

Litigation Related to Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)

Last updated OCTOBER 21, 2021

On July 16, 2021, the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas issued a decision holding the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program unlawful. The court vacated the 2012 DACA Memo (the document from then-Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary Napolitano), which created DACA, and remanded the memo to DHS. In its accompanying order, the court prohibited the federal government from granting DACA to anyone requesting DACA for the first time. Thus, as of July 16, 2021, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) is not acting on any first-time DACA requests (although it can still accept submissions of these applications). USCIS continues to accept and grant DACA renewal requests from individuals who have previously had DACA and remain eligible for its protections. This latest development in the DACA program—which was created in 2012 to protect certain young people from removal from the United States—follows years of efforts by opponents to dismantle the program and by supporters to preserve it.

Previously, on September 5, 2017, the Trump administration announced that it was terminating DACA. NILC, along with partners and others around the country, filed litigation challenging the Trump administration's termination of DACA in the *Batalla Vidal* case. Between January 2018 and June 2020, orders from three U.S. district courts kept DACA partially in place by requiring USCIS to continue accepting DACA applications from people who have or previously had DACA. The lower courts' rulings were challenged all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, which issued its opinion on June 18, 2020, holding that DHS's termination of DACA was arbitrary and capricious, and therefore was unlawful. The Court's decision in *Department of Homeland Security v. Regents of the University of California*, 591 U.S. ___, 140 S. Ct. 1891 (2020), remanded the termination to DHS.

Despite the victory of the Supreme Court rejecting the government's 2017 attempt to terminate DACA, USCIS failed to update its website or issue guidance on acceptance of first-time DACA applications. The Supreme Court issued its certified judgment in *Regents* on July 20, 2020, formally effectuating its June 18 opinion.

On July 28, 2020, Chad Wolf, claiming to be serving as the acting secretary of Homeland Security, issued a new memo (the Wolf Memo), that sought to dismantle DACA again. The Wolf Memo directed DHS personnel to reject all pending and future first-time requests for DACA, to reject all pending and future applications for advance parole absent "exceptional circumstances," and to shorten DACA renewals from two years to one year. In response to the Wolf Memo, the *Batalla Vidal* plaintiffs amended their complaint, challenging the issuance of the Wolf Memo on the grounds that it was arbitrary and capricious, and that Chad Wolf had no legal authority to issue the memo. Plaintiffs also sought to certify class of those eligible for DACA under the 2012 Napolitano Memo. On November 14, 2020, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York certified a class of those eligible for DACA under the 2012 Memo and a subclass of those whose DACA applications were pending between June 30, 2020, and July 28, 2020, and were not or would not be adjudicated under the 2012 Memo. The court also found that Chad Wolf was not lawfully serving as DHS Secretary when he issued the Wolf Memo. On December 4, 2020, the *Batalla Vidal* court vacated the Wolf Memo, effectively reopening DACA. The court further ordered DHS to provide public notice that it was again accepting requests based on how DACA was administered before September 5, 2017, including first-time requests for DACA and applications for advance parole. The court also extended to two years all DACA grants and employment authorizations that had been issued for only one year. On December 10, 2020, the court ordered DHS to send appropriate notices to relevant individuals whose

applications for advance parole and first-time applications for DACA were wrongly rejected under the Wolf Memo, as well as to those who wrongly received one-year grants of deferred action and employment authorization documents (EADs) that expired after only one year. The court also ordered the government to mail the one-year EAD recipients new work permits no later than 30 days before the expiration of their current EADs.

The two tables in this publication provide information about litigation related to DACA. Table 1 includes cases seeking to require the government to restore DACA, as created by the 2012 Napolitano Memo. Some of these cases seek to require USCIS to comply with the *Regents* decision by adjudicating DACA applications in accordance with the 2012 Napolitano Memo; others challenge the Wolf Memo directly, primarily by challenging the legality of Wolf's service as acting secretary and, thus, his legal authority to issue the memo and the memo's lawfulness under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). 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 provides information about the single case challenging the legality of DACA itself, which Texas and six other states filed on May 1, 2018.

Table 1: Cases Challenging the Trump Administration’s Actions Related to DACA

LAWSUIT NAME	COURT	PLAINTIFF(S) ¹	STATUS OF CASE
<p>Batalla Vidal v. Wolf ²</p> <p>Case No. 1:16-cv-04756 (NGG) (JO)</p> <p>Before Judge Nicholas G. Garaufis</p>	<p>Filed in E.D.N.Y.</p> <p>Supreme Court issued opinion on 6/18/20</p> <p>Amended Complaint to challenge the Wolf Memo on 8/28/20</p>	<p>Martín Jonathan Batalla Vidal, Antonio Alarcón, Eliana Fernández, Carlos Vargas, Carolina Fung Feng, M.B.F. by her next friend Lucia Feliz, Ximena Zamora, Sonia Molina, Johana Larios Sainz (on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated individuals)</p> <p>Make the Road New York (on behalf of itself, its members, and its clients)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8/25/16: Case filed.³ Case assigned to Judge Nicholas G. Garaufis. • 9/19/18: Complaint amended to challenge 2017 DACA termination.⁴ • 2/13/18: District court granted a motion for preliminary injunction requiring USCIS to accept DACA applications from people who have previously had DACA.⁵ • The government appealed the preliminary injunction and other orders to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. However, before the Second Circuit issued a ruling, the government filed a highly unusual petition for “cert before judgment,” asking the Supreme Court to hear the case without waiting for the Second Circuit to rule. • 6/28/2019: The Supreme Court granted certiorari and consolidated the case with the <i>Regents of the Univ. of Calif.</i> and <i>NAACP</i> cases for oral argument. The Supreme Court held oral argument on 11/12/19. • 6/18/20: The Supreme Court issued a decision holding that DHS improperly terminated DACA in violation of the APA.⁶ • 7/28/20: Acting Secretary Chad Wolf issued a memo (Wolf Memo) again attempting to dismantle DACA. • 8/28/20: Fourth Amended Complaint filed to challenge the Wolf Memo.⁷ Plaintiffs challenge the legality of Chad Wolf’s service as acting secretary of Homeland Security, bringing claims under the Federal Vacancies Reform Act (FVRA),

			<p>the Homeland Security Act (HSA), and the Appointments Clause of the Constitution. They also bring claims under the APA challenging the legality of the Wolf Memo, as well as procedural due process claims.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment on the claims challenging the lawfulness of Wolf’s service and a motion for class certification seeking to represent DACA-eligible individuals nationwide. Defendants cross-moved for summary judgment. Briefing on the motions for summary judgment and motion for class certification was completed on 10/7/2020. • 11/14/20: The court ruled that Wolf was serving unlawfully as the acting secretary of Homeland Security and thus that the Wolf Memo was issued unlawfully.⁸ The court also certified a nationwide class in the case. The court appointed the National Immigration Law Center, Jerome N. Frank Legal Services Organization at Yale Law School, and Make the Road New York as class counsel. • 11/18/20: The court held a conference to discuss next steps and ordered briefing on the relief that should be ordered flowing from the 11/14/20 decision. • 11/24/20: Plaintiffs filed a motion for partial summary judgment requesting that the court vacate the Wolf Memo and grant other relief. • 12/4/20: The court granted plaintiffs’ motion for partial summary judgment, vacated the Wolf Memo, ordered DHS to provide public notice that it was again accepting requests based on the terms of the DACA program prior to 9/5/17. The court further ordered the federal government to provide a status report on the DACA program by 1/4/21. • 12/10/20: After consideration of a Joint Status Report filed by the parties the previous day, the court ordered DHS to
--	--	--	---

			<p>send appropriate notices by 1/8/21 to relevant individuals whose first-time DACA applications and applications for advance parole were wrongly rejected under the Wolf Memo, as well as to those who wrongly received a one-year grant of deferred action and a one-year employment authorization document.</p> <p>For more information on the case and for the latest developments: www.nilc.org/batalla-vidal-v-baran-et-al/ Class members (DACA-eligible individuals) can receive updates here: dacaclassaction.org</p>
<p>NY v. Trump, et al. Case No. 17-cv-5228 Before Judge Nicholas G. Garaufis</p>	<p>Filed in E.D.N.Y. Supreme Court issued opinion on 6/18/20. Amended Complaint to challenge the Wolf Memo on 8/28/20</p>	<p>New York, Massachusetts, Washington, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/6/17: Case filed.⁹ • 9/7/17: The court reassigned this case to Judge Garaufis, who has heard this case in tandem with <i>Batalla Vidal v. Nielsen</i>. • 8/28/2020: Complaint amended to challenge the Wolf Memo.¹⁰ Plaintiffs bring claims under the Federal Vacancies Reform Act and the Homeland Security Act challenging Chad Wolf's service as acting secretary of Homeland Security. They also bring claims under the APA challenging the legality of the memo and bring procedural due process claims. Plaintiffs also filed a motion for summary judgment on the claims challenging the lawfulness of Wolf's service. <p>See <i>Batalla Vidal</i>, above for other history and relevant upcoming dates. The <i>New York</i> and <i>Batalla Vidal</i> cases are separate and have not been consolidated, but have proceeded along parallel schedules, and Judge Garaufis has issued joint opinions for the two cases.</p>
<p>Regents of the Univ. of Calif. v. DHS (lead case)</p>	<p>Filed in N.D. Cal. Supreme Court issued</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Regents of the University of California 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/8/17: Case filed.¹¹

<p>Case No. 17-cv-05211</p> <p>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>Before Judge William Alsup</p>	<p>opinion on 6/18/20</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California, Maine, Maryland, and Minnesota • County of Santa Clara and Service Employees International Union Local 521 (Local 521) • Dulce Garcia, Miriam Gonzalez Avila, Saul Jimenez Suarez, Norma Ramirez, Jirayut Latthivongskorn, Marco Antonio Salinas Munoz, Dulce Berenice Vargas Baltazar, Ericka Liseth Daniel Santellan, Grisel Guadalupe Chavez Diaz, and Felipe Alvarez Carrillo • City of San Jose 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/20/17: 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 the cases were then reassigned to Judge Alsup. • 1/9/18: The court granted the preliminary injunction requiring the federal government to accept applications for renewal of DACA. • 11/8/18: The Ninth Circuit upheld the preliminary injunction requiring the government to continue accepting DACA renewal applications.¹² • 6/18/20: The U.S. Supreme Court issued a decision in this case and in the E.D.N.Y. and the D.D.C. (<i>NAACP</i>) cases holding that DHS improperly terminated DACA in violation of the APA.¹³ Because the Court 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>. • 8/18/20: Plaintiffs filed a letter with the district court requesting a status conference with Judge Alsup to determine the next steps in the case.¹⁴ The letter states that plaintiffs intend to challenge the Wolf Memo. • 10/22/20: Judge Alsup held a case management conference, during which he adopted the schedule proposed by the parties. • 11/2/20: Plaintiffs filed amended complaints.¹⁵ • 3/22/21: Parties requested that the court lift all deadlines and stay the proceedings. The court granted the request on 3/23/21. <p>For more information on the case and for the latest developments, see the UC and California AG’s websites, including https://oag.ca.gov/daca and https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/daca.</p>
---	---------------------------	---	---

<p>CASA de Maryland v. Trump Case No. 17-cv-02942-RWT Before Judge Paul W. Grimm</p>	<p>Filed in D. Md.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10/5/17: Case filed.¹⁶ • 3/5/18: The U.S. district court in Maryland granted summary judgment 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.¹⁷ • 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.¹⁸ • 5/24/19: The government filed a petition with the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari, asking the Court to review the Fourth Circuit’s decision.¹⁹ 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 6/3/19. • 6/30/20: Mandate issued by the Fourth Circuit.²⁰ • 7/17/20: District court issued an order stating the “rescission of the DACA policy is VACATED, and the policy is restored to its pre-September 5, 2017 status.”²¹ • 7/24/20: During a status conference, the federal government revealed that it placed pending initial DACA applications “into a bucket” while the government reviewed the DACA policy. • 8/14/20: Plaintiffs filed a motion to hold the federal government in contempt or, in the alternative, compel compliance, with the Fourth Circuit’s mandate and district
---	------------------------	---	---

			<p>court order restoring DACA to its pre-9/5/17 status.²² Briefing was completed on 9/4/20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/13/21: The Court held a status conference where it approved Plaintiffs’ proposed briefing schedule for their motion for attorney fees. The briefing is expected to conclude by November 15, 2021. <p>For more information on the case and for the latest developments, see CASA’s press releases, including https://wearecasa.org/casa-condemns-trumps-daca-dismantling/.</p>
<p>NAACP v. Trump Case No. 17-cv-01907 Before Judge John D. Bates</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"> • 9/18/17: Case filed.²³ • 1/18/17: The court consolidated this case with Trustees of Princeton University v. USA (see below), and the consolidated case was reassigned to Judge John D. Bates. • 4/24/18: The court issued a decision partially granting summary judgment to the plaintiffs,²⁴ holding that the DACA termination was arbitrary and capricious, in violation of the APA, 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 stayed its order for 90 days 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 CASA de Maryland 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. • 6/22/18: The government submitted a new memo from Secretary of Homeland Security Kirstjen Nielsen, which

			<p>reaffirmed the decision to end DACA. In response, the court delayed its order to vacate the memo terminating DACA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8/3/18: The court issued a decision regarding the 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 took effect. • 8/17/18: With the consent of the plaintiffs, the court partially stayed its order as it applied to initial applications and advance parole. This meant that the order went 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. • 6/18/2020: The U.S. Supreme Court issued an opinion in this case, the N.D. Cal. cases, and the E.D.N.Y. cases, which were heard together. The Court affirmed the lower court’s judgment. • 9/16/20: In a joint status report, the plaintiffs stated that they did not currently intend to challenge the Wolf Memo but reserved their right to do so in the future. <p>For more information on the case and for the latest developments, see NAACP, AFT, and UFCW press releases, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://www.naacp.org/latest/naacp-applauds-supreme-court-victory-in-naacp-v-trump/ • https://www.aft.org/press-release/aft-president-randi-weingarten-us-supreme-court-decision-daca • http://www.ufcw.org/press-releases/dacasupremecourt
--	--	--	--

<p>Trustees of Princeton University, et al. v. USA, et al. Case No. 17-cv-02325 Before Judge John D. Bates</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"> • 11/3/17: Case filed.²⁵ • 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. • See <i>NAACP v. Trump</i>, above. <p>For more information on the case and for the latest developments, see Microsoft and Princeton’s press releases, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://blogs.microsoft.com/on-the-issues/2020/06/18/scotus-upholds-daca-dreamers/ • https://www.princeton.edu/news/2020/06/18/princeton-microsoft-maria-perales-sanchez-18-welcome-supreme-court-ruling-restore
<p>Santa Fe Dreamers Project, et al. v. Wolf, et al. Case No. 20-cv-02465 Before Judge Reggie B. Walton</p>	<p>Filed in D.D.C.</p>	<p>Santa Fe Dreamers Project, Spanish Community Center, American Gateways</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/3/20: Case filed. Plaintiffs challenge the Wolf Memo by bringing claims under the FVRA, the HSA, and the Appointments Clause of the U.S. Constitution to challenge Wolf’s service as acting secretary of Homeland Security, and under the APA. • 9/11/20: Plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment. Defendants cross-moved for summary judgment. Briefing was complete on 10/16/2020. • 1/12/21: Plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed their case without prejudice. <p>For more information on the case and for the latest developments, see MALDEF press releases, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • https://www.maldef.org/court-cases/immigrants-rights/
<p>Perez Lazarte, et al. v. Wolf, et al. Case No. 20-cv-00894</p>	<p>Filed. E.D. Va.</p>	<p>Daniel Perez Lazarte and Gerson Aguilar Delgadillo</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8/6/20: Case filed. Plaintiffs challenged retroactive changes to DACA through the Wolf Memo that shorten the DACA renewal period from two years to one year after they applied.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/18/20: Plaintiffs dismissed their lawsuit, citing their status as putative class members in the <i>Batalla Vidal</i> class action. • 9/22/20: The court dismissed the lawsuit without prejudice.
<p>FIEL Houston Inc., et al., v. Wolf, et al. Case No. 20-cv-02515 Before Judge Vanessa D. Gilmore</p>	<p>Filed S.D. Tex.</p>	<p>FIEL Houston, Maria Gutierrez, Enrique Contreras, Fernando Miranda Marin, Orlando Saenz, Shayli Rodriguez, Anahi Lagunas, Elizabeth Reboloso, Cesar Espinosa</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7/16/20: Case filed. Plaintiffs challenged USCIS's refusal to accept and adjudicate initial applications for DACA as a violation of the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Regents</i> and the Fourth Circuit's mandate in <i>CASA de Maryland</i> and bring claims under the APA and seek mandamus under the All Writs Act. • 7/17/20: Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint. • 7/31/20: Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction and motion for class certification. Briefing on the preliminary injunction motion was complete on 9/30/20. The court directed the parties to meet and confer on a proposed schedule for the briefing on the plaintiffs' motion for class certification after the plaintiffs' motion for class certification and the defendants' motion to dismiss. • 9/4/20: Defendants filed a motion to dismiss. • 12/1/20: The parties filed a Joint Discovery/Case Management Plan. The parties disagreed about the availability of discovery but agreed that any discovery should be stayed pending the court's ruling on the motion to dismiss. • 12/24/20: The court dismissed the lawsuit without prejudice.
<p>Valle Arrizon v. Wolf, et al. Case No. 20-cv-00788 Before Judge Hala Y. Jarbou</p>	<p>Filed W.D. Mich.</p>	<p>Gonzalo Valle Arrizon and Efen Valle Arrizon</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8/21/20: Case filed. Plaintiffs challenged defendants' refusal to accept their applications for emergency advance parole. Plaintiffs proceeded on several legal theories, including seeking to enforce the Supreme Court ruling in <i>Regents</i>, arguing that plaintiffs' advance parole applications present "exceptional circumstances" and should have been accepted under the Wolf Memo, and that the Wolf Memo is

			<p>invalid because Wolf was not lawfully serving as the acting secretary of DHS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10/26/20: Defendants filed a motion to dismiss.²⁶ • 11/19/20: The court ordered plaintiffs to file their response to defendants' motion to dismiss on or before 12/7/20. • 11/24/20: Plaintiffs filed a motion to request an extension until 3/7/21 and noted that the parties were engaged in settlement discussions. The court denied the motion for extension on 12/2/20. • 12/4/20: The parties stipulated to the dismissal of plaintiffs' claims regarding the validity of the Wolf Memo and claims pursuant to the APA regarding the rejection of plaintiffs' applications for emergency advance parole, noting that plaintiffs would fall within the class certified in the <i>Batalla Vidal v. Wolf</i> case. Plaintiffs maintained their claims under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA). By order of the court, the stipulated dismissal took effect on 12/7/20. • 12/7/20: Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint reasserting their RFRA claim and adding a procedural due process claim alleging that defendants had, without due process of law, deprived them of their liberty to travel. • 12/21/20: Defendants filed a motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. The court granted Defendants' motion on 1/8/21 and dismissed DHS and USCIS as Defendants for lack of jurisdiction. • 5/21/21: The individual defendants filed a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim. • 8/25/21: Defendants filed a motion for a temporary stay of the proceedings. On 9/2/21, the court granted the motion and stayed the case.
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10/21/21: The court granted Defendants' motion to dismiss. The court concluded that it did not have personal jurisdiction over Defendants Cuccinelli and Renaud, that Plaintiffs failed to state a claim, and that Defendants were entitled to qualified immunity. The court also asked Plaintiffs to show cause as to why the complaint should not be dismissed against the Doe defendants.
--	--	--	--

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

LAWSUIT NAME	COURT	PLAINTIFF(S)	STATUS OF CASE
<p>Texas et al. v. United States et al. Case No. 1:18-cv-00068 Before Judge Andrew S. Hanen</p>	<p>Filed in S.D. Tex., Brownsville Division</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"> • 5/1/18: Case filed.²⁷ Case first assigned to Judge Rolando 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. • 5/2/18: Plaintiff states filed a request for a preliminary injunction that would halt DACA 2012 from operating during the pendency of this lawsuit, both for initial and renewal applications.²⁸ Texas and the other states requested relief from Judge Hanen by July 23, 2018, the date on which the 90-day period set out in the <i>NAACP v. Trump</i> and <i>Princeton et al. v. Trump</i> cases had been scheduled to run out. • 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

			<p>intervene, formally making them defendant-intervenors in the case.²⁹ 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6/25/18: The court granted a request by the New Jersey to intervene, formally making it a defendant-intervenor in the case. • 8/8/18: A hearing was held on the plaintiff states' motion for a preliminary injunction. (This hearing was originally scheduled for 7/17/18 but was postponed in light of the developments in the U.S. district court in DC, described above.) • 8/31/18: The court issued an opinion and order denying the plaintiff states' motion for a preliminary injunction.³⁰ Although the court found that the plaintiff states were likely to succeed on substantive and procedural APA 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 interlocutory appeal order 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.³¹ • 2/4/19: Plaintiff states moved for summary judgment, stating that no further discovery was needed.
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11/22/19: The U.S. district court granted New Jersey’s motion to stay the proceedings in the case until 30 days after the Supreme Court ruled in the <i>Regents</i> case. • 6/18/20: The U.S. district court ordered the parties to file a joint status report by 7/24/20 setting out their respective positions given the Supreme Court’s <i>Regents</i> opinion and an agreed schedule to resolve the matter. • 8/21/20: The U.S. district court dismissed the plaintiff states’ motion for summary judgment without prejudice and granted plaintiffs leave to re-file the motion incorporating additional arguments from the <i>Regents</i> decision. • 10/7/20: The individual defendant-intervenors filed a motion to compel and extend the discovery period by an additional 30 days. Briefing was complete on 10/30/20. • 10/9/20: The plaintiff states filed a motion for summary judgment. • 11/6/20: The federal defendants, New Jersey Defendant-Intervenors, and individual defendant-intervenors filed their responses. The individual defendant-intervenors cross-moved for summary judgment. Briefing was complete on 11/30/20. • 12/7/20: The individual defendant-intervenors and New Jersey filed an opposed motion to continue the summary judgment hearing set for 12/22/20 until a date after 1/4/21 on the grounds, among others, that the status report ordered by the court in <i>Batalla Vidal v. Wolf</i> by that date would allow the parties to provide a status update to the court on the present practice of the federal government regarding DACA. Briefing was complete on 12/10/20. • 12/16/20: The U.S. district court denied the motion to continue the hearing.
--	--	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12/22/2020: The court heard oral argument on the motions for summary judgment. • 3/30/21: The court held a status conference to hear the parties on the possible impact of the American Dream and Promise Act on the substantive and procedural aspects of this lawsuit. The court directed the parties to file any further written responses by 4/9/21. The federal government and the individual Defendant-Intervenors filed Supplemental Briefs on 4/9/21 addressing the impact of the proposed bill on the litigation. • 7/16/21: The court issued its decision on the legality of DACA, concluding that DACA is unlawful because it was issued in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act. The court vacated the 2012 DACA Memo and remanded it to the agency. The court also prohibited the federal government from granting DACA for the first time to anyone who had not previously had DACA before 7/16/21. The court stayed its order as to those with DACA currently and those seeking renewals – i.e., it permitted USCIS to continue adjudicating renewal requests. • 9/10/21: The federal government and the individual Defendant-Intervenors filed a Notice of Appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to appeal the district court’s decision on the legality of DACA. The New Jersey Defendant-Intervenors filed their Notice of Appeal on 9/13/21. • 10/4/21: The federal government asked the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to hold the appeal in abeyance pending the completion of a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) relating to the DACA program. On 10/15/21, the Fifth Circuit denied the government’s request.
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10/20/21: The federal government asked the U.S. Court of Appeals to extend the deadline to file appellants' brief from November 8, 2021, to December 8, 2021. On 10/21/21, the Defendant-Intervenors also filed a request for a 30-day extension to file their brief.
--	--	--	---

¹URLs and Notes

¹ Plaintiffs listed are the plaintiffs on the operative complaint where complaints have been amended.

² The case name, like many others in this table, has changed over the course of the litigation as DHS has cycled through different secretaries and acting secretaries under the Trump administration.

³ www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Batalla-Vidal-v-Baran-et-al-complaint-2016-08-25.pdf.

⁴ www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Batalla-Vidal-v-Duke-2d-Amended-Complaint-2017-09-19.pdf.

⁵ <https://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Batalla-Vidal-v-Nielsen-updated-pi-order-2018-02-13.pdf>.

⁶ <https://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/DHS-v-Regents-of-UC-2020-06-18.pdf>.

⁷ <https://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Batalla-fourth-amended-complaint-2020-08-28.pdf>.

⁸ <https://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Batalla-order-class-cert-Wolf-memo-2020-11-14.pdf>.

⁹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nyed.406590.1.0.pdf>.

¹⁰ <https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nyed.406590/gov.uscourts.nyed.406590.271.0.pdf>.

¹¹ <https://universityofcalifornia.edu/sites/default/files/UC-DACA-Complaint.pdf>.

¹² <http://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/general/2018/11/08/18-15068%20Opinion.pdf>.

¹³ <https://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/DHS-v-Regents-of-UC-2020-06-18.pdf>.

¹⁴ <https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cand.316722/gov.uscourts.cand.316722.304.0.pdf>.

¹⁵ The amended complaints are available at <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/default/files/DACA%20FAC%20-%20Filed%2011.02.2020.pdf>;

<https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cand.316722/gov.uscourts.cand.316722.311.0.pdf>;

<https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cand.317144/gov.uscourts.cand.317144.98.0.pdf>;

<https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cand.318004/gov.uscourts.cand.318004.87.0.pdf>;

<https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cand.316976/gov.uscourts.cand.316976.103.0.pdf>.

¹⁶ www.washlaw.org/pdf/daca_complint_10_05_17.PDF.

¹⁷ <http://cdn.cnn.com/cnn/2018/images/03/06/maryland-daca-opinion.pdf>.

¹⁸ <https://www.ca4.uscourts.gov/Opinions/181521.P.pdf>.

¹⁹ <https://bit.ly/2I8JZVX>.

²⁰ <https://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/CASA-v-DHS-4th-Dkt71-Mandate-2020-06-30.pdf>.

²¹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mdd.403497/gov.uscourts.mdd.403497.97.0.pdf>.

²² <https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mdd.403497/gov.uscourts.mdd.403497.115.1.pdf>.

²³ <https://www.naacp.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/NAACP-DACA-complaint.pdf>.

²⁴ https://ecf.dcd.uscourts.gov/cgi-bin/show_public_doc?2017cv2325-70.

²⁵ <https://www.princeton.edu/sites/default/files/documents/2017/11/DACA%20Complaint%2011%203%2017%20FINAL.pdf>.

²⁶ <https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.miwd.98742/gov.uscourts.miwd.98742.12.1.pdf>.

²⁷ https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/epress/File-Stamped_Complaint.pdf.

²⁸ https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/epress/Mt_for_PI.pdf.

²⁹ 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/.

³⁰ <https://www.nilc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Texas2-v-US-memorandum-opinion-and-order-2018-08-31.pdf>.

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