

1 XAVIER BECERRA
 Attorney General of California
 2 ANGELA SIERRA
 Senior Assistant Attorney General
 3 MICHAEL L. NEWMAN
 Supervising Deputy Attorney General
 4 JAMES F. ZAHRADKA II (SBN 196822)
 CHRISTINE CHUANG
 5 REBEKAH A. FRETZ
 RONALD H. LEE
 6 KATHLEEN VERMAZEN RADEZ
 SHUBHRA SHIVPURI
 7 Deputy Attorneys General
 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor
 8 Oakland, CA 94612-1499
 Telephone: (510) 879-1247
 9 E-mail: James.Zahradka@doj.ca.gov

10 *[Additional counsel listed on signature page]*

11 *Attorneys for Non-Party the State of California*

12
 13 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 14 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 15 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
 16

17
 18 **THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY**
 19 **OF CALIFORNIA and JANET**
 20 **NAPOLITANO**, *in her official capacity as*
President of the University of California,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 v.

23 **U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND**
 24 **SECURITY and ELAINE DUKE**, *in her*
official capacity as Acting Secretary of the
 25 *Department of Homeland Security,*

26 Defendants.
 27
 28

Case No. 17-cv-05211-WHA

STATES OF CALIFORNIA, MAINE,
MARYLAND, AND MINNESOTA'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO
CONSIDER WHETHER CASES
SHOULD BE RELATED PURSUANT TO
N.D. CAL. CIVIL L.R. 3-12(B)

Trial Date: Not Set
 Action Filed: September 8, 2017

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-12(b), non-parties the States of California, Maine, Maryland,
3 and Minnesota (“States”) respectfully request that the Court consider whether the action *State of*
4 *California v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security*, Case No. 17-cv-05235 (the “Multi-State
5 Action”) should be related to the instant case, *The Regents of the University of California v. U.S.*
6 *Department of Homeland Security*, Case No. 17-cv-5211 (the “University of California Action”).¹
7 “An action is related to another when: (1) The actions concern substantially the same parties,
8 property, transaction or event; and (2) it appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome
9 duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different
10 Judges.” N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 3-12(a).

11 **II. DISCUSSION**

12 Both cases concern substantially the same parties and events. On September 5, 2017,
13 Defendant Acting Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security Elaine Duke (“Duke”)
14 issued a memorandum rescinding the federal government’s Deferred Action for Childhood
15 Arrivals (“DACA”) program. The States and the University of California are both challenging
16 the rescission of this program on substantially similar grounds against the same Defendants. The
17 University of California alleges that the rescission of DACA violates the Administrative
18 Procedure Act (“APA”) because (1) the rescission is arbitrary, capricious, and unreasonable, and
19 was not supported by any adequate explanation; and (2) the rescission of DACA constituted a
20 substantive final rule under the APA, and the rescission of DACA is therefore unlawful for failure
21 by the government to engage in notice-and-comment rulemaking. The University of California
22 also advances a Fifth Amendment claim for the deprivation of constitutionally-protected rights
23 without due process.

24 The States allege overlapping and other related claims: in addition to substantially similar
25 causes of action under the APA, the States advance a claim under the Regulatory Flexibility Act
26 for failure by the government to engage in—and publish for public comment—the required

27 ¹ The complaint in the Multi-State Action is attached as Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of
28 James F. Zahradka II filed herewith.

1 regulatory flexibility analyses required for substantive final rules; a Fifth Amendment due process
2 claim and an equitable estoppel claim based on the allegation that the States' resident DACA
3 recipients have relied on the government's alleged promises not to misuse their personal
4 information; and a Fifth Amendment claim alleging that the government violated the equal
5 protection of the laws when it rescinded DACA, allegedly depriving DACA grantees, as a class,
6 of their substantial interests in pursuing a livelihood to support themselves and further their
7 education.

8 Both cases name as defendants Elaine C. Duke, Acting Secretary of the Department of
9 Homeland Security, and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. The States additionally
10 name the United States as a defendant. Both cases seek the Court to declare the rescission of
11 DACA as contrary to law and to enjoin Defendants from rescinding DACA.

12 Given the overlap in parties, factual and legal issues involved, and the relief sought in these
13 cases, conducting the actions in two courts simultaneously may lead to unnecessary duplication of
14 effort and the potential for conflicting results.

15 **III. CONCLUSION**

16 For the reasons set forth above, the States respectfully request this Court to consider
17 whether the Multi-State Action should be related to the University of California Action.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: September 15, 2017

Respectfully Submitted,

XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General of California
MICHAEL L. NEWMAN
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

BRIAN E. FROSH
Attorney General of Maryland
STEVEN M. SULLIVAN (*pro hac vice*)
Solicitor General
200 Saint Paul Place, 20th Floor
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
Telephone: (410) 576-6325
Email: ssullivan@oag.state.md.us

/s/ James F. Zahradka II
JAMES F. ZAHRADKA II
Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for State of Maryland

Attorneys for State of California

JANET T. MILLS
Attorney General of Maine
SUSAN P. HERMAN (*pro hac vice*)
Deputy Attorney General
6 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333
Telephone: (207) 626-8814
Email: susan.herman@maine.gov

LORI SWANSON
Attorney General
State of Minnesota
JULIANNA F. PASSE (*pro hac vice*)
Assistant Attorney General
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 1100
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2128
Telephone: (651) 757-1136
Email: julianna.passe@ag.state.mn.us

Attorneys for State of Maine

Attorneys for State of Minnesota

Filer's Attestation:

Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(h)(3), I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in the filing of the document has been obtained from each of the other Signatories.

Dated: September 15, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ James F. Zahradka II
James F. Zahradka II