In the Supreme Court of the United States

Donald J. Trump, $et \ al.$,

Applicants,

v.

CASA INC., et al.,

Respondents

Donald J. Trump, et al.,

Applicants,

υ.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

Respondents

DONALD J. TRUMP, et al.,

Applicants,

v.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, et al.,

Respondents

RESPONDENTS' JOINT MOTION FOR DIVIDED ARGUMENT

Under Rules 21 and 28.4, Respondents in Nos. 24A884, 24A885, and 24A886 respectfully move this Court for divided argument. Respondents intend to divide oral argument time evenly between New Jersey Solicitor General Jeremy Feigenbaum, who would speak for the state and city Respondents in Nos. 24A885 and 24A886, and Kelsi Corkran, who would speak for Respondents in No. 24A884, who are all private individuals and non-governmental organizations. Applicants take no position on the motion.

1. These consolidated cases present fact- and party-specific issues on standing and the proper scope of remedies. See Stay Appl. 21-25, 28. The governmental Respondents in Nos. 24A885 and 24A886 and the private Respondents in No. 24A884 thus have separate interests in this litigation. See Stephen M. Shapiro, *et al.*, Supreme Court Practice 777 (10th ed. 2013) ("Having more than one lawyer argue on a side is justifiable ... when they represent different parties with different interests or positions.").

2. Indeed, this Court has regularly divided argument when governmental and private parties appear on the same side of the case. See, *e.g.*, *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. Univ. of N.C.*, 143 S. Ct. 46 (mem.); *Nat'l Pork Producers Council v. Ross*, 143 S. Ct. 46 (2022) (mem.); *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, 141 S.

-

¹ As the Stay Application is not directed at the individual Respondents in No. 24A885, those parties will not be represented at argument.

Ct. 230 (2020) (mem.); Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter & Paul Home v. Pennsylvania, 140 S. Ct. 2665 (2020) (mem.); Am. Legion v. Am. Humanist Ass'n, 139 S. Ct. 951 (2019) (mem.); Janus v. Am. Fed'n of State, Cnty., & Mun. Emps., Council 31, 138 S. Ct. 974 (2018) (mem.); Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colo. Civil Rights Comm'n, 138 S. Ct. 466 (2017) (mem.). That is also true of immigration- and citizenship-related cases like this one. See, e.g., Trump v. Sierra Club, 141 S. Ct. 1264 (2021) (mem.); Dep't of Homeland Sec. v. Regents of Univ. of Cal., 140 S. Ct. 398 (2019) (mem.); Dep't of Com. v. New York, 139 S. Ct. 1543 (2019) (mem.).

3. Given Respondents' legally distinct interests and this case's national significance, the proposed division of argument time will ensure that all Respondents have their interests appropriately represented and that the Court fully understands their perspectives and arguments.

Respondents thus jointly request that the Court divide oral argument time equally between Mr. Feigenbaum and Ms. Corkran, with Mr. Feigenbaum presenting first, followed by Ms. Corkran.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kelsi Brown Corkran
KELSI BROWN CORKRAN
Supreme Court Director
Institute for Constitutional
Advocacy & Protection
600 New Jersey Ave NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 661-6728
Kbc74@Georgetown.edu
Counsel of Record for
Respondents in No. 24A884

/s/ Noah G. Purcell
NOAH G. PURCELL
Solicitor General
Office of the Washington
Attorney General
1125 Washington Street, SE
P.O. Box 40100
Olympia, WA 98504-0100
(360) 753-6200
Noah.Purcell@atg.wa.gov
Counsel of Record for
State Respondents in No. 24A885

/s/ Jeremy M. Feigenbaum
JEREMY M. FEIGENBAUM
Solicitor General
Office of the New Jersey
Attorney General
25 Market Street
Trenton, NJ 08625
(862) 350-5800
Jeremy.Feigenbaum@njoag.gov
Counsel of Record for
Respondents in No. 24A886

/s/ Matthew Hyrum Adams
MATTHEW HYRUM ADAMS
Northwest Immigrant
Rights Project
615 Second Avenue
Suite 400
Seattle, WA 98104
(206) 957-8611
Matt@nwirp.org
Counsel of Record for
Individual Respondents in
No. 24A885