

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

No. 24A1174

DONALD J. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, *et al.*,
Applicants,

v.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO, *et al.*,
Respondents.

**On Application to Stay the Order Issued
by the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
and Request for an Immediate Administrative Stay**

**BRIEF *AMICUS CURIAE* OF
AMERICA'S FUTURE,
U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS LEGAL DEFENSE FUND, AND
CONSERVATIVE LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION FUND
IN SUPPORT OF APPLICANTS**

RICK BOYER
INTEGRITY LAW FIRM
P.O. Box 10953
Lynchburg, VA 24506

WILLIAM J. OLSON*
JEREMIAH L. MORGAN
WILLIAM J. OLSON, P.C.
370 Maple Avenue West, Suite 4
Vienna, Virginia 22180
(703) 356-5070
wjo@mindspring.com
*Counsel of Record
June 9, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.	ii
INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
STATEMENT	3
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.	5
ARGUMENT	
I. THE COURTS BELOW MERELY ASSUMED THAT THE PRESIDENT’S PLANNED REORGANIZATIONS AND REDUCTIONS IN FORCE WILL CAUSE AGENCIES TO VIOLATE CONGRESSIONALLY ASSIGNED DUTIES.	7
II. THE DISTRICT COURT CIRCUMVENTED THE SPECIALIZED STATUTORY SCHEMES FOR HANDLING CHALLENGES BROUGHT BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.	9
III. THE EXECUTIVE’S AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT REDUCTIONS IN FORCE AND REORGANIZATIONS IS WELL ESTABLISHED.	12
IV. TO PROTECT EMPLOYEES, FAMILIES, AND COMMUNITIES FROM THE EFFECTS OF LAYOFFS, THE DISTRICT COURT INVENTS A GONE-TOO-FAR TEST	14
CONCLUSION	15
APPENDIX	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

U.S. CONSTITUTION

Article II	4
------------------	---

STATUTES

5 U.S.C. § 3502(a).....	12
5 U.S.C. § 7105.....	11
5 U.S.C. § 7703.....	11

REGULATIONS

5 C.F.R. § 351.901	11
--------------------------	----

CASES

<i>AFGE v. Clinton</i> , 180 F.3d 727 (6th Cir. 1999)	13, 14
<i>National Treasury Employees Union v. Reagan</i> , 663 F.2d 239 (D.C. Cir. 1981)...	13

MISCELLANEOUS

“A Study of the Long-Term Effects of Federal Workforce Reduction in the 1990s,” <i>Coalition for Effective Change</i> (Mar. 2013)	13
J. Davis, “Biden’s Last ‘Gift’ to the Country: Tidal Wave of New Federal Govt. Employees,” <i>USA Journal</i> (Jan. 11, 2025)	4
G. Henderson, “Reagan RIFs concentrated in Washington,” <i>UPI</i> (Aug. 15, 1985).....	12
N. Lim, “Majority of workers agree DOGE ‘5 things’ email request is ‘reasonable’: Poll,” <i>Washington Examiner</i> (Mar. 5, 2025)	3
T. Riccard, “Reductions in Force (RIFs): An Overview,” <i>Congressional Research</i> <i>Service</i> (Feb. 13, 2025).....	13
I. Saric, “Biden admin moves to shield federal workers from potential Trump purge,” <i>Axios</i> (Apr. 4, 2024).....	4
F. Siddiqui, <i>et al.</i> , “Federal layoffs ‘likely’ if too few employees choose to quit, memo says,” <i>Washington Post</i> (Feb. 5, 2025)	12, 13
“US Federal Budget 2025: Spending, Revenue, and the \$1.8 Trillion Deficit,” <i>Economics Insider</i> (May 23, 2025)	3

INTEREST OF THE *AMICI CURIAE*¹

Amici curiae America's Future, U.S. Constitutional Rights Legal Defense Fund, and Conservative Legal Defense and Education Fund are nonstock, nonprofit organizations, exempt from federal income taxation under sections 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code. Each is dedicated, *inter alia*, to the correct construction, interpretation, and application of law. *Amici* participate actively in the public policy process and have filed numerous *amicus curiae* briefs in federal and state courts.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On February 11, 2025, President Trump issued Executive Order 14210, “Implementing the President’s ‘Department of Government Efficiency’ Workforce Optimization Initiative” (the “Workforce EO”), 90 *Fed. Reg.* 9,669. The Workforce EO provided, *inter alia*, that “Agency Heads shall promptly undertake preparations to initiate large-scale reductions in force (RIFs), consistent with applicable law.... All offices that perform functions not mandated by statute or other law shall be prioritized in the RIFs.” *Id.*, Sec. 3(c). It further provided:

Within 30 days of the date of this order, Agency Heads shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget a report that identifies any statutes that establish the agency, or subcomponents of the agency, as statutorily required entities. The report shall discuss whether the agency or any of its subcomponents should be eliminated or consolidated. [*Id.*, Sec. 3(e).]

¹ It is hereby certified that no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part; and that no person other than these *amici curiae*, their members, or their counsel made a monetary contribution to its preparation or submission.

The Workforce EO did not specify any numeric or percentage-based requirements federal agencies should target, and provided exceptions: “The Director of OPM may grant exemptions from this order where those exemptions are otherwise necessary....” *Id.*, Sec. 4(c). The EO repeatedly instructed that any reductions to be recommended should be made “consistent with applicable law.” The directors of the Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) and the Office of Personnel Management (“OPM”) took steps to implement the Executive Order, instructing agency heads to submit Agency RIF and Reorganization Plans (“ARRPs”) to OMB and OPM for review and approval: Phase 1 ARRPs by March 13, 2025 and Phase 2 ARRPs by April 14, 2025. *See* Memorandum to Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies (Feb. 26, 2025), Appendix to the Application (“App.”) at 4a-9a.

On April 28, 2025, Plaintiff employee unions, organizations, cities, and counties filed a massive suit naming as defendants more than 20 federal government departments and the heads thereof, as well as President Trump. The district court for the Northern District of California granted a Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”) on May 9, 2025. *See AFGE v. Trump*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 89344 (N.D. Cal. 2025) (“*AFGE I*”). The district court followed with a preliminary injunction on May 22, 2025. *See AFGE v. Trump*, 2025 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 98195 (N.D. Cal. 2025) (“*AFGE II*”). A divided motions panel of the Ninth Circuit denied the Government’s emergency motion for a stay of the preliminary

injunction. *AFGE v. Trump*, 2025 U.S. App. LEXIS 13315 (May 30, 2025) (“*AFGE III*”). The Government then sought an immediate administrative stay from this Court.

STATEMENT

It was perhaps not surprising that almost half of the federal workforce objected to replying to an email from the Department of Government Efficiency to report what they accomplished the past week,² but it is surprising that a federal judge would enjoin the President from reducing a bloated workforce in order to make government more efficient. The Federal Budget for FY 2025 shows a deficit of \$1.865 trillion, or 27 percent of federal spending.³ There is no principle of law that federal employment provides a lifetime sinecure which must be spared from downsizing, but one has been invented by a district court judge.

The private sector understands that efficiencies can be obtained by downsizing. If downsizing made a private business unable to compete, every company that has downsized would soon go out of business. There is additional context to the current effort to tie the hands of President Trump. Last year, the Biden OPM adopted a rule to protect persons hired during the Presidency from

² N. Lim, “[Majority of workers agree DOGE ‘5 things’ email request is ‘reasonable’: Poll](#),” *Washington Examiner* (Mar. 5, 2025).

³ “[US Federal Budget 2025: Spending, Revenue, and the \\$1.8 Trillion Deficit](#),” *Economics Insider* (May 23, 2025).

being fired should President Trump be elected.⁴ Nine days before turning over the government to President Trump, it was reported that “Under Biden’s administration, the permanent federal workforce has grown by nearly 6% since he took office.... Biden is concluding his term with a record number of government workers on taxpayer-funded payrolls.”⁵

From the moment the district court issued its TRO on May 9, 2025, virtually all of the efforts of the elected President of the United States to reorganize and reduce the federal workforce have been halted in their tracks by one unelected federal district judge in San Francisco. For a month — one-twelfth of the first year President Trump will be in office — this action has enjoined even planning for agency reorganizations and staff reductions. For this period, one district court judge has negated the Constitution’s vesting and take care clauses, which provide: “The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America,” and “he shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed....” Article II, Sections 1 and 3. Making matters worse, the district court refused to stay the injunction pending appeal, as has the Ninth Circuit. Every day that this injunction stays in place, those who favor using federal judicial power to impede this

⁴ See, e.g., I. Saric, [“Biden admin moves to shield federal workers from potential Trump purge,”](#) *Axios* (Apr. 4, 2024).

⁵ J. Davis, [“Biden’s Last ‘Gift’ to the Country: Tidal Wave of New Federal Govt. Employees,”](#) *USA Journal* (Jan. 11, 2025).

President's policy choices win by running out the clock until the next presidential election.

This case is not the only such instance of the President's agenda being stymied and must be viewed in that context. These *amici* have attempted to assemble at least a partial list of the injunctions entered against the Trump Administration since January 20, 2025, and that partial list has grown to an astonishing 85 injunctions. Of those, six were issued by the Northern District of California, even though that district is only one of 94 federal judicial districts. *See* Appendix. And, the TRO and the Preliminary Injunction below were both nationwide injunctions, of the sort this Court is now reviewing. *See Trump v. CASA*, No. 24A884.

The federal judiciary simply cannot function as a firewall to resist changes implemented by new Presidents. The current case is particularly egregious for two reasons. First, the district court clearly acted *ultra vires*, as Congress denied jurisdiction to district courts when it committed such issues to separate review processes. Second, the district court admitted that it had not found that even a single Congressional duty would not be fulfilled by agencies staffed with fewer employees.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The district court lacked jurisdiction to usurp the role of the Federal Labor Relations Authority and the Merit Systems Protection Board by hearing a challenge to a prospective workforce reduction and enjoining even its planning. The

government made this case for implicit denial of authority to the district court convincingly, and these *amici* only discuss it briefly in section II.

What these *amici* focus on is the virtual admission by the district court that it did not lay the proper foundation to issue any injunction. The district court asserted that the reason that the Workforce EO and OPM and OMB implementation would require special congressional approval was that federal agencies would simply be unable to carry out their statutory responsibilities. For this proposition, the district court provided no evidence, and indeed admitted in language buried in a footnote near the end of its opinion that such matters would need to be addressed later, on the merits. This omission was exposed on appeal by Judge Callahan in her dissent. The district court could not just assume that large-scale layoffs would make the federal government unable to fulfil its Congressionally assigned duties, which it identified as the central reason it was granting relief.

Government RIFs go back to the Civil War. Presidents Reagan and Clinton made significant cuts in the federal workforce without judicial intervention. Although the district court recognizes the President's power to conduct RIFs, it asserts that these RIFs are fundamentally different because they are "large-scale," and thus the power the President normally would enjoy should be curtailed here because he has, in essence, "gone too far." There is no support for such a proposition, especially since the district court could not make findings that Congressionally delegated responsibilities could not be carried out by fewer workers.

ARGUMENT

I. THE COURTS BELOW MERELY ASSUMED THAT THE PRESIDENT’S PLANNED REORGANIZATIONS AND REDUCTIONS IN FORCE WILL CAUSE AGENCIES TO VIOLATE CONGRESSIONALLY ASSIGNED DUTIES.

The district court began its decision granting a preliminary injunction on solid footing in its first two sentences, but then badly veered away from the evidence on the record before it. The district court correctly recognized:

Presidents may set policy priorities for the executive branch, and agency heads may implement them. This much is undisputed. But **Congress** creates **federal agencies**, funds them, and gives them **duties** that — by statute — they **must carry out**. [*AFGE II* at *13-14 (emphasis added).]

From those two beginning sentences of an order granting broad injunctive relief, one naturally would assume that the district court would then provide a list of those **duties** which specific **federal agencies** would no longer **carry out** if their workforce is reduced according to President Trump’s planned reduction in force. However, the Plaintiffs made no such showing, and the district court made no such legitimate findings. Therefore, the Plaintiffs are highly unlikely to prevail on the merits, and the preliminary injunction was issued erroneously and should be stayed by this Court.

What the district court did was to **assume** that the President had no authority to make either any large-scale reorganizations or large-scale reductions in the federal workforce without specific Congressional authorization because the agencies *ipse dixit* then would be unable to carry out their duties:

Agencies may not conduct **large-scale** reorganizations and reductions in force in blatant disregard of Congress's mandates, and a President may not initiate **large-scale** executive branch reorganization without partnering with Congress.... After dramatic staff reductions, these agencies **will not be able to do** what Congress has directed them to do. [*Id.* at *14-15 (emphasis added).]

The district court merely **asserts** that, if a reorganization or a reduction in force is significant, the agencies will not be able to follow Congress's mandates and they will be disregarded. For a district court to make such bald assertions, which are better described as assumptions or accusations, without evidence, is highly improper, and certainly provides no basis for injunctive relief. In an effort to provide some evidence, the district court drops a footnote to summarize some of Plaintiffs' claims which speculate that large-scale reductions would render departments and agencies unable to fulfill Congressional directives, but no actual proof of any inability to fulfill statutory requirements. *Id.* at *15, n.1.

Dissenting from the denial of the stay of the district court injunction, Judge Callahan pointed out this key weakness in the district court opinion: "The court did not reach the question whether the RIFs will 'essentially "eliminate" Congressionally-created agencies or prevent those agencies from fulfilling their statutory mandates.'" *AFGE III* at *44 (Callahan, J., dissenting from denial of stay). Indeed, the district court essentially admitted that it did not have the predicate for its injunction in an astonishing admission buried in the last part of a footnote late in the district court's opinion:

One of the questions **to be litigated** in this case, and which will require further development of the factual record, is **whether the**

RIFs here are so extensive that they essentially “eliminate” Congressionally-created agencies or **prevent those agencies from fulfilling their statutory mandates**. [*AFGE II* at *66, n.18 (emphasis added).]

Judge Callahan explained why the district court’s failure to make proper findings was fatal to its preliminary injunction:

But that is the question that should guide the separation of powers analysis. Surely the Executive, under the direction of the President, has substantial discretion over the management of its own personnel, including the number of personnel needed to ensure that the laws are faithfully executed. *See Nixon [v. Fitzgerald]*, 457 U.S. at 757. **So long as the Executive exercises that authority within the confines set by the Legislature, it cannot be said to usurp** any legislative power. [*AFGE III* at *44 (Callahan, J., dissenting from denial of stay) (emphasis added).]

Judge Callahan concluded her explanation that even if the claims were considered justiciable, the Plaintiffs are unlikely to prevail:

Because the district court **failed to analyze and to make findings** whether the RIFs likely have resulted or will result in statutory violations, it applied the **wrong legal standard**. Therefore, even if Plaintiffs’ claims are justiciable, Defendants are likely to prevail in this appeal. [*Id.* at *45 (emphasis added).]

II. THE DISTRICT COURT CIRCUMVENTED THE SPECIALIZED STATUTORY SCHEMES FOR HANDLING CHALLENGES BROUGHT BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

The district court repeatedly asserted that “large-scale” personnel reductions require Congressional authorization. *AFGE I* at *63, *67-68; *AFGE II* at *14, *69, *71, & *83. The district court also asserted that the specialized statutory systems established by Congress are not suitable for review of large numbers of claims, and that the agencies tasked with that responsibility are not suitable, in its opinion, to

review Plaintiffs' claims. Thus, the district court believed that the specialized statutory systems established by Congress are not up to the task, requiring that a "large-scale" exception be read into these specialized statutory systems, because only a federal district court can truly address claims of the sort brought by Plaintiffs. This effort to find some justification for a district court without jurisdiction to usurp jurisdiction to enable it to issue a national injunction to impede actions of the current Administration is becoming a familiar pattern.

In *Noem v. National TPS Alliance*, U.S. Supreme Court No. 24A1059, on May 19, 2025, [this Court stayed an injunction](#) from a federal district court who felt at liberty to disregard statutory limitations on its jurisdiction in order to prevent the Trump Administration from revoking Temporary Protected Status for certain Venezuelans. In *Noem v. Doe*, U.S. Supreme Court No. 24A1079, on May 30, 2025, [this Court stayed an injunction](#) from a federal district court which also disregarded statutory limitations on its jurisdiction to prevent the Trump Administration from terminating parole status for Cubans, Haitians, Nicaraguans, and Venezuelans. Another such case is now before this Court in *Department of Homeland Security v. D.V.D.*, No. 24A1153, where this Court is being called on to stay yet another federal district court injunction where the court disregarded statutory limitations on its jurisdiction to prevent the Trump Administration from deporting certain illegal aliens, including murderers and sex offenders, to a third country which will accept them, in accordance with law.

Here, the limitation on the district court's authority is not explicit, as in the *Noem v. TPS*, *Noem v. Doe*, and *Department of Homeland Security v. D.V.D.* cases, but it is implicit and is well established. The first of these two specialized statutory schemes is the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Act, which established the Federal Labor Relations Authority ("FLRA") with authority over disputes related to collective bargaining. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 7105(c)(2). Decisions of the FLRA may be appealed to the Federal Circuit. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 7703. The second statute is the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 which allows employees who have suffered an "adverse action" to appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board ("MSPB").

Specifically, according to 5 C.F.R. § 351.901, employees who have been furloughed, separated, or demoted by a RIF may appeal to the MSPB. Decisions of the MSPB may be appealed to circuit court. For the reasons set out in the Government's Application, it is impossible to view these two statutes creating specialized agencies and establishing specialized procedures for resolving federal personnel disputes, which both provide for a right of appeal to circuit courts, to be anything but an implicit withdrawal of authority from district courts to resolve these same disputes. *See* Appl. at 29a-30a. Whether the denial of district court jurisdiction is express or implicit, the result is the same, and the district court acted *ultra vires* in derailing the Trump Administration's effort to reduce federal workforce expenses and increase government efficiency.

III. THE EXECUTIVE’S AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT REDUCTIONS IN FORCE AND REORGANIZATIONS IS WELL ESTABLISHED.

Although Congress has established rules to follow, the Executive Branch’s authority to hire employees carries with it the concurrent power to fire people, including through reductions in force. “Congress has expressly recognized agencies’ authority to implement RIFs since shortly after the Civil War....” Defendant’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Order to Show Cause (“Def. Opp”), Dkt. 60, at 40 (N.D. Cal., May 7, 2025), 3:25-cv-3698-SI.

In 5 U.S.C. § 3502(a), Congress provided that OPM “shall prescribe regulations for the release of competing employees in a **reduction in force** which give due effect to — (1) tenure of employment; (2) military preference... ; (3) length of service; and (4) efficiency or performance ratings.” (Emphasis added.) The challenged Workforce EO instructed federal agencies across-the-board to develop a plan for reductions in force consistent with law for each agency, but if it is lawful for one agency, it does not become unlawful when being conducted simultaneously across multiple agencies.

As the Government pointed out below, previous RIFs by previous Presidents passed without any apparent concern by the courts. Def. Opp. at 9-11. President Reagan’s RIFs downsized 33,000 federal workers in his first term alone.⁶ “[D]uring the Reagan administration ... more than 800 of 11,500 [General Services

⁶ G. Henderson, “[Reagan RIFs concentrated in Washington](#),” *UPI* (Aug. 15, 1985).

Administration] employees received reduction-in-force notices.”⁷ During Reagan’s administration, “reductions led to a 7.2 percent cut to non-defense personnel.”⁸ President Clinton called for “reinventing government.” Under Clinton’s “National Performance Review (NPR) ... between 1993 and 1998, the federal workforce shrank 15.4 percent.” *Id.* at 1. The Congressional Research Service recently noted that agencies have had “discretion to determine if a RIF is necessary, the number and types of positions needed to be abolished, and the timing of when a RIF occurs.”⁹

The D.C. Circuit upheld President Reagan’s 1981 hiring freeze against a challenge by employee unions. There, the circuit court noted that “the President did not attempt to rescind the appointment authority of the department heads. Instead, he directed the relevant appointing authorities to implement the freeze and issued ‘instructions’ for them to follow.” *National Treasury Employees Union v. Reagan*, 663 F.2d 239, 250 (D.C. Cir. 1981). In President Clinton’s case, suit was filed by AFGE alleging that a Clinton RIF had improperly transferred jobs to a private contractor to allow for the plaintiffs’ termination as federal employees. The Sixth Circuit dismissed the case on standing grounds. *AFGE v. Clinton*, 180 F.3d

⁷ F. Siddiqui, *et al.*, “[Federal layoffs ‘likely’ if too few employees choose to quit, memo says](#),” *Washington Post* (Feb. 5, 2025).

⁸ “[A Study of the Long-Term Effects of Federal Workforce Reduction in the 1990s](#),” at 1-2, *Coalition for Effective Change* (Mar. 2013).

⁹ T. Riccard, “[Reductions in Force \(RIFs\): An Overview](#),” p. 1, *Congressional Research Service* (Feb. 13, 2025).

727 (6th Cir. 1999). In contrast to the Trump Workforce EO, the Reagan and Clinton RIFs occurred without judicial interference.

IV. TO PROTECT EMPLOYEES, FAMILIES, AND COMMUNITIES FROM THE EFFECTS OF LAYOFFS, THE DISTRICT COURT INVENTS A GONE-TOO-FAR TEST.

One does not have to read far into the district court's opinion to understand that its real objection to the President's Executive Order, and the efforts by OMB and OPM to implement it, is that it fundamentally disagrees with the policy. The district court laments that the Workforce EO "seeks to 'commence[] a critical transformation of the Federal bureaucracy.'" *AFGE I* at *9. The district court apparently believes it is its responsibility to prevent that transformation. This, the district court warns, has resulted in "layoffs pending across multiple federal agencies." *Id.* at *10. The district court speculates about potential cuts at federal agencies, some based on "reports," and characterizes them as seismic in scope. "The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is **reportedly** preparing a RIF to reduce its workforce by more than half.... **Reports also suggest** that HUD is preparing to cut half of its staff and close many field offices.... **Reports suggest** the Internal Revenue Service ... plans to cut 40% of its staff." *Id.* at *21-22 (emphasis added).

The district court identified with and took the side of not just federal workers, but also those indirectly affected, including "communities": "The Court here is **not considering** the potential loss of income of one **individual employee**, but the widespread termination of **salaries and benefits for individuals**,

families, and communities.” *Id.* at *70 (emphasis added). The court added, “[t]he President has the authority to seek changes to executive branch agencies, but he must do so ... in the case of large-scale reorganizations, with the cooperation of the legislative branch.” *Id.* at *76. For that proposition, the district court provides no authority. However, by its reasoning, the district court implicitly concedes that modest force reductions would be unobjectionable, but that President Trump’s “large-scale” cuts simply have gone too far. For its application of what could be described as a “gone-too-far” test, no authority has been provided.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should stay the district court’s preliminary injunction.

Respectfully submitted,

RICK BOYER
INTEGRITY LAW FIRM
P.O. Box 10953
Lynchburg, VA 24506

WILLIAM J. OLSON*
JEREMIAH L. MORGAN
WILLIAM J. OLSON, P.C.
370 Maple Avenue West, Suite 4
Vienna, Virginia 22180
(703) 356-5070
wjo@mindspring.com
*Counsel of Record
June 9, 2025

APPENDIX

***TRUMP V. AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES,
AFL-CIO***

Appendix to Amicus Brief

**FEDERAL COURT INJUNCTIONS AGAINST
THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION**

(January 20, 2025 through June 2, 2025)

BIRTHRIGHT CITIZENSHIP

1. [*New Hampshire Indonesian Community Support v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00038](#) — Judge Joseph N. Laplante (G.W. Bush) of the District of New Hampshire enjoined any enforcement of Trump’s birthright citizenship EO within the state. The case was appealed to the [First Circuit](#) on April 11, where it is pending.
2. [*Washington v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-00127](#) — Judge John C. Coughenour (Reagan) of the District of Washington enjoined any enforcement of Trump’s birthright citizenship EO nationwide. The case was appealed to the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court, where argument on the universal injunction was held May 15.
3. [*New Jersey v. Trump; Doe v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-10139](#) — Judge Leo T. Sorokin (Obama) of the District of Massachusetts enjoined any enforcement of Trump’s birthright citizenship EO within the state. The case was appealed to the First Circuit and the Supreme Court, where argument on the universal injunction was held May 15.
4. [*CASA Inc. v. Trump*, No. 8:25-cv-00201](#) — Judge Deborah L. Boardman (Biden) of the District of Maryland enjoined any enforcement of Trump’s birthright citizenship EO nationwide. The case was appealed to the Fourth Circuit and the Supreme Court, where argument on the universal injunction was held May 15.

IMMIGRATION

5. [*J.G.G. v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00766](#) — Judge James E. Boasberg (Obama) of the District of D.C. ordered flights of gang members and terrorists rerouted back to the United States, and then ordered that Trump cannot deport anyone under the Alien Enemies Act without a hearing. This was upheld by D.C. Circuit, then on April 7, the Supreme Court [vacated the district court’s](#) TROs. Judge Boasberg on April 16 [threatened the Trump administration](#) with criminal contempt charges, but on April 18 the DC Circuit issued an [administrative stay](#) in the appeal from Judge Boasberg’s Apr. 16 contempt-related order. Plaintiffs filed an [April 24 amended complaint](#) including a habeas petition for a class of individuals and an [April 25 motion for a permanent injunction](#).

App.2

6. [*Chung v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-02412](#) — Judge Naomi R. Buchwald (Clinton) of the Southern District of New York issued a temporary restraining order preventing Trump from deporting a Columbia University student for pro-Hamas activism.

7. [*Phila. Yearly Meeting of The Religious Soc’y of Friends v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, No. 8:2025-cv-00243](#) — Judge Theodore D. Chuang (Obama) of the District of Maryland enjoined ICE raids in houses of worship.

8. [*M.K. v. Joyce*, No. 1:25-cv-01935](#) — Judge Jesse M. Furman (Obama) of the Southern District of New York issued a temporary restraining order forbidding the removal of a prisoner from the U.S. to Venezuela until the court could rule on the merits of the removal. This case was transferred on March 19 as [*Khalil v. Joyce*, 2:25-cv-01963](#) — Judge Michael E. Farbiarz (Biden) of the District of New Jersey ordered on that same day that “Petitioner shall not be removed from the United States unless and until the Court issues a contrary Order.”

9. [*Parra v. Castro*, No. 1:24-cv-00912](#) — Judge Kenneth J. Gonzales (Obama) of the District of New Mexico issued a [temporary restraining order](#) on February 9 blocking the transfer of three Venezuelans to Gitmo. They were then removed to their home country instead and voluntarily dismissed their case.

10. [*Vizguerra-Ramirez v. Choate*, No. 1:25-cv-00881](#) — Judge Nina Y. Wang (Biden) of the District of Colorado enjoined the ICE deportation of a Mexican citizen.

11. [*National TPS Alliance v. Noem*, No. 3:25-cv-01766](#) — Judge Edward M. Chen (Obama) of the Northern District of California enjoined ending Temporary Protected Status (“TPS”) for 350,000 to 600,000 Venezuelans. After the 9th Circuit denied a stay, the Supreme Court on [May 19 stayed the district court](#) decision.

12. [*Pacito v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-00255](#) — Judge Jamal N. Whitehead (Biden) of the Western District of Washington granted a nationwide preliminary injunction on February 28 blocking President Trump’s Executive Order indefinitely halting entry through the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP). On appeal, the Ninth Circuit [partially granted](#) the Trump administration’s emergency motion to stay, and filed an [order clarifying their stay](#) on April 21.

13. [*City and County of San Francisco v. Donald J. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-01350](#) — Judge William H. Orrick III (Obama) of the Northern District of California granted a [preliminary injunction](#) April 24 enjoining President Trump’s efforts to have the Department of Justice investigate and prosecute “sanctuary cities” policies and government officials interfering with immigration enforcement.

14. [*D.V.D. v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security*, No. 1:25-cv-10676](#) — Judge Brian E. Murphy (Biden) of the District of Massachusetts on March 28 issued a [temporary restraining order](#) enjoining the Trump administration over the recent policy of deporting non-citizens with final removal orders to a third country, specifically El Salvador, without first providing an opportunity to contest removal. [First Circuit](#) denied stay pending appeal April 7. Judge Murphy granted class certification and issued a [preliminary injunction](#) April 18, and further orders on [May 20](#), May 21, May 23, and May 26. [SCOTUS Application](#) for Stay was filed May 27, and the case was remanded to the 5th Circuit, where briefs are pending, with oral argument scheduled June 30.
15. [*Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto v. U.S. Dep't of HHS*, No. 3:25-cv-02847](#) — Judge Araceli Martinez-Olguin (Biden) of the Northern District of California issued a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 1 blocking Defendants from terminating funding for Department of Health and Human Services' (HHS) Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) funding for legal representation services for unaccompanied immigrant children through April 16, then on April 10 [extended the TRO](#) through April 30. Defendants' appeal of the TRO to the Ninth Circuit [was denied](#), as was a petition for [rehearing en banc](#). On April 29, the District Court granted a [preliminary injunction](#) blocking Defendants from withdrawing the services or funds provided by ORR until a final judgment in the matter is issued. Defendants appealed the PI to the [9th Circuit](#) on Apr. 30.
16. [*J.A.V. v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00072](#) — Judge Fernando Rodriguez (Trump) of the Southern District of Texas on April 9 [temporarily enjoined](#) the Trump administration from deporting Venezuelans outside of the district under the Alien Enemies Act. On May 1, Judge Rodriguez certified a class and granted a [permanent injunction](#).
17. [*G.F.F. v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-02886](#) — Judge Alvin Hellerstein (Clinton) of the Southern District of New York granted a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 9 on behalf of a class of all persons in the district subject to deportation under the Alien Enemies Act. A [Preliminary Injunction](#) was granted May 6.
18. [*Doe v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-10495](#) — Judge Indira Talwani (Obama) of the District of Massachusetts, on April 14, granted a [motion to stay](#) the Department of Homeland Security's blanket revocation of Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Venezuela parole programs (the "CHNV parole programs") and ordering case-by-case review of any termination of work authorization permits to remain in the United States. After the First Circuit denied a stay, the Supreme Court on [May 30 stayed the district court decision](#).

19. [*Viloria Aviles v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-00611](#) — Judge Gloria Maria Navarro (Obama) of the District of Nevada issued a [preliminary injunction](#) on April 17 prohibiting the government from removing the Petitioner from the United States under the Alien Enemies Act until after his merits hearing.
20. [*D.B.U. v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-01163](#) — Judge Charlotte Sweeney (Biden) of the District of Colorado issued a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 22 forbidding the administration from removing Venezuelan illegal aliens from Colorado for deportation under the Aliens Enemies Act. A motion for a preliminary injunction is pending. On [appeal to the 10th Circuit](#), a panel on [April 29 denied an emergency motion](#) for stay.
21. [*A.S.R. v. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-00113](#) — Judge Stephanie Haines (Trump) of the Western District of Pennsylvania granted a [temporary restraining order on April 25](#) on behalf of a class of all persons in the district subject to deportation under the Alien Enemies Act that they must be given 14 days' notice and hearing before any removal from the district, pursuant to the Supreme Court's decision in *J.G.G. v. Trump*.
22. [*Mahdawi v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-00389](#) — Judge Geoffrey W. Crawford (Obama) of the District of Vermont extended a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 24 “for a period of 90 days or until dismissal of this case or grant of a preliminary injunction, whichever is earliest ... no respondent... shall remove [Mohsen Mahdawi, a Palestinian] from Vermont without further order from this court.”
23. [*Yostin Sleiker Gutierrez-Contreras v. Warden Desert View Annex*, No. 5:25-cv-00911](#) — Judge Sunshine S. Sykes (Biden) of the Central District of California, issued a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 16 preventing the government from removing a Venezuelan at risk of being deported to El Salvador under the Alien Enemies Act. On April 28, the TRO was dissolved since the Plaintiff was in Texas when the petition was filed.

*NOTE: [According to Politico](#), there have been over 100 lawsuits and 50 restraining orders related to the F-1 visas and the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) in 23 states. The Trump Administration is working to resolve this situation, so these cases are not included here.

TRANSGENDER

24. [*Talbott v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00240](#) — Judge Ana C. Reyes (Biden) of the District of D.C., a lesbian, enjoined Trump's rule preventing “transgender” persons from serving in the military. The case is on appeal to the D.C. Circuit.

25. [*PFLAG v. Trump*, No. 8:25-cv-00337](#) — Judge Brendan A. Hurson (Biden) of the District of Maryland granted an injunction against Trump’s order denying federal funding to institutions performing chemical or surgical “transgender” mutilation on minors.
26. [*Washington v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-00244](#) — Judge Lauren J. King (Biden) of the Western District of Washington enjoined Trump’s order denying federal funding to institutions performing chemical or surgical “transgender” mutilation on minors. The case is on appeal to the Ninth Circuit.
27. [*Ireland v. Hegseth*, No. 1:25-cv-01918](#) — Judge Christine P. O’Hearn (Biden) of the District of New Jersey enjoined the Air Force from removing two “transgender” service members pursuant to Trump’s order banning “transgender” service members.
28. [*Doe v. McHenry; Doe v. Bondi*, No. 1:25-cv-00286](#) — Judge Royce C. Lamberth (Reagan) of the District of D.C. enjoined the transfer of twelve “transgender women” to men’s prisons under Trump’s order, and terminating their taxpayer-funded hormone treatments. The injunction has been appealed to the D.C. Circuit.
29. [*Moe v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-10195](#) — Senior Judge George A. O’Toole Jr. (Clinton) of the District of Massachusetts enjoined the transfer of a “transgender woman” to a men’s prison under Trump’s order. This case has been transferred to another, unidentified, district.
30. [*Jones v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-401](#) — Judge Royce C. Lamberth (Reagan) of the District of D.C. enjoined the transfer of three “transgender women” to men’s prisons and termination of their taxpayer-funded hormone treatments under Trump’s order.
31. [*Shilling v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-00241](#) — Judge Benjamin H. Settle (G.W. Bush) of the Western District of Washington enjoined Trump’s order to remove “transgender” service members. The Ninth Circuit denied a request for a stay of the injunction; an Application for Stay filed at the Supreme Court ([24A1030](#)), and the stay was granted May 6.
32. [*Maine v. Department of Agriculture*, No. 1:25-cv-00131](#) — Judge John Woodcock (G.W. Bush) of the District of Maine granted a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 11 on behalf of Maine, in its lawsuit against Trump’s federal education funding freeze to Maine for its refusal to ban boys from girls’ teams.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

33. [*Dellinger v. Bessent*, No. 1:25-cv-00385](#) — Judge Amy B. Jackson (Obama) of the District of D.C. issued a restraining order invalidating Trump’s firing of U.S. special counsel Hampton Dellinger. The order was upheld by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court, then was temporarily lifted by the Court of Appeals on March 5; on March 6, Dellinger announced that he was dropping his case.

34. [*American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO v. U.S. Office of Personnel Management*, No. 3:25-cv-01780](#) — Judge William H. Alsup (Clinton) of the Northern District of California enjoined Trump’s order for six federal agencies to dismiss thousands of probationary employees. The injunction was upheld by the [*Ninth Circuit*](#), and the Supreme Court issued a [*stay based on standing*](#).

35. [*Wilcox v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00334](#) — Judge Beryl A. Howell (Obama) of the District of D.C. enjoined Trump’s firing of National Labor Relations Board member Gwynne Wilcox, a Democrat, and ordered her reinstated to finish her term. The [*D.C. Circuit*](#) stayed the injunction, then reinstated it, and an [*application for a stay*](#) at the Supreme Court was [*granted by Chief Justice Roberts*](#) on April 9, and by the [*Supreme Court on May 22*](#).

36. [*Harris v. Bessent*, No. 1:25-cv-00412](#) — Judge Rudolph Contreras (Obama) of the District of D.C. enjoined Trump’s firing of Merit Systems Protection Board member Cathy Harris and ordered her reinstated. The [*D.C. Circuit*](#) stayed the injunction, then reinstated it, an [*application for a stay*](#) at the Supreme Court was [*granted by Chief Justice Roberts*](#) on April 9, and by the [*Supreme Court on May 22*](#).

37. [*American Foreign Service Association v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00352](#) — Judge Carl J. Nichols (Trump) of the District of D.C. issued a temporary restraining order against Trump’s firing of USAID employees. He later vacated the TRO and denied a preliminary injunction against the firings.

38. [*Does 1-9 v. Department of Justice*, No. 1:25-cv-00325](#) — Judge Jia M. Cobb (Biden) of the District of D.C. enjoined Trump from releasing the names of any FBI agents who worked on the January 6 investigation.

39. [*Doctors for America v. U.S. Office of Personnel Management*, No. 1:25-cv-00322](#) — Judge John D. Bates (G.W. Bush) of the District of D.C. ordered that CDC and FDA webpages that “inculcate or promote gender ideology” be restored after Trump ordered them removed.

40. [*Perkins Coie v. DOJ*, No. 1:25-cv-00716](#) — Judge Beryl A. Howell (Obama) of the District of D.C. enjoined Trump’s directive barring government agencies doing business with Perkins Coie and banning PC attorneys from federal buildings.

41. [*Jenner Block v. DOJ*, No. 1:25-cv-00916](#) — Judge John D. Bates (G.W. Bush) of the District of D.C. on March 28 granted a [temporary restraining order](#) against Trump's directive barring government agencies from doing business with Jenner Block and banning that firm's attorneys from federal buildings. Judge Block granted Jenner's motions for summary judgment and [permanent injunction on May 23](#).
42. [*Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP v. Executive Office of the President*, No. 1:25-cv-00917](#) — Judge Richard J. Leon (G.W. Bush) of the District of D.C. enjoined Trump's directive barring government agencies from doing business with Wilmer and banning that firm's attorneys from federal buildings.
43. [*Susman Godfrey LLP v. Executive Office of the President*, No. 1:25-cv-01107](#) — Judge Loren L. AliKhan (Biden) of the District of D.C. on [April 15 enjoined](#) Trump's directive barring government agencies from doing business with Susman Godfrey and banning that firm's attorneys from federal buildings.
44. [*American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO v. Ezell*, No. 1:25-cv-10276](#) — Senior Judge George A. O'Toole Jr. (Clinton) of the District of Massachusetts issued a temporary restraining order against Trump's buyout of federal employees. The judge later lifted the TRO and denied an injunction, allowing the buyout to go forward.
45. [*Maryland v. US Dept. of Agriculture*, No. 1:25-cv-00748](#) — James K. Bredar (Obama) of the District of Maryland issued a TRO ordering 38 agencies to stop firing employees and reinstate fired employees. On April 9, the Fourth Circuit [stayed the district court injunction](#), noting the [Supreme Court's stay](#) in [AFGE, AFL-CIO v. OPM and Ezell](#).
46. [*Does 1-26 v. Musk*, No. 8:25-cv-00462](#) — Judge Theodore D. Chuang (Obama) of the District of Maryland ordered DOGE to reinstate email access for fired USAID employees.
47. [*American Federation of Teachers v. Bessent*, No. 8:25-cv-00430](#) — Judge Deborah L. Boardman (Biden) of the District of Maryland enjoined DOE and Office of Personnel Management from disclosing personal information of employees to DOGE. On April 7, the Fourth Circuit [granted a stay](#) to the Defendants pending the appeal.
48. [*American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO v. Social Security Administration*, No. 1:25-cv-00596](#) — Judge Ellen L. Hollander (Obama) of the District of Maryland granted an injunction forbidding the Social

Security Administration from providing personal information to DOGE. The [Fourth Circuit](#) dismissed an appeal for [lack jurisdiction](#). On May 2, the Trump administration filed an [Application for a Stay](#) of the Injunction and Requested an Emergency stay.

49. [Brehm v. Marocco, No. 1:25-cv-00660](#) — Judge Richard J. Leon (G.W. Bush) of the District of D.C. issued a temporary restraining order forbidding Trump from removing Brehm from, and appointing Marocco to, the U.S. African Development Foundation.

50. [American Oversight v. Hegseth, No. 1:25-cv-00883](#) — Judge James E. Boasberg (Obama) of the District of D.C. issued an order “as agreed by the parties,” for the government to preserve all Signal communications related to the leak to an *Atlantic* editor of DoD conversations in Houthi strike.

51. [National Treasury Employees Union v. Trump, No. 1:25-cv-00935](#) — Judge Paul Friedman (Clinton) of the District of D.C., on April 25, [enjoined agencies](#) from implementing Trump’s executive order limiting collective bargaining rights for many federal employees, but specifically did not enjoin President Trump.

52. [Woonasquacket River Watershed Council v. Department of Agriculture, No. 1:25-cv-00097](#) — Judge Mary McElroy (Trump) of the District of Rhode Island issued a [preliminary injunction](#) against Trump’s federal funding freeze for various departments including the EPA. The Trump administration [appealed to the 1st Circuit](#) on May 1.

53. [Associated Press v. Budowich, No. 1:25-cv-00532](#) — Judge Trevor McFadden (Trump) of the District of D.C. on [April 8 enjoined](#) the White House from keeping AP reporters out of the White House press briefings until it agrees to refer to the “Gulf of America.”

54. [Novedades Y Servicios, Inc. v. FinCEN, 3:25-cv-00886](#) — Judge Janis L. Sammartino (G.W. Bush) of the Southern District of California granted a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 22 against Department of Treasury FinCEN’s Geographic Targeting Order which requires businesses along the southern border to file Currency Transaction Reports with FinCEN at a \$200 threshold.

55. [New York, et al. v. Donald J. Trump, No. 1:25-cv-01144](#) — Judge Jeannette A. Vargas (Biden) of the Southern District of New York issued a [preliminary injunction](#) on February 21 blocking DOGE’s access to certain Treasury Department payment records. Then on April 11, Judge Vargas [partially dissolved her preliminary injunction](#) since “based on existing record” mitigation, training and vetting procedures were adequate to satisfy her concerns.

56. [*American Federation Of Government Employees, AFL-CIO v. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-03698](#) — Judge Susan Y. Illston (Clinton) of the Northern District of California granted a Temporary Restraining Order on May 9 to pause the Defendants' reductions in force under EO 14210, and issued a Preliminary Injunction on May 22. Defendants immediately appealed this order to the Ninth Circuit, and filed an Application for a stay at the US Supreme Court on June 2.

FUNDING

57. [*National Treasury Employees Union v. Vought*, No. 1:25-cv-00381](#) — Judge Amy B. Jackson (Obama) of the District of D.C. halted Trump's budget cuts and layoffs at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. On March 31, the [government appealed](#) Judge Jackson's preliminary injunction order to the D.C. Circuit; which on April 11 ordered a [partial stay](#) of the preliminary injunction.

58. [*AIDS Vaccine Advocacy Coalition v. Department of State*, No. 1:25-cv-00400](#) — Judge Amir H. Ali (Biden) of the District of D.C. ordered Trump to unfreeze and spend \$2 billion in USAID funds. The Supreme Court, in a 5-4 ruling with Justices Alito, Thomas, Kavanaugh, and Gorsuch dissenting, left the [order in place](#). On Apr. 2, [defendants appealed](#) Judge Ali's Mar. 10 preliminary injunction order to the D.C. Circuit.

59. [*Colorado v. US Dept. of Health and Human Services*, No. 1:25-cv-00121](#) — Judge Mary S. McElroy (Trump) of the District of Rhode Island, issued a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 5 reinstating payments to a coalition of states which sued the Trump administration over the cancellation of \$11 billion in public health funding.

60. [*National Council of Nonprofits v. OMB*, No. 1:25-cv-00239](#) — Judge Loren L. AliKhan (Biden) of the District of D.C. blocked Trump's order to pause federal aid while reviewing to determine if it aligned with administration policy. Appeal to the D.C. Circuit [docketed April 25](#).

61. [*Massachusetts v. NIH*, No. 1:25-cv-10338](#) — Judge Angel Kelley (Biden) of the District of Massachusetts issued a preliminary injunction on March 5 prohibiting implementation of the NIH Guidance "in any form with respect to institutions nationwide."

62. [*New York v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00039](#) — Judge John J. McConnell Jr. (Obama) of the District of Rhode Island enjoined Trump's order to freeze federal spending while reviewing to determine that it aligned with administration policy. The [First Circuit](#), on March 26, denied defendants' motion for a stay pending appeal of the district court's preliminary injunction order.

63. [*RFE/RL, Inc. v. Lake*, No. 1:25-cv-00799](#) — Judge Royce C. Lamberth (Reagan) of the District of D.C. issued a temporary restraining order forbidding Trump from cutting funds to Voice of America.

64. [*Widakuswara v. Lake*, No. 1:25-cv-01015](#) — Judge Royce C. Lamberth (Reagan) of the District of D.C. issued a [preliminary injunction on April 22](#) requiring the reinstatement of employment positions and funding for Voice of America and U.S. Agency for Global Media. The government [appealed to the DC Circuit](#) April 24.

65. [*Radio Free Asia v. United States of America*, No. 1:25-cv-00907](#) — Judge Royce C. Lamberth (Reagan) of the District of D.C. issued a preliminary injunction requiring restoration of funding of Radio Free Asia and Middle East Broadcasting Networks on April 25. The government immediately filed an [appeal to the D.C. Circuit](#), which granted a [stay pending appeal](#) on May 3.

66. [*Massachusetts Fair Housing Ctr. v. HUD*, No. 3:25-cv-30041](#) — Judge Richard G. Stearns (Clinton) of the District of Massachusetts enjoined Trump's cuts to HUD grant funding and ordered spending reinstated.

67. [*Climate United Fund v. Citibank, N.A.*, No. 1:25-cv-00698](#) — Judge Tanya S. Chutkan (Obama) of the District of D.C. issued a temporary restraining order enjoining EPA's Termination of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund Grants.

68. [*Association of American Medical Colleges v. NIH*, No. 1:25-cv-10340](#) — Judge Angel Kelley (Biden) of the District of Massachusetts enjoined Trump's NIH grant funding cuts. The Case has been [appealed to the First Circuit](#).

69. [*American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education v. McMahon*, No. 1:25-cv-00702](#) — Judge Julie R. Rubin (Biden) of the District of Maryland issued an injunction requiring reinstatement of terminated education grant funds. [Defendants appealed](#) the preliminary injunction to the Fourth Circuit. On April 1, the Fourth Circuit denied Plaintiffs' motion to place the case in abeyance, and on April 10, granted the defendants' motion for stay pending appeal.

70. [*Mayor and City Council of Baltimore et al. v. Vought*, No. 1:25-cv-00458](#) — Judge Matthew J. Maddox (Biden) of the District of Maryland issued a TRO preventing Trump from defunding the CFPB.

71. [*Association of American Universities v. Department of Health and Human Services*, No. 1:25-cv-10346](#) — Judge Angel Kelley (Biden) of the District of Massachusetts issued a nationwide injunction against Trump's NIH funding cuts. [Defendants appealed](#) to the First Circuit on April 9.

72. [*Association of American Universities v. Dept. of Energy*, No. 1:25-cv-10912](#) — Judge Allison D. Burroughs (Obama) of the District of Massachusetts issued a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 16 against the cap instituted on reimbursements for indirect costs for federal research grants from the Department of Energy.

73. [*American Library Association v. Sonderling*, No. 1:25-cv-01050](#) — Judge Richard J. Leon of the District of D.C. granted a [temporary restraining order](#) on May 1 against the executive order which requires spending reduction of the Institute for Museum and Library Services.

74. [*Rhode Island v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00128](#) — Chief Judge John J. McConnell, Jr. (Obama) of the District of Rhode Island, granted a preliminary injunction on May 6 to a coalition of states which sued over an Executive Order which requires 7 agencies to reduce their functions.

75. [*State of New York v. U.S. Dep't of Education*, No. 1:25-cv-02990](#) — Judge Edgardo Ramos (Obama) of the Southern District of New York granted a preliminary injunction that prohibits the U.S. Department of Education from cancelling over \$1 billion in unspent COVID-19 pandemic funding grants extended past the original deadline by the prior administration.

76. [*San Fransisco U.S.D. v. AmeriCorps*, 3:25-cv-02425](#) — Judge Edward M. Chen (Obama) of the Northern District of California granted a [temporary restraining order](#) on March 31 after San Francisco Unified School District sued over actions taken to fire employees and freeze grant funding at AmeriCorps.

77. [*Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington v. U.S. DOGE Service*, 1:25-cv-00511](#) — Judge Christopher R. Cooper (Obama) of the District of D.C. issued a [preliminary injunction](#) on March 10 in a lawsuit against DOGE and Elon Musk regarding compliance with FOIA and the Federal Records Act.

ELECTIONS

78. [*League of United Latin American Citizens v. EOP*, No. 1:25-cv-00946](#) — Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly (Clinton) of the District of D.C. granted a [universal injunction](#) on April 24 against Executive Order 14,248, requiring documentary proof of United States citizenship to vote in Federal elections. This case consolidates three suits brought by racial minority associations and by Democrat Party, campaigns, and elected officials.

DEI-RELATED PROGRAMS

79. [*Nat'l Ass'n of Diversity Officers in Higher Educ. v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00333](#) — Judge Adam B. Abelson (Biden) of the District of Maryland enjoined Trump's order blocking federal funding for DEI programs. On [March 14, the Fourth Circuit granted](#) the government's motion for a stay of the preliminary injunction pending appeal.

80. [*California v. Department of Education*, No. 1:25-cv-10548](#) — Judge Myong J. Joun (Biden) of the District of Massachusetts granted a temporary restraining order blocking Trump's withdrawal of funds to schools teaching DEI. The First Circuit [denied a motion](#) for stay pending appeal. On April 4, the [Supreme Court granted a stay](#) pending appeal, writing "the Government is likely to succeed in showing the District Court lacked jurisdiction" and that the case may need to be brought in the Court of Federal Claims.

81. [*Chicago Women in Trades v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-02005](#) — Senior Judge Matthew F. Kennelly (Clinton) of the Northern District of Illinois entered a temporary restraining order commanding the reinstatement of DEI grants.

82. [*Doe 1 v. Office of the Director of National Intelligence*, No. 1:25-cv-00300](#) — Judge Anthony J. Trenga (G.W. Bush) of the Eastern District of Virginia issued an "administrative stay" against firing DEI employees with CIA and DNI. The court then considered and rejected imposing a TRO to the same effect. On March 31, Judge Trenga granted a [preliminary injunction](#) enjoining the defendants. On May 6, defendants filed [notice of appeal](#) to the 4th Circuit.

83. [*American Federation of Teachers v. U.S. Department of Education*, No. 1:25-cv-00628](#) — Judge Stephanie A. Gallagher (Trump) of the District of Maryland enjoined the U.S. Department of Education's February 14, 2025 "Dear Colleague Letter" ending diversity, equity, and inclusion practices in schools by threatening to withhold federal funding from those that refuse to comply.

84. [*National Education Association v. US Department of Education*, No. 1:25-cv-00091](#) — Judge Landya B. McCafferty (Obama) of the District of New Hampshire enjoined the U.S. Department of Education's February 14, 2025 "Dear Colleague Letter" ending diversity, equity, and inclusion practices in schools by threatening to withhold federal funding from those that refuse to comply.

85. [*NAACP v. U.S. Department of Education*, No. 1:25-cv-01120](#) — Judge Dabney L. Friedrich (Trump) of the District of D.C. enjoined the U.S. Department of Education's February 14, 2025 "Dear Colleague Letter" ending diversity, equity, and inclusion practices in schools by threatening to withhold federal funding from those that refuse to comply.