

In the Supreme Court of the United States

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, ET AL., APPLICANTS

v.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, ET AL.

**APPLICATION TO STAY THE ORDER
OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

D. JOHN SAUER
Solicitor General
Counsel of Record
Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
SupremeCtBriefs@usdoj.gov
(202) 514-2217

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Statement.....	5
A. Legal and factual background	5
B. Proceedings below	7
C. Parallel proceedings in <i>Florida v. DHS</i>	9
Argument	11
A. Respondents lack Article III standing.....	11
B. Section 1373 establishes that DHS has statutory authority to adopt the modified SAVE system	18
C. Respondents' Privacy Act and APA claims lack merit.....	23
D. Respondents' Social Security Act claim lacks merit	30
E. The remaining factors support a stay	33
Conclusion.....	37

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Applicants (defendants-appellants below) are the United States Department of Homeland Security; Markwayne Mullin, in his official capacity as Secretary of Homeland Security; the Social Security Administration; and Frank Bisignano, in his official capacity as Commissioner of Social Security. Respondents (plaintiffs-appellees below) are the League of Women Voters, League of Women Voters of Texas, League of Women Voters of Louisiana, League of Women Voters Louisiana Education Fund, League of Women Voters of Virginia, and the Electronic Privacy Information Center (plaintiffs-appellees below). The State of Texas intervened as a defendant in the district court but has not participated in the appeal.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

United States District Court (D.D.C.):

League of Women Voters v. DHS, No. 25-cv-3501 (June 22, 2026)

United States Court of Appeals (D.C. Cir.):

League of Women Voters v. DHS, No. 26-5243 (Sept. 4, 2026)

In the Supreme Court of the United States

No. 26A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, ET AL., APPLICANTS

v.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, ET AL.

APPLICATION TO STAY THE ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Pursuant to Rule 23 of the Rules of this Court and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. 1651, the Solicitor General—on behalf of applicants U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), et al.—respectfully requests that this Court stay the order issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia (App., *infra*, 76a-77a) pending further proceedings in the D.C. Circuit and this Court.

The district court has issued an indefensible order that threatens the integrity of upcoming elections by vacating the federal government’s authority to internally use Social Security data when fulfilling its duty to respond to requests by States to verify the citizenship of individuals for voting and other purposes. The court’s order exceeds its jurisdiction, as the organizations challenging the government’s policy lack Article III standing. The court’s order also fails on the merits, as the policy is consistent with all applicable federal statutes. The order will irreparably harm the federal government, the States, and the public by depriving the government of an effective tool to verify the eligibility of registered voters and benefits applicants under various state and federal programs.

Congress has directed DHS to “implement a system for the verification of immigration status” that is “available to all the States,” 42 U.S.C. 1320b–7 note, and also to “respond to an inquiry by a Federal, State, or local government agency, seeking to verify or ascertain the citizenship or immigration status of any individual within the jurisdiction of the agency * * * by providing the requested verification or status information,” 8 U.S.C. 1373(c). DHS fulfills those obligations through Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements, or SAVE, an online service that enables users to verify a person’s citizenship status, often within seconds. Yet, until recently, SAVE suffered from serious limitations: Among other things, it could verify a person’s citizenship status only if the user supplied that person’s alien registration number (or other DHS number)—which States often do not know, and which natural-born citizens do not have.

In May 2025, DHS updated SAVE so that a user could enter a person’s Social Security number, rather than his alien registration number, as a numeric identifier (and so that requests could be made in bulk, rather than one at a time). Those updates made SAVE significantly more responsive. The updated system processed more than a million requests each day, for purposes such as verifying eligibility to register to vote and to receive public benefits. But in the decision below, the district court—at the behest of several voting-rights and privacy-rights organizations, who are respondents here—universally vacated both the notices articulating the SAVE updates and the modified SAVE system itself. The court concluded that the modified system violates statutory restrictions on the sharing of data within and by the federal government. The district court and the D.C. Circuit both denied a stay pending appeal.

This Court should stay the district court’s order, which is unlikely to withstand appellate review. To start, respondents lack standing to challenge the updated SAVE

system. The district court reasoned that respondents’ members face voter injury (because States might revoke voters’ registrations if SAVE cannot confirm their citizenship), privacy injury (because of the sharing of information about respondents’ members), and reputational injury (because gaps in Social Security records might sometimes leave SAVE unable to confirm the citizenship of individuals who are in fact citizens). But SAVE does not disqualify any voter; instead, it merely notifies the States whether the federal government can confirm citizenship. Thus, any voter injury is caused by the States, not by the federal government, and would not be redressed by the relief the court entered against the federal government. SAVE also does not invade any judicially cognizable privacy interest: The information it discloses to the States—whether the federal government can confirm that a person is a citizen—is not the type of private information traditionally protected by privacy torts, and the sharing of Social Security data within the government is not a cognizable injury at all. Nor does SAVE cause reputational harm; it never asserts that anyone is not a citizen, only that it sometimes cannot confirm citizenship.

Respondents’ claims also fail on the merits. When a State “seek[s] to verify or ascertain the citizenship or immigration status of any individual,” Section 1373 commands DHS to “provid[e] the requested verification or status information.” 8 U.S.C. 1373(c). Section 1373 also specifies that, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision” of federal law, other federal entities may not prohibit or restrict the exchange of information regarding citizenship or immigration status. 8 U.S.C. 1373(a)-(b). By requiring DHS to provide citizenship verification, Section 1373 authorizes DHS to take steps—such as checking Social Security records—that are reasonably necessary to perform that duty. And by twice using the word “notwithstanding,” Section 1373 overrides restrictions that the Privacy Act and Social Security Act might otherwise

impose on such sharing.

Even putting aside Section 1373, respondents' claims fail. The district court concluded that SAVE's use of Social Security records violates the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. 552a, but that statute expressly limits when prospective (rather than monetary) relief is available, and courts cannot end-run those limits by invoking the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. 551 *et seq.*, 701 *et seq.* In any event, the federal government has complied with the Privacy Act's substantive and procedural requirements. The court also concluded that SAVE's use of Social Security records violates a provision of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), but that clause applies only to records obtained or maintained "pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990." The Social Security Administration (SSA) obtains Social Security numbers pursuant to a law enacted long before that date, and DHS does not share Social Security numbers at all. The court of appeals concluded that the government forfeited its arguments under the Social Security Act, but that is incorrect; in any event, the government's remaining arguments, which were indisputably preserved, suffice to establish the government's likelihood of success.

The remaining factors favor a stay. The district court's order warrants review because it universally vacates an important governmental policy—the improvement of a system that has processed millions of citizenship-verification requests every week and that is used for purposes ranging from maintaining voter rolls to ensuring that ineligible aliens do not wrongly receive federal benefits. The federal government, the States, and the public face irreparable harm from the court's sudden upending of the updated system and from being required to return to an older, more cumbersome, and less reliable version of the system. Those harms dwarf any harms faced by respondents, who cannot show even an Article III injury, much less irreparable injury.

STATEMENT

A. Legal And Factual Background

1. In 1986, Congress required the federal government to “implement a system for the verification of immigration status * * * so that the system is available to all the States.” 42 U.S.C. 1320b–7 note; see Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-603, § 121, 100 Stat. 3391. In 1996, in a provision captioned “OBLIGATION TO RESPOND TO INQUIRIES,” Congress required the Immigration and Naturalization Service—whose functions have since been transferred to DHS—to “respond to an inquiry by a Federal, State, or local government agency, seeking to verify or ascertain the citizenship or immigration status of any individual within the jurisdiction of the agency for any purpose authorized by law, by providing the requested verification or status information.” 8 U.S.C. 1373(c); see Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), Pub. L. No. 104-208, § 642(c), 110 Stat. 3009–707; 8 U.S.C. 1551 note. To ensure DHS can satisfy this duty, the statute twice provides that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law,” no federal entity or official (among others) may “prohibit, or in any way restrict,” the sharing with or by DHS of “information regarding” citizenship or immigration status. 8 U.S.C. 1373(a)-(b). Separately, each State has a federal statutory duty to “ensure that voter registration records in the State are accurate and are updated regularly.” 52 U.S.C. 21083(a)(4).

To fulfill the federal government’s statutory obligations, and to help the States fulfill theirs, DHS operates Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements, or SAVE. SAVE is an “online service * * * that provides point in time immigration status and U.S. citizenship information to federal, state, local, territorial, and tribal agencies.” USCIS, *About SAVE* (Oct. 7, 2025), <https://perma.cc/5888-TH46>. SAVE can verify a

person’s “immigration status or U.S. citizenship * * * within seconds.” *Ibid.* But SAVE does not “[d]etermine [a person’s] eligibility for a specific benefit.” *Ibid.* That determination is instead made by the agency responsible for issuing the benefit, most often a state or local agency. *Ibid.*

Since 2005, States have entered into agreements with DHS to use SAVE to verify putative voters’ citizenship status. See D. Ct. Doc. 77-2, ¶ 20 (Apr. 2, 2026). Yet, until recently, SAVE suffered from significant limitations. Most importantly, it could not verify citizenship status without a DHS-specific immigration identifier, such as an alien registration number (or “A-number”)—which States do not always know, and which natural-born citizens do not have. See USCIS, *Guide to Understanding SAVE Verification Responses* 3 (Apr. 2022) (*SAVE Guide*), <https://perma.cc/BW9M-WJUT>. SAVE could also accept only one verification request at a time. See USCIS, *Optimizing SAVE* (May 22, 2025), <https://perma.cc/LM3N-RB76>.

2. In April 2025, DHS began a comprehensive update to SAVE. In May 2025, it announced the two changes relevant here: users may now make requests using Social Security numbers, and they may enter multiple requests at once. See *Optimizing Save*.

Under the updated system, a SAVE user manually enters the following data into a spreadsheet: first name; last name; date of birth; full or partial Social Security number, A-number, or other DHS numeric identifier; and the reason for verification. DHS A.R. 1443. The user uploads the spreadsheet, and SAVE then checks SSA databases to determine whether the supplied information matches Social Security records, whether the individual is a citizen, and whether the individual is deceased. 90 Fed. Reg. 48,948, 48,950 (Oct. 31, 2025).

If that check matches SSA records but does not confirm that the individual is

a living U.S. citizen, and a DHS numeric identifier is available either from the user’s initial input or from Social Security records, SAVE automatically checks 16 additional systems across the federal government. DHS A.R. 1450-1458. If that check, too, does not confirm that the individual is a U.S. citizen, the case is referred to an analyst for manual review. D. Ct. Doc. 77-2, ¶ 15. That manual review includes a variety of searches in systems available to DHS, including, if necessary, physical records. *Id.* ¶ 16.

If the search identifies the individual as a citizen, SAVE returns that result to the user, and no further steps are required. DHS A.R. 1507-1508. But if the search fails to confirm that the individual is a citizen, the user is prompted to “contact the [individual] to obtain proof of U.S. citizenship” (or to provide further information to continue the SAVE search). DHS A.R. 762. SAVE never definitively asserts that a person is not a U.S. citizen.

B. Proceedings Below

1. In September 2025, the League of Women Voters and other advocacy organizations (respondents here) challenged the modified SAVE system in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. App., *infra*, 12a. The court denied respondents’ motion for a preliminary injunction, finding that they had failed to show irreparable harm. See D. Ct. Doc. 55, at 11 (Nov. 17, 2025). The district court later granted summary judgment to respondents. App., *infra*, 1a-75a. The court held that respondents’ members face several types of injuries that give rise to Article III standing. First, it concluded that respondents’ members face “voter injuries” because States might ask them to prove citizenship, and might cancel their voter registrations, if inaccuracies in Social Security records prevent SAVE from confirming their citizenship. *Id.* at 31a; see *id.* at 31a-38a. Second, the court concluded that respond-

ents’ members face “privacy injuries” from the disclosure of private information contained in their Social Security records. *Id.* at 24a; see *id.* at 25a-29a. Third, the court concluded that respondents’ members suffer “reputational injuries” if SAVE fails to confirm their citizenship. *Id.* at 24a; see *id.* at 29a-31a. Finally, the court concluded that respondents have suffered “procedural injuries” from the government’s alleged violation of their procedural rights under the Privacy Act and the APA. App., *infra*, 23a; see *id.* at 38a-40a.

Turning to the merits, the district court concluded that the modified SAVE system is unlawful. The court first concluded that the updated system violates a restriction in the Social Security Act on the disclosure of Social Security numbers and related records. App., *infra*, 43a-44a. The court also concluded that the updated system violates the Privacy Act and the APA, reasoning that DHS and SSA had not complied with applicable substantive and procedural limits on the sharing of information. *Id.* at 44a-65a. Last, the court rejected the contention that 8 U.S.C. 1373 overrides the limits that the Social Security Act and the Privacy Act might otherwise impose on SAVE. *Id.* at 65a-72a.

As a remedy, the district court “vacate[d] and se[t] aside” two notices issued under the Privacy Act—one by DHS, the other by SSA—articulating the modifications to SAVE. App., *infra*, 76a. The court also “vacate[d] and se[t] aside the SAVE ‘modified system’ described in” DHS’s notice. *Ibid.* Applicants moved for a stay pending appeal, which the court denied. *Id.* at 78a-100a.

2. A divided panel of the D.C. Circuit denied applicants’ motion for a stay pending appeal, after considering it for nearly two months. App., *infra*, 102a-154a.

The panel majority concluded that applicants had not shown a likelihood of success on appeal. App., *infra*, 110a-130a. The majority first endorsed the district

court’s conclusion that respondents’ members faced voter injuries. *Id.* at 110a-112a. On the merits, it concluded that the government had forfeited its arguments that the modified SAVE system complies with the Social Security Act, *id.* at 113a-120a; concluded in the alternative that those arguments lack merit, *id.* at 122a-130a; and rejected the argument that Section 1373 overrides any limits that statute might otherwise impose on SAVE, *id.* at 120a-122a. The majority did not consider the district court’s remaining merits holdings. *Id.* at 132a.

Because the majority found that applicants were unlikely to succeed on the merits, it had “no occasion to consider the remaining stay factors.” App., *infra*, 130a. It nonetheless “briefly note[d]” its view that the equities do not support granting interim relief here. *Ibid.*; see *id.* at 130a-132a.

Judge Katsas dissented. App., *infra*, 133a-154a. Observing that a court may consider standing and the merits in either order at the stay stage, he concluded that applicants are likely to prevail on the merits and so did not consider standing. *Id.* at 139a (citing *Mullin v. Doe*, 146 S. Ct. 2121, 2137 (2026) (plurality opinion)). Judge Katsas opined that the modified SAVE system likely complies with the Social Security Act, *id.* at 139a-142a, and that any forfeiture of that argument should be excused, *id.* at 142a-145a. He further opined that the district court’s remaining rationales on the merits are unlikely to withstand appellate review. *Id.* at 148a-151a. Finally, he concluded that the equities favor a stay. *Id.* at 151a-153a.

C. Parallel Proceedings In *Florida v. DHS*

In 2024 and 2025, before the update to SAVE, five States filed suits claiming that the federal government was violating 8 U.S.C. 1373 because the old SAVE system could not provide meaningful responses to most of their verification requests. One suit was filed by Florida and later joined by Iowa, Indiana, and Ohio, see *Florida v. DHS*,

No. 24-cv-509 (N.D. Fla.) (filed Oct. 16, 2024); the other suit was brought by Texas, see *Attorney General of Texas v. Noem*, No. 24-cv-49 (W.D. Tex.) (filed Oct. 22, 2024).

After DHS updated SAVE, the federal government entered into a settlement agreement that resolved *Florida*. 24-cv-509 D. Ct. Doc. 30-1 (N.D. Fla. Nov. 28, 2025). In the settlement, DHS agreed that SAVE would maintain certain minimum capabilities, such as “allow[ing] searches with full Social Security Numbers (SSNs) to be used as a non-DHS enumerator” and “[t]he capacity to process bulk upload verification requests so that users of the system will not need to input verification requests one-by-one.” *Id.* ¶ 10. In light of the settlement, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida issued an order dismissing Florida’s suit. 24-cv-509 D. Ct. Doc. 31 (Dec. 1, 2025). The order stated that the *Florida* court “retains jurisdiction * * * for the purpose of enforcement of the parties’ settlement agreement, which is approved by and incorporated by reference into this order.” *Id.* at 1-2.

Months later, the district court in this case entered its final judgment, and the federal government immediately came into compliance by disabling the modified SAVE system, while promptly seeking a stay pending appeal. See D. Ct. Doc. 126, at 3 (July 10, 2026). But the *Florida* court then issued a conflicting order, over the government’s objection, requiring DHS to “immediately comply” with the settlement “by reinstating [the plaintiff States’] access” to certain features of the updated SAVE system. 24-cv-509 D. Ct. Doc. 45, at 9 (N.D. Fla. July 7, 2026). To comply with both courts’ orders to the greatest extent possible, the government has restored certain features of the updated SAVE system for the four States in *Florida*, while continuing to disable those features for everyone else. Respondents then intervened in *Florida* and appealed to the Eleventh Circuit. See 24-cv-509 D. Ct. Doc. 54 (N.D. Fla. Jul. 19, 2026); 24-cv-509 D. Ct. Doc. 55 (N.D. Fla. Jul. 20, 2026).

ARGUMENT

Under Rule 23 of the Rules of this Court and the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. 1651, to obtain a stay of a vacatur order pending review in the court of appeals and in this Court, an applicant must show a likelihood of success on the merits, a reasonable probability of obtaining certiorari, and a likelihood of irreparable harm. See *NRCC v. Brown*, No. 26A274, slip op. 4 (Sept. 4, 2026) (per curiam). In “close cases,” the Court balances the equities and weighs the relative harms. *Ibid.*

All those factors warrant a stay here. The government is likely to succeed on appeal because respondents lack Article III standing; because the district court’s order contravenes 8 U.S.C. 1373; and because respondents’ Privacy Act, Social Security Act, and APA claims lack merit. And the government, the States, and the public will suffer irreparable harm from the district court’s order, which undermines the government’s ability to fulfill its duty to verify an individual’s citizenship upon request by a State, and thereby impairs determinations of an individual’s eligibility to vote and to qualify for various federal benefits.

A. Respondents Lack Article III Standing

To establish the existence of an Article III case or controversy, a plaintiff must show that it has standing—*i.e.*, that it suffered a judicially cognizable injury, that the injury was likely caused by the defendant’s challenged action, and that the injury would likely be redressed by judicial relief. See *TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez*, 594 U.S. 413, 423 (2021). The district court credited multiple theories of standing, of which the court of appeals majority endorsed only the first. None is sound.

Voter injury. The lower courts concluded that respondents have standing because their members face “voter injuries.” App., *infra*, 31a; see *id.* at 112a. The district court found that, after using SAVE, Texas asked four of respondents’ members—

naturalized citizens who had not updated their Social Security records—to confirm their citizenship. *Id.* at 25a, 32a-33a. Two provided the requested citizenship information and remain registered; the other two failed to do so, and their voter registrations remain revoked. *Id.* at 33a. The district court concluded that respondents have standing because two members’ registrations remain revoked. *Id.* at 34a-35a. The district court and court of appeals also found standing because other States could ask other members for proof of citizenship in the future. *Id.* at 35a-36a, 110a-112a.

Even setting aside several objections to treating those “voter injuries” as injuries in fact, respondents lack standing because they cannot show that the injuries were likely “caused by the defendant’s conduct.” *FDA v. Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine*, 602 U.S. 367, 382 (2024). That requirement is usually “easy” to satisfy where, unlike here, the challenged governmental action “require[s] or forbid[s] some action by the plaintiff.” *Ibid.* But where, as here, the federal government has neither required nor forbidden the plaintiff to act, and the claimed injury “hinges on the response of [a] third party to the government action,” standing is “substantially more difficult to establish.” *Id.* at 382-383. This Court has often rejected “standing theories that rest on speculation about the decisions of independent actors.” *Clapper v. Amnesty International USA*, 568 U.S. 398, 414 (2013); see, e.g., *Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine*, 602 U.S. at 383; *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 561-562 (1992).

SAVE does not require respondents or their members “to do anything or to refrain from doing anything.” *Trump v. New York*, 592 U.S. 125, 134 (2020) (per curiam). SAVE instead provides information to States. DHS’s standard agreement with States specifies that a SAVE response “is not intended to be, and should not be construed as, an opinion on the part of DHS-USCIS or the United States regarding

any right or benefit or any program administered by the User Agency.” DHS A.R. 767. The agreement further specifies that States must obtain “additional verification” for any “voter that does not verify as a U.S. citizen on initial verification,” must provide “notice and hearing or other due process available under State or other applicable law” before “any removal from a voter roll,” and must comply with all other applicable federal and state laws. DHS A.R. 762, 764. Reflecting those limitations, SAVE never asserts that an individual is *not* a citizen, instead prompting users to seek additional verification.

Any injuries to the four Texas voters were thus caused by Texas, not the federal government. It was Texas, applying Texas law and acting through Texas officials, that asked those individuals to provide proof of their citizenship. See App., *infra*, 32a-33a. And it was Texas, applying procedures set out in Texas law, that revoked those voters’ registrations. See *id.* at 33a. Similarly, any future injuries to voters in other States would be attributable to those States. The fact that respondents have asserted actual voter injuries only with respect to four individuals in Texas—even though 27 States have agreed to use the modified SAVE system to check the voter rolls, and even though there have been 59.7 million voter-verification requests between January 1, 2025, and April 1, 2026, see D. Ct. Doc. 77-2, ¶¶ 21-22—confirms the point. What produces the claimed injury is a State’s decision to act after receiving a SAVE response, not the SAVE response itself.

Reinforcing the absence of standing, a SAVE response is neither necessary nor sufficient for a State to demand proof of citizenship or to revoke a voter’s registration. It is not necessary, because a State’s ability to demand proof of citizenship from any of its registered voters, and revoke registrations under state law, does not require any federal involvement at all. And it is not sufficient, because a SAVE response, on

its own, changes no voter's status; only the State's independent decision to question or cancel a registration does that. SAVE thus provides, at most, only one input into a determination that the State controls as it administers its own voting laws and manages its own voter rolls. Respondents cannot establish standing through "speculation" about the States' "unfettered choices." *Amnesty International*, 568 U.S. at 415 n.5.

Making the causal connection even more dubious, respondents cannot tie their asserted voter injuries to the specific conduct they challenge, the modifications to the SAVE system made in May 2025. Under both the old and the improved system, a State could ask SAVE to verify citizenship. Under both the old and the improved system, gaps in government records might sometimes leave SAVE unable to verify a person's citizenship, even when the person is a citizen—in fact, the old system's input restrictions made it much *less* able to confirm the citizenship of actual citizens. See p. 6, *supra*. And under both the old and the improved system, a State can decide for itself whether to act on that non-response by demanding proof of citizenship. Respondents cannot establish standing given that they would have faced the same injury both before and after the May 2025 update.

Notably, the lower courts never found that the May 2025 update somehow made SAVE less accurate. The voter-injury theory instead boils down to the notion that the government has injured respondents by making SAVE *more* accurate and easier to use. Before the May 2025 update, the theory seems to go, SAVE was so outdated, incomplete, and cumbersome that most States made little or no use of it. But after the update, the theory continues, the system verifies more voters as citizens, leaving a smaller pool of putative voters for States to scrutinize. Neither respondents nor the lower courts have cited any authority for the counterintuitive proposition that

a voter-verification system can injure someone by working better.

For similar reasons, respondents cannot establish that the relief entered against the federal government would likely redress the asserted voter injuries. Respondents complain that Texas sought proof of citizenship from four voters and revoked the registrations of two of those voters, but nothing in the district court’s judgment requires Texas to reinstate those registrations. Respondents likewise complain that other States could seek proof of citizenship from voters or revoke their registrations, but the States remain free to take those steps even after the court’s judgment. Because the judgment “would not give [respondents] legally enforceable protection from the [asserted voter injuries],” “they cannot satisfy Article III.” *Haaland v. Brackeen*, 599 U.S. 255, 293-294 (2023).

The D.C. Circuit majority concluded that “the threatened injuries are fairly traceable and redressable because setting aside modified SAVE removes the federal response that sets the [States’ citizenship-verification] process in motion.” App., *infra*, 112a. But the district court’s remedy does not “remov[e] the federal response.” *Ibid.* To the contrary, the old SAVE system would provide the *same* (non-)response—that the federal government cannot confirm a person’s citizenship—for an even larger pool of people. See p. 6, *supra*. The majority also found it “predictable” that States would react to SAVE by demanding proof of citizenship from voters. App., *infra*, 112a. But as to respondents’ members, that prediction appears to have panned out for only four voters in one State, out of tens of millions of verification requests in 27 States. See p. 13, *supra*. That just underscores that any voter injury is caused by the States, not the federal government.

The district court, meanwhile, sought to paper over those shortcomings by emphasizing that Texas has intervened as a defendant in this case. See App., *infra*, 36a-

37a. But that does not change the reality that respondents have sued and obtained relief against the federal government—even though the federal government has not caused their injuries and even though relief against the federal government would not redress those injuries. Texas’s participation as an intervenor does not create standing to sue and obtain a judgment against the United States.

Privacy injury. The district also concluded that respondents face “privacy injuries” because SAVE discloses “their members’ private information in SSA records (including their [Social Security numbers] and citizenship status)” to the States. App., *infra*, 24a. But the asserted privacy injury is not concrete; it lacks the requisite “close historical or common-law analogue.” *TransUnion*, 594 U.S. at 424.

As for SAVE’s limited disclosure of information *to the States*, that does not cause any cognizable privacy injury. SAVE never reveals anyone’s Social Security number to the States; instead, a State must already have a person’s partial or full Social Security number if it wishes to include that information as part of a SAVE request. All SAVE discloses to the State is whether the federal government can confirm that the individual in question is a citizen. See pp. 6-7, *supra*. The district court viewed a person’s “citizenship status” as the type of “private information” whose disclosure can give rise to “privacy injuries,” but it cited no authority for that extraordinary claim. App., *infra*, 24a. Putative voters must attest that they are citizens when registering to vote; stating whether the federal government can confirm such attestations does not somehow reveal the type of information that the law has traditionally treated as private. In fact, far from treating citizenship status as private, federal law affirmatively requires DHS to verify citizenship status in response to requests from States. See 8 U.S.C. 1373(c).

As for the disclosure of information *within the Executive Branch*, that too does

not cause any cognizable privacy injury. When a SAVE user makes a request containing a partial Social Security number, and that partial number matches other information in the request, SSA discloses the full Social Security number to DHS. See 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,950. Such intra-governmental information sharing lacks a “close relationship to harms traditionally recognized as providing a basis for lawsuits in American courts.” *TransUnion*, 594 U.S. at 425. The district court noted that the common law provides redress for torts such as intrusion upon seclusion and breach of confidence, see App., *infra*, 25a-29a, but those torts involve disclosures to the public, not the sharing of information within the government. The court sought to cabin its novel holding to the “unauthorized” sharing of information, App., *infra*, 26a, but injury in fact does not depend on legal authorization. See *TransUnion*, 594 U.S. at 427 (“[A]n injury in law is not an injury in fact.”). The court’s rationale thus implies, illogically, that an individual suffers an Article III injury whenever the government internally shares Social Security numbers in a perfectly lawful manner—for instance, when using the numbers to confirm the identity of an individual seeking entry to a secure facility.

Reputational injury. The district court next held that respondents’ members face “reputational injuries” when SAVE identifies them as “potential non-citizens.” App., *infra*, 23a, 25a. But SAVE never definitively asserts that a putative voter is not a citizen. Instead, it informs the user that it cannot verify a person’s citizenship and prompts the user to seek further proof. See pp. 6-7, *supra*. The statement that SAVE cannot confirm a person’s citizenship—which is factually true—does not cause cognizable reputational harm. The court analogized the alleged harm here to the harm caused by the tort of defamation, see App., *infra*, 29a-31a, but true statements are not defamatory, see *Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 489 (1975).

Respondents also cannot show that the asserted reputational harms were fairly traceable to, or would be redressed by the relief entered against, the challenged updates to SAVE. As discussed, the district court did not find that the update reduced SAVE’s accuracy. See p. 14, *supra*. Instead, the update *increased* the number of individuals whose citizenship the system could verify. Respondents thus cannot identify any individual whose citizenship would have been verified under the old system—thus avoiding the putative reputational injury—but would not be verified under the improved system. That, too, defeats standing on this theory.

Procedural injury. Finally, the district court held that respondents face “procedural injury” because they claim that the government has violated their procedural rights under the Privacy Act and the APA. App., *infra*, 38a. “But deprivation of a procedural right without some concrete interest that is affected by the deprivation—a procedural right *in vacuo*—is insufficient to create Article III standing.” *Summers v. Earth Island Institute*, 555 U.S. 488, 496 (2009); see *Department of Education v. Brown*, 600 U.S. 551, 562 (2023). Procedural injury suffices only when a person “has been accorded a procedural right to protect his concrete interests.” *Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. at 572 n.7. Because respondents lack cognizable concrete interests for the reasons discussed above, their procedural-injury theory also fails.

B. Section 1373 Establishes That DHS Has Statutory Authority To Adopt The Modified SAVE System

On the merits, respondents primarily contended below that DHS lacks the statutory authority to verify citizenship status through SAVE. See, e.g., C.A. Stay Opp. 16. The district court declined to rely on that theory, instead principally holding that the Privacy Act and the Social Security Act prohibit the sharing of Social Security data under the modified SAVE system. See App., *infra*, 43a-56a. But 8 U.S.C.

1373 forecloses that rationale. Section 1373 authorizes DHS to verify citizenship through SAVE after obtaining relevant information from other agencies, and it also expressly displaces any prohibition on such information-sharing that other federal statutes may impose. As even the D.C. Circuit majority acknowledged, that argument is “properly preserved” for appeal. App., *infra*, 120a. And the lower courts’ rejection of the argument, see *id.* at 69a-72a, 120a-122a, was manifestly erroneous.

Statutory authority. Section 1373 consists of three subsections. Section 1373(a) provides that, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision” of law, a “government entity or official may not prohibit, or in any way restrict, any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, [DHS] information regarding the citizenship or immigration status * * * of any individual.” 8 U.S.C. 1373(a). Section 1373(b), captioned “ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY OF GOVERNMENT ENTITIES,” provides that, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision” of law, “no person or agency may prohibit, or in any way restrict,” a government entity from sending, requesting, exchanging, or maintaining “information regarding the immigration status * * * of any individual.” 8 U.S.C. 1373(b). Finally, Section 1373(c), captioned “OBLIGATION TO RESPOND TO INQUIRIES,” provides that DHS “shall respond to an inquiry” by a State “seeking to verify or ascertain the citizenship or immigration status of any individual within [its] jurisdiction * * * by providing the requested verification or status information.” 8 U.S.C. 1373(c).

Section 1373(c) thus unambiguously requires, and so authorizes, DHS to “verify or ascertain the citizenship or immigration status of any individual.” 8 U.S.C. 1373(c). That provision is framed as a command, and “[c]ommand includes permission.” Antonin Scalia & Bryan A. Garner, *Reading Law* 193 (2012). “If you must do something, then you are necessarily allowed to do it.” *Ibid.*

Sections 1373(a) and (b), too, authorize the update to SAVE. By prohibiting interference with DHS’s sending and receiving of information regarding citizenship status, Section 1373(a) necessarily implies that DHS possesses the authority to send and receive that information. And Section 1373(b)’s caption, “ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY OF GOVERNMENT ENTITIES,” shows that it grants governmental entities the authority to engage in the activities it lists—sending, requesting, exchanging, and maintaining information regarding immigration status.

The district court questioned whether obtaining information from SSA is “absolutely necessary” to verify citizenship, App., *infra*, 69a, but that absolute-necessity standard is too strict. Section 1373 authorizes SSA to share with DHS “information regarding [an individual’s] citizenship status,” 8 U.S.C. 1373(a), and SSA information qualifies whether or not it is absolutely necessary to verify citizenship. See *Patel v. Garland*, 596 U.S. 328, 339 (2022) (the word “regarding” “generally has a broadening effect, ensuring that the scope of a provision covers not only its subject but also matters relating to that subject”). Moreover, under a principle known as the predicate-act canon, the authorization of an act also authorizes a “reasonably” necessary “predicate act.” Scalia & Garner 192-193 (emphasis omitted). In other words, when a legal text grants a power, it also authorizes the recipient of the power to use any “ordinary and appropriate means” of exercising it. *Free Speech Coalition, Inc. v. Paxton*, 606 U.S. 461, 478 (2025). It makes no difference that “some other approach” is “less restrictive” or “equally or more effective.” *Id.* at 497-498.

The update to SAVE satisfies that test. Section 1373 requires and authorizes DHS to verify the citizenship status of “*any* individual.” 8 U.S.C. 1373(c) (emphasis added); see 8 U.S.C. 1373(a) (“any individual”); 8 U.S.C. 1373(b) (“any individual”). Yet the old SAVE could not verify the citizenship of natural-born citizens, both be-

cause they lack alien registration numbers and because individuals who never had any encounters with DHS did not appear in DHS records. See *SAVE Guide* 3. The updated SAVE overcomes the former problem by allowing users to enter Social Security numbers rather than alien registration numbers as numeric identifiers, and the latter problem by using SSA records (which do cover natural-born citizens). That is an ordinary, appropriate, and reasonably necessary means of fulfilling DHS's obligation to verify the citizenship status of any individual. Indeed, neither of the lower courts explained how DHS can reasonably comply with its obligation under Section 1373 to verify the citizenship of *any* individual a State asks about *without* obtaining SSA information.

Interaction with other statutes. Section 1373 does not just authorize DHS to verify citizenship (and to use SSA records to do so). For two reasons, it also precludes courts from relying on other statutes, such as the Privacy Act and the Social Security Act, to block citizenship-verification responses based on the sharing of Social Security information.

First, statutes “should be interpreted in a way that renders them compatible, not contradictory. There can be no justification for rendering provisions in conflict if they can be interpreted harmoniously.” *Maracich v. Spears*, 570 U.S. 48, 68 (2013) (quoting Scalia & Garner 180) (brackets and ellipsis omitted). As explained in more detail below, the government's reading of the Privacy Act and Social Security Act enables it to comply with those laws while still fulfilling its obligations under Section 1373(c). See pp. 23-33, *infra*. On the district court's reading, by contrast, the Privacy Act and the Social Security Act effectively prevent the government from complying with Section 1373(c).

Second, even if the Privacy Act or the Social Security Act did prevent the shar-

ing of SSA information that DHS uses to verify citizenship status under Section 1373, the latter statute would prevail. Section 1373 was enacted in 1996—after the Privacy Act (1976) and the Social Security Act provision at issue (1990). In general, later statutes take precedence over earlier ones. See *EC Term of Years Trust v. United States*, 550 U.S. 429, 435 (2007). Moreover, Section 1373 applies “notwithstanding any other provision” of law. 8 U.S.C. 1373(a)-(b). The word “notwithstanding” “shows which provision prevails in the event of a clash.” *NLRB v. SW General, Inc.*, 580 U.S. 288, 301 (2017) (quoting Scalia & Garner 126-127).

The district court reasoned that reading Section 1373 to override the Privacy Act and the Social Security Act would violate the presumption against implied repeals. App., *infra*, 65a-66a. But that presumption does not apply where, as here, a statute includes a notwithstanding clause. See *PLIVA, Inc. v. Mensing*, 564 U.S. 604, 621-623 (2011) (opinion of Thomas, J.). Such a clause—also known as a *non obstante* clause, after the Latin for “notwithstanding”—“acknowledge[s] that the statute might contradict prior law and instruct[s] courts not to apply the general presumption against implied repeals.” *Id.* at 622. When Congress enacts such a clause, a court “need look no further than ‘the ordinary meaning’” of the new statute; it “should not distort [the statute] to accommodate” other laws. *Id.* at 623. For the reasons discussed above, the ordinary meaning of Section 1373 permits the update to SAVE.

The D.C. Circuit majority, for its part, saw “little basis to read § 1373(c)’s general instruction to answer citizenship inquiries as * * * *silently displacing* an otherwise applicable confidentiality restriction.” App., *infra*, 121a (emphasis added). But the majority entirely ignored Section 1373(a) and (b), which specify that Section 1373 applies “notwithstanding any other provision.” 8 U.S.C. 1373(a) and (b). The whole point of the phrase “notwithstanding any other provision,” *ibid.*, is to *expressly* “dis-

plac[e]” other laws, App., *infra*, 121a.

C. Respondents’ Privacy Act And APA Claims Lack Merit

Even putting aside Section 1373, the district court erred in holding that the update to SAVE violates the Privacy Act (and, as a result, also violates the APA). App., *infra*, 44a-65a. Respondents lack a right of action to seek prospective relief for violations of the Privacy Act, and their substantive and procedural contentions under that Act are incorrect regardless. While the court of appeals majority expressly declined to address those issues, see App., *infra*, 132a, Judge Katsas’s dissent agreed with the government on the merits arguments (without reaching the right-of-action argument), see *id.* at 146a.

Right of action. The Privacy Act contains a comprehensive remedial scheme for violations of its provisions. See 5 U.S.C. 552a(g). That scheme permits suit only by an “individual,” 5 U.S.C. 552a(g)(1), a term defined to mean a citizen or lawful permanent resident, 5 U.S.C. 552a(a)(2). For two types of violations—refusals to amend records or to provide access to records—the Act authorizes individuals to seek prospective relief. See 5 U.S.C. 552a(g)(2)-(3). For all other violations, the Act authorizes individuals to seek only damages, and only if the violation was intentional or willful. See 5 U.S.C. 552a(g)(4). Because respondents are all organizations rather than individuals, the Act does not authorize them to sue at all. And because the violations alleged here fall in the catchall category for which the Act provides only damages, the Act does not authorize prospective relief. Respondents accordingly have no right of action under the Act to seek vacatur of the modified SAVE system. The district court did not suggest otherwise.

Nevertheless, the district court held that respondents could invoke the APA to obtain prospective relief for violations of the Privacy Act. See App., *infra*, 45a-49a.

But respondents may not invoke the general right of action conferred by the APA to evade the restrictions imposed by the Privacy Act's specific remedial scheme.

In statutory interpretation, “the specific governs the general,” and where “a general authorization and a more limited, specific authorization exist side-by-side,” “[t]he terms of the specific authorization must be complied with.” *RadLAX Gateway Hotel, LLC v. Amalgamated Bank*, 566 U.S. 639, 645 (2012). Otherwise, the “specific provision [would be] swallowed by the general one, ‘violating the cardinal rule that, if possible, effect shall be given to every clause and part of a statute.’” *Ibid.* (brackets omitted). As a result, “a precisely drawn, detailed statute pre-empts more general remedies.” *Hinck v. United States*, 550 U.S. 501, 506 (2007). Consistent with that principle, this Court has repeatedly held that plaintiffs may not use the APA “to evade limitations on suit contained in other statutes.” *Match-E-Be-Nash-She-Wish Band of Pottawatomí Indians v. Patchak*, 567 U.S. 209, 215 (2012). For instance, a plaintiff may not use the APA to end-run a specific statute's limits on who may sue, see *Block v. Community Nutrition Institute*, 467 U.S. 340, 345-348 (1984); its exhaustion requirement, see *ibid.*; or its limitations period, see *Block v. North Dakota ex rel. Board of University & School Lands*, 461 U.S. 273, 286 n.22 (1983). By the same logic, respondents may not invoke the APA here to end-run the Privacy Act's limits on the available relief.

Confirming that conclusion, the APA does not authorize review where other “statutes preclude judicial review,” 5 U.S.C. 701(a)(1), or where “any other statute * * * expressly or impliedly forbids the relief which is sought,” 5 U.S.C. 702. The Privacy Act “impliedly forbids the relief which is sought” here, *ibid.*, because it explicitly authorizes suit only by individuals and prospective relief only for two specific categories of violations, see 5 U.S.C. 552a(g)(1)-(3). It thus necessarily denies author-

ization for suits by organizations and prospective relief for other categories.

The same conclusion follows from the provisions stating that the APA permits review only of final agency action “for which there is no other adequate remedy in a court,” 5 U.S.C. 704, and that a plaintiff may sue under the APA only if “the special statutory review proceeding relevant to the subject matter” is “inadequa[te],” 5 U.S.C. 703. The Privacy Act provides an adequate remedy: It expressly authorizes individuals to seek damages for “intentional or willful” violations. 5 U.S.C. 552a(g)(4). Damages are the classic example of an adequate remedy at law that forecloses equitable relief. See, e.g., *Schoenthal v. Irving Trust Co.*, 287 U.S. 92, 95 (1932). And damages are the traditional remedy for the privacy torts to which the district court analogized the Privacy Act violations here. See App., *infra*, 25a-31a. In all events, the Privacy Act’s reticulated remedial scheme reflects Congress’s own judgment about what remedies are adequate for Privacy Act violations, and courts cannot second-guess that legislative choice through the APA.

The district court concluded that the D.C. Circuit had already rejected those arguments in *Doe v. Stephens*, 851 F.2d 1457 (D.C. Cir. 1988). See App., *infra*, 46a. But *Stephens* permitted an APA action to enforce a different statute—a law governing veterans’ records—that borrowed some of the Privacy Act’s substantive standards but contained no remedial scheme of its own. See 851 F.2d at 1465-1467. In any event, the D.C. Circuit’s decision does not bind this Court.

The district court also found it significant that Congress has codified both the APA and the Privacy Act in Title 5 of the U.S. Code. See App., *infra*, 47a. But when Congress codified Title 5, it expressly instructed that “[a]n inference of a legislative construction is not to be drawn by reason of the location in the United States Code of a provision enacted by this Act.” Act of Sept. 6, 1966, Pub. L. No. 89-554, § 7(e), 80

Stat. 631. Such “interpretation clauses are to be carefully followed.” Scalia & Garner 225; see *United States v. Dixon*, 347 U.S. 381, 385-386 (1954). Regardless, the codification of both the APA and the Privacy Act in Title 5 does not affect the crucial point: Respondents may not invoke a general provision (whether labeled the APA or 5 U.S.C. 702) to circumvent and nullify the limits of a specific provision (whether labeled the Privacy Act or 5 U.S.C. 552a).

Substantive requirements. Even if respondents had a right of action, their Privacy Act claim would still fail. The district court held that SSA’s disclosure of SSA records under the updated SAVE system violates a provision of the Privacy Act that prohibits an agency from disclosing a record without the consent of the individual concerned. 5 U.S.C. 552a(b). But that provision is subject to exceptions, and the disclosures here fit within the exception for “routine use.” 5 U.S.C. 552a(b)(3).

The Privacy Act defines “routine use” as the “use of [a] record for a purpose which is compatible with the purpose for which it was collected.” 5 U.S.C. 552a(a)(7). A core “purpose” of Social Security numbers, *ibid.*, is to identify a particular individual. “Social Security numbers are unique numerical identifiers and are used pervasively in [federal] programs” for “keep[ing] track” of people and “matching” data with the right people. *Bowen v. Roy*, 476 U.S. 693, 710-711 (1986). The use of Social Security numbers in the updated SAVE system is “compatible” with that purpose, 5 U.S.C. 552a(a)(7), because SAVE uses those numbers to ensure that the citizenship information returned by SSA is matched with the correct individual. See 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,950.

The district court rejected that argument because it believed that the “purpose” of Social Security numbers is limited to verifying “work authorization and eligibility for SSA benefits.” App., *infra*, 51a. But that cramped understanding of the purpose

of Social Security numbers is flawed. Social Security numbers are used in many contexts besides employment and Social Security benefits: tax returns, bank accounts, Selective Service System registration forms, passport applications, and driver's license applications, to name just a few. Social Security numbers are thus all-purpose numeric identifiers—which is why most Americans remember their Social Security numbers, but not, say, their driver's license numbers. SAVE's use of Social Security numbers is entirely compatible with that broad purpose. The district court wrongly “fram[ed] the collection purpose at too low a level of generality, which is at odds with both the statute's forgiving text (‘compatible’) and * * * the SSN's long-established role as a ‘nearly universal identifier.’” *Id.* at 148a (Katsas, J., dissenting).

Procedural requirements. The district court separately concluded that the government failed to comply with the Privacy Act's notice-and-comment procedures, see App., *infra*, 56a-61a, and that those procedural defects rendered the update to SAVE arbitrary and capricious under the APA, see *id.* at 61a-65a. These procedural objections are baseless.

The Privacy Act provides that, to invoke the routine-use exception, an agency must first “publish in the Federal Register notice of any new use or intended use of the information in the system, and provide an opportunity for interested persons to submit written data, views, or arguments to the agency.” 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(11). There is no dispute that DHS and SSA published notices about the updated SAVE system in the Federal Register. See 90 Fed. Reg. 48,948 (Oct. 31, 2025); 90 Fed. Reg. 50,879 (Nov. 12, 2025). There is also no dispute that the agencies solicited public comment for the 30-day period required by statute. See 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(11). Both agencies then certified that they received and considered the comments submitted. See D. Ct. Doc. 64-1 (Mar. 2, 2026); D. Ct. Doc. 65-1 (Mar. 11, 2026). The Privacy Act requires

no more.

The district court observed that the agencies updated SAVE in May 2025 but published the notices in October and November 2025. See App., *infra*, 57a. In doing so, the court overlooked that respondents have sought only prospective relief to redress alleged future harm, not damages to redress past harm. See *City of Los Angeles v. Lyons*, 461 U.S. 95, 111-113 (1983) (distinguishing future from past harm). The court’s observation about the timing of the notices shows at most that the past operation of the updated SAVE system may have violated the Privacy Act’s procedural requirements. But as to the current and future operation of the system—the only conduct respondents seek to prohibit through this suit and the only purported harm redressed by the district court’s vacatur order—the statutory notice-and-comment requirements have been satisfied. In other words, “now that the agencies *have* provided the requisite notice and opportunity to comment, any past procedural violations cannot justify *forward*-looking relief against modified SAVE.” App., *infra*, 149a (Katsas, J., dissenting).

The district court also concluded that the agencies were insufficiently “open-minded” when reviewing comments. App., *infra*, 58a. But this Court has rejected the open-mindedness test in the context of APA notice-and-comment procedures, see *Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter & Paul Home v. Pennsylvania*, 591 U.S. 657, 685 (2020), and its reasons for doing so apply equally to the Privacy Act, see App., *infra*, 149a-150a (Katsas, J., dissenting). Like the APA, the Privacy Act requires an agency to satisfy certain “objective criteria”—namely, providing notice and providing an opportunity to comment. *Little Sisters*, 591 U.S. at 685. It does not require an agency to satisfy subjective criteria, such as maintaining a particular level of “open-mindedness.” *Ibid.* In nonetheless applying such a criterion, the district court vio-

lated “the general rule against inquiring into ‘the mental processes of administrative decisionmakers,’” *Department of Commerce v. New York*, 588 U.S. 752, 781 (2019), and disregarded the “presumption of regularity” owed to the agencies’ certifications that they considered the comments, *United States v. Chemical Foundation, Inc.*, 272 U.S. 1, 14 (1926).

The district court next faulted the agencies for not issuing written responses to the comments, see App., *infra*, 63a, but that rationale ignores the differences between the APA’s and the Privacy Act’s notice-and-comment procedures. The APA requires an agency to provide “notice,” to provide an opportunity to submit “written data, views, or arguments,” *and* then to issue “a concise general statement of [the rule’s] basis and purpose” reflecting “consideration of the relevant matter presented.” 5 U.S.C. 553(c). The Privacy Act, by contrast, requires only “notice” and opportunity to submit “written data, views, or arguments”; it says nothing about issuing a statement reflecting consideration of the comments. 5 U.S.C. 552a(e)(11). This Court “do[es] not lightly assume that Congress has omitted from its adopted text requirements that it nonetheless intends to apply, and [its] reluctance is even greater when Congress has shown elsewhere * * * that it knows how to make such a requirement manifest.” *Jama v. ICE*, 543 U.S. 335, 341 (2005); see App., *infra*, 149a (Katsas, J., dissenting). Moreover, it is a “basic tenet of administrative law” that agencies may “fashion their own rules of procedure” and that courts are “not free to impose” “procedural requirements” beyond those legislated by Congress. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 519, 524, 544 (1978). Confirming that reading, agencies ordinarily do not provide responses to comments under the Privacy Act.

Finally, the district court erred in holding that the agencies’ lack of a response to the comments rendered their actions arbitrary and capricious. See App., *infra*,

61a-65a. The obligation to respond to comments in APA rulemakings arises not from the APA’s arbitrary-and-capricious standard but from its notice-and-comment clauses—which, as just explained, do not apply here. To be sure, an agency acts arbitrarily if it “entirely fail[s] to consider an important aspect of the problem” (whether or not raised in comments). *Motor Vehicle Manufacturers Ass’n v. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983). The court suggested that the agencies had committed such an error because they did not consider “the reliance interests of persons who had provided information to SSA,” App., *infra*, 62a, but no such reliance interests exist. Social Security numbers are issued *by SSA to* individuals—not provided to the agency by individuals who have reliance interests in how the numbers are used. There is no plausible argument that any of respondents’ members would not have sought issuance of Social Security numbers if they had known that SSA would share information with DHS under the modified SAVE system. Indeed, lacking any Social Security number would make it far *more* likely that the voter and reputational injuries they allege would occur, given that the lack of a Social Security number would strongly suggest that they were not citizens.

D. Respondents’ Social Security Act Claim Lacks Merit

The Social Security Act provides that “[s]ocial security account numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained * * * pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990, shall be confidential.” 42 U.S.C. 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). Without any meaningful analysis, the district court concluded that the “modified SAVE system violates this prohibition,” App., *infra*, 43a, because the provision forbids both SSA’s disclosure of information “to DHS” and DHS’s later disclosure of information “to SAVE users,” *id.* at 44a. That is wrong.

SSA’s disclosure of information to DHS does not violate Section 405(c)(2). The

cited clause, by its plain terms, protects only numbers and related records that were “obtained or maintained * * * pursuant to any provision of law enacted *on or after October 1, 1990*.” 42 U.S.C. 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) (emphasis added). But SSA has issued Social Security numbers since 1936 and has required proof of citizenship or immigration status to obtain such numbers since October 1972. See Carolyn Puckett, SSA, *The Story of the Social Security Number* (July 2009), <https://perma.cc/8Z3Z-DDB3>. The agency thus “obtains and maintains its relevant records pursuant to laws enacted well before 1990.” App., *infra*, 140a (Katsas, J., dissenting).

DHS’s disclosure of information to SAVE users likewise does not violate Section 405(c)(2), for two independent reasons. For one, as the D.C. Circuit majority noted, DHS provides citizenship information through SAVE pursuant to Section 1373. See App., *infra*, 125a. As discussed, that statute applies “[n]otwithstanding any other provision” of law. 8 U.S.C. 1373(a)-(b), see p. 22, *supra*. Even the majority recognized that the government had preserved that argument, see App., *infra*, 120a, and it provides a complete defense to respondents’ Social Security Act claim.

For another, responses to SAVE users do not violate the requirement that “[s]ocial security account numbers and related records” be kept “confidential.” 42 U.S.C. 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). DHS, again, does not share Social Security numbers with SAVE users. See App., *infra*, 141a (Katsas, J., dissenting). Nor does it share “related records,” a term defined to mean records that “indicat[e], directly or indirectly, the identity of any individual” whose Social Security records are maintained. 42 U.S.C. 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(IV); see App., *infra*, 141a (Katsas, J., dissenting). The only information that DHS discloses to the SAVE user is whether the person identified by the user is a citizen (and whether he is deceased)—not information that reveals anyone’s identity. Identifying information flows the other way; it is supplied *by* the SAVE user

to DHS when making a SAVE request. Thus, DHS *does* preserve the confidentiality of the Social Security records that it obtains from SSA.

The lower courts asserted that the government had forfeited its argument about the meaning of the Social Security Act—though not its argument about Section 1373—in its summary-judgment briefing. See App., *infra*, 81a-85a, 114a. But that briefing just reflects how respondents have litigated this case. The D.C. Circuit majority’s assertion that respondents “squarely invoked § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I),” App., *infra*, 115a (citing D. Ct. Doc. 66-1, at 32-33 (Mar. 12, 2026)), is an overstatement. Respondents’ summary-judgment brief primarily argued over the course of ten pages that the statutes establishing SAVE did not authorize its use for voter verification at all, see D. Ct. Doc. 66-1, at 26-35, and relegated the Social Security Act provision on which the district court ultimately relied to a *single paragraph* in the pages cited by the D.C. Circuit majority, see *id.* at 32-33. For that reason, the government appropriately focused its response on the argument that the use of SAVE for voter verification is statutorily authorized, while just as briefly invoking Section 1373 to refute respondents’ cursory invocation of Section 405(c)(2). See D. Ct. Doc. 77-1, at 45-52 (Apr. 2, 2026). Applicants cannot be faulted for failing to preemptively address an argument that was not meaningfully raised in respondents’ briefing and that took on prominence only in the district court’s opinion.

Regardless, “[o]nce a federal claim is properly presented, a party can make any argument in support of that claim; parties are not limited to the precise arguments they made below.” *Yee v. City of Escondido*, 503 U.S. 519, 534 (1992). Relatedly, “[w]hen an issue or claim is properly before the court, the court * * * retains the independent power to identify and apply the proper construction of governing law.” *Kamen v. Kemper Financial Services, Inc.*, 500 U.S. 90, 99 (1991). The question

whether the updated SAVE system complies with the Social Security Act is properly before this Court. The government may therefore raise, and this Court may consider, any arguments that it does. Addressing those arguments “would n[ot] prejudice the plaintiffs”; the government, at a minimum, “made its likely winning argument in stay motions before the district court and [the court of appeals],” and respondents “thoroughly responded on the merits.” App., *infra*, 145a (Katsas, J., dissenting).

In all events, contrary to the D.C. Circuit majority’s suggestion, the government’s arguments under the Social Security Act are not its “central ground for a stay.” App., *infra*, 114a. The government’s stay motion in the court of appeals, like its application here, primarily argued that respondents lack standing, see Gov’t C.A. Stay Mot. 10-15, and that Section 1373 overrides the statutory provisions on which respondents rely, see *id.* at 17-18, 23. Those concededly preserved contentions independently justify a stay.

E. The Remaining Factors Support A Stay

In deciding a stay application, this Court also considers the applicant’s likelihood of obtaining certiorari; its likelihood of suffering irreparable harm; and, in close cases, the balance of the equities. See p. 11, *supra*. Those factors support a stay here.

Certworthiness. If the D.C. Circuit affirms the district court’s judgment, its decision would warrant this Court’s review. Instead of granting individualized relief to particular litigants, the district court “vacate[d] and se[t] aside the SAVE ‘modified system’” universally. App., *infra*, 76a. The order’s universal scope weighs in favor of this Court’s review. See *Labrador v. Poe*, 144 S. Ct. 921, 931 & n.3 (2024) (Kavanaugh, J., concurring). The order’s universal scope also limits percolation in other courts and hampers the development of a circuit conflict. See *Trump v. Hawaii*, 585 U.S. 667, 713 (2018) (Thomas, J., concurring). This Court often grants review when

lower courts universally vacate important agency actions, even absent a circuit conflict. See, e.g., *Bondi v. VanDerStok*, 604 U.S. 458, 467 (2025); *Department of Education v. Career Colleges & Schools of Texas*, 145 S. Ct. 1039 (2025); *United States v. Texas*, 599 U.S. 670, 675 (2023).

SAVE’s importance underscores the need for this Court’s review. Around 1350 federal, state, local, and tribal agencies nationwide use SAVE for a range of purposes, such as checking eligibility to vote, to receive public benefits, and to obtain licenses. See D. Ct. Doc. 116-2, ¶ 4 (July 1, 2026); D. Ct. Doc. 77-2, ¶ 7. In Fiscal Year 2025, SAVE completed 198.9 million verifications. See D. Ct. Doc. 77-2, ¶ 19. And before the district court’s vacatur order, the updated SAVE system processed more than one million verification requests every day. See D. Ct. Doc. 116-2, ¶ 5.

Irreparable harm. The district court’s order causes irreparable harm to the government and the public (including the States), whose interests merge here. See *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 435 (2009). The government has a statutory obligation to verify citizenship upon request by a State. See 8 U.S.C. 1373(c). The district court’s order precludes the government from using the system best suited to that task and instead forces the government to use an older, slower, more cumbersome, and less capable process. As noted above, that older system could not verify citizenship status without a DHS-specific immigration identifier (which States often do not know, and which natural-born citizens do not have) and required users to enter requests one by one rather than in bulk. See p. 6, *supra*.

By making SAVE more difficult to use, the district court’s order impairs the proper administration of federal elections. Many States rely on SAVE to help fulfill their federal statutory obligation to “ensure that voter registration records in the State are accurate and are updated regularly.” 52 U.S.C. 21083(a)(4). Since May

2025, the updated SAVE system has verified more than 65 million voters across 26 States as U.S. citizens, while flagging 28,635 potential non-U.S. citizens on state voter lists. See D. Ct. Doc. 116-2, ¶ 12. The district court’s order, however, makes it harder to detect ineligible voters, undermining the integrity of federal elections and public confidence in the results of those elections. Because reversal of the district court’s judgment “would come too late for the 2026 midterms,” those harms are irreparable. *Trump v. California*, No. 26A124, slip op. 9 (Aug. 24, 2026) (per curiam).

The court of appeals majority discounted those election-related harms on the ground that “federal law constrains systematic voter-list maintenance * * * within the 90-day period preceding a federal primary or general election.” App., *infra*, 131a (citing 52 U.S.C. 20507(c)(2)(A)). But that assumes that the cited provision restricts States’ authority to remove aliens from the voter rolls. While two circuits have read the provision that way, another circuit has read it the opposite way, and it is for now an open question in the remaining circuits—one that this Court is poised to decide in the coming Term. See Gov’t Cert. Br. at 14-16, *RNC v. Mi Familia Vota*, No. 25-1017. Accordingly, a stay would not come too late for most of the States in the country to use the modified SAVE system insofar as they agree with the government’s position that the 90-day provision does not apply to noncitizens who were never properly registered in the first place. See Gov’t Br. at 31-44, *Mi Familia Vota*, *supra* (No. 25-1017); see also *Beals v. Virginia Coalition for Immigrant Rights*, No. 24A407, 2024 WL 4608863, at *1 (Oct. 30, 2024) (staying injunction restricting removal of noncitizens from the voter rolls within the 90-day period). In addition, even if it is now too late for States to conduct “systematic” voter-list maintenance, App., *infra*, 131a, the district court’s order inflicts irreparable harm by preventing the use of the modified SAVE system for *individualized* decisions that all agree are not covered by the 90-

day provision, see *id.* at 152a n.4 (Katsas, J., dissenting).

Adding to the irreparable harm caused by the district court’s order, SAVE is used for a variety of purposes beyond verifying voter eligibility. The President has ordered executive agencies to take appropriate action to ensure that federal public benefits are not provided to ineligible aliens. See Exec. Order 14,159, § 20, 90 Fed. Reg. 8443, 8447 (Jan. 29, 2025); Exec. Order 14,218, § 2, 90 Fed. Reg. 10,581, 10,581 (Feb. 25, 2025). Consistent with those orders, “multiple federal agencies have submitted over 298 million verification requests through SAVE, mostly using a combination of the SSNs and the bulk upload tool.” D. Ct. Doc. 116-2, ¶ 6. Further, the Department of Transportation requires States to use the updated SAVE system to verify eligibility for commercial driver’s licenses, see 91 Fed. Reg. 7044 (Feb. 13, 2026), and the Department of Housing and Urban Development had planned to require States to use the updated system to verify applicants’ eligibility for certain housing programs, see 91 Fed. Reg. 8151 (Feb. 20, 2026). Many States also use SAVE to verify eligibility for state-provided benefits. See D. Ct. Doc. 116-2, ¶ 7.

The irreparable harm caused by the district court’s order does not end there. By preventing DHS from updating its own records with more current citizenship and immigration information held by SSA, the order creates gaps in the government’s ability to verify identity and status. See D. Ct. Doc. 116-2, ¶ 8. Malicious actors could exploit those gaps to obtain benefits fraudulently or to gain government employment, entry into secure facilities, or government-issued licenses or credentials. See *id.* ¶ 11. In addition, the court’s order has forced DHS, at substantial cost, to maintain both the old SAVE system and the upgraded SAVE system in parallel. See *id.* ¶ 10. And the order interferes with the government’s ability to comply with another federal court’s order enforcing an earlier settlement that resolved several States’ challenges

to the old SAVE system. See App., *infra*, 151a (Katsas, J., dissenting).

Balance of the equities. Respondents would not suffer any irreparable harm from a stay. See App., *infra*, 153a (Katsas, J., dissenting). The updated SAVE system does not cause respondents even an Article III injury, see pp. 11-18, *supra*, much less irreparable harm. Moreover, the district court denied respondents’ motion for a preliminary injunction, finding that they had failed to establish irreparable harm at that time. See D. Ct. Doc. 55, at 11 (Nov. 17, 2025). A stay would therefore preserve the status quo that had existed for over a year (from the May 2025 update until the court’s June 2026 order), not inflict some new injury on respondents. In all events, this is not the type of “close cas[e]” where the balance of equities matters in considering a stay application, see *Brown*, No. 26A274, slip op. 4 (citing *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 558 U.S. 183, 190 (2010) (per curiam)), because, as demonstrated above, the government has shown a high likelihood of success on the merits and serious irreparable harm, which are the “most critical” factors, *California*, No. 26A124, slip op. 3 (quoting *Nken*, 556 U.S. at 434).

CONCLUSION

This Court should stay the order of the district court pending further proceedings in the D.C. Circuit and this Court.

Respectfully submitted.

D. JOHN SAUER
Solicitor General

SEPTEMBER 2026

APPENDIX

District court opinion granting summary judgment (D.D.C. June 22, 2026)	1a
District court order granting summary judgment (D.D.C. June 22, 2026)	76a
District court opinion denying stay (D.D.C. July 8, 2026)	78a
District court order denying stay (D.D.C. July 8, 2026)	101a
Court of appeals opinion denying stay (D.C. Cir. Sept. 4, 2026)	102a

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 25-3501 (SLS)

Judge Sparkle L. Sooknanan

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This case implicates two fundamental rights that protect Americans from government overreach: the right to privacy and the right to vote. In the past year, several federal agencies have joined forces to create a centralized federal database that contains the private information of United States citizens, including Social Security numbers, citizenship status, and other sensitive data. But decades ago, Congress put protections in place to prevent precisely this type of centralized data bank. And the record in this case shows that the federal agencies that created this database knew that the database violates those statutory protections. The agencies were scrambling to comply with an Executive Order aimed at reshaping federal elections, which directed them to create a system for mass voter verification. So they haphazardly combined and repurposed the private information of millions of Americans, including citizenship data that they knew to be unreliable. Since then, states have partnered with the federal government to access the database and are actively removing United States citizens from voter rolls based on inaccurate information. All in all, the federal government has knowingly trampled on the privacy rights of American citizens in a manner that threatens the sacred right to vote. This Court cannot stand idly by while that happens.

Last March, President Donald J. Trump signed a sweeping Executive Order directing actions related to the administration of elections. Exec. Order No. 14248 of March 25, 2025, Preserving and Protecting the Integrity of American Elections, 90 Fed. Reg. 14,005 (Mar. 28, 2025) (DHS AR 334–39). Several lawsuits followed, and courts across the country have since enjoined various aspects of that Executive Order. As relevant here, the Executive Order instructed certain federal agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Social Security Administration (SSA), to put systems in place for state and local authorities to verify the citizenship or immigration status of registered voters or individuals registering to vote. The Executive Order triggered an overhaul of a system maintained by DHS to verify citizenship and immigration status—the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) system. The 2025 SAVE overhaul modified the system in three major ways: (1) to include the records of natural-born citizens, (2) to access SSA records, including Social Security numbers, and (3) to permit bulk searches of records by SAVE users.

The League of Women Voters, its local affiliates, and the Electronic Privacy Information Center sued DHS, SSA, and other federal governmental actors (collectively, the Federal Defendants) to challenge the overhaul of SAVE, including the establishment of the modified system and two related notices published by DHS and SSA. They allege that the modifications transformed the system’s functionality, increased the scope of covered individuals, made SAVE less accurate, violated statutory procedures, and were contrary to law. The Plaintiffs originally moved for an Administrative Procedure Act (APA) stay, which this Court denied for failure to show irreparable harm. Since then, states have run their voter rolls through the modified SAVE system, and some of the Plaintiffs’ members have been wrongfully identified as non-citizens by

SAVE, resulting in the cancellation of their voter registrations. Meanwhile, the Court permitted the State of Texas to intervene as a Defendant in this action.

The Plaintiffs now move for summary judgment. The Court agrees that the establishment of the SAVE modified system and the notices that followed are unlawful in several respects. First, they violate a prohibition in the Social Security Act against the disclosure of Social Security numbers and other related SSA records. Second, they violate both substantive and procedural protections in the Privacy Act, which prevent the non-consensual disclosure of certain information (both by federal agencies and between federal agencies) and require notice and comment for certain actions relevant here. Third, they violate the APA. The Court therefore sets aside and vacates the 2025 SAVE modified system and the related notices because they were contrary to law, arbitrary and capricious, in excess of statutory authority, and without observance of procedure required by law.

BACKGROUND

A. Social Security Act

The Social Security Act of 1935 creates financial assistance benefit programs for certain Americans. Pub. L. No. 74–271, 49 Stat. 620 (codified at 42 U.S.C. § 301 *et seq.*). Soon after its enactment, the Social Security Board established the Social Security number (SSN) as an identifier for “U.S. workers, enabling employers to submit accurate reports of covered earnings for use in administering benefits under the new Social Security program.” Carolyn Puckett, *The Story of the Social Security Number*, Soc. Sec. Bull., Vol. 69, No. 2 (July 2009), <https://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/ssb/v69n2/v69n2p55.html> [<https://perma.cc/H96G-835X>]. This “is still the primary purpose for the SSN.” *Id.*

Privacy was central to the newly formed regulatory scheme. In 1937, the Social Security Board enacted its very first regulation, which “governed privacy and disclosure of Social Security

records.” *Social Security History: Regulation No. 1*, SSA, <https://www.ssa.gov/history/reg1.html> [<https://perma.cc/NGU4-FPM6>]. That regulation prohibited any “member, officer, or employee of the Board” from producing or disclosing “any record . . . or any information acquired therefrom . . . pertaining to any person.” Disclosure of Official Records & Information, 2 Fed. Reg. 1,256, 1,256 (June 18, 1937). In 1939, Congress codified the language of that regulation into the Social Security Act, prohibiting the disclosure of “any file, record, report, or other paper, or any information” obtained by the Board except as the agency’s regulations prescribe. Social Security Act Amendments of 1939, Pub. L. No. 76–379, title VIII, § 1106, 53 Stat. 1360, 1398 (codified as amended at 42 U.S.C. § 1306(a)). Today, the Social Security Act expressly prohibits federal employees from disclosing the “[s]ocial security account numbers and related records . . . obtained or maintained . . . pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.” 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I).

B. Privacy Act

The Privacy Act of 1974 establishes “certain safeguards for an individual against an invasion of personal privacy by requiring Federal agencies” to “collect, maintain, use, or disseminate any record of identifiable personal information in a manner that assures that such action is for a necessary and lawful purpose.” Pub. L. No. 93–579, § 2(b)(4), 88 Stat. 1896, 1896 (codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552a note). The Act “was passed largely out of concern over ‘the impact of computer data banks on individual privacy.’” *U.S. DOJ v. Reps. Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 766 (1989) (quoting H.R. Rep. No. 93–1416, at 7 (1974)).

1. Statutory Background

The Privacy Act’s animating concern is that “the increasing use of computers and sophisticated information technology, while essential to the efficient operations of the

Government, has greatly magnified the harm to individual privacy that can occur from any collection, maintenance, use, or dissemination of personal information.” Privacy Act of 1974 § 2(a)(2), 88 Stat. at 1896 (codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552a note). Indeed, the Act was precipitated by proposals in the 1960s for a computerized “data center” maintained by the Executive Branch that would bring “the data collected by various agencies into a single consistent body” and “identify individual respondents in some way, [likely] by social security number.” *Computer Privacy: Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Admin. Prac. and Proc. of the S. Comm. on the Judiciary*, 90th Cong. 4–5 (1967) (statement of Carl Kaysen, Dir., Inst. for Advanced Study, Princeton Univ.). Rather than garner support, these proposals “immediately caused a public outcry,” necessitating a congressional response. Dongsheng Zang, *The Privacy Act of 1974: The American Bill of Rights on Data and Its Unfinished Business*, 86 U. Pitt. L. Rev. 85, 100 (2024) (detailing the legislative background of the Privacy Act of 1974).

Congress reacted by holding high-profile hearings on “The Computer and Invasion of Privacy” and “Federal Data Banks,” where extensive criticism ensured that “the National Data Center [idea was] probably dead.” *Id.* at 114–121 (citations omitted); *see also Sampson v. Murray*, 415 U.S. 61, 96 n.2 (1974) (Douglas, J., dissenting) (recognizing that the hearings reflected a “congressional concern” that “we live in an Orwellian age in which the computer has become ‘the heart of a [national] surveillance system’” (quoting Arthur R. Miller, *Computers, Data Banks and Individual Privacy: An Overview*, 4 Colo. Human Rights L. Rev. 1, 2 (1972))). At the time, it became evident that there was a grave “threat to privacy implicit in the accumulation of vast amounts of personal information in computerized data banks or other massive government files,” and that “[t]he right to collect and use such data for public purposes is typically accompanied by a

concomitant statutory or regulatory duty to avoid unwarranted disclosures.” *Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 605 (1977).

Congress enacted the Privacy Act to address this “growing awareness that governmental agencies were accumulating an ever-expanding stockpile of information about private individuals that was readily susceptible to . . . inaccuracies that the citizen would never know of, let alone have an opportunity to rebut or correct.” *Londrigan v. FBI*, 670 F.2d 1164, 1169 (D.C. Cir. 1981). It responded with a detailed statutory scheme to prevent “the creation of secret information systems or data banks” by the federal government that would result in “the wrongful disclosure and use, in some cases, of [such] personal files held by Federal agencies.” *Id.* (quoting S. Rep. No. 1183, at 1, 2 (1974)). Thus, the Privacy Act “was designed to provide individuals with more control over the gathering, dissemination, and accuracy of agency information about themselves,” *Greentree v. U.S. Customs Serv.*, 674 F.2d 74, 76 (D.C. Cir. 1982) (emphasis omitted), and to “establish safeguards to protect individuals against the disclosure of confidential records ‘which could result in substantial harm, embarrassment, inconvenience, or unfairness to any individual on whom information is maintained,’” *FAA v. Cooper*, 566 U.S. 284, 294–95 (2012) (quoting 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(10)).

The statute’s provisions work together “to prevent the creation of formal or de facto national data banks,” “centralized Federal information systems[,]” or “interagency computer data banks”—by making it “legally impossible for the Federal Government in the future to put together anything resembling a ‘1984’ personal dossier on a citizen, and [ensuring] proper regard for individual privacy, the confidentiality of data, and the security of [any] system” of records maintained by the federal government. *See United States v. Weber*, 816 F. Supp. 3d 1168, 1194 (C.D. Cal. 2026) (cleaned up) (quoting S. Comm. on Gov’t Operations & H.R. Comm. On Gov’t

Operations, 94th Cong., Source Book on Privacy 168, 217, 884 (Joint Comm. Print 1976)). The Act accomplishes its goal through both substantive and procedural “safeguards . . . against an invasion of personal privacy.” *Cooper*, 566 U.S. at 294–95 (quoting Privacy Act of 1974 § 2(b), 88 Stat. at 1896).

2. Substantive Safeguards

The Privacy Act’s substantive safeguards provide robust protections related to significant governmental use and retention of identifiable personal information. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552a. For instance, the statute instructs federal agencies to “collect information to the greatest extent practicable directly from the subject individual” when use of the information can adversely affect the individual’s rights. *Id.* § 552a(e)(2). It requires agencies to maintain records “with such accuracy, relevance, timeliness, and completeness as is reasonably necessary to assure fairness to the individual.” *Id.* § 552a(e)(5). And it provides various mechanisms to give individuals notice of what records are maintained by the federal government as well as to correct any inaccuracies in those records. *Id.* § 552a(d)–(g). Importantly, the Act prohibits both inter-agency and extra-agency disclosure of government records except in limited circumstances. *Id.* § 552a(b). One such circumstance is a “routine use,” which is defined as “the use of such record for a purpose which is compatible with the purpose for which it was collected.” *Id.* § 552a(a)(7), (b)(3).

The statute also has special provisions governing the use of Social Security numbers. The Act provides that “[i]t shall be unlawful for any Federal, State or local government agency to deny to any individual any right, benefit, or privilege provided by law because of such individual’s refusal to disclose his social security account number.” Privacy Act of 1974 § 7(a)(1), 88 Stat. at 1909 (codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552a note). The Act further requires that “[a]ny Federal, State, or local government agency which requests an individual to disclose his social security account

number shall inform that individual whether that disclosure is mandatory or voluntary, by what statutory or other authority such number is solicited, and what uses will be made of it.” *Id.* § 7(b), 88 Stat. at 1909.

In 1988, Congress amended the Privacy Act with the Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act of 1988. Pub. L. No. 100–503, 102 Stat. 2507 (codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552a note). That statute prohibits federal agencies from disclosing records to other federal agencies, state governments, or local governments through a “computer matching program” without a written agreement. 5 U.S.C. § 552a(o)(1). The Act establishes various statutory procedures and requirements governing such agreements. *Id.* § 552a(o). And it prohibits state or local governments from duplicating or disclosing federal records received pursuant to such an agreement “except where required by law or essential to the conduct of the matching program.” *Id.* § 552a(o)(1)(H). That same prohibition applies to federal agencies with respect to records provided by “any State or local government, or agency thereof, which discloses records to be used in a matching program.” *Id.* § 552a(a)(11), (o)(1)(H).

Congress further provided that nothing in the 1988 Act “shall be construed to authorize (1) the establishment or maintenance by any agency of a national data bank that combines, merges, or links information on individuals maintained in systems of records by other Federal agencies; (2) the direct linking of computerized systems of records maintained by Federal agencies”; or “(3) the computer matching of records not otherwise authorized by law.” Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act of 1988 § 9, 102 Stat. at 2514.

3. Procedural Safeguards

The Privacy Act also prescribes procedural safeguards that apply when records maintained by a federal agency—a so-called “system of records”—are changed or used in a new way. 5 U.S.C.

§ 552a(a)(5), (e). Congress enacted these safeguards to “permit an individual to determine what records pertaining to him are collected, maintained, used, or disseminated by [federal] agencies” and to ensure “adequate safeguards are provided to prevent misuse of such information.” Privacy Act of 1974 § 2(b)(1), (4), 88 Stat. at 1896.

In relevant part, the statute establishes strict notice and comment requirements in these circumstances. 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(4), (11). When an agency “establish[es] or revis[es]” any “system of records,” it must “publish in the Federal Register . . . a notice of the existence and character of the system of records,” *i.e.*, a System of Records Notice (SORN). *Id.* § 552a(e)(4). Each SORN “shall include” nine categories of information:

- (A) the name and location of the system;
- (B) the categories of individuals on whom records are maintained in the system;
- (C) the categories of records maintained in the system;
- (D) each routine use of the records contained in the system, including the categories of users and the purpose of such use;
- (E) the policies and practices of the agency regarding storage, retrievability, access controls, retention, and disposal of the records;
- (F) the title and business address of the agency official who is responsible for the system of records;
- (G) the agency procedures whereby an individual can be notified at his request if the system of records contains a record pertaining to him;
- (H) the agency procedures whereby an individual can be notified at his request how he can gain access to any record pertaining to him contained in the system of records, and how he can contest its content; and
- (I) the categories of sources of records in the system.

Id. To publish a statutorily compliant SORN, a federal agency must provide at least thirty days prior “notice of any new use or intended use of the information in the system, and provide an opportunity for interested persons to submit written data, views, or arguments to the agency.” *Id.* § 552a(e)(11). And the agency must provide notice to Congress as well. *Id.* § 552a(r).

C. Factual Background

1. SAVE System of Records

SAVE is a system administered by DHS that is “designed to help federal, state, tribal, and local government agencies confirm citizenship and immigration status prior to granting benefits and licenses, as well as for other lawful purposes.” DHS AR 195. SAVE users “formalize the purpose and use in which they use SAVE through a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or Computer Matching Agreement (CMA)” establishing “the terms and conditions for the user agency’s participation in SAVE.” DHS AR 195–96. One purpose for which states can enter into such an agreement is to verify the citizenship of registered voters. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. 48,948, 48,951 (Oct. 31, 2025) (DHS AR 117) (DHS 2025 SORN). Prior to May 2025, SAVE users could access the immigration status of individuals with information stored in the SAVE system, and SAVE’s response was based on the limited records maintained by DHS, the State Department, and the Justice Department. *See* Notice of Modified System of Records, 85 Fed. Reg. 31,798, 31,802 (May 27, 2020) (DHS AR 112) (2020 SORN). Also prior to May 2025, DHS recognized SAVE as a system of records subject to the Privacy Act—which means that DHS appeared to comply with the statute’s notice-and-comment requirements and issued SORNs for changes to SAVE.¹

¹ *See* Notice of Modified System of Records, 85 Fed. Reg. 31,798, 31,798 (May 27, 2020) (DHS AR 108); DHS USCIS–004 SAVE Program System of Records, 81 Fed. Reg. 78,619, 78,619 (Nov. 8, 2016); DHS USCIS–004—SAVE Program System of Records, 77 Fed. Reg. 47,415, 47,415 (Aug. 8, 2012); USCIS–004 Verification Information System (VIS) System of Records Notice, 73 Fed. Reg. 75,445, 75,445–46 (Dec. 11, 2008); USCIS VIS System of Records Notice, 73 Fed. Reg. 10,793, 10,793 (Feb. 28, 2008); Privacy Act: VIS Records Notice, 72 Fed. Reg. 17,569, 17,569 (Apr. 9, 2007); Privacy Act of 1974 System of Records, 67 Fed. Reg. 64,134, 64,134 (Oct. 17, 2002); Privacy Act of 1974 System of Records, 66 Fed. Reg. 46,812, 46,812 (Sep. 7, 2001).

2. Establishment of the Modified SAVE

On March 25, 2025, President Trump signed a sweeping Executive Order directing federal agencies to take various actions related to the administration of federal elections. Exec. Order No. 14248, 90 Fed. Reg. at 14,006–09 (DHS AR 335–38). The Executive Order instructs that for the purpose of “identify[ing] unqualified voters registered in the States,” “the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, consistent with applicable law, ensure that State and local officials have, without the requirement of the payment of a fee, access to appropriate systems for verifying the citizenship or immigration status of individuals registering to vote or who are already registered.” *Id.* at 14,006 (DHS AR 335). The Executive Order further requires DHS to “share database information with States upon request” under 8 U.S.C. § 1373(c) for voter list maintenance, and it directs DHS, in coordination with the Department of Government Efficiency, to compare voter records with “Federal immigration databases.” *Id.* at 14,005–06 (DHS AR 334–35). And the Executive Order specifically directs SSA to make its databases available “to all State and local election officials” for verifying voter eligibility. *Id.* at 14,007 (DHS AR 336).

The Executive Order prompted a flurry of action by the Federal Defendants charged with its implementation. SSA AR 1–2; DHS AR 39–68. On May 15, 2025, DHS and SSA executed a letter agreement to overhaul the SAVE system, which authorized “information sharing” between DHS and SSA “by matching data submitted through SAVE to SSA records in SSA’s Master Files of Social Security Number (SSN) Holders and SSN Applications.” DHS AR 423 (citation omitted); SSA AR 9 (citation omitted). The “SSA Master Files” (or NUMIDENT)—which would be linked to SAVE under the new information sharing agreement—contains SSNs, names, dates and places of birth, citizenship indicators, death records, and information obtained while processing requests for SSNs. SSA AR 170–71; DHS AR 253. On May 22, 2025, the Federal

Defendants publicly launched the expanded SAVE system. DHS AR 493; DHS AR 1385. But no agency published a SORN or otherwise provided an opportunity for the public to comment on the modifications prior to publication. Mot. Hr’g Tr. 71:15–22, ECF No. 48. At that juncture, the operative SORN for SAVE was published on May 27, 2020. Notice of Modified System of Records, 85 Fed. at 31,798 (DHS AR 108).

3. Present Litigation and Promulgation of New SORNs

In September 2025, the Plaintiffs filed this action challenging the modified SAVE as unlawful, *see* Compl., ECF No. 1, and moved for an emergency stay under Section 705 of the APA, Mot. Stay, ECF No. 16. During those emergency proceedings, the Federal Defendants would not say one way or the other whether the Privacy Act applies to modifications to SAVE—despite DHS’s prior practice of publishing SORNs for modifications to the system. Mot Hr’g Tr. 69:18–24. But the Federal Defendants conceded that the then-recent modification to SAVE was substantial enough that the Privacy Act would require a SORN if it applied. *Id.* The Court ultimately denied the Plaintiffs’ emergency motion for failure to show irreparable harm. *See League of Women Voters v. DHS.*, No. 25-cv-3501, 2025 WL 3198970, at *5 (D.D.C. Nov. 17, 2025).

The administrative record provides a window into DHS’s understanding of the SAVE “modified system.” Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,948 (DHS AR 114). Internal “Privacy Threshold Analysis” documents from July and September 2025 show that DHS was aware that the modification of SAVE was “not in compliance” with the Privacy Act, DHS AR 277; DHS AR 319, and that “[s]hortfalls in data accuracy” in SSA citizenship data integrated into the new SAVE system “could cause incomplete or false results,” DHS AR 260; DHS AR 302. This was in part because “[t]here is no obligation for an individual to report to SSA

a change in their citizenship or immigration status until they request a replacement card or file a claim for a Social Security benefit.” SSA AR 103. Thus, a naturalized citizen who applied for a Social Security card or otherwise interacted with SSA prior to naturalization may be incorrectly identified as a non-citizen in SSA records. *Id.*

After the hearing on the Plaintiffs’ emergency motion, DHS and SSA both published SORNs (2025 SORNs) for the modifications made to their respective systems. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,948–55 (DHS AR 114–21); Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. 50,879 (Nov. 12, 2025) (SSA AR 206) (SSA 2025 SORN); Fed. Defs.’ Suppl. Resp. 8, ECF No. 51; Fed. Defs.’ Notice of Publication of SORN, ECF No. 54. The 2025 SORNs outlined the “modified system” that resulted from the modification of SAVE in May 2025. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,949 (DHS AR 115); *see also* Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 50,880 (SSA AR 207). The DHS 2025 SORN established a new “Routine Use L” to enable DHS to disclose records to SSA “and other federal, state, tribal, territorial, local, governments and other authorized entities to assist [SAVE] user agencies [to] determine U.S. citizenship and immigration status of an individual when a DHS approved agreement is in place between DHS and the entity.” Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,954 (DHS AR 120). The SSA 2025 SORN added a new “Routine Use No. 49” for disclosures of “citizenship and immigration status” to DHS “pursuant to 8 U.S.C. [§] 1373(a).” Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 50,883 (SSA AR 210). The 2025 SORNs solicited comments from the public—but they also provided that the modified SAVE system outlined in the 2025 SORNs would be effective immediately (*i.e.*, before the public could submit comments). *See* Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,949 (DHS AR 115); Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 50,880 (SSA AR 207)

(recognizing immediate effect except for new routine uses which would automatically take effect after thirty days). The modified system that resulted from the Federal Defendants’ self-described “overhaul” of SAVE differed from SAVE’s prior functionality (authorized by DHS’s 2020 SORN) in three primary ways. *See* DHS AR 493.

First, the old SAVE did not previously have access to the records of natural-born citizens unless those individuals had some other interaction with DHS, *e.g.*, as a sponsor of a non-citizen. *See* Notice of Modified System of Records, 85 Fed. Reg. at 31,801 (DHS AR 111). But the new SAVE includes records about “U.S. citizens by birth.” Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,949–51 (DHS AR 115–17).

Second, the old SAVE only accessed records stored in DHS systems, along with certain immigration-related records systems at the State Department and the Department of Justice identified in the 2020 SAVE SORN. *See* Notice of Modified System of Records, 85 Fed. Reg. at 31,802 (DHS AR 112). The old SAVE did not access SSA databases and SAVE users could not run initial SAVE searches using an individual’s SSN or partial SSN. Notice of Modified System of Records, 85 Fed. Reg. at 31,798–99, 31,802 (DHS AR 108–09, 112). Instead, users had to provide an individual’s DHS numeric identifier (*e.g.*, an alien registration number or A-Number). Notice of Modified System of Records, 85 Fed. Reg. at 31,799 (DHS AR 09); DHS AR 248; DHS AR 399. The old SAVE only had access to Social Security numbers “in very limited circumstances” when benefits applicants submitted that number through DHS’s Form G-845, a form used to document a person’s immigration status and verify their identity. Notice of Modified System of Records, 85 Fed. Reg. at 31,802 (DHS AR 111). Previously, “[i]f SAVE display[ed] an ‘Institute Additional Verification’ message,” SAVE users could require completion of the form “G-845 with the applicant’s knowledge and consent,” which could include a social security

number. DHS AR 192; *see also* DHS AR 205–06, 278. But beyond this circumstance, SAVE did not have access to social security numbers. *See* Notice of Modified System of Records, 85 Fed. Reg. at 31,802 (DHS AR 112); DHS AR 278. Because most U.S.-born citizens do not have DHS numeric identifiers, before 2025 SAVE generally did not query the records of natural-born U.S. citizens. *See* DHS AR 248.

Meanwhile, the new SAVE “update[d] the categories of records in the system to include collecting both full and truncated (last four digits) Social Security number[s]” and added the SSA Master File as a “record source” for SAVE. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,949 (DHS AR 115). The result is that SAVE users may use the modified system to query any non-citizen, naturalized citizen, and natural-born citizen who have Social Security numbers in the SSA Master File. *See* DHS AR 248.

Third, the old SAVE could only conduct individual searches; SAVE users could not conduct bulk searches of more than one person’s data at a time. *See* DHS AR 247. But the new SAVE added “the capability to create cases in SAVE by uploading a file with a list of multiple cases” for a bulk search. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,951 (DHS AR 117).

4. Modified SAVE’s User Experience

The SAVE “modified system” operates as follows. *Id.* at 48,948 (DHS AR 114). After user agencies execute an MOA or CMA with USCIS, which establish “the terms and conditions for the user agency’s participation in SAVE,” DHS AR 195–96; *see also* DHS AR 223; DHS AR 1344, those users may conduct bulk searches.

A SAVE user first downloads a spreadsheet and manually enters some or all the following data: first name, last name, date of birth, either a full or partial SSN, and the reason for verification

(e.g., voter verification). DHS AR 1443. The SAVE user can also provide voters' DHS numeric identifiers (e.g., an A-number). DHS AR 225; DHS AR 2. The user then uploads the completed file into the SAVE interface. DHS AR 1444. Once that happens, SAVE automatically discloses the voters' uploaded data to SSA and uses it to search the SSA Master File. *See* DHS AR 224–25; DHS AR 253; DHS AR 1525. SSA automatically discloses the SSA Master File search results to DHS, including the following fields:

- SSN Match (True/False);
- Full SSN for all matches (when a partial SSN is provided);
- Name Match (True/False);
- Date of Birth Match (True/False);
- Citizenship/Foreign Indicator:
 - Blank – Citizenship code is blank and foreign-born indicator is blank;
 - “A” – U.S. citizen;
 - “B” – Legal alien, eligible to work;
 - “C” – Legal alien, not eligible to work;
 - “D” – Other;
 - “E” – Alien student, restricted work authorized; and
 - “F” – Conditionally legalized alien;
- Foreign Born indicator (citizenship code is not present, but voter was foreign born);
- State/Country Code;
- American Samoa indicator (True/False);
- Alien Registration number (where applicable);
- Death indicator (Yes Deceased/Not Deceased); and
- Error code descriptions (transaction and record levels).

Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,950 (DHS AR 116); DHS AR 225–26; DHS AR 233; DHS AR 424; DHS AR 437–38.

If the search identifies a potential non-U.S. citizen and a DHS numeric identifier is available (either from the user's initial input or SSA records), SAVE automatically queries

additional systems across the federal government, DHS AR 1450–58; DHS AR 1525; Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,953–54 (DHS AR 119–20); DHS AR 227–30. After a manual review of responses, SAVE may then return a response that will either include the voter’s citizenship status—*e.g.*, “U.S. Citizen” or “Lawful Permanent Resident”—or request additional actions by the SAVE user, including requesting the submission of additional documents. DHS AR 1525; DHS AR 1507; DHS AR 1378–79; DHS AR 1530.

If the match to SSA records is inconclusive, the SSA records confirm that a voter is a citizen or is deceased, or SAVE identifies a potential non-U.S. citizen status and no DHS numeric identifier is available, then SAVE ends the automated query, DHS AR 254–55; DHS AR 297, and generates one of the following responses:

- U.S. Citizen (per SSA Record);
- Deceased (per SSA record);
- Immigration Enumerator [*i.e.* DHS identifier] Required – Resubmit with Additional Information;
- Unable to Return Record from SSA – Resubmit with Additional Information;
or
- Full SSN Required – Resubmit with Additional Information.

DHS AR 1379.

If SAVE identifies a voter as a citizen, then the SAVE user need not take any further steps or gather “additional information.” *See* DHS AR 1507–08. If SAVE identifies the individual as anything else, then the template SAVE MOA directs the SAVE user to “contact the registrant or registered voter to obtain proof of U.S. citizenship.” DHS AR 762. And if the SAVE result is inconclusive (*e.g.*, SAVE provides an “Immigration Enumerator Required – Resubmit with Additional Information” response), then (1) the SAVE user must provide the voter’s DHS numeric identifier (which state and local agencies likely do not possess), and/or (2) the SAVE user must

“contact the registrant or registered voter to obtain proof of U.S. citizenship.” *See* DHS AR 762; DHS AR 1526.

D. Procedural Background

On January 21, 2026, after the comment period expired for the 2025 SORNs, the Plaintiffs—the League of Women Voters, League of Women Voters of Texas, League of Women Voters of Louisiana, League of Women Voters of Louisiana Education Fund, League of Women Voters of Virginia, and the Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC)—filed an Amended and Supplemental Complaint challenging the three major modifications to the SAVE system outlined in those SORNs. Am. Compl., ECF No. 61. On April 6, 2026, the Court permitted the State of Texas, a SAVE user, to intervene as a Defendant in this action. Order, ECF No. 86. The Plaintiffs moved for summary judgment, asking this Court to set aside and vacate the modified SAVE system and 2025 SORNs as unlawful under the APA and the Constitution. Pls.’ Mem. Supp. Summ. J. Mot., ECF No. 66-1 (Pls.’ Mot.). The Federal Defendants cross-moved for either dismissal of this action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and failure to state a claim or for summary judgment. Fed. Defs.’ Combined Mem. Supp. Mot. Dismiss/Mot. Summ. J. and Opp’n to Pls.’ Mot. (Fed. Defs.’ Mot.), ECF No. 77-1. And the State of Texas moved to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and failure to state a claim. Texas Mot. Dismiss (Texas Mot.), ECF No. 97. These motions are fully briefed and ripe for review. Pls.’ Combined Reply & Opp’n to Fed. Defs.’ Mot. (Pls.’ Reply), ECF Nos. 99 & 100; Pls.’ Opp’n to Texas Mot. (Pls.’ Opp’n), ECF No. 104; Texas Reply, ECF No. 105; Fed. Defs.’ Reply, ECF No. 106.²

² The Court has received and considered amicus briefs in support of the Plaintiffs filed by Travis County, Travis County Tax Assessor-Collector Celia Israel, and Travis County Clerk Dyana Limon-Mercado; Campaign Legal Center, Center for Media and Democracy, Common Cause, and Protect Democracy Project; Texas Civil Rights Project; Lawyers Defending American

LEGAL STANDARD

A court “shall grant summary judgment if the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). In the context of an APA challenge, summary judgment “serves as a mechanism for deciding, as a matter of law, whether the administrative record supports the agency action and whether the agency action is consistent with the APA standard of review.” *Int’l Swaps & Derivatives Ass’n v. U.S. CFTC*, 887 F. Supp. 2d 259, 266 (D.D.C. 2012) (citing *Richards v. INS*, 554 F.2d 1173, 1177 & n.28 (D.C. Cir. 1977)).

“A motion under Rule 12(b)(1) ‘presents a threshold challenge to a court’s [subject-matter] jurisdiction.’” *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Int’l Dev. Fin. Corp.*, 585 F. Supp. 3d 63, 69 (D.D.C. 2022) (quoting *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Jackson*, 815 F. Supp. 2d 85, 89 (D.D.C. 2011)). The plaintiff “bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over her claims.” *Schmidt v. U.S. Capitol Police Bd.*, 826 F. Supp. 2d 59, 69 (D.D.C. 2011). When evaluating a motion under Rule 12(b)(1), “the court may consider documents outside the pleadings to assure itself that it has jurisdiction.” *Sandoval v. U.S. DOJ*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 101, 104 (D.D.C. 2018).

Under Rule 12(b)(6), a court must dismiss a complaint that does not “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)). Courts “must construe the complaint ‘in favor of the plaintiff, who must be granted the benefit of all inferences that can be derived from the facts alleged.’” *Hettinga v. United States*, 677 F.3d 471, 476 (D.C. Cir. 2012) (quoting *Schuler v. United States*, 617 F.2d 605, 608 (D.C. Cir. 1979)). But

Democracy, Inc.; Service Employees International Union; and the American Civil Liberties Union. ECF Nos. 68, 89, 91, 87, 88 & 94.

courts need not accept as true “a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation,” nor an “inference[] . . . unsupported by the facts set out in the complaint.” *Trudeau v. FTC*, 456 F.3d 178, 193 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (first quoting *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 286 (1986); and then quoting *Kowal v. MCI Commc’ns Corp.*, 16 F.3d 1271, 1276 (D.C. Cir. 1994)).

DISCUSSION

The Plaintiffs contend that the Federal Defendants have unlawfully established a modified SAVE system of records in violation of the APA and the Constitution. Specifically, they argue that the establishment of the modified SAVE and the 2025 SORNs (1) violated the APA because of substantive provisions in the Social Security Act and the Privacy Act, (2) violated certain procedural protections in the Privacy Act and are arbitrary and capricious under the APA, and (3) violated the constitutional separation of powers. The Plaintiffs seek summary judgment on their claims, asking the Court to hold unlawful, vacate, and set aside the modified SAVE system and the accompanying 2025 SORNs.

The Federal Defendants and the State of Texas (collectively, the Defendants) seek dismissal of the Plaintiffs’ claims. They first raise threshold arguments in support of dismissal—arguing that the Plaintiffs lack standing, that the challenged activity is not a final agency action, and that the Plaintiffs have an adequate remedy elsewhere. They also defend the establishment of the modified SAVE and the 2025 SORNs on the merits, asserting that they did not violate the APA or the Constitution and were otherwise authorized by immigration laws.

Having reviewed the comprehensive briefing in this case, the Court is convinced that the Plaintiffs have the better of the arguments. The Defendants’ threshold arguments are easily dispensed with. And on the merits, the Court holds that the establishment of the modified SAVE system and the 2025 SORNs are unlawful for at least three reasons. First, they violated the Social Security Act. Second, they violated both substantive and procedural protections in the Privacy Act.

And third, they are arbitrary and capricious in violation of the APA. Because relief is warranted on these claims alone, the Court declines to address the Plaintiffs' remaining claims.³

A. Standing

Standing leads off. Recall that the Plaintiffs are non-profit organizations. An organization may demonstrate standing by either (1) asserting associational “standing solely as the representative of its members,” or (2) identifying an organizational injury “in its own right.” *Students for Fair Admissions, Inc. v. President & Fellows of Harvard Coll.*, 600 U.S. 181, 199 (2023) (quoting *Warth v. Seldin*, 422 U.S. 490, 511 (1975)). To establish associational standing, an organization must show that: “(1) at least one of its members has standing to sue in her or his own right, (2) the interests it seeks to protect are germane to its purpose, and (3) neither the claim asserted nor the relief requested requires the participation of an individual member in the lawsuit.” *Institutional S’holder Servs., Inc. v. SEC*, 142 F.4th 757, 764 (D.C. Cir. 2025) (quoting *Wash. All. of Tech. Workers v. DHS*, 50 F.4th 164, 175 (D.C. Cir. 2022)). The first two prongs are rooted in Article III of the Constitution, but the “third prong is a prudential one” focused on “matters of administrative convenience and efficiency.” *United Food & Com. Workers Union Loc. 751 v. Brown Grp., Inc.*, 517 U.S. 544, 555–57 (1996).

Here, the Defendants do not appear to challenge the final two prongs. The League of Women Voters and their state affiliates seek to protect the voting rights of their members, which is germane to the League’s purpose to “empower voters and defend democracy, including by registering voters and increasing voter participation.” Stewart Decl. ¶¶ 2, 7, ECF No. 16-5; *see also* LeBombard Decl. ¶¶ 2, 5, 14, ECF No. 66-7; Suppl. Green Decl. ¶¶ 2, 6, ECF No. 66-8; Porte

³ The Court need not address the Plaintiffs’ constitutional claims; Privacy Act accuracy claims, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(5), (6), (10); claims under Section 1306(a)(1) of the Social Security Act; and mandamus claims to enforce the Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act.

Decl. ¶¶ 2, 3, 11, 14, ECF No. 16-6. And EPIC seeks to protect the privacy rights of its members, which is germane to its “mission . . . to secure the fundamental right to privacy in the digital age.” Butler Decl. ¶ 3, ECF No. 66-10. Furthermore, individual member participation is not necessary where an organization seeks APA vacatur on behalf of its members. *See Powder River Basin Res. Council v. U.S. Dep’t of Interior*, 749 F. Supp. 3d 151, 162 (D.D.C. 2024); *Sierra Club v. Perry*, 373 F. Supp. 3d 128, 135 (D.D.C. 2019).

Standing thus turns on whether “at least one of [the Plaintiffs’] members has standing to sue in her or his own right.” *Institutional S’holder Servs.*, 142 F.4th at 764 (quoting *Wash. All. of Tech. Workers*, 50 F.4th at 175). “To establish Article III standing, a plaintiff must show (1) injury in fact that is concrete and particularized and actual or imminent rather than conjectural or hypothetical, (2) causation fairly traceable to the defendant’s challenged action and (3) redressability by a favorable decision that is likely as opposed to merely speculative.” *Am. Whitewater v. FERC*, 125 F.4th 1139, 1150 (D.C. Cir. 2025) (citing *Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560–61 (1992)). The “plaintiff[] must demonstrate standing for each claim that they press and for each form of relief that they seek.” *TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez*, 594 U.S. 413, 431 (2021). And where an action involves only non-monetary relief, “[o]nly one plaintiff . . . needs standing in order for a particular claim to go forward. . . . That is, if constitutional standing ‘can be shown for at least one plaintiff, [the Court] need not consider the standing of the other plaintiffs to raise that claim.’” *Whitman-Walker Clinic v. U.S. HHS*, 485 F. Supp. 3d 1, 18 (D.D.C. 2020) (quoting *Carpenters Indus. Council v. Zinke*, 854 F.3d 1, 9 (D.C. Cir. 2017)).

Here, the Court concludes that the League of Women Voters and the League of Women Voters of Texas have standing to proceed. *See* Nel Decl., ECF No. 66-3; A. Doe Decl., ECF

No. 66-4; B. Doe Decl., ECF No. 66-5; J. Doe 4 Suppl. Decl., ECF No. 16-3.⁴ Their members suffered three types of injuries: privacy or reputational injuries, voter injuries, and procedural injuries. Pls.’ Mot. 13.⁵ The Court addresses each in turn.

1. Privacy or Reputational Injuries

The Plaintiffs first argue that the disclosure of their members’ personal information in violation of the Social Security Act and the Privacy Act has caused privacy or reputational injuries that are sufficiently concrete to confer Article III standing. *See id.* The Court agrees.

“[F]or Article III purposes, an injury is ‘concrete’ if it is similar to a type of harm cognizable at common law.” *Pileggi v. Washington Newspaper Publ’g Co.*, 146 F.4th 1219, 1226 (D.C. Cir. 2025) (quoting *TransUnion*, 594 U.S. at 424). Of course, “Article III does not require ‘an exact duplicate in American [common-law] history and tradition’”—“an injury is concrete if it has ‘a close historical or common-law analogue’” and there is a “close relationship” between the harm that Congress sought to remedy and that analogue. *Id.* (quoting *TransUnion*, 594 U.S. at 424–25). In providing a private cause of action, Congress may even “identif[y] a modern relative of a harm with long common law roots,” *Gadelhak v. AT&T Servs., Inc.*, 950 F.3d 458, 462 (7th Cir. 2020) (Barrett, J.), and “elevate to the status of legally cognizable injuries [those] concrete, *de facto* injuries that were previously inadequate in law,” *TransUnion*, 594 U.S. at 425–26 (quoting *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, 578 U.S. 330, 341 (2016)). Thus, the injury-in-fact requirement is satisfied if a party brings a “private right of action to remedy” a harm recognized in common law or “a harm that is a lesser form of a harm recognized at common law.” *Pileggi*, 146 F.4th

⁴ Members of local and state Leagues of Women Voters are also members of the League of Women Voters. Stewart Decl. ¶ 6, ECF No. 16-5; Suppl. Stewart Decl. ¶ 10, ECF No. 66-5.

⁵ Because the Plaintiffs’ injuries suffice to confer standing for their claims, the Court does not address the Plaintiffs’ argument that organizational or informational standing can also support some of their claims. *See* Pls.’ Mot. 13.

at 1227. “Th[e]se include, for example, reputational harms, disclosure of private information, and intrusion upon seclusion.” *TransUnion*, 594 U.S. at 425.

The Privacy Act “provide[s] certain safeguards for an individual against an invasion of personal privacy.” *Cooper*, 566 U.S. at 294–95 (quoting Privacy Act of 1974 § 2(b), 88 Stat. at 1896). “[T]he Act serves interests similar to those protected by defamation and privacy torts”—“there is good reason to infer that Congress relied upon those torts in drafting the Act” and “parallel[ed]” those “common-law torts” in its statutory scheme. *Id.* at 295–96.

Here, the Plaintiffs have established privacy injuries because of the modified SAVE system. They claim that the Federal Defendants have disclosed their members’ private information in SSA records (including their SSNs and citizenship status) without their consent through bulk SAVE queries. Specifically, they allege that Texas, Louisiana, and other SAVE users have accessed and continue to have access to this private information through SAVE in violation of the Social Security Act and the Privacy Act. *See* Nel Decl. ¶¶ 27–43; A. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 18, 23–24; B. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 32–44, 46–47; C. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 19–25, ECF No. 66–6. The Plaintiffs further allege that their members provided this private information to SSA when they applied for SSNs, and that they reasonably expected the agency to keep that information confidential and use it only for that purpose. *See* Nel Decl. ¶ 33; A. Doe Decl. ¶ 18; B. Doe Decl. ¶ 38; C. Doe Decl. ¶ 25; Kisselburgh Decl. ¶ 15, ECF No. 66-11; Suppl. Green Decl. ¶ 49; J. Doe 4 Suppl. Decl. ¶ 9; J. Doe 6 Decl. ¶¶ 10, 20, ECF No. 16-8.

The Plaintiffs establish reputational injuries, too. As they tell it, their members include individuals who applied for SSNs when they were non-citizens but have since naturalized. Nel Decl. ¶ 34; A. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 4–6; B. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 4–6; Suppl. Green Decl. ¶¶ 32, 35; J. Doe 4 Suppl. Decl. ¶¶ 2, 8; C. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 4–5; J. Doe 6 Decl. ¶¶ 2, 9. For those individuals, their Social

Security files are outdated and incorrectly list them as non-citizens. Nel Decl. ¶ 34; B. Doe Decl. ¶ 39; Suppl. Green Decl. ¶ 11; J. Doe 4 Suppl. Decl. ¶ 14; C. Doe Decl. ¶ 26; J. Doe 6 Decl. ¶ 15. The Plaintiffs state that their members had no reason to believe that failure to update their citizenship status with SSA would have any impact on their lives. Nel Decl. ¶ 34; A. Doe Decl. ¶ 19; B. Doe Decl. ¶ 39; C. Doe Decl. ¶ 26. But because of the Federal Defendants’ disclosure of their citizenship status through the modified SAVE, these individuals were identified as potential non-citizens by the State of Texas based on a “comparison of the information in [their] voter registration records with the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services SAVE records.” Nel Decl., Ex. 1; A. Doe Decl., Ex. 1; B. Doe Decl., Ex. 2; C. Doe Decl., Ex. 1. And they have had to provide proof of citizenship within thirty days to avoid cancellation of their voter registrations. A. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 11–14 & Ex. 1; C. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 12–14, 18 & Ex. 1. Some of the Plaintiffs’ members have had their voter registrations wrongfully cancelled for failure to provide documentation within thirty days of these notices. *See* Nel Decl. ¶¶ 19–21, 24, 26 & Exs. 1, 2; B. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 11–17, 21–22, 24–27, 30–31 & Exs. 1, 2.

The Plaintiffs argue that statutory claims challenging the disclosure of their private information to both DHS and SAVE users have three common-law analogues: intrusion upon seclusion, breach of confidence, and defamation. Pls.’ Mot. 14–16. The Court agrees that all three analogues fit the bill. Therefore, it concludes that the Plaintiffs have established concrete injuries that serve as a basis for standing in this Court.

a. Intrusion Upon Seclusion

The first analogue is intrusion upon seclusion. Pls.’ Mot. 14. An “injury . . . closely analogous to the harm of intrusion upon seclusion” is cognizable under Article III. *Pileggi*, 146 F.4th at 1228. Intrusion upon seclusion is an “intentional[] intrusi[on], physical or otherwise, upon

the solitude or seclusion of another or his private affairs or concerns . . . if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.” *Id.* (quoting Restatement (Second) of Torts § 652B (A.L.I. 1977)). Various courts across the country, *see, e.g., Am. Fed. of State, Cnty. & Mun. Emps. v. SSA*, 172 F.4th 361, 369 (4th Cir. 2026) (en banc), and nearly “every court in this circuit” have held that the unauthorized disclosure of Social Security and other “private information” by government employees is the exact type of injury protected by the tort of intrusion upon seclusion, *AFL-CIO v. Dep’t of Lab.*, No. 25-cv-339, 2026 WL 879518, at *10 (D.D.C. Mar. 31, 2026) (collecting cases). And the Plaintiffs are challenging just that—an unauthorized disclosure of Social Security and other private information. This supports Article III standing.

The Defendants urge the contrary. They say that intrusion upon seclusion has an additional requirement: “knowledge that a third party is engaged in” the invasion of privacy, relying on the Fourth Circuit’s abrogated opinion in *Am. Fed’n of Teachers v. Bessent*, 152 F.4th 162, 172 (4th Cir. 2025), *abrogated by* 172 F.4th 361 (4th Cir. 2026). *See* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 19; Texas Mot. 11–12. That decision reasoned that intrusion upon seclusion is targeted to privacy injuries “that invade[] one’s space or disrupt[] one’s daily activities,” while “[u]nauthorized knowledge of sensitive information” like Social Security information without a “feeling of unease” or “trespass” stemming from knowledge of that disclosure is more akin to “defamation.” *Bessent*, 152 F.4th at 172 (citation omitted). *Bessent*’s rationale is both unconvincing and inapposite for three reasons.

First and foremost, *Bessent* was decided on an emergency basis and therefore on an expedited timeline, and it thus concluded only that the plaintiffs there *likely* lacked standing. *Id.* at 171. With more time to consider the issue, the *en banc* Fourth Circuit concluded that *Bessent* misread the Second Restatement of Torts and held instead that disclosure of SSA data is akin to

the tort of intrusion upon seclusion irrespective of knowledge of the disclosure. *Am. Fed. of State, Cnty. & Mun. Emps.*, 172 F.4th at 370–71.

Second, *Bessent* is inapposite. In *Bessent*, none of the plaintiffs alleged that “any particular row of information [in the database] belonging to any particular Plaintiff [was] examined” by a third party. 152 F.4th at 172. In stark contrast, the record here abounds with declarations that SSA handed over individuals’ private information to state authorities, that those authorities revoked or threatened to revoke voter registrations based on the unauthorized and inaccurate disclosures, and that the unauthorized and inaccurate disclosures disrupted the individuals’ daily lives when they were forced to correct the inaccuracies. *See, e.g.*, A. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 11–14; C. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 12–14, 18. These facts—United States citizens receiving notices from state authorities threatening revocation of their voter registration and possible criminal sanctions based on the unauthorized disclose of inaccurate, private information—undoubtedly create a “feeling of unease when and where one should ideally be at peace.” *Bessent*, 152 F.4th at 172.

Third, *Bessent* is unpersuasive on its own terms. Most glaringly, it did not grapple with *TransUnion*’s instruction that Article III does not “require an exact duplicate” to a harm cognizable in common law and that Congress “may ‘elevate to the status of legally cognizable injuries concrete, *de facto* injuries that were previously inadequate in law.’” *TransUnion*, 594 U.S. at 425–26, 433 (quoting *Spokeo*, 578 U.S. at 341). Courts considering this instruction have held that the disclosure of SSA data is undoubtedly the “same kind of harm that common law” privacy torts, like intrusion upon seclusion, protect. *See All. for Retired Ams. v. Bessent*, 770 F. Supp. 3d 79, 104 (D.D.C. 2025) (quoting *Gadelhak*, 950 F.3d at 462). Indeed, *TransUnion* itself made clear that “retention of information *lawfully* obtained, *without further disclosure*, traditionally has not provided the basis for a lawsuit in American courts,” but a different analysis is necessary in

equitable suits where (1) private information is “provided” to third parties, (2) there is a “serious likelihood of disclosure” of that information, or (3) when plaintiffs are “aware of . . . misleading information” provided about them. 594 U.S. at 434, 436 n.7, 438 (emphases added) (cleaned up). Courts have long held that the “*unlawful*” “collection, storage, and use” of private data “qualifies as an invasion of a ‘private domain, much like an act of trespass would be’” and “is closely analogous to historical claims for invasion of privacy.” *Fox v. Dakkota Integrated Sys., LLC*, 980 F.3d 1146, 1155 (7th Cir. 2020) (emphasis added) (cleaned up) (collecting cases and holding that a plaintiff’s claim that her workplace unlawfully retained and shared her biometric data with a third-party was sufficiently analogous to historical claims for invasion of privacy to establish an Article III injury).

Accordingly, the Court concludes that the tort of intrusion upon seclusion is a sufficient analogue for the disclosure claims under the Privacy and Social Security Acts. The Plaintiffs have suffered a concrete injury for purposes of Article III standing.

b. Breach of Confidence

The Parties next dispute whether the tort of breach of confidence provides an analogue. Pls.’ Mot. 14; Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 20–21; Texas Mot. 14–15. The tort of breach of confidence—“a harm that has traditionally been regarded as providing a basis for a lawsuit in English or American courts”—“‘lies where a person offers private information to a third party in confidence and the third party reveals that information’ to another.” *Jeffries v. Volume Servs. Am., Inc.*, 928 F.3d 1059, 1064 (D.C. Cir. 2019) (first quoting *Spokeo*, 578 U.S. at 340–41; and then quoting *Muransky v. Godiva Chocolatier, Inc.*, 922 F.3d 1175, 1190–91 (11th Cir. 2019)). Importantly, breach of confidence bears a close resemblance to the Privacy Act’s prohibition on “disclosure” or “use of [a] record for a purpose which is [in]compatible with the purpose for which it was collected.”

5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(7), (b)(3). “[T]here is good reason to infer[, then,] that Congress relied upon [this] tort[] in drafting the Act,” *Cooper*, 566 U.S. at 295, and that a violation of this provision in the Privacy Act is a close “analogue” to breach of confidence, *TransUnion*, 594 U.S. at 424. Accordingly, the Court agrees that the Plaintiffs’ Privacy Act claim challenging the “wrongful sharing of sensitive information” through SAVE “bears a close relationship to the harms traditionally redressable through . . . breach of confidence” as well. *League of United Latin Am. Citizens v. Exec. Off. of the President*, 818 F. Supp. 3d 34, 110 (D.D.C. 2026).

c. Defamation

Finally, the Plaintiffs also rely on the common law tort of defamation as an analogue for their disclosure injuries. Pls.’ Mot. 16. “Under longstanding American law, a person is injured when a defamatory statement ‘that would subject him to hatred, contempt, or ridicule’ is published to a third party.” *TransUnion*, 594 U.S. at 432 (quoting *Milkovich v. Lorain Journal Co.*, 497 U.S. 1, 13 (1990)) (citing Restatement (First) of Torts § 559 (A.L.I. 1938)). “Any act whereby the defamatory matter is intentionally or negligently communicated to a third person is a publication.” Restatement (First) of Torts § 577 cmt. a (A.L.I. 1938). Thus, when a plaintiff is “injured by [the] dissemination of allegedly inaccurate information” to a third party—that injury “bears a close relationship to the common-law tort of defamation” and constitutes an Article III injury. *Ranjan v. U.S. DHS*, 747 F. Supp. 3d 192, 199–200 (D.D.C. 2024). As another judge in this District has explained:

To understand this [harm], it is useful to begin with the Supreme Court’s decision in *TransUnion*. The plaintiff class sued TransUnion, a credit reporting agency, arguing that it had “failed to use reasonable procedures to ensure the accuracy of their credit files.” 594 U.S. at 417. For about 1,800 class members, TransUnion had disseminated misleading credit reports to businesses, “label[ing] the class members as potential terrorists, drug traffickers, or serious criminals.” *Id.* at 432. The Court analogized that injury to the tort of defamation . . . [where] “a person is injured when a defamatory statement ‘that would subject him to hatred, contempt, or

ridicule’ is published to a third party.” *Id.* (quoting [*Milkovich*, 497 U.S. at 13]). Because those class members had “suffered a harm with a ‘close relationship’ to the harm associated with the tort of defamation,” the Court had “no trouble concluding” that they had experienced a concrete harm sufficient to confer standing. *Id.* . . . [But] the Court held that the roughly 6,000 [other] class members whose inaccurate reports had never been disseminated could not satisfy the concrete-harm requirement. *Id.* at 434–35[.]

Ranjan, 747 F. Supp. 3d at 199–200.

Similarly, here, the undisputed record shows that the Plaintiffs’ members have been injured by “dissemination of . . . inaccurate information” falsely indicating that they are non-citizens. *Id.* at 199. Such publication is defamatory not only because it resulted in the revocation or threatened revocation of their voter registrations but because it carries an implication that those members are “serious criminals.” *TransUnion*, 594 U.S. at 432; see 18 U.S.C. § 611 (criminalizing non-citizen voting); *id.* § 1015 (criminalizing voter registration by non-citizens); Press Release, Tex. Sec’y of State, *Texas Completes Citizenship Verifications in the SAVE Database* (Oct. 20, 2025), <https://www.sos.state.tx.us/about/newsreleases/2025/102025.shtml> [https://perma.cc/9WZ2-XVDA] (stating that “individuals who are deemed non-citizens” under SAVE and “that voted in a Texas election will be referred to the Office of the Attorney General” of Texas for investigation). Undoubtedly then, the Plaintiffs have suffered injuries with “a sufficiently close relationship to the harm[s] from . . . false and defamatory statement[s].” *TransUnion*, 594 U.S. at 433.

The Defendants’ arguments to the contrary border on the absurd. The Defendants argue that “a former non-citizen being described as a current non-citizen—even if mistakenly and inaccurately, after naturalization—does not come close to” defamation and “is nothing like being labeled a ‘potential terrorist.’” Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 22; see also Texas Mot. 15. The Defendants’ view on the importance of citizenship bears little resemblance to reality. See *Schneiderman v. United States*, 320 U.S. 118, 122 (1943) (“[I]t is safe to assert that nowhere in the world today is the right of citizenship of greater worth to an individual than it is in this country. It would be difficult to

exaggerate its value and importance. By many it is regarded as the highest hope of civilized men.”); *Kennedy v. Mendoza-Martinez*, 372 U.S. 144, 159 (1963) (“Citizenship is a most precious right.”); *Fedorenko v. United States*, 449 U.S. 490, 506–07 (1981) (citizenship is a “priceless treasure” (quoting *Johnson v. Eisentrager*, 339 U.S. 763, 791 (1950) (Black, J., dissenting))). As evidenced by the actions taken by state authorities in this case, even the mere suggestion of non-citizenship can cause grievous consequences. See *Klapprott v. United States*, 335 U.S. 601, 616 (1949) (Rutledge, J., concurring in judgment) (“To take away a man’s citizenship deprives him of a right no less precious than life or liberty, indeed of one which today comprehends those rights and almost all others.”). This remains as true for a naturalized citizen as any other. See *Luria v. United States*, 231 U.S. 9, 22 (1913) (“Under our Constitution, a naturalized citizen stands on an equal footing with the native citizen in all respects, save that of eligibility to the Presidency.”). Suffice it to say that in the context of voting—where citizenship status can distinguish an engaged voter from a criminal—accusing a registered voter of being a non-citizen counts as, at the very least, “a lesser form” of defamation. *Pileggi*, 146 F.4th at 1227.

* * *

Having found that the Plaintiffs have suffered privacy and reputational injuries, the remaining standing inquiries are easily satisfied. The Defendants do not contest that those injuries are the result of the SAVE modified system, and a favorable decision by this Court would undoubtedly redress those injuries.

2. Voter Injuries

The Plaintiffs next argue that they have suffered cognizable Article III voter injuries that can alternatively provide standing for all their claims. Pls.’ Mot. 16. The Court agrees.

It goes without saying that voting is “a process ‘of the most fundamental significance under our constitutional structure.’” *Bost v. Ill. State Bd. of Elections*, 607 U.S. 71, 77 (2026) (quoting *Ill. Bd. of Elections v. Socialist Workers Party*, 440 U.S. 173, 184 (1979)). Thus, “[t]here is no doubt that the right to vote is a legally protected interest” cognizable under Article III of the Constitution. *Am. Encore v. Fontes*, 152 F.4th 1097, 1111 (9th Cir. 2025). And “[a] plaintiff need not have the franchise wholly denied to suffer injury” to this concrete interest. *Charles H. Wesley Educ. Found., Inc. v. Cox*, 408 F.3d 1349, 1352 (11th Cir. 2005). Voters are injured when “they [a]re wrongly identified as non-citizens” and their franchise is burdened as a result. *Arcia v. Fla. Sec’y of State*, 772 F.3d 1335, 1341 (11th Cir. 2014). Even an “increased risk” of disenfranchisement can make an injury “sufficiently ‘imminent’ for standing purposes.” *Richardson v. Trump*, 496 F. Supp. 3d 165, 179 (D.D.C. 2020) (quoting *Attias v. Carefirst, Inc.*, 865 F.3d 620, 627 (D.C. Cir. 2017)). For instance, in a challenge to an Arizona law requiring the use of SAVE, the Ninth Circuit found that naturalized voters had standing based on evidence that “SAVE may not” have up-to-date “naturalization records,” and the resulting “danger” that “properly registered voters, who in fact are citizens, may have their voter registrations cancelled[,] . . . losing their constitutional right to vote.” *Mi Familia Vota v. Fontes*, 129 F.4th 691, 708–09 (9th Cir. 2025). And the Eleventh Circuit similarly held that naturalized voters had “standing to prospectively challenge” Florida’s “attempt to remove non-citizens from the voter rolls using the SAVE database” based on “potential errors that could occur when the Secretary attempted to confirm their immigration status in various state and federal databases.” *Arcia*, 772 F.3d at 1341.

Here, as the Federal Defendants admit, the “Plaintiffs have found four people who were apparently asked to confirm their citizenship to Texas officials.” Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 24 (citing Nel Decl.; A. Doe Decl.; B. Doe Decl.; C. Doe Decl.). Sworn declarations from those individuals

establish that they were naturalized citizens with inaccurate SSA records; that Texas threatened to revoke their voter registrations because of information obtained through the modified SAVE system; and that they were required to confirm their citizenship to maintain their voter registrations. *See, e.g.*, Nel Decl. ¶¶ 19–21, 24–26, 34 & Exs. 1, 2; A. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 11–14 & Ex. 1; B. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 11–17, 21–22, 24–28, 30–31, 39; C. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 12–14, 18 & Ex. 1. Two members had to provide proof of citizenship to maintain their registered voter status. A. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 11–14; C. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 12–14, 18. One member had her voter registration revoked without her knowledge and was asked to submit new documentation to restore her registration. B. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 11–17, 21–22, 24–27, 30–31. And two members’ voter registrations remained revoked at the time that they filed their declarations in this case. Nel Decl. ¶¶ 19–26; B. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 30–31. The Defendants have neither disputed this sworn testimony nor challenged their introduction. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c) (requiring a party opposing summary judgment to point to a contrary portion of the record, assert the presence of a dispute, or argue evidence is inadmissible in order to show a genuine dispute of material fact).⁶ On this record, the Plaintiffs’ voter injuries are sufficient to confer standing.

The Defendants’ arguments do not alter this conclusion. First, the Defendants ask this Court to “infer[] . . . that, after denial of their preliminary-injunction motion,” the “Plaintiffs went searching for affected individuals, found a few, and signed them up for membership.” Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 13. If the Defendants are arguing that the Plaintiff organizations engaged in improper solicitation, they cite no record evidence whatsoever to support that claim. And they never asked

⁶ Although Rule 56 operates differently with respect to a court’s review of an administrative record, Rule 56(c), alongside that rule’s other provisions, governs the consideration of declarations in support of standing at the summary judgment posture, even in APA cases. *See, e.g., Teva Pharms. USA, Inc. v. U.S. FDA*, 514 F. Supp. 3d 66, 89 n.3 (D.D.C. 2020).

this Court for discovery on this issue. *See* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 13 n.6 (noting that the Federal Defendants requested this information, did not receive it, but never raised the issue before the Court); Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e)(2) (permitting the Court to “consider [a] fact undisputed” if the opposing party fails to properly address it). Regardless, the Court can think of no reason why this is relevant to the standing inquiry, and the Defendants certainly do not explain why.

Next, the Defendants characterize the voting-related injury suffered by the member whose voter registration was cancelled because of the modified SAVE as a “past injury.” Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 24; Texas Mot. 12. They are wrong. This member was facing “continuing, present adverse effects” when the Plaintiffs filed this lawsuit by virtue of her voter registration being cancelled—which is more than enough to satisfy Article III. *O’Shea v. Littleton*, 414 U.S. 488, 495–96 (1974). And nothing in the record suggests that this injury has been redressed. *Nel Decl.* ¶ 26.

Relatedly, the Federal Defendants suggest that no Article III injury exists because the identified members “hav[e] now had the opportunity to correct their records” and have not claimed “any paperwork issues” preventing them from doing so. Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 24–25; Fed. Defs.’ Reply 10. But it is well established that the need to take “affirmative steps to avoid the risk of harm” is itself an Article III injury. *Meese v. Keene*, 481 U.S. 465, 475 (1987). And the “disruption of daily activities” to correct one’s citizenship information to vote is an injury-in-fact under Article III. *Env’t Def. Fund v. FERC*, 2 F.4th 953, 971 (D.C. Cir. 2021) (quoting *Sierra Club v. FERC*, 867 F.3d 1357, 1366 (D.C. Cir. 2017)); *B. Doe Dec.*; ¶¶ 19–23 (describing various phone calls with Texas election officials to determine why their voter registration was cancelled and how to fix it). The same is true of the pocket-book injury of “even a small amount of money,” such as the cost of printing, postage, and obtaining an envelope to correct one’s voter registration. *Czyzewski v. Jevic Holding Corp.*, 580 U.S. 451, 464 (2017); *see also Mack v. Resurgent Cap.*

Servs., L.P., 70 F.4th 395, 405–07 (7th Cir. 2023) (holding that the time, effort, and money for postage that a consumer spent responding to improper debt collector communication constituted a concrete injury); *Ebaugh v. Mediacredit, Inc.*, No. 24-1838, 2025 WL 1088077, at *1 (8th Cir. Apr. 11, 2025) (same); *See* B. Doe Decl. ¶ 23 (resubmitting voter registration forms was necessary when their voter registration was cancelled due to SAVE).

In any event, “past wrongs may serve as evidence” of “a real and immediate threat of repeated injury” as well. *Jibril v. Mayorkas*, 20 F.4th 804, 814 (D.C. Cir. 2021) (cleaned up) (quoting *N.B. ex rel. Peacock v. District of Columbia*, 682 F.3d 77, 84 (D.C. Cir. 2012)). That risk is particularly pronounced on this record. The Plaintiffs have produced affidavits from individuals whose citizenship status in SSA records is incorrect and who live in states that have agreements with the Federal Defendants to use the modified SAVE to purge voter rolls. J. Doe 4 Decl. ¶¶ 8–12; J. Doe 6 Decl. ¶¶ 5, 14–15. The administrative record shows that DHS “assumes the accuracy of the Social Security Administration data” in its operation of SAVE, and thus, the system runs the risk of “incomplete or false results” when individuals with inaccurate SSA data are run through it. DHS AR 260; DHS AR 302; *see also* DHS AR 760 n.2. Indeed, the State of Texas does not dispute that an independent investigation in Travis County, Texas, found that “twenty-five percent of the non-citizen matches” in that county were individuals who had already proven citizenship in the United States. Texas Mot. 17 (quoting Am. Compl. ¶¶ 141–42). The administrative record also shows that, pursuant to its template agreement, DHS requires SAVE users to “contact the registrant or registered voter to obtain proof of U.S. citizenship” “in all cases where the User Agency receives any SAVE response other than that of U.S. citizen.” DHS AR 762. Thus, the Plaintiffs have shown that their members will necessarily need to take “affirmative steps to avoid the risk of harm” that accompanies being labeled a potentially ineligible voter should the modified SAVE system

continue to operate. *Meese*, 481 U.S. at 475. This is sufficient to demonstrate an Article III injury. *See Mi Familia Vota*, 129 F.4th at 708–09; *Arcia*, 772 F.3d at 1341; *League of Women Voters of the U.S. v. Newby*, 838 F.3d 1, 8 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (holding that the “experience of the Kansas League” showed it was “almost certain that similar obstacles to registration will spring up in Alabama and Georgia when those States decide to enforce their [proof-of-citizenship] laws”).

The Defendants make much of the fact that only a small proportion of the U.S. electorate are naturalized voters with potentially inaccurate citizenship data in SSA records. This is a red herring. The fact that only a “tiny number” of people are impacted by unlawful activity does not mean that an Article III injury is not present. *Contra* Texas Mot. 16. Members of the Plaintiff organizations are among those people—they live in States that have agreed to use SAVE data to purge voter rolls and their SSA citizenship data is out of date. J. Doe 4 Decl. ¶¶ 8–12; Doe 6 Decl. ¶¶ 5, 15. The rule is not that an injury must be a generally shared grievance for it to be brought in federal court. Rather, to sustain an action, an organization need only show that “one of its members” suffered a particularized harm. *Institutional S’holder Servs.*, 142 F.4th at 764 (quoting *Wash. All. of Tech. Workers*, 50 F.4th at 175). And in this context, “even one disenfranchised voter” is one “too many.” *League of Women Voters of N.C. v. North Carolina*, 769 F.3d 224, 244 (4th Cir. 2014).

Having established cognizable voter injuries, the Court turns to causation and redressability. The Federal Defendants contend that the Plaintiffs’ voter injuries are caused by “the independent action of some third party not before the court”—namely, states such as Texas. Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 25–26 (citation omitted). Before addressing the Federal Defendants’ argument head on, the Court notes that Texas is now a Defendant in this case. And “[w]hen a party intervenes, it becomes a full participant in the lawsuit and is treated just as if it were an original party”—the

Court’s decision constitutes a “complete adjudication” on the merits and “the possibility that the plaintiff will be able to obtain relief against the intervenor-defendant is part of the price paid for intervention.” *Schneider v. Dumbarton Devs., Inc.*, 767 F.2d 1007, 1017 (D.C. Cir. 1985) (first quoting *United States v. Oregon*, 657 F.2d 1009, 1014 (8th Cir. 1981); and then quoting *District of Columbia v. MSPB*, 762 F.2d 129, 132 (D.C. Cir. 1985)); *see also Food & Water Watch v. U.S. EPA*, 5 F. Supp. 3d 62, 67 n.1 (D.D.C. 2013); *Donovan v. Oil, Chem., & Atomic Workers Int’l Union & Its Loc. 4-23*, 718 F.2d 1341, 1350–51 (5th Cir. 1983); *United States v. Jim*, 891 F.3d 1242, 1252–53 (11th Cir. 2018).

Nevertheless, the Federal Defendants’ argument about third parties does not change the result. As the Federal Defendants recognize, Article III “requires no more than *de facto* causality.” *Dep’t of Com. v. New York*, 588 U.S. 752, 768 (2019) (quoting *Block v. Meese*, 793 F.2d 1303, 1309 (D.C. Cir. 1986) (Scalia, J.)); Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 26–27. A plaintiff has standing to sue the federal government if “‘third parties will likely react’ to the government[’s] [action] (or judicial relief) ‘in predictable ways’ that will likely cause (or redress) the plaintiff’s injury.” *Diamond Alt. Energy, LLC v. EPA*, 606 U.S. 100, 112 (2025) (quoting *Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine*, 602 U.S. 367, 383 (2024)). The Defendants argue that states are the true cause of the Plaintiffs’ injuries because “[n]o voter is cancelled from the rolls based solely on a SAVE response”; rather, Texas engages in “additional verification” before cancelling voter registration. Texas Mot. 17; *see also* Fed. Defs.’ Mot 26–27. But as explained above, that additional verification is itself an Article III injury. And the undisputed record shows that the Plaintiffs’ members suffer that injury because “SAVE records show that [they] are not . . . United States citizen[s].” B. Doe Decl., Ex. 2. It is hardly surprising that additional voter verification and potential voter disenfranchisement is “the predictable effect of” the federal government incorrectly informing a state that an individual may

be ineligible to vote. *Hawkins v. Haaland*, 991 F.3d 216, 225 (D.C. Cir. 2021) (quoting *New York*, 588 U.S. at 768).

Furthermore, this injury “is likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial decision.” *Students for Fair Admissions*, 600 U.S. at 199 (quoting *Spokeo*, 578 U.S. at 338). Reverting SAVE to its prior functionality before the recent changes—without the inaccurate SSA data labeling the Plaintiffs’ members as non-citizens—would likely redress the Plaintiffs’ harms. Their future harms from “potential errors” would certainly be redressed. *Arcia*, 772 F.3d at 1341; *see also Mi Familia Vota*, 129 F.4th at 708–09.

3. Procedural Injuries

Finally, the Parties seem to dispute whether the Plaintiffs have standing to pursue their procedural claims under the Privacy Act and the APA as well. *See* Pls.’ Mot. 22–25; Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 11–32; Texas Mot. 12–21. The Court finds that these injuries, too, are sufficient to support standing.

Again, to demonstrate standing, a plaintiff must show: (1) that she suffered an “injury in fact” that is concrete, particularized, and imminent, (2) that there is a fairly traceable “causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of,” and (3) that it is “likely” rather than “speculative” that “the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision.” *Dep’t of Educ. v. Brown*, 600 U.S. 551, 561 (2023) (quoting *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 560–61). But for a procedural injury, “courts relax—while not wholly eliminating—the issues of imminence and redressability[.]” *Ctr. for L. & Educ. v. Dep’t of Educ.*, 396 F.3d 1152, 1157 (D.C. Cir. 2005); *see Brown*, 600 U.S. at 561. A plaintiff need only show “some concrete interest that is affected by the deprivation.” *Brown*, 600 U.S. at 562 (quoting *Summers v. Earth Island Inst.*, 555 U.S. 488, 496–97 (2009)). A plaintiff need not demonstrate that observing proper procedure “would have led to (caused) a

different substantive outcome.” *Id.* at 565–66. Rather, the question is whether an agency’s “*substantive* decisions” have any “causal relationship” to the interests that the plaintiff seeks to vindicate. *Id.* at 566.

For instance, “a plaintiff with concrete plans to observe nature in a particular area ‘would be harmed if [a] [land-management project] went forward without incorporation of the ideas he would have suggested’ in his comments.” *Id.* (second alteration in original) (quoting *Summers*, 555 U.S. at 494). This is true even if it is “uncertain whether public comment would alter [that] particular land-management decision[.]” *Id.* “A person ‘living adjacent to the site for proposed construction of a federally licensed dam’” similarly “has standing to challenge the licensing agency’s failure to prepare an environmental impact statement, even though he cannot establish with any certainty that the statement will cause the license to be withheld or altered.” *Id.* at 561 (quoting *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 572 n.7). “In th[ese] context[s], the fact that the defendant might well come to the same decision[s] after abiding by the contested procedural requirement does not deprive a plaintiff of standing.” *Id.* at 561–62. On the other hand, a plaintiff cannot bring a procedural challenge to an agency action that bears no relationship to the “*substantive* decisions” made by that agency. *Id.* at 566. For instance, a plaintiff whose application for a statutory benefit was denied cannot challenge an agency’s procedure in deciding “to give other people [that benefit] under a different statutory scheme.” *Id.* at 565 (emphasis omitted). That plaintiff’s injury—denial of the statutory benefit—cannot be “traced” because the agency’s procedures governed a different kind of benefit altogether. *Id.* at 567 (quoting *Simon v. Eastern Ky. Welfare Rights Org.*, 426 U.S. 26, 42–43 (1976)). The question is whether the “procedural right” a plaintiff seeks to vindicate has any bearing on the “protect[ion]” of the “concrete interest[s]” of that plaintiff. *Ctr. for L. & Educ.*, 396 F.3d at 1157 (emphasis omitted).

Here, as discussed, the Plaintiffs’ “legally protect[able] interest[s]” in privacy and voting have been put at risk by the Federal Defendants’ failure to comply with the procedural requirements of the Privacy Act and the APA. *See Fontes*, 152 F.4th at 1111. And the Federal Defendants’ failure to follow these procedures deprived the Plaintiffs of the “adequate safeguards . . . to prevent misuse of [their] information” that the law provides. Privacy Act of 1974 § 2(b)(1), (4), 88 Stat. at 1896. Without these safeguards, the Plaintiffs were subject to nonconsensual disclosure of their private information to DHS and SAVE users and the voter injuries that resulted from inaccuracies in that data—the types of harms that these procedures were designed to remedy. Undoubtedly then, the Plaintiffs have also shown that they have met the relaxed standard for procedural standing based on the threat to their privacy and voting interests.

* * *

In sum, the Plaintiffs have unlocked three doors to show concrete injuries suffered by their members. And with causation and redressability, they have sufficiently met their burden of establishing Article III standing.

B. Final Agency Action

Moving to the next threshold argument, the Defendants contend that the establishment of the modified SAVE system outlined in the DHS and SSA SORNs does not constitute a final agency action reviewable under the APA. Texas Mot. 21–23; Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 36–38. This does not pass muster.

The APA only permits review of “final agency action.” 5 U.S.C. § 704. An agency action is final if it is (1) “the consummation of the agency’s decision-making process,” and (2) an action “by which rights or obligations have been determined, or from which legal consequences will flow.” *Rhea Lana, Inc. v. Dep’t of Lab.*, 824 F.3d 1023, 1026 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (quoting *Bennett v.*

Spear, 520 U.S. 154, 177–78 (1997)). But whether rights or obligations have been determined or “‘legal consequences will flow’ from an agency action is a ‘pragmatic’ inquiry.” *Ipsen Biopharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Azar*, 943 F.3d 953, 956 (D.C. Cir. 2019) (quoting *U.S. Army Corps of Eng’rs v. Hawkes Co.*, 578 U.S. 590, 599 (2016)). Courts focus on the “concrete consequences” of the “agency action” at issue. *Cal. Cmty. Against Toxics v. EPA*, 934 F.3d 627, 637 (D.C. Cir. 2019).

The D.C. Circuit has long recognized that establishing “a policy of disclosing confidential information without notice” constitutes a final agency action—observing that “permitting [federal] employees to disclose confidential information without notice is surely a ‘consummation of the agency’s decisionmaking process.’” *Venetian Casino Resort, L.L.C. v. EEOC*, 530 F.3d 925, 931 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (quoting *Bennett*, 520 U.S. at 177–78). After all, such a policy both determines “the submitter’s rights” over the information handed over “and the agency’s obligations” on how to handle that information. *Id.* (cleaned up). This is the exact result of the establishment of the SAVE “modified system” outlined in the 2025 SORNs. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,948 (DHS AR 114); *see also* Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 50,879–84 (SSA AR 206–11). Those SORNs—which “illuminate[] the nature of the policy”—reflect that establishing the modified system constituted the adoption of “a policy of disclosing confidential information without notice.” *Venetian Casino*, 530 F.3d at 931. Thus, establishing the SAVE modified system of records, as it is described in the 2025 SORNs, is a final agency action.

In addition, the Plaintiffs challenge the SORNs themselves, which also count as final agency action. *See* Pls.’ Reply 23. The SORNs permitted new “routine use[s] of the records contained in the system[]” that they described and laid out “the policies and practices of the agency

regarding storage, retrievability, access controls, retention, and disposal of the records.” 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(4)(D)–(E); *see* Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,948–49 (DHS AR 114–15); Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 50,880 (SSA AR 207).⁷

The Defendants try to argue otherwise by relying on the D.C. Circuit’s decision in *Centro de Trabajadores Unidos v. Bessent*, 167 F.4th 1218, 1236 (D.C. Cir. 2026). Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 37–38; Texas Mot. 5. But that case is inapposite. There, the D.C. Circuit held that when the “text of the statute unambiguously authorizes . . . disclosure” of information, then a memorandum of understanding explaining how that mandated disclosure will be executed is not a final agency action. *Centro de Trabajadores Unidos*, 167 F.4th at 1234. This is because the memorandum “does not impose binding duties—and therefore causes no legal consequences—when it merely clarifies existing duties under a statute.” *Id.* at 1236 (cleaned up).

But unlike the statute at issue in *Centro*, the Privacy Act only authorizes a routine use disclosure “within the scope of a routine use notice published by the agency.” *Ames v. U.S. DHS*, 861 F.3d 238, 240 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (citing 5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(7), (e)(4)(D)). Thus, the 2025 DHS and SSA SORNs are undoubtedly final agency actions, because the “concrete consequence[]” of their promulgation is authorizing the challenged disclosures to occur, a consequence not authorized by any other separate statutory mandate. *Cal. Cmty. Against Toxics*, 934 F.3d at 637; *see Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. v. Browner*, 215 F.3d 45, 48 (D.C. Cir. 2000) (“[D]ocument[s] reflecting a settled agency position and having legal consequences . . . may constitute ‘final agency action’ for

⁷ The 2025 SSA SORN provided that its authorization of new routine uses would become automatically effective after thirty days. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. 50,879, 50,880 (Nov. 12, 2025) (SSA AR 207) Thus, even if the SORN did not constitute final agency action when it was issued, it certainly does now.

the purpose of judicial review.”). The SORNs act both as final “agency statement[s] of . . . future effect designed to implement” the modified SAVE system and “license[s]” “permit[ting]” or acting as a “form of permission” for the system, routine uses, and disclosures that they outline. *Norton v. S. Utah Wilderness All.*, 542 U.S. 55, 62 (2004) (first alteration in original) (quoting 5 U.S.C. § 551). Both the establishment of the modified SAVE system described by the 2025 SORNs and the SORNs themselves are final agency actions that may be challenged under the APA.

C. The Social Security Act

Turning to the merits, the Plaintiffs first argue that the modified SAVE system of records violates the Social Security Act. They are correct.⁸

The Social Security Act instructs that: “Social security account numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained by authorized persons pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990, shall be confidential, and no authorized person shall disclose any such social security account number or related record.” 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). An “authorized person” is “an officer or employee of the United States, an officer or employee of any State, political subdivision of a State, or agency of a State or political subdivision of a State, and any other person” who has access to such records. *Id.* § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(III).

There can be no question that the modified SAVE system violates this prohibition—the system discloses both Social Security numbers and related records maintained by SSA. And the Defendants do not argue otherwise. Instead, they contend that the Plaintiffs lack a cause of action to enforce the Social Security Act—relying on inapposite cases where the relevant cause of action

⁸ Because the Plaintiffs succeed on their Social Security Act claim based on 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), the Court does not address their alternative argument that the modified SAVE also violates 42 U.S.C. § 1306(a)(1). Pls.’ Mot. 32.

was not the APA. Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 50 (citing *Biccum v. City of Watertown*, No. 17-cv-645, 2019 WL 4752927 (N.D.N.Y. Sep. 30, 2019) (concerning a Section 1983 claim)). But the Defendants ignore that “the APA provides an omnibus cause of action for violations of other statutes.” *FDA v. R. J. Reynolds Vapor Co.*, 606 U.S. 226, 232 n.4 (2025). The Plaintiffs’ claim challenging compliance with the Social Security Act was brought under the APA. *See* Am Compl. ¶ 204. And the APA’s judicial review provision, 5 U.S.C. § 702, “permits suit[s]” by any person aggrieved by agency action “for violations of numerous statutes of varying character that do not themselves include causes of action for judicial review.” *Lexmark Int’l, Inc. v. Static Control Components, Inc.*, 572 U.S. 118, 130 (2014). The Defendants do not explain why the APA’s cause of action may not be used to remedy the Plaintiffs’ injuries caused by violations of the Social Security Act. Indeed, the Defendants’ briefs are devoid of any mention of this subject. *See* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 49–50; Texas Mot. 26–27. Accordingly, the Defendants have conceded both (1) that an APA cause of action exists for this claim, and (2) that the Social Security Act forbids disclosure of SSA data to DHS or in responses to SAVE users. *Texas v. United States*, 798 F.3d 1108, 1110 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (“[I]f a party files an opposition to a motion and therein addresses only some of the movant’s arguments, the court may treat the unaddressed arguments as conceded.” (quoting *Wannall v. Honeywell, Inc.*, 775 F.3d 425, 428 (D.C. Cir. 2014))). By itself, this is sufficient for the Plaintiffs to prevail.⁹

D. The Privacy Act

But there is more. Turning to the Privacy Act, the Plaintiffs argue that the SAVE modified system violates the Act’s substantive and procedural protections. Pls.’ Mot. 35–40. The

⁹ The Defendants do argue that other statutes authorize the disclosure notwithstanding the Social Security Act, which the Court addresses below. *See infra* Discussion F; *see also* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 49–50; Texas Mot. 26–27.

Defendants challenge the Plaintiffs’ ability to bring these claims under the APA and argue that they fail in any event. *See* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 54–59. The Plaintiffs’ arguments are more persuasive.

1. Other-Adequate-Remedy Bar

First, the Defendants argue that the Plaintiffs’ Privacy Act claims fail because “judicial review” under the APA is not available when there is “[an]other adequate remedy in a court.” 5 U.S.C. § 704; Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 39. They point out that the Privacy Act provides judicial remedies for some violations but does not authorize equitable relief to enforce the statute’s notice and comment requirements or its limitations on disclosure. *See* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 40–41 (citing 5 U.S.C. § 552a(g)); *see also Sussman v. U.S. Marshals Serv.*, 494 F.3d 1106, 1122 (D.C. Cir. 2007). Because the Privacy Act provides limited avenues for judicial review, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(g), the Federal Defendants argue that Section 704 precludes APA relief based on that “other . . . remedy,” 5 U.S.C. § 704. *See* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 39; Texas Mot. 23–24.

It is true that courts in this District have precluded APA suits for Privacy Act violations when they “duplicate existing procedures for review of agency action.” *Haleem v. U.S. Dep’t of Def.*, No. 23-cv-1471, 2024 WL 230289, at *13–14 (D.D.C. Jan. 22, 2024) (quoting *Bowen v. Massachusetts*, 487 U.S. 879, 903 (1988)). But these precedents are inapplicable to the statute’s procedural requirements, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(4), (11), and to forward-looking remedies to enforce the statute’s disclosure provisions, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b), for which the Privacy Act does not “offer[] relief of the same genre,” *Haleem*, 2024 WL 230289, at *13 (quoting *Garcia v. Vilsack*, 563 F.3d 519, 522 (D.C. Cir. 2009)). Rather than suggesting a bar on APA review, the “absence of equitable relief” for these claims in the Privacy Act’s judicial review provisions is easily “explained by the availability of such relief under the APA,” *Cooper*, 566 U.S. at 303 n.12 (characterizing *Doe v. Chao*, 540 U.S. 614, 619 n.1 (2004)); *see also id.* (“The [Privacy] Act deters violations of its

substantive provisions in other ways—for instance . . . possibly by allowing for injunctive relief under the [APA]” (citations omitted)).¹⁰

Indeed, the D.C. Circuit has held that APA equitable or vacatur relief is available for Privacy Act violations in a case where “the Privacy Act does not by itself authorize the injunctive relief sought” by a plaintiff. *Doe v. Stephens*, 851 F.2d 1457, 1463, 1465–67 (D.C. Cir. 1988) (challenging agency disclosure as not constituting a routine use under 5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(7), (b)). Various district courts have similarly rejected the Defendants’ reading of Section 704. *See Ctr. for Taxpayer Rts. v. IRS*, 815 F. Supp. 3d 1, 43 (D.D.C. 2025); *Am. Fed’n of Gov’t Emps. v. U.S. OPM*, 786 F. Supp. 3d 647, 691–92 (S.D.N.Y. 2025); *Doe v. Noem*, 783 F. Supp. 3d 907, 923–24 (W.D. Va. 2025). And the Supreme Court has cautioned that the APA’s other-adequate-remedy bar, 5 U.S.C. § 704, should be “construed” narrowly and primarily to avoid “duplication,” rather than “to defeat the [APA’s] central purpose of providing a broad spectrum of judicial review of agency action.” *Bowen*, 487 U.S. at 903. “The mere fact that some acts are made reviewable,” *Abbott*

¹⁰ The Court notes that the inquiry is more complex for 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(5) and (e)(6), which require federal agencies to ensure the “accura[cy], complete[ess], timel[iness], and relevan[ce]” of records maintained to “mak[e] any determination about any individual” or that are “disseminated . . . to any person other than an agency.” These provisions are violated when it is reasonably “feasible, necessary, and proper for the agency . . . to determine whether each filed item of information is accurate,” timely, and relevant, but the agency fails to do so. *Strang v. U.S. Arms Control & Disarmament Agency*, 864 F.2d 859, 866 (D.C. Cir. 1989) (quoting *Doe v. United States*, 821 F.2d 694 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (en banc)). The Privacy Act provides for some injunctive relief when an agency fails to correct records “which the individual believes is not accurate, relevant, timely, or complete.” 5 U.S.C. § 552a(d)(2)–(3), (g)(1)(A). But the D.C. Circuit has made clear that the Privacy Act’s remedial provisions were not “intended to be [the] exclusive” remedies for such violations. *Vymetalik v. F.B.I.*, 785 F.2d 1090, 1098 n.12 (D.C. Cir. 1986). And it is evident that Sections 552(e)(5) and (6) were violated here. *See, e.g.*, DHS AR 240 (finding “risk” that the modified SAVE “may share inaccurate information with registered agencies”); DHS AR 260 (recognizing the modified SAVE’s “[s]hortfalls in data accuracy”); DHS AR 302 (same); SSA AR 44 (“[C]itizenship information in SSA’s records might not be current.”). Nevertheless, the Court does not rest its conclusion with respect to the Privacy Act on these violations given that the Federal Defendants also violated other provisions of the Privacy Act for which there is unambiguously no adequate relief for the Plaintiffs other than 5 U.S.C. §§ 702, 706.

Lab'ys v. Gardner, 387 U.S. 136, 141 (1967) (citation omitted), or that “a naked money judgment” could be sought does not preclude APA review, *Bowen*, 487 U.S. at 905.

Stepping back, it is unclear whether the APA’s other-adequate-remedy bar even applies to the Privacy Act. 5 U.S.C. § 704. Although courts commonly use terms like the “Administrative Procedure Act” (or the “Freedom of Information Act”) to refer to the parts of Title 5 that carry forward the substantive provisions of that Act, that language is technically imprecise. It is true that the provisions of Chapter 5 and Chapter 7 of Title 5 “were originally enacted by act June 11, 1946, ch. 324, 60 Stat. 237, popularly known as the ‘Administrative Procedure Act.’” 5 U.S.C. ch. 5, subch. II note. But the Administrative Procedure Act was actually “repealed as part of [a] general revision” by Congress in 1966. *Id.* In that revision, Congress repealed various statutes “relating to the organization of government” and reenacted them as a single consolidated “Act” known as “title 5.” Pub. L. No. 89–554, pmb., §§ 7(a), 8, 80 Stat. 378, 378, 631–32 (1966). The APA was one of the statutes repealed, *id.* § 8, 80 Stat. at 632 (repealing the APA, Pub. L. No. 79–404, 60 Stat. 237 (1946)), and Congress reenacted its provisions throughout the new “Act” “without substantive change,” Pub. L. No. 89–554 § 7(a), 80 Stat. at 631. Thus, although courts popularly use terms like the “Administrative Procedure Act”—there is in fact no Administrative Procedure Act, just Title 5. *See id.* § 7(b), 80 Stat at 631 (“A reference to a law replaced by sections 1–6 of this Act, including a reference in a regulation, order, or other law, is deemed to refer to the corresponding provision enacted by this Act.”); *Univ. of Cincinnati v. Shalala*, 891 F. Supp. 1262, 1269 n.18 (S.D. Ohio 1995) (“Defendant cites to the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). The APA was, however, repealed by Pub. L. No. 89–554, Sept. 6, 1966, 80 Stat. 381. The former APA’s provisions were incorporated into 5 U.S.C. ch. 5 and 7.” (citation omitted)).

Importantly, in 1974, Congress enacted the Privacy Act as an amendment to that Act, Title 5, and placed it in Chapter 5 alongside the APA’s provisions. Privacy Act of 1974 pmbl., 88 Stat. at 1896 (“To amend title 5, United States Code, by adding a section 552a[.]”). Thus, it is unclear whether the other-adequate-remedy bar (Section 704 of Title 5) directs a comparison between relief under the Privacy Act and relief under the APA. Think of it this way. Section 704 asks whether “there is no *other* adequate remedy in a court” to review “final agency action,” 5 U.S.C. § 704 (emphasis added), meaning that “APA review is not available if Congress has provided a ‘special and adequate review procedure’ elsewhere,” *V.I. Hous. Fin. Auth. v. Fed’l Emergency Mgmt. Agency*, 151 F.4th 409, 418 (D.C. Cir. 2025) (quoting *Bowen*, 487 U.S. at 904)). But review under the Privacy Act might not count as review “elsewhere,” *id.*, given that both the Privacy Act and the APA might be properly conceived of as components of the same scheme: Title 5. Compare 5 U.S.C. § 552a(g) (authorizing “civil action[s] against [an] agency” regarding “the matters under the provisions of this subsection”), with *id.* § 702 (entitling aggrieved persons “to judicial review”); cf. *id.* § 552a(d)(3) (referring to § 552a(g)(1)(A) as provisions for “judicial review”). This would explain why the “inattention” to detail in the Privacy Act’s equitable relief provisions is largely “explained by the general provisions for equitable relief within the Administrative Procedure Act” provisions of Title 5. *Doe*, 540 U.S. at 619 n.1.¹¹

¹¹ Indeed, the APA’s typical remedy for a violation of Title 5 is to “set aside” the agency action altogether. 5 U.S.C. § 706. But for some violations not at issue here, the Privacy Act provides for lesser, more tailored equitable relief. See 5 U.S.C. § 552a(g)(2)–(3) (authorizing the court to order lesser remedies of amending records or mandating disclosure when an agency violates provisions in 5 U.S.C. § 552a(d)). Authorizing courts to grant lesser relief for some violations does not mean that the ordinary set-aside remedy is no longer available for others (*e.g.*, failure to provide notice and comment). See *Bowen v. Massachusetts*, 487 U.S. 879, 901 (1988) (remedial schemes providing “doubtful and limited relief” for the violation at issue are not adequate remedies within the meaning of the APA).

This understanding—that Section 704 does not bar Privacy Act relief—is supported by the Office of Management and Budget’s interpretive guidelines “issued contemporaneously with the statute,” *Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369, 394 (2024), which recognized that the Privacy Act’s judicial review provisions would not preclude “judicial review under *other* provisions of the [APA],” OMB Privacy Act Implementation: Guidelines and Responsibilities, 40 Fed. Reg. 28,948, 28,968 (July 9, 1975) (emphasis added). And subsequent enactments show that this was Congress’ understanding, too. Later amendments (not at issue here) expanding civil liability under the Privacy Act have indicated when Privacy Act remedies are “exclusive.” Judicial Redress Act of 2015, Pub. L. No. 114–126, § 2(b), 130 Stat. 282, 282–84 (codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552a note). And “[w]here Congress includes particular language in one section of a statute but omits it in another section of the same Act, it is generally presumed that Congress acts intentionally and purposely in the disparate inclusion or exclusion.” *City & Cnty. of S.F. v. EPA*, 604 U.S. 334, 344 (2025) (quoting *Russello v. United States*, 464 U.S. 16, 23 (1983)). Thus, the statutory scheme and context suggest that Privacy Act claims (when not brought under the provisions explicitly designated exclusive) are neither exclusive nor barred by Section 704 of the APA.

Ultimately, the Defendants ask this Court to discard this statutory structure and depart from the D.C. Circuit’s binding precedent in *Stephens*, arguing that the Circuit’s decision is not entitled to deference because it *sua sponte* construed the plaintiff’s complaint as raising an APA claim. *See* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 42 n.10. But the Defendants do not explain why this means that *Stephens* is entitled to less precedential weight. “[I]t is axiomatic” that any precedential holding of the D.C. Circuit must be “binding on this court.” *Alabama v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng’rs*, 774 F. Supp. 3d 142, 154 (D.D.C. 2025). The Defendants may not like it, but Section 704 is not a bar to the Plaintiffs’ APA claims.

2. Disclosure Claims

On the merits of the disclosure claims, the Plaintiffs argue that the Federal Defendants' disclosure of their SSA data to DHS and SAVE users violates the Privacy Act's protections against non-consensual disclosures. Pls.' Mot. 35. They are plainly correct.

The Privacy Act makes it "unlawful for an agency to disclose a record to another agency" or to any other entity "without the written consent of the person to whom the record pertains." *Cooper*, 566 U.S. at 289 n.2 (citing 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b)). The Act defines a "record" broadly as encompassing "any item, collection, or grouping of information about an individual that is maintained by an agency, including . . . his name, or the *identifying number*, symbol, or other identifying particular assigned to the individual." 5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(4) (emphasis added). And a disclosure encompasses "any means of communication." *Id.* § 552a(b). Thus, the Act is violated whenever there is a "nonconsensual disclosure of any information that has been retrieved from a protected record." *Bartel v. FAA*, 725 F.2d 1403, 1408 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

This limitation is subject to "certain exceptions." *Cooper*, 566 U.S. at 289 n.2. One such exception is a "routine use," which is defined as "the use of such record for a purpose which is compatible with the purpose for which it was collected." 5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(7), (b)(3). "To fit within the confines of the routine-use exception to the Privacy Act, an agency's disclosure of a record must be both (i) 'for a purpose which is compatible with the purpose for which it was collected' and (ii) within the scope of a routine use notice published by the agency." *Ames*, 861 F.3d at 240 (first quoting 5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(7); and then citing *id.* § 552a(e)(4)(D)). "[C]ourts have held that compatibility requires a 'meaningful degree of convergence' between the agency's purpose in collecting the record and the agency's purpose in disclosing the record." *Id.* at 240 n.1 (quoting *Britt v. Naval Investigative Serv.*, 886 F.2d 544, 549 (3d Cir. 1989)) (citing *Swenson v.*

Postal Service, 890 F.2d 1075, 1078 (9th Cir. 1989)); *see also Chichakli v. Tillerson*, 882 F.3d 229, 233–34 (D.C. Cir. 2018).¹²

On this record, the Court concludes that DHS’s use of Social Security numbers and other SSA data for voter verification through SAVE is not a routine use under the Privacy Act. Although the DHS and SSA SORNs adopted new routine uses for SSA data for “citizenship and immigration” verification “to the Department of Homeland Security,” Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 50,880 (SSA AR 207); *see also* Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,954 (DHS AR 120), this does not change the fact that SSA collected this information for purposes concerning work authorization and eligibility for SSA benefits, *see* SSA AR 115–16; SSA AR 132; SSA AR 149; SSA AR 168–69; SSA AR 188–89; Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 50,880 (SSA AR 207). The purpose of collecting such information was never the maintenance of “U.S. citizenship records” for voter verification. SSA AR 103. Indeed, SSA recognizes that its “citizenship information is accurate for SSA’s program purposes” only—“if used later for other purposes, it may not be current.” *Id.*

The Federal Defendants’ response to this argument is underwhelming. The Federal Defendants start by rejecting the premise that SSA “‘collected’ some form of ‘personal data’ from individuals” at all. Fed Defs.’ Mot. 58 (emphasis omitted). That is because, they say, “Social Security numbers are issued by SSA, to individuals”—thus, SSA collected nothing. *Id.* (emphasis

¹² It has long been suggested that the Privacy Act requires “actual notice” of any routine uses at the time the record was collected. *USPS v. Nat’l Ass’n of Letter Carriers*, 9 F.3d 138, 146 (D.C. Cir. 1993); *Covert v. Harrington*, 876 F.2d 751, 755–56 (9th Cir. 1989). This understanding is based on the Privacy Act’s requirement that “the routine uses which may be made of the information, as published pursuant to [the SORN]” must be “on the form which [the agency] uses to collect the information or on a separate form that can be retained by the individual.” 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(3)(C). The Parties do not brief this issue. But without question, the record provides nothing supporting that the Plaintiffs’ members received actual notice that their SSA data would be used for voter verification purposes when they disclosed that information to SSA.

omitted). As an initial matter, it is unclear what the Federal Defendants believe to be the upshot of this argument. Asking about the “purpose for which [a record] was collected” is an inquiry prompted by the routine-use exception, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(7), not the Privacy Act’s prohibition on disclosure, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b), or the definition of record, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(4). The Federal Defendants do not explain why the source of Social Security numbers permits them to circumvent the Privacy Act’s disclosure prohibition.

If the Federal Defendants are arguing that Social Security numbers are not records subject to the Privacy Act’s prohibition on disclosure, that position does not square with the statutory text. Under the Privacy Act, a “record” encompasses any “grouping of information about an individual”—which includes an “identifying number” (such as an SSN), the individual’s “name,” and any other particularized information about that individual (*e.g.*, “criminal or employment history”). 5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(4). The disclosure prohibition comes into effect whenever such a record becomes retrievable by that “name,” “identifying number,” or “identifying particular.” *Id.* § 552a(a)(5), (b). Further, the contemporary ordinary meaning of the verb “collect” at the time the Privacy Act was passed was: “[t]o bring together into a group; gather; assemble”; “[t]o accumulate as a hobby or study”; “[t]o recover control of”; “[t]o gather together; congregate; accumulate.” *Collect*, *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* 261 (New Coll. Ed. 1976). And the contemporary ordinary meaning of the adjective “collected” was “brought together or placed from various sources.” *Id.* Thus, both the statutory definitions and the ordinary meaning of the Privacy Act’s text suggest that an SSN is a record—at least when it is grouped, gathered together, or placed with other personal information. So when an individual fills out a Social Security application with her name and other personal information and SSA attaches an “identifying number” to that information, a record is “collected” within the meaning of the Privacy Act. And

undoubtedly, SSA's master file is a system of records containing private data organized by these identifiers. The Court thus concludes that an SSN and any information accumulated with it are records that are subject to the non-disclosure provisions of the Privacy Act.

As icing on the cake, this understanding is supported by the enactment history of the Privacy Act. When Congress enacted the statute, it created an expert "Privacy Protection Study Commission" to examine government "data banks, automated data processing programs, and information systems"; to recommend practices consistent with "the requirements and principles" of the Act to the President; and to make "legislative recommendations" to Congress "to protect the privacy of individuals while meeting the legitimate needs of government." Privacy Act of 1974 § 5(b), 88 Stat. at 1906 (codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552a note). In particular, Congress instructed the Commission to study the "use of social security numbers . . . to gain access to, integrate, or centralize information systems and files." *Id.* § 5(c)(1)(C), 88 Stat at 1906.

That Commission examined the Internal Revenue Service's (IRS) existing practice of disclosing individuals' "name[s], address[es]," and "Social Security number[s]" "primarily to identify individuals who may have failed to file." Priv. Prot. Study Comm'n, Federal Tax Return Confidentiality, at 46 (June 1976). The Commission concluded that there was "uncertainty" about the IRS's privacy obligations, that the Privacy Act "would appear to constrain [the IRS's] disclosure[] of data about taxpayers," and that the IRS had continued such disclosures after the passage of the Act. *Id.* at 15. The Commission thus recommended "that the Congress permit the Internal Revenue Service to disclose the Social Security numbers of Federal taxpayers in a locality" in certain circumstances. *Id.* at 4. Congress thereafter amended the Internal Revenue Code to authorize this use of Social Security numbers and implement the Commission's recommendation. Tax Reform Act of 1976, Pub. L. No. 94-455, § 1211(c), 90 Stat. 1520, 1712

(codified as amended at 26 U.S.C. § 6109(a), (d)). Indeed, since the enactment of the Privacy Act, Congress has consistently employed express statutory authorizations when it permits disclosure or use of Social Security numbers for verification purposes. Lawyers Defending American Democracy Amicus Br. 12–13 (collecting statutes), ECF No. 87. These provisions would be superfluous if the Federal Defendants were correct and SSNs were not subject to the non-disclosure requirements of the Privacy Act. The Court declines to adopt such an interpretation. *Nielsen v. Preap*, 586 U.S. 392, 414 (2019) (recognizing that courts generally do not construe statutes such that they cause other statutory provisions “to have no consequence” (quoting Antonin Scalia & Bryan A. Garner, *Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts* 174 (2012))).

The Federal Defendants next argue that sharing SSA records to verify U.S. citizenship for voting is a proper routine use because government agencies have widely used the Social Security number as a “means of identifying and gathering information about an individual.” Fed Defs.’ Mot. 58 (citation omitted). But this is irrelevant, as it does not go to why a Social Security number and the accompanying information were “collected” in the first place. 5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(7). The routine-use inquiry looks to whether the disclosure is “compatible with the purpose for which [the record] was collected.” *Id.* And the Defendants fail to explain why the federal government’s collection of private information to assess Social Security benefits has any nexus to state governments’ voter verification efforts.

Finally, the Defendants ask this Court to defer to an OMB interpretation, promulgated over a decade after the Privacy Act was enacted, stating that a routine use encompasses any use that the Executive considers “necessary and proper.” Texas Mot. 29 (citing OMB, Guidance on the Privacy Act, 52 Fed. Reg. 12,990, 12,993 (Apr. 20, 1987)); Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 57 (same). The Defendants concede that the OMB interpretation is less “searching” than the widely accepted interpretation of

the Privacy Act “articulated by the Third Circuit and cited approvingly by the D.C. Circuit” and other courts nationwide, *see* Tex. Mot. 29, but they advance it, nonetheless. It is hard to understand how this argument could survive the Supreme Court’s recent instruction to not afford blind deference to agency interpretations. *See generally Loper Bright Enters. v. Raimondo*, 603 U.S. 369 (2024); *see also USPS v. Nat’l Ass’n of Letter Carriers*, 9 F.3d 138, 148–49 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (Randolph, J., dissenting) (suggesting that the prior regime of “judicial deference” to agency interpretations of the Privacy Act has allowed “the federal government [to] cede[]—lock, stock and barrel—its statutory responsibility under the Privacy Act to preserve the confidentiality of records pertaining to individuals”). And regardless, the statute does not contain the sort of ambiguity that would previously have invited such deference—“the term ‘routine use’ means, with respect to the disclosure of a record, the use of such record for a purpose which is compatible with the purpose for which it was collected.” 5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(7). Indeed, the Defendants fail to identify any language in the statute that supports interpreting the routine-use exception to mean any use designated “necessary and proper” by the Executive Branch. *See* Texas Mot. 29; Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 57.

Without question, it is the duty of Congress, not federal agencies, to determine what is “necessary and proper for carrying into [e]xecution” other enactments. Art. I, § 8, cl. 18. Congress determined that “it is necessary and proper for the Congress” itself, not agencies, “to regulate the collection, maintenance, use, and dissemination of information” “to protect the privacy of individuals identified in information systems maintained by Federal agencies.” Privacy Act of 1974 § 2(a)(5), 88 Stat. at 1896 (codified at 5 U.S.C. § 552a note). And Congress provided that it is the duty of federal agencies to not disclose records for any purpose not “compatible with the purpose for which [the record] was collected.” 5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(7), (b)(3). SSA’s disclosure of

Social Security numbers and associated information that SSA collected to DHS and states for voter verification is not such a “compatible” use.

Meanwhile, Texas argues that the disclosure is authorized under another exception altogether—the law enforcement exception in 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b)(7). That exception permits disclosure for law enforcement “within or under the control of the United States” when “the head of the agency or instrumentality has made a written request to the agency which maintains the record specifying the particular portion desired and the law enforcement activity for which the record is sought.” *Id.*; Texas Mot. 29–30. As the Plaintiffs correctly point out, there is no suggestion that any such request was made. *See* Pls.’ Opp’n 19. Texas does not dispute this point and candidly admits that the “Plaintiff[s] identified several errors in Texas’s Motion.” Texas Reply 1 n.1. So this argument is unavailing as well. The Federal Defendants clearly violated the Privacy Act’s non-disclosure bar by disclosing SSA records to DHS and SAVE users (including states) without the consent of the Plaintiffs’ members. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b).

3. Procedural Claims

Next, the Plaintiffs argue that the establishment of the modified SAVE system outlined in the 2025 SORNs without notice and comment violates the Privacy Act’s procedural protections. Pls.’ Mot. 38–44. The Court agrees.

The Privacy Act requires notice and comment at least thirty days in advance of a “new use or intended use of the information” in a system of records. 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(11). The statute further requires the publication of a SORN “upon establishment or revision” of such a system. *Id.* § 552a(e)(4). Undoubtedly, SAVE is a system of records under the statute—a fact that DHS has

acknowledged in at least eight SORNs,¹³ and in a May 2025 agreement governing data sharing between DHS and SSA, DHS AR 420–31. At a prior stage of these proceedings, the Federal Defendants even conceded that the 2025 modifications to SAVE were substantial enough that the Privacy Act would require notice if it covered SAVE. Mot Hr’g Tr. 69:21–24.

Yet the Defendants failed to publish SORNs at least thirty days before overhauling SAVE. They instead launched the modified SAVE system without a SORN on May 22, 2025. *See* DHS AR 491; DHS AR 493; DHS AR 1385. And they continued the new uses for five months before DHS issued a SORN on October 31, 2025, and SSA issued a SORN on November 12, 2025. *See* Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,948 (DHS AR 114); Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 50,879–80 (SSA AR 206–07). Further, the SORNs—when eventually published—had some curious features. The DHS SORN made clear that the modification was already “effective upon publication”; that relevant individuals could “[s]ubmit comments on or before December 1, 2025”; and that “[n]ew or modified routine uses w[ould] be effective December 1, 2025,” regardless. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,949 (DHS AR 115).

The Plaintiffs argue that the establishment of the modified SAVE system as described in the 2025 SORNs—as well as the SORNs themselves—violated a long line of D.C. Circuit cases holding that an opportunity to comment must be “meaningful,” *Rural Cellular Ass’n v. FCC*, 588 F.3d 1095, 1101 (D.C. Cir. 2009), and that a postponed opportunity for notice and comment can

¹³ *See* Notice of Modified System of Records, 85 Fed. Reg. at 31,798 (DHS AR 108); DHS USCIS–004 SAVE Program System of Records, 81 Fed. Reg. at 78,619; DHS USCIS–004—SAVE Program System of Records, 77 Fed. Reg. at 47,415; USCIS–004 Verification Information System of Records Notice, 73 Fed. Reg. at 75,445; USCIS VIS System of Records Notice, 73 Fed. Reg. at 10,793; Privacy Act: VIS Records Notice, 72 Fed. Reg. at 17,569; Privacy Act of 1974 System of Records, 67 Fed. Reg. at 64,134; Privacy Act of 1974 System of Records, 66 Fed. Reg. at 46,812.

have a “curative effect depend[ing] on the agency’s mind remaining open enough at [that] later stage,” *McLouth Steel Prods. Corp. v. Thomas*, 838 F.2d 1317, 1323 (D.C. Cir. 1988). Undoubtedly, the Federal Defendants’ process was anything but open-minded. The DHS SORN made clear that the modifications to SAVE were immediately effective and that new uses would go into effect automatically on December 1, 2025, on the last day that comments were still being solicited. *See* Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,949 (DHS AR 115). And the SSA SORN added the disclosure of Social Security numbers to DHS as a new routine use long after SSA had already begun such disclosures, offering no opportunity for benefits applicants and concerned persons to offer comments prior to the sharing of their data. *See* DHS AR 431 (May 2025 agreement authorizing disclosure of records); Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 50,880 (SSA AR 207) (notice of new routine use on November 12, 2025). The SAVE notice and comment process thus provided little opportunity for meaningful input and consideration of comments.

The Defendants argue that the line of D.C. Circuit precedents upon which the Plaintiffs rely was overturned by the Supreme Court’s recent instruction in *Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter & Paul Home v. Pennsylvania* that “the APA imposes no general ‘open-mindedness’ requirement on agencies beyond the statute’s specific ‘objective criteria.’” *Bahman Grp. v. Palluconi*, No. 22-cv-3826, 2025 WL 3225196, at *5 (D.D.C. Sep. 29, 2025) (quoting *Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter & Paul Home v. Pennsylvania*, 591 U.S. 657, 685 (2020)); Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 55; Texas Mot. 30–31. But *Little Sisters* was just an application of the “general proposition that courts are not free to impose upon agencies specific procedural requirements that have no basis in the APA.” *Little Sisters*, 591 U.S. at 685 (quoting *Pension Benefit Guar. Corp. v. LTV Corp.*, 496 U.S. 633, 654 (1990)). That rule has little relevance here.

Indeed, in *Little Sisters*, the lower court held that an agency failed to maintain an open mind when its “final rules” were “virtually identical” to their pre-comment counterparts. *Id.* (citation omitted). The Supreme Court recognized that the APA, among other things, “requires that final rules must be published 30 days before they become effective” and that “interested persons” must be provided an opportunity to comment. *Id.* at 685–86. There, the rules at issue “were published on November 15, 2018, [and] did not become effective until January 14, 2019—more than 30 days after being published” and subject to comment. *Id.* at 686. Since the agency “complied with . . . these statutory procedures,” the Supreme Court ruled that the lower court erred in “impos[ing] judge-made procedures in addition to the APA’s mandates” by requiring the agency to “maintain[] an open mind” as well. *Id.* at 684–86 (cleaned up).

Here, unlike in *Little Sisters*, SAVE’s “modified system [was] effective upon publication” of the SORNs, and public comment was permitted only *after the modified SAVE system was implemented*. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,949 (DHS AR 115); *see also* Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 50,880 (SSA AR 207). This is flatly inconsistent with the Privacy Act’s statutory requirement that “notice of any new use or intended use of the information in the system” and “an opportunity” for comment must be provided “at least 30 days prior” to the final SORN. 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(11). And a final SORN must be published “subject to the provisions” of the Act requiring notice and comment. *Id.* § 552a(e)(4). The SSA and DHS SORNs—as well as the modified SAVE system they describe—fail to meet these statutory requirements because they were never preceded by proposed revision notice and comment periods “30 days prior.” *Id.* § 552a(e)(11). Unlike in *Little Sisters* where the final rule was promulgated “more than 30 days after” they were proposed, the 2025 SORNs at issue here

were not in compliance with the “procedural requirements that Congress”—not the courts—established. *Little Sisters*, 591 U.S. at 686 (cleaned up).

“The Privacy Act’s public notice and comment structure is an essential component of the Act and an essential piece of American democracy. Americans deserve to know the nature, scope, and routine uses of the records *before* they are collected by the federal government.” *Weber*, 816 F. Supp. 3d at 1193 (emphasis added); *see also* Privacy Act of 1974 § 2(b)(1), 88 Stat. at 1896 (noting the Privacy Act’s protections seek to “permit an individual to determine what records pertaining to him are collected, maintained, used, or disseminated by such agencies”). Indeed, “[i]t is flatly inconsistent with the text, structure, and purpose of the Privacy Act for an agency to initiate a major new data-sharing program affecting the sensitive data of millions of Americans, then validate that program as a ‘routine use’ months after it has begun.” *League of United Latin Am. Citizens*, 818 F. Supp. 3d at 115–16. These requirements were imposed by Congress—they are not “judge-made.” *Little Sisters*, 591 U.S. at 685 (quoting *Perez v. Mortg. Bankers Ass’n*, 575 U.S. 92, 102 (2015)).

Assuming that the Federal Defendants are correct and *Little Sisters* abrogated the D.C. Circuit’s use of the open-mindedness test, the Federal Defendants are no better off. The open-mindedness test is at best a “judge-made procedur[e]” to *excuse* failure to comply with statutory obligations. *Id.* at 685 (quoting *Mortg. Bankers Ass’n*, 575 U.S. at 102). Without it, there is no basis to conclude that the Federal Defendants may ever use “additional commentary” to excuse failure to provide notice “without actual suspension of the [agency action] in question.” *Forester v. Consumer Prod. Safety Comm’n*, 559 F.2d 774, 788 n.19 (D.C. Cir. 1977). Thus, since the Federal Defendants have neither shown compliance with the open-mindedness test nor the Privacy

Act’s notice and comment requirements, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(11), they have acted “without observance of procedure required by law,” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(D).¹⁴

E. The Administrative Procedure Act

The Plaintiffs also argue that the establishment of the SAVE modified system was arbitrary and capricious under the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). Pls.’ Mot. 40–44. The Court is persuaded.

The APA “requires agencies to engage in reasoned decision-making” and “to reasonably explain to reviewing courts the bases for the actions they take and the conclusions they reach.” *Bhd. Of Locomotive Eng’rs v. Fed. R.R. Admin.*, 972 F.3d 83, 115 (D.C. Cir. 2020) (quoting *DHS v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal. (Regents)*, 591 U.S. 1, 16 (2020)). To do so, an agency must “examine the relevant data and articulate a satisfactory explanation for its action.” *FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.*, 556 U.S. 502, 513 (2009) (quoting *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n of U.S. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983)). Agency action is arbitrary and capricious if it “has 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.” *State Farm*, 463 U.S. at 43.

¹⁴ The Defendants claim that the comment period provided by the SORNs render the notice-and-comment claim moot and suggest that the Plaintiffs must establish standing for each component of the modified SORN (*i.e.*, bulk searches). *See* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 33; Texas Reply 6–7. But the Plaintiffs’ notice-and-comment claim is not moot because notice and comment is required “prior to” the new use. 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(11). The Plaintiffs have shown procedural standing to challenge the agency action—the 2025 SORNs and the modified SAVE detailed in the 2025 SORNs—which the record shows affected their privacy disclosure and voter registration interests. That injury is not moot. The Defendants’ point about each component of the modified SORN perhaps goes to severability. But that is an issue that was not properly raised before this Court and is thus conceded.

Importantly, this “standard demands that an agency give a reasoned justification for its decision to alter an existing regulatory scheme,” *Farmers Union Cent. Exch., Inc. v. FERC*, 734 F.2d 1486, 1500 (D.C. Cir. 1984), a principle known as the “change-in-position doctrine,” *FDA v. Wages & White Lion Invs., L.L.C.*, 604 U.S. 542, 568 (2025). “An agency may not, for example, depart from a prior policy *sub silentio* or simply disregard rules that are still on the books.” *Fox Television*, 556 U.S. at 515 (citing *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683, 696 (1974)). “And of course the agency must show that there are good reasons for the new policy.” *Id.* Under the doctrine, agencies are “free to change their existing policies as long as they provide a reasoned explanation for the change, display awareness that they are changing position, and consider serious reliance interests.” *Wages & White Lion Invs.*, 604 U.S. at 568 (cleaned up).

Here, the Federal Defendants concede that they changed position, but they stress that they expressed awareness of the change through press releases. Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 56. But by failing to engage in notice and comment when “expanding the scope” of the SAVE program, the Federal Defendants neither “consider[ed] serious reliance interests” nor considered opposing views. *Fox Television*, 556 U.S. at 515, 517. Indeed, the “central object of requiring that the public be afforded notice and an opportunity to comment is to assure that the agency fully understands the potential impact of a proposed rule before finalizing it. Public notice and comment, that is, might alter an agency’s initial assumptions about whether (and how) a proposed rule affects the public at large.” *City of Billings v. TSA*, 153 F.4th 46, 53 (D.C. Cir. 2025). By changing their position without the statutorily required notice and comment, the Federal Defendants both failed to consider “factors which Congress . . . intended [them] to consider” (*i.e.*, the “written data, views, or arguments” of impacted persons, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(11)), and they “entirely failed to consider an important aspect of the problem” (*i.e.*, the reliance interests of persons who had provided information to SSA

or failed to update SSA data without knowledge of how it would now be used). *State Farm*, 463 U.S. at 43. Even “[s]tanding alone, a notice and comment violation establishes that the government’s conduct was arbitrary and capricious.” *See In re Long-Distance Tel. Serv. Fed. Excise Tax Refund Litig.*, 751 F.3d 629, 637 (D.C. Cir. 2014).

Furthermore, even if the Federal Defendants later considered comments in response to the modified SORNs, those comments could not provide a “reasoned explanation for the change” that the Federal Defendants undertook. *Wages & White Lion Invs.*, 604 U.S. at 568 (citation omitted). Indeed, an agency’s “explanation ‘must be viewed critically’ to ensure that the [change] is not upheld on the basis of impermissible ‘post hoc rationalization.’” *Regents*, 591 U.S. at 21 (quoting *Citizens to Pres. Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe (Overton Park)*, 401 U.S. 402, 420 (1971)). “It is a ‘foundational principle of administrative law’ that judicial review of agency action is limited to ‘the grounds that the agency invoked when it took the action.’” *Id.* at 20 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 758 (2015)). This is mandated by the APA’s instruction to consider “the ‘whole record’” before the agency when engaging in judicial review. *Overton Park*, 401 U.S. at 419 (quoting 5 U.S.C. § 706). Since the Federal Defendants implemented the SAVE modified system in May 2025, the explanations in the 2025 SORNs and the comments received thereafter are not properly before the Court because they postdate the decision to implement the challenged program. And without the statutorily mandated comments, the Federal Defendants were unable to “assess whether there were reliance interests, determine whether they were significant, and weigh any such interests against competing policy concerns.” *Regents*, 591 U.S. at 33. To state the obvious, this was arbitrary and capricious. *Id.*

Since the Federal Defendants are unable to rely on “belated justifications” to explain their failure to comply with the procedural requirements of the APA and Privacy Act, they must “deal

with the problem afresh” should they wish to implement any SAVE modifications not barred by the substantive provisions of the Privacy Act or Social Security Act. *Id.* at 21, 23 (first quoting *SEC v. Chenery Corp. (Chenery I)*, 318 U.S. 80, 94 (1943); and then quoting *SEC v. Chenery Corp. (Chenery II)*, 332 U.S. 194, 201 (1947)). In the words of the Supreme Court:

The Government . . . protests that requiring a new decision before considering . . . new justifications would be “an idle and useless formality.” Procedural requirements can often seem such. But here the rule serves important values of administrative law. Requiring a new decision before considering new reasons promotes “agency accountability[]” by ensuring that parties and the public can respond fully and in a timely manner to an agency’s exercise of authority.

Id. at 23 (citations omitted). Accordingly, this Court must vacate the modified SAVE system and the Federal Defendants “must comply with the procedural requirements for new agency action.” *Id.* at 21. That means revising SAVE or authorizing any other “new use or intended use of the information in the system” only *after* engaging in notice and comment. 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(11).

Finally, the Federal Defendants argue that they are not required to comply with the APA’s arbitrary and capricious procedural requirement because:

Unlike for an APA rulemaking . . . —which starts with a notice of proposed rulemaking and ends with a final rule—a Privacy Act SORN publication does not end with any agency obligation to state “in the rules adopted a concise general statement of their basis and purpose.” 5 U.S.C. § 553(c). So arbitrary-and-capricious review—which is typically based on the quality and the content of the agency’s explanation in that “statement” of the final rule’s “basis and purpose,” *id.*—does not make sense in this . . . context.

Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 54 (emphasis omitted). But this argument is not supported by the text of the APA. The arbitrary-and-capricious principle is laid out in Section 706 of the APA, not Section 553(c). And the argument has also been rejected by the Supreme Court. *See Overton Park*, 401 U.S. at 417–21 (holding that an agency that was exempt from making findings under Section 553(c) due to exclusion in Section 553(a)(2) was nevertheless subject to arbitrary-and-capricious review, with review focusing on the “whole record” before the agency when it took the decision).

“Justice Holmes famously wrote that ‘men must turn square corners when they deal with the Government.’ But it is also true, particularly when so much is at stake, that the Government should turn square corners in dealing with the people. The basic rule here is clear . . . [t]his is not the case for cutting corners to allow DHS to rely upon reasons absent from its original decision.” *Regents*, 591 U.S. at 24 (cleaned up).

F. Other Statutes

Having flunked compliance with the Social Security Act, the Privacy Act, and the APA, the Defendants look to other statutes to justify the establishment of the modified SAVE system. They contend that even if the agency action violates the Social Security Act, the Privacy Act, or the APA, it is nevertheless authorized by provisions of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (1986 Act), Pub. L. No. 99–603, 100 Stat. 3359, and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (1996 Act), Pub. L. No. 104–208, 110 Stat. 3009–546. Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 45–53; Texas Mot. 25–27. This argument is not a winner either.

Start with this: The Defendants are effectively arguing that the 1986 Act and the 1996 Act displace or supersede the relevant provisions of the Social Security Act, the Privacy Act, and the APA. But that argument runs contrary to the “strong presumption that repeals by implication are disfavored and that Congress will specifically address pre-existing law when it wishes to suspend its normal operations in a later statute.” *Epic Sys. Corp. v. Lewis*, 584 U.S. 497, 510 (2018) (cleaned up). When interpreting statutory provisions that appear to be in tension, a court “must . . . strive to give effect to both” and is not at “liberty to pick and choose among” them. *Id.* (quoting *Morton v. Mancari*, 417 U.S. 535, 551 (1974)). A court will only imply otherwise “if there is a ‘positive repugnancy’ between overlapping statutes,” and even then, the court must cure such a conflict only “to the extent of the repugnancy.” *United States v. Philip Morris Inc.* 263 F. Supp. 2d

72, 76 (D.D.C. 2003) (quoting *United States v. Borden Co.*, 308 U.S. 188, 198–99 (1939)). Thus, courts find implied repeals only in cases where: (1) “two statutes are in ‘irreconcilable conflict,’” or (2) “the latter Act covers the whole subject of the earlier one and ‘is clearly intended as a substitute.’” *Branch v. Smith*, 538 U.S. 254, 273 (2003) (Scalia, J.) (quoting *Posadas v. Nat’l City Bank*, 296 U.S. 497, 503 (1936)).

The Federal Defendants argue that applying this canon runs contrary to the understanding that “statutes enacted by one Congress cannot bind a later Congress, which remains free to repeal the earlier statute, to exempt the current statute from the earlier statute, to modify the earlier statute, or to apply the earlier statute but as modified.” Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 49 (quoting *Dorsey v. United States*, 567 U.S. 260, 274 (2012)). But this argument misapprehends the basis of the presumption against implied repeals. The presumption is founded on the principle that:

Since laws are presumed to be passed with deliberation, and with full knowledge of existing ones on the same subject, it is but reasonable to conclude that the legislature, in passing a statute, did not intend to interfere with or abrogate any former law relating to the same matter, unless the repugnancy between the two is irreconcilable.

Scalia & Garner, *Reading Law* 328 (citation omitted). Undoubtedly then, requiring a “clear[] statement” for implied repeals does not in any way impair Congress’ authority to undo or modify its predecessors’ actions but merely “reflect[s] ‘common sense as to the manner in which Congress is likely’” to do so. *See Biden v. Nebraska*, 600 U.S. 477, 511 (2023) (Barrett, J., concurring) (quoting *FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 529 U.S. 120, 133 (2000)).

Here, the Defendants have failed to meet their “heavy burden of showing” that the statutes they cite and the Privacy Act “cannot be harmonized.” *Epic Sys. Corp.*, 584 U.S. at 510. Indeed, none of the provisions that the Defendants cite support their proposition.

The Defendants first point to the 1986 Act, which provides that DHS “shall implement a system for the verification of immigration status under paragraphs (3) and (4)(B)(i) of

section 1137(d) of the Social Security Act (as amended by this section) so that the system is available to all the States.” § 20(c)(1), 100 Stat. at 3391 (codified at 42 U.S.C. § 1320b–7 note). But this provision, alongside its cross-references, has little relevance to this case. Section 1137(d) governs “income and eligibility verification,” “documentation,” and “denial of benefits” under the Social Security Act. 42 U.S.C. § 1320b–7(d). Paragraph (3) provides that “the State shall utilize the individual’s alien file or alien admission number to verify with [DHS] the individual’s immigration status through an automated or other system” when a non-citizen or non-national applies for certain benefits. *Id.* § 1320b–7(d)(3). It is expressly limited to benefits applications for applicants who are “not a citizen or national of the United States” and makes no reference to using a Social Security number as opposed to “the individual’s alien file or alien admission number.” *Id.* § 1320b–7(d)(2), (3). Paragraph (4)(B)(i) provides that if a State finds that a non-citizen has other documentation which “constitutes reasonable evidence” that he is eligible for benefits, then the State must provide “photostatic or other similar copies of such documents, or information from such documents, as specified by [DHS], for official verification.” *Id.* § 1320b–7(4)(B)(i).

While SAVE was originally established to effectuate the 1986 Act’s benefit-verification provisions, DHS AR 420, these provisions govern benefits, not voter eligibility. And nothing in the 1986 Act suggests that any resulting system could not be harmonized with the protections in the Privacy Act. To the contrary, the 1986 Act expressly amended the Social Security Act to ensure that the “automated or other system . . . protects the individual’s privacy to the maximum degree possible.” § 121(d)(3)(B), 100 Stat. at 3385 (codified at 42 U.S.C. § 1320b–7(d)(3)(B)).

Next, the Defendants rely on a provision in the 1996 Act that provides that DHS “shall respond to an inquiry by a Federal, State, or local government agency, seeking to verify or ascertain the citizenship or immigration status of any individual within the jurisdiction of the agency for any

purpose authorized by law, by providing the requested verification or status information.” 8 U.S.C. § 1373(c). The Federal Defendants argue that this provision authorizes the modified SAVE and permits DHS to verify citizenship in any manner that it sees fit—notwithstanding prior statutory limitations on inter-agency data sharing and disclosure of private information. *See* Fed. Defs.’ Mot 46–49. But such a reading is inconsistent with normal rules of statutory interpretation.¹⁵ “[N]o statute pursues any single purpose at all costs,” and courts no longer depart from a statute’s ordinary meaning merely to effectuate the executive’s claim that doing so would merely help it “make effective a statute’s purpose.” *See Medina v. Planned Parenthood S. Atl.*, 606 U.S. 357, 368 (2025) (cleaned up). Rather, “[i]t is a fundamental canon of statutory construction that the words of a statute must be read in their context and with a view to their place in the overall statutory scheme.” *West Virginia v. EPA*, 597 U.S. 697, 721 (2022) (quoting *Davis v. Mich. Dep’t of Treasury*, 489 U.S. 803, 809 (1989)).

“Context is not found exclusively within the four corners of a statute”; “[b]ackground legal conventions, for instance, are part of the statute’s context.” *Nebraska*, 600 U.S. at 512 (Barrett, J., concurring) (cleaned up). One such convention is that the 1996 Act should not be read to impliedly amend or repeal the Privacy Act’s protections unless it “expressly contradicts” those protections or “such a construction is absolutely necessary in order [for] the words” of the 1996 Act to “have any meaning at all.” *Nat’l Ass’n of Home Builders v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 551 U.S. 644, 662–63

¹⁵ Because the Defendants lack a basis for their actions based on the plain meaning of the statutes that they cite, the Court does not address whether they would also satisfy the “clear statement” rule of the major questions doctrine—should that rule apply in this context. *See Biden v. Nebraska*, 600 U.S. 477, 505–06 (2023); *but see* Louis J. Capozzi III, *Biden v. Nebraska and the Continued Refinement of the Major Questions Doctrine*, Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol’y: Per Curiam, Summer 2024 No. 13, at 6–7 (suggesting that an action is politically significant for purposes of the major questions doctrine if it raises concerns that the Executive is using vague terms to “try to enact policies circumventing Congress,” especially on an issue of ongoing public debate).

(2007) (cleaned up); *see also id.* at 664 n.8 (“[W]e have repeatedly recognized that implied amendments are no more favored than implied repeals.”). As evidenced by the record before this Court, the Federal Defendants do not need to depart from the Privacy Act’s procedural requirements or its substantive protections to verify citizenship requests. Indeed, since the 1996 Act’s passage, the Federal Government has never needed SSA data or to depart from Privacy Act procedures to verify citizenship requests. *See supra* Bkd. (noting that SAVE did not access SSA data until 2025). Furthermore, the ordinary meaning of “verify” is “to establish the truth, accuracy, or reality of” something. *Verify*, *Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary* (10th Ed. 1996); *see also Verification*, *Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary* (10th Ed. 1996) (“the act or process of verifying”; “the state of being verified”). And the record shows that the modified SAVE has caused inaccurate rather than accurate matching of citizenship data. *See, e.g.*, DHS AR 240 (finding “risk” that the modified SAVE “may share inaccurate information with registered agencies”); DHS AR 260 (recognizing the modified SAVE’s “[s]hortfalls in data accuracy”); DHS AR 302 (same); SSA AR 44 (“[C]itizenship information in SSA’s records might not be current.”). Simply put, there is no reason to believe that an implied repeal or amendment of the protections of the Privacy Act or Social Security Act is “absolutely necessary” for the verification provisions in Section 1373(c) to have any effect. *Mittleman v. Postal Regul. Comm’n*, 757 F.3d 300, 306 (D.C. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Nat’l Ass’n of Home Builders*, 551 U.S. at 662–63).

Finally, the Defendants argue that Section 1373(a) of the 1996 Act authorized the establishment of the modified SAVE system of records. *See Fed Defs.’ Mot.* 45–46. That provision states: “Notwithstanding any other provision of Federal, State, or local law, a Federal, State, or local government entity or official may not prohibit, or in any way restrict, any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, [DHS] information regarding the citizenship or

immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.” 8 U.S.C. § 1373(a). But prohibitory language such as “shall not” or “may not” is generally not read as an “an affirmative grant of power.” See *New England Power Co. v. New Hampshire*, 455 U.S. 331, 341 (1982). Nothing in this provision permits the Federal Defendants to create a new system of records with complete disregard for the Privacy Act’s protections. Indeed, the “Executive Branch interpretation . . . issued roughly contemporaneously with enactment of the statute” and “the longstanding ‘practice of the government’” since the 1996 Act’s enactment confirms that this is not the case. *Loper Bright*, 603 U.S. at 386 (quoting *NLRB v. Noel Canning*, 573 U.S. 513, 525 (2014)); see *Relationship Between Illegal Immigr. Reform & Immigrant Resp. Act of 1996 & Statutory Requirement for Confidentiality of Census Info.*, 23 Op. O.L.C. (May 18, 1999) (slip op. at 6), 1999 WL 34995963 (recognizing that Section 1373(a) does “not clearly invest governmental officials or entities with the affirmative authority to disclose information in circumstances where they otherwise would be prohibited from doing so by a federal statute”); see *supra* Bkd. (explaining that DHS complied with the Privacy Act in instituting SAVE up until 2025). Simply put, Section 1373(a) does not on its own authorize the establishment of the SAVE modified system—it is merely a prohibition on conduct.

Moreover, “the overall statutory scheme” of the 1996 Act also does not support the Defendants’ interpretation. *West Virginia*, 597 U.S. at 721 (quoting *Davis*, 489 U.S. at 809). For instance, another provision of the 1996 Act authorizes SSA to “compare[] the name and social security account number provided in an inquiry” to its own files, but only “to confirm (or not confirm) the validity of the information provided regarding an individual whose identity and employment eligibility must be confirmed,” and only as part of a temporary employment verification pilot program (E-Verify) that, among others, states and the “Department[s] of the

Federal Government shall elect to participate in.” §§ 402(e)(1)(A)(i), 404(e), 110 Stat. at 658, 665 (codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1324a note). Importantly, that temporary “system” does not permit SSA to “disclose or release social security information (other than such confirmation or nonconfirmation)” and prohibits SSA from “utiliz[ing] any information, data base, or other records” in the program “for any other purpose.” *Id.* § 404(e), (h)(1), 110 Stat. at 3009–665. The 1996 Act also provides that the authorization for this matching system would be temporary and only last a “4-year period.” *Id.* § 401(b), 110 Stat. at 3009–655–56 (codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1324a note).¹⁶ The 1996 Act’s authorization for limited Social Security number verification for employment purposes only, its strict controls on what SSA information can be accessed and how it is used, and the limited program duration would make little sense if another provision of that same Act, *e.g.*, Section 1373(a) or (c), already authorized SSA to share any of its records regardless of any other law, as the Defendants suggest. *Cf.* 1986 Act § 101(a), 100 Stat. at 3361–65 (codified as amended at 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(b), (d)) (establishing that, like voter eligibility, the Federal Government is also authorized to verify employment eligibility of non-citizens). Courts generally presume that Congress does not enact such “surplusage.” *Preap*, 586 U.S. at 414 (recognizing that courts are hesitant to adopt an interpretation that “causes [a provision] to duplicate another provision” (quoting Scalia & Garner, *Reading Law* 174)). And “[w]here Congress uses certain language in one part of a statute and different language in another, it is generally presumed that Congress acts intentionally.” *Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519, 544 (2012). Here, the statutory scheme of the 1996 Act shows that “Congress knew how to” permit Social Security number verification “when it wanted to” and chose not to in Section 1373(a) or (c). *Allina Health Servs. v.*

¹⁶ Congress has since extended the deadline for termination of that program to September 30, 2026. Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2026, Pub. L. No. 119–75, § 5014, 140 Stat. 173, 631 (codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1324a note).

Price, 863 F.3d 937, 944 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (Kavanaugh, J.). None of the provisions that the Defendants cite support the overhaul of SAVE.

G. Comity and Equitable Considerations

Finally, the Defendants ask this Court to deny relief to the Plaintiffs based on “principles of equity and comity”; entering a judgment for the Plaintiffs, they say, may interfere with consent decrees entered during this litigation in other federal courts while this litigation was ongoing. *See* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 62. The Court is not convinced for two reasons.

First, the Defendants’ argument necessarily requires this Court to construe the Defendants’ consent decrees before other courts—something that this Court lacks the authority to do. *See Martini v. Republic Steel Corp.*, 532 F.2d 1079, 1081 (6th Cir. 1976) (“As to those counts of appellants’ complaint which allege that the consent decree is not being properly implemented we note that . . . [t]he consent decree applies nationwide, but principles of comity certainly require that these issues be raised before the court which granted the decree.”). This alone is a basis to reject the Defendants’ argument.

Second, even if it were a proper consideration, comity does not favor dismissing or abstaining in this circumstance. “[T]he doctrine of federal comity . . . permits one federal district court to defer to the jurisdiction of another federal district court on an issue properly before the latter court in order to avoid unnecessarily burdening the federal judiciary and delivering conflicting judgments.” *Beck v. U.S. DOJ*, No. 88-cv-3433, 1991 WL 519827, at *5 (D.D.C. Jan. 31, 1991) (citing *Kerotest Mfg. Co. v. C–O–Two Fire Equipment Co.*, 342 U.S. 180 (1952)). The doctrine applies most readily “where previously-filed litigation is brought promptly to the attention of the district court” and comity considerations are asserted early in litigation. *See Church of Scientology of Cal. v. U.S. Dep’t of the Army*, 611 F.2d 738, 750 (9th Cir. 1979), *overruled on*

other grounds by *Animal Legal Def. Fund v. U.S. FDA*, 836 F.3d 987, 989 (9th Cir. 2016) (per curiam). The Court’s decision is “equitable in nature,” with an eye towards “[w]ise judicial administration, giving regard to conservation of judicial resources and comprehensive disposition of litigation[.]” *Kerotest Mfg.*, 342 U.S. at 183. And this Court has “ample . . . discretion” in assessing these interests, *Stone & Webster, Inc. v. Ga. Power Co.*, 779 F.3d 614, 617 (D.C. Cir. 2015) (quoting *Kerotest Mfg.*, 342 U.S. at 183–84), which “requires a balancing not of empty priorities but of equitable considerations genuinely relevant to the ends of justice,” *Columbia Plaza Corp. v. Sec. Nat. Bank*, 525 F.2d 620, 628 (D.C. Cir. 1975) (quoting *Polaroid Corp. v. Casselman*, 213 F. Supp. 379, 381 (S.D.N.Y. 1962)). See *Kline v. Burke Constr. Co.*, 260 U.S. 226, 229 (1922) (“The forbearance which courts of co-ordinate jurisdiction, administered under a single system, exercise towards each other . . . [has] perhaps no higher sanction than the utility which comes from concord[.]” (quoting *Covell v. Heyman*, 111 U.S. 176, 182 (1884))).

The Court doubts that judicial administration and efficiency warrant dismissing this case for comity reasons at this late stage of proceedings—where all Parties have briefed the merits and the Court is ready to enter final relief. Nor is it apparent that the Federal Defendants having entered a consent decree purportedly barring the very relief sought in this litigation while it was ongoing is consistent with the equitable considerations of clean hands, “good faith,” and the prevention of “forum shopping.” *EEOC v. Univ. of Pa.*, 850 F.2d 969, 972, 979 (3d Cir. 1988), *aff’d*, 493 U.S. 182 (1990). The Court finds that equity would not bar this suit where the result would be “to circumvent” the APA action at issue. *Id.* at 978. Indeed, comity does not favor deferring to another forum when it is not “apparent that a remedy is available there”—and the Plaintiffs have no say in the consent decrees that the Federal Defendants enter in other districts. *Mann Mfg., Inc. v. Hortex*,

Inc., 439 F.2d 403, 408 (5th Cir. 1971) (quoting *Lapin v. Shulton, Inc.*, 333 F.2d 169, 172 (9th Cir. 1964)).

Simply put, even if they were appropriately before the Court in these circumstances, the Defendants’ comity arguments are unavailing. *See Emrick v. Bethlehem Steel Corp.*, 624 F.2d 450, 454 (3d Cir. 1980) (affirming the district court’s dismissal of a direct challenge to a consent decree for comity purposes but reversing the district court’s dismissal of other statutory claims merely because they may implicate the consent decree).

H. Constitutional Claims

Finally, because this case can be resolved on a statutory basis, the Court does not reach the Plaintiffs’ constitutional claims. *See* Pls.’ Mot. 33. “[C]ourts ‘ought not to pass on questions of constitutionality unless such adjudication is unavoidable.’” *United States v. Gaffney*, 812 F. Supp. 3d 49, 81 (D.D.C. 2025) (quoting *Matal v. Tam*, 582 U.S. 218, 231 (2017)).

REMEDY

The APA mandates that a “reviewing court *shall* . . . hold unlawful and set aside agency action” that is in excess of statutory authority, contrary to law, unconstitutional, arbitrary and capricious, or procedurally defective. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)–(D) (emphasis added). Setting aside an agency action means “re-establish[ing] the status quo absent the unlawful agency action.” *Las Ams. Immigrant Advoc. Ctr. v. U.S. DHS*, 783 F. Supp. 3d 200, 233 (D.D.C. 2025) (citation omitted); *see also Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Haaland*, No. 22-cv-3588, 2023 WL 5161741, at *7 (D.D.C. Aug. 11, 2023) (“The remedy of vacatur under the Administrative Procedure Act restores the prior regulatory status quo; the invalid rule is eliminated and replaced by any preexisting rule it had superseded.” (cleaned up)). Accordingly, the Court sets aside and vacates the 2025 DHS and SSA SORNs as unlawful. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. 48,948 (DHS AR 114–21); Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. 50,879

(SSA AR 205–11). The Court further sets asides and vacates the SAVE “modified system” described in the 2025 DHS SORN. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48,948 (DHS AR 114–21).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court grants the Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 66, and denies the Federal Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (or in the alternative Motion for Summary Judgment), ECF No. 77, and the State of Texas’ Motion to Dismiss, ECF No. 97.

A separate order will issue.

SPARKLE L. SOOKNANAN
United States District Judge

Date: June 22, 2026

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 25-3501 (SLS)

Judge Sparkle L. Sooknanan

ORDER

For the reasons stated in the Court’s Memorandum Opinion, ECF No. 111, the Court grants the Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment, ECF No. 66, and denies the Federal Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (or in the alternative Motion for Summary Judgment), ECF No. 77, and the State of Texas’ Motion to Dismiss, ECF No. 97.

The Court vacates and sets aside the October 2025 Department of Homeland Security Notice of a Modified System of Records for the SAVE system of records. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. 48,948 (October 31, 2025) (DHS AR 114–21). The Court vacates and sets aside the November 2025 Social Security Administration Notice of a Modified System of Records for the Master Files of Social Security Number Holders and Social Security Number Applications. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. 50,879 (November 12, 2025) (SSA AR 205–11). The Court further vacates and sets aside the SAVE “modified system” described in the October 2025 Department of Homeland Security Notice of a Modified System of Records for the SAVE system of records. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg.

at 48,948 (October 31, 2025) (DHS AR 114–21). The Court directs the Clerk of the Court to terminate this case from the active docket.

SO ORDERED.

SPARKLE L. SOOKNANAN
United States District Judge

Date: June 22, 2026

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
HOMELAND SECURITY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 25-3501 (SLS)

Judge Sparkle L. Sooknanan

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This case is about the unlawful creation of a centralized federal database containing the private information of United States citizens. On June 22, 2026, this Court set aside (1) the establishment of the database, a modified version of the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) system, a system of records maintained by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to verify citizenship and immigration status; and (2) two System of Records Notices (SORNs) for the modified SAVE, which authorized the establishment, revisions, and disclosures from the DHS system of records and from the Social Security Administration's (SSA) central file used to operate the modified SAVE. The Court determined that the modified SAVE system and its respective SORNs violated the Social Security Act, the Privacy Act, and the Administrative Procedure Act (*i.e.*, Chapter 5 and 7 of Title 5). *See* ECF Nos. 111, 112. On June 25, 2026, the Federal Defendants appealed that decision, ECF No. 113, and they now move to stay the Court's order pending appeal, Mot., ECF No. 116-1. For the reasons explained below, the Court denies the Federal Defendants' motion.

LEGAL STANDARD

“A stay pending appeal is an extraordinary remedy.” *M.M.V. v. Barr*, 459 F. Supp. 3d 1, 4 (D.D.C. 2020) (citing *Cuomo v. U.S. Nuclear Regul. Comm’n*, 772 F.2d 972, 978 (D.C. Cir. 1985)). “It is ‘an intrusion into the ordinary processes of administration and judicial review and accordingly is not a matter of right.’” *Id.* (quoting *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 427 (2009)). “It is instead an exercise of judicial discretion, and [t]he propriety of its issue is dependent upon the circumstances of the particular case.” *Nken*, 556 U.S. at 433 (cleaned up). “The party requesting a stay bears the burden of showing that the circumstances justify an exercise of that discretion.” *Id.* at 433–34.

Courts must consider four factors in connection with a stay motion: “(1) whether the stay applicant has made a strong showing that he is likely to succeed on the merits; (2) whether the applicant will be irreparably injured absent a stay; (3) whether issuance of the stay will substantially injure the other parties interested in the proceeding; and (4) where the public interest lies.” *Nken*, 556 U.S. at 434 (quoting *Hilton v. Braunskill*, 481 U.S. 770, 776 (1987)). For the first factor, the D.C. Circuit has said that the chance of success on the merits must be “substantial.” *Wash. Metro. Area Transit Comm’n v. Holiday Tours, Inc.*, 559 F.2d 841, 843 (D.C. Cir. 1977). Failure to satisfy this standard is “an arguably fatal flaw for a stay application.” *Citizens for Resp. & Ethics in Wash. v. FEC*, 904 F.3d 1014, 1017–19 (D.C. Cir. 2018) (per curiam). For the second factor, “[w]here there is a low likelihood of success on [the] merits, a movant must show a proportionally greater irreparable injury[.]” *M.M.V.*, 459 F. Supp. 3d at 4 (citing *Cuomo*, 772 F.2d at 974). And the final two factors “merge when the Government” is a party. *Id.* (quoting *Nken*, 556 U.S. at 435).

DISCUSSION

The Federal Defendants fall well short of satisfying the high burden needed for a stay pending appeal. The Court is not convinced that they are likely to succeed on the merits, that they will be irreparably injured absent a stay, or that the balance of equities favors a stay.¹

A. Likelihood of Success on the Merits

As explained at length in the Court’s Memorandum Opinion, *League of Women Voters v. DHS*, ___ F. Supp. 3d. ___, No. 25-cv-3501, 2026 WL 1784297 (D.D.C. June 22, 2026), ECF No. 111, the Federal Defendants cannot show a substantial likelihood of success on the merits. The Court’s Memorandum Opinion lays out its reasoning on the merits. But in urging the Court to grant the extraordinary remedy of a stay, the Federal Defendants do two things that the Court will address here. Most egregiously, they make arguments that they did not advance in prior briefing, including arguments that the Court found had been conceded in its Memorandum Opinion. *See, e.g., League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *20 (“[T]he Defendants have conceded . . . that the Social Security Act forbids disclosure of SSA data to DHS or in responses to SAVE users.”). The Federal Defendants certainly know that a stay motion is not an avenue to raise new arguments that they chose not to advance earlier. Such an approach would cause manifest injustice to the Parties and disrupt the orderly judicial resolution of the disputes before the Court. The Federal Defendants do not stop there. In seeking a stay, they mischaracterize the Court’s Memorandum Opinion, accusing it of stepping into the shoes of Congress and inventing new

¹ The Federal Defendants waited nine days to move for a stay after this Court issued its Memorandum Opinion. The Court nonetheless moved expeditiously to set a briefing schedule on their stay motion to close in roughly six days (which included a federal holiday and weekend). Yet hours after the Federal Defendants filed their reply brief, they proceeded to give this Court roughly a day and a half to decide their motion—promising to bypass this Court and go to the D.C. Circuit then. *See* Notice re Timing, ECF No. 121.

statutory requirements under the Privacy Act. The Court did no such thing. Indeed, according to the administrative record, DHS itself recognized that the modified SAVE was not in compliance with the Privacy Act. *League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *6. In the end, the Federal Defendants cannot show a “substantial” likelihood of success on the merits, which is “an arguably fatal flaw” for their stay application. *Citizens for Resp. & Ethics in Wash.*, 904 F.3d at 1017–19.

1. Forfeited Arguments

“[A] motion to stay should not be used to relitigate matters, submit new evidence, or ‘raise arguments which could, and should, have been made before the judgment issued.’” *ODonnell v. Harris Cnty.*, 260 F. Supp. 3d 810, 815 (S.D. Tex. 2017) (quoting *Rosenzweig v. Azurix Corp.*, 332 F.3d 854, 863–64 (5th Cir. 2003)) (citing 11 Charles A Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 2810.1 (3d ed. 2012)).

The Federal Defendants seek a stay of the Court’s decision that the modified SAVE violated the Social Security Act’s prohibition that “Social security account numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained by authorized persons pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990, shall be confidential, and no authorized person shall disclose any such social security account number or related record.” 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). In their stay motion, the Federal Defendants raise two arguments never previously presented to the Court. First, they argue that the data in the modified SAVE are not “related records” under the Act, and that the matching and confirmation of social security numbers to SAVE users under the modified SAVE does not constitute a disclosure under the Act. Second, they contend that the

original Social Security Act of 1935 authorizes the collection and maintenance of all information in SSA's central file (NUMIDENT). These arguments are forfeited.²

To start, through a series of cross references, the Federal Defendants contend that the matching and confirmation of social security data under the modified SAVE does not constitute the disclosure of “related record[s]” under the Social Security Act because it does not “indicate[], directly or indirectly, the identity of any individual with respect to whom a social security account number or a request for a social security account number is maintained.” Mot. 7–8 (citation omitted). This argument is nowhere to be found in the Federal Defendants’ summary judgment briefing. Indeed, a search for the term “related record” in the Federal Defendants’ briefs yields zero results. *See* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. Dismiss, ECF No. 77-1; Fed. Defs.’ Reply, ECF No. 106. The Federal Defendants surely know that they did not contest this point at summary judgment, despite the Plaintiffs having argued that the Federal “Defendants are collecting, verifying, and disclosing SSNs and related records en masse” pursuant to “a statute enacted ‘after October 1, 1990.’” Pls.’ Summ. J. Mot. 33, ECF No. 66-1. The Federal Defendants chose not to dispute the Plaintiffs’ characterization of “related records.” And the Court thus found: The modified SAVE “system discloses both Social Security numbers and related records maintained by SSA. And the Defendants did not argue otherwise.” *League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *20.

Relatedly, the Federal Defendants say that although there may have been disclosures of social security numbers and related records to DHS, there were no such “disclosures” to SAVE users as that term is understood in the Social Security Act. Mot. 7–8. But again, this argument never shows up in the Federal Defendants’ summary judgment briefs. *See* Fed. Defs.’

² Although the State of Texas did not move for a stay, the Court notes that it did not advance these arguments at summary judgment either. No Defendant raised the arguments now advanced in the Federal Defendants’ stay motion.

Mot. Dismiss; Fed. Defs.’ Reply. Rather than be forthright about the fact that they are making a new argument, the Federal Defendants pretend that it was before the Court all along, suggesting that the Court “conflate[d] two interactions at play in any given query to the SAVE system: first, the disclosure of information by SSA to DHS; second, the disclosure of information by DHS to the SAVE user.” Mot. 6. But that was not the Court’s analysis. The Court merely stated a fact that no Party to this litigation had then disputed—that the modified SAVE requires the disclosure of social security numbers and related records. Unhappy with their litigating decision, the Federal Defendants cannot now change course and ask this Court to re-engage in fact-finding in this emergency stay posture.

In other words, the Federal Defendants are too late. It is impermissible to raise new arguments in the posture of a stay motion and ask for judicial fact-finding on issues for the first time after final judgment has been entered. The Court need not now, on an expedited basis, scour the administrative record to explain to the Federal Defendants why each record first transmitted from SSA to DHS and then from DHS to SAVE users constituted a social security number or related record under the Social Security Act. Nor would it be appropriate for the Court to explain how the matching and confirmation of a social security number constitutes a disclosure of that individual’s social security number to SAVE users. If the Federal Defendants wished to contest these points, they should have raised them during summary judgment proceedings when the Plaintiffs first openly argued that the modified SAVE is “collecting, verifying, and disclosing SSNs and related records en masse[.]” Pls.’ Summ. J. Mot. 33.

Next, the Federal Defendants, without citing a specific collection or maintenance provision of the Act, contend that the maintenance of the SSA central file (NUMIDENT) is actually authorized by the original Social Security Act of 1935 and thus not maintained pursuant to “a

statutory authority prior to October 1, 1990.” *See* Mot. 8. Of course, it is odd for a party seeking the extraordinary remedy of a stay to attempt to meet its burden on a question of statutory interpretation without citing a single provision of the U.S. Code on the subject. But the Court need not address this new argument because, like the last, it appears nowhere in the Federal Defendants’ merits briefing, *see* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. Dismiss, Fed. Defs.’ Reply, and was thus forfeited.

Ultimately, the Plaintiffs posited that the Federal “Defendants are collecting, verifying, and disclosing SSNs and related records en masse” pursuant to “a statute enacted ‘after October 1, 1990.’” Pls.’ Summ. J. Mot. 33. And the Federal Defendants made only two counterarguments to that assertion: (1) that the Plaintiffs lacked a cause of action, and (2) that other immigration statutes nevertheless authorized disclosure. Fed. Defs.’ Mot. Dismiss. 49–50. The Court made factual findings and addressed those arguments in detail. *League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *20 & n.9, *30–33. But that is the extent of the Court’s consideration. The Court stated clearly in its Memorandum Opinion that the Defendants had conceded “that the Social Security Act forbids disclosure of SSA data to DHS or in responses to SAVE users.” *Id.* at *20. A stay motion does not give defendants a do-over, which is exactly what the Federal Defendants seem to want.

Indeed, courts apply rules of forfeiture because tardy and overdue arguments are “not only unfair to [a litigant] but also entails the risk of an improvident or ill-advised opinion on the legal issues” by reducing the time in which the Court may engage in meaningful review. *See McBride v. Merrell Dow & Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1208, 1210 (D.C. Cir. 1986) (cleaned up). This case, though expedited, was not decided on a short timeline or emergency briefing. In fact, the Court denied the Plaintiffs’ early request for preliminary relief so that the Parties could conduct factual development and establish a record. *See League of Women Voters v. DHS*, No. 25-cv-3501, 2025 WL 3198970 (D.D.C. Nov. 17, 2025), ECF No. 55. And the Court granted the Federal

Defendants additional time to flesh out their arguments, despite the time-sensitive nature of the Plaintiffs' injuries. *See* Min. Order (May 8, 2026). The Parties spent months briefing these issues in hundreds of pages. And the Court spent significant time reviewing the record and the Parties' arguments, resulting in a 75-page Memorandum Opinion. Yet the Federal Defendants now want another bite at the apple to raise new arguments on an emergency basis through a stay motion—arguments that they had every opportunity to raise earlier. And rather than acknowledge that they are asking for just that and explain why the Court should consider their belated arguments, the Federal Defendants feign that these arguments are fair game. The Court will not tolerate such gamesmanship.³ Manifest justice favors “assessment . . . when the factual record and legal arguments of the parties are fully developed and the Court has time for thorough consideration.” *Pippenger v. U.S. Doge Serv.*, No. 25-cv-1090, 2025 WL 1148345, at *2 (D.D.C. Apr. 17, 2025). Given that the Federal Defendants forfeited these arguments by raising them for the first time in their stay motion, they are unlikely to succeed on appeal on these bases.

³ The Federal Defendants seemingly recognize that they forfeited these arguments in their reply brief, though they stop short of admitting it outright. Reply 2 (“[T]hose arguments were originally framed differently or in a more abbreviated fashion[.]”). And they seemingly ask the Court to excuse any such forfeiture. *Id.* (“Had Plaintiffs emphasized 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) as heavily in their briefing as this Court did in its opinion, the United States would surely have addressed that provision in more detail. But, particularly in a case of this significance, it would be inequitable to hold that the United States forfeited a response to an argument that appeared in full form only in the Court’s opinion.”). But a court may discretionarily forgive forfeiture only where correction is needed to ensure “the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings.” *United States v. Olano*, 507 U.S. 725, 732 (1993) (cleaned up). And the fairness and integrity of these judicial proceedings do not support reviving forfeited arguments in an expedited fashion through a stay motion. The Federal Defendants are free to ask this Court to excuse their forfeited arguments in a Rule 52(b) motion, where they can receive adequate and thorough consideration. *See id.* (suggesting that Rule 52(b) is the proper vehicle to argue that forfeiture should be excused).

2. Other Mischaracterizations

Next, the Federal Defendants mischaracterize the Court’s Privacy Act conclusions, saying that the “Court disagree[d] with Congress’s assessment.” Mot. 1. They suggest that the Court “imposed judge-made procedures in addition to the statute’s mandates” when deciding the procedural claims. Mot. 10 (cleaned up). And they claim that the Court imposed “independent notice-and-comment obligation[s] . . . on top of that required by the Privacy Act.” *Id.* (emphasis omitted). A review of the Court’s Memorandum Opinion reveals that none of that is true.

As the Court explained, *see League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *26–28, the Privacy Act’s procedural requirements do not permit the Federal Defendants to issue SORNs *after* the establishment or modification of a system of records. Rather, the statute requires that a SORN be published “upon establishment or revision” of a system of records. 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(4). And as noted in the Memorandum Opinion, the Federal Defendants did not dispute that the SAVE system was modified to include SSA data long before the agencies published the relevant SORNs. *See League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *26–28. Nor could they, because when the Parties first appeared before the Court for preliminary injunction proceedings, the agencies had published no SORNs at all.

Further, a SORN may only be published “subject to the provisions of paragraph (11)” of subsection (e) of the Privacy Act. 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(4). The term “*subject to*” indicates that the main clause it introduces . . . does not derogate from the provision to which it refers.” Antonin Scalia & Brian Garner, *Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts* 126 (2012). That cross-referenced provision mandates that any SORN publishing “each routine use of the records contained in the system, including the categories of users and the purpose of such use,” 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(4)(D), must afford “30 days *prior to* publication” “notice” in the Federal Register “of

any new use or intended use of the information in the system,” and “provide an opportunity for interested persons to submit written data, views, or arguments to the agency,” *id.* § 552a(e)(11) (emphasis added). The DHS SORN “include[d] updates and modifications to the (1) purpose(s) of the system, (2) categories of individuals covered by the system, (3) categories of records in the system, (4) records source categories, and (5) routine uses of records maintained in the system.” Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. 48,948, 48,948 (Oct. 31, 2025) (DHS SORN). Yet it expressly stated: “This modified system will be effective upon publication.” *Id.* at 48,949.⁴ The Federal Defendants do not dispute that this modified system alongside its new routine uses were already effective at the time the SORN was published. *See League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *26. As the Court previously detailed, the same is true of the SSA SORN, which also added a new routine use. *Id.* In other words, the modified SAVE and the 2025 SORNs failed to comply with 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(4) and (11).

Permitting an agency to publish a SORN *after* already establishing or modifying a system of records—as the Federal Defendants did—would eviscerate the “prior to” language from the Privacy Act’s text. 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(11). It would also nullify the provisions ensuring notice and comment—disclosure could be made with or without prior notice. *See id.* And other provisions of the Privacy Act, such as those requiring “routine uses” in the SORN be included on intake forms, *id.* § 552a(e)(3)(C), and for disclosures, *id.* § 552a(b)(3), would be put in jeopardy as well.

Rather than focus on the Court’s analysis of the Privacy Act’s text, the Federal Defendants say: “[T]o the extent the Court’s opinion suggests that the APA imposes an independent notice-and-comment obligation—including some obligation to provide a written explanation or

⁴ The DHS SORN also included new functionalities that were not yet in effect, *see, e.g.*, DHS SORN at 48,951, that are not at issue in this suit.

response to comments received—on top of that required by the Privacy Act, that imposition would call into question virtually every SORN publication dating back decades.” Mot. 10 (emphasis omitted) (citation omitted). The Court made no such suggestion. It merely identified the notice-and-comment obligations already in the statute. 5 U.S.C. § 552a(e)(11). Indeed, it is notable that the Federal Defendants provide no citation to the Court’s Memorandum Opinion to support this proposition, citing only their own merits brief. Mot. 10.⁵

Of course, it is an uncontroversial point that agencies that fail to comply with statutorily obligated notice-and-comment requirements act “without observance of procedure required by law” and in an “arbitrary” and “capricious” manner. 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), (D). The Court relied on these APA provisions to enforce the very procedure required by the Privacy Act itself, not to impose obligations “on top of that required by the Privacy Act.” *Compare* Mot. 10, *with League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *28–30.

* * *

With these clarifications, the Court reiterates that for the reasons explained in its Memorandum Opinion, the Federal Defendants cannot show a substantial likelihood of success on the merits. *See League of Women Voters v. DHS*, __ F. Supp. 3d __, No. 25-cv-3501, 2026 WL 1784297 (D.D.C. June 22, 2026). Accordingly, this factor weighs heavily against a stay.

⁵ Since the Federal Defendants do not provide any citation to the Memorandum Opinion, it is unclear what APA argument they are even referencing. The lack of citation is good reason to question whether the Federal Defendants actually understand the Court’s Memorandum Opinion to add procedural requirements beyond those in the statute. The Court stresses (as it did in its Memorandum Opinion) that application of the change-in-position doctrine and arbitrary-and-capricious review generally does not require the findings and statement of purpose normally required under 5 U.S.C. § 553(c). *See League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *30 (“[A]n agency that [i]s exempt from making findings under Section 553(c) . . . [i]s nevertheless subject to arbitrary-and-capricious review, with review focusing on the ‘whole record’ before the agency when it took the decision.” (characterizing *Citizens to Pres. Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 417–21 (1971))).

B. Irreparable Harm, Public Interest, and Balance of the Equities

Given their low likelihood of success on the merits, the Federal Defendants “must show a proportionally greater irreparable injury” to justify a stay. *M.M.V.*, 459 F. Supp. 3d at 4 (citing *Cuomo*, 772 F.2d at 974). And since the “the Government” is the moving party, “harm to the opposing party and the public interest, merge.” *See Nken*, 556 U.S. at 435. Together, these remaining factors do not help the Federal Defendants.

The Federal Defendants’ arguments fall into three buckets. First, they discuss their purported harms and interests in citizenship verification. Second, they focus on their purported harms and interests related to a consent decree. *See* Mot. 11–13. Third, they discuss injuries stemming from a court order enforcing that decree. *See* Reply 7–9, ECF No. 120. The Court addresses each in turn.

1. Verification Injuries

First, the Federal Defendants argue that they are irreparably harmed because without the modified SAVE, “verifications can only occur much more slowly and at much greater cost.” Mot. 11.⁶ And the Federal Defendants go on to suggest that this harm extends to “state and local agencies [that] rely on the modified SAVE system to maintain accurate voter-registration lists and to verify eligibility for public benefits.” Mot. 12. To the extent that the Federal Defendants can

⁶ The Federal Defendants claim that they face “substantial cost” to retain “both the ‘old’ SAVE and the upgraded system in parallel.” Mot. 11 (citing Broderik Decl. ¶ 10, Mot. Ex. A, ECF No. 116-2). But in support of this proposition, the Defendants cite only a declaration stating that the parallel system of records is being maintained to “prevent[] costly code divergence”—not that maintaining both systems is costly. Broderik Decl. ¶ 10. And it is the moving party’s burden to “substantiate the claim” of irreparable injury. *Wisconsin Gas Co. v. FERC*, 758 F.2d 669, 674 (D.C. Cir. 1985). The Federal Defendants do not carry their burden. Even if the Federal Defendants did provide evidence of increased costs from parallel maintenance, the Court is perplexed as to how those costs could be attributed to its Order. Nothing in the Court’s Order calls for or authorizes maintenance of a parallel systems of records.

rely on purported injuries to others to show irreparable harm,⁷ this argument is misguided.

As the Court explained in its Memorandum Opinion, the ordinary meaning of “verification” is “the act or process of verifying” or “the state of being verified.” *League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *32 (quoting *Verification*, Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary (10th ed. 1996)). And to “verify” means “to establish the truth, accuracy, or reality of something.” *Id.* (quoting *Verify*, Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary (10th ed. 1996)). Here, the Court found, based on the administrative record, that SSA data in the modified SAVE was partially “inaccurate” and therefore resulted in false identifications of U.S. citizens as non-citizens, a fact that the Federal Defendants did not dispute. *See, e.g., id.* at *15, *32. Based on this finding, the Court held that the modified SAVE was not being used for “verification” of the Plaintiffs’ members—because it failed to establish the “truth,” “accuracy,” or “reality” of their citizenship on voter registration forms. *Id.* at *32. In fact, it did the opposite. *See id.* at *15, *32. The Federal Defendants face little harm to their ability to verify the accuracy of information if the verification system that they seek to use has known inaccuracies in the first place. *See id.* at *6 (noting that the Federal Defendants were aware of the inaccuracies).

But even assuming that the Federal Defendants suffer verification injuries, the extent of those injuries are minimal. The Federal Defendants can hardly complain that it slows them down to comply with the Social Security Act and the Privacy Act. After all, Congress enacted those statutes to protect the privacy interests of Americans, recognizing that the statutory protections might lead to decreased government efficiency. And recall that DHS has long conducted similar verifications without using SSA data. It is also unclear whether any verification injuries are

⁷ *See DeRouin v. NASA*, No. 26-cv-1087, 2026 WL 890421, at *2 n.1 (D.D.C. Apr. 1, 2026) (“[I]njuries to third parties are not a basis to find irreparable harm.” (alteration in original) (quoting *Alcresta Therapeutics, Inc. v. Azar*, 318 F. Supp. 3d 321, 326 (D.D.C. 2018))).

imminent since many states have already conducted voter roll maintenance through SAVE. The Federal Defendants previously represented that state voter roll maintenance in the ninety days prior to a federal primary or general election would be unlawful. *See* Opp’n to Prelim. Inj. Mot. 35–36, ECF No. 37. So it is unclear what harm the Federal Defendants truly face from failure to use the modified SAVE in the immediate future.

In sum, any verification injuries, to the extent they exist, are minimal and do not outweigh the other stay factors.

2. Consent Decrees

Somewhat audaciously, the Federal Defendants next argue that they are irreparably harmed based on their belief that complying with the Court’s Order “brings [the Federal] Defendants out of compliance with a” consent decree “entered in the Northern District of Florida” *during the course of this litigation*. Mot. 12. The Defendants made a similar argument at summary judgment when they asked the Court to dismiss the case altogether based on this very decree. As the Court noted then, it is unclear whether “equitable considerations of clean hands, ‘good faith,’ and the prevention of ‘forum shopping’” would permit the award of equitable relief based on such a decree. *League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *34 (quoting *EEOC v. Univ. of Pa.*, 850 F.2d 969, 972, 979 (3d Cir. 1988), *aff’d*, 493 U.S. 182 (1990)).

That consent decree was filed on November 28, 2025, and approved on December 1, 2025—nearly two months after the Plaintiffs filed this action. *See* Pl.’s Mot. Dismiss, *Florida v. DHS*, No. 3:24-cv-00509, ECF No. 30 (N.D. Fla. Nov. 28, 2025); Order, *Florida v. DHS*, No. 3:24-cv-00509, ECF No. 31 (N.D. Fl. Dec. 1, 2025). The proposed decree was accompanied by an Amended Complaint that added various states into that action who had initially filed suits in other fora. *See* Am. Comp., *Florida v. DHS*, No. 3:24-cv-00509, ECF No. 29 (N.D. Fla. Nov. 28,

2025); Notice (Dec. 5, 2025), ECF No. 59. In doing so, the Federal Defendants were able to consolidate several suits against them nationwide into a single forum and reach a consent decree in their chosen district. *See* Notice (Dec. 5, 2025). At that time, the Federal Defendants were also fully aware that the Plaintiffs were seeking the relief at issue in this case and had adverse interests to the parties to that consent decree. Indeed, the Federal Defendants expeditiously informed the Court when that decree was entered, making clear that they knew the interrelated nature of these suits. *See* Notice (Dec. 5, 2025).

The Federal Defendants thus knew that this suit had the potential to implicate the permissible “terms” under that agreement and their statutory “authority” to make certain concessions in a consent decree. *Keith v. Volpe*, 118 F.3d 1386, 1393 (9th Cir. 1997). The Defendants choose to ignore those considerations, making any injury arising from that decision self-inflicted. And “a party may not satisfy the irreparable harm requirement if the harm complained of is self-inflicted.” 11A Charles A Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 2948.1 (3d ed., Apr. 2026 Update) (citing *Bennett v. Isagenix International LLC*, 118 F.4th 1120, 1129 (9th Cir. 2024); and *Di Biase v. SPX Corporation*, 872 F.3d 224, 235 (4th Cir. 2017)); *see also Cuomo*, 772 F.2d at 977.

Stepping back, consider the upshot of the Federal Defendants’ argument in light of the other stay factors. No one denies that the “perpetuation of unlawful agency action” does not serve the “public interest.” *League of Women Voters of United States v. Newby*, 838 F.3d 1, 12 (D.C. Cir. 2016). Yet accepting the Federal Defendants’ argument would eviscerate that factor altogether. The Executive Branch could enter into settlement agreements to engage in statutorily prohibited conduct and thus circumvent any restriction that Congress placed on it during the course of an appeal. In other words, put a consent decree into the mix and the stay inquiry will always be

inversed: the proper enforcement of federal statutes would always weigh against a stay (as irreparable harm arising from tension with the consent decree) rather than only for it (in favor of the public interest). The Executive Branch could manufacture “irreparable injury” in advance of judgment in an action. Where a stay was once an “extraordinary remedy,” it would become a mundane one. *M.M.V.*, 459 F. Supp. 3d at 4. Neither law nor common sense supports such an absurd result.

To the extent that manufactured harms can be considered injury, the public’s “substantial” interest “in having governmental agencies abide by the federal laws that govern their existence and operations” overrides it. *Newby*, 838 F.3d at 12 (quoting *Washington v. Reno*, 35 F.3d 1093, 1103 (6th Cir. 1994)). “[T]he thrust of the [] laws cannot be avoided merely by claiming that the otherwise illegal conduct is compelled by contractual obligations. Were it otherwise, the [] laws could be nullified. Contractual obligations cannot thus supersede statutory imperatives.” *United States v. Loew’s, Inc.*, 371 U.S. 38, 51 (1962), *abrogated on other grounds by Illinois Tool Works Inc. v. Indep. Ink, Inc.*, 547 U.S. 28 (2006). For this reason, the “United States” is not “bound” by an “agreement to do or cause to be done what the law does not sanction or permit.” *OPM v. Richmond*, 496 U.S. 414, 420 (1990) (quoting *Utah Power & Light Co. v. United States*, 243 U.S. 389, 408–409 (1917)). Any other approach would make a mockery of Congress and our constitutional structure. See *Concrete Pipe & Prods. of California, Inc. v. Constr. Laborers Pension Tr. for S. California*, 508 U.S. 602, 642 (1993) (“If the regulatory statute is otherwise within the powers of Congress, therefore, its application may not be defeated by private contractual provisions.” (quoting *Connolly v. Pension Ben. Guar. Corp.*, 475 U.S. 211, 223–24 (1986))); *Connolly*, 475 U.S. at 224 (“[W]hen contracts deal with a subject matter which lies within the control of Congress, they have a congenital infirmity.”); *Guar. Tr. Co. of New York v. Henwood*,

307 U.S. 247, 258–59 (1939) (“[C]ontracts between private parties cannot create vested rights which serve to restrict and limit an exercise of a constitutional power of Congress.”).

Not only does the Federal Defendants’ argument make a mockery of separation of powers, it undercuts the very underpinning of our justice system. Due process deeply rooted in “Anglo-American jurisprudence” has long recognized that one cannot be “bound by a judgment in personam in a litigation in which [one] is not designated as a party or to which [one] has not been made a party by service of process.” *In re Admin. Subpoena 25 1431 032 to Rhode Island Hosp.*, No. 1:26-cv-0007, 2026 WL 1392565, at *4 (D.R.I. May 14, 2026) (quoting *Martin v. Wilks*, 490 U.S. 755, 765 (1989)); *see also Hansberry v. Lee*, 311 U.S. 32, 40 (1940). But the Federal Defendants ask the Court to do just that. Under their approach, the Plaintiffs’ rights are determined not by an action where they are given notice and an opportunity to be heard. Rather, the Federal Defendants posit that a “decree among parties to a[nother] lawsuit” should “conclude the[ir] rights” to speedy resolution of disputes. *In re Admin. Subpoena*, 2026 WL 1392565, at *4. Equity and the public interest do not require such hardship. And this self-imposed harm plainly does not favor a stay.

3. Florida Court Order

Finally, the Federal Defendants say that they are irreparably harmed because a court in the Northern District of Florida entered an order yesterday—shortly before the reply deadline set by this Court—enforcing the Florida consent decree. *See Reply*, ECF No. 120; *Florida Order*, ECF No. 120-2. But with all due respect, that court, which was no doubt pressed for time with emergency briefing on a motion to enforce the consent decree over a holiday weekend, erred in significant ways. And that court may well correct those errors down the road once made aware of them, which would mitigate any harm to the Federal Defendants.

For starters, the Northern District of Florida court presumed that it could determine “the precise legal rights of the parties” or “resolve the merits of the claims” underlying the Florida consent decree. *Citizens for a Better Env’t v. Gorsuch*, 718 F.2d 1117, 1126 (D.C. Cir. 1983) (quoting *Metro. Hous. Dev. Corp. v. Vill. of Arlington Heights*, 616 F.2d 1006, 1014 (7th Cir. 1980)). In enforcing the decree yesterday, that court stated that it had “implicitly found that the modifications [to SAVE] were not inconsistent with federal law when it approved the [consent decree]”—despite admittedly approving the decree without “undertak[ing] an extensive assessment of the legality of the features that the settlement agreement required the SAVE system to include.” Florida Order 6 & n.5. The court clarified that it was engaging in a merits assessment and “ma[de] explicit what was implicit in the approval of the settlement agreement—the modifications to the SAVE system, including the bulk-upload and SSN-search features, do not violate the Social Security Act or the Privacy Act.” Florida Order 6 n.5. But of course, it is black-letter law that “a decree, which appears by the record to have been rendered by consent is always affirmed, *without considering the merits of the cause.*” *Swift & Co. v. United States*, 276 U.S. 311, 324 (1928) (emphasis added) (quoting *Nashville, C. & St. L. Ry. Co. v. United States*, 113 U.S. 261, 265 (1885)); *see also NLRB. v. Ochoa Fertilizer Corp.*, 368 U.S. 318, 323 (1961) (same).

“When entering consent decrees, federal courts do ‘not inquire into the precise legal rights of the parties nor reach and resolve the merits of the claims or controversy.’” *Mi Familia Vota v. Fontes*, 152 F.4th 1153, 1156 (9th Cir. 2025) (Nelson, J., concurring in part and dissenting from denial rehearing *en banc*) (quoting *Gorsuch*, 718 F.2d at 1126); *see also EEOC v. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc.*, 768 F.2d 884, 889 (7th Cir. 1985) (collecting cases) (“[A] district court should refrain from resolving the merits of the controversy or making a precise determination of the parties’ respective legal rights.”). This is because Article III limits the “judicial power” only to “actual

controversies arising between *adverse litigants*.” *Muskrat v. United States*, 219 U.S. 346, 361 (1911) (emphasis added). And “[w]hen ‘both litigants desire precisely the same result,’ as with consent decrees, there is ‘no case or controversy within the meaning of Art. III of the Constitution.’” *Mi Familia Vota*, 152 F.4th at 1156 (Nelson, J., concurring in part and dissenting from denial of rehearing *en banc*) (quoting *Moore v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ.*, 402 U.S. 47, 48 (1971)). It follows, then, that the Northern District of Florida court had no authority to make merits determinations about the legality of SAVE, either implicitly or explicitly.⁸

The prohibition on rendering advisory opinions without adverse parties is not only jurisdictional but prudential. The only parties before the Northern District of Florida court were the federal government and the States that it mutually contracted with. And a decision on the merits without adverse briefing from directly affected parties is fundamentally unsound. *Cf. NRC v. Texas*, 605 U.S. 665, 677 (2025) (“[P]articipation by amici in a court proceeding does not make the amici parties[.]”). This Court’s 75-page Memorandum Opinion was the result of thorough, adverse briefing on the merits. The Northern District of Florida court spent roughly one paragraph to reach differing conclusions, Florida Order 7–8, and did so without the benefit of adverse parties raising every argument in their favor and pointing out the flaws in contrary ones. The errors in the resulting order, both on the nature of review when entering a consent decree and on the merits issues themselves, illustrate why courts do not proceed in this way.

For instance, the Northern District of Florida court cites to a provision of the Social Security Act in its Privacy Act analysis to suggest that the purpose of a social security number is “to establish the age, citizenship, or alien status and true identity” of individuals. Florida Order 8

⁸ The Court does not fault the Northern District of Florida court for the oversight, as none of the parties in that litigation (chiefly, DHS) seemed to have alerted the court to these constraints.

(quoting 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(B)(ii)). But the cited provision does not govern the purpose of social security numbers at all. Rather, that provision merely explains the contents of an application for a social security number:

The Commissioner of Social Security shall require of applicants for social security account numbers such evidence as may be necessary to establish the age, citizenship, or alien status, and true identity of such applicants, and to determine which (if any) social security account number has previously been assigned to such individual.

42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(B)(ii). And, of course, application requirements do not necessarily illuminate the purpose of the thing being applied for.⁹

In the end, the federal government entered into a consent decree with non-adverse parties with full recognition that adverse third parties—*i.e.*, the Plaintiffs in this suit—were challenging the legality of the very terms that they were agreeing to. And they did not make the Northern District of Florida court aware of this fact. Indeed, that court observed that “the conundrum that now exists might have been avoided” had “the parties to th[at] case” brought the instant “case to th[at] [c]ourt’s attention before it approved the settlement agreement.” Florida Order 7 n.6. And had the federal government chosen to proceed in that manner instead, the Northern District of Florida court certainly could have weighed the principle based in equity and comity that “judges should not enter consent decrees interfering with the legal entitlements of non-consenting parties.” *People Who Care v. Rockford Bd. of Educ. Sch. Dist. No. 205*, 964 F.2d 639, 640 (7th Cir. 1992). The Northern District of Florida court was correct in observing that “the conundrum that now exists might have been avoided” by the actions of the Federal Defendants. Florida Order 7 n.6.

⁹ For instance, an individual applying for a library card from their county library might be asked to provide proof that they reside in that county. That does not mean that the purpose of the library card is to establish proof of the applicant’s residence. The purpose of the card is to allow that individual to borrow books.

And such “self-imposed” injuries cannot constitute irreparable harm that would warrant the stay that the Federal Defendants now seek in this Court. *See Gorsuch*, 718 F.2d at 1126.

More broadly, it is abundantly clear that this Court would have erred had it simply “deferred to [the Northern District of Florida’s] implicit determination that the modifications to the SAVE system were lawful” in deciding the instant case—as that court suggested was the proper course. Florida Order 7 n.6. There are no “implicit” merits determinations in the entry of a consent decree. *Cf. Gorsuch*, 718 F.2d at 1126 (“The court’s duty when passing upon a settlement agreement is fundamentally different from its duty in trying a case on the merits.”). To the contrary, it is a consent decree that may “warrant reexamination” based on “changes in governing law or its interpretation by the courts.” *Horne v. Flores*, 557 U.S. 433, 447–48 (2009); *see also Agostini v. Felton*, 521 U.S. 203, 215, 239 (1997) (holding a district court abused its discretion by failing to modify its consent decree prospectively based on changes in “decisional law” under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(5) but noting a court “rarely” needs to do so retrospectively under Rule 60(b)(6)); *Rufo v. Inmates of Suffolk Cnty. Jail*, 502 U.S. 367, 388 (1992) (“A consent decree must of course be modified if, as it later turns out, one or more of the obligations placed upon the parties has become impermissible under federal law,” including intervening “decisional law”). It goes without saying that decisional law may only arise from cases or controversies between “adverse parties, whose contentions are submitted to the court for adjudication.” *Muskrat*, 219 U.S. at 357 (quoting *In re Pac. Ry. Comm’n*, 32 F. 241, 255 (C.C.N.D. Cal. 1887) (Field, J.)). And favorable parties cannot contract for judicial determination of a legal issue where an Article III controversy would not otherwise exist. *Cf. id.* at 359–60 (“It never was the thought that, by means of a friendly suit, a party beaten in the legislature could transfer to the courts an inquiry as to the constitutionality of the legislative act.” (quoting *Chi. & G.T. Ry. Co. v. Wellman*, 143 U.S. 339,

345 (1892)); *Sosna v. Iowa*, 419 U.S. 393, 398 (1975) (“[Parties] may not by stipulation invoke the judicial power of the United States in litigation which does not present an actual ‘case or controversy.’” (quoting *Richardson v. Ramirez*, 418 U.S. 24 (1974))).

Ultimately though, even if the order from the Northern District of Florida stands, any (self-imposed) harm to the Federal Defendants does not justify a stay of the entirety of this Court’s Order. The consent decree in Florida binds only DHS, not SSA, as SSA is not a party to that action. *See Order, Florida v. DHS*, No. 3:24-cv-00509, ECF No. 31 (N.D. Fl. Dec. 1, 2025). So that consent decree has no bearing on this Court’s order with respect to SSA. It is well established that a judgment in a suit against one federal agency is not “binding” upon others—“[t]hey were not parties to the suit, and there is no reason they should be obliged to honor an incidental legal determination the suit produced.” *Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 569 (1992). Further, the equitable relief obtained as a result of the Florida consent decree governs only the states that are parties in that action. *See generally Trump v. CASA, Inc.*, 606 U.S. 831 (2025). Thus, it would not be a basis to stay the effects of the Court’s order with respect to other SAVE users.

* * *

Weighing the stay factors in totality, the Federal Defendants do not meet their heavy “burden of showing that the circumstances justify” a stay. *Nken*, 556 U.S. at 434.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court denies the Defendants' Motion for Stay Pending Appeal, ECF No. 116.

A separate order will issue.

SPARKLE L. SOOKNANAN
United States District Judge

Date: July 8, 2026

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 25-3501 (SLS)

Judge Sparkle L. Sooknanan

ORDER

For the reasons stated in the Court's Memorandum Opinion, ECF No. 123, the Court **DENIES** the Federal Defendants' Motion to Stay Pending Appeal, ECF No. 116.

SO ORDERED.

SPARKLE L. SOOKNANAN
United States District Judge

Date: July 8, 2026

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 26-5243

September Term, 2026

1:25-cv-03501-SLS

Filed On: September 4, 2026

League of Women Voters, et al.,

Appellees

v.

United States Department of Homeland
Security, et al.,

Appellants

State of Texas,

Appellee

Consolidated with 26-5301

BEFORE: Srinivasan, Chief Judge, and Wilkins and Katsas*, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the emergency motion for stay pending appeal, which includes a request for an administrative stay, the response thereto, and the reply; the motions to participate as amici curiae and the lodged amicus briefs; and the Rule 28(j) letters, it is

ORDERED that the motions to participate as amici curiae be granted. The Clerk is directed to file the lodged briefs. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion for stay be denied. For the reasons discussed in the attached per curiam statement, appellants have not satisfied the stringent requirements for a stay pending appeal. See Nken v. Holder, 556 U.S. 418, 434 (2009); D.C. Circuit Handbook of Practice and Internal Procedures 33 (2025). It is

* Circuit Judge Katsas would grant the motion for stay pending appeal for the reasons discussed in the attached dissenting statement.

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 26-5243

September Term, 2026

FURTHER ORDERED that the request for an administrative stay be dismissed as moot. It is

FURTHER ORDERED, on the court's own motion, that these consolidated appeals be expedited and that, within 10 days of the date of this order, the parties submit a proposed expedited schedule and proposed formats for the briefing of these cases.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/
Francis A. Walter
Deputy Clerk

PER CURIAM:

A stay pending appeal is “extraordinary relief.” *Citizens for Resp. & Ethics in Washington (CREW) v. FEC*, 904 F.3d 1014, 1017 (D.C. Cir. 2018) (per curiam). To obtain its requested stay, the government therefore must make, among other things, a “strong showing that [it] is likely to succeed on the merits” of its appeal. *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 434 (2009) (citation omitted).

Here, the government faces a further obstacle. Only after the district court had already granted summary judgment for plaintiffs did the government raise what are now its central arguments regarding plaintiffs’ Social Security Act claim. When the government first aired those forfeited arguments in moving for a stay pending appeal, the district court declined to consider them in that expedited posture but expressly invited the government to submit a post-judgment motion to excuse the forfeiture and receive full consideration of the late-raised arguments. The government did not do so, instead coming straight to our court and seeking a stay pending appeal based in significant part on the forfeited arguments.

To grant the extraordinary relief of a stay, we would need to elect to excuse the government’s forfeiture for purposes of this preliminary stage of the proceedings and then conclude that there is a strong showing that the forfeited arguments—yet to be considered on the merits by any court—are likely to succeed in this appeal. We decline to overlook the forfeiture for purposes of the government’s stay motion; and at any rate, even considering the forfeited arguments as they are presented in the necessarily constrained context of an expedited stay motion, we cannot conclude that the government has made the requisite strong showing of a likelihood of success. We therefore deny the government’s motion.

2

I.

A.

The Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements program, or SAVE, is an immigration- and citizenship-verification system administered by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Congress created SAVE in 1986, directing DHS's predecessor to establish an automated means of verifying the immigration status of noncitizens applying for certain public benefits. *See* Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-603, § 121(c)(1), 100 Stat. 3359, 3391; 42 U.S.C. § 1320b-7(d); Gov't Mot. 2–3.

For nearly four decades, SAVE principally searched DHS's own immigration records. An agency generally submitted a request about a specific individual using a DHS identifier for the person, such as an alien registration number. SAVE returned citizenship or immigration-status information, and the requesting agency made any ultimate eligibility determination. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1320b-7(d)(5)(A); Gov't Mot. 3–4. The system ordinarily could not verify the citizenship of a person born in the U.S. (about whom DHS would have no immigration records), it could not be searched using a Social Security number (SSN), and it could not accept bulk queries encompassing multiple persons. Gov't Mot. 4–5.

That changed as a result of modifications to SAVE implemented in 2025. In March of that year, President Trump issued an Executive Order directing DHS to ensure that state and local election officials had “access to appropriate systems for verifying the citizenship or immigration status of individuals registering to vote or who are already registered.” Exec. Order No. 14,248, § 2(b)(i), 90 Fed. Reg. 14005, 14006 (Mar. 25, 2025). The order also directed the Social Security Administration (SSA) to make its Social Security Number

Verification Service, Death Master File, and other relevant federal databases available for that purpose. *Id.* § 3(a), 90 Fed. Reg. at 14007.

DHS soon announced the new system at issue here, which we, like the district court and the parties, will call “modified SAVE.” The new system differed from its predecessor version in three principal respects: (i) it connected SAVE to SSA records and permitted searches using full or partial SSNs; (ii) that connection allowed SAVE to return information about persons—including many U.S.-born citizens—who had no DHS immigration records; and (iii) the system permitted bulk queries. Gov’t Mot. 5–6; DHS Administrative Record (DHS AR) 115–17.

The information exchange under modified SAVE generally works in relevant respects as follows. Using a web interface, a requesting agency—for example, a state or local government—can access the SAVE system and initiate a request about a person or group of persons. The requester provides the names, dates of birth, full or partial SSNs, and other available identifying information for each person encompassed by the query. DHS then sends those data to SSA. SSA compares the submitted information with its own records and generates separate true-or-false match indicators for the SSN, name, and date of birth for each person. SSA returns a file to DHS containing the match results, as well as yes-or-no indicators capturing whether queried individuals are citizens, deceased, or foreign-born, and other data fields that indicate state or country of birth and alien registration number if applicable and available. If the requester provided only a partial SSN and SSA nonetheless identified a match in its own records, SSA shares the associated full (nine-digit) SSN with DHS for DHS’s own records. SSA also sends any error code descriptions associated with errors incurred during SSA’s search. Gov’t Mot. 6; DHS AR 116, 224–26, 424, 437–38.

DHS then makes the results available to the requesting agency through the SAVE web interface. For each person encompassed by the query, the SAVE results report the name, SSN, date of birth, and other identifying information contained in the request, alongside search results. The search results may include an indicator of citizenship or immigration status, an indicator capturing whether the individual is deceased, and descriptions of errors generated by the search process. As to the latter, if, for example, a requesting agency submitted only a partial SSN and SSA was unable to identify a match in its records, SAVE says “Full SSN Required – Resubmit with Additional Information.” With respect to a person’s citizenship, if SAVE does not provide confirmation that the person is a U.S. citizen, SAVE may instruct the requesting agency to contact the individual, who may then be asked for proof of citizenship. SAVE users can review the results for each person one by one or can download a bulk file containing the composite results for all individuals in a query. The time to produce SAVE results can vary from a matter of seconds to a number of days depending on the complexity of the query and the need for human involvement. Gov’t Mot. 6–7; DHS AR 762, 1379, 1443–44, 1507–08, 1525–26.

B.

Plaintiffs include the League of Women Voters (the League), several state League affiliates, the Electronic Privacy Information Center, and individual citizens. In September 2025, plaintiffs filed this action challenging modified SAVE on several grounds, including that DHS and SSA lacked statutory authority for the new system and that its implementation violated the Social Security Act, the Privacy Act, and the Administrative Procedure Act.

The district court initially denied preliminary relief on the ground that plaintiffs had not shown irreparable harm. *League*

of Women Voters v. DHS, No. 25-cv-3501, 2025 WL 3198970, at *5 (D.D.C. Nov. 17, 2025). The parties then fully briefed the merits. Plaintiffs moved for summary judgment, and the government cross-moved to dismiss or, alternatively, for summary judgment. *See* Pls.’ Summ. J. Mot., Dkt. 66-1; Fed. Defs.’ Mot., Dkt. 77-1; Pls.’ Reply & Opp., Dkt. 99; Fed. Defs.’ Reply, Dkt. 106.

On June 22, 2026, the district court granted plaintiffs summary judgment. *League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *35. The court held that plaintiffs had standing, that DHS lacked statutory authority to implement modified SAVE, that the system violated the Social Security Act and the Privacy Act, and that its adoption was arbitrary and capricious. *Id.* at *11–18, *20–33; Add. 25–70. The court set aside modified SAVE, along with two Systems of Records Notices issued by DHS and SSA that described the new uses of their records. *League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *35; Add. 76–77.

The government appealed and asked the district court to stay its decision pending the appeal. In the stay motion, the government presented entirely new arguments concerning plaintiffs’ claim under the Social Security Act. That claim rests on a confidentiality mandate established by 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), which generally bars disclosure of SSNs “and related records that are obtained or maintained . . . pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.” Plaintiffs had also argued that the same sharing of information independently violated another provision of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1306(a)(1). The district court did not reach that alternative theory because it concluded that the government had offered no response under the terms of § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I).

Throughout the months-long summary-judgment proceedings, the government never made an argument under the terms of § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I)’s confidentiality mandate. That is, the government never argued that, to the extent the provision’s confidentiality mandate applies, modified SAVE is consistent with it. *See* Add. 94–97. Instead, the government argued only that § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) does not apply in the first place because other immigration statutes—chiefly, 8 U.S.C. § 1373(c)—specifically authorize the disclosures brought about by modified SAVE. *See* Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 49–50; Add. 94–97. Then, after the district court granted summary judgment for plaintiffs on the Social Security Act claim, the government’s motion for a stay pending appeal for the first time engaged with the substance of § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I)’s confidentiality mandate. Only then did the government argue that, to the extent modified SAVE discloses any information at all, any such disclosures are consistent with § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). Add. 94–97.

The district court held those new arguments forfeited. Add. 94–98. It emphasized that the government’s new theories implicated two relevant transfers of information in response to a SAVE query: SSA’s initial transmission of responsive information to DHS, and DHS’s ensuing transmission of information to the initial SAVE requester. The court explained that the forfeited arguments could require renewed examination of the administrative record and additional factual determinations about what is communicated at each step. Add. 95–97. The court declined to take up the forfeited arguments “in an expedited fashion” in the context of “a stay motion,” but it expressly invited the government to ask it to excuse the forfeiture and engage with the arguments through a postjudgment motion, “where they can receive adequate and thorough consideration.” Add. 98 n.3. The government did

not take up the district court's invitation, instead filing the present motion in this court for a stay pending appeal.

II.

In attempting to satisfy its burden to make a strong showing of a likelihood of success on the merits of its appeal, the government initially argues that plaintiffs lack standing. The government has not shown the requisite likelihood of success on that argument.

The League has associational standing if one member would have standing in her own right, the interests it seeks to protect are germane to its purpose, and neither the claim nor the requested relief requires an individual member's participation. *Institutional S'holder Servs., Inc. v. SEC*, 142 F.4th 757, 764 (D.C. Cir. 2025). Only the first requirement is disputed. And because the League seeks prospective relief, the question is whether at least one member faces an ongoing or sufficiently imminent injury.

At least two do. J. Doe 4 is a League member and U.S. citizen who lives in Louisiana, which has agreed to use modified SAVE for voter-list maintenance. J. Doe 4 Suppl. Decl. ¶¶ 1–2, 5, 13, Dkt. 16-3. Doe applied for an SSN while a noncitizen, later became a U.S. citizen, and states in a sworn declaration that SSA's records continue to list them as a noncitizen. *Id.* ¶¶ 2, 8, 14. J. Doe 6 is likewise a League member and U.S. citizen who lives in Virginia, where election officials have agreed to use modified SAVE for voter-list maintenance. J. Doe 6 Decl. ¶¶ 1–2, 5, 14, Dkt. 16–8. J. Doe 6 likewise applied for an SSN before naturalizing and states that SSA's records continue to list them as a noncitizen. *Id.* ¶¶ 2, 9, 15. While SSA does not require individuals to update their records when their citizenship status changes (since such a change would not necessarily affect eligibility for related

benefits), J. Doe 6 nonetheless tried unsuccessfully to update their SSA citizenship data before the November 2025 elections. *Id.* ¶ 15.

If modified SAVE were used to obtain information about them, the inaccurate SSA records for J. Doe 4 and J. Doe 6 would likely produce a SAVE record that fails to confirm their citizenship. What would then presumably follow would count as injury for standing purposes. DHS instructs election officials receiving such a response to obtain proof of citizenship from the voter. DHS AR 762. And President Trump has “directed” states to remove all ineligible voters from their rolls “immediately.” White House, *President Trump Delivers an Address to the Nation*, at 39:36–39:46 (YouTube, July 16, 2026), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iIlqG0untYM>. If a person needs to prove their citizenship to remain registered to vote or if they are removed from the registration rolls, they suffer a cognizable injury. *See Meese v. Keene*, 481 U.S. 465, 475 (1987).

The agencies themselves have made clear that the threatened injury J. Doe 4 and J. Doe 6 describe is far from speculative. DHS warned that “[s]hortfalls in data accuracy” in SSA citizenship data could produce “incomplete or false results.” DHS AR 260, 302; *see also* DHS AR 240. SSA likewise cautioned that its citizenship information is accurate “for SSA’s program purposes,” but “if used later for other purposes, it may not be current.” SSA Administrative Record (SSA AR) 103; *see also* SSA AR 44. The implementation of modified SAVE in Texas shows how the dynamic can materialize in practice. When modified SAVE produced adverse results for Texas League members whom federal records misclassified as noncitizens, state officials required them to prove their citizenship and, in some cases, cancelled their registrations. *See* Nel Decl. ¶¶ 19–21, 24, 26 & Exs. 1, 2, Dkt. 66-3; A. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 11–14 & Ex. 1, Dkt. 66-4; B. Doe

Decl. ¶¶ 11–17, 21–22, 24–27, 30–31 & Exs. 1, 2, Dkt. 66-5; C. Doe Decl. ¶¶ 12–14, 18 & Ex. 1, Dkt. 66-6. That experience, together with J. Doe 4’s and J. Doe 6’s out-of-date federal records and their own states’ planned use of modified SAVE, makes injury sufficiently likely to establish their standing. *See Jibril v. Mayorkas*, 20 F.4th 804, 814 (D.C. Cir. 2021).

Contrary to the government’s argument, the intervening role of state officials does not defeat causation. An injury remains fairly traceable to federal action when third parties “will likely react” to it “in predictable ways.” *Diamond Alt. Energy, LLC v. EPA*, 606 U.S. 100, 112 (2025) (cleaned up). The sequence of events in Texas illustrates that states’ response to an adverse SAVE result is not conjectural—after all, the states wanting to use modified SAVE to conduct citizenship checks do so because they expect its result to inform their eligibility determinations. And the threatened injuries are fairly traceable and redressable because setting aside modified SAVE removes the federal response that sets the process in motion. The government thus has not shown that it is likely to succeed in challenging plaintiffs’ standing.

III.

Nor has the government made the requisite strong showing that it is likely to succeed on the merits of its appeal. The district court’s grant of summary judgment against the government on plaintiffs’ Social Security Act claim independently supports its judgment. As to that claim, the central arguments the government now advances in its stay motion were forfeited before the district court. We decline to excuse that forfeiture for purposes of considering the government’s preliminary request for an interim stay, regardless of whether the forfeiture might ultimately be overcome when the government’s appeal is considered on the merits after the full briefing attending that stage. And at any

10

rate, even if we consider the government's forfeited arguments in this posture, the government still does not make the requisite strong showing of a likelihood of success on those new arguments as currently presented.

A.

The Social Security Act's relevant confidentiality mandate provides:

Social security account numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained by authorized persons pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990, shall be confidential, and no authorized person shall disclose any such social security account number or related record.

42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I).

A "social security account number" is an SSN, and a "related record" is "any record, list, or compilation that indicates, directly or indirectly, the identity of any individual with respect to whom a social security account number or a request for a social security account number is maintained." *Id.* § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(IV). There is no dispute that the confidentiality mandate's disclosure prohibition applies not only to the transmission of information from within the federal government to outside it (e.g., DHS to a SAVE user) but also from one federal agency to another (e.g., SSA to DHS).

1.

Plaintiffs contend that modified SAVE violates § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). In moving for summary judgment on that claim and in defending against plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, the government offered two responses. Neither

disputed plaintiffs’ argument that, insofar as § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) applies to modified SAVE, the program violates the provision’s confidentiality mandate. The government instead argued only that plaintiffs lack a cause of action to assert a violation of § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) and that other statutes in any event provide the requisite authorization for modified SAVE’s information sharing. Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 49–50. The district court rejected both of those arguments (the first of which the government no longer presses). *League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *20, *30–33.

The government, as explained, first raised arguments under the terms of § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) only after the district court entered judgment. Add. 94–97. Although the district court deemed the arguments forfeited, the government now relies on them as the central basis of its challenge to the district court’s ruling on the Social Security Act claim. Gov’t Mot. 15–17. The government’s stay motion thus asks us to doubly exercise discretion in its favor. First, a stay pending appeal is “not a matter of right”; it is an “exercise of judicial discretion” governed by equitable principles, *Nken*, 556 U.S. at 433–34 (citations omitted), and is relief we have correspondingly termed “extraordinary,” *CREW*, 904 F.3d at 1017. Second, consideration of an argument forfeited in the district court is also not a matter of right. *See Flynn v. Comm’r*, 269 F.3d 1064, 1068–69 (D.C. Cir. 2001). The usual rule is that a forfeited argument will not be considered on appeal at all, *Kingdomware Technologies, Inc. v. United States*, 579 U.S. 162, 173 (2016); *OBB Personenverkehr AG v. Sachs*, 577 U.S. 27, 38 (2015), much less considered as the central ground for a stay pending appeal, *see Ohio v. EPA*, 603 U.S. 279, 298–99 (2024).

In that regard, when considering whether to grant a stay pending appeal, we ordinarily assess whether a party is likely to succeed in appealing the district court’s rejection of an argument that was thoroughly examined based on full

development through meaningful adversarial testing. A forfeited argument does not come to us with the benefit of that sort of exploration by either the parties or the district court. Of course, our court still might decide in unusual circumstances to consider a forfeited argument after full merits briefing and argument. But it is another matter altogether to rely on the same forfeited argument to grant discretionary interim relief pending the appeal at an expedited preliminary stage, without the benefit of meaningful development in full merits briefing. *See Nken*, 556 U.S. at 433–34; *McBride v. Merrell Dow & Pharms., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1208, 1210–11 (D.C. Cir. 1986). The concerns animating forfeiture principles—that late-raised arguments create “the risk of an improvident or ill-advised opinion” by denying courts and parties normal opportunities for development, *McBride*, 800 F.2d at 1210 (citation omitted)—have added force at this threshold stage.

Those considerations carry pronounced weight here given the course of the litigation. The government had a full opportunity before the district court’s judgment to raise and develop the theories it now presses. Plaintiffs squarely invoked § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), Pls.’ Summ. J. Mot. 32–33; the parties briefed the merits of that and other issues over a period of months; and the government not only opposed plaintiffs’ motion but also cross-moved for judgment in its favor. Fed. Defs.’ Mot. The government does not seriously dispute its forfeiture, Gov’t Mot. 17–18, and it does not ask us to find that the district court erred in deeming the arguments forfeited.

The district court also, in an unusual gesture, affirmatively invited the government to make use of a second opportunity to gain discretionary consideration of its late-raised arguments. In its denial of the government’s motion for a stay, the district court directed the government to a procedural pathway that would allow it to ask the court to excuse the forfeiture and

engage with the new theories in a manner allowing for their full development and consideration. Add. 98 n.3. That course accords with our precedent, which directs a party wishing to gain postjudgment consideration of a new issue to first present it to the district court, often under Rule 59(e) (or potentially under Rule 60(b)(6) when appropriate). *City of New York v. Nat’l R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 776 F.3d 11, 17 (D.C. Cir. 2015); *see Arias v. DynCorp*, 752 F.3d 1011, 1016 (D.C. Cir. 2014); *Jones v. Horne*, 634 F.3d 588, 603 (D.C. Cir. 2011). Here, such a route was still available: a motion of the kind invited by the district court can be filed within 28 days of the judgment, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e); *accord* Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(b), and the district court extended its invitation when 12 days remained in that period. The government, though, declined to take up the invitation and instead immediately sought relief in this court, forgoing further development and consideration of the forfeited arguments in the district court.*

* The district court suggested that the government file a motion under Rule 52(b), Add. 98 n.3, which allows a party to move within 28 days of a judgment for a court to amend or supplement its findings and amend the judgment accordingly; Rule 59(e), relatedly, permits a party within the same period to ask the court directly to alter or amend the judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(b), 59(e). The two rules are routinely invoked together and provide closely related and overlapping forms of postjudgment relief in precisely the same timeframe. *See* 9C Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 2582 (3d ed. updated Apr. 2026); *Nat’l Metal Finishing Co. v. BarclaysAmerican/Com., Inc.*, 899 F.2d 119, 122 (1st Cir. 1990) (describing “the close relationship between Rule 59(e) and Rule 52(b)” and the relief available under them as “so similar”). Whatever the precise procedural vehicle—Rule 52(b), Rule 59(e), or both—the district court expressly offered and essentially encouraged the government to ask the court to exercise its discretion to grant first-instance, “adequate and thorough consideration” of the late-raised arguments. Add. 98 n.3.

Granted, we retain “independent power to identify and apply the proper construction of governing law.” *Kamen v. Kemper Fin. Servs., Inc.*, 500 U.S. 90, 99 (1991). But our “respect for the district judges,” among other considerations, favors giving the court that entered judgment the first opportunity to consider, develop, and resolve a late-raised issue that might call for adjusting the court’s result. *City of New York*, 776 F.3d at 17. And in the circumstances of this case, as the district court explained, the new theories could require further factual development in that court: an informed consideration of the new arguments could turn in part on what information passes from SSA to DHS, what information later passes from DHS to SAVE users, and what the system’s matching and confirmation responses communicate. Add. 95–97. De novo review of the ultimate statutory question does not eliminate the need for an adequately developed factual account of the system to which the statute applies. Courts of appeals “do not sit as self-directed boards of legal inquiry and research” into such matters. *Carducci v. Regan*, 714 F.2d 171, 177 (D.C. Cir. 1983).

In asking us to overlook its forfeiture, the government submits that “[i]t would be extraordinary to use this unusual litigation history to justify precluding millions of verifications” through modified SAVE. Gov’t Mot. 18. But the government makes that appeal in the context of asking us to grant it the “extraordinary relief” of a stay pending appeal. *CREW*, 904 F.3d at 1017. And it would be all the more out-of-the-ordinary to grant that extraordinary relief on the basis of forfeited arguments: the government does not identify any case in which a court has granted a stay pending appeal based on a likelihood of ultimate success as to forfeited (and hence underdeveloped) arguments.

The asserted interests of states that rely on SAVE, *see* Dissent 11, do not warrant departing from ordinary forfeiture principles either. The consequences of a party's litigation choices often—indeed, nearly always—extend beyond the party itself. Those downstream interests also run in both directions here, and nothing in this preliminary stay posture necessarily calls for allocating the risk of error to citizens eligible to vote who may be burdened by inaccurate modified-SAVE results rather than to states temporarily unable to use modified SAVE's new functionality. If such downstream effects sufficed to excuse forfeiture, ordinary forfeiture principles could give way whenever—as may often be the case—government action affects nonparties. Nor does that description fit every state invoking those interests: Texas intervened as a defendant to protect its interests in modified SAVE and independently briefed the Social Security Act claim, yet it too did not advance the specific late-raised theories on which the government now principally relies. *See* Order Granting Tex. Mot. to Intervene 1, Dkt. 86; Tex. Mot. to Dismiss 26, Dkt. 97.

Here, moreover, the statutory obligations the states invoke—determining eligibility for various benefits and maintaining accurate voter rolls—long predate modified SAVE's introduction in 2025. For decades, states carried out those duties using the preexisting SAVE system and other available means. The district court's judgment requires only that they return to those long-used methods while an appeal determines whether modified SAVE is lawful. Whatever advantages modified SAVE's functions afford, the question at this stage is limited to their interim unavailability during the appeal.

The significance of the issues in this appeal to the public at large does not dictate a contrary conclusion. In a related

context, we have declined to consider an argument raised only in a limited fashion by a party even where—and indeed, especially because—“important questions of far-reaching significance are involved.” *Carducci*, 714 F.2d at 177 (internal quotation marks omitted). And the Supreme Court, when considering an emergency stay application involving a major federal regulatory program, declined to consider a theory advanced by the dissent rather than the government itself in opposing the stay: “if the government had arguments along these lines,” the Court emphasized, “it did not make them” despite its “ample resources and voluminous briefing”—and the Court in that context thought that “sticking to [its] normal course of declining to consider forfeited arguments [was] the right course.” *Ohio v. EPA*, 603 U.S. 279, 298–99 (2024). We similarly adhere to that course here.

We are unpersuaded to do otherwise based on the parallel proceedings pertaining to modified SAVE in the Northern District of Florida. Several states there entered into a settlement with DHS requiring, among other things, access to modified SAVE’s SSN-search and bulk-upload functionality. After the district court here set aside modified SAVE, the Florida court enforced the parties’ settlement there and ordered DHS to restore those functions for the plaintiff states. *See Florida v. DHS*, No. 3:24-cv-509, Dkt. 45, at 5–9 (N.D. Fla. July 7, 2026); Add. 105–12.

It is far from clear that the two proceedings present conflicting legal determinations. The district court here adjudicated plaintiffs’ claims on the merits; the Florida court, by contrast, enforced a settlement DHS voluntarily entered while this litigation was already pending. The Florida court did not—and, by nature of the proceeding, could not—address the substance of the claims presented here. The fate of the Florida court’s enforcement order also is uncertain as it is presently on

appeal in the Eleventh Circuit. And questions about the effect of the district court's judgment here on the Florida proceedings are being litigated in the Eleventh Circuit appeal.

The government, meanwhile, has not sought to reduce any practical tension raised by its obligations in the two cases by arguing here that the district court's relief is too broad; and the mere existence of parallel proceedings—even assuming the orders in fact conflict—does not itself suggest which order, if either, should yield. Indeed, the state parties there have themselves opposed expedition, arguing that the appeal presents “many novel and complex questions” and urging that both appeals proceed “in the ordinary course.” State Appellees’ Opp. to Mot. to Expedite 1–2, 13, *Florida v. League of Women Voters*, No. 26-12533 (11th Cir. July 28, 2026). Those circumstances provide limited reason to depart from ordinary forfeiture principles here.

We therefore decline to take the highly unusual step of considering the government's forfeited arguments at this preliminary stage. A subsequent merits panel remains free to decide for itself whether to entertain the arguments after full appellate briefing. And in any event, as we explain below, even if we consider the government's forfeited arguments at this stage on the present record, the government fails to make the required strong showing of a likelihood of success.

2.

Before taking up the government's forfeited arguments in the alternative, we first explain why the government does not make a strong showing of a likelihood of success if we confine our consideration to the sole properly preserved argument the government now presses on the Social Security Act claim. Fed. Defs.’ Mot. 44–50. That argument is one the government advances only as a fallback matter. Gov’t Mot. 17. It rests on

8 U.S.C. § 1373(c), which generally requires DHS to respond to state and local inquiries seeking citizenship or immigration-status information. That provision does not establish a likelihood of success for the government.

A general duty to answer a citizenship inquiry under 8 U.S.C. § 1373(c) does not by itself authorize disclosure of information that another statute, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), specifically makes confidential. The two commands can readily coexist and function together: DHS may answer the inquiries Congress calls for it to answer while still complying with a separate restriction on the disclosure of specific information Congress deemed confidential. *See League of Women Voters*, 2026 WL 1784297, at *30–33.

Congress’s treatment of employment verification in the same 1996 legislation that enacted § 1373(c) reinforces that conclusion. Congress expressly authorized SSA to participate in an employment-verification system by matching names and SSNs against its records; specified what information SSA could return; and restricted how that information could be used. *See* Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-208, § 404(e), (h), 110 Stat. 3009-546, 3009-665 (codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1324a note). Section 1373(c) contains no comparable reference to SSA records, SSN matching, or the Social Security Act’s confidentiality rule. Congress thus knew how to authorize SSN matching, and it expressly did so elsewhere in the same statute. We see little basis to read § 1373(c)’s general instruction to answer citizenship inquiries as both silently accomplishing the same thing and silently displacing an otherwise applicable confidentiality restriction.

Once the forfeited theories are removed from consideration per the usual rule attending forfeiture, then, the government is left with no preserved argument in its stay

motion that independently makes a strong showing that it is likely to defeat the Social Security Act claim. That itself warrants denying the government's stay motion because we would decline to consider the forfeited arguments at this stage for the reasons explained. We nevertheless next take up those forfeited theories in the alternative and explain why the government still does not carry its burden.

B.

The government's forfeited theories, even if considered, do not make the requisite strong showing of a likelihood of success. Recall the terms of the Social Security Act's relevant confidentiality mandate: "Social security account numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained by authorized persons pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990, shall be confidential, and no authorized person shall disclose any such social security account number or related record." 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). In its forfeited arguments, the government posits two theories under that provision's terms: (i) that the information conveyed under modified SAVE is "obtained or maintained" "pursuant to . . . law[s] enacted" before "October 1, 1990"; and (ii) that regardless, modified SAVE does not involve "disclos[ure]" of a "social security account number or related record." *Id.*

Those new arguments implicate unresolved legal questions whose factual premises are incompletely developed in the available briefing and record. And since the government raised those arguments too late to enable their full development in (and full consideration by) the district court—and since the government in any event bears the burden to justify the extraordinary interim relief it seeks—any uncertainties resulting from the arguments' inadequate development at this stage weigh against the granting of relief. Considered in that light, neither of the government's new theories, at least as

presently constituted, makes the requisite showing of a strong likelihood of success on the merits of its appeal.

1.

The government first argues that the confidentiality provision's temporal limitation excludes the records implicated by modified SAVE. Gov't Mot. 15–16. Section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) protects from disclosure SSNs and related records “obtained or maintained” pursuant to law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. The government submits that this temporal limitation excludes essentially everything flowing from SSA because SSA began issuing SSNs in the 1930s and collecting citizenship or alien-status information in the 1970s. The government reasons from that history that, even if SSNs or related records are disclosed via modified SAVE, the fact that those records exist under a long-existing legal architecture necessarily means their disclosure cannot breach the confidentiality mandate. Gov't Mot. 15–16.

The statutory terms, however, call for a particular inquiry: is the disclosed information “obtained or maintained . . . pursuant to [a] provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990”? 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). As to the question posed by the statute—i.e., pursuant to what provision of law is each SSN and related record at issue obtained or maintained—the government's stay motion identifies no “provision of law,” pre-1990 or otherwise. Instead, it cites an article written by an SSA employee that recounts the history of the SSN and describes SSA's recordkeeping practices. *See* Gov't Mot. 16 (citing Carolyn Puckett, *The Story of the Social Security Number*, 69 Soc. Sec. Bull. 55 (2009)). Read in its entirety, the article does not adequately answer the question posed by the statute's terms in a way that would satisfy the government's burden at this stage.

For one thing, the article itself explains that SSA’s Numerical Identification System (Numident)—the database in which SSA maintains records associated with SSNs—is not simply a collection of records fixed when each SSN was first assigned. When information changes—including when statutes require changes in the procedures by which data are “obtained or maintained,” § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I)—SSA adds a new “entry” or “iteration” to each individual’s record. A single Numident record thus can contain dozens, and sometimes hundreds, of entries. Puckett, *supra*, at 63. The article also surveys the many times, before and after 1990, when Congress enacted laws that altered SSA’s collection and verification of information. *See, e.g.*, Help America Vote Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-252, § 303(a)(5)(C), 116 Stat. 1666, 1710–11; Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, Pub. L. No. 108-458, § 7213(a)(1)(B)–(C), 118 Stat. 3638, 3830–31.

Neither the government’s briefing nor the present record tells us which Numident entry supplies the information used to fulfill queries from modified SAVE; when that entry was created or updated; or pursuant to what specific statutory authority it has been “obtained or maintained” within the meaning of § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). That is, the fact that SSA generally began collecting the same broad categories of information long before 1990 does not establish that the particular records at issue here fall outside the temporal limitation established by § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). Indeed, if the pre-1990 origins of SSA’s system place SSNs outside the confidentiality mandate, as the government now argues, it is unclear what in § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) would prevent SSA from publicly releasing any—or even every—SSN in its database. *Cf.* 42 U.S.C. § 1306(a)(1) (similar confidentiality provision).

In any event, modified SAVE does not merely transmit preexisting fields from Numident. It also generates *new* person-specific records at several junctures—and the government’s temporal argument does not address those new records or their implications for the temporal question raised by § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) either. In responding to a query, SSA compares the information supplied by DHS with its own records and creates a new, query-specific match record, which flags whether matches to its database using the submitted SSN, name, and date of birth were successful and appends the results to the requested citizenship information. DHS likewise creates and retains a person-specific SAVE case for ten years. Although our dissenting colleague notes that the SAVE case itself is not disclosed to the SAVE user, Dissent 8, DHS uses the SAVE case to create a “SAVE case response”—another new, user-facing file—that is disclosed. DHS AR 114–20; Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. 48948, 48950, 48954–55 (Oct. 31, 2025).

Assuming those records are SSNs or “related records” and that the transfers are disclosures within the meaning of § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii), the temporal question is, again, pursuant to what authority are they obtained or maintained. The government does not say. Elsewhere, the government invokes § 1373(c) as authority for the modified-SAVE exchange, but that provision cannot supply the needed pre-1990 authority: Congress enacted § 1373(c) in 1996. Gov’t Mot. 3, 17.

The government thus ultimately at best establishes a potentially salient historical fact: SSA began collecting certain categories of information long before 1990. But the government does not provide adequate support for the proposition its argument requires: that the particular SSNs and related records implicated by modified SAVE are neither obtained nor maintained pursuant to any post-1990 law. Of course, had the government timely raised the argument in the

district court or sought to fully develop it in the way the district court invited, the picture might look quite different. And full merits briefing in this appeal might also flesh out the arguments (and potential responses) in ways that alter our understanding of the meaning of the confidentiality provision. But on the briefing and record before us at this preliminary stage, the argument does not make a strong showing that the temporal limitation defeats plaintiffs' claim.

2.

The government next argues that modified SAVE does not “disclose” SSNs or “related records” in a way that § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) bars. The theory is that the sole information disclosed to a SAVE user is citizenship status (and, when applicable, an indicator that the person is deceased). That information, the government posits, is neither an SSN nor a “related record” that identifies an individual. Gov’t Mot. 16–17. At least on the record before us at this stage, that account of modified SAVE is inadequate to carry the government’s burden.

First, modified SAVE undisputedly involves at least one disclosure of an SSN in the most literal sense. When a SAVE user submits only a partial SSN and the query produces a match, SSA sends DHS the complete nine-digit number. Gov’t Mot. 6, 15; DHS AR 424. SSA thus gives DHS a full SSN that DHS did not previously possess. Assuming the SSN otherwise falls within § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), that is plainly a disclosure. The government acknowledges the transfer of a person’s full SSN—and, in fact, explains in its stay motion the conditions under which it occurs—but does not address how it may fall outside the confidentiality mandate. Gov’t Mot. 6.

Second, modified SAVE does more than merely return an indicator for citizenship or death status. It verifies the information supplied by the SAVE user against SSA's records, including as to a person's SSN. For each query, SSA takes the submitted SSN, name, and date of birth and creates a query-specific match record containing three separate results: SSN match—true or false; name match—true or false; date-of-birth match—true or false. SSA then sends those new matching results to DHS together with citizenship and other information. DHS AR 116, 225–26, 424, 437–38.

There are sound reasons to think verification of that kind might well amount to a “disclos[ure]” of an SSN for purposes of § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). Although we have no need to authoritatively construe the provision's use of that term at this stage, we have repeatedly recognized in related privacy contexts that an agency can reveal new information by confirming its accuracy. As we have explained, confirmation by an agency “in a position to know” may be revealing because it removes “any lingering doubts” about the information in question. *Frugone v. CIA*, 169 F.3d 772, 774–75 (D.C. Cir. 1999) (citation omitted); *Knight First Amend. Inst. at Columbia Univ. v. CIA*, 11 F.4th 810, 816 (D.C. Cir. 2021) (citation omitted).

Here, the verifying agency itself assigns and maintains the records being checked. When SSA reports an SSN match, it confirms that its records associate the submitted number with the person identified in the query; and when it reports no match, it communicates the contrary. Indeed, the familiar *Glomar* response to a Freedom of Information Act request—refusing either to confirm or deny whether particular records exist—rests on the premise that either answer may itself disclose protected information. See *Wolf v. CIA*, 473 F.3d 370, 374 (D.C. Cir. 2007). Separately, we have rejected the categorical

proposition that information cannot be “disclosed” to a recipient whenever the recipient already knows it. *See Pilon v. Dep’t of Just.*, 73 F.3d 1111, 1119–26 (D.C. Cir. 1996). Those authorities of course do not definitively resolve the meaning of § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). They do, however, call into question the government’s premise that verification cannot amount to disclosure when the requester supplied the information being verified. After all, if a party asked SSA to verify that a particular nine-digit number it believes may be a given person’s SSN is in fact the correct SSN, and SSA would respond with either a yes or a no rather than declining to answer, it is quite conceivable that an affirmative answer amounts to a disclosure by SSA of the person’s SSN at some meaningful level.

There appears to be no dispute that verification of an SSN occurs when SSA transfers information to DHS in response to a query using modified SAVE; and that verification itself involves a possible violation of § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I)’s confidentiality mandate. As for the ensuing transfer of information from DHS to the querying SAVE user, the present record leaves uncertain precisely how, and to what extent, SSA’s match information ultimately reaches a SAVE user. At least some error messages appear in user-facing responses. *See* DHS AR 762. And DHS’s own description of the system states that, when a corresponding record is located, SAVE sends a “SAVE case response” that “includes the data elements used to create the case” and other fields supplied by SSA. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48950; *see also* DHS AR 1379, 1443–44. The district court specifically identified this as a question on which further factual development could have been useful had the issue been timely presented. Add. 95–97. Those sorts of factual uncertainties weigh against the government at this stage.

Finally, the government’s argument about “related records” rests on a similarly narrow—possibly too narrow—description of what modified SAVE discloses. Congress defines a “related record” as “any record, list, or compilation that indicates, directly or indirectly, the identity of any individual” for whom an SSN or request for one is maintained. 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(IV). The government reasons that a citizenship (or death status) indicator does not itself identify anyone and that the identifying information instead “flows the other way,” from the SAVE user to DHS. Gov’t Mot. 16.

That, though, is not the specific inquiry called for by the statutory definition. The statute does not ask whether one field in a record—“U.S. Citizen,” for example—alone identifies a person. It asks whether the “record, list, or compilation” indicates the identity of an individual, “directly or indirectly.” 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(IV). The government’s motion narrows both parts of that definition: it focuses on a single data field rather than the record in which the field appears, and it replaces “directly or indirectly” with an ellipsis when quoting the statute. Gov’t Mot. 16; Pls.’ Resp. 20–21.

The records produced by modified SAVE seem to fit the definition as written. DHS creates a separate SAVE case for each person submitted and retains that record for ten years. Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. at 48950, 48954–55. And the “SAVE case response” DHS sends to a user “includes the data elements used to create the case” together with additional citizenship or immigration information. *Id.* at 48950. For bulk submissions, users may also generate reports listing cases, statuses, and SAVE responses. *Id.* at 48951. A record that links a person’s submitted name, date of birth, and SSN to a citizenship response can indicate whose information it reports even if the

citizenship field itself contains no name. The government does not explain why such a record falls outside the definition merely because the requester initially supplied many of its data elements. For that reason, too, the government has not made a strong showing that the records disclosed through modified SAVE fall outside § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(IV).

IV.

The government does not argue that it could be entitled to a stay pending appeal even if it fails to make a strong showing of a likelihood of success on the merits. We thus have no occasion to consider the remaining stay factors—whether the government would be irreparably injured absent a stay, whether a stay would substantially injure the other parties, and where the public interest lies. *Nken*, 556 U.S. at 434. We nonetheless briefly note some considerations that would inform that inquiry, as to which the government would bear the burden to show that the circumstances would justify an exercise of our equitable discretion. *Id.* at 433–34.

The government’s principal operational harm from the denial of a stay pending appeal is that, without interim access to modified SAVE during the pendency of the appeal, some citizenship verifications are slower and more cumbersome. Gov’t Mot. 26–27. And the government identifies certain specific programs that will be impeded without access to modified SAVE, including verifications of eligibility for commercial driver’s licenses and certain housing benefit programs. Gov’t Mot. 26. Those operational consequences are real, but it also bears noting that they are not of an all-or-nothing character: whatever its limitations, the preexisting SAVE program in operation for decades remains available to the states and to federal programs. The harm stems from the unavailability of modified SAVE’s SSN- and bulk-search

functionalities, not the loss of SAVE-based verification altogether—and then only for the pendency of this appeal.

Although the chief use of modified SAVE giving rise to this litigation concerns citizenship verifications related to voter eligibility, disruptions to that use do not present the kind of imminent harm that would warrant intervention in this posture. Federal law constrains systematic voter-list maintenance in the immediate time ahead. The National Voter Registration Act makes it unlawful to undertake systematic voter removal within the 90-day period preceding a federal primary or general election. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 20507(c)(2)(A). As the government itself argued when opposing plaintiffs’ request for preliminary relief in the district court, the NVRA’s 90-day limitation was “fatal” to a claim of imminent harm premised on systematic voter-roll maintenance. *See* Add. 103–04. By the time the government sought a stay pending appeal in this court, that limitation was already operative in several states and soon would be in many more: when the government filed its motion on July 8, for instance, Florida (an amicus supporting the government) was already within the 90-day period preceding its August 18 primary, and the 90-day period leading up to the general election was less than one month away.

While the Supreme Court’s recent order granting a stay in *Trump v. California*, No. 26A124 (Aug. 24, 2026), focused on the timing of an asserted election-related harm, the situation there was materially different. The Court emphasized that, absent interim relief, ordinary appellate review would itself deprive the Executive of an ability to pursue its election-related objectives: “reversal of the District Court’s judgment would come too late.” *Id.* (slip op. at 9). Here, by contrast, federal law itself—in the form of the NVRA—constrains the principal election-related use of modified SAVE during the relevant period. Denying a stay thus does not deprive the government or the states of an otherwise available opportunity to undertake

systematic voter-list maintenance while ordinary appellate review proceeds. And although our dissenting colleague suggests that modified SAVE could be used for individualized decisions that may fall outside the NVRA’s reach, Dissent 20 n.4, the government itself drew no such distinction when it invoked the NVRA to address the imminence of election-related harm in the district court. In any event, the preexisting version of SAVE remains available during the appeal for individualized queries of the sort it has long permitted.

As for the competing harms to plaintiffs that would attend the grant of an interim stay, the district court described the adverse consequences to citizens from using inaccurate SSA citizenship information in modified SAVE, including the risk—already borne out in Texas—that citizens may be required to prove citizenship to remain registered and, in some cases, may have their registrations cancelled. Add. 103–04. The public interest does not favor interim restoration of a system the government has not made a strong showing it may lawfully operate. *See League of Women Voters of the United States v. Newby*, 838 F.3d 1, 12 (D.C. Cir. 2016).

* * * * *

Because the district court’s ruling under the Social Security Act independently supports its judgment, we do not address the court’s additional holdings concerning DHS’s statutory authority, the Privacy Act, or arbitrary-and-capricious review. The government has not made the requisite “strong showing that [it] is likely to succeed on the merits” of the Social Security Act claim, *Nken*, 556 U.S. at 434, and we therefore deny its motion for a stay pending appeal.

KATSAS, *Circuit Judge*, dissenting: For decades, states have obtained data regarding citizenship and immigration status from the Department of Homeland Security to assess eligibility for public benefits and voting. DHS answers these queries through its Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) database. Before 2025, SAVE had limited utility: States could submit only individualized queries, DHS had no means of confirming the citizenship of U.S.-born individuals, and DHS lacked access to relevant records of the Social Security Administration. After multiple states sued, demanding that DHS make SAVE more effective, the agency implemented changes that permitted bulk queries and allowed internal agency use of social security numbers to determine the citizenship of individuals lacking an immigration number from DHS.

A voting-rights organization and a privacy organization challenged these changes. On summary judgment, the district court vacated the notices announcing the changes and the modified SAVE program. For the reasons set forth below, I would stay the order pending the government’s appeal.

I

A

The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) directed the Department of Homeland Security’s predecessor agency to “implement a system for the verification of immigration status.” Pub. L. No. 99-603, § 121(c)(1), 100 Stat. 3359, 3391. Congress requires states and some federal agencies to use this system to assess eligibility for a wide array of federal benefits. *See, e.g.*, 42 U.S.C. § 1320b-7(a), (b)(1)–(4), (d)(3) (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, Medicaid, unemployment compensation, and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program); *id.* § 1436a(d)(3) (housing benefits); 20 U.S.C. § 1091(g) (student aid); *see also* 49 C.F.R.

§ 383.73(m) (commercial driver’s license); 6 C.F.R. § 37.13(b) (REAL ID).

To comply with IRCA, DHS administers the Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) program. SAVE allows federal, state, and local government agencies to query DHS about the citizenship or immigration status of individuals. The federal government also uses SAVE to control “access [to] sensitive government functions—such as employment in government positions, entry to secure facilities,” and “government-issued licenses and credentials.” Add. 88. SAVE does not itself determine eligibility for any benefits; ultimate eligibility determinations are left to the querying agencies that use SAVE. 42 U.S.C. § 1320b-7(d)(5).

Congress also has required states to ensure that their voter-registration records are accurate, *see* 52 U.S.C. §§ 21083(a)(4), 20501(b)(4), and prohibited aliens from voting in federal elections, *see* 18 U.S.C. § 611(a). Furthermore, under the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA), DHS has the “[o]bligation to ... respond to an inquiry by a Federal, State, or local government agency, seeking to verify or ascertain the citizenship or immigration status of any individual within the jurisdiction of the agency for any purpose authorized by law, by providing the requested verification or status information.” 8 U.S.C. § 1373(c). Since 2005, states have used SAVE to verify that voters are citizens. Today, 27 states use SAVE for that purpose. From January 1, 2025, to April 1, 2026, these states made some 60 million voter-verification queries to SAVE. In all, over 1,300 federal, state, and local government agencies use SAVE, which processed some 25 million queries in fiscal year 2024 and 200 million queries in fiscal year 2025. Add. 83; *About SAVE*, USCIS, <https://perma.cc/XXG4-498F>.

3

B

Before 2025, SAVE had three significant shortcomings. First, it could not verify the citizenship of individuals born in the United States. Second, SAVE could access only DHS records linked to an individual's DHS numeric identifier, such as an alien registration number. It could not access records of the Social Security Administration (SSA) or conduct searches using social security numbers (SSNs). Third, SAVE could process verification requests only one individual at a time; it could not process bulk requests. According to the plaintiffs themselves, these shortcomings made SAVE "exceedingly limited in scope and functionality." First Amended and Supplemental Complaint, ECF Doc. 61, at 2.

Dissatisfied with these limitations, a group of states sued DHS in the District Court for the Northern District of Florida in late 2024. The states alleged that SAVE's deficiencies made DHS unable to comply with its obligation under IIRIRA to respond to their inquiries about citizenship or immigration status. The states and DHS resolved the case through a settlement agreement executed in November 2025 and approved by the Northern District in December 2025. The agreement required DHS to ensure that SAVE could "integrate with the Social Security Administration to allow searches with full SSNs" or "with last-four-digits SSNs" and could "process bulk upload verification requests so that users of the system will not need to input verification requests one-by-one." *Florida v. DHS*, No. 24-cv-509, 2026 WL 1968339, at *1 (N.D. Fla. July 7, 2026) (cleaned up).

In March 2025, President Trump ordered DHS to ensure that state and local officials have "access to appropriate systems for verifying the citizenship or immigration status of individuals registering to vote or who are already registered."

Exec. Order No. 14248, *Preserving and Protecting the Integrity of American Elections*, 90 Fed. Reg. 14005, 14006 (Mar. 25, 2025). He also ordered the SSA to “take all appropriate action to make available the Social Security Number Verification Service, the Death Master File, and any other Federal databases containing relevant information to all State and local election officials engaged in verifying the eligibility of individuals registering to vote or who are already registered.” *Id.* at 14007. Thus, in May 2025, DHS announced two major changes to the SAVE database. First, SAVE users could now verify the citizenship or immigration status of individuals using their SSNs. Second, SAVE users could submit queries in bulk, checking their entire voter-registration lists against federal databases to identify potential non-citizen voters. *Optimizing SAVE: New Options to Create Cases with a Social Security Number and by Bulk Upload*, USCIS, <https://perma.cc/BY4S-AXKP>. I refer to this new version as “modified SAVE.”

With modified SAVE, the requesting agency enters into a spreadsheet the following required information for each person whose citizenship or immigration status it seeks to verify: first and last name, date of birth, the reason for verification, and at least one numeric identifier, such as an SSN or any DHS identifier. DHS AR 1443–45. If the user provides SSNs, SAVE then checks individuals listed in the spreadsheet against the SSA’s records. *Id.* at 1364. As relevant here, the SSA reports to DHS whether the submitted name, date of birth, and SSN match its records. Add. 18. If the requesting agency supplies a partial SSN that matches, the SSA reports the full SSN to DHS. *Id.* The SSA also reports to DHS whether its records show each individual to be a citizen, the immigration status of any non-citizen, whether the individual was foreign-born, and whether the individual is deceased. *Id.*

If the search of SSA records flags a potential non-citizen, DHS attempts to verify citizenship status by other means. Add. 18–19. If a DHS numeric identifier is available, SAVE automatically queries additional federal databases. *Id.* If those queries do not confirm citizenship, DHS conducts manual searches of yet other DHS systems. Add. 80. If this process confirms that the individual is a citizen, the requesting agency is so informed. *Id.* at 19. If SAVE returns anything else—such as a non-citizen status, an unconfirmed status, or a death indicator—the requesting agency is told to contact the individual for more information. *Id.* at 19–20.

II

The lead plaintiffs in this case are two nonprofit organizations: the League of Women Voters and the Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC). The League of Women Voters is dedicated to “encouraging Americans to participate in the electoral process,” and it registers people to vote. First Amended and Supplemental Complaint, ECF Doc. 61, at 4–5. EPIC is dedicated to monitoring “government activities that impact individual privacy.” *Id.* at 6. In September 2025, the plaintiffs sued DHS and the SSA in the District Court for the District of Columbia. The organizations contend they have members who have been incorrectly identified as non-citizens under modified SAVE and thus required to document their citizenship, as well as members whose SSNs have been disclosed without consent. The organizations argue that the agencies’ operation of modified SAVE lacks statutory authorization, violates the Social Security Act and the Privacy Act, and is arbitrary.

The district court denied a stay under the Administrative Procedure Act, but then granted summary judgment to the plaintiffs. As relevant here, the court concluded that the

plaintiffs have Article III standing to challenge the operation of modified SAVE, that its operation violates substantive disclosure restrictions in the Social Security Act and the Privacy Act, that DHS and the SSA failed to give adequate notice of the new uses of data, and that the agencies acted arbitrarily. The court issued final, universal relief purporting to vacate modified SAVE, including its ability to accept bulk queries from requesting agencies, and the notices implementing modified SAVE.

In response to the D.D.C. order, DHS and the SSA disabled modified SAVE. Arguing that this order conflicted with the settlement agreement approved by the Northern District of Florida, the state plaintiffs moved that court to enforce the settlement agreement against DHS. The Northern District concluded that DHS had violated the settlement agreement, granted the enforcement motion, and ordered DHS to reinstate the bulk-upload and SSN-search functions of modified SAVE as to the four state plaintiffs. *Florida v. DHS*, 2026 WL 1968339, at *4. The League of Women Voters and EPIC intervened in the Northern District and appealed the enforcement order to the Eleventh Circuit. *Florida v. DHS*, No. 26-12533 (11th Cir. July 21, 2026). In the D.D.C., the League of Women Voters and EPIC moved to enforce the summary-judgment order. In a minute order, that court deferred ruling on the motion to enforce, pending the outcome of the Eleventh Circuit appeal.

DHS and the SSA (collectively “the government”) appealed the D.D.C. summary-judgment order and moved in that court for a stay pending appeal. The district court denied the stay motion, and the government then moved this Court for a stay pending appeal.

7

In assessing the government's stay motion, we consider the government's likelihood of success on the merits, whether it will suffer irreparable injury absent relief, and the balance of the equities. *Trump v. California*, Nos. 26A124, 26A139, 2026 WL 2473573, at *2 (U.S. Aug. 24, 2026) (per curiam).

III

The government argues that the plaintiffs are unlikely to succeed on appeal because they lack Article III standing and their claims are without merit. In determining likelihood of success at the stay stage, we may consider standing and merits questions, and we may do so in either order. *See Mullin v. Doe*, 146 S. Ct. 2121, 2137 (2026) (plurality). I conclude that the government is likely to succeed on the merits, so I need not address standing at this stage.

A

The government is likely to succeed in showing that modified SAVE does not violate the Social Security Act's prohibition on disclosure of SSNs or related records. That Act provides:

Social security account numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained by authorized persons pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990, shall be confidential, and no authorized person shall disclose any such social security account number or related record.

42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). In considering whether the operation of modified SAVE violates this disclosure bar, we must consider both (1) disclosures from the SSA to DHS and

(2) disclosures from DHS to the requesting agency. In my view, section 405 does not bar either category of disclosure.

To begin, the bar does not apply to the SSA’s disclosures to DHS, because the SSA obtains and maintains its relevant records pursuant to laws enacted well before 1990. The Social Security Act of 1935 authorizes the SSA to create and maintain SSNs. *See* Pub. L. No. 74-271, § 808, 49 Stat. 620, 638; Identification of Taxpayers under Title VIII of the Social Security Act, 1 Fed. Reg. 2023, 2024 (Nov. 7, 1936). And, in 1972, amendments to that Act instructed the SSA to “require of applicants for social security account numbers such evidence as may be necessary to establish the age, citizenship, or alien status, and true identity of such applicants.” Social Security Amendments of 1972, Pub. L. No. 92-603, § 137(2), 86 Stat. 1329, 1364–65 (codified at 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(B)(ii)). In sum, the SSA creates, obtains, and maintains SSNs and records related to age, citizenship and alien status, and identity pursuant to statutes enacted decades before 1990.¹ And that information is exactly what the SSA discloses to DHS. 90 Fed. Reg. at 48950, 48952.²

¹ The majority finds it implausible that section 405’s disclosure bar may not apply to the SSA’s handling of core records like SSNs. *Ante*, at 21. But the bar itself was not even enacted until November 1990. *See* Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-624, §§ 1735(b), 2201(c), 104 Stat. 3359, 3792, 3952. And Congress enacted the bar in direct conjunction with provisions newly permitting *other* agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture, to collect SSNs. *See id.* §§ 1735(a), 2201(a)–(b), 104 Stat. at 3791–92, 3951–52. So it is thus hardly surprising that this 1990 bar does not cover the SSA’s management of its own core records, though of course other statutes may.

² The majority contends that SAVE generates new types of records: a “match record” from the SSA, a “SAVE case” that DHS

Moreover, DHS discloses neither SSNs nor related records to the requesting agency. Instead, DHS conveys only information about the individual’s citizenship or immigration status (plus whether the individual is still alive). *See* 90 Fed. Reg. at 48950; Add. 18–19. Thus, if the SSA provides a matching SSN to DHS, the SSN itself never leaves DHS. *See id.* Nor does DHS disclose any related records covered by the disclosure bar. A “related record” is “any record, list, or compilation that indicates, directly or indirectly, the identity of any individual with respect to whom a social security account number or a request for a social security account number is maintained.” 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(IV). The plaintiffs note that DHS “obtain[s]” such records from the SSA when it receives a “full SSN for all matches (when a partial SSN is provided) and a ‘true/false’ match response on certain inputted fields: SSN, name, and date of birth.” Plaintiffs’ Resp. at 21 (cleaned up). But even if DHS *obtains* such covered data from the SSA, DHS never *discloses* it to the requesting agency or to anyone else. Nor does DHS “indicate[], directly or indirectly, the identity of any individual,” 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(IV), because its disclosure to the requesting agency communicates only what SSA records say about the citizenship of individuals *identified by the requesting agency* when it provides DHS with a first and last name, date of birth, and SSN or other identifier. Moreover, the Social Security Act itself distinguishes between the “identity” of an individual, which DHS does not provide to the requesting

maintains for ten years, and SAVE’s responses to user queries. *Ante*, at 22. However, the “match record” merely includes the contents of records that the SSA maintains pursuant to pre-1990 law. *See* 90 Fed. Reg. at 48952. DHS does not disclose any “SAVE case” records to the requesting agency, except for the responses that SAVE automatically provides. *See id.* at 48954–55; Add. 19. And as explained below, those responses do not qualify as “related record[s]” under the Social Security Act.

agency, and “the fact that such individual is a citizen or a noncitizen,” which DHS does seek to provide. *See id.* § 405(c)(2)(B)(i)(III). In sum, SAVE responses are not “related records” because they simply repeat identifying information provided by the SAVE user, in the course of conveying any additional, unprotected information about the identified individual’s citizenship status.³

The district court treated these arguments as forfeited, but we have discretion to excuse forfeitures “in cases involving uncertainty in the law” and in “extraordinary situations with the potential for miscarriages of justice.” *Flynn v. Comm’r*, 269 F.3d 1064, 1069 (D.C. Cir. 2001). The majority stresses that we should exercise this discretion sparingly, both in general and especially in the context of stay litigation. *Ante*, at 9–17. I have no quarrel with those propositions in the abstract. But in my view, several considerations support excusing the forfeiture in the quite unusual circumstances presented here.

³ The majority notes that disclosure bars sometimes cover disclosures to individuals who already know the protected information. *Ante*, at 24–25 (citing *Pilon v. DOJ*, 73 F.3d 1111, 1119–26 (D.C. Cir. 1996)). Fair enough, but it seems to me quite a stretch to extend that principle to the identifying information at issue here, where the assertedly protected information flows from the requesting agency to DHS, and does so for the sole purpose of generating a discrete response disclosing unprotected information about citizenship or immigration status. Similarly inapposite is the cloak-and-dagger law regarding official acknowledgment and *Glomar* responses, *ante*, at 24–25, which applies where the existence or not of agency records is itself protected information. *See, e.g., Knight First Amend. Inst. at Columbia v. CIA*, 11 F.4th 810, 813–16, 819–20 (D.C. Cir. 2021). Here, it is no secret that the SSA since 1972 has been statutorily required to obtain and maintain records regarding the citizenship or alien status of individuals authorized or required to have SSNs. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(B)(ii).

First, this case involves the ongoing administration of an important federal program mandated by Congress to facilitate eligibility determinations for voting and a wide range of federal benefits. *See* Pub. L. No. 99-603, § 121(c)(1), 100 Stat. at 3391 (IRCA); 8 U.S.C. § 1373(c) (IIRIRA). The original SAVE program was severely limited in its functionality; among other things, it could not even confirm the citizenship of U.S.-born individuals, and it required queries to be performed one-by-one. The modified SAVE program cured those deficiencies, so we should not lightly frustrate its operation based on legal premises that may be erroneous. Instead, we should exercise our “independent power to identify and apply the proper construction of governing law.” *Kamen v. Kemper Fin. Servs., Inc.*, 500 U.S. 90, 99 (1991).

Second, the program implicates various statutory obligations, entitlements, and interests of the states. Federal law requires the states to ensure that their voter-registration rolls are accurate. *See* 52 U.S.C. §§ 21083(a)(4), 20501(b)(4). It also prohibits aliens from voting in federal elections, *see* 18 U.S.C. § 611(a), the manner of which is presumptively a state responsibility, U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1. How are states to carry out these responsibilities effectively, if they cannot obtain reliable information about the citizenship and immigration status of their residents from a federal government assigned with the primary “power over the subject of immigration and the status of aliens”? *Arizona v. United States*, 567 U.S. 387, 394 (2012). To help states carry out these responsibilities, as well as the responsibility for enforcing eligibility restrictions governing state-administered federal programs, IIRIRA gives states an affirmative entitlement to receive from DHS information about “the citizenship or immigration status of any individual” within their respective jurisdictions. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1373(c) (imposing on DHS the “[o]bligation to respond” to such queries). Likewise, states have important interests in

receiving this information to the extent that many state entitlement programs are also limited to United States citizens resident in the state. *See* Br. of Amici Curiae Iowa, Florida, Indiana, and Ohio at 5–7 (States’ Br.). It is one thing to saddle the United States with the consequences of its own litigation decisions; it is quite another to so saddle the states.

Third, this case involves dueling district-court injunctions, as the district court here has *prohibited* what the Northern District of Florida has *compelled*. Specifically, the Northern District ordered DHS to “immediately comply with the court-approved settlement agreement” in the case before it “by reinstating [the plaintiff states’] access to the bulk-upload and SSN-search features in the [modified] SAVE system.” *Florida v. DHS*, 2026 WL 1968339, at *4. And the district court here purported to “set[] aside and vacate[] the 2025 SAVE modified system,” Add. 5, thus effectively and universally enjoining its use. The majority notes that the Northern District did not expressly “address the substance of the claims presented here.” *Ante*, at 16. True enough, though the Northern District did state that its approval of the settlement agreement reflected an “implicit determination that the modifications to the SAVE system were lawful.” *Florida v. DHS*, 2026 WL 1968339, at *3. And the Northern District did expressly “disagree[] with the conclusions” of the district court here, *id.*, which in turn stated its view that the Northern District had “erred in significant ways” in enforcing the settlement agreement, Add. 107. In any event, the respective orders unquestionably impose conflicting *legal obligations*, regardless of how the respective district courts might view the underlying merits. And in doing our part to resolve the conflict, we should say what the governing law actually is. In other words, if the Northern District provided the state plaintiffs there with legally justified relief, we should not allow its order to be frustrated based on any litigation missteps by the federal government in this case.

Finally, excusing the forfeiture here would neither prejudice the plaintiffs nor sandbag the district court. The government made its likely winning argument in stay motions before the district court and this Court; the plaintiffs thoroughly responded on the merits both below and here; the district court had a chance to excuse the forfeiture; and the issue depends “on a pure issue of statutory interpretation” that we would review *de novo* and that does not depend on further factual development. *Amcast Indus. Corp. v. Detrex Corp.*, 2 F.3d 746, 749–50 (7th Cir. 1993) (Posner, J.).

Against all of this, the majority notes that the district court offered the government an opportunity to seek consideration of its forfeited arguments under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 52(b). *Ante*, at 13 n* (citing Add. 98 n.3). That rule allows post-judgment motions asking the court to “amend its findings—or make additional findings” and to “amend the judgment accordingly.” But “findings” under Rule 52 involve matters of fact, not “conclusions of law” that the rule separately addresses. Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(a)(1); *see Env’t Comm. of Fla. Elec. Power Coordinating Grp., Inc. v. EPA*, 94 F.4th 77, 91 (D.C. Cir. 2024) (per curiam). As explained above, the forfeited arguments here turn on what statutes authorize the SSA to obtain or maintain SSNs and information regarding citizenship or immigration status, and on whether the disclosures made by DHS under modified SAVE qualify as “related records” under the disclosure bar in the Social Security Act. As those disputes involve pure questions of law, Rule 52(b) was not an available avenue for the government.

The majority likewise suggests another possibility not mentioned by the district court—that the government could and should have sought to raise its forfeited arguments through a motion to alter or amend the district court’s judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). *Ante*, at 13. True, we

have indicated that parties “should” present new arguments by seeking reconsideration in the district court before raising them on appeal. *City of New York v. Nat’l R.R. Passenger Corp.*, 776 F.3d 11, 17 (D.C. Cir. 2015). But there is no categorical requirement to do so, and we have sometimes reached the merits despite even an express waiver below, above and beyond the mere failure to seek reconsideration. *United States ex rel. Cimino v. IBM Corp.*, 3 F.4th 412, 418 n.1 (D.C. Cir. 2021). Moreover, new arguments are substantially disfavored in reconsideration motions under Rule 59(e), which we have described as “not a vehicle to present a new legal theory that was available prior to judgment.” *Leidos, Inc. v. Hellenic Republic*, 881 F.3d 213, 217 (D.C. Cir. 2018) (cleaned up). So the hypothetical Rule 59(e) motion posited by the majority would have presented essentially the same question that we now confront—whether unusual circumstances warrant excusing a forfeiture. *See, e.g., Dyson v. District of Columbia*, 710 F.3d 415, 420 (D.C. Cir. 2013). And the government’s failure to move for reconsideration does not undermine any of the reasons for excusing the forfeiture here: Administration of modified SAVE is still important. The states’ interests in receiving information from modified SAVE are still pressing. The two judicial orders still conflict. And the governing legal questions are still cleanly presented.

B

The government is also likely to succeed in showing that modified SAVE does not violate the Privacy Act. It argues that the Privacy Act claims here are not judicially reviewable and that they lack merit. Because the government is likely to succeed on the merits, I need not consider its alternative non-reviewability arguments.

The Privacy Act generally bars agencies from disclosing individuals' records without consent, 5 U.S.C. § 552a(b), but it exempts "routine use[s]," which are disclosures "compatible with the purpose for which [the record] was collected," *id.* § 552a(b)(3), (a)(7). This Court has not settled on a definitive test for compatibility, but every possible formulation sets a low bar. Judge Silberman and Judge Williams construed the term according to its ordinary meaning: A disclosure of a record is "compatible" so long as it does not conflict with or frustrate the purposes for which the record was collected. *U.S. Postal Serv. v. Nat'l Ass'n of Letter Carriers*, 9 F.3d 138, 144 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (opinion of Silberman, J.); *id.* at 146–47 (Williams, J., concurring in part). Other circuits, relying on legislative history, require "some meaningful degree of convergence" between the purposes of collection and disclosure. *Britt v. Naval Investigative Serv.*, 886 F.2d 544, 549–50 (3d Cir. 1989); *Swenson v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 890 F.2d 1075, 1078 (9th Cir. 1989). We need not settle on a "precise definition of 'compatibility,'" *Chichakli v. Tillerson*, 882 F.3d 229, 233 (D.C. Cir. 2018), because modified SAVE satisfies "any reasonable formulation of the compatibility test," *Ames v. DHS*, 861 F.3d 238, 240 n.1 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (Kavanaugh, J.).

Even if SSN data was originally collected only to establish authorization to work and eligibility for social-security benefits, disclosing that data to confirm eligibility for other benefits and voting neither conflicts with nor frustrates those initial purposes. Similarly, such disclosure likely satisfies *Britt*'s stricter standard as well, because the same purpose runs through the collection and disclosures here: establishing individuals' eligibility to work, vote, or receive government benefits. The SSA maintains SSNs to match individuals to benefits they are entitled to; SAVE uses the same data to match

individuals to extant records of their citizenship or immigration status, which allows requesting agencies to determine eligibility for those same benefits, for other public benefits, and for voting. The district court likely erred by framing the collection purpose at too low a level of generality, which is at odds with both the statute's forgiving text ("compatible") and with the SSN's long-established role as a "nearly universal identifier." Puckett, *The Story of the Social Security Number*, 69 Soc. Sec. Bull. no. 2 (2009), <https://perma.cc/59V7-XG2D>.

The government is also likely to succeed in showing that the Privacy Act's procedural requirements provide no basis for affording prospective relief against the future operation of modified SAVE.

Under the Privacy Act, a system of records is "a group of any records under the control of any agency from which information is retrieved by the name of the individual or by some identifying number, symbol, or other identifying particular assigned to the individual." 5 U.S.C. § 552a(a)(5). When an agency establishes or revises a system of records, it must publish in the Federal Register a notice of the system's "existence and character," including "each routine use" of the records. *Id.* § 552a(e)(4). An agency may not put a new routine use of the information into effect until at least 30 days after the notice is published, during which time there must be "an opportunity for interested persons to submit written data, views, or arguments to the agency." *Id.* § 552a(e)(11). The notice is called a System of Records Notice (SORN). The parties agree that SAVE qualifies as a system of records subject to these notice requirements.

Neither DHS nor the SSA published a SORN when the agencies set up modified SAVE in May 2025, but each agency

later published a SORN regarding its respective new routine uses of data. The SORNs described those new uses, invited comments within 30 days, and provided that the new uses would become effective at the close of the comment period. *See* Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. 48948, 48948–50 (Oct. 31, 2025) (DHS); Notice of a Modified System of Records, 90 Fed. Reg. 50879, 50879–81 (Nov. 12, 2025) (SSA). The SORNs could not retroactively authorize any uses of data that occurred before their effective date. But now that the agencies *have* provided the requisite notice and opportunity to comment, any past procedural violations cannot justify *forward*-looking relief against modified SAVE.

The district court concluded that the SORNs failed to provide the requisite opportunity for comment. Relying on cases concerning notice-and-comment rulemaking under the APA, the court reasoned that the SORNs, in making modified SAVE effective on the last day of the comment period, made clear that the opportunity to comment was not “meaningful” and that the administrative “process was anything but open-minded.” Add. 59–60. But unlike the APA, which requires “notice,” an “opportunity” to comment, and “*consideration*” of the comments, 5 U.S.C. § 553(c) (emphasis added), the Privacy Act requires only “notice” and “opportunity” to comment, *id.* § 552a(e)(11). Given the ubiquity of APA notice-and-comment procedures, Congress’s omission of the “consideration” requirement for SORNs is striking. Moreover, the opportunity to comment *was* meaningful despite the effective date set at 30 days out: The agencies might have changed their minds based on comments received, either before or after the original effective date. A rule promulgated pursuant to APA notice-and-comment procedures binds the agency once it is final. *See, e.g., Humane Soc’y of the U.S. v. USDA*, 41 F.4th 564, 575 (D.C. Cir. 2022). In contrast, nothing would have prevented DHS or the SSA from ending the new

routine uses of data for modified SAVE, even after its effective date, if the agencies found persuasive any comments submitted during the 30-day period. So, announcing the effective date denied no “meaningful” opportunity to comment. Furthermore, the district court’s analysis would have been mistaken even under the APA requirement for “consideration” of comments. In *Little Sisters of the Poor Saints Peter and Paul Home v. Pennsylvania*, 591 U.S. 657 (2020), the Supreme Court held that the APA imposes no “open-mindedness test” on agencies considering proposed rules, and reviewing courts may not impose such atextual procedural requirements on the agencies. *Id.* at 685; *see also* *Vt. Yankee Nuclear Power Corp. v. NRDC*, 435 U.S. 519, 524–25, 549 (1978). In sum, the SORNs likely satisfied the Privacy Act’s procedural requirements of notice and an opportunity to comment.

Whether styled as an injunction or vacatur, forward-looking relief must rest on ongoing or threatened unlawful conduct, not past violations. *See Little Sisters*, 591 U.S. at 686 & n.14; *City of Los Angeles v. Lyons*, 461 U.S. 95, 102–03 (1983). Here, there was likely no ongoing procedural violation when the district court entered summary judgment. Once 30 days elapsed from each SORN’s publication, the requisite notice and opportunity to comment had been provided. With no ongoing or imminent procedural violation to remedy, the prospective vacatur of modified SAVE was likely erroneous.

C

The government is likely to succeed in showing that the adoption of modified SAVE was not arbitrary. As explained above, that program is manifestly reasonable: It advances important government interests such as complying with IIRIRA, enforcing eligibility restrictions for federal benefits, and ensuring election integrity. The district court’s only basis

for claiming arbitrariness was that the government did not engage with comments. Add. 62–63. That conclusion rested on the legal premise that the government could not establish the close of the comment period as the effective date. *Id.* As that premise is likely mistaken, the court likely had no basis on which to rest a holding of arbitrariness.

IV

The government will suffer irreparable harm absent a stay. Its “inability to enforce its duly enacted plans clearly inflicts irreparable harm on” it. *Abbott v. Perez*, 585 U.S. 579, 602 n.17 (2018); *see also Make the Rd. N.Y. v. Mullin*, 179 F.4th 16, 25 (D.C. Cir. 2026) (“the Government is harmed by an improper intrusion by a federal court into the workings of a coordinate branch of the Government” (cleaned up)). Vacatur of the bulk-process and SSN-lookup functions of modified SAVE makes it much more difficult for DHS to carry out its IIRIRA duties effectively, which no one disputes are legitimate. *Cf. Maryland v. King*, 567 U.S. 1301, 1303 (2012) (Roberts, C.J., in chambers). And the dueling judicial orders put the government in an impossible position: To comply with the order under review here, the government must violate an order of the Northern District of Florida.

V

The balance of equities tilts in the government’s favor. In analyzing that balance, we consider both the parties’ interests and the public interest. *See Allen v. Milligan*, 146 S. Ct. 1377, 1381 (2026) (per curiam).

The district court’s order inflicts significant harm on the government. Without modified SAVE, it is much more difficult to protect the “integrity of the electoral process,” which is an “interest[] of the highest importance.” *First Nat’l*

Bank of Bos. v. Bellotti, 435 U.S. 765, 788–89 (1978). Electoral integrity is also a priority of the administration, *see* Exec. Order No. 14248, 90 Fed. Reg. 14005, and of the states that sued to compel effective performance of DHS’s legal obligations under IIRIRA, *Florida v. DHS*, 2026 WL 1968339, at *1. The order also creates security vulnerabilities for the government, which uses SAVE to control “access [to] sensitive government functions—such as employment in government positions, entry to secure facilities,” and “government-issued licenses and credentials.” Add. 88. And it frustrates eligibility determinations for a wide array of federal programs, ranging from SNAP benefits and Medicaid to Department of Housing and Urban Development eligibility determinations for federal housing programs. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1320b-7(b)(1)–(4), (d)(3); *id.* § 1436a(d)(3), (f). Finally, the order hamstring[s] the states’ ability to effectively police eligibility for state professional licenses and for voting in state elections. *See* States’ Br. at 5–7. For example, appearing as a defendant-intervenor below, the State of Texas explained that modified SAVE helps it “maintain[] accurate voter rolls, prevent[] illegal votes, and ensur[e] fair and accurate elections.” State of Texas’s Emergency Motion to Intervene, ECF Doc. 43, at 7.⁴

⁴ The majority notes that the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) prohibits states from conducting “any program the purpose of which is to systematically remove the names of ineligible voters” from official lists within 90 days of a federal primary or general election. 52 U.S.C. § 20507(c)(2)(A); *see ante*, at 28. But the plaintiffs did not invoke the NVRA to downplay the immediate harms to the federal government and the states from enjoining modified SAVE. And it is unclear to me whether the NVRA covers modified SAVE. For one thing, the “purpose” of modified SAVE, which is run by a federal agency, is to generate information for a wide variety of federal and state agencies seeking the information for a wide variety of purposes. Moreover, even for requesting agencies

On the other side of the ledger, granting a stay would impose relatively little harm on the plaintiffs and their members. Individuals who were issued SSNs before they became citizens, but who have not updated the SSA with their citizenship status, will not lose the right to vote. Instead, they will simply have to provide proof of citizenship to remain on the voter rolls of state or local governments. That burden might qualify as a concrete injury for purposes of Article III standing, *ante*, at 8, but it is not an especially substantial one. The alleged privacy harms are also modest: At worst, an individual's SSN will be known by one more federal agency (DHS), but never will be disclosed to the requesting agency or the public. Unsurprisingly, the record contains no evidence of significant harm to the plaintiffs' members during the period between the denial of an APA stay in November 2025 and the grant of summary judgment in June 2026. And even if the public interest in using SSNs for modified SAVE were undercut by privacy considerations, the public interest at a minimum would still favor allowing states to do bulk searches without SSNs, which the district court has also effectively enjoined.

focused on voter qualifications, SAVE itself makes no final eligibility determinations. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1320b-7(d)(5). And states may use information from modified SAVE to make decisions regarding voter eligibility individually rather than “systematically.” Regardless, states always may run programs to systematically remove the names of voters who have died—another piece of information that modified SAVE can provide. 52 U.S.C. § 20507(c)(2)(B)(i), (a)(4)(A); Add. 18. And the NVRA imposes no restriction on the efforts of state and federal agencies to assess eligibility in contexts other than voting.

For these reasons, I would grant the government's motion for a stay pending appeal. As my colleagues deny the motion, I respectfully dissent.