

**IN THE 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

**JOINT STATUS REPORT**

In response to this Court's March 4, 2022, Paperless Order, ECF No. 162, the Parties file the following status report:<sup>1</sup>

The posture of the various cases challenging the Department of Homeland Security's now-vacated Public Charge Rule remains largely unchanged. As of Plaintiffs' most recent Status Report, ECF No. 159, the States of Texas, Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Ohio, Oklahoma, Mississippi, Montana, South Carolina, and West Virginia ("the States") were engaged in ongoing efforts to intervene in cases challenging the Public Charge rule that originated in the U.S. District for the Northern District of Illinois and district courts in the Ninth Circuit. Those efforts continue.

On August 17, 2021, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois denied the States' motion to intervene in the case before that court as well as their related motion for relief from judgment. *Cook County v. Mayorkas*, No. 19-cv-6334, ECF No. 285, 2021 WL

---

<sup>1</sup> The Parties have consulted with the Plaintiffs in *City of Gaithersburg v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security*, No. 8:19-cv-2851-PWG (D. Md.), who agree with the contents of this Status Report.

3633917 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 17, 2021). The States appealed that decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, and filed their opening brief on appeal on November 3, 2021. Appellees filed their brief on January 18, 2022; and the States filed their reply on March 10, 2022. The Seventh Circuit heard oral argument on April 13, 2022.

On February 23, 2022, the Supreme Court heard oral argument in *Arizona v. City & County of San Francisco*, Case No. 20-1775 (S. Ct. Oct. 29, 2021). A decision is expected by the end of June. In addition, on February 24, 2022, the Department of Homeland Security issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking which “would implement a different policy than” the public charge rule challenged here. 87 Fed. Reg. 10570. The comment period for that proposed rulemaking closed on April 25, 2022.

The Parties continue to anticipate that this case will be resolved expeditiously when the Department of Homeland Security issues its new rule concerning the public charge ground of inadmissibility, or if the States’ various efforts to intervene in the cases challenging the Public Charge Rule are denied. The Parties propose that they file another joint status report in 90 days, by August 31, 2022.

Dated: June 2, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Joseph W. Mead  
Mary B. McCord (D. Md. 21998)  
Joseph W. Mead (D. Md. 22335)  
Amy L. Marshak\*

INSTITUTE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ADVOCACY  
AND PROTECTION  
Georgetown University Law Center  
600 New Jersey Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 661-6607  
jm3468@georgetown.edu  
mbm7@georgetown.edu

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

*\*Admitted pro hac vice*

*/s//James L. Shea (by consent)*

James L. Shea #00142  
Baltimore City Solicitor  
Jane Lewis #20981  
Assistant Solicitor  
Baltimore City Department of Law  
City Hall, Room 109  
100 N. Holliday Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
(410) 396-0165  
james.shea@baltimorecity.gov  
jane.lewis@baltimorecity.gov

*Attorneys for Mayor and City Council of Baltimore*

BRIAN D. NETTER  
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

BRIGHAM BOWEN  
Assistant Branch Director

*/s//Joshua M. Kolsky (by consent)*

JOSHUA M. KOLSKY (D.C. Bar. No. 993430)  
KUNTAL V. CHOLERA  
Trial Attorneys  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
Washington, D.C. 20530  
Tel: (202) 305-7664 / Fax: (202) 616-8460  
Email: joshua.kolsky@usdoj.gov

*Attorneys for Defendants*