

Nos. 18-587, 18-588, and 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.

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States
Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

DONALD J. TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, ET AL.,
Petitioners,

v.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED
PEOPLE, ET AL.,
Respondents.

On Writ of Certiorari Before Judgment to the United States
Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

KEVIN K. MCALEENAN, ACTING SECRETARY OF HOMELAND
SECURITY, ET AL.,
Petitioners,

v.

MARTIN JONATHAN BATALLA VIDAL, ET AL.,
Respondents.

On Writ of Certiorari Before Judgment to the United States
Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

**BRIEF OF CURRENT MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND
BIPARTISAN FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AS
AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

ELIZABETH B. WYDRA
BRIANNE J. GOROD*
BRIAN R. FRAZELLE
DAYNA J. ZOLLE**
CONSTITUTIONAL
ACCOUNTABILITY CENTER
1200 18th Street NW
Suite 501
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-6889
brianne@theusconstitution.org

Counsel for Amici Curiae

October 4, 2019

* Counsel of Record

** Not admitted in D.C.; supervised by
principals of the firm

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT	5
DACA WAS A LAWFUL EXERCISE OF EXECUTIVE DISCRETION, AND ITS RESCISSION ON THE GROUND THAT IT WAS UNLAWFUL THEREFORE VIOLATED THE APA	5
I. DACA WAS A VALID EXERCISE OF EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY.....	5
A. Congress Has Long Conferred Significant Discretion on the Executive Branch.....	5
B. The Executive Branch Has Long Exercised This Broad Discretion with Congress’s Affirmative Approval	11
C. DACA Was a Valid Exercise of Executive Discretion	17
II. THE TERMINATION OF DACA ON THE GROUND THAT IT WAS UNLAWFUL VIOLATED THE APA.....	23
CONCLUSION	29
APPENDIX	1A

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases</u>	Page(s)
<i>Apex Hosiery Co. v. Leader</i> , 310 U.S. 469 (1940).....	14
<i>Arizona v. United States</i> , 567 U.S. 387 (2012).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Barnhart v. Peabody Coal Co.</i> , 537 U.S. 149 (2003).....	28
<i>Bob Jones Univ. v. United States</i> , 461 U.S. 574 (1983).....	17
<i>Burlington Truck Lines, Inc. v. United States</i> , 371 U.S. 156 (1962).....	24
<i>Dames & Moore v. Regan</i> , 453 U.S. 654 (1981).....	13
<i>Harisiades v. Shaughnessy</i> , 342 U.S. 580 (1952).....	5
<i>Heckler v. Chaney</i> , 470 U.S. 821 (1985).....	6, 10
<i>INS v. Chadha</i> , 462 U.S. 919 (1983).....	6
<i>Jama v. ICE</i> , 543 U.S. 335 (2005).....	8
<i>Lichter v. United States</i> , 334 U.S. 742 (1948).....	10
<i>Marx v. Gen. Revenue Corp.</i> , 568 U.S. 371 (2013).....	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – cont'd

	Page(s)
<i>Mathews v. Diaz</i> , 426 U.S. 67 (1976).....	8
<i>Medellin v. Texas</i> , 554 U.S. 759 (2008).....	6, 21
<i>Mistretta v. United States</i> , 488 U.S. 361 (1989).....	9
<i>Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> , 463 U.S. 29 (1983).....	24
<i>Reno v. Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm.</i> , 525 U.S. 471 (1999).....	2, 7, 8, 11, 17
<i>Scripps-Howard Radio v. F.C.C.</i> , 316 U.S. 4 (1942).....	22
<i>SEC v. Chenery Corp.</i> , 332 U.S. 194 (1947).....	24
<i>Tex. Dep't of Hous. & Cmty. Affairs v. Inclusive Cmty. Project, Inc.</i> , 135 S. Ct. 2507 (2015).....	14
<i>Texas v. United States</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2271 (2016).....	5
<i>Texas v. United States</i> , 809 F.3d 134 (5th Cir. 2015).....	5, 25, 26, 27
<i>United States ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy</i> , 338 U.S. 537 (1950).....	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – cont’d

	Page(s)
<i>United States v. Craft</i> , 535 U.S. 274 (2002)	21
<i>United States v. Rutherford</i> , 442 U.S. 544 (1979)	14
<i>United States v. Vonn</i> , 535 U.S. 55 (2002)	28

Constitutional Provisions and Legislative Materials

5 U.S.C. § 551 <i>et seq.</i>	2
5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)	4, 25
6 U.S.C. § 202(5)	<i>passim</i>
8 C.F.R. § 109.1(b)(7) (1984)	11
8 C.F.R. § 245a.2(a)(2)(iv)(5) (1989)	12
8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(c)(14) (1989)	11, 16
8 U.S.C. § 1101 <i>et seq.</i>	1
8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(1)	7
8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(3)	3, 7, 18, 19
8 U.S.C. § 1151(b)(2)(A)(i)	25
8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(D)(i)(II)	15, 16
8 U.S.C. § 1154(a)(1)(D)(i)(IV)	15, 16
8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)	26

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.