Northern District of California

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

J.L., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KENNETH T. CUCCINELLI, et al., Defendants.

Case No. 18-cv-04914-NC

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE DEFENDANTS SHOULD **CONTEMPT**

Re: Dkt. No. 223

On December 13, 2019, the parties filed a joint statement notifying the Court that three Class Members had been removed from the United States in an apparent violation of the Court's October 24, 2018, preliminary injunction. See Dkt. No. 223. According to Defendants, the three Class Members at issued are: N.P.G., who was removed on June 26, 2019; E.A., who was removed on August 22, 2019; and R.M.N., who was removed on September 4, 2019. See id. at 5–6. Plaintiffs' counsel, however, were not notified of N.P.G.'s removal until November 14, 2019, and were not notified of E.A. or R.M.N.'s removal until December 12, 2019. *Id.* at 2, 4–5.

In the preliminary injunction, the Court ordered Defendants to "provide no less than 14 days notice to Plaintiffs' counsel before Defendants take any adverse adjudicatory or enforcement action against any . . . members of the Proposed Class." Dkt. No. 49 at 28. Far more than 14 days have passed since N.P.G., E.A., and R.M.N.'s removal. The Court

United States District Court Northern District of California

is deeply concerned with Defendants' failure to timely notify Plaintiffs' counsel of the three Class Members' removal.

Accordingly, Defendants are ORDERED to show cause why they should not be found in violation of the preliminary injunction and held in civil contempt. By **Decem**

found in violation of the preliminary injunction and held in civil contempt. By **December 18, 2019, at 12:00 p.m.**, Defendants must file a response under penalty of perjury explaining: (1) why their actions were not a violation of the preliminary injunction; (2) who is responsible for the removals; (3) when Defendants discovered the removals; and (4) what they are now doing to remedy the violations. This matter is set for hearing at **December 18, 2019, at 1:00 p.m.**

Regardless whether final approval of the proposed settlement is granted (*see* Dkt. Nos. 218, 222), the Court will retain jurisdiction to enforce the preliminary injunction.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 16, 2019

NATHANAEL M. COUSINS United States Magistrate Judge