

Nos. 18-587, 18-588, 18-589

In the **Supreme Court of the United States**

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, *et al.*, *Petitioners*,
v.
REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, *et al.*,
Respondents.

DONALD J. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, *et al.*, *Petitioners*,
v.
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF
COLORED PEOPLE, *et al.*, *Respondents*

KEVIN K. MCALEENAN, ACTING SECRETARY OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, *et al.*, *Petitioners*,
v.
MARTIN JONATHAN BATALLA VIDAL, *et al.*, *Respondents*.

**On Writs of Certiorari to the United States Courts of
Appeals for the Ninth, District of Columbia, and
Second Circuits**

**BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE OF CITIZENS UNITED,
CITIZENS UNITED FOUNDATION, AND
THE PRESIDENTIAL COALITION, LLC
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS**

ROBERT J. OLSON*
JEREMIAH L. MORGAN
HERBERT W. TITUS
WILLIAM J. OLSON
WILLIAM J. OLSON, P.C.
370 Maple Ave. W., Ste. 4
Vienna, VA 22180
(703) 356-5070
wjo@mindspring.com
**Counsel of Record*

August 26, 2019

Attorneys for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
INTEREST OF THE <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
STATEMENT	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	6
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.	7
ARGUMENT	
I. DHS’ DECISION TO END DACA AND ENFORCE IMMIGRATION LAW IS NOT JUDICIALLY REVIEWABLE	9
A. Revising Reviewability Precedents: From “No Opinion” to “May Be” to “Is”	10
B. The Decision to End DACA Is Not a “Nonenforcement Decision”	13
II. DHS’ DECISION TO END DACA WAS LAWFUL UNDER <u>SEC</u> V. <u>CHENERY</u>	16
III. DACA HAS BEEN UNLAWFUL SINCE ITS INCEPTION, BUT EVEN IF FOUND LAWFUL, WAS LAWFULLY RESCINDED	18

A. The Ninth Circuit Clearly Erred by Failing to Consider the Constitutionality of DACA. 18

B. DACA Is an Unconstitutional Exercise of Legislative Power 20

C. DACA Violates Separation of Powers Principles. 22

D. DACA Violates the Take Care Clause . . . 24

E. Even if DACA Was Lawful, It Can Be Lawfully Rescinded. 26

CONCLUSION 31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<u>HOLY BIBLE</u>	
<i>Exodus</i> 18:16	31
<u>U.S. CONSTITUTION</u>	
Art. I, Sect. 1.	23, 26
Art. I, Sect. 7.	23
Art. II, Sect. 1, Cl. 8	24
Art. II, Sect. 3.	24
<u>STATUTES</u>	
5 U.S.C. § 701, <i>et seq.</i>	6, 16
Immigration and Nationality Act	6, <i>passim</i>
<u>CASES</u>	
<u>Arizona v. United States</u> , 567 U.S. 387	
(2012)	4, 5, 21
<u>City of Arlington v. FCC</u> , 569 U.S. 290	
(2013)	12, 13
<u>Clinton v. New York</u> , 524 U.S. 417 (1998)	
	25
<u>Cooper v. Aaron</u> , 358 U.S. 1 (1958).	
	27
<u>Dept. of Transportation v. Ass'n. of American</u>	
<u>R.R.</u> , 135 S. Ct. 1225 (2015).	23, 26
<u>District of Columbia v. Heller</u> , 554 U.S. 570	
(2008)	28
<u>Franklin v. Massachusetts</u> , 505 U.S. 768 (1992).. .	
	9
<u>Harper v. Va. Dep't of Taxation</u> , 509 U.S. 86	
(1993)	28
<u>Heckler v. Chaney</u> , 470 U.S. 821 (1985) .. .	
	10, 11, 13
<u>IRAP v. Trump</u> , 857 F.3d 554 (4th Cir. 2017). . . .	
	10
<u>Marbury v. Madison</u> , 5 U.S. 137 (1803)	
	7, 28

<u>Montana Air Chapter No. 29 v. Federal Labor Relations Authority</u> , 898 F.2d 753 (9th Cir. 1990)	11, 12
<u>SEC v. Chenery Corp.</u> , 318 U.S. 80 (1943)	16, 17, 18
<u>Texas v. United States</u> , 86 F. Supp. 3d 591 (S.D. Tex. 2015)	6
<u>Texas v. United States</u> , 809 F.3d 134 (5th Cir. 2015)	6
<u>United States v. Texas</u> , 136 S.Ct. 2271 (2016)	6
<u>Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer</u> , 343 U.S. 579 (1952)	14, 22

MISCELLANEOUS

50 Core American Documents (C. Burkett, ed.: Ashbrook Press: 2016)	29
B. Adams, “Late to the party: CNN and MSNBC anchors discover there’s a crisis at the border,” <i>Washington Examiner</i> (June 26, 2019)	4
W. Blackstone, <u>Commentaries on the Laws of England</u> (Univ. Chi. Facsimile ed.: 1765)	27
G. Carey & J. McClellan, <u>The Federalist</u> (Liberty Fund: 2001)	14, 29
E. Chemerinsky, In Defense of Judicial Supremacy, 58 WM. & MARY L. REV. 1459 (2017)	28
Customs and Border Protection, Southwest Border Migration FY 2019	5
S.A. Camarota and K. Zeigler, “63% of Non-Citizen Households Access Welfare Programs,” <i>Center for Immigration Studies</i> (Nov. 20, 2018)	3

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.