

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

NAMOD PALLEK, *et al.*

Plaintiffs,

v.

BROOKE L. ROLLINS, in her official
capacity as U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, *et
al.*

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-01650-JMC

NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY

Plaintiffs respectfully advise the Court of a preliminary injunction that issued yesterday in a lawsuit in which 22 states, and the District of Columbia, have challenged Defendants’ demand for SNAP data. Judge Maxine M. Chesney of the Northern District of California entered an injunction under which USDA is precluded from “disallowing SNAP funding based on the Plaintiff States’ failure to comply with” the data demands at issue in the instant litigation. Order Granting Plaintiff States’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction (ECF 106), *State of California v. United States Department of Agriculture*, No. 25-cv-06310 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 15, 2025), at 25, attached hereto as Ex. A. The court declined to grant a stay pending appeal. *Id.*

Three points bear emphasis. *First*, the court found that no statute likely empowers USDA to demand that states turn over individual SNAP data in the present circumstances. *Id.* at 13–19. *Second*, the court’s preliminary conclusion on the states’ arbitrary and capricious claim, *see id.* at 19–21, does not impact the arbitrary and capricious claim Plaintiffs press here, which relies on different arguments and an Administrative Record bereft of reasoning.

Third, final relief in this case remains urgent because the *California* injunction only preliminarily stops USDA from punishing 22 states¹ for withholding data. Many of the other 31 SNAP jurisdictions—including states to which Plaintiffs Hollingsworth and Ramos have provided information—are already sharing data pursuant to USDA’s demands. *See id.* at 23. Nor does the injunction do anything to redress the injuries to MAZON’s core activities or injuries that all plaintiffs have suffered from USDA’s failure to abide by the Privacy Act, the Paperwork Reduction Act, or the APA’s bar on arbitrary and capricious decisionmaking.

Dated: October 16, 2025

Respectfully Submitted,

Deana El-Mallawany*
PROTECT DEMOCRACY PROJECT
15 Main Street, Suite 312
Watertown, MA 02472
(202) 579-4582
deana.elmallawany@protectdemocracy.org

/s/ Daniel A. Zibel
Daniel A. Zibel (D.C. Bar No. 491377)
Madeline Wiseman (D.C. Bar No. 90031948)
NATIONAL STUDENT LEGAL DEFENSE
NETWORK
1701 Rhode Island Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 734-7495
dan@defendstudents.org
madeline@defendstudents.org

Nicole Schneidman*
PROTECT DEMOCRACY PROJECT
P.O. Box 341423
Los Angeles, CA 90034-9998
(202) 579-4582
nicole.schneidman@protectdemocracy.org

Counsel for Plaintiffs

JoAnna Suriani (D.C. Bar No. 1645212)*
PROTECT DEMOCRACY PROJECT
2020 Pennsylvania Ave. NW, Suite # 163
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 579-4582
joanna.suriani@protectdemocracy.org

John L. Davisson (D.C. Bar #1531914)
Sara Geoghegan (D.C. Bar #90007340)
Kabbas Azhar (D.C. Bar #90027866)
ELECTRONIC PRIVACY
INFORMATION CENTER
1519 New Hampshire Ave, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 483-1140
Fax: (202) 483-1248
davisson@epic.org

*Counsel for Plaintiffs MAZON, EPIC, Ramos
& Hollingsworth*

¹ Nevada is a plaintiff in *California* but the court found its claims moot, so the preliminary injunction only shields 21 of the plaintiff states, plus D.C. *See* Ex. A at 2 n.2.

Saima A. Akhtar (NY Bar No. 4661237)*
NATIONAL CENTER FOR LAW AND
ECONOMIC JUSTICE
50 Broadway, Suite 1500
New York, NY 10004
(212) 633-6967 (telephone)
(212) 633-6371 (fax)
akhtar@nclej.org

geoghegan@epic.org
azhar@epic.org

Counsel for EPIC

**Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

*Counsel for Plaintiffs MAZON, EPIC, Ramos
& Hollingsworth*