

No.

In the Supreme Court of the United States

KIRSTJEN M. NIELSEN, SECRETARY OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, ET AL., PETITIONERS

v.

MARTIN JONATHAN BATALLA VIDAL, ET AL.

*ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
BEFORE JUDGMENT TO THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT*

**APPENDIX TO THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF
CERTIORARI BEFORE JUDGMENT**

NOEL J. FRANCISCO
*Solicitor General
Counsel of Record*

JOSEPH H. HUNT
Assistant Attorney General

JEFFREY B. WALL
Deputy Solicitor General

HASHIM M. MOOPPAN
*Deputy Assistant Attorney
General*

JONATHAN Y. ELLIS
*Assistant to the Solicitor
General*

MARK B. STERN
ABBY C. WRIGHT
THOMAS PULHAM
*Attorneys
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
SupremeCtBriefs@usdoj.gov
(202) 514-2217*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Appendix A — District court memorandum and order (Nov. 9, 2017)	1a
Appendix B — Notice of appeal (Jan. 8, 2018).....	59a
Appendix C — District court amended memorandum & order & preliminary injunction (Feb. 13, 2018).....	62a
Appendix D — Notice of appeal (Feb. 20, 2018).....	130a
Appendix E — District court memorandum and order (Mar. 29, 2018).....	133a
Appendix F — Notice of appeal (May 21, 2018)	172a
Appendix G — Court of appeals order accepting interlocutory appeals (July 5, 2018).....	175a

APPENDIX A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

No. 16-CV-4756 (NGG) (JO)

MARTÍN JONATHAN BATALLA VIDAL ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

v.

ELAINE C. DUKE, ACTING SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELAND SECURITY, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

No. 17-CV-5228 (NGG) (JO)

STATE OF NEW YORK ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

v.

DONALD TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
ET AL., DEFENDANTS

Filed: Nov. 9, 2017

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

NICHOLAS G. GARAUFGIS, United States District Judge.

Plaintiffs in the above-captioned cases challenge the rescission of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (“DACA”) program, as well as other actions that Defendants are alleged to have taken in connection with the rescission of that program. Defendants have moved to dismiss these cases for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and for failure to state a claim. (See Defs.

Mot. to Dismiss (Dkt. 95)¹; Defs. Mem. of Law in Supp. of Mot. to Dismiss (“Defs. Mem.”) (Dkt. 95-1.) For the reasons that follow, the court GRANTS IN PART and DENIES IN PART Defendants’ motion to dismiss for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and RESERVES RULING on Defendants’ motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim.

I. BACKGROUND

The court begins by providing some background on the DACA program, the steps Defendants have taken to end it, and the increasingly complicated procedural history of these cases.

A. Factual Background

1. Deferred Action

The DACA program originates in a mismatch between the number of individuals unlawfully present in the United States and DHS’s ability to remove these individuals from the country. As of 2014, for example, approximately 11.3 million removable individuals were present in the United States.² (The Department of

¹ Except as noted, all docket citations refer to the docket in Batalla Vidal v. Duke, No. 16-CV-4756 (E.D.N.Y.). For convenience, the court refers to the Plaintiffs in Batalla Vidal v. Duke as the “Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs”; Plaintiff Make the Road New York as “MRNY”; the Plaintiffs in New York v. Trump, No. 17-CV-5228 (E.D.N.Y.), as the “State Plaintiffs”; the U.S. Department of Homeland Security as “DHS”; U.S. Customs and Border Protection as “CBP”; U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services as “USCIS”; U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement as “ICE”; and the U.S. Department of Justice as “DOJ.”

² “Aliens may be removed if they were inadmissible at the time of entry, have been convicted of certain crimes, or meet other criteria

Homeland Security’s Authority to Prioritize Removal of Certain Aliens Unlawfully Present in the United States and to Defer Removal of Others, 38 Op. O.L.C. at 1 (2014) (“OLC Op.”) (Admin. R. (“AR”) (Dkt. 77-1) at 4.) DHS has the resources to remove only a small percentage of these individuals—specifically, about 400,000 per year, or less than four percent of the total, as of 2014. (*Id.* at 1; DHS, 2015. Yearbook of Immigration Statistics tbl. 39 (2016) (listing 333,341 removals and 129,122 “returns” for the year 2015).) Because of the “practical fact” that it cannot deport all these individuals, the Executive Branch has significant discretion to prioritize the removal of some and to deprioritize the removal of others. *See Arpaio v. Obama*, 797 F.3d 11, 16 (D.C. Cir. 2015).

“One form of discretion the Secretary of Homeland Security exercises is ‘deferred action,’ which entails temporarily postponing the removal of individuals unlawfully present in the United States.” *Id.* “Deferred action,” sometimes referred to as “nonpriority status,” is “in effect, an informal administrative stay of deportation,” *Lennon v. INS*, 527 F.2d 187, 191 n.7 (2d Cir. 1975), by which immigration authorities decide not to initiate, or decide to halt, removal proceedings “for humanitarian reasons or simply for . . . convenience,” *Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 484 (1999) (“AAADC”). Immigration authorities have used deferred action and similar policies on numerous occasions since at least the early 1960s. *Arpaio*, 797 F.3d at 16 (citing OLC Op. at 7-8, 12-13). Although deferred action was initially “developed without express

set by federal law.” *Arizona v. United States*, 567 U.S. 387, 396 (2012) (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1227).

statutory authorization,” AAADC, 525 U.S. at 484 (quoting 6 C. Gordon et al., Immigration Law and Procedure § 72.03(2)(h) (1998)), it has since been referenced in the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) and in DHS regulations, see 8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(D)(i)(II), (IV) (making certain individuals “eligible for deferred action and work authorization”); 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(c)(14) (authorizing certain recipients of deferred action to apply for work authorization).

2. DACA and DAPA

In 2012, the Obama Administration created the DACA program by issuing a memorandum stating that DHS would consider according deferred action to certain undocumented immigrants who entered the United States as children. (Mem. from Janet Napolitano, Sec’y of DHS, to David V. Aguilar, Acting Comm’r, CBP, et al., Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children (June 15, 2012) (the “2012 DACA Memo”) (AR 1).) The 2012 DACA Memo directed CBP, USCIS, and ICE to consider exercising prosecutorial discretion with respect to individuals without lawful immigration status who (1) were under the age of sixteen when they entered the United States; (2) had been continuously present in the United States for at least the five years leading up to June 15, 2012; (3) were currently in school, had graduated from high school or obtained GEDs, or were honorably discharged veterans; (4) had not been convicted of felonies, significant misdemeanors, or multiple misdemeanors, and did not “otherwise pose[] a threat to national security or public safety”; and (5) were not above the age of thirty. (Id.) Individuals who met these criteria, passed a back-

ground check, and were granted relief “on a case by case basis” were shielded from removal and eligible to apply for work authorization, subject to renewal every two years. (*Id.* at 2-3.) The 2012 DACA Memo made clear, however, that it “confer[red] no substantive right, immigration status or pathway to citizenship,” but only “set forth policy for the exercise of discretion within the framework of the existing law.” (*Id.* at 3.) Following the issuance of the 2012 DACA Memo, approximately 800,000 individuals have been granted deferred action and work authorization under the program. (Second Am. Compl. (“SAC”) (Dkt. 60) ¶ 73; USCIS, Number of Form I-821D, Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, by Fiscal Year, Quarter, Intake, Biometrics and Case Status, Fiscal Year 2012-2017 (June 30, 2017) (Am. Compl. (“State Pls. Am. Compl.”), Ex. 1 (No. 17-CV-5228, Dkt. 55-1)).)

In 2014, the Obama Administration announced a new deferred action program for the parents of U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents, Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (“DAPA”). (Mem. from Jeh Charles Johnson, Sec’y of DHS, to León Rodríguez, Dir., USCIS., et al, Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children and with Respect to Certain Individuals Who Are the Parents of U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents (Nov. 20, 2014) (the “2014 DAPA Memo”) (AR 37).) The 2014 DAPA Memo also expanded the DACA program by (1) permitting individuals born before June 15, 1981, to apply for deferred action; (2) extending the term of the benefits obtained under the DACA program from two to three years; and (3) adjusting the date-of-entry requirement so that individuals who en-

tered the United States before January 1, 2010, could obtain deferred action and work authorization. (Id. at 3-4.) The court refers to these changes to the DACA program as the “DACA Expansion.”

Following the issuance of the 2014 DAPA Memo, twenty-six states, led by Texas, filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, claiming that the DAPA program violated the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. § 550 et seq., and the Take Care Clause of the U.S. Constitution, U.S. Const. art. II, § 3. See Texas v. United States, 86 F. Supp. 3d 591, 598 (S.D. Tex. 2015). On February 16, 2015, the district court concluded that those states had standing to sue and were likely to succeed on the merits of their procedural APA claim that the 2014 DAPA Memo was invalid because it constituted a “substantive rule,” not a “general statement of policy,” and thus should have been promulgated through notice-and-comment rulemaking. Id. at 671-72. The court issued a nationwide injunction against the implementation of the DAPA program, id. at 677-78, and the DACA Expansion, id. at 678 n.111. The Fifth Circuit affirmed that decision, finding that the plaintiff states were likely to succeed both on their claim that the 2014 DAPA Memo should have been made through notice-and-comment procedures and on their claim that the memo was substantively contrary to the INA. Texas v. United States, 809 F.3d 134, 178, 186 (5th Cir. 2015) (as revised). The Fifth Circuit declined to reach the plaintiff states’ Take Care Clause claim. Id. at 146 n.3. The decision was affirmed by an equally divided Supreme Court. See 136 S. Ct. 2271 (Mem.).

3. DAPA Rescission

The Executive Branch's immigration-enforcement priorities shifted with the election of President Donald Trump. Shortly after his Inauguration, President Trump issued an executive order that cast doubt on the exemption of "classes or categories of removable aliens from potential enforcement." Exec. Order 13,768, Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States, 82 Fed. Reg. 8799 (Jan. 25, 2017). The following month, then-Secretary of DHS John Kelly implemented that order by issuing a memorandum rescinding "all existing conflicting directives, memoranda, or field guidance regarding enforcement of our immigration laws and priorities for removal," except for the DACA and DAPA programs, which he left in place. (Mem. from John Kelly, Sec'y, PHS, to Kevin McAleenan, Acting Comm'r, CBP, et al., Enforcement of the Immigration Laws to Serve the National Interest at 2 (Feb. 20, 2017) (AR 230).) Four months later, Secretary Kelly issued another memorandum, which rescinded the DAPA program and the DACA Expansion based on "the preliminary injunction in this matter, the ongoing litigation, the fact that DAPA never took effect, and our new immigration enforcement priorities." (Mem. from John F. Kelly, Sec'y, DHS, to Kevin K. McAleenan, Acting Comm'r, CBP, et al., Rescission of November 20, 2014, Memorandum Providing for Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents ("DAPA") at 3 (June 15, 2017) (AR 235).) That memorandum did not, however, rescind the original DACA program or revoke the three-year-long deferred action and work authorization issued between the announcement of the DACA Expansion and the

Southern District of Texas’s issuance of a preliminary injunction against that program. (Id. at 2 & n.3).

4. DACA Rescission

Following the rescission of the 2014 DAPA Memo, Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton wrote on behalf of eleven states to Attorney General Jeff Sessions to demand that the “Executive Branch” rescind the 2012 DACA Memo. (Ltr. from Ken Paxton, Att’y Gen. of Texas, to Hon. Jeff Sessions, Att’y Gen. of the U.S. (June 29, 2017) at 2 (AR 239).) Paxton warned that, if DHS did not act to end the DACA program, the plaintiff states would amend their complaint in Texas v. United States to challenge the DACA program and the remaining work permits issued under the DACA Expansion. (Id. at 2.)

Thereafter, Attorney General Sessions wrote to Acting DHS Secretary Elaine Duke to “advise that [DHS] should rescind” the 2012 DACA Memo.³ (Letter from Jefferson B. Sessions, III, Att’y Gen. of the U.S., to Elaine C. Duke, Acting Sec’y, DHS (the “Sessions Letter”) (AR 251).) The Attorney General opined that DACA was unconstitutional and that the Texas plaintiffs would likely prevail in their anticipated challenge to the program:

DACA was effectuated by the previous administration through executive action, without proper statutory authority and with no established end-date, after Congress’ repeated rejection of proposed legislation that would have accomplished a similar result. Such an open-ended circumvention of immigration

³ While the letter is not dated, the PDF of the AR dates the letter September 4, 2017. (See also Defs. Mem. at 9.)

laws was an unconstitutional exercise of authority by the Executive Branch. The related Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA) policy was enjoined on a nationwide basis in a decision affirmed by the Fifth Circuit on the basis of multiple legal grounds and then by the Supreme Court by an equally divided vote. Then-Secretary of Homeland Security John Kelly rescinded the DAPA policy in June. Because the DACA policy has the same legal and constitutional defects that the courts recognized as to DAPA, it is likely that potentially imminent litigation would yield similar results with respect to DACA.

(Id. (citation omitted).)

On September 5, 2017, Defendants rescinded the DACA program.”⁴ The Attorney General announced the decision at a press conference, and Acting Secretary Duke implemented the decision by issuing a mem-

⁴ Defendants maintain that, as a legal matter, Acting Secretary Duke is solely responsible for the decision to rescind the DACA program. (Defs. Oct. 10, 2017, Reply in Supp. of Mot. to Vacate (Dkt. 80) at 3-4.) As the court has noted, however, Defendants previously represented to the court that the Attorney General and Acting Secretary Duke jointly decided to end the DACA program. (Tr. of Sept. 14, 2017, Hr’g (Docket Number Pending) 13:17-14:06, 24:21-24, 26:1-6; Oct. 17, 2017, Mem. & Order (Dkt. 86) at 9-10.) Defendants had not then, and still have not, presented this court with any reason why it should disregard their earlier representations as to who decided to end the DACA program. (See Oct. 17, 2017, Mem. & Order at 10; Oct. 19, 2017, Mem. & Order at 10-11.) For purposes of this motion, however, nothing turns on the question of whether Acting Secretary Duke acted alone or with the Attorney General and the President when terminating the DACA program, so the court simply refers to the actions of “Defendants” in this regard.

orandum (the “DACA Rescission Memo”) to her subordinates. (DOJ, Press Release, Attorney General Sessions Delivers Remarks on DACA (Sept. 5, 2017), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/attorney-general-sessions-delivers-remarks-daca>; Mem. from Elaine C. Duke, Acting Sec’y, DHS, to James W. McCament, Acting Dir., USCIS, et al., Rescission of the June 15, 2012 Memorandum Entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children” (Sept. 5, 2017) (AR 252).) Duke pointed to the rulings of the Fifth Circuit and the Supreme Court in the Texas litigation, as well as to the Attorney General’s “legal determination” that DACA was “an open-ended circumvention of immigration laws” and “an unconstitutional exercise of authority”:

Taking into consideration the Supreme Court’s and the Fifth Circuit’s rulings in the ongoing litigation, and the September 4, 2017 letter from the Attorney General, it is clear that the June 15, 2012[,] DACA program should be terminated. In the exercise of my authority in establishing national immigration policies and priorities, except for the purposes explicitly identified below, I hereby rescind the June 15, 2012 memorandum.

(Id. at 3-4 (quoting Sessions Letter).)

Rather than terminating the DACA program outright, the DACA Rescission Memo provided for a phased “wind down” of the program. First, DHS would consider initial applications for deferred action and work authorization that it had received as of September 5, 2017. (DACA Rescission Memo at 4.) Second, DHS would “adjudicate—on an individual, case by case basis” requests for renewal of deferred action and

work authorization “from current beneficiaries whose benefits will expire between [September 5, 2017,] and March 5, 2018 that have been accepted by [DHS] as of October 5, 2017.” (*Id.*) DHS would not consider other applications for deferred action or work authorization under the DACA program. (*Id.*) Existing grants of deferred action and work authorization would remain in effect “for the remaining duration of their validity periods,” though DHS would retain the authority to terminate or deny deferred action when it deemed appropriate. (*Id.*) Under the DACA Rescission Memo, the benefits granted as part of the DACA program will therefore expire gradually over the next two years.

B. Procedural Background

1. Prior to the DACA Rescission

The first of the above-captioned cases, Batalla Vidal v. Duke, No. 16-CV-4756 (E.D.N.Y.), predates the Trump Administration’s decision to rescind the DACA program. In that case, Plaintiff Martin Batalla Vidal initially challenged DHS’s compliance with the nationwide injunction issued by the Southern District of Texas in Texas v. United States. Batalla Vidal applied for deferred action and work authorization in November 2014 and, in February 2015, was notified that he had received deferred action and work authorization for the next three years under the terms of the DACA Expansion. (Compl. (Dkt. 1) ¶ 32.) On May 14, 2015, however, DHS revoked his three-year work authorization, citing the Texas injunction, and replaced it with a two-year permit. (*Id.* ¶¶ 34-36.) Batalla Vidal challenged that decision, contending that the Texas plaintiffs lacked standing to seek, and the Southern District of Texas lacked jurisdiction to issue, a nationwide in-

junction. (*Id.* ¶¶ 43-47.) Batalla Vidal subsequently amended his complaint to add the nonprofit organization MRNY as a plaintiff and name then-Director of USCIS León Rodríguez as a defendant. (Am. Compl. (Dkt. 29).) In November 2016, the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs moved with Defendants’ consent to stay briefing in the case “[d]ue to uncertainty regarding the future of the [DACA] program.” (Pls. Nov. 21, 2016, Mot. to Stay (Dkt. 35); Apr. 4, 2017, Joint Mot. to Stay (Dkt. 40).)

2. Following the DACA Rescission

Following Defendants’ announcement of the decision to rescind the DACA program. Plaintiffs brought these actions challenging that decision and certain other actions that Defendants have taken relating to that decision. On September 6, 2017, fifteen states and the District of Columbia⁵ filed suit challenging both the rescission of the DACA program and DHS’s alleged changes in its policy regarding the use of DACA applicants’ information for immigration-enforcement purposes. (State Pls. Compl. (No. 17-CV-5228, Dkt. 1) ¶¶ 269-301.) The State Plaintiffs asserted claims under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the APA, and the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 601-12 (the “RFA”). (*Id.*) Two weeks later, the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs again amended their

⁵ The State Plaintiffs were initially comprised of the States of North Carolina, Hawaii, New York, Washington, Iowa, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Illinois, Connecticut, New Mexico, and Delaware; the Commonwealths of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Virginia; and the District of Columbia. (State Pls. Compl. (No. 17-CV-5228, Dkt. 1).) Colorado has since joined the case. (State Pls. Am. Compl. (No. 17-CV-5228, Dkt. 54).)

complaint to assert certain claims similar to those brought by the State Plaintiffs, as well as a claim that Defendants violated the Due Process Clause by failing to notify DACA recipients that they needed to renew their deferred action and work authorization by October 5, 2017. (SAC ¶¶ 160-66.) Finally, the State Plaintiffs amended their complaint to add claims (1) challenging the notice provided to DACA recipients of the rescission of the DACA program; and (2) further challenging the change in DHS’s information-use policy. (State Pls. Am. Compl. (No. 17-CV-5228, Dkt. 54) ¶¶ 246-52, 274-80.) Together, Plaintiffs now assert the following claims:

Equal Protection. Both sets of Plaintiffs allege that the decision to rescind the DACA program violated the equal-protection principles incorporated in the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, see Boiling v. Sharpe, 347 U.S. 497, 498-500 (1954), because that decision was motivated by improper considerations. (SAC ¶¶ 167-70; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 233-39.) The State Plaintiffs allege that the DACA Rescission Memo “target[s] individuals for discriminatory treatment, without lawful justification” and that it was “motivated, at least in part, by a discriminatory motive and/or a desire to harm a particular group.” (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 235-36.) The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs allege that President Trump, Attorney General Sessions, and Acting Secretary Duke violated the Due Process Clause in deciding to rescind the DACA program because that decision “targets Latinos and, in particular, Mexicans, and will have a disparate impact on these groups,” and “was substantially motivated by animus toward Latinos and, in particular, Mexicans.” (SAC ¶¶ 169-70.)

Due Process—Individualized Notice. Both sets of Plaintiffs also contend that Defendants violated the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause by failing to provide DACA recipients with adequate notice of the decision to rescind the DACA program. (SAC ¶¶ 160-66; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 274-80.) In particular, the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs allege that, prior to the DACA Rescission Memo, DHS advised DACA recipients to submit applications to renew their deferred action and work authorization “as soon as possible” and, in particular, 120-150 days before expiration, to ensure that those benefits did not expire before DHS could process the renewal applications. (SAC ¶ 1164.) Following the issuance of the DACA Rescission Memo, Defendants did not send individual revised notices to alert DACA recipients who were eligible to renew their deferred action and work authorization (*i.e.*, individuals whose benefits expired before March 5, 2018) that they only had until October 5, 2017, to do so. (*Id.* ¶ 165.) The State Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment by failing to provide DACA recipients with “adequate notice” about “the procedures and timeline for renewing their DACA status,” “the general termination of the DACA program after March 5, 2018,” or “their inability to apply for renewal of their DACA status after March 5, 2018.” (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 276-77.)

Due Process—Information-Use Policy. Both sets of Plaintiffs assert that DHS impermissibly backtracked on its representations that it would use information gleaned from DACA applications for immigration-enforcement purposes only in limited circumstances. (SAC ¶¶ 151, 153; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 240-45.) While, as discussed below, the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs

fold this challenge into their substantive APA claim, the State Plaintiffs challenge this decision as “fundamentally unfair,” in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 243.)

Equitable Estoppel—Information-Use Policy. The State Plaintiffs argue that the doctrine of equitable estoppel bars DHS from changing its policy regarding the use of DACA applicants’ information. (*Id.* ¶¶ 246-52.) The State Plaintiffs allege that Defendants, having “made repeated affirmative statements about the protections that would be given to the personal information provided by DACA applicants” and “placed affirmative restrictions on the use of such information for purposes of immigration enforcement” (*id.* ¶ 248), are now estopped from using that information for immigration-enforcement purposes (*id.* ¶¶ 250-51). The court refers to this claim, together with Plaintiffs’ constitutional information-use policy claims, as Plaintiffs’ “information-use policy claims.”

APA—Arbitrary and Capricious. Both sets of Plaintiffs challenge the decision to end the DACA program under the APA as substantively “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). (SAC ¶¶ 149-54; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 253-56.) The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs contend that Attorney General Sessions and Acting Secretary Duke acted arbitrarily and capriciously by deciding to end the DACA program and by changing DHS’s policy regarding the confidentiality of DACA applicants’ information because those decisions “(a) lack a rational explanation for the change in policy on which persons had reasonably relied, (b) are based on a legal error, and (c) failed to consider all relevant

factors.” (SAC ¶ 151.) The State Plaintiffs argue that the implementation of the DACA Rescission Memo and termination of the DACA program “with minimal formal guidance” constituted arbitrary, capricious, and unlawful action in violation of Section 706 of the APA. (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 254-55.) The court refers to these claims together as Plaintiffs’ “substantive APA claims.”

APA—Notice and Comment. Both sets of Plaintiffs also contend that DHS’s implementation of the DACA Rescission Memo constitutes a substantive or legislative “rule” for purposes of the APA, and thus needed to be made through notice-and-comment rulemaking procedures. See 5 U.S.C. § 553. (SAC ¶¶ 144-48; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 257-65.) In particular, the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs argue that the DACA Rescission Memo is a substantive rule, “as it binds DHS to categorically deny applications for deferred action to individuals who fit the original DACA eligibility criteria.” (SAC ¶ 146.) The State Plaintiffs, on the other hand, argue that the promulgation and implementation of the DACA Rescission Memo “categorically and definitively changed the substantive criteria by which individual DACA grantees work, live, attend school, obtain credit, and travel in the United States,” impacting those beneficiaries’ “substantive rights.” (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 261.) The court refers to these claims together as Plaintiffs’ “procedural APA claims.”

RFA. Finally, both sets of Plaintiffs assert claims under the RFA. Plaintiffs claim that Defendants violated the RFA by issuing the DACA Rescission Memo without conducting an analysis of the rescission’s impact on “small entities.” (SAC ¶¶ 155-59; State Pls.

Am. Compl. ¶¶ 266-73.) MRNY alleges that it is a “small organization” that is directly affected by the DACA Rescission Memo and thus has a cause of action under the RFA. (SAC ¶ 156.) The State Plaintiffs assert that they and their “small governmental jurisdictions, nonprofits, and businesses, and their residents” are harmed by Defendants’ failure to conduct such a regulatory impact analysis. (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 273.) The court refers to these claims as Plaintiffs “RFA claims.”

The following chart summarizes these claims:

a. Table: Claims Presented

Challenged Action	Cause of Action	<i>Batalla Vidal v. Duke</i> ⁶	<i>New York v. Trump</i> ⁷
Termination of the DACA program	Due Process Clause	Fifth claim, ¶¶ 167-70	First claim, ¶¶ 233-39
	APA (substantive)	Second claim, ¶¶ 149-54	Fourth claim, ¶¶ 253-56
	APA (procedural)	First claim, ¶¶ 144-48	Fifth claim, ¶¶ 257-65
	RFA	Third claim, ¶¶ 155-59 (MRNY only)	Sixth claim, ¶¶ 266-73
Notification of DACA recipients of (1) the termination of the DACA program and (2) revised renewal deadlines	Due Process Clause	Fourth claim, ¶¶ 160-66 (notice of revised renewal deadlines only)	Seventh claim, ¶¶ 274-80
Changes to DHS policy regarding the use of DACA applicants’ information for immigration-enforcement purposes	Due Process Clause		Second claim, ¶¶ 240-45
	APA (substantive)	Second claim, ¶¶ 149-51, 153-54	
	Equitable estoppel		Third claim, ¶¶ 246-52

3. District Court Proceedings

The parties have vigorously litigated these actions before this court. Although the full procedural history can be discerned from the relevant dockets, the court

⁶ All citations refer to the SAC.

⁷ All citations refer to the State Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint.

provides the following limited summary of the proceedings to date.

Consistent with the regular practice of courts in this district in civil cases, discovery matters were referred to the magistrate judge assigned to the case, Magistrate Judge James Orenstein, to decide in the first instance. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); Local Civ. R. 72.2. After soliciting the views of the parties as to whether discovery should proceed (Sept. 15, 2017, Order (Dkt. 58)), Judge Orenstein authorized discovery to proceed over Defendants' objections (Tr. of Sept. 26, 2017, Hr'g (Docket Number Pending) 26:21-27:22). Judge Orenstein then issued a case management and scheduling order (the "Case Management Order"), which confirmed the previously announced discovery schedule. (Sept. 27, 2017, Order (Dkt. 67).) Of particular relevance to these proceedings, the Case Management and Scheduling Order required Defendants to produce, by October 6, 2017, an administrative record as well as a privilege log describing "every document considered within any component of the executive branch as part of the process of determining the policy and actions at issue in these actions that are not being produced and as to which the defendants would assert a claim of privilege, regardless of whether the defendants deem such . . . record to be part of the official administrative record." (Id. ¶ II(c) (the "Privilege Log Requirement").)

Defendants promptly challenged the Case Management Order. On September 29, 2017, Defendants filed a motion before this court "seek[ing] relief from" the Privilege Log Requirement, which, they argued, "raise[d] substantial separation-of-powers concerns," to the

extent it could be read as applying to White House communications, and required Defendants to assert privilege with respect to documents that were not properly included in the administrative record. (Sept. 29, 2017, Defs. Mot. to Vacate (Dkt. 69) (“Defs. Sept. 29 Mot.”) at 2-5.) Defendants also argued that it would be impossible to comply with the Privilege Log Requirement within the deadline set by the Case Management Order (id. at 5), and that the court should consider threshold arguments for dismissal of these cases before allowing discovery to proceed (id. at 5-6). Defendants did not specifically argue that discovery was inappropriate, although they reincorporated arguments against discovery by reference to a letter they had filed with Judge Orenstein a week earlier and briefly outlined three “threshold dismissal arguments.” (Id. at 1, 5-6; see also Defs. Sept. 22, 2017, Ltr. Regarding Discovery (Dkt. 65).)

The court issued two orders in response to Defendants’ objections. The first order extended the deadline for complying with the Privilege Log Requirement by two weeks, so that the court could consider whether the as-yet-unproduced administrative record was adequate and whether Defendants retained the presumption that they had correctly compiled the record. (Oct. 3, 2017, Order (Dkt. 72).) Defendants subsequently asked the court to narrow the Privilege Log Requirement or vacate it entirely. (Defs. Oct. 10, 2017, Reply in Supp. of Mot. to Vacate (Dkt. 80) at 2.) At the same time, Defendants also asked the court to stay discovery pending resolution of Defendants’ anticipated dispositive motions, which Defendants averred would “raise arguments that are strong, purely legal, and completely dispositive of Plaintiffs’ claims.” (Id.

at 4.) Defendants did not, however, specifically identify what those arguments were (instead cross-referencing their September 29 Motion and string-citing to authority discussed below) or address any of the factors that courts in this district consider in analyzing whether a party has demonstrated “good cause” to stay discovery. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c); Richards v. N. Shore Long Island Jewish Health Sys., No. 10-CV-4544 (LDW) (ETB), 2011 WL 4407518, at *1 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 21, 2011).

The court then issued its second order, which narrowed the scope of the Privilege Log Requirement but denied Defendants’ request to stay discovery. (Oct. 17, 2017 Mem. & Order (the “Oct. 17 M&O”) (Dkt. 86).) With respect to Defendants’ arguments that discovery outside the administrative record was inappropriate, the court noted that Defendants had not identified any reason why its review of Plaintiffs’ information-use policy and notice claims should be limited to an administrative record that only purported to document the decision to rescind the DACA program. (Id. at 3-5.) The court declined to vacate the Privilege Log Requirement before Judge Orenstein decided whether the administrative record was complete. (Oct. 17 M&O at 5-6.) The court agreed, however, that the Privilege Log Requirement should be narrowed to exclude materials other than DHS and DOJ communications. (Id. at 7-9.) Finally, the court declined to exempt DOJ from the Privilege Log Requirement, as Defendants had failed to explain their apparent reversal in position regarding whether Attorney General Sessions was responsible for the decision to rescind the DACA program. (Id. at 9-10.)

The following evening, Defendants renewed their motion to stay discovery, this time threatening to seek mandamus review if the court did not address their objections by 2 p.m. the following day. (Defs. Oct. 18, 2017, Mot. to Stay (Dkt. 87).) The court ruled expeditiously on these requests. On October 19, 2017, Judge Orenstein issued an order granting Plaintiffs' motion to compel Defendants to produce a complete administrative record. (Oct. 19, 2017, Order Granting Motion to Produce (Dkt. 89).) The same day, this court issued another memorandum and order, granting in part and denying in part Defendants' motion for a stay. (Oct. 19, 2017, Mem. & Order (the "Oct. 19 M&O") at 9-11.) In light of Defendants' ongoing (and, this time, factually substantiated) concerns about the burdens of complying with the Privilege Log Requirement, the court agreed to stay the Privilege Log Requirement except with respect to documents directly considered by the Attorney General, Acting Secretary Duke, and their subordinates who directly advised them on the decision to end the DACA program. (*Id.*) The court concluded, however, that Defendants had not demonstrated "good cause" warranting a stay of discovery (*id.* at 4-9), nor that they were entitled to a stay pending mandamus review (*id.* at 11-12).

On October 20, 2017, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit issued an emergency stay of discovery and record supplementation in proceedings before this court, contingent on Defendants' filing a full petition for a writ of mandamus by 3 p.m. on October 23, 2017. (Oct. 20, 2017, USCA Order (Dkt. 91).) Four days later, the Second Circuit issued a second order, which extended the stay pending determination of the mandamus petition but deferred ruling on that petition

“until such time as the district court has considered and decided expeditiously issues of jurisdiction and justiciability.” (Oct. 24, 2017, USCA Order (Dkt. 99).) In light of that order, the court directed the parties to file supplemental briefs as to whether the court “lacks jurisdiction to consider the claims raised in [these cases] or why such claims are otherwise non-justiciable.” (Oct. 24, 2017, Order.) In response to that order, Defendants filed the motion to dismiss currently before the court. That motion not only argues that the court lacks jurisdiction to hear these cases, but also contends that Plaintiffs fail to state a claim upon which relief should be granted and that the court should not grant a nationwide injunction, should it decide that Plaintiffs are entitled to relief.⁸

II. LEGAL STANDARDS

Pursuant to the Second Circuit’s direction, the court addresses only “issues of jurisdiction and justiciability” at this point in the proceedings. (Oct. 24, 2017, USCA Order; Oct. 27, 2017, Order (Dkt. 98).) Accordingly, the court will consider only those portions of Defend-

⁸ Prior to filing their Motion to Dismiss, Defendants requested and received leave to file an overlong brief “in order . . . to fully present their dismissal arguments in these cases.” (Defs. Oct. 25, 2017, Appl. for Leave to File Excess Pages (Dkt. 94); Oct. 26, 2017, Order Granting Defendants’ Application for Leave to File Excess Pages.) That application did not expressly indicate that Defendants intended to present arguments for dismissal for failure to state a claim under Rule 12(b)(6), as opposed to just the “jurisdiction and justiciability” arguments specifically referenced by the Second Circuit’s and this court’s October 24, 2017, orders. Defendants would not have required these excess pages had they confined their briefing to those issues. (See Oct. 27, 2017, Order (Dkt. 98).)

ants' motion to dismiss that challenge the court's subject-matter jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Under Rule 12(b)(1), the court must dismiss a claim “for lack of subject matter jurisdiction . . . when the . . . court lacks the statutory or constitutional power to adjudicate it.” Makarova v. United States, 201 F.3d 110, 113 (2d Cir. 2000). When considering a Rule 12(b)(1) motion, the court “must take all uncontroverted facts in the complaint . . . as true, and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the party asserting jurisdiction.” Tandon v. Captain’s Cove Marina of Bridgeport, Inc., 752 F.3d 239, 243 (2d Cir. 2014). Nevertheless, “the party asserting subject matter jurisdiction ‘has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that it exists.’” Id. (quoting Makarova, 201 F.3d at 113). “[W]here jurisdictional facts are placed in dispute, the court has the power and obligation to decide issues of fact by reference to evidence outside the pleadings, such as affidavits.” Id. (quoting APWU v. Potter, 343 F.3d 619, 627 (2d Cir. 2003)).

III. DISCUSSION

Defendants raise four challenges to the court's authority to hear the above-captioned cases. First, Defendants argue, these cases are not justiciable under the APA because the decision to rescind the DACA program was “committed to agency discretion by law.” See 5 U.S.C. § 701(a)(2). (Defs. Mem. at 12-17.) Second, Defendants contend that the decision to terminate the DACA program constitutes a denial of deferred action, judicial review of which is barred by Section 1252(g) of the INA. See 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g). (Id. at 17-19.) Third, they maintain, the Batalla Vidal Plain-

tiffs lack standing to bring certain claims (*id.* at 28-29, 34-35, 37), and the State Plaintiffs lack Article III standing to bring any claims (*id.* at 19-21). Fourth, Defendants assert, the State Plaintiffs and MRNY cannot bring claims under the APA because they assert interests that fall outside the “zone of interests” protected by the INA. (*Id.* at 19-20.) The court addresses each argument in turn.

A. Committed to Agency Discretion by Law

Defendants first argue that these cases are non-justiciable because the decision to end the DACA program was committed to DHS’s exclusive discretion by law. The court disagrees. Certain agency decisions, including decisions not to institute enforcement action, are presumptively immune from judicial review under the APA because they are “committed to agency discretion by law.” 5 U.S.C. § 701(a)(2); *Heckler v. Chaney*, 470 U.S. 821 (1985). But the rescission of the DACA program was not such a decision, nor have Defendants explained why Section 701(a)(2) precludes review of Plaintiffs’ constitutional claims or other claims challenging actions other than the decision to rescind the DACA program.⁹

⁹ It is not clear whether Section 701(a)(2) limits the court’s jurisdiction or instead forms an “essential element” of a claim for relief under the APA. *Sharkey v. Quarantillo*, 541 F.3d 75, 87-88 (2d Cir. 2008); *accord Conyers v. Rossides*, 558 F.3d 137, 143 n.8 (2d Cir. 2009). Nothing turns on this distinction here, however, because Section 701(a)(2) does not shield Defendants’ actions from Judicial review.

1. Statutory and Equitable Claims

Section 701(a)(2) of the APA does not preclude judicial review of Plaintiffs' statutory and equitable claims. "Under the APA, a party aggrieved by agency action is generally 'entitled to judicial review thereof.'" Westchester v. U.S. Dep't of Hous. and Urban Dev., 778 F.3d 412, 418 (2d Cir. 2015) (quoting 5 U.S.C. § 702). "There is a strong presumption favoring judicial review of administrative action." Salazar v. King, 822 F.3d 61, 75 (2d Cir. 2016). Judicial review is not available, however, "to the extent that . . . statutes preclude judicial review," 5 U.S.C. § 701(a)(1), or "agency action is committed to agency discretion by law," § 701(a)(2). The latter is "a very narrow exception" to the presumption of reviewability of agency action under the APA, and it applies "in those rare instances where 'statutes are drawn in such broad terms that in a given case there is no law to apply.'" Citizens to Pres. Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe, 401 U.S. 402, 410 (1971) (quoting S. Rep. No. 752, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., 26 (1945)), abrogated on other grounds by Califano v. Sanders, 430 U.S. 99 (1977); see also Chaney, 470 U.S. at 830 (agency action is unreviewable "if a statute is drawn so that a court would have no meaningful standard against which to judge the agency's exercise of discretion"). "To determine whether there is 'law to apply' that provides 'judicially manageable standards' for judging an agency's exercise of discretion, the courts look to the statutory text, the agency's regulations, and informal agency guidance that govern the agency's challenged action." Salazar, 822 F.3d at 76 (quoting Chaney, 470 U.S. at 830). These enactments supply "law to apply" because they may govern the agency's exercise of its own discretion. See id. at

76-77 (citing INS v. Yueh-Shaoi Yang, 519 U.S. 26, 32 (1996)); Sec’y of Labor v. Twentymile Coal Co., 456 F.3d 151, 158-59 (D.C. Cir. 2006).

a. “Law to Apply”

Here, there is “law to apply,” permitting meaningful judicial review of Plaintiffs’ statutory claims. Plaintiffs assert statutory claims under the APA and RFA. With respect to Plaintiffs’ procedural APA and RFA claims, the relevant “law to apply” is found in the APA and RFA themselves, both of which specify procedures that agencies must follow when engaging in “substantive” or “legislative” rulemaking. See 5 U.S.C. §§ 553, 604. The process by which an agency makes a rule may be reviewed for compliance with applicable procedural requirements regardless of whether the substance of the rule is itself reviewable. See Lincoln v. Vigil, 508 U.S. 182, 195-98 (1993); Am. Med. Ass’n v. Reno, 57 F.3d 1129, 1134 (D.C. Cir. 1995); N.Y.C. Employees’ Ret. Sys. v. SEC, 45 F.3d 7, 11 (2d Cir. 1995).

There is also “law to apply” permitting meaningful judicial review of Plaintiffs’ substantive APA claims. In order to satisfy Section 706(2)(a), Plaintiffs must identify some source of law, other than the APA’s “arbitrary and capricious” standard, against which the court can review their claims: “If agency actions could be challenged as ‘arbitrary and capricious,’ without reference to any other standard, then § 701 (a)(2)’s limitation on APA review would amount to no limitation at all, and nothing would ever be ‘committed to agency discretion by law.’” Lunney v. United States, 319 F.3d 550, 559 n.5 (2d Cir. 2003). The court agrees that Plaintiffs have identified “law to apply” to these claims. In deciding to rescind the DACA program, Defendants

expressly and exclusively relied on a legal determination that the program was unlawful and could not be sustained in court. (Sessions Letter, AR 251; DACA Rescission Memo, AR 253-55.) The court may review that rationale in light of, among other sources, the text of the INA and other statutes, the history of the use of deferred action by immigration authorities, and the OLC Opinion.¹⁰ While Defendants attempt to recast the decision to rescind the DACA program as the product of a discretionary “balancing of the costs and benefits of keeping the policy in place, on one hand, with the risk of ‘potentially imminent litigation’ that could throw DACA into immediate turmoil” (Defs. Mem. at 15), that argument is unsupported by the text of the Sessions Letter and the DACA Rescission Memo.

Defendants’ argument that the decision to rescind the DACA program is unreviewable, notwithstanding the “substantive legal” rationale given for that decision (Defs. Mem. at 15), is unpersuasive. Defendants correctly note that unreviewable agency action does not become reviewable simply because “the agency gives a reviewable reason for otherwise unreviewable action.” (Defs. Mem. at 13 (quoting ICC v. Bhd. of Locomotive Eng’rs, 482 U.S. 270, 283 (1987) (“BLE”).) See BLE, 482 U.S. at 283 (“[A] common reason for failure to

¹⁰ The State Plaintiffs also assert a claim for equitable estoppel. (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 246-52.) With respect to the State Plaintiffs’ equitable estoppel claim, the court assumes for the sake of argument that the relevant “law to apply” may be found in DHS’s past statements and practices regarding the use of DACA applicants’ information. See Salazar, 822 F.3d at 76-77. (See State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 39-44.) The court need not decide this question, however, because, as discussed below, the State Plaintiffs lack standing to assert this claim. (See infra Section III.C.2.b.)

prosecute an alleged criminal violation is the prosecutor's belief . . . that the law will not sustain a conviction. That is surely an eminently 'reviewable' proposition, in the sense that courts are well qualified to consider the point; yet it is entirely clear that the refusal to prosecute cannot be the subject of judicial review." That argument simply begs the question, however, of whether the decision to rescind DACA is actually unreviewable. While it may be true that a presumptively unreviewable decision does not become subject to judicial review simply because the decision-maker expresses a "reviewable" rationale," *see id.*, the decision to rescind the DACA program was not inherently such a decision, as the following section discusses in detail.

b. Prosecutorial Discretion

Nor does the decision to end the DACA program fall within a class of decisions traditionally regarded as presumptively immune from judicial review under Section 701(a)(2) of the APA. (Defs. Mem. at 12-14.) Defendants assert that the decision to rescind the DACA program constitutes "an exercise of enforcement discretion" that is "entrusted to the agency alone" and immune from judicial review. (*Id.* at 15.) The court concludes, however, that the decision to eliminate the DACA program—a program by which certain undocumented immigrants could request immigration authorities to exercise prosecutorial discretion with respect to them—was not itself a presumptively unreviewable exercise of enforcement discretion.

Defendants rely in particular on *Chaney*, which held that decisions not to take enforcement action were presumptively not subject to judicial review under the

APA. In Chaney, the Court rejected an attempt by a group of prisoners awaiting execution by lethal injection to force the Food and Drug Administration to take enforcement action to prevent the use of certain drugs for capital punishment. See Chaney, 470 U.S. at 823-25, 830-33. The Court held that a regulator’s refusal to take enforcement action was presumptively unreviewable, because decisions not to take enforcement action typically “involve[] a complicated balancing of a number of factors which are peculiarly within [the agency’s] expertise,” id. at 831, and do not implicate the agency’s exercise of “coercive power over an individual’s liberty or property rights, and thus do[] not infringe upon areas that courts often are called to protect,” id. at 832.

The decision to rescind DACA is unlike the non-enforcement decision at issue in Chaney. First, Plaintiffs do not challenge an agency’s failure or refusal to prosecute or take enforcement actions with respect to certain violations of law. Instead, they challenge Defendants’ affirmative decision to eliminate a program by which DHS exercised prosecutorial discretion with respect to a large number of undocumented immigrants. The DACA Rescission Memo curtails (if it does not eliminate outright) DHS’s ability to exercise prosecutorial discretion with respect to individuals previously eligible to request deferred action. Although the DACA Rescission Memo notes that it does not limit DHS’s “otherwise lawful enforcement or litigation prerogatives,” it makes clear that DHS “[w]ill reject all DACA initial requests and associated applications for Employment Authorization Documents filed after [September 5, 2017]” and “[w]ill reject all DACA renewal requests and associated applications for Employment Authorization Documents” inconsistent with

the terms of the Memo. This affirmative decision to constrain DHS's prosecutorial discretion cannot be analogized to an exercise of prosecutorial discretion, which would be presumptively immune from judicial review. Cf. Texas, 809 F.3d at 165-69 (creation of the DAPA program was reviewable because it was a "affirmative agency action," not an exercise of enforcement discretion). Second, Plaintiffs do not challenge non-enforcement decisions, which do not subject individuals to the "coercive power" of the state. Chaney, 470 U.S. at 831. To the contrary, the rescission of the DACA program subjects individuals who previously enjoyed some protection from removal to coercive state authority. Third, Defendants' decision to rescind the DACA program does not appear to have been motivated by a "complicated balancing of a number of factors which are peculiarly within [the agency's] expertise." See id. Instead, Defendants stated that they were required to rescind the DACA program because it was unlawful, which suggests both that Defendants did not believe that they were exercising discretion when rescinding the program and that their reasons for doing so are within the competence of this court to review. (Sessions Letter; DACA Rescission Memo at 4.) The decision to rescind the DACA program is thus manifestly unlike the non-enforcement decision at issue in Chaney. While courts have also held that agency decisions to take (as opposed to refrain from taking) enforcement action are also unreviewable under the APA when there are no judicially manageable standards for reviewing the agency's discretion in choosing to bring an enforcement action, see Speed Mining, Inc. v. Fed. Mine Safety & Health Rev. Comm'n, 528 F.3d 310, 316-19 (4th Cir. 2008); Twentymile Coal, 456 F.3d at

155-59, those cases are inapposite because there is “law to apply” to review the decision to rescind DACA.

Finally, Defendants’ arguments that Section 701(a)(2) precludes judicial review of Plaintiffs’ suits focus on the decision to rescind the DACA program. Defendants do not explain why the alleged decision to change DHS’s policy regarding the use of DACA applicants’ information should be immune from judicial review. To the contrary, there is “law to apply” in reviewing that decision (namely, DHS’s prior statements about the uses of DACA applicants’ information), and the court does not understand how the change in that policy can be analogized to the sorts of decisions, such as enforcement and non-enforcement decisions, that courts have recognized as presumptively exempt from judicial review. Accordingly, to the extent the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs also challenge DHS’s alleged change in information-use policy as part of their substantive APA claim, that claim is reviewable. (SAC ¶¶ 151, 153-54.)

2. Constitutional Claims

Nor does Section 701(a)(2) preclude judicial review of Plaintiffs’ constitutional claims. It is well-established that “even where agency action is ‘committed to agency discretion by law,’ review is still available to determine if the Constitution has been violated.” Padula v. Webster, 822 F.2d 97, 101 (D.C. Cir. 1987); accord Inova Alexandria Hosp. v. Shalala, 244 F.3d 342, 347 (4th Cir. 2001); Woodward v. United States, 871 F.2d 1068, 1072-73 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

In Webster v. Doe, 486 U.S. 592 (1988), the Court rejected the Government’s argument that Section 701(a)(2) barred a former CIA employee from bringing

constitutional claims challenging his termination from the agency. Because the National Security Act of 1947 vested the CIA Director with authority over firing decisions, the decision to fire the plaintiff because of his sexual orientation had been “committed to agency discretion by law,” and he could not challenge that decision under the APA. *Id.* at 594-95, 599-601. The National Security Act did not expressly preclude review of constitutional claims, however, so the Court would not presume that such claims were unreviewable. *Id.* at 603-04 (noting that the Court has held that “where Congress intends to preclude judicial review of constitutional claims its intent to do so must be clear,” in order to “avoid the ‘serious constitutional question’ that would arise if a federal statute were construed to deny any judicial forum for a colorable constitutional claim” (quoting Bowen v. Mich. Acad. of Family Physicians, 476 U.S. 667, 681 n.12 (1986))). Similarly, Defendants identify no express indication that Congress intended to preclude judicial review of the actions at issue in these cases. While DHS undoubtedly exercises “wide discretion . . . in the enforcement of the immigration laws” (Defs. Mem. at 16), that is insufficient to preclude review of Plaintiffs’ constitutional claims.

3. Deference to the Executive Branch on Immigration Matters Does Not Counsel a Different Result

Lastly, Defendants contend that the court should read Section 701(a)(2) broadly in light of the Executive Branch’s wide discretion to enforce the immigration laws. (*Id.* at 16-17.) The Supreme Court, however, has applied the “strong presumption in favor of judicial review of administrative action” in the immigration

context. See INS v. St. Cyr, 533 U.S. 289, 299 (2001). Defendants’ specific arguments for a broad reading of Section 701(a)(2) likewise unavailing. While Defendants argue that judicial review of these cases is inappropriate because review could slow down the Executive Branch’s removal of undocumented immigrants from this country, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) already precludes individuals in removal proceedings from delaying those proceedings by claiming that they were improperly denied deferred action. See AAADC, 525 U.S. at 485. In any event, those concerns do not apply to these cases, as the court discusses in Section III.B below. Defendants also argue that judicial review of immigration decisions is inappropriate because judicial review “may involve ‘not merely the disclosure of normal domestic law enforcement priorities and techniques, but often the disclosure of foreign-policy objectives’ or other sensitive matters.” (Def. Mem. at 16 (quoting AAADC, 525 U.S. at 490).) Defendants’ stated rationale for rescinding the DACA program, however, turns wholly on questions of U.S. constitutional and administrative law, not sensitive law-enforcement, intelligence, or foreign-policy issues. In any event, vague speculation that judicial review might somehow implicate foreign-policy concerns is insufficient to justify a presumption that immigration cases are not subject to judicial review. Washington v. Trump, 847 F.3d 1151, 1161 (9th Cir. 2017) (“[T]he Supreme Court has repeatedly and explicitly rejected the notion that the political branches have unreviewable authority over immigration”), reconsid. en banc denied, 853 F.3d 933 (9th Cir. 2017), superseded by 858 F.3d 1168 (9th Cir. 2017). While the court is sensitive to the deference warranted to the Executive Branch in this sphere, Defendants’ claims

for deference cannot substitute for the “clear and convincing evidence” that Congress intended to restrict judicial review of administrative action. Sharkey v. Quarantillo, 541 F.3d 75, 84 (2d Cir. 2008) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

B. INA Jurisdictional Bar

Nor does the INA divest the court of jurisdiction to hear this case. That Act contains a provision, 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g), that limits judicial review of certain actions “by or behalf of any alien arising from” certain deportation proceedings. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g); see AAADC, 525 U.S. at 472. As explained below, that provision has no bearing on these cases, which do not arise from one of the three specifically enumerated actions by immigration authorities that trigger application of the statute. Moreover, by its terms, Section 1252(g) does not apply to claims brought by MRNY or the State Plaintiffs.

1. Programmatic Challenges to DACA-Related Decisions

First, the court considers whether Section 1252(g) strips the court of jurisdiction to hear Plaintiffs’ challenges to the decision to rescind the DACA program. The court begins, as usual, with the text of the statute. In relevant part, Section 1252(g) provides as follows:

Except as provided in this section and notwithstanding any other provision of law (statutory or nonstatutory) . . . no court shall have jurisdiction to hear any cause or claim by or on behalf of any alien arising from the decision or action by the Attorney General to commence proceedings, adju-

dicating cases, or execute removal orders against any alien under this chapter.

(emphasis added). As the Court has stated, this “provision applies only to three discrete actions that the Attorney General make take: her ‘decision or action’ to ‘commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders.’” AAADC, 525 U.S. at 482. Accordingly, the court must consider whether Plaintiffs’ suits “arise from [a] decision or action by [DHS¹¹] to commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders against any alien.” 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g).

They do not, Defendants’ termination of the DACA program does not, by itself, “commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders against any alien.” Id. By rescinding the DACA program, Defendants eliminated a set of guidelines identifying a discrete class of undocumented immigrants who were eligible to apply for deferred action. (See 2012 DACA Memo.) That decision, by itself, did not trigger any specific enforcement proceedings.¹² Nor do the indi-

¹¹ As part of transferring many immigration-related responsibilities from the Attorney General to the Secretary of DHS, the Homeland Security Act of 2002 provides that statutory references “to any department, commission, or agency or any officer or office the functions of which are so transferred shall be deemed to refer to the Secretary [of DHS], other official, or component of [DHS] to which such function is so transferred.” 6 U.S.C. § 557; Shabaj v. Holder, 718 F.3d 48, 51 n.3 (2d Cir. 2013).

¹² Defendants have represented publicly that no action will be taken against DACA recipients prior to March 5, 2018. (See, e.g., Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump), Twitter.com (Sept. 7, 2017, 6:42 a.m.), <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/905788459301908480> (“For all of those (DACA) that are concerned about your

vidual Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs attack decisions by DHS to “commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders” against them or any other specific individuals. Each of those Plaintiffs has received deferred action (see SAC ¶¶ 3-42), and the record does not suggest that any are currently in removal proceedings and seek to challenge the end of the DACA program as a means of obstructing those proceedings. Instead, Plaintiffs bring broad, programmatic challenges to Defendants’ decisions (1) to end the DACA program; (2) to provide limited notice of that decision to DACA recipients; and (3) to change DHS’s information-use policy. None of those constitutes a “decision or action . . . to commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders against any alien.” 8 U.S.C. | § 1252(g); cf. Texas, 809 F.3d at 164 (creation of DAPA reviewable because “decision to grant lawful presence to millions of [undocumented immigrants] on a class-wide basis” was not enumerated in the text of Section 1252(g)). Accordingly, Section 1252(g) does not bar judicial review of challenges to those decisions.

This conclusion comports with both the plain meaning of the statute and with the Supreme Court’s decision in AAADC. First, AAADC makes clear that Section 1252(g) only limits judicial review with respect to suits arising from certain enumerated decisions by immigration authorities. Writing for the Court, Justice Scalia specifically rejected the notion that Section 1252(g) was “a sort of ‘zipper’ clause that says ‘no judicial review in deportation cases unless this section provides judicial review.’” 525 U.S. at 482. Instead,

status during the 6 month period, you have nothing to worry about —No action!”.)

“[t]he provision applies only to [the] three discrete actions” referenced above. Id. While “[t]here are of course many other decisions or actions that may be part of the deportation process,” the Court stated, “[i]t is implausible that the mention of three discrete events along the road to deportation was a shorthand way of referring to all claims arising from deportation proceedings.” Id. Defendants’ argument that Section 1252(g) encompasses challenges to the decision to end the DACA program because “[t]he denial of continued deferred action is a necessary step in commencing enforcement proceedings at some later date” (Defs. Mem. at 18), is thus at odds with AAADC.

Second, the reasoning of AAADC does not support extending Section 1252(g) to encompass challenges to the decision to rescind DACA. In AAADC, the Court reasoned that Section 1252(g) must have been intended to limit judicial review of denials of deferred action:

Section 1252(g) seems clearly designed to give some measure of protection to “no deferred action” decisions and similar discretionary determinations, providing that if they are reviewable at all, they at least will not be made the bases of separate rounds of judicial intervention outside the streamlined process that Congress has designed [(i.e., for judicial review of final orders of removal)].

525 U.S. at 485. These limits were “entirely understandable” in order to prevent “the deconstruction, fragmentation, and hence prolongation of removal proceedings” that could result if immigrants were allowed to attack in-process removal proceedings by claiming that they were singled out by immigration authorities for adverse treatment. Id. at 487; see id. at 487-92.

Because the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs challenge the programmatic decision to rescind DACA, rather than attempting to obstruct their specific removal proceedings by claiming that they were improperly denied deferred action, these cases do not implicate the concern raised in AAADC.

Accordingly, Section 1252(g) does not preclude review of these actions.

2. Claims by MRNY and the State Plaintiffs

Moreover, Section 1252(g) does not preclude judicial review of the claims brought by MRNY or the State Plaintiffs in particular. Again, the court begins with the text of the statute. Section 1252(g) only bars suits “by or on behalf of any alien arising from the decision or action . . . to commence proceedings, adjudicate cases, or execute removal orders against any alien.” (emphasis added). But neither MRNY nor the State Plaintiffs are suing “on behalf of any alien” in removal proceedings or subject to an order of removal. Instead, MRNY sues in its own right, because it claims that the rescission of DACA has interfered with its operations. (SAC ¶¶ 54-57.) Likewise, the State Plaintiffs sue not “on behalf of any alien,” but instead to vindicate their own proprietary and quasi-sovereign interests.¹³ (State Pls. Opp’n to Mot. to Dismiss (“State

¹³ While a parens patriae suit is in some sense brought by a state “on behalf of” its citizens, “[t]he asserted quasi-sovereign interests will be deemed sufficiently implicated to support parens patriae standing only if ‘the injury alleged affects the general population of a State in a substantial way.’” Puerto Rico ex rel. Quiros v. Bramkamp, 654 F.2d 212, 215 (2d Cir. 1981) (emphasis added) (quoting Maryland v. Louisiana, 451 U.S. 725, 738 (1981)). A state cannot sue parens patriae simply to assert its citizens’ personal claims.

Pls. Opp'n") (No. 17-CV-5228, Dkt. 82) at 19-22.) MRNY and the State Plaintiffs seek to assert their own rights and the rights of the general public, not those of individual immigrants in removal proceedings or subject to orders of removal. There is no reason why Section 1252(g) would deprive the court of jurisdiction over their claims, brought on their own behalf.

C. Standing

The court next considers whether Plaintiffs have established that they have standing to sue. Defendants only cursorily raise Article III standing defenses. (Defs. Mem. at 19-20, 34, 37.) "Because the standing issue goes to this [c]ourt's subject matter jurisdiction," however, "it can be raised sua sponte." Cent. States Se. & Sw. Areas Health & Welfare Fund v. Merck-Medco Managed Care, L.L.C., 433 F.3d 181, 198 (2d Cir. 2005).

Under the U.S. Constitution, federal courts may hear only certain "cases" or "controversies." U.S. Const. art. III, § 2. This "case-or-controversy requirement" means that a plaintiff must have "standing," or a sufficient interest in a live dispute, to sue in federal court. See Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins, 136 S. Ct. 1540, 1546-47 (2016). At its "irreducible constitutional minimum," Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560 (1992), standing consists of three elements:

See Pennsylvania v. New Jersey, 426 U.S. 660, 665-66 (1976) (per curiam) (collecting cases). To the extent the State Plaintiffs attempt to bring parens patriae claims based on harm to their quasi-sovereign interests, those claims are not "on behalf of" specific immigrants, but instead seek to protect the general welfare of their residents. In any event, as the court discusses below, the State Plaintiffs lack parens patriae standing to bring these claims.

To establish Article III standing, [Plaintiffs] must demonstrate: “(1) injury-in-fact, which is a concrete and particularized harm to a legally protected interest; (2) causation in the form of a fairly traceable connection between the asserted injury-in-fact and the alleged actions of the defendant; and (3) redressability, or a non-speculative likelihood that the injury can be remedied by the requested relief”

Allco Fin. Ltd. v. Klee, 861 F.3d 82, 95 (2d Cir. 2017) (quoting W.R. Huff Asset Mgmt. Co., LLC v. Deloitte & Touche LLP, 549 F.3d 100, 106-07 (2d Cir. 2008)); accord Lujan, 504 U.S. at 560-61. The “first and foremost” of these three requirements, “injury-in-fact” requires a plaintiff to “show that he or she suffered an invasion of a legally protected interest that is ‘concrete and particularized’ and ‘actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical.’” Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins, 136 S. Ct. 1540, 1548 (2016) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted) (quoting Lujan, 504 U.S. at 560). To be “imminent,” the injury must be “certainly impending”; “allegations of possible future injury are not sufficient.” Clapper v. Amnesty Int’l USA, 568 U.S. 398, 409 (2013) (internal quotation marks, alteration, and citation omitted). The second and third requirements, “causation” and “redressability,” require a plaintiff to demonstrate that the “injury-in-fact” he or she suffers is “fairly traceable to the challenged action of the defendant and likely to be redressed by a favorable decision.” Lexmark Int’l, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc., 134 S. Ct. 1377, 1386 (2014) (citing Lujan, 504 U.S. at 560). A plaintiff need not, however, demonstrate that the defendant was the proximate or “but-for” cause of the injury-in-fact. Id. at 1391 n.6; Rothstein v. UBS AG, 708 F.3d 82, 91-92 (2d Cir. 2013).

The court considers standing separately with respect to each claim raised in each case. DaimlerChrysler Corp. v. Cuno, 547 U.S. 332, 352 (2006). “[T]he presence of one party with standing is sufficient to satisfy Article III’s case-or-controversy requirement” with respect to each claim and form of relief sought. Rumsfeld v. Forum for Acad. & Inst. Rights, Inc., 547 U.S. 47, 53 n.3 (2006) (“FAIR”). The court therefore considers whether, for each claim raised in each of these two actions, at least one plaintiff has standing to sue.

1. Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs

a. DACA Rescission Claims

Defendants unsurprisingly do not contest that the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs have standing to challenge the decision to rescind the DACA program. If the DACA program ends, the individual Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs almost certainly will lose their work authorization, the availability of which turns on their status as recipients of deferred action. See 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(c)(14). Loss of their ability to work in the United States is clearly an “injury-in-fact” fairly traceable to the rescission of the DACA program. Additionally, if they were to lose their deferred action, the individual Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs would be subject to removal from the United States. There is nothing “speculative” about the possibility that they would actually be removed. See Hedges v. Obama, 724 F.3d 170, 195-97 (2d Cir. 2013) (to establish standing, a plaintiff who is clearly in violation of a “recent and not moribund” statute need not affirmatively demonstrate the government’s intent to enforce the statute, absent “a disavowal by the government or another reason to conclude that no such intent exist[s]” (quoting Doe v. Bolton, 410 U.S. 179,

188 (1973)): *cf. Amnesty Int'l*, 568 U.S. at 410-16 (no standing where alleged injury-in-fact rested on a “speculative” “chain of contingencies”). Those harms are “fairly traceable” to the termination of the DACA program and would be redressed by the vacatur of that decision. The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs thus have Article III standing to challenge the decision to rescind the DACA program.

The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs also have standing to challenge the process by which Defendants decided to end the DACA program. Plaintiffs have standing to assert procedural rights “so long as the procedures in question are designed to protect some threatened concrete interest . . . that is the ultimate basis of [their] standing.” *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 573 n.8. “When a litigant is vested with a procedural right, that litigant has standing if there is some possibility that the requested relief will prompt the injury-causing party to reconsider the decision that allegedly harmed the litigant.” *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497, 518 (2007). Here, there is “some possibility” that if Defendants had subjected the decision to rescind the DACA program to notice and comment and analyzed the impact of that decision on small entities, they would have reached a different outcome. Accordingly, the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs also have Article III standing to assert their procedural APA claim, and MRNY has Article III standing to assert its RFA claim.

Defendants contend that Plaintiffs cannot assert procedural APA claims because, if the decision to rescind the DACA program was a “substantive” or “legislative” rule requiring notice-and-comment rulemaking, then, “*a fortiori* so was enacting the policy in the

first place,” and the DACA program itself was thus “void ab initio—leaving Plaintiffs without a remedy.” (Defs. Mem. at 28-29.) It does not follow, however, that if the rescission of the DACA program required notice and comment, the program’s creation necessarily required notice and comment as well. (See Defs. Mem. at 29 n.7.) While Defendants might be correct on the merits (an issue that the court does not consider or resolve at this time), all that Article III requires is that Plaintiffs show that their alleged injury would be redressed by the ruling they seek—i.e., that the decision to rescind DACA should be vacated because it was procedurally defective.

b. Information-Use Policy Claim

The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs also have standing to challenge the alleged changes to DHS’s information-use policy. To obtain deferred action and work authorization under DACA, an applicant was required to provide USCIS with extensive personal information, including his or her home address, height, weight, hair and eye color, fingerprints, photograph, and signature, and submit to a background check. (See USCIS, Form I-821D: Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (SAC, Ex. B (Dkt. 60-1)) at ECF pp. 6-8; USCIS, Instructions for Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (SAC, Ex. B (Dkt. 60-1)) at ECF p.3.) The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs also allege that DACA applicants “routinely provided” other personal information, “including copies of school records, pay stubs, bank statements, passports, birth certificates, and similar records,” in support of their applications. (SAC ¶ 70.) They contend that this information will enable DHS to deport them more

easily once their deferred action expires. (Id. ¶ 127.) The court agrees. It is not difficult to infer that this information would facilitate DHS’s ability to remove these individuals from the country. This increased likelihood of removal is sufficiently concrete, imminent, and traceable to Defendants’ alleged conduct to establish standing.

Defendants argue that Plaintiffs lack standing to pursue their information-use policy claims because “[n]o Plaintiff plausibly alleges that the agency has in fact used his DACA information for any enforcement purpose, much less initiated enforcement proceedings against him as a result, or that there is any imminent threat of this occurring.” (Defs. Mem. at 37.) The individual Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs need not wait, however, until they are deported to have standing to press this claim. Once their deferred action expires, they will be subject to removal from the United States, and the court will presume that Defendants will enforce the immigration laws against them. See Hedges, 724 F.3d at 197. Nor will the court ignore the obvious reality that many DACA recipients will be removed from the country when their deferred action expires. (See, e.g., State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 71 (quoting a statement by Acting Director of ICE Thomas Homan that undocumented immigrants “should be uncomfortable” and “should look over [their] shoulder[s]” and “be worried”).) The threat of removal based on information provided to DHS is sufficiently imminent as to constitute injury-in-fact.

c. Notice Claim

The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs lack standing, however, to assert their notice claim. In their Second Amended Complaint, the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs allege that, following the enactment of the DACA Rescission Memo, Defendants failed to send DACA recipients whose status expired by March 5, 2018, individualized notices “advising them that they must apply to renew DACA by October 5, 2017 or be forever ineligible to renew their status.” (SAC ¶ 1165; *see id.* at 3, ¶¶ 48, 103-05, 160-66.) As Defendants correctly note, however, the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs have not alleged that any of them missed the October 5, 2017, deadline or suffered other adverse effects from not receiving such individualized notice. (Defs. Mem. at 34-35.) Nor, even drawing all reasonable inferences in Plaintiffs’ favor, does the Second Amended Complaint show that MRNY was injured by Defendants’ failure to provide DACA recipients with individualized notice of the renewal deadline.¹⁴ While the Second Amended Complaint alleges that “MRNY has not been able to reach four

¹⁴ The court also notes that the renewal deadline provided by the DACA Rescission Memo was not significantly different than that provided by existing DHS policy. The State Plaintiffs allege that “[p]rior to termination of DACA, a DACA grantee whose renewal status expires in February 2018 would have received an individualized renewal notice informing the grantee that he or she had to file a renewal 120-150 days prior to expiration . . . in order to avoid a lapse in deferred action and employment authorization.” (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 93.) Under the DACA Rescission Memo, a DACA recipient whose deferred action and work authorization was set to expire on March 4, 2018, was required to file an application for renewal by October 5, 2018—*i.e.*, 150 days before those benefits were set to expire.

DACA recipients to inform them that they need to renew now” (SAC ¶ 48), that does not support the reasonable inferences either that those individuals failed to apply for renewal or that such failure was “fairly traceable” to Defendants’ actions.¹⁵ In the absence of a showing that anyone has been harmed by a failure to receive notice of the change to the application deadline, the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs have not demonstrated that they have Article III standing to bring this claim.

2. State Plaintiffs

The court next considers whether the State Plaintiffs have Article III standing. As the Court has noted, the ordinary rules of standing are somewhat different when a state is a plaintiff. States are “not normal litigants for the purposes of invoking federal jurisdiction,” and they are entitled to “special solicitude” when they seek to vindicate their “proprietary” or “quasi-sovereign” interests.¹⁶ Massachusetts v. EPA,

¹⁵ Even if those conditions were met, it is not clear that MRNY would have organizational standing to bring this claim. See Summers v. Earth Island Inst., 555 U.S. 488, 498 (2009) (“[O]ur prior cases . . . have required plaintiff-organizations to make specific allegations establishing that at least one identified member had suffered or would suffer harm.”)

¹⁶ The Court has categorized a state’s litigation interests using the trichotomy of “sovereign,” “quasi-sovereign,” and “proprietary” interests. See Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico, ex rel., Barez, 458 U.S. 592, 601 (1982) (“Snapp”). Proprietary interests are those that a state may have akin to a private party, such as ownership of land or participation in a business venture. Id. at 601. Sovereign interests are interests the state has in its capacity as a state, such as “the exercise of sovereign power over individuals and entities within the relevant jurisdiction” and “the demand for recognition from other sovereigns.” Id. “Quasi-

549 U.S. at 518. This does not mean, however, that states have unbridled license to sue.

a. The State Plaintiffs Have Standing to Challenge the DACA Rescission

The State Plaintiffs have Article III standing to challenge Defendants’ decision to rescind the DACA program, as well as the procedures by which that decision was made and implemented, based on that decision’s impacts to the State Plaintiffs’ proprietary interests. States, “like other associations and private parties,” may have a “variety of proprietary interests” that they may vindicate in court. Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico, ex rel., Barez, 458 U.S. 592, 601-02 (1982) (“Snapp”). A state has proprietary interests, for example, in its ownership of land, *id.* at 601, and in its relationships with its employees, *see Indiana v. IRS*, 38 F. Supp. 3d 1003, 1009 (S.D. Ind. 2014) (“The Defendants recognize, as they must, that a State and its political subdivisions may sue in their capacity as employers.”). A state also has proprietary interests in its “participat[ion] in a business venture,” *Snapp*, 458 U.S. at 601, and in the operation of state-run institutions, such as state colleges and universities, Washington, 847 F.3d at 1159-61; Aziz v. Trump, 231 F. Supp. 3d 23, 32-33 (E.D. Va. 2017).

Here, the State Plaintiffs have amply alleged and documented that the rescission of DACA would harm

sovereign” interests are harder to define but “consist of a set of interests that the State has in the well-being of its populace.” *Id.* at 602; *see also id.* at 607 (“[T]he articulation of [quasi-sovereign] interests is a matter for case-by-case development—neither an exhaustive formal definition nor a definitive list of qualifying interests can be presented in the abstract . . .”).

the states' proprietary interests as employers and in the operation of state-run colleges and universities. (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 190 (states employ “[m]any DACA recipients”).). For example, the State of Washington represents that it employs DACA recipients within state government (e.g., Decl. of Paul Quinonez ¶¶ 1-6 (State Pls. Am. Compl., Ex. 56 (Dkt. 55-56)); Decl. of E. Alexandra Monroe ¶ 3-4 (State Pls. Am. Compl., Ex. 62 (Dkt. 55-62))) and at state-run colleges and universities (e.g., Decl. of Lucila Loera ¶ 4 (State Pls. Am. Compl., Ex. 58 (Dkt. 55-58))). If DACA were rescinded, these employees would lose their work authorization, and the State of Washington would incur expenses in identifying, hiring, and training their replacements. (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 190.) Accordingly, the State of Washington has standing to assert equal protection and substantive APA claims challenging the decision to end the DACA program. Moreover, Washington has standing to challenge the procedures by which Defendants decided to end the DACA program, because “there is some possibility” that, if DHS complied with notice-and-comment and RFA rulemaking procedures, it might “reconsider the decision.” See Massachusetts v. EPA, 549 U.S. at 518. Because Washington has established its standing to assert substantive and procedural APA and RFA claims, the State Plaintiffs therefore have Article III standing to bring these claims. See FAIR, 547 U.S. at 53 n.3.

Defendants' arguments that State Plaintiffs lack Article III standing because they would be only “incidentally” harmed by the rescission of the DACA program are without merit. (See Defs. Mem. at 19.) Defendants protest that “[i]t would be extraordinary to find Article III standing” based on a state's assertions

of “alleged harms to their residents, employees, tax bases, health expenditures, and educational experiences at their universities,” as “virtually any administration of federal law by a federal agency could have such effects.” (*Id.*) That a federal policy may have sweeping, adverse effects on states and state-run institutions is not, however, a convincing argument that states should not have standing to challenge that policy. Moreover, Defendants’ position is irreconcilable with their own stated rationale for rescinding the DACA program. Defendants have stated that they rescinded the DACA program because it suffered from the same legal flaws as the DAPA program and could not be defended in court against the threatened challenge by Texas and other state plaintiffs. That necessarily assumes that at least one of the plaintiff states in the Texas litigation has standing to challenge the existence of the DACA program. *Cf. Texas*, 809 F.3d at 150-62 (finding standing based on the likely costs of having to issue drivers licenses to DAPA beneficiaries). Defendants offer no convincing reason why states should have standing to challenge the DACA program but not to challenge the decision to end that program.¹⁷

¹⁷ Defendants’ arguments to the contrary are unpersuasive. (Defs. Mem. at 21.) First, Defendants argue that neither the Acting Secretary nor the Attorney General “expressly relied upon or gave any indication that they agreed with the Fifth Circuit’s justiciability rulings.” (*Id.*) Jurisdiction is, however, a prerequisite to a ruling on the merits, so the plaintiff states could prevail in their threatened challenge to the DACA program only if they had standing. Second, Defendants argue that “it was far from arbitrary and capricious for the Acting Secretary to weigh litigation risk based on judicial decisions without regard to whether those courts had been correct to assert jurisdiction in the first place,” and

b. The State Plaintiffs Lack Standing to Bring Notice and Information-Use Policy Claims

Whether the State Plaintiffs can assert their notice or information-use policy claims, however, is a close question. In order to assert these claims, the State Plaintiffs must identify some cognizable proprietary or quasi-sovereign interest that was harmed by Defendants’ challenged conduct—*i.e.*, (1) with respect to the notice claim, Defendants’ communication of its decision to rescind the DACA program and impose an October 5, 2017, renewal deadline; and (2) with respect to the information-use policy claims, the alleged change in DHS policy regarding the use of DACA applicants’ information. In the court’s view, the State Plaintiffs have not identified any interests harmed by these actions that they can sue the federal government to redress, and so they lack standing to bring these claims.

i. Proprietary Interests

While the State Plaintiffs allege that their proprietary interests will be harmed by the termination of DACA (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 15, 100), they do not identify any proprietary interests that have been or

that the Executive Branch has “an independent duty to consider the legality of . . . policies regardless of whether they are judicially reviewable.” (*Id.*) The DACA Rescission Memo does not indicate, however, that Defendants actually considered these issues when deciding to rescind the DACA program. Finally, Defendants argue that the adoption of the DACA program could have been reviewed as an abdication of DHS’s statutory responsibilities—a grounds for justiciability that would not apply to the decision to rescind the program. (*Id.* at 21-22.) The Fifth Circuit expressly did not rely on that theory of standing, 809 F.3d at 150, nor is there any indication that the Attorney General or Acting Secretary considered it in rescinding the DACA program.

will be harmed by Defendants' alleged failure to provide DACA recipients with "adequate notice" of the "procedures and timeline for renewing their DACA status," "about the general termination of the DACA program after March 5, 2018," or "of [DACA recipients'] inability to apply for renewal of their DACA status after March 5, 2018" (*id.* ¶¶ 276-78; *cf.* State Pls. Mem. at 19-21). It is certainly conceivable that many DACA recipients who were eligible to renew their deferred action and work authorization under the DACA Rescission Memo failed to do so before the October 5, 2017 deadline. (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 96 (noting that "up to one third of DACA grantees who are eligible for renewal had not applied as of two days before the . . . deadline".)) The State Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint does not provide a sufficient basis for the court to conclude, however, that (1) such failures to renew were "fairly traceable" to Defendants' decision not to provide each DACA recipient with individualized notice of the change in application procedures and timelines; or (2) that these failures to renew harmed any State Plaintiff's proprietary interests (for example, by depriving a state employee of work authorization). See Amnesty Int'l, 568 U.S. at 410-16. Accordingly, the State Plaintiffs fail to assert a proprietary interest that would give them standing to bring their notice claim.¹⁸

¹⁸ In this circuit, the State Plaintiffs need not demonstrate, however, that the individuals they seek to protect must themselves meet the injury-in-fact, causation, and redressability requirements of Article III. See Connecticut v. Am. Elec. Power Co., 582 F.3d 309, 338-39 (2d Cir. 2009), aff'd in relevant part by an equally divided court, 564 U.S. 410, 420 (2011).

Nor do the State Plaintiffs identify a cognizable proprietary interest harmed by the alleged change to DHS's information-use policy. The State Plaintiffs' information-use policy claims challenge not the decision to rescind DACA itself, but the alleged changes in DHS's information-use policy, which, Plaintiffs allege, will facilitate the deportation of DACA applicants. As discussed above, the court accepts that these changes (if true) will likely result in more undocumented immigrants' removal from the United States. (See State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 86.) The State Plaintiffs have not, however, identified any cognizable harm to their proprietary interests that would result from the removal of their undocumented residents. The State Plaintiffs have proffered evidence that the removal of DACA beneficiaries would grievously affect state economies. (See Decl. of Dr. Ike Brannon ¶¶ 12, 14 (State Pls. Am. Compl., Ex. 4 (Dkt. 55-4)) (estimating that the removal of DACA recipients from the United States "would cost . . . the economy as a whole \$215 billion in lost GDP," with impacts falling hardest on states with the largest number of DACA recipients).) Despite the scale of these impacts, the State Plaintiffs' own authority makes clear that states lack standing to bring a "claim . . . that actions taken by United States Government agencies had injured a State's economy and thereby caused a decline in general tax revenues." Wyoming v. Oklahoma, 502 U.S. 437, 448 (1992). Absent some showing of injury to their own proprietary interests (for example, "direct injury in the form of a loss of specific tax revenues," *id.*), the State Plaintiffs cannot maintain their information-use policy claims based on alleged harms to their proprietary interests.

ii. Quasi-Sovereign Interests

Accordingly, the court will consider whether the State Plaintiffs can assert these claims parens patriae to vindicate their quasi-sovereign interests. States may bring parens patriae (literally, “parent of the country”) suits to vindicate what the Court has characterized as “quasi-sovereign” interests. See Snapp, 458 U.S. at 600-02. There are no bright-line rules for which interests qualify as “quasi-sovereign.” See id. at 600, 607; 13B Charles A. Wright et al., Federal Practice and Procedure § 3531.11.1, at 117 (3d ed. 2008) (“Wright & Miller”). In general, however, the Court has recognized that a state has quasi-sovereign interests in the “health and well-being—both physical and economic—of its residents in general,” in protecting state “residents from the harmful effects of discrimination,” and in challenging the discriminatory denial of a state’s “rightful status within the federal system.” Id. at 607, 609. There are, however, at least two notable limitations on states’ parens patriae standing.

First, to be “quasi-sovereign,” the state’s interests must be sufficiently generalized that the state is seeking to vindicate its citizens’ welfare, rather than simply pressing suit on behalf of its individual residents. See id. at 607 (“[M]ore must be alleged than injury to an identifiable group of individual residents . . .”). A state cannot sue parens patriae when it is “merely litigating as a volunteer the personal claims of its citizens.” Pennsylvania v. New Jersey, 426 U.S. 660, 665 (1976).

Second, special considerations are present when a state brings a parens patriae suit against the federal government. See 13B Wright & Miller § 3531.11.1, at

96. In Massachusetts v. Mellon, 262 U.S. 447 (1923), the Court rejected Massachusetts’s attempt to bring a parens patriae suit challenging a federal statute as unconstitutional. See id. at 485-86. “While the state, under some circumstances, may sue in [a parens patriae] capacity for the protection of its citizens, it is no part of its duty or power to enforce their rights in respect of their relations with the federal government. In that field it is the United States, and not the state, which represents them as parens patriae” Id. (emphasis added); see also Snapp, 458 U.S. at 609 n.16 (“A State does not have standing as parens patriae to bring an action against the Federal Government.”). The Court has rejected the argument, however, that Massachusetts v. Mellon bars all state parens patriae claims against the federal government. See Ariz. State Legislature v. Ariz. Indep. Redistricting Comm’n, 135 S. Ct. 2652, 2664 n.10 (2015) (observing that “[t]he cases on the standing of states to sue the federal government seem to depend on the kind of claim that the state advances” (quoting Richard Fallon et al., Hart and Wechsler’s The Federal Courts and the Federal System 263-66 (6th ed. 2009))). Compare Massachusetts v. EPA, 549 U.S. at 520 n.17, with id. at 538-39 (Roberts, C.J., dissenting). Instead, states may sue the federal government parens patriae to enforce rights guaranteed by a federal statute. See Massachusetts v. EPA, 549 U.S. at 520 n.17; see also New York v. Sebelius, No. 1:07-CV-1003 (GLS) (DRH), 2009 WL 1834599, at *12 (N.D.N.Y. June 22, 2009) (collecting cases). Massachusetts v. EPA expressly did not disturb the settled rule, however, that a state may not sue parens patriae to “protect her citizens from the operation of federal statutes.” Massachusetts v. EPA,

549 U.S. at 520 n.17 (quoting Georgia v. Penn. R. Co., 324 U.S. 439, 447 (1945)).

The court concludes that the State Plaintiffs lack standing to bring either their notice and information-use policy claims. With respect to their notice claim, the State Plaintiffs have not argued or demonstrated that Defendants' alleged failure to provide DACA applicants with adequate notice of changes in the DACA program and renewal deadline has actually harmed "the health and well-being" of state residents or any other cognizable quasi-sovereign interest. See Snapp, 458 U.S. at 607. (Cf. State Pls. Am. Compl. 15, 100; State Pls. Opp'n at 21-22.) Even if they had done so, they would be challenging federal enforcement of federal immigration laws as unconstitutional, which Massachusetts v. Mellon prohibits. See Massachusetts v. EPA, 549 U.S. at 520 n.17 ("[T]here is a critical difference between allowing a State 'to protect her citizens from the operation of federal statutes' (which is what Mellon prohibits) and allowing a State to assert its rights under federal law (which it has standing to do)."). For the same reason, the State Plaintiffs also lack standing to assert their information-use policy claims. Even assuming, as discussed above, that the change in information-use policy will facilitate the removal of undocumented immigrants from these states, and that this removal will harm the "health and well-being—both physical and economic" of state residents, see Snapp, 458 U.S. at 607, the thrust of the State Plaintiffs' information-use policy claims is to challenge as fundamentally unfair a change in federal policy that will facilitate the federal government's enforcement of the immigration laws.

The State Plaintiffs’ argument that they merely seek to “enforce—as opposed to overturn or avoid—application of a federal statute” is unpersuasive. (State Pls. Opp’n at 21 n.11) Plaintiffs plainly seek to invalidate federal action as unconstitutional. Such claims more closely resemble constitutional challenges to application of federal statutes, which Massachusetts v. Mellon prohibits states from asserting parens patriae than suits to enforce compliance with federal statutory law, which Massachusetts v. EPA permits states to bring parens patriae. When challenging federal action on constitutional grounds, “it is no part of [the state’s] duty or power to enforce [its citizens’] rights in respect of their relations with the federal government.” Massachusetts v. Mellon, 262 U.S. at 485-86. But see Aziz, 231 F. Supp. 3d at 31-32 (concluding that “a state is not be barred by the Mellon doctrine from a parens patriae challenge to executive action when the state has grounds to argue that the executive action is contrary to federal statutory or constitutional law” (emphasis added)).

The court concludes, therefore, that the State Plaintiffs lack standing to assert their notice and information-use policy claims.

D. Whether State Plaintiffs Have Cause of Action under the APA

Lastly, Defendants assert that neither MRNY’s nor the State Plaintiffs’ claims are justiciable because those Plaintiffs do not assert interests that are “arguably within the zone of interests . . . protected or regulated by the statute . . . in question.” (Defs. Mem. at 21 (quoting Clarke v. Secs. Indus. Ass’n, 479 U.S. 388, 395 (1987) (first alteration added)).) To bring suit under

the APA, a plaintiff “must satisfy not only Article III’s standing requirements, but an additional test: [t]he interest he asserts must be ‘arguably within the zone of interests to be protected or regulated by the statute’ that he says was violated.” Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians v. Patchak, 567 U.S. 209, 224 (2012) (“Match-E-Be-Nash”) (quoting Ass’n of Data Processing Serv. Orgs., Inc. v. Camp, 397 U.S. 150, 153 (1970)). This test “is not meant to be especially demanding” and “forecloses suit only when a plaintiff’s ‘interests are so marginally related to or inconsistent with the purposes implicit in the statute that it cannot reasonably be assumed that Congress intended to permit the suit.’” Id. (quoting Secs. Indus. Ass’n, 479 U.S. at 399).

Critically, for the court’s current purposes, whether MRNY and the State Plaintiffs assert interests falling within the “zone of interests” protected by the APA is not a question of “jurisdiction” or “justiciability.” As the Supreme Court has explained, the question of whether a plaintiff falls within the zone of interests protected by a statute is not properly classed as an issue of “prudential standing,” but is instead an issue of “whether a legislatively conferred cause of action encompasses a particular plaintiff’s claim.” Lexmark Int’l, 134 S. Ct. at 1387. That issue “goes not to the court’s jurisdiction—that is, ‘power’—to adjudicate a case, but instead to whether the plaintiff has adequately pled a claim.” Chabad Lubavitch of Litchfield Cnty., Inc. v. Litchfield Historic Dist. Comm’n, 768 F.3d 183, 201 (2d Cir. 2014) (citing Lexmark Int’l, 134 S. Ct. at 1387 n.4, 1389 n.5); see also Casper Sleep, Inc. v. Mitcham, 204 F. Supp. 3d 632, 637-38 (S.D.N.Y. 2016) (arguments for dismissal for lack of “prudential standing” were appropriately addressed under Rule 12(b)(6), not Rule 12(b)(1), of the Federal Rules of

Civil Procedure). Because this argument does not raise an issue of “jurisdiction or justiciability,” the court does not address it here.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Defendants’ motion to dismiss for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction (Dkt. 95) is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. The following claims are dismissed:

- Batalla Vidal v. Duke, No. 16-CV-4756:
 - Fourth claim for relief (Due Process Clause—Notice)
- New York v. Trump, No. 17-CV-5228:
 - Second claim for relief (Due Process Clause—Information-Use Policy)
 - Third claim for relief (Equitable Estoppel—Information-Use Policy)
 - Seventh claim for relief (Due Process Clause—Notice)

Defendants’ motion to dismiss for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction is denied with respect to all other claims. The court RESERVES RULING on Defendants’ motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
Nov. [9], 2017

/s/ NICHOLAS G. GARAUFIS
NICHOLAS G. GARAUFIS
United States District Judge

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

No. 1:16-cv-04756 (NGG) (JO)

MARTÍN JONATHAN BATALLA VIDAL, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

v.

KIRSTJEN M. NIELSEN, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

No. 1:17-cv-05228 (NGG) (JO)

STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

v.

DONALD TRUMP, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

Filed: Jan. 8, 2018

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Notice is hereby given that all Defendants in the above-captioned matters hereby appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from the November 9, 2017 Memorandum & Order of the Honorable Nicholas G. Garaufis, United States District Judge (*Batalla Vidal* ECF No. 104; *State of New York* ECF No. 85). Defendants appeal pursuant to the district court's January 8, 2018 order granting certification under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b).

60a

Dated: Jan. 8, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

CHAD A. READLER
Acting Assistant Attorney General

RICHARD P. DONOGHUE
United States Attorney

BRETT A. SHUMATE
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

JENNIFER D. RICKETTS
Director, Federal Programs Branch

JOHN R. TYLER
Assistant Branch Director

BRAD P. ROSENBERG
Senior Trial Counsel

/s/ STEPHEN M. PEZZI
STEPHEN M. PEZZI (DC Bar #995500)
RACHAEL L. WESTMORELAND
KATE BAILEY
Trial Attorneys
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
20 Massachusetts Avenue N.W.
Washington, DC 20530
Tel.: (202) 305-8576
Fax: (202) 616-8470
Email: Stephen.pezzzi@usdoj.gov

61a

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

Counsel for Defendants

APPENDIX C

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

No. 16-CV-4756 (NGG) (JO)

MARTÍN JONATHAN BATALLA VIDAL ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

v.

KIRSTJEN M. NIELSEN, SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELAND SECURITY, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

No. 17-CV-5228 (NGG) (JO)

STATE OF NEW YORK ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

v.

DONALD TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
ET AL., DEFENDANTS

Filed: Feb. 13, 2018

**AMENDED MEMORANDUM & ORDER &
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

NICHOLAS G. GARAUFGIS, United States District
Judge.

In 2012, the Department of Homeland Security created the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (“DACA”) program. That program permitted certain individuals without lawful immigration status who entered the United States as children to obtain “deferred action”—contingent, discretionary relief from deportation

—and authorization to work legally in this country. Since 2012, nearly 800,000 DACA recipients have relied on this program to work, study, and keep building lives in this country.

On September 5, 2017, Defendants announced that they would gradually end the DACA program.¹ (Letter from Jefferson B. Sessions III to Elaine C. Duke (Admin. R. (Dkt. 77-1)² 251) (“Sessions Ltr.”); Mem. from Elaine C. Duke, Acting Sec’y, DHS, Rescission of the June 15, 2012 Memorandum Entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children” (Sept. 5, 2017) (Admin. R. 252) (“DACA Rescission Memo”).) The Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) would consider pending DACA applications and renewal requests, as well as promptly filed renewal requests by DACA beneficiaries whose benefits were set to expire within six months, but would reject all other applications and renewal requests. (DACA Rescission Memo at 4.) Plaintiffs in the above-captioned cases promptly

¹ Plaintiffs have named as defendants President Donald J. Trump, Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security Kristjen Nielsen, and Attorney General Jefferson B. Sessions III. Plaintiffs allege that the President terminated the DACA program because of unlawful discriminatory animus, in violation of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. (3d Am. Compl. (Dkt. 113, No. 16-CV-4756) ¶¶ 89-100, 195-98; Am. Compl. (Dkt. 54, No. 17-CV-5228) ¶¶ 57-70, 233-39.) Because the APA does not permit direct review of Presidential decisionmaking, Franklin v. Massachusetts, 505 U.S. 788, 800-01 (1992), only the Attorney General and Secretary Nielsen are defendants with respect to Plaintiffs’ substantive APA claims, which are the focus of this opinion. (3d Am. Compl. (Dkt. 113, No. 16-CV-4756) at ECF p.40.)

² All record citations refer to the docket in Batalla Vidal v. Nielsen, No. 16-CV-4756, except as otherwise noted.

challenged Defendants’ decision on a number of grounds, including, most relevant for purposes of this Memorandum and Order, that the decision violated the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 551 *et seq.* (the “APA”). (2d Am. Compl. (Dkt. 60)); Compl. (Dkt. 1, No. 17-CV-5228).) Plaintiffs now seek a preliminary injunction barring Defendants from ending the DACA program pending a final adjudication of these cases on the merits. (Mem. in Supp. of Mot. for Prelim. Inj. (Dkt. 123-1) (“BV Pls. Mot.”); Mem. in Supp. of Mot. for Prelim. Inj. (Dkt. 96-1, No. 17-CV-5228) (“State Pls. Mot.”).)

“Congress passed the [APA] to ensure that agencies follow constraints even as they exercise their powers. One of these constraints is the duty of agencies to find and formulate policies that can be justified by neutral principles.” FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc., 556 U.S. 502, 537 (2009) (Kennedy, J., concurring in part and in the judgment). To that end, the APA authorizes parties harmed by federal agencies to obtain judicial review of agency decisions. 5 U.S.C. § 702. The reviewing court must set aside “action, findings, [or] conclusions” that are, among other things, “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.” Id. § 706(2)(A).³ Review under this “arbitrary and capricious” standard is “narrow,” and the court may not “substitute its judgment for that of the agency”; instead, the court consid-

³ On November 9, 2017, the court rejected Defendants’ arguments that judicial review under the APA was unavailable because the decision to rescind the DACA program was “committed to agency discretion by law.” (Nov. 9, 2017, Mem. & Order (Dkt. 104) at 20-28.)

ers only whether the agency’s decision “was the product of reasoned decisionmaking.” Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n of U.S., Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 463 U.S. 29, 43, 52 (1983) (“State Farm”). If the agency decision “examine[d] the relevant data and articulate[d] a satisfactory explanation for its action including a ‘rational connection between the facts found and the choice made,’” the court will uphold the agency’s decision. Id. at 43 (quoting Burlington Truck Lines v. United States, 371 U.S. 156, 168 (1962)). If, however, the agency’s decision “relied on factors which Congress has not intended it to consider, entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem, offered an explanation for its decision that runs counter to the evidence before the agency, or is so implausible that it could not be ascribed to a difference in view or the product of agency expertise,” that decision must be set aside. Id.

Review under the arbitrary-and-capricious standard is generally limited to the agency’s stated rationale for its decision, State Farm, 463 U.S. at 43; Camp v. Pitts, 411 U.S. 138, 143 (1973) (per curiam), and to the “full administrative record that was before the [agency] at the time [it] made [its] decision,” Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe, 401 U.S. 402, 420 (1971) (“Overton Park”). The court “may not supply a reasoned basis for the agency’s action that the agency itself has not given.” State Farm, 463 U.S. at 43 (citing SEC v. Chenery Corp., 332 U.S. 194, 196 (1947) (“Chenery II”)); SEC v. Chenery Corp., 318 U.S. 80, 87 (1943) (“Chenery I”). Nor may the court uphold agency action based on “post hoc rationalizations of agency action.” State Farm, 463 U.S. at 50; see also Williams Gas Processing—Gulf Coast Co., L.P. v.

FERC, 373 F.3d 1335, 1345 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (Roberts, J.) (“It is axiomatic that [the court] may uphold agency orders based only on reasoning that is fairly stated by the agency in the order under review; post hoc rationalizations by agency counsel will not suffice.” (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)).

The APA thus sometimes places courts in the formalistic, even perverse, position of setting aside action that was clearly within the responsible agency’s authority, simply because the agency gave the wrong reasons for, or failed to adequately explain, its decision. E.g., State Farm, 463 U.S. at 42-43, 48-56; Overton Park, 401 U.S. at 416, 420. Based on the present record, these appears to be just such cases.

Defendants indisputably can end the DACA program. Nothing in the Constitution or the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101 et seq. (the “INA”), requires immigration authorities to grant deferred action or work authorization to individuals without lawful immigration status. The DACA program, like prior deferred-action and similar discretionary relief programs, simply reflected the Obama Administration’s determination that DHS’s limited enforcement resources generally should not be used to deport individuals who were brought to the United States as children, met educational or military-service requirements, and lacked meaningful criminal records. (Mem. from Janet Napolitano, Sec’y, DHS, Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children at 1-2 (June 15, 2012) (Admin. R. 1-2) (the “2012 DACA Memo”).) New Administrations may, however, alter or abandon their predecessors’ policies, even if these policy shifts may

impose staggering personal, social, and economic costs.⁴

The question before the court is thus not whether Defendants could end the DACA program, but whether they offered legally adequate reasons for doing so. Based on its review of the record before it, the court concludes that Defendants have not done so. First, the decision to end the DACA program appears to rest exclusively on a legal conclusion that the program was unconstitutional and violated the APA and INA. Because that conclusion was erroneous, the decision to end the DACA program cannot stand. Second, this erroneous conclusion appears to have relied in part on the plainly incorrect factual premise that courts have recognized “constitutional defects” in the somewhat analogous Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (“DAPA”) program. Third, Defendants’ decision appears to be internally contradictory, as the means by which Defendants chose to “wind down” the program (namely, by continuing to adjudicate certain DACA renewal applications) cannot be reconciled with their stated rationale for ending the program (namely, that DACA was unconstitutional). Any of these flaws would support invalidating the DACA rescission as arbitrary and capricious.

⁴ These costs are detailed in greater length in the exhibits to Plaintiffs’ motions for preliminary injunction, and in the many helpful briefs filed by amici in these cases. (See, e.g., Brief of Amici Curiae 114 Companies (Dkt. 160) (estimating the costs of the DACA rescission over the next decade at \$460.3 billion in lost GDP and \$24.6 billion in lost Social Security and Medicare tax contributions).)

Before this court, Defendants have attempted to reframe their decision as motivated by “litigation risk.” They contend that the decision to end the DACA program was reasonable in light of the prospect that Texas and several other states would seek to amend their complaint in Texas v. United States, No. 14-CV-254 (S.D. Tex.), to challenge the DACA program; that the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas would issue a nationwide injunction ending the program; and that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit and the U.S. Supreme Court would affirm that injunction. (Defs. Opp’n to Pls. Mots. for Prelim. Inj. (Dkt. 239) at 1, 10-11, 21-24.) The Administrative Record does not support Defendants’ contention that they decided to end the DACA program for this reason. Even if it did, reliance on this “litigation risk” rationale would have been arbitrary and capricious, in light of Defendants’ failure to explain their decision or to consider any factors that might have weighed against ending the DACA program. And even if this “litigation risk” rationale were both supported by the Administrative Record and a reasonable basis for rescinding the DACA program, the court would nevertheless likely set Defendants’ decision aside, as the court cannot say that any of the aforementioned errors were harmless, for purposes of review under the APA.

Accordingly, the court concludes that Plaintiffs are likely to succeed on the merits of their substantive APA claims. Because Plaintiffs also satisfy the remaining requirements for the court to issue a preliminary injunction, the court ENJOINS Defendants from rescinding the DACA program, pending a decision on the merits of these cases. Defendants thus must continue processing DACA renewal requests under the

same terms and conditions that applied before September 5, 2017, subject to the limitations described below. The scope of this preliminary injunction conforms to that previously issued by the U.S. District Court of the Northern District of California. See Order Denying Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject-Matter Jurisdiction and Granting Provisional Relief (Dkt. 234), *Regents of the Univ. of Calif. v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, No. 3:17-CV-5211 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2018) (“*Regents*”) (Alsup, J.), pet. for cert. before judgment filed, No. 17-1003.

The court makes clear, however, what this order is not.

- **This order does not hold that the rescission of DACA was unlawful.** That question is for summary judgment, not motions for a preliminary injunction. Cf. *Hamilton Watch Co. v. Benrus Watch Co.*, 206 F.2d 738, 742 (2d Cir. 1953) (“[A] preliminary injunction . . . is, by its very nature, interlocutory, tentative, provisional, ad interim, impermanent, mutable, not fixed or final or conclusive, characterized by its for-the-time-beingness.”).
- **This order does not hold that Defendants may not rescind the DACA program.** Even if the court ultimately finds that Defendants’ stated rationale for ending the DACA program was legally deficient, the ordinary remedy is for the court to remand the decision to DHS for reconsideration. See *Chenery I*, 318 U.S. at 94-95. On remand, DHS “might later, in the exercise of its lawful discretion, reach the same result for a different reason.” *FEC v. Akins*, 524 U.S. 11, 25 (1998).

- **This order does not require Defendants to grant any particular DACA applications or renewal requests.** Restoring the DACA program to the status quo as of September 4, 2017, does not mean that every DACA recipient who requests renewal of his or her deferred action and work authorization will receive it. The DACA program identified “criteria [that] should be satisfied before an individual is considered for an exercise of prosecutorial discretion.” (2012 DACA Memo at 1.) It did not require immigration officials to defer action against any individuals who met these criteria; to the contrary, the 2012 DACA Memo stated that DHS would exercise prosecutorial discretion “on an individual basis” and would not “provide any assurance that relief will be granted in all cases.” (*Id.* at 2-3.) Preserving the status quo means only that Defendants must continue considering DACA applications and renewal requests, not that they must grant all such applications and requests. (See U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Servs., Frequently Asked Questions at Q6 (Apr. 25, 2017) (“Apr. 25 DACA FAQs”), Ex. 41 to State Pls. Mot. (Dkt. 97-2, No. 17-CV-5228) at ECF p.186.)
- **This order does not prevent Defendants’ from revoking individual DACA recipients’ deferred action or work authorization.** Under the 2012 DACA Memo, DHS may terminate a DACA recipient’s deferred action “at any time, with or without a Notice of intent to Terminate, at [its] discretion.” (Apr. 25 DACA FAQs at Q27.) Maintaining the status quo does nothing to alter that.

Because the court issues the preliminary injunction requested by Plaintiffs, the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification (Dkt. 124) is DENIED as moot. The court will address by separate order Defendants' motions to dismiss Plaintiffs' operative complaints. (Defs. Mot. to Dismiss Third Am. Compl. (Dkt. 207); Defs. Mot. to Dismiss (Dkt. 71, No. 17-CV-5228).)

I. BACKGROUND

The court provides a brief history of immigration authorities' use of "deferred action" and similar discretionary-relief programs, the DACA and DAPA programs, and this litigation to offer context for the discussion that follows. For further background, the reader may consult this court's prior orders (see Oct. 3, 2017, Order (Dkt. 72); Oct. 17, 2017, Mem. & Order (Dkt. 86); Oct. 19, 2017, Mem. & Order (Dkt. 90); Nov. 9, 2017, Mem. & Order (Dkt. 104); Nov. 20, 2017, Order (Dkt. 109); Dec. 15, 2017, Order (Dkt. 122); Jan. 8, 2018, Mem. & Order (Dkt. 233)), the Northern District of California's opinion in Regents, 2018 WL 339144, at *1-8, and the opinion of the Office of Legal Counsel regarding DAPA (see The Department of Homeland Security's Authority to Prioritize Removal of Certain Aliens Unlawfully Present in the United States and to Defer Removal of Others, 38 Op. O.L.C. at 1 (2014) (Admin. R. 4) ("OLC Op.")).

A. History of Deferred Action

"The Government of the United States has broad, undoubted power over the subject of immigration and the status of aliens." Arizona v. United States, 567 U.S. 387, 394 (2012). That power derives from the Constitution, which authorizes Congress "[t]o establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization," U.S. Const. art. I.,

§ 8, cl. 4, and from the Government’s “inherent power as sovereign to control and conduct relations with foreign nations.” Arizona, 567 U.S. at 395. Acting under this authority, the Government has created an “extensive and complex” statutory and regulatory regime governing, among other things, who may be admitted to the United States, who may work here, and who may be removed from the country. Id.; see id. at 395-97.

Not all “removable” aliens are, in fact, deported from this country. Immigration officials “cannot act against each technical violation of the statute[s they are] charged with enforcing,” but must determine which enforcement actions are worthwhile. Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821, 831 (1985); Arpaio v. Obama, 797 F.3d 11, 15-16 (D.C. Cir. 2015). “A principal feature of the removal system is the broad discretion exercised by immigration officials,” who “as an initial matter, must decide whether it makes sense to pursue removal at all,” and, “[i]f removal proceedings commence,” may decide whether removable aliens warrant asylum or “other discretionary relief allowing them to remain in the country or at least to leave without formal removal.” Arizona, 567 U.S. at 396; see also Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm., 525 U.S. 471, 483 (1999) (“AAADC”) (observing that throughout the removal process, immigration officials have “discretion to abandon the endeavor”). Immigration officials’ enforcement discretion is a practical necessity as well as a legal reality: By one recent estimate, there are approximately 11.3 million undocumented aliens present in the United States, of whom DHS has the resources to remove fewer than 400,000 per year—about 3.5 percent of the total. (OLC Op. at 1.)

Over the years, Congress and the Executive Branch have developed a number of means by which immigration officials may exercise their discretion not to deport removable aliens. “Some of these discretionary powers have flowed from statute,” such as “parole,” see 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A), and “temporary protected status,” see id. § 1254a. Regents, 2018 WL 339144, at *2; see also, e.g., 8 U.S.C. § 1229b (cancellation of removal); id. § 1229c (voluntary departure). Others, such as “deferred enforced departure” or “extended voluntary departure,” have been ad hoc exercises of executive authority, grounded in the Executive Branch’s responsibility for conducting foreign relations and enforcing immigration laws, rather than in express congressional authorization. Regents, 2018 WL 339144, at *2; OLC Op. at 12 & n.5.

The cases before this court concern one such form of discretionary relief. “Deferred action” is a longstanding practice by which the Executive Branch exercises its discretion to abandon, or to decline to undertake, deportation proceedings “for humanitarian reasons or simply for its own convenience.” AAADC, 525 U.S. at 484; see also Arpaio, 797 F.3d at 16 (“‘[D]eferred action’ . . . entails temporarily postponing the removal of individuals unlawfully present in the United States.”). By granting a removable alien deferred action, immigration officials convey that they do not currently intend to remove that individual from the country. As such, deferred action offers the recipient some assurance—however non-binding, unenforceable, and contingent on the recipient’s continued good behavior—that he or she may remain, at least for now, in the United States. Additionally, recipients of deferred action may apply for authorization to work legally in the United States,

provided that they “establish[] an economic necessity for employment.” 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(c)(14); see also 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(h)(3) (excluding from the definition of “unauthorized aliens,” who may not be knowingly employed in the United States, aliens “authorized to be . . . employed . . . by the Attorney General”). Deferred action does not, however, confer lawful immigration status, a pathway to citizenship, or a defense to removal, and is revocable by immigration authorities. United States v. Arrieta, 862 F.3d 512, 514 (5th Cir. 2017); Ariz. Dream Act Coal. v. Brewer, 757 F.3d 1053, 1058 (9th Cir. 2014). (2012 DACA Memo at 3.)

“Although the practice of granting deferred action ‘developed without express statutory authorization,’ it has become a regular feature of the immigration removal system that has been acknowledged by both Congress and the Supreme Court.” (OLC Op. at 13 (quoting AAADC, 525 U.S. at 484).) DHS and its predecessor, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, have employed deferred action and similar discretionary-relief programs, such as “nonpriority status” and “extended voluntary departure,” since at least the 1960s. Arpaio, 797 F.3d at 16 (citing OLC Op. at 7-8, 12-13). (Br. of Amicus Curiae Former Federal Immigration and Homeland Security Officials (Dkt. 198-1) (“Former Fed. Officials Amicus Br.”) at 6-11; Andorra Bruno et al., Cong. Res. Serv., Analysis of June 15, 2012 DHS Memorandum, Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children, at 20-23 (July 13, 2012), <https://edsource.org/wp-content/uploads/old/Deferred-Action-Congressional-Research-Service-Report1.pdf> (“CRS Rep.”).) These programs were used to provide relief to, among dozens of examples, refugees from

war-torn and communist countries; spouses and children of aliens granted legal status under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-603, 100 Stat. 3359; aliens eligible for relief under the Violence Against Women Act (“VAWA”) or the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000; foreign students affected by Hurricane Katrina; and certain widows and widowers of U.S. citizens. (OLC Op. at 14-17; Former Fed. Officials Amicus Br. at 8-10.)

Congress has repeatedly ratified immigration officials’ practice of according deferred action to certain aliens without lawful immigration status. See, e.g., 8 U.S.C. § 1151 note (certain immediate family members of certain alien U.S. combat veterans are “eligible for deferred action, advance parole, and work authorization”); id. § 1154(a)(1)(D)(i)(II) (VAWA petitioners “eligible for deferred action and work authorization”); id. § 1227(d)(2) (denial of administrative stay of removal “shall not preclude the alien from applying for . . . deferred action”); USA PATRIOT Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-56, § 423(b), 115 Stat. 272, 361 (certain immediate family members of lawful permanent residents killed in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, “may be eligible for deferred action and work authorization”).

B. DACA and DAPA

On June 15, 2012, then-DHS Secretary Janet Napolitano issued the 2012 DACA Memo, which stated that DHS would consider granting deferred action to certain individuals without lawful immigration status who entered the United States as children. (2012 DACA Memo at 1.) Secretary Napolitano stated that DHS was implementing this program as an “exercise of

prosecutorial discretion” in the enforcement of immigration laws, to “ensure that . . . enforcement resources are not expended on . . . low priority cases.” (*Id.*) Under the 2012 DACA Memo, individuals were eligible for consideration for deferred action if they (1) “came to the United States under the age of sixteen”; (2) had “continuously resided in the United States for a[t] least five years preceding the date of this memorandum and [were] present in the United States” on that date; (3) were “in school,” had “graduated from high school,” had obtained GEDs, or were honorably discharged veterans of the Armed Forces or Coast Guard; (4) had not been convicted of felonies, significant misdemeanors, or multiple misdemeanors, or been deemed to “otherwise pose[] a threat to national security or public safety”; and (5) were not above the age of thirty. (*Id.*) DACA applications from individuals meeting these criteria would be evaluated “on an individual” or “case-by-case” basis and would not necessarily be “granted in all cases.” (*Id.* at 2.) The 2012 DACA Memo “confer[red] no substantive right, immigration status or pathway to citizenship.” (*Id.* at 2-3.)

In late 2014, DHS announced the DAPA program, which would have granted deferred action to certain parents of U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents. (Mem. from Jeh Charles Johnson, Sec’y of DHS, Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children and with Respect to Certain Individuals Who Are the Parents of U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents (Nov. 20, 2014) (the “2014 DAPA Memo”) (Admin R. 40).) As part of that program, then-DHS Secretary Jeh Johnson directed U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”) “to establish a process, similar

to DACA, for exercising prosecutorial discretion through the use of deferred action, on a case-by-case basis,” to certain individuals who, among other things, lacked formal immigration status and had a son or daughter who was a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident. (*Id.* at 1.) Secretary Johnson also announced that the DACA program would be expanded by (1) removing the requirement that DACA applicants be under the age of 30 as of June 2012; (2) extending the duration of the deferred action and work authorization obtained through the program from two to three years; and (3) adjusting the date-of-entry requirement to open DACA to individuals brought to the United States between June 15, 2007, and January 1, 2010. (*Id.* at 3-4 (the “DACA Expansion”).)

C. The Texas Litigation

Following DHS’s issuance of the 2014 DAPA Memo, Texas and 25 other states filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, alleging that the DAPA program violated the APA and the Take Care Clause of the U.S. Constitution, U.S. Const. art. II, § 3. See Texas v. United States, 86 F. Supp. 3d 591, 598 (S.D. Tex. 2015). On February 16, 2015, after concluding that Texas and its fellow plaintiffs had standing to sue, Judge Andrew Hanen determined that they were likely to succeed on the merits of their claim that DAPA constituted a “legislative” or “substantive” rule that, under the APA, should have been made through notice-and-comment rulemaking procedures. *Id.* at 664-72. In particular, Judge Hanen found that the 2014 DAPA Memo, “[a]t a minimum, . . . ‘severely restrict[ed]’ any discretion that Defendants argue exists” in the adjudication of DAPA applications, and

that DHS had not genuinely exercised discretion in reviewing DACA applications. Id. at 669 & n.101. The court issued a nationwide injunction against the implementation of both the DAPA program and the DACA Expansion. Id. at 677-78.

The Fifth Circuit denied a stay of the preliminary injunction, 787 F.3d 733, 743 (5th Cir. 2015), and affirmed the district court on two independent, alternative grounds, 809 F.3d 134, 178 (5th Cir. 2015) (revised). First, the Fifth Circuit upheld the district court's ruling that the plaintiff states were likely to prevail on the merits of their claim that the DAPA program was invalid because it was not developed through notice-and-comment rulemaking. See id. at 170-78. In particular, the Fifth Circuit found that Judge Hanen did not clearly err in finding that “[n]othing about DAPA genuinely leaves the agency and its [employees] free to exercise discretion,” based partly on evidence that supposedly showed that USCIS exercised little case-by-case discretion in adjudicating DACA applications. Id. at 172 (quoting 86 F. Supp. 3d at 670 (alterations in original)); see id. at 172-78.

Second, the Fifth Circuit concluded that the plaintiff states were likely to prevail on the merits of their claim that the DAPA program was substantively arbitrary and capricious because, in that court's view, the program was contrary to the INA. See id. at 178-86. The Fifth Circuit observed that “Congress has enacted an intricate process for illegal aliens to derive a lawful immigration classification from their children's immigration status,” in the form of family-preference visas, id. at 179, and cancellation of removal and adjustment of status, id. at 180. While admitting that DAPA did

not “confer the full panoply of benefits that a visa gives,” the Fifth Circuit held that DAPA nevertheless conflicted with these statutory forms of relief by permitting “illegal aliens to receive the benefits of lawful presence” without meeting the stringent requirements applicable to these provisions. See id. at 180. Similarly, the Fifth Circuit held that DAPA conflicted with the INA by providing an easier path to “lawful presence” and work authorization for approximately four million undocumented immigrants—a question of great national importance that Congress could not have intended to delegate implicitly to DHS. See id. at 180-81. The Fifth Circuit acknowledged that there was a long history of discretionary-relief programs but held that past practice was not dispositive of DAPA’s legality and distinguished DAPA from past programs on the grounds that such programs were “done on a country-specific basis, usually in response to war, civil unrest, or natural disasters,” id. at 184 (quoting CRS Rep. at 9); used as a “bridge[] from one legal status to another,” id.; or “interstitial to a statutory legalization scheme,” such as the Family Fairness program enacted by the Reagan and George H.W. Bush Administrations, id. at 185. Accordingly, “DAPA [wa]s foreclosed by Congress’s careful plan . . . and therefore was properly enjoined.” Id. at 186.

The Supreme Court granted the Government’s petition for a writ of certiorari, 136 S. Ct. 906 (2016), and affirmed the decision of the Fifth Circuit by an equally divided court, 136 S. Ct. 2271 (Mem.).

D. The DACA Rescission

On January 25, 2017, the newly inaugurated President Donald Trump issued an executive order stating that “[i]t is the policy of the executive branch to . . . [e]nsure the faithful execution of the immigration laws of the United States,” and that “[w]e cannot faithfully execute the immigration laws of the United States if we exempt classes or categories of removable aliens from potential enforcement.” Exec. Order 13,768, Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States (Jan. 25, 2017), 82 Fed. Reg. 8799. Shortly thereafter, then-DHS Secretary John F. Kelly issued a memorandum implementing this executive order by rescinding “all existing conflicting directives, memoranda, or field guidance regarding enforcement of our immigration laws and priorities for removal,” except for the DACA and DAPA programs, which he left in place. (Mem. from John F. Kelly, Sec’y, DHS, Enforcement of the Immigration Laws to Serve the National Interest at 2 (Feb. 20, 2017) (Admin. R. 230).)

Four months later, Secretary Kelly issued another memorandum rescinding DAPA and the DACA Expansion in light of “the preliminary injunction in this matter, the ongoing litigation, the fact that DAPA never took effect, and our new immigration enforcement priorities.” (Mem. from John F. Kelly, Sec’y, DHS, Rescission of November 20, 2014, Memorandum Providing for Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (“DAPA”) at 3 (June 15, 2017) (Admin. R. 237).) This memo left the original DACA program in place and did not affect the remaining three-year grants of deferred action that were issued under the DACA Expansion prior to Judge

Hanen’s issuance of a preliminary injunction in Texas. (Id. at 2 & n.3).

Following the rescission of the 2014 DAPA Memo, Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton, joined by the attorneys-general of ten other states, wrote to Attorney General Jefferson B. Sessions to insist that the Executive Branch rescind the 2012 DACA Memo. (Ltr. from Ken Paxton, Att’y Gen. of Tex., to Hon. Jeff Sessions, Att’y Gen. of the U.S. (June 29, 2017) (Admin. R. 238).) Paxton threatened that if DHS did not stop issuing or renewing deferred action and work authorization under DACA or the DACA Expansion, the plaintiff states would amend their complaint in the Texas litigation “to challenge both the DACA program and the remaining Expanded DACA permits.” (Id. at 2.) If, however, Defendants agreed to rescind the 2012 DACA Memo and to cease “renew[ing] or issu[ing] any new DACA or Expanded DACA permits in the future,” the plaintiffs would voluntarily dismiss their complaint. (Id.)

On September 5, 2017, Defendants announced that the DACA program would be brought to a gradual end. In an undated letter (the “Sessions Letter”), the Attorney General wrote to then-Acting DHS Secretary Elaine C. Duke to “advise that [DHS] should rescind” the 2012 DACA Memo.⁵ (Sessions Ltr.) The Attorney General opined that DACA was unlawful, unconstitutional, and likely to be invalidated in court:

⁵ While the Sessions Letter is not dated, the bookmarks in the electronic PDF file of the Administrative Record ascribe a date of September 4, 2017, to this letter.

DACA was effectuated by the previous administration through executive action, without proper statutory authority and with no established end-date, after Congress' repeated rejection of proposed legislation that would have accomplished a similar result. Such an open-ended circumvention of immigration laws was an unconstitutional exercise of authority by the Executive Branch. The related Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA) policy was enjoined on a nationwide basis in a decision affirmed by the Fifth Circuit on the basis of multiple legal grounds and then by the Supreme Court by an equally divided vote. Then Secretary of Homeland Security John Kelly rescinded the DAPA policy in June. Because the DACA policy has the same legal and constitutional defects that the courts recognized as to DAPA, it is likely that potentially imminent litigation would yield similar results with respect to DACA.

(Id. (citation omitted).)

Thereafter, Acting Secretary Duke issued a memorandum (the "DACA Rescission Memo") instructing her subordinates to "execute a wind-down of the program." (DACA Rescission Memo at 1.) Acting Secretary Duke briefly summarized the creation of the DACA and DAPA programs and stated that, although the DACA program "purported to use deferred action—an act of prosecutorial discretion meant to be applied only on an individualized case-by-case basis," "USCIS has not been able to identify specific denial cases where an applicant appeared to satisfy the programmatic categorical criteria as outlined in the [2012 DACA Memo] but still had his or her application denied based

solely upon discretion.” (Id. at 2 & n.1.) Acting Secretary Duke then described the history of the Texas litigation, noting that the Fifth Circuit had affirmed the injunction against the implementation of the DAPA program based on the finding “that DACA decisions were not truly discretionary,” and observed that Secretary Kelly had acted to end categorical or class-based exemptions of aliens from potential enforcement of the immigration laws and to rescind the DAPA program while leaving the DACA program “temporarily . . . in place.” (Id. at 2; see id. at 2-3.)

The Acting Secretary then noted that Texas and several other states had threatened to challenge the DACA program, and she briefly summarized the Attorney General’s opinion that DACA was unconstitutional, unlawful, and likely to be struck down because it shared “the same legal and constitutional defects that the courts recognized as to DAPA.” (Id. at 3 (quoting Sessions Ltr.)) “Taking into consideration the Supreme Court’s and the Fifth Circuit’s rulings in the ongoing litigation, and the September 4, 2017 letter from the Attorney General,” she concluded, “it is clear that the June 15, 2012, DACA program should be terminated.” (Id. at 4.)

In light of “the complexities associated with winding down the program,” however, Acting Secretary Duke directed that the program should be wound down gradually. (Id.) Initial applications, renewal requests, and associated applications for work authorization that had been “accepted” by DHS by September 5, 2017, would be adjudicated “on an individual, case-by-case basis.” (Id.) Likewise, all DACA renewal requests and associated applications for work authoriza-

tion submitted by “current beneficiaries whose benefits will expire between [September 5, 2017] and March 5, 2018,” would be adjudicated, provided that these requests were “accepted by [DHS] as of October 5, 2017.” (*Id.*) DHS would, however, “reject all DACA initial requests and associated applications for [work authorization] filed after the date of this memorandum” and “all DACA renewal requests and associated applications for [work authorization] filed outside of the[se] parameters.” (*Id.*) Existing DACA benefits would not be terminated immediately but would not be renewed, and DHS would no longer approve further applications for advance parole.” (*Id.*)

E. Procedural History

The court will not restate the procedural history of these cases prior to November 2017, which is set forth in the court’s November 9 Memorandum and Order. The court will, however, provide the following timeline of recent developments in these cases.

On December 11, 2017, the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs filed their Third Amended Complaint (Dkt. 113), which largely tracked their Second Amended Complaint but added a claim that Defendants Nielsen and Sessions violated the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment by rejecting DACA renewal applications that (1) were promptly mailed but received by USCIS after October 5, 2017, due to U.S. Postal Service delays; (2) were delivered to USCIS by October 5, 2017, but rejected because they arrived too late in the day; or (3) contained “minor perceived or actual clerical errors.” (Third Am. Compl. (Dkt. 113), ¶ 203; *see id.* ¶¶ 199-205.)

On December 20, 2017, the Supreme Court vacated the decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit denying Defendants’ petition for a writ of mandamus to the Northern District of California in similar litigation challenging Defendants’ decision to end the DACA program. In re United States, No. 17-801 (U.S. Dec. 20, 2017) (per curiam). The Supreme Court held that the “Government [has made] serious arguments that at least portions of the District Court’s order are overly broad” and that, “[u]nder the specific facts of [that] case,” the district court should have resolved the Government’s arguments that the decision to rescind the DACA program was not subject to judicial review before ordering the Government to produce a complete administrative record. Id. (slip op. at 3). The Court suggested that the district court “may consider certifying that ruling for interlocutory appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b) if appropriate.” Id. (slip op. at 4).

One week later, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit denied Defendants’ petition for a writ of mandamus to this court and lifted its stay of record-related orders entered by this court and by Magistrate Judge James Orenstein. (Dec. 27, 2017, USCA Order (Dkt. 210).) The Second Circuit rejected Defendants’ position that they could unilaterally determine which portions of the administrative record the court could consider, and determined that, in light of the “strong suggestion that the record before the [District Court] was not complete,” plaintiffs were entitled to discovery as to whether Defendants had produced a full administrative record. (Id. at 2 (quoting Dopico v. Goldschmidt, 687 F.2d 644, 654 (2d Cir. 1982)) (alteration in original).) Rejecting Defendants’ contention that compliance with this court’s and Judge Orenstein’s record-

related orders would burden the Executive Branch, the Second Circuit noted that this court had repeatedly limited the scope of those orders, such that, as the Government conceded, “the number of documents, covered by the order, as modified, is approximately 20,000, a far smaller number than the Government’s papers led this court to believe.” (*Id.* at 3-4.) The Second Circuit distinguished *In re United States* on the grounds that this court had already considered and rejected Defendants’ jurisdictional arguments, clarified that the orders in question did not apply to White House documents, and limited the orders to apply to dramatically fewer documents than were at issue in the cases before the Northern District of California. (*Id.* at 4-5.)

Defendants then moved for the court to certify its November 9 Memorandum and Order for interlocutory appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). (Mot. to Certify Order for Appeal (Dkt. 219).) They argued that certification would “materially advance the disposition of the litigation” by either “terminat[ing] the litigation” or “clarify[ing] the rights of the parties” and “limiting the claims going forward in this litigation.” (Mem. in Supp. of Mot. to Certify Order for Appeal (Dkt. 219-1) at 14.) On January 8, 2018, the court granted Defendants’ motion to certify the November 9 Memorandum and Order for interlocutory appeal because, among other things, there was “substantial ground for difference of opinion” on the question of whether the DACA rescission was committed to agency discretion by law. (Jan. 8, 2018, Mem. & Order (Dkt. 233) at 4-6.) Defendants then argued that the court should delay an oral argument scheduled for January 18, 2018, pending the Second Circuit’s consideration of the interlocutory appeal, as “all (or at least most) of [the] district-court

proceedings [regarding Defendants’ motions to dismiss, Plaintiffs’ motions for a preliminary injunction, and the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs’ motion for class certification] will be unnecessary if the Second Circuit accepts some or all of the government’s arguments on jurisdiction and justiciability.” (Defs. Jan. 11, 2018, Ltr. (Dkt. 236) at 1.) Before the Second Circuit, however, Defendants abruptly changed tack, agreeing with Plaintiffs “that holding the petition [for interlocutory appeal] in abeyance would be the most efficient course of action,” pending this court’s consideration of Defendants’ motion to dismiss and Plaintiffs’ motions for preliminary relief and class certification. (Reply in Supp. of Pet. for Permission to Appeal (Dkt. 28, Nielsen v. Vidal, No. 18-122 (2d Cir.)) at 2.)⁶

On January 9, 2018, the Northern District of California denied Defendants’ motion to dismiss Regents and its companion cases and granted the plaintiffs a preliminary injunction. (Nov. 9, 2018, Order Denying FRCP 12(b)(1) Dismissal and Granting Provisional Relief (Dkt. 234, Regents.) Like this court, Judge William Alsup rejected Defendants’ contentions that the decision to end the DACA program was committed to agency discretion by law and that 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g) barred judicial review of that decision. (Id. at 18-23.)

⁶ Defendants’ new litigation position is thus directly at odds with its arguments for why this court should certify the November 9 Memorandum and Order. The court is uncertain whether the inconsistency in Defendants’ position should be ascribed to lack of coordination between the Department of Justice’s Federal Programs Branch and Civil Appellate staff, or instead to a deliberate attempt to delay the resolution of these cases. In any event, the court is not pleased that Defendant have requisitioned judicial resources to decide a motion for relief that they seem not to have actually wanted.

Judge Alsup further concluded that the plaintiffs were entitled to a preliminary injunction because they were likely to prevail on the merits of their claim that the decision to rescind the DACA program was substantively “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law,” because that decision “was based on a flawed legal premise” that the DACA program was illegal. (Id. at 29; see id. at 29-38.) Judge Alsup rejected Defendants’ argument that “DHS acted within its discretion in managing its litigation exposure in the Fifth Circuit, weighing its options, and deciding on an orderly wind down of the program so as to avoid a potentially disastrous injunction in the Fifth Circuit” as a “classic post hoc rationalization” and, in any event, insufficient to support the decision to rescind the DACA program because Defendants had neither considered defenses to Texas’s potentially imminent suit nor weighed supposed litigation risks against “DACA’s programmatic objectives as well as the reliance interests of DACA recipients.” (Id. at 38-43.)

II. LEGAL STANDARD

“[A] preliminary injunction is an extraordinary and drastic remedy, one that should not be granted unless the movant, by a clear showing, carries the burden of persuasion.” Mazurek v. Armstrong, 520 U.S. 968, 972 (1997) (per curiam) (quoting 11A Charles A. Wright et al., Federal Practice and Procedure § 2948, at 130 (2d ed. 1995)) (emphasis omitted). A party “seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits; that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief; that the balance of equities tips in his favor; and that an injunction is in the public interest.” Winter v. Nat.

Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008).⁷ To establish a likelihood of success on the merits, the party seeking an injunction “need only make a showing that the probability of his prevailing is better than fifty percent.” Eng v. Smith, 849 F.2d 80, 82 (2d Cir. 1988); see also Nken v. Holder, 556 U.S. 418, 434 (2009) (“It is not enough that the chance of success on the merits be ‘better than negligible.’” (quoting Sofinet v. INS, 188 F.3d 703, 707 (7th Cir. 1999))). When an injunction is “mandatory,” however—that is, when the injunction “alter[s] the status quo by commanding some positive act”—the movant must demonstrate a “clear”

⁷ The Second Circuit has, at times, formulated this standard differently. For example, a party seeking a preliminary injunction may demonstrate the existence of “a serious question going to the merits to make them a fair ground for trial, with a balance of hardships tipping decidedly in [its] favor,” rather than a likelihood of success on the merits. Citigroup Global Mkts., Inc. v. VCG Special Opportunities Master Fund Ltd., 598 F.3d 30, 35 (2d Cir. 2010); see also id. at 35-38 (holding that this “serious questions” standard survives Winter and other Supreme Court cases applying a “likelihood of success on the merits” standard). The Second Circuit’s “serious questions” standard does not apply, however, “[w]hen . . . a preliminary injunction will affect government action taken in the public interest pursuant to a statute or regulatory scheme.” Friends of the East Hampton Airport, Inc. v. Town of East Hampton, 841 F.3d 133, 143 (2d Cir. 2016) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). The court need not decide whether the more permissive “serious questions” standard applies here, as Plaintiffs concede that the “likelihood of success” standard applies here and have met this standard. See generally Haitian Ctrs. Council, Inc. v. McNary, 969 F.2d 1326, 1338-39 (2d Cir. 1992) (“serious questions” standard applies when challenged governmental action is not specifically authorized by statute or regulation), cert. granted and judgment vacated as moot, Sale v. Haitian Ctrs. Council, Inc., 509 U.S. 918 (1993).

or “substantial” showing of likelihood of success. Tom Doherty Assocs., Inc. v. Saban Entm’t, Inc., 60 F.3d 27, 34 (2d Cir. 1995). To obtain a mandatory injunction, a movant must also “make a strong showing of irreparable harm.” State of New York ex rel. Schneiderman v. Actavis PLC, 787 F.3d 638, 650 (2d Cir. 2015) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

III. DISCUSSION

For the reasons that follow, Plaintiffs have demonstrated that they are entitled to a preliminary injunction against implementation of the DACA Rescission Memo.

A. Likelihood of Success on the Merits

First, Plaintiffs are substantially likely to succeed on the merits of their claim that Defendants’ decision to end the DACA program was substantively arbitrary and capricious.⁸ Plaintiffs contend that this decision violated APA § 706(2)(A) because, among other things, it was based on an erroneous legal conclusion that DACA was unlawful, failed to consider important aspects of the problem, and was internally contradictory. (BV Pls. Mot. at 11-20, 23-27; State Pls. Mot. at 5-13.) Defendants aver, however, that the decision reflects a reasonable assessment of litigation risk. (Defs. Opp’n at 1, 10-13, 15-24.) Based on the record before it, the

⁸ The court need not decide whether the injunction sought by Plaintiffs is “mandatory,” in that it would compel Defendants to take affirmative acts to adjudicate DACA applications and renewal requests, or non-mandatory, in that it would only preserve the status quo as of September 4, 2017. Because Plaintiffs have demonstrated a “clear” or “substantial” likelihood of success on the merits, they are entitled to a preliminary injunction regardless of the standard that applies.

court concludes that Plaintiffs, not Defendants, are substantially likely to be correct.

1. The Stated Rationale for Rescinding DACA Appears To Be Arbitrary and Capricious

Plaintiffs have identified at least three respects in which Defendants' decision to rescind the DACA program appears to be arbitrary, capricious, and an abuse of discretion. First, the decision rests on the erroneous legal conclusion that the DACA program is unlawful and unconstitutional. Second, the decision rests on the erroneous factual premise that courts have determined that the DACA program violates the Constitution. Third, the stated rationale for that decision is internally contradictory, as Defendants have continued to grant DACA renewal requests despite ending the DACA program on the grounds that it is, by their lights, unconstitutional. The court addresses each of these reasons in turn.

a. The Decision Relies on the Legally Erroneous Premise that DACA Is Illegal

An agency decision that is based on an erroneous legal premise cannot withstand arbitrary-and-capricious review. See 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). It is well-established that when “[agency] action is based upon a determination of law as to which the reviewing authority of the courts does come into play, an order may not stand if the agency has misconceived the law.” Chenery I, 318 U.S. at 94. Accordingly, numerous courts have recognized that agency action based on a misconception of the applicable law is arbitrary and capricious in substance. See, e.g., Yale-New Haven Hosp. v. Leavitt, 470 F.3d 71, 86-87 (2d Cir. 2006); Transitional Hosps. Corp. of La., Inc. v. Shalala, 222 F.3d 1019, 1029

(D.C. Cir. 2000) (Garland, J.); see also Planned Parenthood Fed. of Am., Inc. v. Heckler, 712 F.2d 650, 666 (D.C. Cir. 1983) (Bork, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part) (“If a regulation is based on an incorrect view of applicable law, the regulation cannot stand as promulgated” (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)). That is no less true when an agency takes some action based on an erroneous view that the action is compelled by law, notwithstanding that the agency could have taken the same action on policy grounds. “An agency action, however permissible as an exercise of discretion, cannot be sustained ‘where it is based not on the agency’s own judgment but on an erroneous view of the law.’” Sea-Land Serv., Inc. v. Dep’t of Transp., 137 F.3d 640, 646 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (quoting Prill v. NLRB, 755 F.2d 941, 947 (D.C. Cir. 1985)). This rule is consistent with cases from outside the administrative-law context, which make clear that a decision based on “an erroneous view of the law” is “by definition” or “necessarily” an abuse of discretion. Koon v. United States, 518 U.S. 81, 100 (1996); Cooter & Gell v. Hartmarx Corp., 496 U.S. 384, 405 (1990). This rule also ensures that agencies are accountable for their decisions: If an agency makes a decision on policy grounds, it must say so, not act as if courts have tied its hands. The court therefore considers whether Defendants’ decision to rescind the DACA program relied on an erroneous view of the law. This review is de novo. 5 U.S.C. § 706; J. Andrew Lange, Inc. v. FAA, 208 F.3d 389, 391 (2d Cir. 2000).⁹

⁹ While in other contexts, an agency’s interpretation of a statute it is charged with administering may be entitled to deference, Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc., 467 U.S. 837,

842-43 (1984), Defendants have not argued that their interpretation of the legality of the DACA program is entitled to formal or controlling deference. That is for good reason. Because neither the Sessions Letter nor the DACA Rescission Memo carry the “force of law,” they do not warrant Chevron deference. United States v. Mead Corp., 533 U.S. 218, 226-27 (2001). Moreover, Defendants’ views about the legality of the DACA program turn not only on whether that program was consistent with the INA (their interpretations of which are entitled to deference, see INS v. Aguirre-Aguirre, 526 U.S. 415, 424-25 (1999)), but also whether that program constituted a “substantive rule” under the APA. Because Defendants are not charged with implementing the APA, their views about whether the DACA program should have been implemented through notice-and-comment rulemaking are not entitled to deference. See Shell Offshore Inc. v. Babbitt, 238 F.3d 622, 627 (5th Cir. 2001). Finally, it almost goes without saying that to the extent Defendants determined that the DACA program was unconstitutional, that determination does not warrant Chevron deference.

Some academic commentators have offered interesting arguments as to why courts should review deferentially Defendants’ decision to end the DACA program. See, e.g., Josh Blackman, Understanding Sessions’s Justification to Rescind DACA, Lawfare (Jan. 16, 2018, 8:00 AM), <https://www.lawfareblog.com/understanding-sessions-justification-rescind-daca> (arguing, based on an “admittedly charitable” reading of the Sessions Letter, that Regents erred by, among other things, failing to consider how the Attorney General’s independent duty to defend the Constitution supported his decision to recommend ending the DACA program); Zachary Price, Why Enjoining DACA’s Cancellation Is Wrong., Take Care Blog (Jan. 12, 2018), <https://takecareblog.com/blog/why-enjoining-daca-s-cancellation-is-wrong> (arguing that “[i]nsofar as DACA was simply an exercise of enforcement discretion, any explanatory burden with respect to its reversal must be minimal”). Defendants themselves have not pressed these arguments before this court, arguing instead that, if their decision is indeed subject to judicial review, it should be reviewed under the ordinary arbitrary-and-capricious standard of APA § 706(2)(A). (Defs. Opp’n at 10-11.)

Fairly read, the Sessions Letter and DACA Rescission Memo indicate only that Defendants decided to end the DACA program because they believed that it was illegal. (While Defendants now argue that the decision was based on “litigation risk,” the record does not support this contention, as the court explains below.) The DACA Rescission Memo offers no independent legal reasoning as to why Defendants believed the DACA program to be unlawful, so the court turns to the Sessions Letter. In that letter, the Attorney General offered two discernible bases for his opinion that the DACA program violated the law and should end: first, that it was unconstitutional, and second, that it “has the same legal and constitutional defects that the courts recognized as to DAPA.” (Sessions Ltr.) Neither conclusion is sustainable.

i. The Attorney General Erred in Concluding that DACA Is Unconstitutional

As noted above, the Attorney General concluded that DACA was unconstitutional because it “was effectuated by the previous administration through executive action, without proper statutory authority and with no established end-date, after Congress’ repeated rejection of proposed legislation that would have accomplished a similar result” and “an open-ended circumvention of immigration laws.” (Sessions Ltr.) This conclusory statement does not support the proposition that DACA is unconstitutional.

DACA is not unconstitutional simply because it was implemented by unilateral, executive action without express congressional authorization. The Executive Branch has wide discretion not to initiate or pursue

specific enforcement actions. Chaney, 470 U.S. at 831-32. Immigration officials have particularly “broad discretion” in deciding whom to deport, deriving both from the considerations specific to the Executive Branch in the foreign-policy arena, Arizona, 567 U.S. at 396, and from the fact that far more removable aliens reside in this country than DHS has resources to deport, OLC Op. at 1; see also Adam B. Cox & Cristina M. Rodríguez, The President and Immigration Law, 119 Yale L.J. 458, 510-19 (2009). Every modern presidential administration has relied on extra-statutory discretionary-relief programs to shield certain removable aliens from deportation. Far from cabining this authority, Congress has amended the INA in ways that expressly acknowledge the Executive Branch’s power to decline to initiate removal proceedings against certain removable aliens. It thus cannot be the case that, by recognizing that certain removable aliens represented lower enforcement priorities than others, the DACA program violates the Constitution.

Nor is DACA unconstitutional because it identified a certain category of removable aliens—individuals who were brought to the United States as children, lacked meaningful criminal histories, and had met educational or military-service requirements—as eligible for favorable treatment. The court is aware of no principled reason why the Executive Branch may grant deferred action to particular immigrants but may not create a program by which individual immigrants who meet certain prescribed criteria are eligible to request deferred action. It is surely within DHS’s discretion to determine that certain categories of removable alien—felons and gang members, for example—are better uses of the agency’s limited enforcement resources than law-abiding

individuals who entered the United States as children. Indeed, unless deferred-action decisions are to be entirely random, they necessarily must be based at least in part on “categorical” or “class-based” distinctions. See Arpaio v. Obama, 27 F. Supp. 3d 185, 210 (D.D.C. 2014) (DACA “helps to ensure that the exercise of deferred action is not arbitrary and capricious, as might be the case if the executive branch offered no guidance to enforcement officials. It would make little sense for a Court to strike down as arbitrary and capricious guidelines that help ensure that the Nation’s immigration enforcement is not arbitrary but rather reflective of congressionally-directed priorities.”). The court cannot see how the use of such distinctions to define eligibility for a deferred-action program transforms such a program from discretionary agency action into substantive lawmaking and (somehow) an encroachment on the separation of powers.

Lastly, DACA is not unconstitutional because, as the Attorney General put it, that program was implemented “after Congress’ repeated rejection of proposed legislation that would have accomplished a similar result.” (Sessions Ltr.) The “proposed legislation” to which the Attorney General referred would not have “accomplished a similar result” to DACA. The DREAM Act, in its many variations, would have offered its beneficiaries a formal immigration status and a pathway to lawful permanent residency. See, e.g., Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act of 2011, S. 952 (112th Cong.); Regents, 2018 WL 339144, at 20 n.15 (collecting proposed legislation). DACA, on the other hand, offers only forbearance from deportation, along with work authorization, and does

not provide an immigration status or a pathway to citizenship. (2012 DACA Memo at 4.)

Even if the DREAM Act had offered benefits similar to those conveyed by DACA, it does not follow that Congress's failure to enact a DREAM Act precluded the Executive Branch from enacting the DACA program. The court does not see how executive action, taken either "pursuant to an express or implied authorization of Congress" or "in the absence of either a congressional grant or denial of authority," becomes unconstitutional simply because Congress has considered and failed to enact legislation that would accomplish similar ends. See Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 343 U.S. 579, 635-37 (1952) (Jackson, J., concurring). Fruitless congressional consideration of legislation is not itself law, see U.S. Const. art. I, § 7, cl. 2, and is an unconvincing basis for ascertaining the "implied will of Congress" to oust the President from acting in the space contemplated by the proposed but un-enacted legislation, see Youngstown Sheet & Tube, 343 U.S. at 637 (Jackson, J., concurring). It strikes the court as improbable that, if the President has some authority, any Member of Congress can divest the President of that authority by introducing unsuccessful legislation on the same subject.

To the extent the decision to end the DACA program was based on the Attorney General's determination that the program is unconstitutional, that determination was legally erroneous, and the decision was therefore arbitrary and capricious. The court does not address whether the DACA program might be unconstitutional on grounds other than those identified by

the Attorney General, as any such grounds are not fairly before the court.

- ii. The Attorney General Erred in Concluding that DACA Has the “Same Legal and Constitutional Defects that the Courts Recognized as to DAPA”

Nor can the Attorney General’s determination that DACA is unlawful rest on the ground that “the DACA policy has the same legal and constitutional defects that the courts recognized as to DAPA.” (Sessions Ltr.) That rationale is arbitrary and capricious not only because it is premised on an obvious factual mistake that courts had recognized “constitutional defects” in DAPA, as the court explains in the next subsection, but also because it is legally erroneous. The Southern District of Texas enjoined the implementation of the DAPA program on the grounds that DAPA was not promulgated through notice-and-comment rulemaking, and the Fifth Circuit affirmed, adding the additional ground for affirmance that DAPA was substantively arbitrary and capricious because it conflicted with the INA. The court is unpersuaded that either ground applies to DACA.

(I) DACA Was Not a Legislative Rule.

DACA does not appear to have been a “legislative” rule that was subject to notice-and-comment rulemaking. The APA generally requires agencies to make “rules” through notice-and-comment procedures, but provides an exception for “interpretative rules, general statements of policy, or rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice.” 5 U.S.C. § 553. The line between legislative rules (which are subject to notice and comment) and non-legislative rules (which are not) is

not always clear. See Chrysler Corp. v. Brown, 441 U.S. 281, 301-03 (1979); Noel v. Chapman, 508 F.2d 1013, 1029-30 (2d Cir. 1975) (characterizing this distinction as “enshrouded in considerable smog”). In general, however, “legislative rules are those that ‘create new law, rights, or duties, in what amounts to a legislative act.’” Sweet v. Sheahan, 235 F.3d 80, 91 (2d Cir. 2000) (quoting White v. Shalala, 7 F.3d 296, 303 (2d Cir. 1993)). A rule is legislative if it creates a “binding norm.” Bellarno Int’l Ltd. v. FDA, 678 F. Supp. 410, 412 (E.D.N.Y. 1988) (quoting Am. Bus Ass’n v. United States, 627 F.2d 525, 529 (D.C. Cir. 1980)). General statements of policy, on the other hand, do not “change ‘existing rights and obligations’” of those regulated, but instead state the agency’s “general policy” or “are rules directed primarily at the staff of an agency describing how it will conduct agency discretionary functions.” Noel, 508 F.2d at 1030 (quoting Lewis-Mota v. Sec’y of Labor, 469 F.2d 478, 482 (2d Cir. 1972)) (internal quotation marks and additional citation omitted); see also Chrysler, 441 U.S. at 302 n.31 (“General statements of policy are statements issued by an agency to advise the public prospectively of the manner in which the agency proposes to exercise a discretionary power.” (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)).

On its face, the 2012 DACA Memo is plainly a “general statement of policy,” not a substantive rule. That memo described how, as a matter of agency policy, DHS would exercise its prosecutorial discretion with respect to a discrete class of individuals without lawful immigration status, and directed DHS staff to implement procedures to facilitate that exercise of discretion. Most importantly, the memo stated that it created no substantive right, that all DACA applications

would be adjudicated on an individualized basis, and that the agency retained discretion to deny or revoke deferred action or work authorization. Based on the text of the 2012 DACA Memo, the court cannot say that the creation of the DACA program either “imposed any rights and obligations” on DHS or the public, or did not “genuinely [leave] the agency and its decisionmakers free to exercise discretion.” Clarian Health W., LLC v. Hargan, 878 F.3d 346, 357 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

To determine whether a rule is properly classed as “legislative” or as a “general statement of policy,” some courts have also considered whether the agency has characterized or treated the rule as binding. Id. In determining that the DAPA program constituted a legislative rule, the Southern District of Texas focused on the purportedly binding effect that DAPA would have on the agency. Texas, 86 F. Supp. 3d at 668-72. Judge Hanen reached that conclusion by determining that DACA had been implemented in such a way as to deprive agency employees of true discretion to evaluate DACA applications on a case-by-case basis, including that (1) the “operating procedures” for implementing DACA were quite long; (2) DACA applications were adjudicated by service-center staff, not field-office employees, using a check-the-box form; (3) certain DACA denials were subject to review by a supervisor; (4) “there is no option for granting DAPA to an individual who does not meet each criterion”; and (5) nearly all DACA applications were granted, and those that were denied were uniformly denied for mechanical reasons or fraud. Id. at 669 & nn.98-101.

The court respectfully finds the Southern District of Texas’s analysis unpersuasive. First, that court appears to have conflated the discretion of the agency with that of individual USCIS employees. (See Br. for the United States at 68-71, Texas v. United States, 136 S. Ct. 2271 (2016) (No. 15-674).) The 2012 DACA Memo indicated how DHS would exercise its discretion by treating certain individuals as lower priorities for removal. Because the 2012 DACA Memo created no substantive rights, it in no way constrained the agency’s discretion in the enforcement of immigration laws, even if it might have affected how rank-and-file USCIS employees reviewed specific requests for deferred action. (See id.) Second, even accepting that the relevant focus of this inquiry is the discretion of rank-and-file employees, the court views the first four factors on which the Southern District of Texas relied as insufficient to support an inference that DHS did not exercise discretion in adjudicating DACA applications. As for the fifth factor—that DHS supposedly granted too many DACA applications—the court finds persuasive the observation by the dissenting judge in the Fifth Circuit that the district court appears to have erroneously conflated rejections of DACA applications, which were made on intake for mechanical reasons, and denials, which were made “when a USCIS adjudicator, on a case-by-case basis, determines that the requestor has not demonstrated that they satisfy the guidelines for DACA or when an adjudicator determines that deferred action should be denied even though the threshold guidelines are met.” Texas, 809 F.3d at 210 (King, J., dissenting). To the contrary, as of December 2014, DHS had denied nearly 40,000 DACA applications out of the more than 700,000 applications accepted for

processing at USCIS service centers, and rejected more than 40,000 applications for administrative reasons. *Id.* at 210 n.44. This rejection rate hardly “suggests an agency on autopilot” and is “unsurprising given the self-selecting nature of the program.” *Id.* at 210 & n.44; see also *Arpaio*, 27 F. Supp. 3d at 209 n.13 (noting that similar statistics “reflect that . . . case-by-case review is in operation”). To the extent Defendants rely on *Texas* for the proposition that the DACA program (which was not challenged in that litigation) was illegal because it was not made through notice-and-comment rulemaking, such reliance is arbitrary and capricious.

*(II) DACA Does Not Conflict with
the INA*

Nor may Defendants rely on *Texas* for the proposition that the DACA program conflicts with the INA. As noted above, the Fifth Circuit held that the DAPA program was not only procedurally invalid, but also substantively arbitrary and capricious because it conflicted with the INA. *Texas*, 809 F.3d at 178-86. That is because, in the view of the Fifth Circuit, the INA prescribes the exclusive means by which aliens may obtain “lawful immigration classification from their children’s immigration status,” and because Congress could not have intended to delegate to DHS the authority to designate approximately four million undocumented immigrants as lawfully present and able to work in this country. See *id.* To the extent Defendants relied, without additional explanation, on this decision as grounds for ending the DACA program, they acted arbitrarily and capriciously, for two reasons.

First, not all the grounds on which the Fifth Circuit decided that DAPA was substantively arbitrary and capricious apply to the DACA program. For example, the Fifth Circuit inferred that by creating procedures by which alien parents of U.S. citizens may obtain lawful status, Congress implicitly prohibited the Executive Branch from granting deferred action and work authorization to such individuals based on more permissive criteria. Even if the court were to accept that dubious logic, it would not apply to DACA, because there is no analogous procedure by which aliens brought to the United States as children may seek to obtain lawful status on that basis. (BV Pls. Mot. at 25; Br. of Amicus Curiae Legal Services Organizations (Dkt. 193) at 6.) The Fifth Circuit also relied extensively on the magnitude of the DAPA program, reasoning that Congress could not have intended the Executive Branch to decide whether more than four million undocumented immigrants could obtain deferred action and work authorization. Texas, 809 F.3d at 179, 181-82, 184 & n.197. Again, even accepting that proposition, it is not clear why it would apply to the DACA program, which is open to far fewer individuals than DAPA would have been, and which is roughly the same scale as the Family Fairness program enacted by the Reagan and George H.W. Bush Administrations in the 1980s.

Second, to the extent that the Fifth Circuit's rationale applies to the DACA program, the court finds it unpersuasive. It does not follow that by prescribing procedures by which some aliens may obtain lawful status, Congress implicitly barred the Executive Branch from granting those or other aliens deferred action and work authorization, a relatively meager and unstable

set of benefits (if, indeed, they can even be described as such). Nor is the court convinced that by expressly recognizing that certain discrete populations of aliens are eligible for deferred action, Congress implicitly precluded the Executive Branch from according deferred action to other aliens; to the contrary, the court views these enactments as ratifying the Executive Branch's longstanding historical practice, rooted in the INA, of forbearing from pursuing deportation proceedings against particular aliens and categories of alien. The court respectfully finds the Fifth Circuit's attempts to distinguish DAPA from prior discretionary-relief programs unpersuasive, as this court does not see what in the INA permits immigration officials to accord discretionary relief "on a country-specific basis," as a "bridge[] from one legal status to another," or as an adjunct to "a statutory legalization scheme," *id.* at 184, but not to generally law-abiding parents of U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents—or, for that matter, individuals who were brought to the United States as children.

For these reasons, and for the reasons stated by the Office of Legal Counsel, the dissent in Texas, and by the Office of the Solicitor General in its brief to the U.S. Supreme Court in Texas, the court concludes that DACA is lawful and not arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to the INA. See Texas, 809 F.3d at 214-18 (King, J., dissenting); OLC Op.; Br. for the United States at 61-65, Texas v. United States, 136 S. Ct. 2271 (2016) (No. 15-674). Defendants acted arbitrarily and capriciously by ending the DACA program based on the erroneous legal conclusion that DACA is either unconstitutional or "has the same legal and constitutional defects that the courts recognized as to DAPA."

b. The Decision Relies on a Factually Erroneous Premise that Courts Have Determined that DACA Is Unconstitutional

This conclusion was also arbitrary and capricious because it is based on an obvious factual mistake. In concluding that the Southern District of Texas and Fifth Circuit would enjoin the continued operation of the DACA program, Defendants appear to have relied on the premise that those courts have recognized “constitutional defects . . . as to DAPA.” (Sessions Ltr.; DACA Rescission Memo at 3.) This premise is flatly incorrect. The Southern District of Texas enjoined the implementation of DAPA, and the Fifth Circuit affirmed that injunction, on the grounds that DAPA violated the APA. 809 F.3d at 170-86; 86 F. Supp. 3d at 665-72. Both courts expressly declined to reach the plaintiffs’ constitutional claim that DAPA violated the Take Care Clause of the U.S. Constitution, see U.S. Const. art. II, § 3, or the separation of powers. 809 F.3d at 154; 86 F. Supp. 3d at 677. Defendants do not attempt to defend this factual premise as correct. (Cf. Defs. Opp’n at 26-27.)

This error alone is grounds for setting aside Defendants’ decision. “[A]n agency decision is arbitrary and must be set aside when it rests on a crucial factual premise shown by the agency’s records to be indisputably incorrect.” Mizerak v. Adams, 682 F.2d 374, 376 (2d Cir. 1982); see also State Farm, 463 U.S. at 43 (agency acts arbitrarily and capriciously by “offer[ing] an explanation for its decision that runs counter to the evidence before the agency”); City of Kansas City, Mo. v. Dep’t of Hous. & Urban Dev., 923 F.2d 188, 194

(D.C. Cir. 1991) (“Agency action based on a factual premise that is flatly contradicted by the agency’s own record does not constitute reasoned administrative decisionmaking, and cannot survive review under the arbitrary and capricious standard.”). Because neither the Southern District of Texas nor the Fifth Circuit “recognized” any “constitutional defects” in the DAPA policy, Defendants’ reliance on this erroneous factual premise was arbitrary and capricious.

Nor was this error harmless. Although judicial review under the APA takes “due account . . . of the rule of prejudicial error,” 5 U.S.C. § 706, “the standard for demonstrating lack of prejudicial error is strict. ‘Agency mistakes constitute harmless error [under APA § 706] only where they clearly had no bearing on the procedure used or the substance of decision reached.’” N.Y. Pub. Interest Research Grp. v. Whitman, 321 F.3d 316, 334 n.13 (2d Cir. 2003) (alteration in original) (quoting Sierra Club v. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Serv., 245 F.3d 434, 444 (5th Cir. 2001)). That cannot be said here, as the Attorney General’s opinion that DACA was unlawful appears to have been based in significant part on his judgment that the program was unconstitutional and on the Texas courts’ decision to enjoin implementation of DAPA. The current record furnishes no basis for this court to conclude that the Attorney General would have reached the same conclusion had he correctly understood the holdings of the Texas courts.

*c. The Decision’s Rationale Is Internally
Contradictory*

Finally, Defendants’ decision to rescind the DACA program was arbitrary and capricious because it appears to be internally inconsistent. See, e.g., Nat’l Res. Def. Council v. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Comm’n, — F.3d —, 2018 WL 472547, at *9 (D.C. Cir. 2018) (“Of course, it would be arbitrary and capricious for the agency’s decision making to be ‘internally inconsistent.’” (citation omitted)); Gen. Chem. Corp. v. United States, 817 F.2d 844, 846 (D.C. Cir. 1978) (per curiam) (vacating decision based on “internally inconsistent and inadequately explained” analysis). Defendants clearly ended the DACA program at least partly because the Attorney General viewed the program as unconstitutional.¹⁰ (Sessions Ltr.; DACA Rescission Memo at

¹⁰ It is not clear that the Attorney General’s views are those of the Administration he serves. On September 5, 2017, President Trump tweeted that “Congress now has 6 months to legalize DACA (something the Obama Administration was unable to do). If they can’t, I will revisit this issue!” (Donald J. Trump, @realdonaldtrump, Twitter.com (Sept. 5, 2017, 7:38 PM), <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/905228667336499200>.) It is not clear how the President would “revisit” the decision to rescind the DACA program if the DACA program were, as the Attorney General has stated, “an unconstitutional exercise of authority by the Executive Branch.” (Sessions Ltr.) See Josh Blackman, Trump’s DACA Decision Defies All Norms: The President’s Incompetence Continues to Temper His Malevolence, Foreign Policy (Sept. 7, 2017, 1:26 PM), <http://foreignpolicy.com/2017/09/07/trumps-daca-decision-defies-all-norms/>. Defendants’ contention that the President simply “emphasized the need for legislative action and expressed [his] intention to revisit Administration policies on childhood arrivals—not the legality and defensibility of the DACA program—if Congress did not timely act” (Defs. Opp’n at 33) is unsupported by the text of the President’s tweet.

3.)¹¹ Rather than terminating the program forthwith, however, Acting Secretary Duke directed her subordinates to begin a phased “wind-down of the program,” under which DHS would continue to renew DACA applications that were set to expire in the next six months and would honor existing DACA benefits until they expired. The means by which Defendants ended the DACA program thus appear to conflict with their stated rationale for doing so. If the DACA program was, in fact, unconstitutional, the court does not understand (nor have Defendants explained) why Defendants would have the authority to continue to violate the Constitution, albeit at a reduced scale and only for a limited time.

It is true but immaterial that the DACA Rescission memo provided that DHS would adjudicate all remaining DACA applications and renewal requests “on an individual, case-by-case basis.” (DACA Rescission Memo at 4.) The 2012 DACA Memo also stated that all DACA applications and renewal requests would be considered on an individual, case-by-case basis (2012 DACA Memo at 1-3), but, in Defendants’ view, that was insufficient to render the program lawful. More importantly, if DHS could render the DACA program constitutional by adjudicating the remaining DACA applications and renewal requests on an “individual, case-by-case” basis, then there was nothing inherently unconstitutional about the DACA program—only how rank-and-file USCIS employees were implementing

¹¹ Defendants’ arguments that “Plaintiffs identify nothing contradictory about the Acting Secretary’s stated justification for the [decision to rescind the DACA program]” (*cf.* Defs. Opp’n at 29-30) are thus once again belied by the record.

that program—and a key reason for ending that program would disappear.

Defendants attempt to sidestep this problem by arguing that there was nothing inherently contradictory about Acting Secretary Duke’s decision to allow the DACA program “to gradually sunset” despite having “concern[s] about [the program]’s legality.” (Defs. Opp’n at 30.) The record makes clear, however, that Defendants ended the program because they believed it to be unconstitutional and unlawful, not because they had “concern[s]” about its legality. (Sessions Ltr.; DACA Rescission Memo at 3-4.) Defendants’ post hoc rationalization is thus unavailing. At the very least, Defendants’ failure to acknowledge and explain the apparent conflict between their determination that the DACA program was unconstitutional and their plan to continue adjudicating a subset of DACA renewal requests renders their decision arbitrary and capricious.

2. Defendants’ Alternative Grounds for Upholding the DACA Rescission Are Unpersuasive

Defendants offer two reasons why the court should uphold the decision to end the DACA program. First, they argue, that decision was reasonable in light of the risk that the plaintiffs in the Texas litigation would amend their complaint to challenge the DACA program and that the Southern District of Texas would strike down the DACA program. (E.g., Defs. Opp’n at 11.) Second, they argue that the court should construe the Attorney General’s legal judgment that the DACA program was unlawful as an “independent policy judgment . . . that immigration decisions of this magnitude should be left to Congress.” (Defs. Opp’n at 25.) Neither argument is persuasive.

a. The DACA Rescission Cannot Be Sustained on the Basis of Defendants' "Litigation Risk" Argument

Defendants frame the decision to end the DACA program as motivated primarily by “litigation risk.” (*Id.* at 1, 10-13, 15-24.) In their view, Acting Secretary Duke considered the Government’s losses in the Texas v. United States litigation and the threat by some of the plaintiffs in that litigation to challenge the DACA program and ultimately “concluded that maintaining the DACA [program] would, in all likelihood, result in another nationwide injunction plunging the policy, and its nearly 800,000 recipients, into immediate uncertainty.” (*Id.* at 11.) That decision, they argue, was reasonable, not arbitrary or capricious, “particularly in view of the near-certain litigation loss in the pending Texas lawsuit.” (*Id.*)

The record does not support Defendants’ contention that they based their decision on a reasonable assessment of litigation risk. As the court has previously noted, the record, fairly read, indicates that Defendants ended the DACA program because they believed it to be illegal. The only basis for Defendants’ “litigation risk” argument is the Attorney General’s statement that, because DACA shared the flaws of the DAPA program, “it is likely that potentially imminent litigation would yield similar results with respect to DACA.” (Sessions Ltr.) This is too thin a reed to bear the weight of Defendants’ “litigation risk” argument. While the court must uphold an agency decision “of less than ideal clarity . . . if the agency’s path may reasonably be discerned,” Bowman Transp.,

Inc. v. Ark.-Best Freight Sys., Inc., 419 U.S. 281, 286 (1974), the court cannot discern a reasoned assessment of “litigation risk” in this conclusory statement. See also Chenery II, 332 U.S. at 196-97 (stating that the grounds on which an agency reaches its decision “must be set forth with such clarity as to be understandable. It will not do for a court to be compelled to guess at the theory underlying the agency’s action; nor can a court be expected to chisel that which must be precise from what the agency has left vague and indecisive.”). The Administrative Record does not indicate, for example, that the Attorney General made any reasoned assessment of the likelihood that DACA would be struck down in light of its similarities to, or differences from DAPA; that he considered any potential defenses to the “potentially imminent litigation”; that he acknowledged contrary rulings by other courts; or that he assessed whether Department of Justice resources would be better spent elsewhere. The court thus cannot conclude that the Attorney General actually considered “litigation risk” in any meaningful sense. Absent Defendants’ post hoc explanations, the court would not have guessed that Defendants made their decision for this reason.

The court views this “litigation risk” rationale as a mere post hoc rationalization, which is insufficient to withstand arbitrary-and-capricious review. State Farm, 463 U.S. at 50; Burlington Truck Lines, 371 U.S. at 168-69. Indeed, it is telling that, to substantiate their argument that the DACA rescission was motivated by concern for DACA recipients and a desire to avoid a disorderly shut-down of the program, Defendants resort to a press release, issued by Acting Secretary Duke, that fleshes out her reasons for ending the

DACA program. (Defs. Opp'n at 12 (quoting Press Release, DHS, Statement from Acting Secretary Duke on the Rescission of DACA (Sept. 5, 2017), <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2017/09/05/statement-acting-secretary-duke-rescission-deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-daca>.) That press release is not in the record, however, so the court may not consider it. See Overton Park, 401 U.S. at 419-20. While Defendants assert that this rationale is reasonably discernible because Plaintiffs addressed it in their briefs (Defs. Opp'n at 12), Plaintiffs cannot be faulted for responding to an argument that Defendants have made throughout this litigation.¹²

Even if the record indicated that Defendants made their decision based on "litigation risk," they acted arbitrarily and capriciously in doing so. The Attorney General's conclusory statement that it was "likely that potentially imminent litigation would yield similar results with respect to DACA" falls well short of the APA's "requirement that an agency provide reasoned explanation for its action." Fox Television Stations, 556 U.S. at 516. For example, the record before the court offers no indication that Defendants considered why the Southern District of Texas would strike down the DACA program (which was not initially challenged in Texas and which lacked certain attributes of the

¹² Judge Alsup found in Regents that "[n]owhere in the administrative record did the Attorney General or [DHS] consider whether defending the program in court would (or would not) be worth the litigation risk." Regents, 2018 WL 339144, at *23. As such, "[t]he new spin by government counsel is a classic post hoc rationalization," which "alone is dispositive of the new 'litigation risk' rationale." Id.

DAPA program that were critical to the Fifth Circuit’s decision that that program was contrary to the INA). Nor does the record indicate that Defendants considered—independent of their opinion that DACA was illegal—why litigating the rescission of DACA was preferable to litigating the decision to maintain the program. See Organized Vill. of Kake v. U.S. Dep’t of Agric., 795 F.3d 956, 970 (9th Cir. 2015) (en banc) (litigation-risk rationale was arbitrary and capricious where agency’s decision “predictably led to . . . lawsuit” and “[a]t most . . . deliberately traded one lawsuit for another”). To the extent that Defendants now argue that their decision was based on a desire to avoid the harms that could result to DACA beneficiaries from a disorderly end to the program, the record offers absolutely no indication that Defendants considered these impacts. While Defendants ask the court to infer a persuasive rationale from their conclusory statements and from the Southern District of Texas’s and Fifth Circuit’s opinions in Texas, it is not the court’s job to “supply a reasoned basis for the agency’s action that the agency itself has not given.” State Farm, 463 U.S. at 43. Even accepting for the sake of argument that the record provides some support for Defendants’ “litigation risk” rationale, that rationale is so inscrutable and unexplained that reliance upon it was arbitrary and capricious.

Even accepting for the sake of argument that “litigation risk” furnished a discernible, reasoned basis for Defendants’ decision to end the DACA program, Defendants nevertheless acted arbitrarily and capriciously by ending that program without taking any account of reliance interests that program has engendered. To withstand review under the APA’s arbitrary-and-

capricious standard, an agency that is changing its policy need not explain why the reasons for the new policy are better than the reasons for the old policy. Fox Television Stations, 556 U.S. at 514-15. The agency must nevertheless engage in reasoned decisionmaking, which, among other things, means that the agency must consider “serious reliance interests” engendered by the previous policy. Id. at 515; see also Encino Motorcars, LLC v. Navarro, 136 S. Ct. 2117, 2125-27 (2016).

Plaintiffs identify a number of reliance interests engendered by the DACA program, including that, in reliance on the continued existence of the program, DACA recipients have “raised families, invested in their education, purchased homes and cars, and started careers” (BV Pls. Mot. at 16; State Pls. Mot. at 9-10); employers have hired, trained, and invested time in their DACA-recipient employees (BV Pls. Mot. at 17; State Pls. Mot. at 10); educational institutions have enrolled DACA recipients who, if they lose their DACA benefits, may be forced to leave the United States or may see little need to continue pursuing educational opportunities (BV Pls. Mot. at 17; State Pls. Mot. at 10); and states have expended resources modifying their motor-vehicle and occupational licensing regimes to accommodate DACA recipients (State Pls. Mot. at 10 & n.18). The record does not indicate that Defendants acknowledged, let alone considered, these or any other reliance interests engendered by the DACA program. That alone is sufficient to render their supposedly discretionary decision to end the DACA program arbitrary and capricious.

Defendants' arguments to the contrary are unpersuasive. First, Defendants appear to argue that they did not need to discuss reliance interests because "controlling legal precedent" had changed. (Defs. Opp'n at 15.) That argument confuses the requirement that the agency show "that there are good reasons for the new policy" with the requirement that it not ignore "serious reliance interests that must be taken into account" when amending or rescinding an existing policy. Fox Television Stations, 556 U.S. at 515. In any event, it is hard to reconcile this argument—in effect, that Defendants were compelled to terminate the DACA program—with their insistence elsewhere that the decision to end the DACA program was discretionary and the product of reasoned deliberation.

Next, Defendants appear to contend that they did not need to consider reliance interests engendered by the DACA policy because those interests were not "longstanding" or serious, to the extent they existed. (Defs. Opp'n at 16-17.) It is true that DACA recipients received deferred action and work authorization for only two years at a time, that DHS retained discretion to revoke those benefits at any time, and that the 2012 DACA Memo "confer[red] no substantive right." (2012 DACA Memo at 3; Defs. Opp'n at 17.) As a practical matter, however, it is obvious that hundreds of thousands of DACA recipients and those close to them planned their lives around the program. It is unrealistic to suggest that these reliance interests were not "serious" or "substantial" simply because DHS retained the ability to terminate DACA recipients' deferred action at its discretion.

Moreover, the court does not see why the contingent, discretionary nature of DACA benefits means that, as Defendants argue, DACA recipients had no “legally cognizable reliance interests—and certainly not beyond the stated duration” in the continued existence of the DACA program. (Defs. Opp’n at 17.) In so contending, Defendants cross-reference their argument, made in their October 27 Motion to Dismiss, that DACA beneficiaries had no “‘protected entitlement’ for due process purposes” because “‘government officials may grant or deny [DACA benefits] in their discretion.’” (Defs. Oct. 27, 2017, Mot. to Dismiss (Dkt. 95) (“Defs. Oct. 27 MTD”) at 35 (quoting Town of Castle Rock v. Gonzales, 545 U.S. 748, 756 (2005)) (emphasis added).) Even accepting for the sake of argument that DACA recipients had no constitutionally protected liberty or property interests in the continued existence of the DACA program and the renewal of their particular DACA applications, it does not follow that they had no reliance interests therein, such that Defendants were free to end the DACA program without considering such interests. Encino Motorcars is instructive: A car dealer may have not have a Fifth Amendment entitlement to the Department of Labor’s hewing to a particular interpretation of the Fair Labor Standards Act, but that does not mean that the Department is free to disregard reliance interests engendered by the longstanding interpretation of the Act when it alters its regulations. See 136 S. Ct. at 2124-26.

Finally, Defendants argue that Acting Secretary Duke effectively considered the relevant reliance interests by adopting a policy that resulted in an orderly wind-down, rather than an immediate shut-down of the DACA program. (Defs. Opp’n at 17-18.) This is

sleight-of-hand and further post hoc rationalization. The record does not indicate that the Acting Secretary actually considered how the end of the DACA program would affect DACA recipients. That her chosen policy may, in practice, ameliorate the impact of the DACA rescission on DACA recipients, as compared to an immediate and disorderly shut-down of the program following a hypothetical injunction in the Texas litigation, does not mean that she actually considered this possibility. While the Acting Secretary stated that she “[r]ecogniz[ed] the complexities associated with winding down the program,” the Sessions Letter makes clear that these complexities referred to the burdens on DHS of winding down the DACA program. (Compare DACA Rescission Memo at 4, with Sessions Ltr. (“In light of the costs and burdens that will be imposed on DHS associated with rescinding this policy, DHS should consider an orderly and efficient wind-down process.” (emphasis added)).)

Accordingly, even if the record were to support Defendants’ “litigation risk” rationale, that rationale would be arbitrary and capricious. Finally, even if this rationale were not arbitrary and capricious, the court would nevertheless likely vacate Defendants’ decision because it is tainted by the errors discussed in Section III.A.1 above. “When an agency relies on multiple grounds for its decision, some of which are invalid, we may nonetheless sustain the decision as long as one is valid and ‘the agency would clearly have acted on that ground even if the other were unavailable.’” Mail Order Ass’n of Am. v. U.S. Postal Serv., 2 F.3d 408, 434 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (quoting Syracuse Peace Council v. FCC, 867 F.2d 654, 657 (D.C. Cir. 1989)). To the extent that Defendants’ “litigation risk” rationale can

be discerned from the Administrative Record and the parties' submissions in these cases, that rationale appears to be intertwined with Defendants' erroneous legal conclusion that the DACA program was unlawful. Because the court cannot say that Defendants clearly would have made the same decision even had they correctly understood the law and the holdings of the Texas courts, that decision is nevertheless likely arbitrary and capricious. See also N.Y. Pub. Interest Research Grp., 321 F.3d at 334 n.13.

b. The Court Cannot Construe This Decision as an "Independent Policy Judgment"

Defendants also contend that, even if the court disagrees with the Attorney General's conclusion that DACA is unconstitutional, the court may nevertheless uphold the decision to end the DACA program because the same facts that led the Attorney General to conclude that the DACA program is unconstitutional "equally support a policy judgment by the Acting Secretary that deferred action should be applied only on an individualized case-by-case basis rather than used as a tool to confer certain benefits that Congress had not otherwise acted to provide by law." (Defs. Opp'n at 25 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).) The record, however, offers no support for the notion that Defendants based their decision on any "policy judgment that immigration decisions of this magnitude should be left to Congress." (*Id.*) Defendants' argument therefore conflicts with fundamental principles of judicial review of agency action—namely that the court reviews the agency's stated reasons for its decision and "may not supply a reasoned basis for the agency's

action that the agency itself has not given.” State Farm, 463 U.S. at 43; see also Chenery II, 332 U.S. at 196; Chenery I, 318 U.S. at 87.

Defendants’ only authority for this novel argument, Syracuse Peace Council, 867 F.2d at 654, is inapposite. In that case, the D.C. Circuit held that when an agency bases its decision on both a judgment about constitutionality and policy reasons, the reviewing court may uphold the decision if the agency clearly would have reached the same decision for policy reasons alone, even if the agency stated that its constitutional and policy rationales were “intertwined.” Id. at 655-57. Syracuse Peace Council does not stand for the proposition that, when an agency bases its decision on constitutional grounds, a reviewing court may, in the first instance, construe that decision as having been based on a “policy judgment” found nowhere in the administrative record.

* * *

For the reasons stated above, the court concludes that Plaintiffs are substantially likely to prevail on the merits of their claim that the decision to rescind the DACA program was arbitrary, capricious, and an abuse of discretion.

B. Irreparable Harm

Plaintiffs have also demonstrated that they are likely to suffer irreparable harm if the court does not enjoin Defendants from fully implementing the DACA rescission.

“To satisfy the irreparable harm requirement, Plaintiffs must demonstrate that absent a preliminary injunction they will suffer an injury that is neither re-

mote nor speculative, but actual and imminent, and one that cannot be remedied if a court waits until the end of trial to resolve the harm.” Grand River Enter. Six Nations, Ltd. v. Pryor, 481 F.3d 60, 66 (2d Cir. 2007) (quoting Freedom Holdings, Inc. v. Spitzer, 408 F.3d 112, 114 (2d Cir. 2005)). Irreparable harm “cannot be remedied by an award of monetary damages.” State of New York ex rel. Schneiderman, 787 F.3d at 660.

Plaintiffs have extensively documented the irreparable harms they will suffer if the DACA program ends. Each day, approximately 122 DACA recipients who failed (or were unable) to renew their DACA status before October 5, 2017, lose their deferred action and work authorization. (BV Pls. Mot at 1-2, 35; State Pls. Mot. at 28.) If the implementation of the DACA Rescission Memo is not enjoined, approximately 1,400 DACA recipients will lose deferred action each work day, beginning on March 5, 2018. (State Pls. Mot. at 28.) As a result, these individuals will face the possibility of deportation from the country. While this possibility of deportation is clearly extremely worrisome to DACA recipients, the court declines to grant a preliminary injunction on this basis. See Winter, 555 U.S. at 21-22; see also Carlsson v. U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Servs., No. 12-CV-7893 (CAS), 2012 WL 4758118, at *9 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2012) (risk of deportation speculative, not imminent, when there were no pending removal proceedings against the plaintiffs).¹³ Nor may the court grant a preliminary in-

¹³ The court notes that Secretary Nielsen recently stated that, even if the DACA program ended, DHS would not prioritize the removal of DACA recipients who had not committed crimes. See Louis Nelson, DHS Chief: Deporting Dreamers Won't Be a Pri-

junction on the grounds that DACA recipients may, for fear of deportation, suffer from anxiety or depression, lose the “abilit[y] to plan for the future and make commitments, whether familial, career-based, academic, or otherwise” (BV Pls. Mot. at 37-38), or be required to turn their U.S. citizen children over to the care of the State Plaintiffs’ child welfare systems, or that public safety will be harmed because former DACA recipients will be less likely to report crimes and other harms to the community (State Pls. Mot. at 28). Because deportation is, at this point, not sufficiently “likely” for purposes of establishing irreparable harm, harms accruing from the fear of deportation are also too speculative to support the grant of a preliminary injunction.

Concomitant with the loss of deferred action, however, DACA recipients will also lose their work authorization. As a result, they will be legally unemployable in this country. Some DACA recipients will lose their employer-sponsored healthcare coverage, which will endanger DACA recipients and their families (BV Pls. Mot. at 36-37) and impose tremendous burdens on the State Plaintiffs’ public health systems (State Pls. Mot. at 31-32). Other DACA recipients, due to the imminent loss of their employment, may lose their homes or need to drop out of school. (BV Pls. Mot. at 37.) Employers will suffer due to the inability to hire or retain erstwhile DACA recipients, affecting their operations on an ongoing basis and causing them to incur unrecoverable economic losses. (Id. at 38; State Pls.

ority for ICE If Talks Fail, Politico (Jan. 16, 2018, 8:30 AM), <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/01/16/dhs-dreamers-deportation-not-priority-340681>.

Mot. at 29-30.) Finally, the DACA rescission will result in “staggering” adverse economic impacts, including, by the State Plaintiffs’ best lights, \$215 billion in lost GDP over the next decade, and \$797 million in lost state and local tax revenue. (State Pls. Mot. at 33 & nn.77-78.) Thus, while it may be true that “[l]oss of employment does not in and of itself constitute irreparable injury,” Savage v. Gorski, 850 F.2d 64, 67 (2d Cir. 1988), these cases present a “genuinely extraordinary situation” warranting injunctive relief, Sampson v. Murray, 415 U.S. 61, 92 n.68 (1974).

While the above is sufficient to demonstrate irreparable harm, the court also notes the obvious fact that the decision to rescind DACA, if carried into effect, will have profound and irreversible economic and social implications. That decision “will profoundly disrupt the lives of hundreds of thousands of people.” In re United States, 875 F.3d 1200, 1210 (9th Cir. 2017) (Watford, J., dissenting). It may force one out of every four hundred U.S. workers out of the lawful workforce. See Jie Zong et al., “A Profile of Current DACA Recipients by Education, Industry, and Occupation,” Migration Policy Institute (Nov. 2017), <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/profile-current-daca-recipients-education-industry-and-occupation>. Former DACA recipients will be separated from their families and communities. It is impossible to understand the full consequences of a decision of this magnitude. If the decision is allowed to go into effect prior to a full adjudication on the merits, there is no way the court can “unscramble the egg” and undo the damage caused by what, on the record before it, appears to have been a patently arbitrary and capricious decision.

Moreover, it is also impossible for the court to adjudicate this dispute on the merits before March 5, 2018, when these harms will begin to materialize in earnest. Defendants set an aggressive timetable for ending the DACA program and have pursued various dilatory tactics throughout this litigation. Notably, they have yet to produce a plausible administrative record in these cases, without which the court cannot render a merits decision. Overton Park, 401 U.S. at 420. For these reasons, it is clear that Plaintiffs will suffer substantial and imminent irreparable harm if the court does not preliminarily enjoin the DACA rescission.

Defendants argue that Plaintiffs have not shown that irreparable harm is “imminent, or even likely, given the preliminary injunction recently issued” in Regents. (Defs. Opp’n at 48.) Defendants are, however, vigorously contesting that injunction before both the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the U.S. Supreme Court. If Judge Alsup or the Ninth Circuit were to lift the injunction in Regents, then Plaintiffs would no doubt suffer irreparable harm. Defendants cite no authority for the proposition that Plaintiffs cannot establish irreparable harm simply because another court has already enjoined the same challenged action.

C. Balancing the Equities and the Public Interest

Finally, the court must consider whether “the balance of equities tips in [Plaintiffs’] favor” and if “an injunction is in the public interest.” Winter, 555 U.S. at 20. To make this decision, the court “balance[s] the competing claims of injury and must consider the effect on each party of the granting or withholding of the requested relief,” as well as “the public consequences

of employing the extraordinary remedy of injunction.” Id. at 24 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “These factors merge when the Government is the opposing party.” Nken, 556 U.S. at 435. The court concludes that these factors weigh firmly in Plaintiffs’ favor.

The court need not restate at length the consequences of the DACA rescission for Plaintiffs, other DACA recipients, those close to them, and the public at large. Allowing the DACA rescission to take immediate effect would quickly cost many DACA recipients the opportunity to work legally in this country, and hence to support themselves and their families. Enjoining the implementation of the DACA Rescission Memo would also preserve the status quo, enabling a full resolution of this matter on the merits, rather than allowing severe social dislocations to unfold based on an agency decision that, as noted above, strongly appears to have been arbitrary and capricious. The public interest is not served by allowing Defendants to proceed with arbitrary and capricious action.

Against these considerations, the court weighs the effect on Defendants of initiating a wind-down of the DACA program on their predetermined timetable. The court does not step in this area lightly. Defendants have broad discretion to set immigration-enforcement priorities. Arizona, 567 U.S. at 394. Moreover, the DACA program was originally created by the Executive Branch, and the Trump Administration should be able to alter the policies and priorities set by its predecessor.

There are, however, several factors that lead the court to conclude that the balance of the equities favors granting an injunction. Defendants do not appear to have rescinded the DACA program as an exercise of their discretion, or because of a reasoned policy judgment, but instead, at least in significant part, because they erroneously concluded that the program was unconstitutional and unlawful. Enjoining Defendants from rescinding the DACA program on erroneous legal grounds therefore does not intrude on their discretion or well-established authority to set immigration-enforcement policies. Moreover, although the Government generally has a substantial interest in the speedy deportation of removable aliens because their presence here “permit[s] and prolong[s] a continuing violation of United States law,” Nken, 556 U.S. at 436 (quoting AAADC, 525 U.S. at 490), the court finds that the Government’s interest in ending the DACA program is not so compelling. For one thing, the President has stated his support for keeping DACA recipients in the country (albeit preferably pursuant to legislation rather than executive action). Donald J. Trump, @realdonaldtrump, Twitter.com (Sept. 14, 2017 3:28 AM), <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/908276308265795585> (“Does anybody really want to throw out good, educated and accomplished young people who have jobs, some serving in the military? Really!”). The current DHS Secretary has also stated that the erstwhile DACA recipients would not be a priority for immigration enforcement. Louis Nelson, DHS Chief: Deporting Dreamers Won’t Be a Priority for ICE If Talks Fail, Politico (Jan. 16, 2018), <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/01/16/dhs-dreamers-deportation-not-priority-340681>. Even if deporting

DACA recipients were a priority of the Administration, an injunction against the end of the DACA program would not impede this policy, as, under the 2012 DACA Memo, DHS retains discretion to revoke specific DACA recipients' deferred action and work authorization.¹⁴

Accordingly, the court finds that the balance of the equities tip decidedly in Plaintiffs' favor, and that the public interest would be well-served by an injunction.

D. Scope of Relief

For the foregoing reasons, the court finds that Plaintiffs have demonstrated that they are entitled to a preliminary injunction. Defendants are therefore ORDERED to maintain the DACA program on the same terms and conditions that existed prior to the promulgation of the DACA Rescission Memo, subject to the following limitations. Defendants need not consider new applications by individuals who have never before obtained DACA benefits; need not continue granting "advanced parole" to DACA beneficiaries; and, of course, may adjudicate DACA renewal requests on a case-by-case, individualized basis. See Regents, 2018 WL 339144, at *28.

Plaintiffs contend that the court should require Defendants to restore the DACA program as it existed on September 4, 2017, in particular by requiring Defendants to adjudicate initial DACA applications submitted by individuals who only became eligible for DACA after that date. (Jan. 30, 2018, Hr'g Tr. (Dkt. Number Pending) 8:24-25.) As in Regents, however, the court

¹⁴ The court expresses no view as to whether the revocation of existing DACA benefits would be consistent with the Due Process Clause or other potentially applicable protections.

finds that the irreparable harms identified by Plaintiffs largely result from Defendants' expected failure to renew existing grants of deferred action and especially work authorization, not from Defendants' refusal to adjudicate new initial DACA applications. While the court is sympathetic to the plight of individuals who were unable to apply for DACA before September 5, 2017, it cannot say that Plaintiffs have demonstrated either that these individuals would be irreparably harmed without injunctive relief or that the balance of equities favors these individuals to the same extent it favors existing DACA beneficiaries.

The court enjoins rescission of the DACA program on a universal or "nationwide" basis. Again, it does not do so lightly. As Defendants correctly note, equitable principles provide that the court should not enter an injunction that is broader than "necessary to provide complete relief to the plaintiffs." (Defs. Opp'n at 50 (quoting Madsen v. Women's Health Ctr., Inc., 512 U.S. 753, 765 (1994)).) See also Church & Dwight Co. v. SPD Swiss Precision Diagnostics, GmbH, 843 F.3d 48, 72 (2d Cir. 2016) ("[I]njunctive relief should be no broader than necessary to cure the effects of the harm caused by the violation" (internal quotation marks and citations omitted)). Moreover, several academic commentators have insightfully observed various problems with the practice of granting nationwide injunctions against the Government, including that such injunctions thwart the development of law in different courts, encourage forum-shopping, and create the possibility that different courts will issue conflicting nationwide injunctions. See Samuel L. Bray, Multiple Chancellors: Reforming the National Injunction, 131 Harv. L. Rev. 417 (2017); Michael T. Morley,

Nationwide Injunctions, Rule 23(b)(2), and the Remedial Powers of the Lower Courts, 97 B.U. L. Rev. 611 (2017); Zayn Siddique, Nationwide Injunctions, 117 Colum. L. Rev. 2095 (2017); Getzel Berger, Note, Nationwide Injunctions Against the Federal Government: A Structural Approach, 92 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1068 (2017).

Nevertheless, the court finds that a nationwide injunction is warranted in these cases. First, it is hard to conceive of how the court would craft a narrower injunction that would adequately protect Plaintiffs' interests. Plaintiffs include not only several individuals and a nonprofit organization, but also sixteen states and the District of Columbia. To protect the State Plaintiffs' interests, the court would presumably need to enjoin Defendants from rescinding the DACA program with respect to the State Plaintiffs' residents and employees, including the employees of any instrumentalities of the state, such as public hospitals, schools, and universities. Such an injunction would be unworkable, partly in light of the simple fact that people move from state to state and job to job, and would likely create administrative problems for Defendants. Furthermore, there is a strong federal interest in the uniformity of federal immigration law. See U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 4 (empowering Congress to "establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization"); Texas, 809 F.3d at 187-88. Because the decision to rescind the DACA program had a "systemwide impact," the court will preliminarily impose a "systemwide remedy." Lewis v. Casey, 518 U.S. 343, 359 (1996) (quoting Dayton Bd. of Educ. v. Brinkman, 433 U.S. 406, 420 (1977)).

IV. CONCLUSION

Plaintiffs' motions for a preliminary injunction (Dkt. 123 in No. 16-CV-4756; Dkt. 96 in No. 17-CV-5228) are GRANTED. The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs' motion for class certification (Dkt. 124) is DENIED as moot.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
Feb. [13], 2018

/s/ NICHOLAS G. GARAUFIS
NICHOLAS G. GARAUFIS
United States District Judge

APPENDIX D

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

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

MARTÍN JONATHAN BATALLA VIDAL, ET AL.,
PLAINTIFFS

v.

KIRSTJEN M. NIELSEN, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

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

STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

v.

DONALD TRUMP, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

Filed: Feb. 20, 2018

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Notice is hereby given that all Defendants in the above-captioned matters hereby appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from the February 13, 2018 Amended Memorandum & Order & Preliminary Injunction of the Honorable Nicholas G. Garaufis, United States District Judge (*Batalla Vidal* ECF No. 255; *State of New York* ECF No. 209). This appeal includes all prior orders and decisions that merge into the Court's February 13, 2018 orders.

Dated: Feb. 20, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

CHAD A. READLER
Acting Assistant Attorney General

RICHARD P. DONOGHUE
United States Attorney

BRETT A. SHUMATE
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

JENNIFER D. RICKETTS
Director, Federal Programs Branch

JOHN R. TYLER
Assistant Branch Director

BRAD P. ROSENBERG
Senior Trial Counsel

/s/ STEPHEN M. PEZZI
STEPHEN M. PEZZI (D.C. Bar #995500)
RACHAEL L. WESTMORELAND
KATE BAILEY
Trial Attorneys
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20530
Tel.: (202) 305-8576
Fax: (202) 616-8470
Email: stephen.pezzi@usdoj.gov

132a

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
Tel: (718) 254-6288
Fax: (718) 254-7489
Email: joseph.marutollo@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Defendants

APPENDIX E

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

No. 16-CV-4756 (NGG) (JO)

MARTÍN JONATHAN BATALLA VIDAL, ET AL.,
PLAINTIFFS

v.

KIRSTJEN M. NIELSEN, SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELAND SECURITY, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

No. 17-CV-5228 (NGG) (JO)

STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

v.

DONALD TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
ET AL., DEFENDANTS

Filed: Mar. 29, 2018

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

NICHOLAS G. GARAUFGIS, United States District Judge.

Plaintiffs in the above-captioned cases challenge Defendants' decisions to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals ("DACA") program and, Plaintiffs allege, to relax the restrictions on federal authorities' use of DACA applicants' personal information for immigration-enforcement purposes. The court assumes familiarity with the factual and procedural history of these cases

and in particular with its November 9, 2017, Memorandum and Order (the “November 9 M&O”) (Dkt. 104),¹ which granted in part and denied in part Defendants’ motion to dismiss these cases for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction,² and its February 13, 2018, Amended Memorandum and Order (the “February 13 M&O”) (Dkt. 254), which granted Plaintiffs’ motions for a preliminary injunction barring Defendants from terminating the DACA program in its entirety. Before the court are Defendants’ motions to dismiss the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs’ third amended complaint pursuant to Rules 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to dismiss the State Plaintiffs’ amended complaint pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6). (3d Am. Compl. (“BV TAC”) (Dkt. 113); Am. Compl. (“State Pls. AC”))

¹ All record citations refer to the docket in Batalla Vidal v. Nielsen, No. 16-CV-4756 (E.D.N.Y.), except as otherwise noted. For ease of reference, the court refers to the Department of Homeland Security as “DHS,” the Department of Justice as “DOJ,” and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services as “USCIS.”

² In the November 9 M&O, the court dismissed for lack of standing the fourth claim asserted in the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs’ second amended complaint, which alleged that Defendants violated the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment by failing to provide individualized written notice to certain DACA recipients that they needed to renew their DACA benefits by October 5, 2017. (2d Am. Compl. (Dkt. 60) ¶¶ 160-65; Nov. 9 M&O at 37-38.) The court also dismissed for lack of standing the State Plaintiffs’ notice and information-use-policy claims. (Nov. 9 M&O at 38-46.) While the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs reassert a notice claim in their third amended complaint (3d Am. Compl. (“BV TAC”) (Dkt. 113) ¶¶ 188-94), they concede that they do so only to preserve the claim for appeal and that, under the reasoning of the November 9 M&O, this claim should be dismissed (Pls. Mem. in Opp’n to Mot. to Dismiss the BV TAC (“BV Pls. Opp’n”) (Dkt. 240) at 4 n.5). Accordingly, the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs’ fourth claim for relief is DISMISSED.

(Dkt. 71, No. 17-CV-5228); Defs. Mem. in Supp. of Mot. to Dismiss the BV TAC (“BV MTD”) (Dkt. 207-1); Defs. Mem. in Supp. of Mot. to Dismiss the State Pls. AC (“State MTD”) (Dkt. 71-1); see also Pls. Mem. in Opp’n to Mot. to Dismiss the BV TAC (“BV Pls. Opp’n”) (Dkt. 240); Pls. Mem. in Opp’n to Mot. to Dismiss the State Pls. AC (“State Pls. Opp’n”) (Dkt. 202, No. 17-CV-5228.) For the reasons that follow. Defendants’ motions are GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART.

I. LEGAL STANDARDS

A. Rule 12(b)(1)

A Rule 12(b)(1) motion tests the court’s subject-matter jurisdiction to hear a claim or case. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1). Under Rule 12(b)(1), the court must dismiss a claim “when the . . . court lacks the statutory or constitutional power to adjudicate it.” Makarova v. United States, 201 F.3d 110, 113 (2d Cir. 2000). When considering a Rule 12(b)(1) motion, the court “must take all uncontroverted facts in the complaint . . . as true, and draw all reasonable inferences in favor of the party asserting jurisdiction.” Tandon v. Captain’s Cove Marina of Bridgeport, Inc., 752 F.3d 239, 243 (2d Cir. 2014). Nevertheless, “the party asserting subject matter jurisdiction ‘has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that it exists.’” Id. (quoting Makarova, 201 F.3d at 113).

B. Rule 12(b)(6)

A Rule 12(b)(6) motion tests the legal adequacy of the plaintiffs complaint. To survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the complaint must “contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662,

678 (2009) (quoting Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). In considering the sufficiency of the complaint, the court “accept[s] all [well-pleaded] factual allegations in the complaint as true, and draw[s] all reasonable inferences in the plaintiff’s favor,” Chambers v. Time Warner, Inc., 282 F.3d 147, 152 (2d Cir. 2002), but does need not to credit “[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements,” Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678. Determining “plausibility” is a “context-specific task,” id. at 679, which “depends on a host of considerations: the full factual picture presented by the complaint, the particular cause of action and its elements, and the existence of alternative explanations so obvious that they render plaintiff’s inferences unreasonable,” L-7 Designs, Inc. v. Old Navy, LLC, 647 F.3d 419, 430 (2d Cir. 2011).

The court’s review of a Rule 12(b)(6) motion is generally limited to “the facts alleged in the complaint, documents attached to the complaint as exhibits, and documents incorporated by reference in the complaint,” as well as documents “integral” to the complaint. DiFolco v. MSNBC Cable LLC, 622 F.3d 104, 111 (2d Cir. 2010).

II. DISCUSSION

The court first analyzes Plaintiffs’ claims challenging the decision to end the DACA program, then turns to the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs’ claims challenging Defendants’ (1) alleged changes to the policy regarding the protection of DACA applicants’ personal information (the “information-use policy”) (BV TAC ¶¶ 177-82); and (2) rejections of DACA renewal requests that were delayed due to postal errors, received late in the day on October 5, 2017, or contained “real or perceived clerical errors” (id. ¶¶ 199-205).

A. DACA Rescission

Plaintiffs have stated a claim that the decision to end the DACA program was substantively arbitrary and capricious, in violation of Section 706(2)(A) of the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. § 706(2), and substantially motivated by discriminatory animus, in violation of the equal-protection principle inherent in the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause. Plaintiffs have not, however, stated a claim that the rescission of the DACA program was invalid because it was not implemented through notice-and-comment rulemaking, nor have they stated a claim that Defendants violated the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. § 601 *et seq.* (“RFA”), by failing to consider the rescission’s impact on small entities.

1. Substantive APA

Plaintiffs challenge the decision to end the DACA program as substantively “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). (BV TAC ¶¶ 177-82; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 253-56.) In its February 13 M&O, the court found that Plaintiffs were likely to succeed on the merits of this claim. For the reasons stated in that opinion, Defendants’ motion to dismiss these claims is DENIED.³ Additionally, the court notes

³ Defendants have also contested whether Make the Road New York (“MRNY”) and the State Plaintiffs fall within the APA’s “zone of interests.” (BV MTD at 12; State MTD at 20-21.) These Plaintiffs fall within the zone of interests of the Immigration and Nationality Act such that they may bring suit under the APA. DACA recipients are members, clients, and employees of MRNY, an organization that advocates for immigrants’ rights. (BV TAC ¶¶ 46, 49-50; BV Pls. Opp’n at 6-7.) At the very least, the State

that it would be inappropriate to dismiss Plaintiffs' substantive APA claims at this stage of the litigation, as "there is a strong suggestion" that the administrative record previously produced by Defendants is incomplete, "entitling [Plaintiffs] to discovery regarding the completeness of the record." (Dec. 27, 2017, USCA Order (Dkt. 210) at 2-3 (quoting Dopico v. Goldschmidt, 687 F.2d 644, 654 (2d Cir. 1982)).)⁴

Plaintiffs employ a number of DACA recipients. (Nov. 9 M&O at 38-40; State Pls. Opp'n at 3-6.) Plaintiffs' interests in the decision to end the DACA program are thus not "so marginally related to or inconsistent with the purposes implicit in the [Immigration and Nationality Act] that it cannot reasonably be assumed that Congress authorized [those] plaintiff[s] to sue." Lexmark Int'l, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc., 134 S. Ct. 1377, 1389 (2014) (quoting Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatomi Indians v. Patchak, 567 U.S. 209, 225 (2012)); see also Clarke v. Sec. Indus. Ass'n, 479 U.S. 388, 399 (1987). Defendants rely on Federation for American Immigration Reform, Inc. v. Reno, 93 F.3d 897 (D.C. Cir. 1996) ("FAIR"), but that case held only that members of an anti-immigration group lacked statutory standing, based on their generalized objections to immigration, to challenge a decision to accord relief to Cuban immigrants. See id. at 900-04. Unlike in FAIR, Plaintiffs in the above-captioned cases are directly affected by Defendants' actions. See Regents of the Univ. of Calif. v. DHS, 279 F. Supp. 3d 1011, 1036 n.12 (N.D. Cal. 2018).

⁴ Record-related discovery remains stayed pending the Second Circuit's ruling on Defendants' interlocutory appeal from the November 9 M&O. (See Jan. 8, 2017, Mem. & Order (Dkt. 233) at 9-10.) The court reiterates that Defendants vigorously sought that interlocutory appeal before reversing course and conceding that the Second Circuit should hold Defendants' petitions for leave to appeal in abeyance pending this court's ruling on Plaintiffs' motions for a preliminary injunction and Defendants' motions to dismiss. (Reply in Supp. of Pet. for Permission to Appeal (Dkt. 28, Nielsen v. Vidal, No. 18-122 (2d Cir.)) at 2; see also Feb. 13 M&O at 21 & n.6.) The Second Circuit thereafter agreed to hold these petitions

2. Procedural APA

Plaintiffs next claim that the decision to end the DACA program was procedurally defective, in violation of Section 706(2)(D) of the APA, because the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) did not use notice-and-comment rulemaking to rescind the program. These claims raise challenging questions but are ultimately unavailing.

Under the APA, an agency generally must use notice-and-comment procedures to make any “rule.” 5 U.S.C. § 553.⁵ The APA exempts from this requirement, however, “general statements of policy,” among other types of rule. *Id.* § 553(b)(A). The parties dispute whether the memorandum announcing the rescission of the DACA program (the “DACA Rescission Memo”) (Mem. from Elaine C. Duke, Acting Sec’y, DHS, Rescission of the June 15, 2012 Memorandum Entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children” (Dkt. 77-1 at ECF p.252)) is a “general statement of policy” exempt from notice-and-comment rulemaking requirements or instead a “legislative rule” subject to these requirements. (Compare BV MTD at 18-20, and State MTD at 28-31, with BV Pls. Opp’n at 12-16, and State Pls. Opp’n at 15-19.) The DACA Rescission Memo was not formulated through notice-and-comment rulemaking,

for leave to file in abeyance pending this court’s ruling on the pending motions. (USCA Jan. 31, 2018, Order (Dkt. 249).)

⁵ The APA defines “rule” as “the whole or part of an agency statement of general or particular applicability and future effect designed to implement, interpret, or prescribe law or policy or describing the organization, procedure, or practice requirements of an agency.” 5 U.S.C. § 551(4).

so if it is a legislative rule, it is invalid. See 5 U.S.C. §§ 553, 706(2)(D).

As the court has already noted, the line between legislative rules and non-legislative rules “is enshrouded in considerable smog.” (Feb. 13 M&O at 30 (quoting Noel v. Chapman, 508 F.2d 1023, 1030 (2d Cir. 1975)).) See also Nat’l Mining Ass’n v. McCarthy, 758 F.3d 243, 251 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (characterizing the inquiry for determining whether an agency action is a legislative rule, an interpretive rule, or a general statement of policy as “quite difficult and confused”). There are, however, general principles to guide the court’s inquiry. If the rule alters the rights or obligations of regulated parties “or produces other significant effects on private interests,” it is legislative. White v. Shalala, 7 F.3d 296, 303 (2d Cir. 1993) (citation omitted); see also Chrysler Corp. v. Brown, 441 U.S. 281, 302 (1979) (legislative rules “affect[] individual rights and obligations” (citation omitted)); Lewis-Mota v. Sec’y of Labor, 469 F.2d 478, 482 (2d Cir. 1972). The D.C. Circuit has summarized what makes a “legislative” rule:

An agency action that purports to impose legally binding obligations or prohibitions on regulated parties—and that would be the basis for an enforcement action for violations of those obligations or requirements—is a legislative rule. An agency action that sets forth legally binding requirements for a private party to obtain a permit or license is a legislative rule.

Nat’l Mining Ass’n, 758 F.3d at 251-52.

If, however, the rule does not alter regulated parties’ rights and obligations but instead “educat[es] . . . agency members in the agency’s work,” or is

“directed primarily at the staff of an agency describing how it will conduct agency discretionary functions,” the rule is a general policy statement. Noel, 508 F.2d at 1030 (first quoting Henry Friendly, The Federal Administrative Agencies 145-46 (1962), and then quoting Arthur E. Bonfield, Some Tentative Thoughts on Public Participation in the Making of Interpretative Rules and General Statements of Policy Under the APA, 23 Admin. L. Rev. 101, 115 (1971)); see also Lincoln v. Vigil, 508 U.S. 182, 197 (1993) (general statements of policy are “issued by an agency to advise the public prospectively of the manner in which the agency proposed to exercise a discretionary power” (quoting Chrysler, 441 U.S. at 302 n.31)); Nat’l Mining Ass’n, 758 F.3d at 252 (“An agency action that merely explains how the agency will enforce a statute or regulation—in other words, how it will exercise its broad enforcement discretion or permitting discretion under some extant statute or rule—is a general statement of policy.”).

The Second Circuit’s decision in Noel helps reveal the uncertain boundary between legislative rules and general statements of policy. In Noel, two Haitian nationals unlawfully present in the United States and subject to orders of deportation married U.S. lawful permanent residents and sought “extended voluntary departure,” a form of discretionary relief from deportation that would have enabled them to remain in this country for up to two years while waiting for visas. 508 F.2d at 1024. Between 1968 and 1972, it was the practice of the New York District Director for Immigration and Naturalization Services (“INS”) routinely to grant extended voluntary departure to such Western Hemisphere aliens who were present in this country and married to permanent resident aliens. Id. at 1025.

In 1972, however, INS issued a directive stating that such aliens “should not routinely be granted extended departure time, but rather should be offered that privilege only in those cases where compelling circumstances warranted the relief.” Id. at 1025-26. The plaintiffs argued, among other things, that this directive was a legislative rule that was invalid because it was not made through notice-and-comment rulemaking. Id. at 1029. The Second Circuit rejected this argument, concluding that the directive was a “general statement of policy” exempt from notice-and-comment requirements. Id. First, the Second Circuit noted that the directive did not purport to amend an existing regulation vesting the district director with sole discretion to extend deportable aliens’ time in the United States or otherwise to oust him of this discretion. Id. at 1030. Instead, the directive only offered “a statement by the agency of its general policy as a guideline for the District Directors” in their exercise of this discretion. Id. Second, the directive did not “change[] the existing right of the [aliens] to have their applications for extensions of time to depart authorized in the sole discretion of the district director,” because those aliens remained eligible to seek deferred voluntary departure, albeit only on the more limited basis of hardship. Id.

Like the directive at issue in Noel, the DACA Rescission Memo appears to be a general statement of policy, not a legislative rule. The DACA Rescission Memo does not deprive individuals of a substantive right to receive deferred action or work authorization, or to have these benefits renewed for additional terms. As the memorandum that launched the DACA program (the “2012 DACA Memo”) states clearly, no such rights exist. (Mem. from Janet Napolitano, Sec’y, DHS, “Ex-

exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children” (“2012 DACA Memo”) (Dkt. 77-1 at ECF p.1.) Instead, the decision to grant or deny an individual deferred action and work authorization continues to lie within immigration authorities’ discretion. Like the 2012 DACA Memo, the DACA Rescission Memo offers guidance to DHS employees as to how the agency intends to exercise this discretion prospectively: Whereas the 2012 DACA Memo advises DHS staff to consider exercising prosecutorial discretion with respect to individuals meeting certain identified criteria (such as age of entry into the United States and absence of a meaningful criminal record), the DACA Rescission Memo directs those staff not to consider those criteria when exercising their prosecutorial discretion. The DACA Rescission Memo is thus “directed primarily at the staff of [DHS] describing how it will conduct agency discretionary functions.” Noel, 508 F.2d at 1030 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

It is true that, if the DACA Rescission Memo were to take effect, hundreds of thousands of individuals would no longer have the opportunity to seek deferred action and work authorization through the DACA program. As Defendants note, however, the DACA Rescission Memo does not purport to strip immigration authorities of the ability to grant deferred action and work authorization, but only provides that they should not do based on the criteria identified in the 2012 DACA Memo, or on the submission of DACA application materials. (BV MTD at 7 (“[A]s was true before implementation of the DACA Policy in 2012, deferred action remains available on an individualized basis.”).) At least in theory, individuals who would have been eligi-

ble for deferred action and work authorization under the DACA program may still qualify for those benefits based on their individual circumstances. As a practical matter, the DACA Rescission Memo almost certainly means that fewer individuals will receive for deferred action and work authorization. But the directive at issue in Noel surely reduced the number of aliens eligible for discretionary relief, too, and that did not render the directive a legislative rule. See Noel, 508 F.2d at 1025-26.

Plaintiffs contend that the DACA Rescission Memo nevertheless is a legislative rule because it binds DHS's discretion and requires the agency to reject all DACA applications and renewal requests not meeting certain criteria. (BV Pls. Opp'n at 12-14; State Pls. Opp'n at 15-19.) As Plaintiffs point out, a number of courts outside this circuit—most notably the D.C. Circuit—have determined whether a rule is legislative at least partly by looking to whether the rule constrains the agency's own discretion. See, e.g., Clarian Health W., LLC v. Hargan, 878 F.3d 346, 357 (D.C. Cir. 2017). In this view, a rule “‘cabining . . . an agency’s prosecutorial discretion can in fact rise to the level of a substantive, legislative rule’ when it ‘is in purpose or likely effect one that narrowly limits administrative discretion.’” Ass’n of Irrigated Residents v. EPA, 494 F.3d 1027, 1034 (D.C. Cir. 2007) quoting Cnty. Nutrition Inst. v. Young, 818 F.2d 943, 948 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (per curiam)). Plaintiffs note that the DACA Rescission Memo mandates the rejection of certain DACA applications, and therefore contend that the memo eliminates DHS's discretion to consider those applications and thus constitutes a legislative rule.

While there is some force to Plaintiffs' arguments, they are unavailing. As an initial matter, it is not clear to this court that an agency's compliance with its stated policy is reason to deem that policy a legislative rule. Because one might expect functional organizations generally to abide by their own policies, treating general compliance with internal policies as evidence that those policies were in fact legislative rules risks writing the "general statements of policy" exception to notice-and-comment rulemaking out of the APA.⁶ Moreover, it is important to remember that the DACA Rescission Memo purports to end a program that was itself created by a policy statement. Plaintiffs' view that Defendants must use notice and comment to stop what started without notice and comment is not only counterintuitive, but also at odds with the general principle that the procedures needed to repeal or amend a rule as the same ones that were used to make the rule in the first place. See Perez v. Mortg. Bankers Ass'n, 135 S. Ct. 1199, 1206 (2015) ("Because an agency is not required to use notice-and-comment procedures to issue an initial interpretive rule, it is also not required to use those procedures when it amends or repeals that interpretive rule.") To whatever extent the DACA Rescission Memo is in fact "binding" on DHS, the court cannot agree that this prospective limitation on the agency's exercise of its discretion renders the memo a legislative rule.

⁶ For an insightful argument why the "practically binding" standard is inconsistent with the Supreme Court's decision in Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 435 U.S. 519 (1978), see Cass R. Sunstein, "Practically Binding": General Policy Statements and Notice-and-Comment Rulemaking, 68 Admin. L. Rev. 491 (2016).

Accordingly, Defendants' motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' notice-and-comment claims is

GRANTED.

3. RFA

Plaintiffs also assert claims under the RFA. (BV TAC ¶¶ 183-87; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 266-73.) Among other things, that statute provides that when an agency engages in rulemaking, it must consider the impact of the rule on "small entities." 5 U.S.C. §§ 603(a), 604(a). The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs claim that the DACA Rescission Memo violated the RFA because it failed to consider the impact of the rescission on Plaintiff Make the Road New York ("MRNY") and similar small entities (BV TAC ¶¶ 184-85), while the State Plaintiffs contend that DHS failed to consider the impact on "small businesses, small nonprofits, and small governmental jurisdictions." (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 266-73).

These claims are also unavailing. The RFA only requires an agency to publish an initial or final regulatory flexibility analysis when the agency is required to use notice-and-comment rulemaking procedures. 5 U.S.C. §§ 603(a), 604(a); U.S. Telecom Ass'n v. FCC, 400 F.3d 29, 42 (D.C. Cir. 2005). Because DHS was not required to use notice and comment to rescind the DACA program, it was not required to conduct a regulatory flexibility analysis in connection with that decision.

Accordingly, Defendants' motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' RFA claims is GRANTED.

4. Equal Protection

The court next turns to Plaintiffs' claims that the decision to end the DACA program violated the U.S. Constitution because it was substantially motivated by racial animus against Latinos and, in particular, Mexicans. (BV TAC ¶¶ 195-98; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 233-39.) Defendants move to dismiss these claims on the grounds that Plaintiffs have failed to plausibly allege that the DACA rescission was motivated by unlawful animus. (E.g., State MTD at 31-34.) The court concludes, however, that Plaintiffs have alleged sufficient facts to raise a plausible influence that the DACA rescission substantially motivated by unlawfully discriminatory purpose.

The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution generally prohibits its government officials from discriminating on the basis of race. U.S. Const, amend. XIV, § 1. Although the Equal Protection Clause by its terms applies to states, the Supreme Court has long recognized that the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment generally prohibits racial discrimination by the federal government as well. Boiling v. Sharpe, 347 U.S. 497, 498-500 (1954). In order to state an equal-protection claim based on racial discrimination. Plaintiffs must allege "that a government actor intentionally discriminated against them on the basis of race." Hayden v. County of Nassau, 180 F.3d 42, 48 (2d Cir. 1999). Where, as here, Plaintiffs challenge facially neutral official action, they may support this claim by alleging either that the facially neutral action "is applied in a discriminatory fashion," or that "it was motivated by discriminatory animus and its application results in a discriminatory

effect.” *Id.* (first citing Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 373-74 (1886), and then citing Vill. of Arlington Heights v. Metro. Hous. Dev. Corp., 429 U.S. 252, 264-65 (1977) (“Arlington Heights”). Only the latter theory is at issue here, as Plaintiffs argue that the DACA Rescission Memo both disadvantages and was intended to disadvantage certain racial groups. (BV TAC ¶ 197; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 235-36.) The court discusses each element of an equal-protection claim in turn.

a) Effect

Plaintiffs allege that the rescission of the DACA program would have a disparate impact on Latinos and especially Mexicans. (BV TAC ¶ 197.) The State Plaintiffs allege that 78 percent of DACA recipients are Mexican nationals. (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 6.) Indeed, according to USCIS data attached to the State Plaintiffs’ amended complaint, of the 793,026 individuals whose initial DACA applications were approved between 2012 and June 30, 2017, more than 78 percent originated in Mexico, and at least 93 percent originated in Latin America as a whole. (USCIS, Number of Form I-821D, Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (Dkt. 55-1 at ECF p.2).)⁷ These allegations are sufficient to raise a plausible inference that the end of the DACA program would have a disproportionately adverse effect on Latinos and especially Mexicans.

Relying heavily on United States v. Armstrong, 517 U.S. 456 (1996), Defendants argue that Plaintiffs bear a “rigorous” or especially “heavy burden” to sur-

⁷ This file lists the number of DACA applications approved for the top 25 countries of origin for DACA recipients, not for all countries from which DACA recipients originate. (*Id.*)

vive a motion to dismiss, and thus that allegations of the outsized impact of the DACA rescission on Latino/a individuals and especially Mexicans are insufficient to plead discriminatory effect. (BV MTD at 20-21; State MTD at 32 (characterizing the prevalence of Mexican nationals among DACA recipients as “an unsurprising accident of geography, not evidence of discrimination”).) Armstrong is, however, inapposite. In that case, the Court considered the initial showing that a criminal defendant asserting a “selective prosecution” claim under the Equal Protection Clause must make before obtaining discovery pursuant to Rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. This is, however, a civil case, the pleading standards for which are set forth in Twombly and Iqbal. Moreover, as the court has previously explained, Plaintiffs are not asserting a “selective-deportation” claim, which might be analogized to the selective-prosecution claim at issue in Armstrong. (Nov. 9 M&O at 28-31.) Rather than alleging that they in particular are being targeted for removal because of their race—in which case judicial review of their suit would presumably be limited by 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g), see Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm., 525 U.S. 471 (1999)—Plaintiffs allege that the categorical decision to end the DACA program, which provided them with some limited assurance that they would not be deported, was motivated by unlawful animus. See Regents of the Univ. of Calif. v. DHS, No. 17-CV-5211 (WHA), 2018 WL 401177, at *6 n.3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 12, 2018) (“Regents 12(b)(6) Order”) (rejecting Defendants’ attempt to characterize similar challenges as selective-prosecution claims).

Defendants also argue that the court should dismiss the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs' equal-protection claim because, among other things, it fails to offer particularized allegations of the discriminatory impact of the DACA rescission on Latino/a and especially Mexican individuals. If the court were considering Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs' third amended complaint on its own, the court might agree. The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs' allegation that "[t]he DACA Termination targets Latinos and, in particular, Mexicans, and will have a disparate impact on these groups" (BV TAC ¶ 197) appears to be a fairly conclusory "recital[] of the elements of a cause of action," which the court need not accept as true. Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678. Their fellow Plaintiffs have, however, alleged particularized facts in support of this allegation. More importantly, the court takes judicial notice of the USCIS data referenced above, which may be considered on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion. Kramer v. Time Warner Inc., 937 F.2d 767, 773 (2d Cir. 1991). The court declines to dismiss the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs' equal-protection claim simply because they did not append the same data to their third amended complaint. Both sets of Plaintiffs have adequately alleged that the rescission of the DACA program has a disproportionate impact on Latino/a and especially Mexican individuals.

b) Purpose

To establish discriminatory motivation. Plaintiffs must ultimately show that "invidious discriminatory purpose was a motivating factor" in the decision. Arlington Heights, 429 U.S. at 266. In other words, they must show that Defendants "selected or reaffirmed a particular course of action at least in part 'because of,' not merely 'in spite of,' its adverse effects upon an identi-

fiable group.” Personnel Adm’r v. Feeney, 442 U.S. 256, 279 (1979). But they “need not prove that the ‘challenged action rested solely on racially discriminatory purposes.’” Hayden v. Paterson, 594 F.3d 150, 163 (2d Cir. 2010) (quoting Arlington Heights, 429 U.S. at 265).

“Because discriminatory intent is rarely susceptible to direct proof, litigants may make ‘a sensitive inquiry into such circumstantial and direct evidence of intent as may be available.’” Id. (quoting Arlington Heights, 429 U.S. at 266). In “extreme” cases, a facially neutral law may have such a “clear” disparate impact, “unexplainable on grounds other than race,” that evidence of disparate impact alone may suffice to show discriminatory purpose. Arlington Heights, 429 U.S. at 266 (citing, e.g., Yick Wo, 118 U.S. at 356, and Gomillion v. Lightfoot, 364 U.S. 339 (1960)). In the absence of such a pattern, however, “impact alone is not determinative, and the [c]ourt must look to other evidence” to determine if the challenged action was motivated by discriminatory purpose. Id. This evidence may include, for example, (1) “[t]he historical background of the decision . . . particularly if it reveals a series of official actions taken for invidious purposes”; (2) “[t]he specific sequence of events leading up to the challenged decision”; (3) “[d]epartures from the normal procedural sequence,” which “might afford evidence that improper purposes are playing a role”; (4) “[s]ubstantive departures . . . particularly if the factors usually considered important by the decisionmaker strongly favor a decision contrary to the one reached”; (5) “[t]he legislative or administrative history . . . especially where there are contemporary statements by members of the decisionmaking body, minutes of its meetings, or reports”; and (6) “[i]n some extraordinary circumstances,”

testimony of official decisionmakers. Id. at 266-68; see also Hayden v. Paterson, 594 F.3d at 163.

To establish discriminatory purpose. Plaintiffs identify a disheartening number of statements made by President Donald Trump that allegedly suggest that he is prejudiced against Latinos and, in particular, Mexicans. (BV TAC ¶¶ 89-99; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 57-77.) These comments include (1) then-candidate Trump’s assertions that Mexican immigrants are not Mexico’s “best,” but are “people that have lots of problems,” “the bad ones,” “criminals, drug dealers, [and] rapists” (BV TAC ¶¶ 91-93; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 58-59); (2) Trump’s characterization of individuals who protested outside a campaign rally as “thugs who were flying the Mexican flag” (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 61); (3) Trump’s statements that a U.S.-born federal judge of Mexican descent could not fairly preside over a lawsuit against Trump’s for-profit educational company because the judge was “Mexican” and Trump intended to build a wall along the Mexican border (BV TAC ¶ 96; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 62); and (4) pre- and post-Inauguration characterizations of Latino/a immigrants as criminals, “animals,” and “bad hombres” (BV TAC ¶¶ 97, 99; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 65-66, 70).

Accepting Plaintiffs’ non-conclusory allegations as true and reading all reasonable inferences in their favor, the court concludes that these allegations are sufficiently racially charged, recurring, and troubling as to raise a plausible inference that the decision to end the DACA program was substantially motivated by discriminatory animus. Although the use of racial slurs, epithets, or other racially charged language does not violate equal protection per se, it can be evidence that

official action was motivated by unlawful discriminatory purposes. See, e.g., Williams v. Bramer, 180 F.3d 699, 706 (5th Cir. 1999); Smith v. Thornburg, 136 F.3d 1070, 1089-90 (6th Cir. 1998); Freeman v. Arpaio, 125 F.3d 732, 738 n.6 (9th Cir. 1997), overruled in part on other grounds by Shakur v. Schriro, 514 F.3d 878, 884-85 (9th Cir. 2008); Ali v. Connick, 136 F. Supp. 3d 270, 279-80 (E.D.N.Y. 2015) (collecting cases). The court is aware of no authority holding that this rule does not apply simply because the speaker is, or is running to be, the President of the United States. The court expresses no view as to whether these statements (which as Defendants note, are not directly connected to the DACA rescission) would ultimately suffice to provide that the rescission was motivated by discriminatory animus; that is a question for summary judgment or trial. The court concludes only that Plaintiffs have alleged sufficient facts to raise a plausible inference that the DACA rescission violated equal protection, and thus to withstand a motion to dismiss.⁸

⁸ Because the comments identified above are sufficient to raise a plausible inference of discriminatory purpose, the court need not decide whether Plaintiffs' remaining allegations support an inference of discriminatory purpose. For example, Plaintiffs allege or argue in their briefs that the President decided to pardon former Maricopa County, Arizona, Sheriff Joe Arpaio (BV TAC ¶ 98; State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 67-69), that he has made offensive statements about Muslims, Native Americans, transgender individuals, and "shithole countries" (BV Pls. Opp'n at 19-20), and that, during the campaign, then candidate Trump retweeted a post apparently criticizing former Florida governor Jeb Bush for speaking "Mexican" (BV TAC ¶ 95). The court observes, however, that these allegations would seem to offer only weak support, at best, for the notion that the President's alleged decision to end the DACA program was motivated by desire to harm Latinos and especially Mexicans.

Defendants do not defend the President's comments but argue instead that the court should simply ignore them. First, Defendants suggest that because the President's statements were "almost all made before he took the oath of office and [were not] made in connection with the [DACA rescission]," these comments "do not tend to show the existence of both discriminatory intent and discriminatory effect." (State MTD at 33.) Defendants cite no authority for the proposition that, to state an equal-protection claim, a plaintiff must point to some evidence that simultaneously demonstrates both discriminatory intent and discriminatory effect, or that evinces discriminatory bias directly in connection with the challenged official action. To the contrary, Arlington Heights states that courts may consider the background of facially neutral decisions to smoke out whether they were covertly motivated by discriminatory purposes. 429 U.S. at 267.

The court recognizes that searching for evidence of discriminatory motivation in campaign-trail statements is potentially fraught. Old statements may say little about what lay behind a later decision. Statements made in the throes of a heated race may be "contradictory or inflammatory," and considering them may indeed incentivize litigants in future cases to embark on an "evidentiary snark hunt" in search of past comments indicative of some sort of bias. Washington v. Trump, 858 F.3d 1168, 1173-74 (9th Cir. 2017) (Kozinski, J., dissenting from denial of reh'g en banc); cf. Regents Rule 12(b)(6) Order, 2018 WL 401177, at *7 (recognizing that consideration of campaign statements "can readily lead to mischief in challenging the policies of a new administration"). Moreover, an equal-protection claim brought against the President raises difficult ques-

tions of whether—and, if so, for how long—any Executive action disproportionately affecting a group the President has slandered may be considered constitutionally suspect.

While these are all good reasons to tread lightly, the court does not see why it must or should bury its head in the sand when faced with overt expressions of prejudice. Arlington Heights calls for a “sensitive inquiry into such circumstantial and direct evidence of intent as may be available,” and campaign-trail statements by the official allegedly responsible for a challenged policy would seem to fall squarely within this inquiry. Cf. Int’l Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump, 883 F.3d 233, 266 (4th Cir. 2018) (en banc) (declining to consider pre-election statements while noting that they “certainly provide relevant context when examining the purpose” of a challenged Presidential proclamation suspending entry of individuals from specified countries), pet. for cert., docketed, No. 17-1270. At the very least, one might reasonably infer that a candidate who makes overtly bigoted statements on the campaign trail might be more likely to engage in similarly bigoted action once in office.

Defendants’ attempts to pass the buck to Acting Secretary Duke are no more persuasive. Defendants argue that the President’s statements are legally irrelevant because Acting Secretary Duke “was the only official vested with authority . . . to make the decision at issue,” and Plaintiffs do not point to similarly objectionable statements by her. (BV MTD at 22; State MTD at 34.) To the extent Defendants argue that Plaintiffs have insufficiently alleged racial animus on the part of Acting Secretary Duke or the Attorney

General, the court is inclined to agree: Plaintiffs have not identified statements by Acting Secretary Duke or the Attorney General that would give rise to an inference of discriminatory motive. Although the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs insinuate that the Attorney General referred to immigrants as “filth” (BV TAC ¶ 100; BV Pls. Opp’n at 20), his prepared remarks make clear that this term was used only to refer to international drug-trafficking cartels and the gang MS-13 (Dep’t of Justice, Press Release, Attorney General Jeff Sessions Delivers Remarks Announcing the Department of Justice’s Renewed Commitment to Criminal Immigration Enforcement (Apr. 11, 2017), <https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/attorney-general-jeff-sessions-delivers-remarks-announcing-department-justice-s-renewed>). This comment therefore does not support a plausible inference that the Attorney General was motivated by racial discrimination when he advised that Acting Secretary Duke end the DACA program.

The court rejects, however, Defendants’ remarkable argument that the President apparently cannot be liable for rescinding the DACA program because only Acting Secretary Duke had the legal authority to end that program. (State MTD at 34.) Our Constitution vests “executive Power” in the President, not in the Secretary of DHS, who reports to the President and is removable by him at will. U.S. Const., art. II, § 1, cl. 1. This position appears to be at odds with the stated position of the President himself, who tweeted that if Congress were unable to “legalize DACA,” he would “revisit this issue,” implying that he (correctly) understands that he has ultimate authority over the program. (Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump), Twitter.com (Sept. 5, 2017 7:38 PM), <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/>

905228667336499200.) If, as Plaintiffs allege, President Trump himself directed the end of the DACA program (e.g., State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶ 16), it would be surprising if his “discriminatory intent [could] effectively be laundered by being implemented by an agency under his control” (BV Pls. Opp’n at 18). As courts have recognized in far more mundane contexts, liability for discrimination will lie when a biased individual manipulates a non-biased decision-maker into taking discriminatory action. Cf. Vasquez v. Empress Ambulance Serv., Inc., 835 F.3d 267, 272-73 (2d Cir. 2016) (discussing “cat’s paw” liability, under which an organization may be held liable for employment discrimination when a prejudiced subordinate manipulates an unbiased superior into taking adverse employment action); Back v. Hastings on Hudson Union Free Sch. Dist., 365 F.3d 107, 126 & n.18 (2d Cir. 2004) (applying cat’s-paw theory to equal-protection claim).

Accordingly, Defendants’ motion to dismiss Plaintiffs’ equal-protection claims is

DENIED.

B. Information-Use Policy

Next, the court considers whether Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs state a claim regarding Defendants’ alleged changes to DHS’s information-use policy.⁹ The court concludes that they have not done so, because materials attached to their third amended complaint refute their allegation that Defendants have changed that policy to make it easier

⁹ Although the State Plaintiffs also asserted similar claims under the Fifth Amendment and principles of equitable estoppel (State Pls. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 240-52), the court previously dismissed these claims for lack of standing (Nov. 9 M&O at 41-46).

to use DACA applicants' information for immigration-enforcement purposes.

The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs contend that Defendants essentially tricked them into exposing themselves and their family members to a heightened risk of deportation. To apply for DACA, individuals disclosed “extensive sensitive and personal information” about themselves and, often, their family members, to immigration authorities. (BV TAC ¶¶ 77-79.) They did so, the third amended complaint alleges, because “Defendants consistently represented . . . that the information they provided would be protected from disclosure to U.S. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) and Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) for immigration enforcement proceedings against them and their family members or guardians, except in limited, delineated circumstances.” (Id. ¶ 80.)¹⁰ Plaintiffs

¹⁰ In particular, the DACA application form provided as follows:

Information provided in this request is protected from disclosure to ICE and [CBP] for the purpose of immigration enforcement proceedings unless the requestor meets the criteria for the issuance of a Notice to Appear or a referral to ICE under the criteria set forth in USCIS' Notice to Appear guidance The information may be shared with national security and law enforcement agencies, including ICE and CBP, for purposes other than removal, including for assistance in the consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals request itself [sic], to identify or prevent fraudulent claims, for national security purposes, or for the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense. The above information sharing clause covers family members and guardians, in addition to the requestor.

This policy, which may be modified, superseded, or rescinded at any time without notice, is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create any right or benefit, sub-

contend that, as part of the DACA rescission, however, “DHS has changed its policy . . . to remove the limitations on using [this] information for immigration-enforcement purposes.” (Id. ¶ 156.) In particular. Plaintiffs attach to the third amended complaint a document of frequently asked questions published by USCIS on November 30, 2017 (the “November 30 FAQs”), which states that “[i]nformation provided to USCIS for the DACA process will not make you an immigration priority for that reason alone. That information will only be proactively provided to ICE or CBP if the requestor meets the criteria for the issuance of a Notice To Appear or a referral to ICE under the criteria set forth in USCIS’ Notice to Appear guidance.” (USCIS, Frequently Asked Questions: Rejected DACA Requests (Last Reviewed/Updated 11/30/2017) (“Nov. 30 FAQs”) (Dkt. 113-1 at ECF p.65) at Q5 (emphasis added).) The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs contend that this alleged change violated Section 706(2)(A) of the APA. (Id. ¶¶ 179, 181.)

Defendants argue that this claim should be dismissed because they have not, in fact, changed the information-use policy. (BV MTD at 2, 5, 17-18.) Ordinarily, the court would not resolve such a factual dispute on a motion to dismiss. But “where a conclusory allegation in the complaint is contradicted by a document attached to the complaint, the document controls and the allegation is not accepted as true.” Amidax Trading Grp. v. S.W.I.F.T. SCRL, 671 F.3d 140, 147 (2d Cir. 2011) (per

stantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any party in any administrative, civil, or criminal matter.

(Form I-821D, Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (Dkt. 113-1 at ECF p.6) at ECF p.25 (emphasis added).)

curiam) (discussing Rule 12(b)(1) motions); Kardovich v. Pfizer, Inc., 97 F. Supp. 3d 131, 140-41 (E.D.N.Y. 2015). Here, the November 30 FAQs, which are attached to Plaintiffs' complaint, state expressly that the DACA "information-sharing policy has not changed in any way since it was first announced, including as a result of the Sept. 5, 2017 memo starting a wind-down of the DACA policy." (Nov. 30 FAQs at Q5; see also USCIS, Frequently Asked Questions: Rejected DACA Requests (Last Reviewed/Updated 12/07/2017) ("Dec. 7 FAQs") (Dkt. 113-1 at ECF p.68) at Q5.) While the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs argue that the court should not credit Defendants' unsworn representation that there has been no change to the information-sharing policy, they do not answer Defendants' argument that they have effectively pleaded themselves out of court by relying on a document that contradicts their otherwise-unsupported allegation of a change to DHS's information-use policy. (Compare BV MTD at 17-18, with BV Pls. Opp'n at 10 n.11.)

Accordingly, Defendants' motion to dismiss the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs' substantive APA claim, to the extent that claim alleges that Defendants arbitrarily and capriciously changed DHS's information-use policy, is GRANTED.¹¹

To be clear, the court holds only that the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs have not plausibly alleged that DHS actually changed its information-sharing policy. If these Plaintiffs were to allege additional facts giving

¹¹ The court notes, however, that two other district courts have denied Defendants' motions to dismiss similar claims. See CASA de Maryland v. U.S. DHS, — F. Supp. 3d —, 2018 WL 1156769, at *14-15 (D. Md. 2018) (estoppel); Regents 12(b)(6) Order, 2018 WL 401177, at *4-5 (substantive due process).

the lie to Defendants' assertion that there has been no change to this policy, they may have a compelling claim to relief. Two other district courts have already denied Defendants' motions to dismiss similar claims. See CASA de Maryland v. U.S. DHS, — F. Supp. 3d —, 2018 WL 1156769, at *14-15 (D. Md. 2018) (estoppel); Regents 12(b)(6) Order, 2018 WL 401177, at *4-5 (substantive due process). The U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland has specifically enjoined Defendants from using DACA applicants' personal information for immigration-enforcement purposes except as authorized by established DHS policy or in camera review, see Am. Order (Dkt. 49), CASA de Maryland v. U.S. DHS, No. 8:17-CV-2942 (RWT) (D. Md. Mar. 15, 2018).

C. Procedural Due Process

Finally, the court turns to the newly asserted claim in the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs' third amended complaint, in which MRNY challenges Defendants' processing of renewal requests submitted pursuant to the DACA Rescission Memo. MRNY states a claim with respect to some categories of DACA recipients whose renewal requests were allegedly unfairly denied in September or October 2017, but not others.

In the DACA Rescission Memo, Acting Secretary Duke stated that DACA recipients whose deferred action and work authorization were set to expire before March 5, 2018, could request a final two-year extension of their benefits. (DACA Rescission Memo at 4.) In particular, DHS would “adjudicate—on an individual, case by case basis—properly filed pending DACA renewal requests and associated applications for Employment Authorization Documents from current beneficiaries that have been accepted by the Department as

of the date of this memorandum, and from current beneficiaries whose benefits will expire between [September 5, 2017] and March 5, 2018 that have been accepted by [DHS] as of October 5, 2017.” (Id.)

According to MRNY, Defendants implemented this directive in a series of unfair ways. First, MRNY alleges, Defendants rejected applications that were delivered to USCIS P.O, boxes late in the day on October 5 but not retrieved by USCIS staff and taken to separate USCIS “lockboxes” until the following day, (BV TAC ¶¶ 115-20.) Second, Defendants allegedly rejected as untimely certain renewal requests that were delivered after October 5 due to unusual U.S. Postal Service delays. (Id. ¶¶ 121-22; see also Liz Robbins, Post Office Fails to Deliver on Time, and DACA Applications Get Rejected, N.Y. Times (Nov, 10, 2017) (Dkt. 113-1 at ECF p.49).) Third, Defendants allegedly rejected renewal requests that were received before October 5 “but had been returned to the applicant due to real or perceived clerical errors.” (BV TAC ¶ 123.) For example, USCIS allegedly rejected one MRNY member’s DACA renewal request because a USCIS employee misread the date on her application-fee check as “2012,” rather than “2017.” (Id. ¶ 124.) DHS invited some of these applicants to refile corrected applications, but when they did so, DHS rejected the refiled requests as untimely. (Id. ¶¶ 123, 127) According to MRNY, this deviated from DHS’s prior practice of allowing individuals whose DACA applications were rejected for minor clerical errors to correct those errors or submit further evidence in support of their applications within a given period of time. (Id. ¶ 123).

On November 15, 2017, Defendants indicated that USCIS would reconsider certain applications that were delayed in the mail or improperly rejected. (Id. ¶ 129 (citing Defs. Nov. 15, 2017, Letter Regarding USCIS Guidance (Dkt. 108).) USCIS allegedly stated that it would reach out to individuals whose applications were rejected as untimely due to mail delays and provide them instructions on how to resubmit their applications. (BV TAC ¶¶ 130.) USCIS allegedly has not, however, created an equivalent process for individuals whose applications were rejected due to real or perceived minor clerical errors. (Id. ¶¶ 132-34.) MRNY contends that this “arbitrary and unfair implementation of the October 5, 2017 [DACA renewal request] deadline violates the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment” by depriving DACA recipients of a liberty or property interest without the process to which they are entitled. (Id. ¶¶ 199-205.)

1. Standing

Defendants first move to dismiss this claim for lack of standing, arguing that MRNY has not alleged that its clients or members suffered an injury-in-fact because “the injuries on which [it] . . . relies have been remedied.” (Id. at 10.)¹² This argument is meritless.

¹² Defendants do not contest that MRNY has organizational standing to assert this claim. “[A]n association has standing to bring suit on behalf of its members when: (a) its members would otherwise have standing to sue in their own right; (b) the interests it seeks to protect are germane to the organization’s purpose; and (c) neither the claim asserted nor the relief requested requires the participation of individual members in the lawsuit.” Hunt v. Wash. State Apple Advert. Comm’n, 432 U.S. 333, 343 (1977). MRNY specifically alleges in the third amended complaint that a number of its

As their submissions make clear, Defendants have not, in fact, remedied all injuries incurred by DACA recipients whose renewal requests were allegedly improperly rejected. For MRNY clients and members whose applications arrived late on October 5, “the agency will identify those individuals affected and invite them to resubmit their DACA requests,” and “those not yet contacted . . . may affirmatively reach out to the agency, explain their situation, and resubmit their request for reconsideration.” (*Id.* (citing Dec. 7 FAQs at Q3).) For individuals whose requests were delayed due to postal-service errors and subsequently rejected as untimely, “USPS is working with USCIS to identify DACA requests that were received after the deadline due to USPS mail-service delays.” (*Id.* at 11 (quoting Dec. 7 FAQs at Q8).) Once such requests are identified, “USCIS will send affected DACA requestors a letter inviting them to resubmit their DACA request.” (*Id.* (quoting Dec. 7 FAQs at Q8).) And individuals whose requests were rejected due to perceived clerical errors “may contact the agency and explain the error believed to have been made”; “[i]dentification of ‘clear error in the processing of a renewal request’ may result in the agency ‘exercising its discretion to review

members’ and clients’ DACA renewal requests were denied due to the alleged processing errors discussed above. (BV TAC ¶¶ 54-56, 118-24, 127-29, 134.) Ensuring that DACA renewal requests are adjudicated in a fair and orderly manner is clearly consistent with MRNY’s purpose of “empowering immigrant, Latino/a, and working-class communities in New York.” (*Id.* ¶ 45.) The court is not aware of any reason why this claim or the relief requested by MRNY requires the participation of individual DACA requestors. Accordingly, the court concludes that MRNY has associational standing to assert this claim.

the request again.’” (Id. (quoting Dec. 7 FAQs at Q7 (emphasis added and alterations adopted)).) Thus, with respect to each category of allegedly wronged MRNY client or member, Defendants’ supposed “remedy” is either that USCIS intends to address the injury in the future or that it will allow the injured party to ask it to reconsider its decision. The court commends Defendants for taking steps to redress the allegedly wrongful denials of these DACA renewal requests. But Defendants err to the extent they contend that, because they have stated that they may reconsider these denials, MRNY members and clients whose applications were denied have not suffered injuries-in-fact. See Wong v. Daines, 582 F. Supp. 2d 475, 479 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (failure to exhaust administrative remedies does not implicate Article III injury-in-fact).¹³ MRNY has standing to assert this claim on behalf of its members and clients who were adversely affected by Defendants’ allegedly wrongful adjudication of their DACA renewal requests.

Nor is this claim moot. Although Defendants have reconsidered their denial of at least one MRNY member’s DACA renewal request (e.g., BV TAC ¶ 120; BV MTD at 10 n.3), MRNY appears that many of its members and clients still await relief (BV Pls. Opp’n at 17-18). Even if Defendants had taken action to right all these alleged wrongs, “[a] defendant’s voluntary cessation of allegedly unlawful conduct ordinarily does not

¹³ Defendants also contend that the court should require MRNY to exhaust administrative remedies before filing suit in federal court. (BV MTD at 11-12.) As the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs note, however (BV Pls. Opp’n at 3, 5), Defendants identify no statute that would require them to exhaust administrative remedies before filing suit. See Darby v. Cisneros, 509 U.S. 137, 153-54 (1993).

suffice to moot a case” unless it is “‘absolutely clear that the allegedly wrongful behavior could not reasonably be expected to recur.’” Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Env'tl. Servs. (TOC), Inc., 528 U.S. 167, 174, 189 (2000) (quoting United States v. Concentrated Phosphate Export Ass'n, 393 U.S. 199, 203 (1968)). Defendants offer no such assurances here.

Accordingly, Defendants’ motion to dismiss the Battalla Vidal Plaintiffs’ sixth claim for relief is DENIED, to the extent it seeks to dismiss this claim for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.

2. Merits

Next, Defendants contend that MRNY has failed to state a procedural-due-process claim based on the allegedly wrongful denials of certain DACA recipients’ renewal requests. (BV MTD at 22-25.) The court agrees in part and disagrees in part.

“A procedural due process claim is composed of two elements: (1) the existence of a property or liberty interest that was deprived and (2) deprivation of that interest without due process.” Bryant v. N.Y. State Educ. Dep’t, 692 F.3d 202, 218 (2d Cir. 2012).

Defendants focus on the first element, contending that MRNY has not identified a constitutionally protected liberty or property interest “for the simple reason that DACA recipients have no . . . interest in deferred action.” (BV MTD at 23.) They correctly argue that only benefits to which a person has a “legitimate claim of entitlement” can support a constitutionally protected liberty or property interest. (Id. (quoting Town of Castle Rock v. Gonzales, 545 U.S. 748, 756 (2005)).) Because the decision to grant deferred ac-

tion and work authorization is ultimately discretionary, they say, there can be no constitutionally protected liberty or property interest in receiving DACA benefits. (Id. at 23-24; see also 2012 DACA Memo at 4.)

This argument is partly true. “In determining whether a given benefits regime creates a ‘legitimate claim of entitlement’ to such benefits, we ask whether the statutes and regulations governing the distribution of benefits ‘meaningfully channel[] official discretion by mandating a defined administrative outcome.’” Barrows v. Burwell, 777 F.3d 106, 113 (2d Cir. 2015) (quoting Kapps v. Wing, 404 F.3d 105, 113 (2d Cir. 2005)). The 2012 DACA Memo only sets out criteria for DHS staffs consideration, and there is no guarantee that fulfillment of these criteria will result in a grant of deferred action or work authorization. Under the memo, the decision to grant or deny those benefits is entirely as a matter of DHS’s discretion. Because DHS is not effectively required to grant any particular DACA renewal requests, MRNY cannot state a procedural-due-process claim challenging the denial of its members’ and clients’ requests. Cf. Yuen Jin v. Mukasev, 538 F.3d 143, 156-57 (2d Cir. 2008) (petitioners for asylum lack liberty or property interest in discretionary relief). While the denial of those requests may affect some DACA recipients’ liberty interests (a question the court need not decide), any such liberty interests are ultimately contingent on DACA beneficiaries’ receipt of renewed deferred action, to which they have no “legitimate entitlement.”

Defendants’ argument is also something of a red herring. MRNY contends not only that Defendants improperly denied its members’ and clients’ renewal

requests, but that Defendants' implementation of the October 5 deadline improperly denied MRNY's members and clients of the opportunity to be considered for renewal. (BV Pls. Opp'n at 23.) As MRNY points out, the DACA Rescission Memo clearly stated that USCIS "will adjudicate . . . properly filed pending DACA renewal requests and associated applications for Employment Authorization Documents . . . from current beneficiaries whose benefits will expire between [September 5, 2017] and March 5, 2018 that have been accepted by [DHS] as of October 5, 2017." (DACA Rescission Memo at 4 (emphasis added); see BV Pls. Opp'n at 23.) While the ultimate decision to grant or deny a renewal request is discretionary, this language makes clear that USCIS would at least consider every "properly filed" and timely "accepted" renewal request. MRNY has therefore sufficiently alleged that its affected members and clients had a legitimate entitlement to submit their renewal requests. Cf. Yuen Jin, 538 F.3d at 161 n.1 (Sack, J., concurring in part and in the judgment) ("Although asylum is a discretionary form of relief, and the Due Process Clause does not protect benefits that government officials may grant or deny in their discretion, every asylum applicant is nonetheless entitled to due process in establishing her eligibility for that form of relief." (internal quotation marks and citations omitted and alteration adopted)).

MRNY has also sufficiently alleged that at least some of its members and clients were deprived of cognizable interests in the consideration of their DACA renewal requests without due process of law. With respect to individuals whose requests were rejected because they were delivered to USCIS P.O. boxes on October 5 but not transferred to the appropriate

“lockbox” until the following day, the DACA Rescission Memo was at least ambiguous as to which applications would be deemed “accepted . . . as of October 5, 2017.” (DACA Rescission Memo at 4.) The DACA Rescission Memo did not state that applications had to be received at a USCIS P.O. box by mid- to late afternoon to be “accepted,” or that only those applications redelivered to a designated USCIS “lockbox” by October 5 would be deemed “accepted,” raising the possibility that MRNY may be able to show that the denial of these requests violated due process. See Meyer v. Jinkosolar Holdings Co., 761 F.3d 245, 249 (2d Cir. 2014) (stating that, on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, “dismissal is appropriate only where [plaintiffs] can prove no set of facts consistent with the complaint that would entitle them to relief). Likewise, MRNY has stated a claim on behalf of individuals whose requests were rejected because USCIS staff incorrectly deemed them to be marred by clerical errors. Such applications were, in fact, “properly filed,” as the DACA Rescission Memo required, but were only rejected due to errors by USCIS staff. It is hard to see how such denials comport with due process.

MRNY has not stated a claim, however, with respect to DACA recipients whose requests were rejected as untimely after being delayed by the U.S. Postal Service. The court sympathizes with the plight of these individuals and commends Defendants for voluntarily taking steps to address this unfortunate situation. The DACA Rescission Memo states, however, that only “properly filed” and “accepted” requests would be considered. It is common for mailing deadlines to be calculated based on when something is postmarked, not when it is actually delivered to the recipient. But

USCIS's stated decision to use a "delivery rule," rather than a "mailbox rule," to determine which requests were timely does not violate the Due Process Clause.

Likewise, MRNY has not stated a claim with respect to individuals whose renewal requests were rejected due to actual (as opposed to incorrectly perceived) clerical errors. In light of the human consequences of the decision to grant or deny an individual a renewal of DACA benefits, it may seem overparticular to deny a renewal request because someone "forg[ot] to check a box, forg[ot] to sign or sign[ed] in the wrong place, or submitt[ed] a check for what applicants previously had to pay for DACA renewal." (BV TAC ¶ 141.) The court hopes that USCIS will review these applications sympathetically, understanding the gravity of taking away someone's livelihood and tentative protection against deportation simply because he or she forgot to check a box on a multi-page form. The court cannot, however, require USCIS to do so, because due process of law does not require the agency to accept incomplete or incorrect renewal requests.

Accordingly, Defendants' motion to dismiss the Battalla Vidal Plaintiffs' sixth claim for relief for failure to state a claim is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. MRNY has adequately alleged that the rejection of DACA renewal requests that arrived late in the day on October 5, 2017, or that were erroneously deemed to contain minor clerical errors, violated procedural due process. MRNY has not, however, stated a procedural-due-process claim on behalf of requestors whose applications arrived after October 5 due to postal delays or actually contained minor clerical errors.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Defendants' motions to dismiss the Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs' third amended complaint and the State Plaintiffs' amended complaint (Dkt. 207 in No. 16-CV-4756; No. 71 in No. 17-CV-5228) are GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART. The Batalla Vidal Plaintiffs' first, third, and fourth claims for relief are dismissed, and the second claim for relief is dismissed to the extent it alleges that Defendants weakened DHS's information-use policy. The sixth claim for relief is dismissed in part, as stated above. The State Plaintiffs' fifth and sixth claims for relief are dismissed.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York
Mar. [29], 2018

/s/ NICHOLAS G. GARAUFIS
NICHOLAS G. GARAUFIS
United States District Judge

APPENDIX F

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

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

MARTÍN JONATHAN BATALLA VIDAL, ET AL.,
PLAINTIFFS

v.

KIRSTJEN M. NIELSEN, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

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

STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL., PLAINTIFFS

v.

DONALD TRUMP, ET AL., DEFENDANTS

Filed: May 21, 2018

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Notice is hereby given that all Defendants in the above-captioned matters hereby appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit from the March 29, 2018 Memorandum & Order of the Honorable Nicholas G. Garaufis, United States District Judge (*Batalla Vidal* ECF No. 260; *State of New York* ECF No. 215). Defendants appeal pursuant to the district court's April 30, 2018 order granting certification under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). *See Batalla Vidal* ECF No. 269; *State of New York* ECF No. 220.

Dated: May 21, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

CHAD A. READLER
Acting Assistant Attorney General

RICHARD P. DONOGHUE
United States Attorney

BRETT A. SHUMATE
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

JENNIFER D. RICKETTS
Director, Federal Programs Branch

JOHN R. TYLER
Assistant Branch Director

BRAD P. ROSENBERG
Senior Trial Counsel

/s/ STEPHEN M. PEZZI
STEPHEN M. PEZZI (D.C. Bar #995500)
RACHAEL L. WESTMORELAND
KATE BAILEY
Trial Attorneys
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, DC 20530
Tel.: (202) 305-8576
Fax: (202) 616-8470
Email: stephen.pezzi@usdoj.gov

174a

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
Tel: (718) 254-6288
Fax: (718) 254-7489
Email: joseph.marutollo@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Defendants

APPENDIX G

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Nos. 18-121, 18-1313

KIRSTJEN M. NIELSEN, SECRETARY OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, ET AL., PETITIONERS

v.

MARTÍN JONATHAN BATALLA VIDAL, ET AL.,
RESPONDENTS

Nos. 18-123, 18-1314

DONALD J. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
ET AL., PETITIONERS

v.

STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL., RESPONDENTS

Filed: July 5, 2018

Present: ROSEMARY S. POOLER, REENA RAGGI, and
PETER W. HALL, *Circuit Judges*.

Petitioners move, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), for leave to appeal November 9, 2017, and March 29, 2018, orders of the district court denying their motions to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction and for failure to state a claim. Upon due consideration, it is hereby ORDERED that the petitions are GRANTED. *See Klinghoffer v. S.N.C. Achille Lauro*, 921 F.2d 21, 23-25 (2d Cir. 1990).

176a

It is further ORDERED that these appeals, as well as the appeals docketed under 2d Cir. 18-1521 and 18-1525, be heard in tandem with Petitioners' appeals of the district court's February 13, 2018, preliminary injunction, 2d Cir. 18-485 and 18-488.

Petitioners are directed to file a scheduling notification within 14 days of the date of entry of this order pursuant to Second Circuit Local Rule 31.2.

FOR THE COURT:

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court

/s/ CATHERINE O'HAGAN WOLFE
[SEAL OMITTED]