

# Litigation Related to Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)

Last updated JUNE 24, 2020

On Sep. 5, 2017, the Trump administration announced that it was terminating Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), which was created during President Obama's administration. Under the terms of the DACA termination, everyone who had filed a first-time or a renewal application for DACA as of Sep. 5, 2017, would continue to have their applications processed. And anyone with a grant of DACA expiring between Sep. 5, 2017, and Mar. 5, 2018, could apply for a two-year renewal of their DACA. Originally, the deadline to submit renewal applications to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) was October 5, 2017. No other DACA applications were to be accepted.

More than ten cases were filed challenging the Trump administration's termination of DACA. Between Jan. 2018 and June 2020, orders from three federal district courts — first in *Regents of the University of California, et al. v. Dept. of Homeland Security (DHS)*, and later in *Batalla Vidal v. Nielsen* and *NAACP v. Trump* — kept DACA partially in place by requiring USCIS to continue accepting DACA applications from previous DACA recipients. The lower courts' rulings were challenged all the way up to the U.S. Supreme Court, which consolidated the cases and heard oral argument on Nov. 12, 2019.

On June 18, 2020, the Supreme Court issued its opinion. The Court, in a 5-4 opinion written by Chief Justice Roberts, held that the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) had improperly terminated DACA, and it remanded the action to the agency. The Court reasoned that the agency's termination of DACA violated the Administrative Procedure Act because (1) DHS failed to con-

sider alternatives to termination, such as retaining the protections from deportation without the benefits associated with DACA (such as work authorization) and (2) DHS failed to assess whether there were reliance interests at stake and to weigh those against competing policy concerns. The Court affirmed the judgment in *NAACP*, which had remanded DHS's termination of DACA to the agency, leaving in place the 2012 DHS policy memo that made DACA available. For information on the opinion, see NILC's [Alert: Supreme Court Overturns Trump Administration's Termination of DACA](#),<sup>1</sup> and for guidance on applying for DACA, see the Home Is Here coalition's [Post-Supreme Court Decision DACA Guidance](#).<sup>2</sup>

The two tables in this publication provide information only about the cases appealed to the Supreme Court and about the only lawsuit challenging DACA that has any traction as of June 24, 2020. The tables were created for easy reference and are not intended to be comprehensive.

Table 1 includes cases challenging the termination of DACA on Sep. 5, 2017. The plaintiffs in these cases brought claims primarily under the Administrative Procedure Act and the U.S. Constitution's Due Process and Equal Protection clauses; some brought claims of estoppel. NILC is counsel only in the *Batalla Vidal v. Wolf* case. For further information about the other cases described in Table 1, you may want to contact the entities involved in them (listed in the table) or read the complaints to which the table hyperlinks.

Table 2 includes the single case challenging the legality of DACA itself, which Texas and six other states filed on May 1, 2018.

**LOS ANGELES** (Headquarters)  
3450 Wilshire Blvd. #108 – 62  
Los Angeles, CA 90010  
213 639-3900  
213 639-3911 fax



**WASHINGTON, DC**  
PO Box 34573  
Washington, DC 20043  
202 216-0261  
202 216-0266 fax

**Table 1: Cases Challenging the Termination of DACA**

LAWSUIT NAME	COURT	PLAINTIFF(S)	STATUS OF CASE
<p><b>Batalla Vidal v. Nielsen</b> Case No. 1:16-cv-04756 (NGG) (JO)</p>	<p>Filed in E.D.N.Y. Supreme Court issued opinion on June 18, 2020</p>	<p>Martín Jonathan Batalla Vidal, Antonio Alarcón, Carolina Fung Feng, Eliana Fernández, Mariano Mondragón, Carlos Vargas, Make the Road New York</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8/25/16: Case <a href="#">filed</a>.<sup>3</sup> Case assigned to Judge Nicholas G. Garaufis.</li> <li>• 9/19/18: <a href="#">Complaint amended</a> to challenge DACA termination.<sup>4</sup></li> <li>• 2/13/18: District court granted motion for preliminary injunction requiring USCIS to accept DACA applications from people who have has DACA previously.</li> <li>• The government appealed the preliminary injunction and other orders to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.</li> <li>• 11/5/18: The government filed a highly unusual <a href="#">petition</a> for “cert before judgment,”<sup>5</sup> asking the Supreme Court to hear the case without waiting for the Second Circuit to rule. The Supreme Court has not yet issued a decision about whether it will hear the appeal.</li> <li>• 1/25/19: The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit heard oral argument on the government’s appeal.</li> <li>• 6/28/19: The U.S. Supreme Court granted cert. before judgment and consolidated the case with the other petitions that were granted in <i>Regents of the Univ. of Calif.</i> and <i>NAACP</i>.</li> <li>• 11/12/19: The U.S. Supreme Court heard oral argument on this case and the other consolidated cases.</li> <li>• 4/2/20: Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Leave to File a Supplemental Brief After Oral Argument. That motion was granted on April 20, 2020.</li> <li>• 6/18/2020: The Supreme Court issued a decision holding that DHS improperly terminated DACA in violation of the APA. Because the Court remanded the termination to the agency, the Court vacated the 2/13/2018 order granting a preliminary injunction, affirmed the 11/9/2017 order partially denying the government’s motion to dismiss, and reversed in part the 3/29/2018 order partially denying the rest of the government’s motion to dismiss.</li> </ul> <p><b>For more information on the case and for the latest developments:</b> <a href="http://www.nilc.org/batalla-vidal-v-baran-et-al/">www.nilc.org/batalla-vidal-v-baran-et-al/</a></p>

LAWSUIT NAME	COURT	PLAINTIFF(S)	STATUS OF CASE
<p><b>NY v. Trump, et al.</b> Case No. 17-cv-5228</p>	<p>Filed in E.D.N.Y. Supreme Court issued opinion on June 18, 2020.</p>	<p>New York, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Washington</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9/6/17: Case filed.</li> <li>• 9/7/17: The court reassigned this case to Judge Nicholas G. Garaufis, who has heard this case in tandem with <i>Batalla Vidal v. Nielsen</i>.</li> <li>• The appeal in <i>New York v. Trump</i> has been consolidated with the appeal in <i>Batalla Vidal v. Nielsen</i>.</li> <li>• <b>See <i>Batalla Vidal</i>, above.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Regents of the Univ. of Calif. v. DHS (lead case)</b> Case No. 17-cv-05211 Consolidated with <i>Calif. v. DHS</i>, Case No. 17-cv-05235; <i>County of Santa Clara v. Trump</i>, Case No. 17-cv-05813; <i>Garcia et al. v. Trump</i>, Case No. 17-cv-05380; and <i>San Jose v. Trump</i>, Case No. 17-cv-05329-SVK.</p>	<p>Filed in N.D. Cal. 9th Circuit issued an opinion upholding preliminary injunction. Supreme Court issued opinion on June 18, 2020.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The regents of the University of California and Janet Napolitano</li> <li>• California, Maine, Maryland, and Minnesota</li> <li>• Santa Clara County and Service Employees International Union Local 521 (Local 521)</li> <li>• Miriam González Ávila, Dulce Garcia, Jirayut Latthivongskorn, Viridiana Chabolla Mendoza, Norma Ramírez, and Saul Jiménez Suarez</li> <li>• City of San Jose</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9/8/17: Case <a href="#">filed</a>.<sup>6</sup></li> <li>• 9/20/17: On this date, the court consolidated this case with <i>City of San Jose v. Trump</i>, <i>State of Calif. v. DHS</i>, and <i>Garcia v. United States</i>. All of the cases were then reassigned to Judge William Alsup.</li> <li>• 1/9/18: The U.S. district court in California granted the preliminary injunction requiring the federal government to accept applications for renewal of DACA.</li> <li>• 1/18/18: DHS filed an unusual request to appeal to the Supreme Court directly, asking that review by the Ninth Circuit be skipped.</li> <li>• 2/26/18: U.S. Supreme Court <a href="#">denied</a> DHS's request,<sup>7</sup> so the case was returned to the lower courts.</li> <li>• 5/15/18: The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals heard <a href="#">oral argument</a> on the case in Pasadena, California.<sup>8</sup></li> <li>• 11/5/18: The government filed a highly unusual <a href="#">petition</a> for "cert. before judgment,"<sup>9</sup> requesting that the Supreme Court hear the case without waiting for the Ninth Circuit to rule.</li> <li>• 11/8/18: The Ninth Circuit <a href="#">upheld</a> the preliminary injunction requiring the government to continue accepting DACA renewal applications.<sup>10</sup></li> <li>• 11/19/18: The government filed a supplemental brief seeking review of the Ninth Circuit's decision under the traditional <a href="#">petition for a writ of certiorari</a>.<sup>11</sup></li> <li>• 6/28/19: The U.S. Supreme Court granted cert and consolidated the case with the petitions that were granted in <i>Batalla Vidal</i> and <i>NAACP</i>.</li> <li>• 11/12/19: The U.S. Supreme Court heard oral argument on this case and the other consolidated cases.</li> <li>• 6/18/2020: The Supreme Court issued a decision holding that DHS improperly terminated DACA in violation of the APA. Because the Court</li> </ul>

LAWSUIT NAME	COURT	PLAINTIFF(S)	STATUS OF CASE
			<p>affirmed the <i>NAACP</i> judgment remanding the termination to the agency, the Court vacated and reversed in part the judgement in <i>Regents</i>.</p> <p><b>For more information on the case and for the latest developments</b>, see UC press releases, including <a href="https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/press-room/uc-celebrates-supreme-court-win-daca-students">https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/press-room/uc-celebrates-supreme-court-win-daca-students</a>.</p>
<p><b>CASA de Maryland v. Trump</b> Case No. 17-cv-02942-RWT</p>	<p>Filed in D.Md. 4th Cir. reversed the lower court’s decision and concluded that the government’s termination of DACA was arbitrary and capricious in violation of the APA. Petition for certiorari remains pending at the Supreme Court.</p>	<p>CASA de Maryland, Arkansas United Community Coalition, CHIRLA, FIRM, Junta for Progressive Action Inc., Make the Road Pennsylvania, Michigan United, OneAmerica, Promise Arizona, Maricruz Abarca, Luis Aguilar, Ángel Aguiluz, José Aguiluz, Josué Aguiluz, María Joseline Cuellar Baldelomar, Missael Garcia, Annabelle Martinez Herra, Eliseo Mages, Heymi Elvir Maldonado, Brenda Moreno Martinez, Jesús Eusebio Perez, Nathaly Uribe Robledo, Estefany Rodriguez, A.M., a minor child, and Isabel Cristina Aguilar Arce, on behalf of A.M.; J.M.O., a minor child, and Adriana Gonzales Magos, on behalf of J.M.O.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10/5/17: Case <a href="#">filed</a>.<sup>12</sup></li> <li>• 3/5/18: The U.S. district court in Maryland <a href="#">granted summary judgment</a> to the plaintiffs on only their information-sharing/estoppel claim, prohibiting the government from using or sharing information provided through the DACA application process for enforcement or deportation purposes.<sup>13</sup> To the extent that the government wants to use the information, the government must apply to the court on a case-by-case basis. The court granted summary judgment to the government, however, on the other claims challenging the termination of DACA.</li> <li>• 4/27/18: Both the plaintiffs and the government appealed the district court’s order to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. Oral argument occurred on Dec. 11, 2018.</li> <li>• 5/17/19: The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals issued a decision reversing the grant of summary judgment to the government and concluding that DACA’s termination was arbitrary and capricious in violation of the APA. The court also concluded that the plaintiffs were not entitled to an injunction related to information sharing.</li> <li>• 5/24/19: The government filed a petition for a <a href="#">writ of certiorari</a> with the Supreme Court, asking the Court to review the Fourth Circuit’s decision.<sup>14</sup> The government also requested an expedited briefing schedule so that the Court could consider its petition before its term ended. The Court denied that request on June 3, 2019.</li> <li>• 6/24/19: The plaintiffs filed their brief opposing the petition for a writ of certiorari.</li> <li>• 7/10/19: The government filed its reply brief.</li> <li>• The U.S. Supreme Court has not yet issued a decision on the government’s petition. It was distributed again for the Court’s conference on June 25, 2020. An order is likely on Monday, June 29, 2020.</li> </ul> <p><b>For more information on the case and for the latest developments</b>, see CASA’s <a href="https://wearecasa.org/daca/">website</a>: <a href="https://wearecasa.org/daca/">https://wearecasa.org/daca/</a>.</p>

LAWSUIT NAME	COURT	PLAINTIFF(S)	STATUS OF CASE
<p><b>NAACP v. Trump</b> Case No. 17-cv-01907</p>	<p>Filed in D.D.C. Supreme Court issued opinion on June 18, 2020.</p>	<p>NAACP, American Federation of Teachers (AFT), United Food and Commercial Workers International Union (UFCW)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9/18/17: Case <a href="#">filed</a>.<sup>15</sup></li> <li>• 1/18/17: The court consolidated this case with <i>Trustees of Princeton University v. USA</i> (see below), and the consolidated case was reassigned to Judge John D. Bates.</li> <li>• 3/14/18: The court heard oral argument on the case.</li> <li>• 4/24/18: The court issued a <a href="#">decision</a> partially granting summary judgment to the plaintiffs,<sup>16</sup> holding that the DACA termination was arbitrary and capricious, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, because the government did not sufficiently explain why it made the decision. The court ordered that the memo terminating DACA be vacated — which would reinstate DACA 2012, allowing DACA-eligible people to file first-time applications — but the court <i>stayed its order for 90 days</i> to give the government time to issue a new memo or better explain why it ended DACA. The court denied the plaintiffs’ request for a preliminary injunction on their information-sharing/estoppel claim, because it found that harm was not imminent given that the <i>CASA de Maryland</i> order (above) currently prevents DHS from sharing that information. The court then dismissed that claim entirely because it found that the claim was not sufficiently pled.</li> <li>• 6/22/18: The government submitted a new memorandum from Secretary of Homeland Security Kirstjen Nielsen, which reaffirms the decision to end DACA. In response, the court delayed its order to vacate the memo terminating DACA.</li> <li>• 8/4/18: The court issued a decision regarding the new Nielsen memo, ruling that it does not change the court’s earlier judgment. The court reinstated its earlier order, i.e., that DACA be reinstated. However, the court gave the government 20 days to appeal before the order takes effect.</li> <li>• 8/17/18: With the consent of the plaintiffs, the court partially stayed its order as it applies to initial applications and advance parole. This means that the order goes into effect on Aug. 23 only with regard to renewal applications — in a manner similar to the orders issued by the U.S. District Courts for the Eastern District of New York and Northern District of California.</li> <li>• 11/5/2018: The government filed a highly unusual <a href="#">petition</a> for “cert. before judgment,”<sup>17</sup> requesting that the Supreme Court hear the case without waiting for the D.C. Circuit to rule.</li> </ul>

LAWSUIT NAME	COURT	PLAINTIFF(S)	STATUS OF CASE
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2/22/2019: The D.C. Circuit held oral argument but has not issued a ruling.</li> <li>• 6/28/2019: The U.S. Supreme Court granted cert before judgment and consolidated the case with the petitions that were granted in <i>Regents of the Univ. of Calif. and Batalla Vidal</i>.</li> <li>• 11/12/19: The U.S. Supreme Court heard oral argument on this case and the other consolidated cases.</li> <li>• 6/18/2020: The U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the lower court’s judgment.</li> </ul> <p><b>For more information on the case and for the latest developments, see NAACP, AFT, and UFCW press releases, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="https://www.naACP.org/latest/naACP-applauds-supreme-court-victory-in-naACP-v-trump/">https://www.naACP.org/latest/naACP-applauds-supreme-court-victory-in-naACP-v-trump/</a></li> <li>• <a href="https://www.aft.org/press-release/aft-president-randi-weingarten-us-supreme-court-decision-daca">https://www.aft.org/press-release/aft-president-randi-weingarten-us-supreme-court-decision-daca</a></li> <li>• <a href="http://www.ufcw.org/2020/06/18/dacasupremecourt/">http://www.ufcw.org/2020/06/18/dacasupremecourt/</a></li> </ul>
<p><b>Trustees of Princeton University, et al. v. USA, et al.</b> Case No. 17-cv-02325</p>	<p>Filed in D.D.C. Supreme Court issued opinion on June 18, 2020.</p>	<p>Trustees of Princeton University, Maria De La Cruz Perales Sanchez, Microsoft Corporation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11/3/17: Case <a href="#">filed</a>.<sup>18</sup></li> <li>• 1/18/17: The court consolidated this case with <i>NAACP v. Trump</i> (above), and the consolidated case was reassigned to Judge John D. Bates.</li> <li>• <b>See <i>NAACP v. Trump</i>, above.</b></li> </ul>

**Table 2: Case Challenging the Creation of DACA 2012**

LAWSUIT NAME	COURT	PLAINTIFF(S)	STATUS OF CASE
<p><b>Texas et al. v. Nielsen et al.</b> Case No. 1:18-cv-00068</p>	<p>Filed in S.D. Tex., Brownsville Division  Stayed until 30 days after the Supreme Court issues its opinion in <i>Regents</i>. Court</p>	<p>States of Texas, Alabama, Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Nebraska, South Carolina, and West Virginia, and the governor of Mississippi</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5/1/18: Case <a href="#">filed</a>.<sup>19</sup> Case first assigned to Judge Olvera, a President Obama appointee, but then later reassigned to Judge Hanen, who presided over the expanded DACA and DAPA (Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents)–related litigation in <i>Texas v. United States</i>. Counter to case-relation rules, this new case was marked as related to <i>Texas v. U.S.</i>, even though the latter case was closed.</li> <li>• 5/2/18: Plaintiff states filed a <a href="#">request for a preliminary injunction</a> that would halt DACA 2012 from operating during the pendency of this lawsuit, both for initial and renewal applications.<sup>20</sup> Texas and the other states requested relief from Judge Hanen by July 23, 2018, the date on</li> </ul>

LAWSUIT NAME	COURT	PLAINTIFF(S)	STATUS OF CASE
	<p>ordered parties to file a joint status report by July 24, 2020.</p>		<p>which the 90-day period set out in the <i>NAACP v. Trump and Princeton et al. v. Trump</i> cases had been scheduled to run out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5/15/18: The court granted a request by 22 individual DACA recipients, represented by the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) to intervene, formally making them defendants in the case.<sup>21</sup> The DACA recipients had argued that because the federal government and the plaintiff states both have taken the same position on the legality of DACA, the agencies of the federal government that are the defendants in the case will not adequately represent DACA recipients' interests if the court does not let the latter become part of the case.</li> <li>• 6/25/18: The court granted a request by the New Jersey to intervene, formally making it a defendant in the case.</li> <li>• 8/8/18: A hearing was held on the plaintiff states' motion for a preliminary injunction. (This hearing was originally scheduled for July 17 but was postponed in light of the developments in the DC district court, described above.)</li> <li>• 8/31/18: The court issued an <a href="#">opinion and order</a> denying the plaintiff states' motion for a preliminary injunction.<sup>22</sup> Although the court found that the plaintiff states were likely to succeed on substantive and procedural due process claims, the court declined to issue a preliminary injunction, recognizing the harm it would cause to DACA recipients who have relied on DACA for protection from deportation and work authorization and reasoning that the plaintiff states could have challenged DACA in 2014, when they filed their suit challenging DAPA and <i>expanded</i> DACA.                      The court also issued an <a href="#">interlocutory appeal order</a> certifying the case for appeal to the Fifth Circuit and staying the case for 21 days to allow the parties to pursue an interlocutory appeal.<sup>23</sup></li> <li>• 9/12/18: Plaintiff states informed the district court that they do not intend to pursue an interlocutory appeal and want to move directly to summary judgment, without discovery.</li> <li>• 11/14/18: The U.S. district court held a conference addressing how the case will proceed. The court issued a discovery schedule and set a trial date for the litigation in May 2020.</li> <li>• 2/4/19: Plaintiff states moved for summary judgment, stating that no further discovery was needed. The court has not yet issued a decision on the plaintiffs' motion.</li> </ul>

LAWSUIT NAME	COURT	PLAINTIFF(S)	STATUS OF CASE
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5/1/19: The U.S. district court <a href="#">issued an order</a> setting a briefing schedule for the motion for summary judgment and a hearing date on the pending motion for July 8, 2019.<sup>24</sup></li> <li>• 6/24/19: The U.S. district court moved the hearing on the motion for summary judgment to October 28, 2019.</li> <li>• 9/18/19: NJ moved for a stay of the case pending the Supreme Court decision in the DACA termination challenges. The Court heard argument on the motion on October 8, 2019.</li> <li>• 11/22/19: The U.S. district court granted New Jersey’s motion to stay the proceedings in this case until 30 days after the Supreme Court rules in the <i>Regents</i> case.</li> <li>• 6/18/20: The U.S. district court <a href="#">ordered</a> the parties to file a joint status report by July 24, 2020, setting out their respective positions given the Supreme Court’s <i>Regents</i> opinion and an agreed schedule to resolve the matter.<sup>25</sup></li> </ul>

## URLs and Notes

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.nilc.org/alert-supreme-court-overturms-trump-administrations-termination-of-daca/>.

<sup>2</sup> <https://dacadecision.com/>.

<sup>3</sup> [www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Batalla-Vidal-v-Baran-et-al-complaint-2016-08-25.pdf](http://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Batalla-Vidal-v-Baran-et-al-complaint-2016-08-25.pdf).

<sup>4</sup> [www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Batalla-Vidal-v-Duke-2d-Amended-Complaint-2017-09-19.pdf](http://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Batalla-Vidal-v-Duke-2d-Amended-Complaint-2017-09-19.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> [https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/18/18-589/71034/20181105135249732\\_Nielsen%20v%20Battalla%20Vidal%20-%20Pet%20-%20REVISED.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/18/18-589/71034/20181105135249732_Nielsen%20v%20Battalla%20Vidal%20-%20Pet%20-%20REVISED.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> <https://universityofcalifornia.edu/sites/default/files/UC-DACA-Complaint.pdf>.

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.supremecourt.gov/search.aspx?filename=/docket/docketfiles/html/public/17-1003.html>.

<sup>8</sup> [https://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/media/view\\_video.php?pk\\_vid=0000013676](https://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/media/view_video.php?pk_vid=0000013676).

<sup>9</sup> [https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/17/17-1003/28381/20180119100226711\\_DACA%20Rule%2011%20Petition.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/17/17-1003/28381/20180119100226711_DACA%20Rule%2011%20Petition.pdf).

<sup>10</sup> <http://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/general/2018/11/08/18-15068%20Opinion.pdf>.

<sup>11</sup> <https://bit.ly/31pw9pu>.

<sup>12</sup> [www.washlaw.org/pdf/daca\\_complint\\_10\\_05\\_17.PDF](http://www.washlaw.org/pdf/daca_complint_10_05_17.PDF).

<sup>13</sup> <http://cdn.cnn.com/cnn/2018/images/03/06/maryland-daca-opinion.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> <https://bit.ly/2I8JZVX>.

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.naacp.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/NAACP-DACA-complaint.pdf>.

<sup>16</sup> [https://ecf.dcd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/show\\_public\\_doc?2017cv2325-70](https://ecf.dcd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/show_public_doc?2017cv2325-70).

<sup>17</sup> [https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/18/18-588/71025/20181105134008371\\_Trump%20v%20NAACP%20-%20Pet%20-%20REVISED.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/18/18-588/71025/20181105134008371_Trump%20v%20NAACP%20-%20Pet%20-%20REVISED.pdf).

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.princeton.edu/sites/default/files/documents/2017/11/DACA%20Complaint%2011%203%2017%20FINAL.pdf>.

<sup>19</sup> [https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/eypress/File-Stamped\\_Complaint.pdf](https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/eypress/File-Stamped_Complaint.pdf).

<sup>20</sup> [https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/eypress/Mt\\_for\\_PI.pdf](https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/eypress/Mt_for_PI.pdf).

<sup>21</sup> MALDEF’s press release about this development is available at [www.maldef.org/news/releases/2018\\_05\\_15\\_Federal\\_Court\\_Grants\\_MALDEF\\_Motion\\_to\\_Intervene\\_on\\_Behalf\\_of\\_Dreamers\\_in\\_Texas-Led\\_Lawsuit\\_Challenging\\_DACA/](http://www.maldef.org/news/releases/2018_05_15_Federal_Court_Grants_MALDEF_Motion_to_Intervene_on_Behalf_of_Dreamers_in_Texas-Led_Lawsuit_Challenging_DACA/).

<sup>22</sup> <https://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Texas2-v-US-memorandum-opinion-and-order-2018-08-31.pdf>.

<sup>23</sup> <https://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Texas2-v-US-interlocutory-appeal-order-2018-08-31.pdf>.

<sup>24</sup> <https://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/Texas-et-al-v-US-et-al-Order-2019-05-02.pdf>.

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.txsd.1501682/gov.uscourts.txsd.1501682.461.0.pdf>.