In the United States Court of Appeals

for the First Circuit

AFRICAN COMMUNITIES TOGETHER; UNDOCUBLACK NETWORK; DAVID KROMA; MOMOLU BONGAY; OTHELLO A.S.C. DENNIS; YATTA KIAZOLU; CHRISTINA WILSON; JERRYDEAN SIMPSON; C. B., by and through their father and next friend David Kroma; AL. K., by and through their father and next friend David Kroma; D. D., by and through their father and next friend David Kroma; AI. K., by and through their father and next friend David Kroma; O. D., by and through their father and next friend Othello A.S.C. Dennis; A. D., by and through their father and next friend Othello A.S.C. Dennis; O. S., by and through their father and next friend Jerrydean Simpson; D. K., by and through their father and next friend David Kroma,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

V.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States; KEVIN K. MCALEENAN; in his official capacity as Acting Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security,

Defendants – Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, No. 4:19-cv-10432 Hon. Judge Timothy S. Hillman

APPELLANTS' BRIEF

Ivan Espinoza-Madrigal Oren Nimni Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law 61 Batterymarch St., 5th Fl. Boston, MA 02110 (617) 988-0606

Dennis H. Hranitzky
Michael A. Losco
Shriram Harid
DECHERT LLP
3 Bryant Park
1095 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-6797

(212) 698-3500

Counsel for Appellants (Additional Counsel Listed on Inside Cover)

Maryum Jordan Dorian Spence Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law 1500 K St. NW, 9th Fl. Washington, DC 20005 (202) 662-8600 Sozi Pedro Tulante DECHERT LLP Cira Centre 2929 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19104-2808 (215) 994-4000

Timothy C. Blank DECHERT LLP 100 Oliver St., 40th Fl. Boston, MA 02110-2605 (617) 728-7100

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26.1, African Communities

Together (ACT) and UndocuBlack Network (UBN) state that they have no parent
companies and no publicly held corporation has an ownership of ten percent or
more in ACT or UBN.

s/ <u>Dennis H. Hranitzky</u> Dennis H. Hranitzky

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COR	PORA	TE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT i
TAB	LE OF	AUTHORITIES iv
REAS	SONS	WHY ORAL ARGUMENT SHOULD BE HEARD x
JURI	SDIC	TIONAL STATEMENT 1
STAT	ГЕМЕ	NT OF ISSUES 1
STAT	ГЕМЕ	NT OF THE CASE2
I.		dent Trump terminates DED in a stark departure from the ce of past Administrations
II.		llants properly alleged that President Trump's justification for g DED is pretextual
	A.	Conditions in Liberia prevent the country from handling the thousands of DED holders affected by the President's decision 9
	В.	Appellants properly alleged that racial animus motivated President Trump's termination of DED
III.	The t	ermination of DED will severely harm Appellants11
IV.	The p	proceedings in the District Court
SUM	MARY	Y OF THE ARGUMENT 16
STA	NDAR	D OF REVIEW 18
ARG	UMEN	NT
I.		President's decision to terminate DED is subject to constitutional

II.	The District Court has the authority to order equitable relief to remedy violations of the Constitution		. 25
	A.	The Court Can Enjoin the President's Subordinates from Enforcing the Termination of DED	. 28
	В.	The Court Can Enjoin the President Himself to Consider Only Constitutionally Relevant Factors or Declare His Actions Unconstitutional	. 34
III.	There	e Is No Other Reason to Affirm the District Court	. 39
CON	CLUS	ION	. 41
CER	ΓΙFΙC	ATE OF COMPLIANCE	. 43
CER	TIFICA	ATE OF SERVICE	. 44
ADD	ENDU	$^{ m JM}$	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

African Communities Together v. Trump, No. 19-10432, 2019 WL 5537231 (D. Mass. Oct. 25, 2019)passim
Al-Bihani v. Obama, 619 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2010)23
Arizona Dream Act Coalition v. Brewer, 855 F.3d 957 (9th Cir. 2017)
Bancoult v. McNamara, 445 F.3d 427 (D.C. Cir. 2006)20
Blumenthal v. Trump, 373 F. Supp. 3d 191 (D.D.C. 2019
Boumediene v. Bush, 553 U.S. 723 (2008)19
Centro Presente v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Security, 332 F. Supp. 3d 393 (D. Mass. 2018)
City and Cty. of San Francisco v. Trump, 897 F.3d 1225 (9th Cir. 2018)31
Clinton v. Jones, 520 U.S. 681 (1997)25
Consumer Data Indus. Ass'n v. King, 678 F.3d 898 (10th Cir. 2012)26
Dep't of Homeland Security v. Regents of Univ. of Cal., 139 S. Ct. 2779 (2019)21
<i>Doe 1 v. Trump</i> , 275 F. Supp. 3d 167 (D.D.C. 2017)24

Doe 2 v. Shanahan, 755 Fed. App'x 19 (D.C. Cir. 2019)	24
East Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump, 932 F.3d 742 (9th Cir. 2018)	21, 31
Ex Parte Merryman, 17 F. Cas. 144 (D. Md. 1861)	23
Ex Parte Milligan, 71 U.S. 2 (1866)	23
Franklin v. Massachusetts, 505 U.S. 788 (1992)	16, 31, 32, 34
Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw, 528 U.S. 167 (2000)	26
Gordo-Gonzalez v. United States, 873 F.3d 32 (1st Cir. 2017)	18
Gratz v. Bollinger, 539 U.S. 244 (2003)	27
Hamdi v. Rumsfeld, 542 U.S. 507 (2004)	23
Hamilton v. Ky. Distilleries, Co., 251 U.S. 146 (1919)	24
Hawaii v. Trump, 859 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2017)	30, 31, 37
Hirabayashi v. United States, 320 U.S. 81 (1943)	24
Int'l Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump, 857 F.3d 554 (4th Cir. 2017)	29, 34, 37

Knight First Amendment Inst. at Columbia Univ. v. Trump, 302 F. Supp. 3d 541 (S.D.N.Y. 2018),	
<i>aff'd</i> , 928 F.3d 226 (2d Cir. 2019)	26, 29, 31, 6, 37
Korematsu v. United States, 323 U.S. 214 (1944)	24
Larson v. Valente, 456 U.S. 228 (1982)	26
Limone v. United States, 579 F.3d 79 (1st Cir. 2009)	18
Little v. Barreme, 6 U.S. 170 (1804)	28
Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555 (1992)	26
Made in the USA Found. v. United States, 242 F.3d 1300 (11th Cir. 2001)	29, 31
Make the Rd. New York v. McAleenan, No. 19-2369, 2019 WL 4738070 (D.D.C. Sept. 27, 2019)	33
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)	16, 18, 38
Massachusetts v. EPA, 549 U.S. 497 (2007)	26, 33
Mhany Mgmt., Inc. v. Cty. of Nassau, 819 F.3d 581 (2d Cir. 2016)	26
Miranda v. Secretary of Treasury, 766 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1985)	23
Mississippi v. Johnson, 71 U.S. 475 (1866)	35

Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass'n of U.S. v. State Farm Mut. Ins. Co., 463 U.S. 29 (1983)	33
Muñiz-Rivera v. United States, 326 F.3d 8, 11 (1st Cir. 2003)	
Nat'l Treasury Emps. Union v. Nixon, 492 F.2d 587 (D.C. Cir. 1974)	37
Ne. Fla. Chapter of Associated Gen. Contractors of Am. v. City of Jacksonville, 508 U.S. 656 (1993)	27
Nguyen v. I.N.S., 533 U.S. 53 (2001)	40
Nixon v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 731 (1982)	35
Nixon v. Sirica, 487 F.2d 700 (D.C. Cir. 1973)	38
Nulankeyutmonen Nkihtaqmikon v. Impson, 503 F.3d 18 (1st Cir. 2007)	26
Quillon v. Walcott, 434 U.S. 246 (1978)	40
Ralls Corp. v. Comm. on Foreign Inv. in U.S., 758 F.3d 296 (D.C. Cir. 2014)	23
Regents of Univ. of California v. United States Dep't of Homeland Sec., 279 F. Supp. 3d 1011 (N.D. Cal.), aff'd, 908 F.3d 476 (9th Cir. 2018), cert. granted on different grounds, 139 S. Ct. 2779 (2019)	33
Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland Security, 908 F.3d 476 (9th Cir. 2018)	
Reno v. Flores, 507 U.S. 292 (1993)	

Rostker v. Goldberg, 453 U.S. 57 (1981)24
Saget v. Trump, 375 F. Supp. 3d 280 (E.D.N.Y. 2019)22
Sessions v. Dimaya, 138 S. Ct. 1204, 1213 (2018)20
Simmons v. United States, 390 U.S. 377 (1968)4
Swan v. Clinton, 100 F.3d 973 (D.C. Cir. 1996)27, 29, 30, 30
Texas v. United States, 809 F.3d 134 (5th Cir. 2015)2
Trump v. Hawaii, 138 S. Ct. 2392 (2018)
Trump v. Int'l Refugee Assistance, 138 S. Ct. 353 (2017)
United States v. Bassford, 812 F.2d 16 (1st Cir. 1987)22
Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing Development Corporation, 429 U.S. 252 (1977)
WildEarth Guardians v. U.S. Dep't of Agriculture, 795 F.3d 1148 (9th Cir. 2015)20
Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886)
Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer, 343 U.S. 579 (1952)23, 28, 29, 35, 36

Zambrano v. I.N.S., 282 F.3d 1145 (9th Cir. 2002)33
Zheng v. Gonzales, 422 F.3d 98 (3d Cir. 2005)20
Statutes
8 U.S.C. § 1254a(b)(1)5
28 U.S.C. § 12911
28 U.S.C. § 13311
28 U.S.C. § 220128
Regulations
Continuation of Employment Authorization and Automatic Extension of Existing Employment Authorization Documents for Eligible Liberians Before Period of Deferred Enforced Departure Ends; U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 84 Fed Reg. 13059 (Apr. 3, 2019)
Other Authorities
Brief for Petitioners, Dep't of Homeland Security v. Regents of Univ. of Cal., 2019 WL 3942900 (Aug. 19, 2019)

REASONS WHY ORAL ARGUMENT SHOULD BE HEARD

This appeal involves the extent of the federal courts' power to remedy violations of fundamental constitutional rights by the Executive Branch, including the President of the United States. Oral argument will facilitate full development of the constitutional issues that will be raised in the parties' briefs.

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Appellants appeal from the Opinion and Order issued by the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts on October 25, 2019, granting Appellees' motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. Appellants seek declaratory and equitable relief for violation of equal protection and due process under the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution. The District Court had jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 as Appellants asserted constitutional claims that presented a federal question.

This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. The District Court issued a final decision by entering an order on October 25, 2019, dismissing all of Appellants' claims. Appellants then filed a timely Notice of Appeal on November 1, 2019.

STATEMENT OF ISSUES

This appeal raises three narrow issues:

1. Did the District Court err in holding that there is no remedy available to Appellants that will have the substantial probability of redressing their alleged constitutional injuries even though the District Court has the authority to grant injunctive and declaratory relief against the President, his subordinates, and government agencies?

- 2. Did the District Court err in holding that a declaratory judgment declaring that the President's termination of Deferred Enforced Departure (DED) for Liberian nationals violated the Constitution due to racial animus cannot redress Appellants' injury?
- 3. Did the District Court err in holding that enjoining the Acting Secretary of Homeland Security and the Department of Homeland Security from enforcing the termination of DED for Liberian nationals cannot redress Appellants' injury?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Since 1991, Deferred Enforced Departure (DED), a life-saving humanitarian relief program, has protected Liberians living in the United States from deportation. Republican and Democratic presidents over four administrations found it necessary to extend this program because of the fragile economic, humanitarian, and security situation in war-torn Liberia. In 2018, however, President Trump issued a Presidential Memorandum that announced the termination of DED on March 31, 2019. Later extended to March 31, 2020, the termination of DED will strip thousands of Liberians of their ability to earn a living and immediately subject them to deportation. Despite purporting to base this decision on improved conditions in Liberia, a motivating factor in President

The balance of this brief has been omitted for this sample.

For a complete version of this brief, please contact our office.

Thank you.