, you may submit a revised brief that eliminates any uncommon acronyms used in the previously filed brief. **If a revised brief or briefs are not submitted, the merits panel assigned to this case will be informed that counsel failed to respond to this letter.** The word limit governing the previously filed brief also applies to the revised brief. For any briefs yet to be filed, the current schedule remains in effect.

Failure to comply with the court's policy may result in an order directing the submission of a conforming brief. See, e.g., CSX Transp., Inc. v. Surface Transp. Board, No. 13-1230 (D.C. Cir. Mar. 25, 2014) (ordering briefs that eliminate uncommon acronyms used in previously filed final briefs, due Mar. 28, 2014); Illinois Public Telecomms. Ass'n v. FCC, No. 13-1059 (D.C. Cir. Mar. 25, 2014) (ordering briefs that eliminate uncommon acronyms used in previously filed final briefs, due Mar. 27, 2014).

If you have any questions concerning this letter, please call Alison Grossman, Special Counsel to the Clerk, at (202) 216-7317.

Sincerely,

/s/

Mark J. Langer, Clerk