



## CIVIL RIGHTS LITIGATION CLEARINGHOUSE

[HOME](#) [ABOUT](#) [FOR TEACHERS](#) [SEARCH](#) [QUESTIONS](#) [RECENT ADDITIONS](#)

[feedback/  
suggestions](#)

[log in/  
register](#)

### CASE PROFILE

[new search](#)  
[page permalink](#)

Case Name	<b>City and County of San Francisco v. Trump</b>	IM-CA-0085
Docket / Court	3:17-cv-00485-WHO ( N.D. Cal. )	<input type="button" value="Save Case"/>
Additional Docket(s)	3:17-cv-00574-WHO [ 17-574 ] 3:17-cv-01535-WHO [ 17-1535 ] 3:17-cv-04642-WHO [ 17-4642 ] 3:17-cv-04701-WHO [ 17-4701 ]	
State/Territory	California	
Case Type(s)	Immigration and/or the Border Presidential/Gubernatorial Authority	
Special Collection	<a href="#">Civil Rights Challenges to Trump Immigration Enforcement Orders</a> <a href="#">Take Care</a>	

**Case Summary** This lawsuit, filed by the City of San Francisco on January 31, 2017, challenges President Trump's January 25, 2017 [Executive Order](#) on immigration enforcement, which threatened to withhold federal funds from "sanctuary jurisdictions" and take enforcement action against any locality that impedes the federal government's immigration law. The City filed its complaint in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

The complaint argued that this issue was one of "state sovereignty and a local government's autonomy to devote resources to local priorities and to control the exercise of its own police powers, rather than being forced to carry out the agenda of the Federal government." Thus, the plaintiff alleged that the executive order violated the Tenth Amendment. The complaint addressed 8 U.S.C. § 1373, which provides that a local government entity cannot prohibit or restrict communication between government entities or officials and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. After asserting its compliance with the statute, the complaint alleged that the U.S. had begun to designate non-compliant cities as sanctuary cities and that San Francisco had been designated as such. The complaint asserted that §1373 unconstitutionally regulated state governments and that San Francisco stood to be harmed by the executive order.

The complaint sought declaratory and injunctive relief. Specifically, the plaintiff asked for a declaration that San Francisco complies with 8 U.S.C. § 1373, that 8 U.S.C. § 1373(a) violates the Tenth Amendment, and that the executive order's enforcement directive violates the Tenth Amendment. The case was initially assigned to Magistrate Judge Donna Ryu, but on February 10, Judge William Orrick granted a motion to relate this case to *County of Santa Clara v. Trump*, [IM-CA-0089](#) in this Clearinghouse, and reassigned this case to himself. On February 27, the plaintiff filed a first amended complaint. The amended complaint added that San Francisco seeks a declaration that the EO's funding restrictions violate the Tenth Amendment, the Spending Clause, and Article I, sec. 1 of the Constitution.

On March 8, the plaintiff filed a motion for a preliminary injunction. In the motion, the plaintiff requested that the court enter a nationwide preliminary injunction prohibiting the defendants from enforcing the executive order. The plaintiff also sought to enjoin the defendants from taking any action that would declare San Francisco a sanctuary city, thereby making the city ineligible for federal funds. On March 23, the city of Richmond moved to relate this case to *Richmond v. Trump* ([IM-CA-0090](#) in this Clearinghouse), which had been filed on March 21 in the same court. The court granted the motion on March 23. Several individuals and organizations have filed amici briefs in support of the plaintiff including the State of California, a local chapter of the NAACP, and several Silicon Valley technology companies. After an April 14 hearing, the Court, on April 25, entered a nationwide injunction against operation of the Order.

The court explained that the federal government at the hearing had disavowed a robust reading of the Executive Order:

It explained for the first time at oral argument that the Order is merely an exercise of the President's "bully pulpit" to highlight a changed approach to immigration enforcement. Under this interpretation, Section 9(a) applies only to three federal grants in the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security that already have conditions requiring compliance with 8 U.S.C. 1373. This interpretation renders the Order toothless; the Government can already enforce these three grants by the terms of those grants and can enforce 8 U.S.C. 1373 to the extent legally possible under the terms of existing law. Counsel disavowed any right through the Order for the Government to affect any other part of the billions of dollars in federal funds the Counties receive every year.

The Court held, however, that the Executive Order "is not reasonably susceptible to the new, narrow interpretation offered at the hearing."

Yet a broader reading was, Judge Orrick explained, unconstitutional: "The Constitution vests the spending powers in Congress, not the President, so the Order cannot constitutionally place new conditions on federal funds. Further, the Tenth Amendment requires that conditions on federal funds be unambiguous and timely made; that they bear some relation to the funds at issue; and that the total financial incentive not be coercive. Federal funding that bears no meaningful relationship to immigration enforcement cannot be threatened merely because a jurisdiction chooses an immigration enforcement strategy of which the President disapproves."

Accordingly, the Court granted a preliminary injunction against any broader implementation of the order, although it emphasized that the preliminary injunction "does not affect the ability of the Attorney General or the Secretary to enforce existing conditions of federal grants or 8 U.S.C. 1373, nor does it impact the Secretary's ability to develop regulations or other guidance defining what a sanctuary jurisdiction is or designating a jurisdiction as such." *County of Santa Clara v. Trump*, 250 F. Supp. 3d 497 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 25, 2017).

The government moved for reconsideration pursuant to a May 22, 2017 memorandum from the Attorney General regarding the implementation of the EO. The memo specified that "the Department of Justice will require jurisdictions applying for certain Department grants to certify their compliance with federal law, including 8 U.S.C. § 1373, as a condition for receiving an award. This certification requirement will apply to any existing grant administered by the Office of Justice Programs and the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services that expressly contains this certification condition and to future grants for which the Department is statutorily authorized to impose such a condition. All grantees will receive notice of their obligation to comply with section 1373." Further, "the term 'sanctuary jurisdiction' will refer only to jurisdictions that 'willfully refuse to comply with 8 U.S.C. 1373.'" On May 23, the plaintiff filed a second amended complaint. The defendants moved to dismiss on June 6. On July 6, the plaintiff Santa Clara (followed by joinders from San Francisco and Richmond on July 7) moved for leave to file a surreply in opposition to the motion to dismiss. The plaintiffs argued that recent statements by President Trump and DHS officials contradicted assertions in the

defendants' reply brief. On July 12, the plaintiff also filed a supplemental request for judicial notice of recent statements by AG Sessions.

On June 16, 2017, the states of West Virginia, Louisiana, Alabama, Arkansas, Michigan, Nevada, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas moved for leave to file an amicus brief in support of the defendants' motion to dismiss. On June 28, 2017, many organizations, including labor unions, civil rights groups, and public schools, as well as individual sheriffs and police chiefs, moved to file amici briefs in support of the plaintiff's opposition to the defendants' motion to discuss.

On July 12, 2017, Judge Orrick held a hearing (in all three related cases) on the defendants' motions to dismiss and motion for reconsideration. He issued an order on July 20, denying the defendants' motions. He denied the motion for reconsideration because the AG Memorandum did not change the analysis from the preliminary injunction order. Additionally, he denied the motion to dismiss because the AG Memorandum did not change his findings of the plaintiff's standing and their claims' ripeness and likelihood of success. Finally, he concluded that the plaintiff had adequately stated a claim for declaratory relief. *County of Santa Clara v. Trump*, 2017 WL 3086064 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2017).

On August 15 and 17, 2017, the plaintiff in an administrative motion and supplemental statement asked the court to relate *City and County of San Francisco v. Trump* to *City and County of San Francisco v. Sessions*. The plaintiff argued that both cases concerned substantially the same parties and challenged the President's withholding of federal funds from sanctuary cities. On August 18, 2017, the defendants responded, arguing that the cases should not be related because the first challenged an EO and the latter an AG program. On August 23, 2017, Judge Orrick granted the plaintiff's request to relate this case to *City and County of San Francisco v. Sessions*. Then on August 25, 2017, he found *State of California v. Sessions* to be a related case, and reassigned it to himself. That case also challenges DOJ's immigration-related conditions on law enforcement funding.

On August 30, 2017 San Francisco and Santa Clara moved for summary judgment. San Francisco argued that the EO was unconstitutional because it violated the separation of powers, the Spending Clause, and the Tenth Amendment. Consequently, San Francisco argued, the court should permanently enjoin the EO's implementation. The defendants, in their September 27, 2017 response, argued that the Constitution authorized their broad immigration enforcement powers as implemented in the EO and § 1373. On September 18, 2017 the defendants appealed, to the Ninth Circuit, Judge Orrick's April 25, 2017 preliminary injunction and July 20, 2017 order denying the defendants' motions to dismiss and motion for reconsideration. The Ninth Circuit opened a docket for the appeal, No. 17-16886. The Ninth Circuit held oral argument on April 11. In the district court, Judge Orrick held an October 23 hearing on the plaintiffs' August 30 motion for summary judgment. On November 20, he granted summary judgment for the plaintiffs, permanently enjoining the defendants from enforcing Section 9(a) of the EO against all jurisdictions deemed as "sanctuary jurisdictions." The injunction applied nationwide because Section 9(a) was facially unconstitutional.

In his opinion, Judge Orrick held that the EO had caused and would continue to cause constitutional injuries, by violating the separation of powers doctrine and depriving the plaintiffs of their Fifth and Tenth Amendment rights. Judge Orrick first stated that the EO's plain language impermissibly empowers the President to place new conditions on all federal funds -- a power properly reserved to Congress under the Spending Clause. The President's and AG's subsequent comments on the EO had confirmed, rather than narrowed, this broad scope. Further, the Fifth and Tenth Amendments forbid funding conditions that are vague, unrelated to the funds at issue, and coercive: "Federal funding that bears no meaningful relationship to immigration enforcement cannot be threatened merely because a jurisdiction chooses an immigration enforcement strategy of which the President disapproves."

On November 29, 2017 the parties jointly requested that the Court dismiss San Francisco's claim for declaratory judgment (that it did not violate § 1373), which the Court would consider instead in *San Francisco v. Sessions*. The next day, Judge Orrick granted this request. On December 14, 2017 the defendants appealed Judge Orrick's November 20 permanent injunction, asking the Ninth Circuit to consolidate this appeal with the other two appeals in process. The plaintiffs, for their part, asked the Ninth Circuit to dismiss the consolidated appeals as moot because they challenged a preliminary injunction that the permanent injunction had superseded. The defendants responded on December 27. Eleven states filed a December 22, 2017 amicus brief supporting the defendants. However, the Ninth Circuit granted the plaintiffs' request on January 4, denying all pending motions as moot.

The Ninth Circuit held oral argument on April 11, 2018. On August 1, 2018 the Ninth Circuit affirmed the grant of summary judgment, but vacated and remanded for reconsideration of the nationwide injunction. The panel held that the executive branch could not refuse to disperse the federal grants without congressional authorization under the Separation of Powers principle and the Spending Clause. The panel found that Congress had not so authorized, and so summary judgment was proper, but that there were no findings to support an injunction with nationwide reach. 2018 WL 3637911.

On August 29, 2018 the plaintiff in an administrative motion asked the court to relate *City and County of San Francisco v. Sessions III* and *State of California v. Sessions*. The defendants did not oppose the motion. On September 10, 2018, the court related the cases to this case.

On August 15, 2019, by the plaintiffs' stipulation, the court dismissed the plaintiffs' request for a nationwide injunction and closed the case.

Ava Morgenstern - 04/14/2018

Jamie Kessler - 05/29/2017

Virginia Weeks - 09/26/2018

[compress summary](#)[- click to show/hide ALL -](#)

## Issues and Causes of Action

[click to show/hide detail](#)

Issues	<p><b>Constitutional Clause</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Due Process</li> <li>Federalism (including 10th Amendment)</li> </ul> <p><b>Content of Injunction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preliminary relief granted</li> </ul> <p><b>Defendant-type</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jurisdiction-wide</li> </ul> <p><b>General</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Funding</li> </ul> <p><b>Immigration/Border</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sanctuary city/state</li> <li>Undocumented immigrants - state and local regulation</li> </ul> <p><b>Plaintiff Type</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>City/County Plaintiff</li> </ul>
Causes of Action	Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201

## Case Details

[click to show/hide detail](#)

Defendant(s)	U.S. Department of Homeland Security U.S. Department of Justice United States
Plaintiff Description	City of San Francisco
Class action status sought	No
Class action status granted	No
Filed Pro Se	No
Prevailing Party	Plaintiff
Public Int. Lawyer	No
Nature of Relief	Preliminary injunction / Temp. restraining order Injunction / Injunctive-like Settlement
Source of Relief	Litigation
Filed	2017
Case Ongoing	Yes

## Related Cases

[click to show/hide detail](#)

Case Listing	<p><a href="#">IM-CA-0089</a> : County of Santa Clara v. Trump (N.D. Cal.)</p> <p><a href="#">IM-CA-0090</a> : City of Richmond v. Trump (N.D. Cal.)</p> <p><a href="#">IM-CA-0094</a> : State of California v. Sessions (N.D. Cal.)</p> <p><a href="#">IM-CA-0093</a> : City and County of San Francisco v. Sessions (N.D. Cal.)</p> <p><a href="#">IM-CA-0133</a> : State of California v. Sessions (N.D. Cal.)</p> <p><a href="#">IM-CA-0132</a> : City and County of San Francisco v. Sessions III (N.D. Cal.)</p>
--------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Additional Resources

[click to show/hide detail](#)

**See this case** at CourtListener.com (*May provide additional documents and, for active cases, real-time alerts*)

**Sanctuary Cities**

www.sfcityattorney.org

Date: Aug. 30, 2017

By: San Francisco City Attorney

[\[ Detail \]](#) [\[ External Link \]](#)**Implementation of Executive Order 13768, "Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States**

The Washington Post

Date: May 22, 2017

By: Jefferson Sessions (U.S. Department of Justice)

[\[ Detail \]](#) [\[ External Link \]](#)**Re: Implementing the President's Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements Policies (Final, 2/20/2017)**

dhs.gov

Date: Feb. 20, 2017

By: DHS Secretary John Kelly (United States Department of Homeland Security)

[\[ Detail \]](#) [\[ PDF \]](#) [\[ External Link \]](#)**Re: Enforcement of the Immigration Laws to Serve the National Interest (Final, 2/20/2017)**

dhs.gov

Date: Feb. 20, 2017

By: DHS Secretary John Kelly (United States Department of Homeland Security)

[\[ Detail \]](#) [\[ PDF \]](#) [\[ External Link \]](#)**Executive Order 13767: Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements**

Federal Register

Date: Jan. 27, 2017

By: President Donald Trump (Office of the President)

Citation: 82 Fed. Reg. Presidential Documents 8793 (Jan. 27, 2017)

[\[ Detail \]](#) [\[ PDF \]](#)**Executive Order 13768: Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States**

Federal Register

Date: Jan. 25, 2017

By: President Donald Trump (Office of the President)

[\[ Detail \]](#) [\[ PDF \]](#) [\[ External Link \]](#)

## Documents

[click to show/hide detail](#)Docket(s) **4:17-cv-00485-DMR** (N.D. Cal.)[IM-CA-0085-9000.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 10/08/2019

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

General Documents

**Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief [ECF# 1]**[IM-CA-0085-0001.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 01/31/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related Pursuant to N.D. Cal.****Civil L.R. 3-12(B) [ECF# 11]**[IM-CA-0085-0002.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 02/07/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Statement of Support Regarding Santa Clara's Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related [ECF# 12]**[IM-CA-0085-0003.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 02/07/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Defendants' Statement of Support Regarding Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related [ECF# 18]**[IM-CA-0085-0004.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 02/10/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Related Case Order [ECF# 19]** (N.D. Cal.)[IM-CA-0085-0005.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 02/10/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**First Amended Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief [ECF# 20]**[IM-CA-0085-0006.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 02/27/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**City and County of San Francisco's Notice of Motion and Motion for Preliminary Injunction; Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support Thereof [ECF# 21]**[IM-CA-0085-0007.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/08/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Declaration of Ben Rosenfield in Support of City and County of San Francisco's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [ECF# 22]**[IM-CA-0085-0008.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/08/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Declaration of Melissa Whitehouse in Support of City and County of San Francisco's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [ECF# 23]**[IM-CA-0085-0009.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/08/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Declaration of Sheriff Vicki Hennessy in Support of City and County of San Francisco's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [ECF# 24]**[IM-CA-0085-0010.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/08/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Declaration of Commander Peter Walsh in Support of City and County of San Francisco's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [ECF# 25]**[IM-CA-0085-0011.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/08/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Declaration of Tomas Aragon, MD, PhD, in Support of City and County of San Francisco's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [ECF# 26]**[IM-CA-0085-0012.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/08/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Declaration of Colleen Chawla in Support of City and County of San Francisco's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [ECF# 27]**[IM-CA-0085-0013.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/08/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Declaration of Sara J. Eisenberg in Support of City and County of San Francisco's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [ECF# 28]**[IM-CA-0085-0014.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/08/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Request for Judicial Notice in Support of City and County of San Francisco's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [ECF# 29]**[IM-CA-0085-0015.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/08/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Letter to the Court Re: CCSG v. Trump, et al.; Case No. 3:17-CV-00485-WHO [requesting guidance for amicus procedures] [ECF# 30]**[IM-CA-0085-0016.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/20/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**[Proposed] Brief Amici Curiae (and Administrative Motion for Leave to File Brief Amici Curiae Supporting Plaintiff) [ECF# 33]**[IM-CA-0085-0018.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/22/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Stipulation and [Proposed] Order [ECF# 34]**[IM-CA-0085-0019.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/22/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Amici Curiae Brief of Professors of Constitutional Law, Administrative Law, and Immigration Law in Support of Plaintiffs' Motions for Preliminary Injunction (and Administrative Motion for Leave to File) [ECF# 36]**[IM-CA-0085-0020.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/22/2017

Save Doc

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Brief of Amicus Curiae Southern Poverty Law Center and Other Amici in Support of County of Santa Clara and City and County of San Francisco's Motions for Preliminary Injunction (and motion for leave to file) [ECF# 38]**

[IM-CA-0085-0021.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/22/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Brief of Amici Curiae Technology Companies in Support of Plaintiffs' Motions for Preliminary Injunction (and motion for leave to file) [ECF# 39]**

[IM-CA-0085-0022.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/22/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Brief of Amici Curiae California Cities and Counties – County of Alameda, City of Berkeley, City of Davis, City of East Palo Alto, City of Fremont, County of Marin, County of Monterey, City of Mountain View, City of Oakland (...) [ECF# 40]**

[IM-CA-0085-0023.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/22/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Proposed Brief for Tahirih Justice Center, Et Al. as Amici Curiae in Support of Plaintiffs' Motions for Preliminary Injunctions (and motion for leave to file) [ECF# 41]**

[IM-CA-0085-0024.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/22/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Administrative Motion of City of Richmond to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related Pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-12(B) and Notice of Related Case Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-13 [ECF# 43]**

[IM-CA-0085-0025.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/23/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Brief of Amicus Curiae the International Municipal Lawyers Association in Support of Plaintiff City and County of San Francisco's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (and motion for leave to file) [ECF# 47]**

[IM-CA-0085-0026.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/23/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Statement of Support Regarding City of Richmond's Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related [ECF# 52]**

[IM-CA-0085-0027.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/24/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Related Case Order [ECF# 53] (N.D. Cal.)**

[IM-CA-0085-0028.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/24/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**[Proposed] Brief of Amici Curiae Public Schools, School Districts, and Associations of Educators (and motion for leave to file) [ECF# 58]**

[IM-CA-0085-0029.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/29/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Brief Amici Curiae of Individual Sheriffs and Police Chiefs in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (and motion for leave to file) [ECF# 59]**

[IM-CA-0085-0030.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/29/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**City and County of San Francisco's Reply and Opposition to Motion for Preliminary Injunction [ECF# 60]**

[IM-CA-0085-0031.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/29/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Supplemental Request for Judicial Notice in Support of City and County of San Francisco's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [ECF# 61]**

[IM-CA-0085-0032.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/29/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

Save Doc

**Amicus Brief of 36 Cities and Counties in Support of City and County of San Francisco's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (and motion for leave to file) [ECF# 62]**

[IM-CA-0085-0033.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 03/29/2017

Save Doc

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Brief of Amici Curiae Constitutional Law Scholars in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction (and motion for leave to file) [ECF# 63]**

[IM-CA-0085-0034.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 03/29/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**The State Superintendent of Public Instruction's Brief as Amicus Curiae in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (and motion for leave to file) [ECF# 64]**

[IM-CA-0085-0035.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 03/29/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**State of California's Amicus Curiae Brief in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (and motion for leave to file) [ECF# 66]**

[IM-CA-0085-0036.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 03/29/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Brief of Amicus Curiae Anti-Defamation League in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction [ECF# 67]**

[IM-CA-0085-0037.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 03/29/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Brief of Nonprofit Associations as Amici Curiae in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (and motion for leave to file) [ECF# 68]**

[IM-CA-0085-0038.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 03/29/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Stipulation and Order [ECF# 72] (N.D. Cal.)**

[IM-CA-0085-0039.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 04/07/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Order Granting the County of Santa Clara's and City and County of San Francisco's Motions to Enjoin Section 9(a) of Executive order 13768 [ECF# 82] (250 F.Supp.3d 497) (S.D. Cal.)**

[IM-CA-0085-0041.pdf](#) | [WESTLAW](#) | [LEXIS](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 04/25/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Order Granting the County of Santa Clara's and City and County of San Francisco's Motions to Enjoin Section 9(a) of Executive Order 13768 [ECF# 98] (250 F.Supp.3d 497) (N.D. Cal.)**

[IM-CA-0085-0040.pdf](#) | [WESTLAW](#) | [LEXIS](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 04/25/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Joint Case Management Statement [ECF# 83]**

[IM-CA-0085-0042.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 05/02/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Defendants' Notice of Motion and Motion for Reconsideration Or, in the Alternative, Clarification of the Court's Order of April 25, 2017; Memorandum of Points and Authorities (and motion for leave to file) [ECF# 102]**

[IM-CA-0085-0043.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 05/22/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Second Amended Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief [ECF# 105]**

[IM-CA-0085-0044.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 05/23/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Defendants' Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss; Memorandum of Point and Authorities [ECF# 111]**

[IM-CA-0085-0045.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 06/06/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Plaintiff City and County of San Francisco's Opposition to Defendants' Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss [ECF# 115]**

[IM-CA-0085-0046.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 06/20/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Reply in Support of Defendants' Motions to Dismiss [ECF# 133]**

[IM-CA-0085-0047.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 06/29/2017



Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Second Supplemental Request for Judicial Notice in Support of Plaintiff City and County of San Francisco's Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss [ECF# 139]**

[IM-CA-0085-0048.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 07/12/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Order Denying the Government's Motions for Reconsideration and To Dismiss With Regards To the City and County of San Francisco and the County of Santa Clara [ECF# 146]** (2017 WL 3086064) (N.D. Cal.)

[IM-CA-0085-0049.pdf](#) | [WESTLAW](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 07/20/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related Pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 3-12(B) [ECF# 149]**

[IM-CA-0085-0050.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 08/15/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Supplemental Statement in Support of Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related Pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 3-12(B) [ECF# 153]**

[IM-CA-0085-0051.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 08/17/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Defendants' Response to Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related Pursuant to N.D. Cal. Civil L.R. 3-12(B) [ECF# 155]**

[IM-CA-0085-0052.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 08/18/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Plaintiff City and County of San Francisco's Notice of Motion and Motion For Summary Judgment, or In the Alternative, Partial Summary Judgment [ECF# 158]**

[IM-CA-0085-0053.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 08/30/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion For Summary Judgment Or, In the Alternative, Partial Summary Judgment [ECF# 172]**

[IM-CA-0085-0054.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 09/27/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Plaintiff City and County of San Francisco's Reply to Opposition to Motion For Summary Judgment or, in the Alternative, Partial Summary Judgment [ECF# 177]**

[IM-CA-0085-0055.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 10/04/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Plaintiff City and County of San Francisco's Administrative Motion to Consider Post-Hearing Developments [ECF# 193]**

[IM-CA-0085-0056.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 11/02/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Order Granting Motion For Summary Judgment [ECF# 200]** (275 F.Supp.3d 1196) (N.D. Cal.)

[IM-CA-0085-0057.pdf](#) | [WESTLAW](#) | [LEXIS](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 11/20/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Stipulation and [Proposed] Order for Voluntary Dismissal of Count One of San Francisco's Second Amended Complaint Without Prejudice [ECF# 201]**

[IM-CA-0085-0058.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 11/29/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Stipulation and Order for Voluntary Dismissal of Count One of San Francisco's Second Amended Complaint Without Prejudice [ECF# 202]** (N.D. Cal.)

[IM-CA-0085-0060.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 11/30/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Errata to Order Granting Motion for Summary Judgment [ECF# 203]**

[IM-CA-0085-0059.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Save Doc

Date: 12/07/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

**Motion to Dismiss Appeals [Ct. of App. ECF# BL-14]**[IM-CA-0085-0061.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 12/15/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

[Save Doc](#)**Motion to Consolidate Appeals and Retain Existing Briefing Schedule [Ct. of App. ECF# BL-15]**[IM-CA-0085-0062.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 12/15/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

[Save Doc](#)**Brief for Appellants [Ct. of App. ECF# BL-16]**[IM-CA-0085-0063.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 12/18/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

[Save Doc](#)**Brief of Amici Curiae the States of West Virginia, Louisiana and 9 Other States in Support of Defendants-Appellants [ECF# BL-26]**[IM-CA-0085-0064.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 12/22/2017

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

[Save Doc](#)**Opinion [Ct. of App. ECF# 136]** (897 F.3d 1225)[IM-CA-0085-0065.pdf](#) | [WESTLAW](#) | [LEXIS](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 08/01/2018

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

[Save Doc](#)**Stipulation and Final Judgment and Order [ECF# 235]** (N.D. Cal.)[IM-CA-0085-0066.pdf](#) | [Detail](#)

Date: 08/15/2019

Source: PACER [Public Access to Court Electronic Records]

[Save Doc](#)

## People

[click to show/hide detail](#)[show all people docs](#)

Judges	<a href="#">Orrick, William Horsley III</a> (N.D. Cal.)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
Plaintiff's Lawyers	<a href="#">Eisenberg, Sara J.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Flynn, Ronald P.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Flynn, Robert Michael</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Gupta, Neha</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Herrera, Dennis J.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Lee, Matthew S.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Lee, Mollie M.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">McGrath, Aileen M.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Mere, Yvonne Rosil</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Sherman, Lee Isaac</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Smith, Jesse C.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Steeley, Tara M.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Taylor, Jennifer Lee</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Van Aken, Christine</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>	
Defendant's Lawyers	<a href="#">Anderson, David Lloyd</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Buckingham, Stephen J.</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Hinshelwood, Brad</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Hunt, Joseph H.</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Mauler, Daniel</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Readler, Chad Andrew</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Simpson, W. Scott</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Stern, Marc</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Stretch, Brian</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Tenny, Daniel</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Tyler, John Russell</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>	
Other Lawyers	<a href="#">Aguilar, Edmundo</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Alger, Maureen P.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Artiga-Purcell, Jose Camilo</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Axelrod, Julie B.</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Badlani, Chirag</a> (Illinois)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Baker, Andrew H.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Benedict, Adriana Lee</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Bergeron, Claire M.</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Bernier, Nicole</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Burricker, Christopher S.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Cabraser, Elizabeth J.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Carroll, Catherine M.A.</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
	<a href="#">Carter, Margaret L.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>

<a href="#">Chapman, Lamar Christopher III</a> (Pennsylvania)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Chatterjee, Indra Neel</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Cotchett, Joseph W.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Dermody, Kelly M.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Dietz, Rebecca H</a> (Louisiana)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Ehrlich, Lisa Catherine</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Escamilla, David A.</a> (Texas)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Fineman, Nancy L.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Foxy, Kimberly M.</a> (Illinois)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Fritz, Kathryn J.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Gertner, Leo</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Gewertz, Nevin M</a> (Illinois)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Ghassemi-Vanni, Sheeva June</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Goldberg, Nicholas Samuel</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Goldstein, Danielle Luce</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Goodmiller, Bruce Reed</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Gorelick, Jamie S.</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Hansen, Greta Suzanne</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Harris, Cody Shawn</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Harvey, Dean M.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Hernandez, Philip M.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Holloway, Amy Bisson</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Holtzman, Jonathan V.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Hyde, Hayes P.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Johnson, Thomas Michael Jr.</a> (West Virginia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Jones, Lauren A.</a> (New York)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Kazantzis, Kyra A.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Keker, John Watkins</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Lamy, Michelle A.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Lederer, Caryn C</a> (Illinois)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Li, Jun</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Lin, James</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Lubin, Katherine Collinge</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Magaziner, Fred T.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Malkani, Latika</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">McClellan, Nathan M.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">McKee, Charles J</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">McRae, Dana</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Menz, Sheila E.</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Morrisey, Patrick</a> (West Virginia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Narayan, Kavita Kandala</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">O'Leary, Ann Margaret</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Perrin, Robert Ward</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Peterson, Erica N.</a> (West Virginia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Piers, Matthew J.</a> (Illinois)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Premo, Patrick E.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Prestel, Claire</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Prouty, Thomas Howard</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Purcell, Daniel Edward</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Purcell, Annasara G.</a> (Washington)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Reider, Nicholas A.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Renne, Louise H.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Rhea, Meghan</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Ross, Linda Margaret</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Salahi, Yaman</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Schuman, Brett M.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Serrano, Lawrence Javier</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Sherman, Monique R</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Shih, Daniel Jeffrey</a> (Washington)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Siegel, Jonathan H.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Smith, Deborah L.</a> (District of Columbia)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Sokol, William A.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Sommovilla, Rachel Hanna</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Spiegel, Julia Blau</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Summer, Alexandra P.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Teshima, Darren S.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Van Nest, Robert A.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Washington, Brian E.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Whelan, Amy E.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Williams, James R.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Winner, Sonya</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Wright, H. Kevin</a> (Washington)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Wright, Franklin H.</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Zane, Shirlee</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>
<a href="#">Ziegler, Donna Raylene</a> (California)	<a href="#">show/hide docs</a>

[Zimmerman, Mitchell](#) (California)

[show/hide docs](#)

[- click to show/hide ALL -](#)

[new search](#)  
[page permalink](#)

[- top of page -](#)



[Contact](#)  
[Report an Error](#)  
[Privacy Policy](#)