

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

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

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 Writ Of Certiorari To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Ninth Circuit And Writs of Certiorari Before Judgment To
The United States Courts Of Appeals For The District Of Columbia
And Second Circuits**

**JOINT MOTION OF RESPONDENTS FOR
ENLARGEMENT OF ARGUMENT TIME AND DIVIDED ARGUMENT
AND RESPONSE TO MOTION BY STATE OF TEXAS FOR LEAVE
TO PARTICIPATE IN ORAL ARGUMENT**

In accordance with Supreme Court Rules 21, 28.3, and 28.4, the forty-five respondents in these consolidated proceedings respectfully move to enlarge the total time for oral argument and to divide oral argument time. Respondents ask the Court to extend the total time for oral argument to eighty minutes, and to divide the forty minutes for respondents evenly between Theodore Olson, who would speak on behalf of the individual and other non-state respondents, and California Solicitor General Michael Mongan, who would speak on behalf of the twenty state respondents and the District of Columbia. The State of Texas, amicus curiae supporting petitioners, has also moved to participate in oral argument. Respondents do not oppose that motion, provided that any time allocated to Texas comes out of the time allotted to petitioners, allowing for an equal division of time on both sides.

Counsel for respondents have conferred with the Office of the Solicitor General, and the position of petitioners is as follows: “The government takes no position on respondents’ requests to expand oral argument to 40 minutes per side or to divide the time allotted to respondents between state and non-state respondents. The government opposes respondents’ suggestion that, if the State of Texas is granted argument time, that time should be taken exclusively from the government’s allotted argument time. Texas has not requested that and Texas supports respondents on one of the two questions presented. Accordingly, as previously stated, the government opposes any change in the allotted argument time that would result either in the government’s receiving less than the currently allotted 30 minutes of argument time or in the government’s receiving less time than respondents.”

STATEMENT

1. These consolidated proceedings arise out of nine separate lawsuits filed by respondents in district courts in California, New York, and the District of Columbia. Each suit challenged petitioners' decision to terminate the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) policy and alleged, among other things, that the decision was arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise not in accordance with law under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

In No. 18-587, the respondents are individual DACA recipients, States, a public university system, a county, a city, and a labor union, who collectively filed five separate suits in the Northern District of California. The district court granted a partial preliminary injunction on the grounds that respondents were likely to succeed on the merits of their APA claim, *Regents* Pet. App. 1a-70a, and denied in part petitioners' motion to dismiss, *see id.* at 71a-90a. The Ninth Circuit affirmed the district court's decision. *Regents* Supp. App. 1a-78a.

In No. 18-588, the respondents are an individual DACA recipient, a company, a private university, a civil rights organization, and labor unions who filed two separate suits in the District Court for the District of Columbia. The district court entered a final judgment vacating the decision to terminate DACA based on its conclusion that the agency's decision was arbitrary and capricious. *NAACP* Pet. App. 1a-74a.

In No. 18-589, the respondents are individual DACA recipients, a nonprofit serving and employing DACA recipients, and States, who filed two separate suits in the Eastern District of New York. The district court entered a preliminary injunction

co-extensive with the Northern District of California's on that basis of respondents' APA claim. *Batalla Vidal* Pet. App. 62a-129a. It also denied in part petitioners' motion to dismiss. *Id.* at 147a-157a.

2. On June 28, 2019, this Court granted certiorari in No. 18-587, granted certiorari before judgment in Nos. 18-588 and 18-589, consolidated the cases, and allotted a total of one hour for oral argument.

3. The State of Texas has filed an amicus curiae brief in support of petitioners on behalf of itself and certain other States. On September 20, 2019, the State of Texas moved for leave to participate in oral argument. Texas requests 10 minutes of argument time.

ARGUMENT

1. These consolidated cases present the important questions whether petitioners' decision to terminate the DACA policy is subject to judicial review and whether that decision was lawful, in particular whether it was arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise not in accordance with law, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

Respondents have a range of distinct interests and perspectives. The individual respondents are all DACA recipients who have structured their lives around the DACA policy and stand to lose their deferred action, along with work authorization and other benefits, if the decision to terminate the policy stands. The private entity respondents are, among other things, employers and universities who have made substantial investments in recruiting, hiring, training, and educating DACA recipients.

And the respondent States, their institutions, and their political subdivisions currently have more than 350,000 residents who are DACA recipients; directly employ DACA recipients; have enrolled DACA recipients in their public schools, colleges, and universities; and stand to lose billions of dollars in tax revenue and suffer other harms if DACA is rescinded.

The proposed equal division of argument time will ensure that the various respondents have their interests fully represented, and that the Court receives a full understanding of the perspectives and arguments of all respondents. Theodore Olson, counsel for certain individual respondents, would represent the interests of the individual and other non-State respondents. Michael Mongan, the California Solicitor General, would represent the interests of the States. Both are members in good standing of the bar of this Court and experienced counsel.

This proposed division is particularly appropriate here because respondents include individual DACA recipients, who are most directly affected by the challenged government action (along with entities that work closely with them), as well as States, which as sovereign governments have unique interests that private parties cannot adequately represent. For that reason, the States have filed their own briefs in the courts of appeals and this Court in the two proceedings in which they are respondents; and in both of those proceedings they presented their own oral arguments in the courts of appeals, alongside counsel for the non-state respondents. This Court has regularly divided argument when States and private parties appear on the same side of the case. *See, e.g., Dep't of Commerce v. New York*, 139 S. Ct. 1543 (2019)

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.