

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 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 Appeal
for the District of Columbia and Second Circuits

**BRIEF OF NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS
ASSOCIATION ET AL. AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN
SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS**

FRANCISCO M. NEGRÓN, JR. RICHARD P. BRESS
Chief Legal Officer *Counsel of Record*

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS SAMIR DEGER-SEN

ASSOCIATION JESSICA SABA
1680 Duke St., FL 2 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
Alexandria, VA 22314 555 11th St., NW, Ste. 1000
(703) 838-6722 Washington, DC 20004
(202) 637-2200
richard.bress@lw.com

Counsel for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
INTERESTS OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	4
ARGUMENT	7
I. THE RESCISSION OF DACA MUST SATISFY NORMAL APA STANDARDS.....	7
A. Reasoned decision-making requires that an agency’s rationale be adequately explained, that any change in policy be acknowledged, and that reliance interests are accounted for.....	8
B. The requirements of reasoned decision-making are fully applicable when an agency’s stated basis for its decision is a change in its interpretation of the law.....	10
C. A court’s independent assessment of whether an agency’s policy is unlawful is inappropriate.....	12
II. THE DECISION TO RESCIND DACA WAS ARBITRARY AND CAPRICIOUS	15
A. DHS failed to adequately explain why it believes DACA is unlawful.	16
1. DHS failed to explain why there was no “statutory authority” for DACA.	19

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
2. DHS failed to acknowledge or account for the differences between DACA and DAPA.	20
3. DHS’s citation to the Fifth Circuit’s DAPA ruling is inadequate to justify its decision to rescind DACA.	21
4. The Supreme Court’s affirmance of the Fifth Circuit’s DAPA ruling has no precedential value.	23
5. DHS fails to identify any constitutional defect of DACA.	24
B. DHS’s post-hoc explanations should be disregarded and, in any event, do not meet the requirements for reasoned decision-making.	24
C. DHS failed to acknowledge its changed policy position or provide reasons for that change.	31
D. DHS did not adequately take into account reliance interests.	32
CONCLUSION.	37

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

<i>Advocates for Highway & Auto Safety v. Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration,</i> 429 F.3d 1136 (D.C. Cir. 2005).....	7
<i>Alpharma, Inc. v. Leavitt,</i> 460 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2006).....	25
<i>Altera Corp. & Subsidiaries v. Commissioner,</i> 926 F.3d 1061 (9th Cir. 2019).....	33
<i>Amerijet International, Inc. v. Pistole,</i> 753 F.3d 1343 (D.C. Cir. 2014).....	16
<i>Animal Legal Defense Fund, Inc. v. Perdue,</i> 872 F.3d 602 (D.C. Cir. 2017).....	12
<i>Arizona Dream Act Coalition v. Brewer,</i> 855 F.3d 957 (9th Cir. 2017), <i>cert. denied</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1279 (2018).....	19
<i>Bowman Transportation, Inc. v. Arkansas-Best Freight System, Inc.,</i> 419 U.S. 281 (1974).....	6, 9, 18, 23
<i>Catholic Healthcare West v. Sebelius,</i> 748 F.3d 351 (D.C. Cir. 2014).....	12, 13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page(s)
<i>Checkosky v. SEC</i> , 23 F.3d 452 (D.C. Cir. 1994).....	30
<i>Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe</i> , 401 U.S. 402 (1971).....	7, 25
<i>East Texas Medical Center-Athens v. Azar</i> , 337 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2018).....	11
<i>Encino Motorcars, LLC v. Navarro</i> , 136 S. Ct. 2117 (2016).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.</i> , 556 U.S. 502 (2009).....	5, 9, 10, 31, 33
<i>Food Marketing Institute v. ICC</i> , 587 F.2d 1285 (D.C. Cir. 1978).....	26, 31
<i>Hispanic Affairs Project v. Acosta</i> , 263 F. Supp. 3d 160 (D.D.C. 2017), <i>aff'd in part, rev'd in part</i> , 901 F.3d 378 (D.C. Cir. 2018).....	32
<i>International Union, United Mine Workers of America v. United States DOL</i> , 358 F.3d 40 (D.C. Cir. 2004).....	22
<i>Interstate Natural Gas Association of America v. FERC</i> , 617 F.3d 504 (D.C. Cir. 2010).....	5

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.