

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

\*

STATE OF MARYLAND, *et al.*,  
*Plaintiffs,*

\*

\*

v.

No. 1:25-cv-00748-JKB

\*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF  
AGRICULTURE, *et al.*,  
*Defendants.*

\*

\* \* \* \* \*

**PLAINTIFFS’ SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF ON SCOPE OF RELIEF**

The Court asked the parties to outline “the contours of a preliminary injunction that is not national in scope yet still redresses the alleged irreparable harms to the Plaintiff States.” ECF No. 114. Respectfully, Plaintiff States maintain that on the facts of this case, a uniform, nationwide preliminary injunction remains “necessary to provide complete relief” to Plaintiffs and is “no more burdensome” than required to ensure they are not irreparably harmed during the course of this litigation. *Madsen v. Women’s Health Ctr., Inc.*, 512 U.S. 753, 765 (1994) (quoting *Califano v. Yamasaki*, 442 U.S. 682, 702 (1979)). In particular, the Defendants have announced their intentions to conduct additional reductions in force (“RIFs”) during the course of this litigation. If the Court only reinstates probationary employees in the Plaintiff States, employees in the Plaintiff States will face a greater likelihood of being subject to the upcoming RIFs than they would if all probationary employees were reinstated. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 3502(a) (establishing various retention preferences); 5 C.F.R. §§ 351.501-351.504 (explaining the order in which groups of employees are released, with probationary employees being released before permanent employees). This will impose additional burdens on the Plaintiff States—such as additional rapid response burdens—

that they should not have to endure as a result of the Defendants' unlawful actions. *See generally* ECF No. 102 at 3-4.

That said, in the event that this Court disagrees, at a minimum the Court must stay or enjoin Defendants' unlawful RIFs as applied to federal probationary employees with duty stations or residence in each Plaintiff State. That is because the Plaintiff States would have to expend resources in either situation that could have been mitigated with proper notice.

To give a concrete example, an employee who resides in Virginia (a non-Plaintiff State) but works in Maryland would generally have to file their unemployment claim in Maryland, their state of employment. That is so because generally an unemployment insurance claim "shall be assigned to the State in which [a terminated employee] had his last official station in Federal service before the filing of his first claim for compensation for the benefit year." 5 U.S.C. § 8504. As this has been unfolding on the ground, Plaintiff States have seen tangible increases in the number of unemployment claims by federal employees compared to the same period last year. *See, e.g.*, MD DOL Decl. ECF No. 4-5 ¶¶ 18, 50, 52 (30-60 claims per day, equating to a 330% increase); NJ DOL Decl. ECF No. 4-11 ¶¶ 14-15 (273% increase); CA EDD Decl. ECF No. 4-7 ¶ 30 (149% increase).

But an employee who resides in Maryland and works in Virginia would generally seek any other social services aimed at mitigating the harms of unemployment from Maryland, their state of residence. *See, e.g.*, COMAR 10.09.24.05-3A ("To be eligible for the Maryland Medical Assistance Program, an applicant or recipient shall be a Maryland resident."); COMAR 07.03.17.08A(2) (requiring applicants for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program ("SNAP") to "reside[] in the political subdivision served by the local department where the household is applying").

As a result, a terminated federal worker who lives in one jurisdiction and works in another would file for different services in different jurisdictions. *Cf., e.g.*, Redacted Declaration, ECF No. 33-6 (Ex. R) ¶¶ 7, 9 (Maryland resident, who pays income tax to Maryland, setting out plans to apply for unemployment insurance benefits with the D.C. government and considering applying to Medicaid and SNAP); Redacted Declaration, ECF No. 33-8 (Ex. T) ¶¶ 7, 10 (similar). The same is true of many part-time remote federal workers whose official worksite may be the office location, not their home location. *See* 5 C.F.R. § 531.605(d)(1) (the agency office is the official worksite of a typically remote employee who is scheduled to work in office at least two days per biweekly pay period). If one of these workers is terminated, he would apply for unemployment insurance benefits in the state where his agency office is located, but would apply for Medicaid, SNAP, and other resources in his home jurisdiction.

Whether a terminated employee works or resides in a Plaintiff State, notice could have mitigated these burdens. The need for a stay or injunction as applied to terminated employees with duty stations in Plaintiff States is obvious. Plaintiff States should have received notice of these separations within their borders, which would have triggered their rapid response efforts and reduced the need for unemployment assistance, among other things. For similar reasons, a stay or injunction is also appropriate as to terminated employees who work in non-Plaintiff States but reside in Plaintiff States. Ultimately, had Defendants followed the law and provided *all* States with notice prior to conducting their RIFs, it would have triggered federally mandated rapid responses in *any* state where the threshold number of terminations was met. *See* 29 U.S.C. § 2864(a)(2)(A)(i)(II); 20 C.F.R. §§ 682.302, 682.305. And had non-Plaintiff States performed those federally mandated duties, employees residing in Plaintiff States may have avoided

unemployment altogether—thereby eliminating the need for social services like Medicaid or supplemental nutrition assistance.

March 27, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

**ANTHONY G. BROWN**

*Attorney General  
State of Maryland*

/s/ Virginia A. Williamson

James D. Handley, Bar No. 20299  
Virginia A. Williamson, Bar. No. 31472  
Assistant Attorneys General

200 St. Paul Place  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
Phone: 410-576-6584  
vwilliamson@oag.state.md.us

**KEITH ELLISON**

*Attorney General  
State of Minnesota*

/s/ Liz Kramer

Liz Kramer†  
Solicitor General

445 Minnesota Street, Suite 1400  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2131  
Phone: 651-757-1059  
Fax: 651-282-5832  
liz.kramer@ag.state.mn.us

**BRIAN SCHWALB**

*Attorney General  
District of Columbia*

Emma Simson  
Senior Counsel to the Attorney General

/s/ Ryan Wilson

Ryan Wilson†  
Senior Counsel

Hannah Cole-Chu, Bar No. 20747  
Anne Deng†  
Pamela Disney\*\*  
Tessa Gellerson, Bar No. 21271  
Charles Sinks, Bar No. 21185  
Cara Spencer, Bar No. 20171  
Assistant Attorneys General

**KRISTIN K. MAYES**

*Attorney General  
State of Arizona*

/s/ Hayleigh S. Crawford

Hayleigh S. Crawford†  
Deputy Solicitor General  
2005 North Central Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
Phone: (602) 542-3333  
Hayleigh.Crawford@azag.gov  
ACL@azag.gov

Office of the Attorney General for  
the District of Columbia  
400 6th Street N.W., 10th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
(202) 230-2342  
Ryan.Wilson@dc.gov

**ROB BONTA**  
*Attorney General*  
*State of California*

/s/ Satoshi Yanai  
Satoshi Yanai†  
Senior Assistant Attorney General

Demian Camacho†  
Miranda Maison†  
300 S. Spring Street, Suite 1702  
Los Angeles, California 90013  
Phone: 213-269-6400  
satoshi.yanai@doj.ca.gov

**KATHLEEN JENNINGS**  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Delaware*

By: /s/ Vanessa L. Kassab  
Ian R. Liston  
Director of Impact Litigation

Vanessa L. Kassab\*  
Deputy Attorney General  
Delaware Department of Justice  
820 N. French Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
(302) 683-8899  
vanessa.kassab@delaware.gov

**WILLIAM TONG**  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Connecticut*

/s/ Michael Skold  
Michael Skold†  
Solicitor General  
165 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, CT 06106  
Phone: (860) 808 5020  
michael.skold@ct.gov

**ANNE E. LOPEZ**  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Hawai'i*

/s/ Kaliko 'onālani D. Fernandes  
David D. Day†  
Special Assistant to the Attorney General  
Kaliko 'onālani D. Fernandes†  
Solicitor General  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
(808) 586-1360  
kaliko.d.fernandes@hawaii.gov

**KWAME RAOUL**

*Attorney General  
State of Illinois*

/s/ Gretchen Helfrich

Gretchen Helfrich†  
Deputy Chief  
Special Litigation Bureau  
Office of the Illinois Attorney General  
115 South LaSalle Street, 35<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, IL 60603  
Tel. (312) 814-3000  
Gretchen.helfrich@ilag.gov

**DANA NESSEL**

*Attorney General  
State of Michigan*

/s/ Bryan Davis, Jr.

Bryan Davis, Jr.†  
Debbie Taylor†  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Department of Attorney General  
Labor Division  
3030 W. Grand Blvd., Ste. 9-600  
Detroit, MI 48202  
davisb47@michigan.gov  
taylord8@michigan.gov  
(313) 456-2200

**RAÚL TORREZ**

*Attorney General  
State of New Mexico*

/s/ Anjana Samant

Anjana Samant\*  
Deputy Counsel for Impact Litigation  
New Mexico Department of Justice  
P.O. Drawer 1508  
Santa Fe, NM 87504-1508  
(505) 490-4060  
asamant@nmdoj.gov

**ANDREA JOY CAMPBELL**

*Attorney General  
Commonwealth of Massachusetts*

/s/ Katherine Dirks

Katherine Dirks†  
Chief State Trial Counsel  
Office of the Attorney General  
1 Ashburton Pl.  
Boston, MA 02108  
617.963.2277  
katherine.dirks@mass.gov

**MATTHEW J. PLATKIN**

*Attorney General  
State of New Jersey*

/s/ Nathaniel Ilan Levy

Nathaniel Ilan Levy, Bar No. 21840  
Deputy Solicitor General  
25 Market Street  
Trenton, NJ 08625  
Phone: (862) 350-5800  
nathaniel.levy@njoag.gov

**LETITIA JAMES**

*Attorney General  
State of New York*

By: /s/ Rabia Muqaddam

Rabia Muqaddam†  
Special Counsel for Federal Initiatives  
New York Office of the Attorney General  
28 Liberty St.  
New York, NY 10005  
(929) 638-0447  
rabia.muqaddam@ag.ny.gov

**DAN RAYFIELD**

*Attorney General  
State of Oregon*

By: /s/ Deanna J. Chang

Deanna J. Chang\*\*  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
100 SW Market Street  
Portland, OR 97201  
(971) 673-1880  
Deanna.J.Chang@doj.oregon.gov

**CHARITY R. CLARK**

*Attorney General  
State of Vermont*

/s/ Jonathan T. Rose

Jonathan T. Rose†  
Solicitor General  
109 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05609  
(802) 828-3171  
Jonathan.rose@vermont.gov

**PHIL WEISER**

*Attorney General of Colorado*

/s/ David Moskowitz

David Moskowitz†  
Deputy Solicitor General  
Office of the Colorado Attorney General  
1300 Broadway, #10  
Denver, CO 80203  
(720) 508-6000  
David.Moskowitz@coag.gov

**PETER F. NERONHA**

*Attorney General for the State of Rhode Island*

By: /s/ Natalya A. Buckler

Natalya A. Buckler (RI Bar No. 8415)\*  
Sarah W. Rice, Bar No. 29113  
Assistant Attorney General  
150 South Main Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
(401) 274-4400, Ext. 2022  
nbuckler@riag.ri.gov

**JOSHUA L. KAUL**

*Attorney General of Wisconsin*

/s/ Brian P. Keenan

Brian P. Keenan†  
Assistant Attorney General  
State Bar #1056525  
Wisconsin Department of Justice  
Post Office Box 7857  
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7857  
(608) 266-0020  
(608) 294-2907 (Fax)  
keenanbp@doj.state.wi.us

**AARON D. FORD**

*Attorney General of Nevada*

/s/ Heidi Parry Stern

Heidi Parry Stern (Bar. No. 8873)\*  
Solicitor General  
Office of the Nevada Attorney General  
555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900  
Las Vegas, NV 89101  
HStern@ag.nv.gov

\* *Pro hac vice application forthcoming*

\*\* *Application for admission pending*

† *Admitted pro hac vice*