

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

CASA DE MARYLAND, INC., et al.,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official  
capacity as President of the United States,  
et al.,

*Defendants.*

No. 8:19-cv-2715-PWG

CITY OF GAITHERSBURG, MARYLAND,  
et al.,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND  
SECURITY, et al.,

*Defendants.*

No. 8:19-cv-2851-PWG

**NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY  
SUPPORTING PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED MEMORANDUM  
IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' CONSOLIDATED MOTION TO DISMISS**

Plaintiffs submit the following notice of supplemental authority regarding the recent decision of the Ninth Circuit in *City & County of San Francisco v. U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services*, --- F.3d ---, No. 19-17213 (9th Cir. Dec. 2, 2020). In the attached decision, the Ninth Circuit affirmed preliminary injunctions issued by the Northern District of California and the Eastern District of Washington against the Department of Homeland Security (DHS)'s Public Charge Rule.

Like this Court did in granting the *CASA* Plaintiffs’ Motion for a Preliminary Injunction, the Ninth Circuit held that the Public Charge Rule is contrary to Immigration and Nationality Act. Slip Op. at 35. In addition, and relevant to Defendants’ pending Consolidated Motion to Dismiss, the Ninth Circuit also held that the DHS acted arbitrarily and capriciously in adopting the Rule. *Id.* at 42. Specifically, as Plaintiffs have alleged in this case, the Ninth Circuit held that DHS failed to adequately address the Rule’s chilling effect or its negative impact on public health, *id.* at 37–40, or to adequately explain its departure from the primarily-dependent standard that the 1999 Field Guidance formalized or consider the serious reliance interests that policy had engendered, *id.* at 40–42. With the Ninth Circuit’s decision, appellate courts that have reviewed arbitrary-and-capricious claims against the Public Charge Rule are unanimous in holding that DHS failed to engage in reasoned decisionmaking. *See New York v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, 969 F.3d 42, 81 (2d Cir. 2020); *Cook County v. Wolf*, 962 F.3d 208, 233 (7th Cir. 2020).<sup>1</sup> The Ninth Circuit also joined the consensus among appellate courts that municipalities like Baltimore and Gaithersburg have standing to challenge the Public Charge Rule. Slip Op. at 26–27; *accord New York*, 969 F.3d at 57, 63 (grouping states and a municipality together and concluding that they collectively had standing); *Cook County*, 962 F.3d at 218–19.

Accordingly, this Court should not dismiss Plaintiffs’ arbitrary-and-capricious claims or dismiss the municipalities on standing grounds, as Defendants have requested.

---

<sup>1</sup> This opinion displaces the contrary analysis of a Ninth Circuit motions panel that had stayed the lower courts’ preliminary injunctions without the benefit of complete briefing or oral argument and on a truncated timeline. *See City & Cty. of San Francisco v. U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Servs.*, 944 F.3d 733 (9th Cir. 2019).

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Harvey L. Reiter

M. Roy Goldberg (MD #14240)  
Brandon R. Nagy (D. Md. #20834)  
Harvey Reiter (DC #232942)\*  
Dennis Lane (DC #953992)\*  
STINSON LLP  
1775 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20006-4605  
Phone: 202.728.3005  
Fax: 202.785.9163  
roy.goldberg@stinson.com  
brandon.nagy@stinson.com  
harvey.reiter@stinson.com  
dennis.lane@stinson.com

Christina J. Hansen (KS #26008)\*  
1625 N. Waterfront Parkway, Suite 300  
Wichita, KS 67206-6620  
Phone: 316.268.7947  
Fax: 316.268.9766  
christina.hansen@stinson.com

Andrew Davis (MN #0386634)\*  
50 South Sixth Street, Suite 2600  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Phone: 612.335.1500  
Fax: 612.335.1657  
andrew.davis@stinson.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs City of Gaithersburg,  
Maryland; Maryland State Senator Jeff  
Waldstreicher; Friends of Immigrants;  
Immigrant Law Center of Minnesota; The  
Jewish Council for Public Affairs; Jewish  
Community Relations Council of Greater  
Washington, Tzedek DC*

*\*Admitted pro hac vice*

Joseph E. Sandler (MD #04324)

/s/ Jonathan L. Backer

Jonathan L. Backer (D. Md. 20000)  
Amy L. Marshak\*  
Joshua A. Geltzer\*  
Mary B. McCord\*  
INSTITUTE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL  
ADVOCACY AND PROTECTION  
Georgetown University Law Center  
600 New Jersey Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 662-9835  
jb2845@georgetown.edu

*Attorneys for CASA Plaintiffs*

*\*Admitted pro hac vice*

/s/ Dana P. Moore

Dana P. Moore #03632  
Acting Baltimore City Solicitor  
Senior Public Safety Counsel and  
Director of Affirmative Litigation  
Jane Lewis #20981  
Assistant Solicitor  
Baltimore City Department of Law  
City Hall, Room 109  
100 N. Holliday Street  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
(443) 388-2190  
law.danapmoore@batimorecity.gov  
jane.lewis@batimorecity.gov

*Attorneys for Mayor and City Council of  
Baltimore*

SANDLER, REIFF, LAMB, ROSENSTEIN &  
BIRKENSTOCK PC  
1090 Vermont Ave., N.W. Suite 750  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Phone: 202.479.1111  
Fax: 202.479.1115  
sandler@sandlerreiff.com

*Attorney for Plaintiff Jewish Community  
Relations Council of Greater Washington*

Dated: December 4, 2020

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on December 4, 2020, I electronically filed a copy of the foregoing. Notice of this filing will be sent via email to all parties by operation of the Court's electronic filing system. Parties may access this filing through the Court's CM/ECF System.

/s/ Jonathan L. Backer  
Jonathan L. Backer