

1 DAVID R. SINGH (Bar No. 300840)  
Email: david.singh@weil.com  
2 WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
3 201 Redwood Shores Parkway, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
4 Telephone: (650) 802-3000  
Facsimile: (650) 802-3100

5  
6 MUNMEETH K. SONI (Bar No. 254854)  
Email: munmeeth@sikhcoalition.org  
7 SAHEL K. SRA\*  
Email: sahel@sikhcoalition.org  
8 THE SIKH COALITION  
165 Broadway, Office 2359  
9 New York, NY 10006  
Telephone: (917) 439-1289

10  
11 JOSHUA ROSENTHAL (Bar No. 325949)  
Email: joshhr@asianlawcaucus.org  
12 KATHERINE ZHAO (Bar No. 304733)  
Email: katherinez@asianlawcaucus.org  
13 ASIAN LAW CAUCUS  
55 Columbus Avenue  
14 San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: (415) 896-1701  
15 Facsimile: (415) 896-1702

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Petitioners*  
17 *John Does 1–4, Jane Doe 1, and the Jakara Movement*

18 *\* Pro Hac Vice applications forthcoming*

19 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

20 **COUNTY OF ALAMEDA**

21 JOHN DOE 1, JOHN DOE 2, JOHN DOE  
22 3, JOHN DOE 4, JANE DOE 1, and the  
JAKARA MOVEMENT,

23 Plaintiffs/Petitioners,

24 v.

25 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR  
26 VEHICLES and STEVE GORDON,

27 Defendants/Respondents.

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**

Superior Court of California,  
County of Alameda

**12/29/2025 at 11:28:19 AM**

By: Andrei Gospel,  
Deputy Clerk

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 1. This action is brought on behalf of approximately 20,000 immigrant drivers and  
3 business owners residing in California who face imminent cancellation of their commercial driver’s  
4 licenses, and the resulting loss of their livelihoods, due to administrative errors committed by the  
5 California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV).

6 2. On November 6, 2025, the DMV notified 17,299 immigrant drivers and business  
7 owners in California that it would cancel their non-domiciled commercial driver’s licenses (“CDLs”)  
8 on January 5, 2026, due to an error with the expiration date on their licenses. DMV subsequently  
9 notified an additional 2,700 immigrant drivers that their licenses would be cancelled in mid-February.  
10 For all 19,999 immigrants, the DMV intends to cancel their CDLs without affording any opportunity  
11 to obtain a corrected license or to contest the cancellation.<sup>1</sup>

12 3. DMV regulations provide that the agency set the expiration date for a CDL given to  
13 an immigrant (“nonresident”) on either the same date or before the expiration of the driver’s work  
14 authorization or legal presence documents.

15 4. For the last several years, however, the DMV has issued licenses inconsistent with this  
16 regulation and has purportedly issued non-compliant CDLs to approximately 20,000 immigrant  
17 drivers.

18 5. In instances like this where the DMV seeks to correct a license with an incorrect  
19 expiration date, California mandates that the DMV either: (1) cancel the license *without* prejudice and  
20 give applicants the opportunity to immediately reapply for a corrected license as required by Cal.  
21 Veh. Code section 13100; or (2) change the expiration date on its own accord (see Cal. Veh. Code §  
22 12816.)

23 6. Despite clear statutory mandates, the DMV is abdicating its duties and neither  
24 canceling the CDLs without prejudice and allowing individuals the right to immediately reapply nor  
25 correcting the expiration date on its own.

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>1</sup> On the same day that affected individuals’ commercial licenses will terminate, the DMV intends to  
28 also cancel their individual noncommercial driver’s licenses, but is allowing them to immediately re-  
apply for a new non-commercial driver’s license.

1           7.       Instead, the DMV has informed applicants that it is not processing—issuing, renewing,  
2 or amending—any nonresident CDL and therefore individuals cannot immediately reapply for a  
3 corrected license. The DMV has also not provided any timeline of when—if ever—individuals will  
4 be permitted to reapply.

5           8.       DMV’s “notice of cancellation” is in effect a notice that DMV will be terminating  
6 their driving privileges for an indefinite period of time. The Vehicle Code sets out basic due process  
7 protections before the DMV takes away a driver’s license temporarily or permanently. Yet, the DMV  
8 has provided no process by which affected individuals can contest the agency’s actions, show valid  
9 work authorization, or reapply for a corrected license.

10          9.       DMV’s plan is therefore to revoke and indefinitely terminate 17,299 licenses on  
11 January 5, 2026, and another 2,700 licenses in mid-February, without providing individuals with  
12 meaningful notice, opportunity to be heard, or avenue for relief.

13          10.      The DMV is aware that its actions will leave thousands of “eligible drivers in the cold  
14 without any resolution” and that the sudden disappearance of them from our roads will disrupt our  
15 supply chains and services on which the public depends. And yet, as of filing, the DMV has not  
16 changed course to ensure its actions are consistent with its statutory duties and comport with basic  
17 due process requirements.

18          11.      Individual Plaintiffs/Petitioners John Does 1, 2, 3, and 4 and Jane Doe 1 (collectively,  
19 “Individual Plaintiffs”) are each non-domiciled CDL holders who received a letter from the DMV  
20 informing them that their CDLs will be cancelled in 60 days due to errors with their expiration date  
21 through no fault of their own. These Individual Plaintiffs represent a class of similarly situated  
22 individuals who received the same letters from DMV notifying them that their CDL will be cancelled.  
23 For these drivers, a valid CDL is a requirement of their job and once their CDL is cancelled, they will  
24 immediately lose their jobs and ability to cover basic expenses, risking further consequences,  
25 including foreclosure or eviction, bankruptcy, food insecurity, and lack of health care.

26          12.      Associational Plaintiff Jakara Movement (“Jakara”) is headquartered in Fresno and  
27 counts among its members hundreds of immigrant commercial drivers residing throughout the state.  
28

1 Many of Jakara’s members received a letter from the DMV notifying them that their CDLs would be  
2 cancelled.

3 13. The Individual Plaintiffs and Jakara’s members—and similarly situated drivers across  
4 the state—play an indispensable role in our local and national economies, providing essential services  
5 that communities rely on every day, including transporting food, driving children to school, and  
6 delivering manufactured goods. The sudden loss of their ability to work threatens not only their  
7 livelihoods but also the stability of our supply chains and services on which the public depends.  
8 Neither the individuals nor our communities can sustain the harm that will occur if these drivers lose  
9 their licenses, careers, and economic stability.

10 14. Plaintiffs bring this class action writ of mandate and complaint for declaratory,  
11 injunctive, monetary, and restitution relief against the DMV and its Director Steve Gordon, in his  
12 official capacity, to compel performance of their duties consistent with state law, to prevent the  
13 erroneous deprivation of Plaintiffs’ statutory, property, and liberty interest in their licenses, and to  
14 ensure they do not exceed the scope of their statutory authority.

15 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

16 15. Jurisdiction is proper pursuant to article VI, section 10 of the Constitution of California  
17 and Code of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

18 16. This Court has authority to issue relief pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure  
19 sections 526, 527, 1060 and 1085.

20 17. Venue is proper under CCP section 393(b)(1) because “some part” of the cause of  
21 action arose in this County. Plaintiff John Doe 1 lives, and has felt the effects of DMV’s actions, in  
22 this county. Venue is further proper under CCP section 401(1) because the DMV is a state agency  
23 which may be sued in a county in which the Attorney General maintains an office and the Attorney  
24 General maintains an office in Alameda County.

25 18. Plaintiffs have standing to pursue this action due to their specific injuries, as taxpayers  
26 under common law, and in furtherance of the public interest.

27  
28

**PARTIES**

1  
2           19.     Plaintiff John Doe 1 is a tax-paying resident of Alameda County. He holds a CDL,  
3 which he first received in 2017. He uses his CDL to drive buses for a leading technology company  
4 and has previously worked for various counties as a transit driver. John Doe 1’s employment requires  
5 him to have a CDL. In November 2025, John Doe 1 received a letter from the DMV notifying him  
6 that his CDL will be revoked within 60 days due to an error made by the DMV, and through no fault  
7 of his own. Without his CDL, he cannot maintain his job and will not be able to support his wife and  
8 two children, one of whom is a child with a severe learning disability.

9           20.     Plaintiff John Doe 2 is a tax-paying resident of California. He holds a CDL and owns  
10 and operates his own tow truck company in California. John Doe 2 relies on his CDL to support his  
11 wife and two minor children and to pay his mortgage, car payments, and various other expenses. His  
12 wife is pregnant and expecting their third child in February. In November 2025, John Doe 2 received  
13 a letter from the DMV notifying him that his CDL will be revoked within 60 days due to an error  
14 made by the DMV, and through no fault of his own.

15           21.     Plaintiff John Doe 3 is a tax-paying resident of California. He holds a CDL, which he  
16 first received in 2021. He was awarded Driver of the Year in 2024 by his current employer. He relies  
17 on his CDL to pay his mortgage for a recently purchased home, make his car payments, and pay  
18 various other expenses. In November 2025, John Doe 3 received a letter from the DMV notifying him  
19 that his CDL will be revoked within 60 days due to an error made by the DMV, and through no fault  
20 of his own.

21           22.     Plaintiff John Doe 4 is a tax-paying resident of California. He holds a CDL, which he  
22 first received in 2019. After driving freight for several years, he obtained a passenger and school-bus  
23 endorsement and currently works for a public school district. He is currently on parental-bonding  
24 leave, following the birth of his youngest child. He relies on his CDL to provide health insurance and  
25 financial support to his family. In November 2025, John Doe 4 received a letter from the DMV  
26 notifying him that his CDL will be revoked within 60 days due to an error made by the DMV, and  
27  
28

1 through no fault of his own. He was particularly confused by this letter because his current CDL  
2 expires on the same day as his current work authorization document.

3 23. Plaintiff Jane Doe 1 is a tax-paying resident of California. She holds a CDL, which  
4 she first obtained in 2018. Since then, she has driven a school bus for a Central Valley public school  
5 district. She finds joy in supporting the schoolchildren that she transports each day and depends on  
6 her job for her family's livelihood. In November 2025, Jane Doe 1 received a letter from the DMV  
7 notifying her that her CDL will be revoked within 60 days due to an error made by the DMV, and  
8 through no fault of her own. Although her district has been looking for alternative jobs for her if she  
9 loses her CDL, the only job available would cut her salary in half.

10 24. Plaintiff the Jakara Movement is a grassroots, membership-based community-building  
11 organization working to empower, educate, and organize working-class Punjabi Sikhs, and other  
12 marginalized communities; to advance their health, education, and arts/cultural, economic, social, and  
13 community power. Several members of Jakara received the November letter from the DMV notifying  
14 them that their CDL will be revoked within 60 days due to an error made by the DMV, and through  
15 no fault of their own.

16 25. Defendant DMV is the California state agency responsible for regulating, overseeing,  
17 and issuing driver's licenses to commercial and noncommercial drivers throughout California.

18 26. Defendant Steve Gordon is the civil executive officer for the DMV, referred to as the  
19 Director of Motor Vehicles. Respondent Gordon oversees administration and enforcement of the  
20 California Vehicle Code as it relates to the DMV and is responsible for his agency's actions.  
21 Respondent Gordon is sued in his official capacity.

22 **STATUTORY FRAMEWORK**

23 27. The DMV is the state agency responsible for executing state and federal laws relating  
24 to the issuance, cancellation, and revocation of commercial driver's licenses.

25 28. To operate a commercial motor vehicle, an individual must possess a valid  
26 commercial driver's license. (See Cal. Veh. Code § 15250(a).)

27  
28

1           29.     California residents who are not United States citizens or legal permanent residents  
2 may obtain and maintain a commercial driver’s license after passing knowledge and driving tests that  
3 comply with both federal and state requirements. (§ 15250(b)(2)(A).)

4           30.     For these CDL holders, DMV’s regulations require the commercial license to expire  
5 on the same date the applicant’s work authorization or legal presence expires. (Cal. Code Regs. tit.  
6 13, § 26.02(c).)

7           31.     The regulations prohibit DMV from renewing or upgrading such a CDL unless the  
8 applicant submits proof of valid work authorization or legal presence. *Id.*

9           32.     If DMV seeks to cancel a CDL due to an error, a cancellation means “that a driver’s  
10 license certificate is terminated without prejudice and must be surrendered.” (Cal. Veh. Code §  
11 13100.) The DMV may cancel licenses only as “specifically authorized” in Vehicle Code section  
12 13100 which is “when application is made for a license to operate vehicles of a higher class, or when  
13 a license has been issued through error or voluntarily surrendered to the department.” *Ibid.* The statute  
14 directs the DMV to allow “any person whose license has been canceled may immediately apply for a  
15 license.” *Ibid.* There is no exception to this requirement.

16           33.     For errors on a driver’s license that relate to expiration dates, the statute allows the  
17 DMV to correct expiration dates without canceling an individual’s nonresident commercial driver’s  
18 license. (See Cal. Veh. Code § 12816 (allowing the DMV to “adjust the expiration date for any  
19 driver’s license”).)

20           34.     The Code draws a clear distinction between license cancellation and license  
21 revocation. A revocation terminates a person’s privilege to drive and bars issuance of a new license  
22 until the revocation period has passed. (Cal. Veh. Code §13101.)

23           35.     Because license revocation results in the termination of a driver’s privilege to drive,  
24 the DMV’s authority is confined to those circumstances expressly authorized by statute. (See  
25 generally Cal. Veh. Code §§ 13350-92 (“Suspension and Revocation by Department”).) The Vehicle  
26 Code requires revocation upon conviction of specific enumerated crimes or offenses. (See Cal. Veh.  
27 Code §§ 13350, 13351, 13351.5, 13352, 13353, 13353.1, 13353.2, 13357.) In limited circumstances,  
28

1 the DMV may also exercise its discretion to revoke a license for “any ground which authorize the  
2 refusal to issue a license.” (§13359.)

3 36. Even where revocation is mandatory, the Vehicle Code imposes procedural constraints  
4 on DMV’s authority. The DMV must provide notice of revocation under Section 13106. And in many  
5 instances, the DMV must afford affected individuals due process protections before a license is  
6 revoked. These protections include adequate notice, an opportunity to examine and present evidence,  
7 hearing before an impartial adjudicator, and the right to appeal. (See, e.g., Cal. Veh. Code §§ 13557,  
8 13378.)

9 37. The Vehicle Code does not grant DMV discretion to cancel or revoke licenses for any  
10 grounds it sees fit; the DMV’s authority to cancel or revoke licenses is limited by what the Code  
11 authorizes.

12 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

13 38. Despite its own regulation, the DMV did not consistently ensure that a CDL’s  
14 expiration date matched the end of a person’s period of work authorization or lawful presence.  
15 Plaintiffs John Doe 1-3 and Jane Doe 1’s own experiences confirm this practice:

16 • John Doe 1’s current work authorization is valid until March 25, 2030, but his CDL  
17 will expire on September 11, 2030;

18 • When John Doe 2 obtained his most recent CDL, his work authorization was set to  
19 expire on April 2, 2025, but his CDL’s expiration date was set as March 17, 2027. Since then, his  
20 work authorization period has been extended to September 24, 2026, but he had no reason to believe  
21 that he should notify the DMV of this change;

22 • When John Doe 3 obtained his most recent CDL, his work authorization was set to  
23 expire on January 9, 2025, but his CDL’s expiration date was set as May 24, 2027. He has since  
24 renewed his work authorization until January 8, 2030, but he had no reason to believe that he should  
25 notify the DMV of this change; and

26 • Jane Doe 1’s current work authorization is valid until April 21, 2027, but her CDL will  
27 expire on August 27, 2027.

28

1 39. Following a recent audit, DMV discovered “shortcomings of its technical systems and  
2 processes” that led to CDLs “being issued with validity dates” not matching the expiration of the  
3 applicant’s work authorization or legal presence documents. (See Letter from DMV to Federal Motor  
4 Carrier Safety Administration, (dated Oct. 26, 2025), at 8-9, [https://calmatters.org/wp-  
5 content/uploads/2025/11/FMCSA-CA-Response-10.26.2026-1-1.pdf](https://calmatters.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/FMCSA-CA-Response-10.26.2026-1-1.pdf) (hereinafter “Oct. 26 Letter”).)  
6 These errors are entirely of DMV’s own making.

7 40. The DMV initiated its audit in response to the September 26, 2025, letter from the  
8 Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (“FMCSA”) finding that California was not in  
9 “substantial compliance with the standards for issuing non-domiciled...CDLs.” (See Preliminary  
10 Determination Letter from FMCSA to DMV, (dated Sept. 26, 2025), at 1,  
11 [https://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/sites/fmcsa.dot.gov/files/2025-  
12 09/Letter%20to%20California\\_2025%20Annual%20Program%20Review%20Findings.pdf](https://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/sites/fmcsa.dot.gov/files/2025-09/Letter%20to%20California_2025%20Annual%20Program%20Review%20Findings.pdf).)

13 41. A “non-domiciled commercial driver’s license” is a defined term in federal law for the  
14 licenses that are issued to drivers who are neither U.S. Citizens nor lawful permanent residents.  
15 (Compare 49 CFR § 383.71(f) with Cal. Veh. Code § 15210(1)(n)(1).)

16 42. Federal regulations set forth the minimum requirements for obtaining a commercial  
17 driver’s license but states may impose additional requirements as California has done. (See generally  
18 49 C.F.R. Part 383; Cal. Veh. Code §15250(b) (enacting by reference federal standards codified in  
19 Part 383 of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations); Cal. Code Regs. tit. 13, § 26.02(c) (requiring  
20 more stringent expiration date requirements for the issuance of nonresident CDLs).)

21 43. With the exception of a brief period between September 29, 2025, through November  
22 13, 2025, federal regulations do not require the expiration dates of nonresident CDLs to match the  
23 expiration date of their work authorization or lawful presence documentation issued by DHS.

24 44. During that brief period, the federal government through promulgation of an Interim  
25 Final Rule (“IFR”) attempted to amend federal regulations to require expiration dates to match. (See  
26 90 Fed. Reg. 46,509, 46,525 (Sep. 29, 2025).) The IFR would have also barred several categories of  
27 immigrants, who were otherwise legally present and authorized to work in the country, from obtaining  
28

1 nonresident CDLs. The IFR directed states to stop issuing, renewing, or maintaining CDLs for  
2 previously eligible categories of immigrants including asylum seekers, asylees, refugees, and  
3 recipients of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. The IFR, however, was stayed in its entirety by  
4 the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals on February 13, 2025. (See *Lujan, et al. v. Federal Motor Carrier*  
5 *Safety Administration, et al.*, No. 25-1215, Order (D.C. Cir. Dec. 3, 2025).

6 45. California—and not the federal government—requires that a nonresident CDL expire  
7 on the same date as an individual’s work authorization or legal presence documents. (Cal. Code Regs.  
8 Tit. 13 section 26.02(c).) Accordingly, when the DMV issued nonresident CDLs with expiration dates  
9 extending beyond the expiration date of an individual’s work permit or legal presence documents, the  
10 DMV was out of compliance with only DMV regulations, not federal law.

11 *November 6<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter*

12 46. Shortly before the D.C. Circuit Court stayed the IFR, the DMV sent out mass  
13 cancellation letters dated November 6, 2025 (hereinafter, “November 6<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter”) to  
14 17,299 immigrants with CDLs residing in California. See Exhibit A (attached hereto).

15 47. Petitioners John Does 1 through 4, Jane Doe 1, and Jakara members, received the  
16 November 6<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter with the subject title reading “Notice of Commercial Driver’s  
17 License (CDL) Cancellation,” which stated that:

18 [T]he DMV [has] determined that your Commercial Driver’s License (CDL)  
19 is not consistent with California law which requires that the expiration date of  
20 a CDL must be on or before the expiration of the legal presence documents  
provided to the DMV.

21 We regret to inform you that the DMV will cancel your commercial driver’s  
22 license 60 days from the date of this letter pursuant to California Vehicle Code  
23 § 13100 unless you provide legal presence documents that meet new federal  
24 guidelines issued on September 26, 2025<sup>2</sup> [...] such as permanent residency or  
25 U.S. citizenship.  
26

27  
28 <sup>2</sup> The Interim Final Rule was publicly announced on September 26, but it became effective on its  
publication in the Federal Register on September 29.

1 The letter further stated that cancellation of the individual’s CDL would also result in the cancellation  
2 of the individual’s noncommercial or regular driver’s license (“DL”) and described the steps the  
3 individual would be required to take to obtain a new DL.

4 48. Though the DMV cited to Section 13100 in support of its cancellation decision, it  
5 provided no process for recipients to immediately re-apply for a new nonresident CDL; it only created  
6 a process for reapplication of a DL.

7 49. The November 6<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter’s reference to the “new federal guidelines”  
8 referred to the IFR, which the D.C. Circuit stayed seven days after the DMV issued the Cancellation  
9 Letters. To date, the DMV has not revised or withdrawn the Cancellation Letters to reflect that the  
10 IFR is no longer in effect and cannot lawfully support the DMV’s decision.

11 50. John Doe 4 received the November 6<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter despite the fact that his  
12 CDL expires on the same day as the work authorization document he presented when he most recently  
13 renewed his CDL.

14 51. One Jakara member attempted to address his concerns about the November 6<sup>th</sup>  
15 Cancellation letter by going to a DMV office in person. Once he arrived, however, he was pressured  
16 into surrendering his CDL, out of fear that his non-commercial driver’s license would already be  
17 cancelled. Although he currently has work authorization, he has not been able to regain his CDL and  
18 is prevented from driving commercially.

19 *December 15<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter*

20 52. On information and belief, the DMV identified an additional 2,700 nonresident CDLs  
21 where the commercial license’s expiration date did not match the expiration date of the individual’s  
22 work authorization or legal presence documents as issued by DHS.

23 53. On information and belief, the DMV sent the 2,700 individuals a letter dated  
24 December 15, 2025, notifying them that their nonresident CDL will be cancelled on February 13,  
25 2026 (hereinafter “December 15 Cancellation Letter”).

26 54. On information and belief, the December 15<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter is materially  
27 identical with the November 6<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter with the exception that the DMV no longer relies  
28

1 on the stayed IFR. Instead, it states: “Pursuant to a preliminary determination of non-compliance  
2 issued by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, the DMV is currently unable to issue non-  
3 domiciled CDLs.”

4 55. This paragraph refers to a preliminary determination by the FMCSA that the California  
5 DMV’s issuance and renewals of CDLs for non-citizen drivers was inconsistent with federal law that  
6 was in effect before the issuance of the IFR.

7 56. The DMV publicly maintains that it cannot issue corrected nonresident CDLs due to  
8 FMCSA’s preliminary determination of non-compliance and threat to withhold funds. The DMV has  
9 taken the opposite position in its communications with the FMCSA. In its October 26, 2025, response  
10 to the FMCSA’s preliminary determination, the DMV’s expressly stated that its compliance issue  
11 under California’s regulation is “not a violation of federal law, which imposed no comparable  
12 requirement before the IFR, and thus is not a basis for withholding highway funding.” (See Response  
13 to September 26, 2025, Letter Regarding Commercial Learning Permit and Commercial Driver’s  
14 License Issuance at 9 (Oct. 26, 2025), [https://calmatters.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/FMCSA-  
15 CA-Response-10.26.2026-1-1.pdf](https://calmatters.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/FMCSA-CA-Response-10.26.2026-1-1.pdf).)

16 57. On information and belief, the DMV reiterated its position to the FMCSA in a follow  
17 up response on December 10, 2025, and explained that it “will resume issuing non-domiciled...CDLs  
18 on December 17, 2025.” On information and belief, DMV believes that its decision to reissue  
19 corrected nonresident CDLs is consistent with FMCSA’s instruction to reissue licenses and does not  
20 run afoul of federal requirements.

21 58. But on December 19, 2025, the DMV reversed course under pressure from the federal  
22 government.

23 *Consequences of DMV’s Cancellation Letters*

24 59. The DMV’s November 6<sup>th</sup> and December 15<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letters have led to  
25 widespread panic and despair. Plaintiffs feel “shattered,” “helpless,” and “left in the dark” by DMV’s  
26 November 6<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter. They are being punished for the state’s failure to meet a  
27 requirement they were unaware of and which DMV did not enforce.

28

1           60.     Plaintiffs have bought homes, cars, and trucks, relying on their ability to continue  
2 working a well-paying job that requires a CDL. Many drivers are the main or even sole providers for  
3 their families. The DMV’s actions will result in the loss of their hard-earned careers and impose  
4 severe financial and emotional hardships on the drivers and their families.

5           61.     John Doe 1 received his nonresident CDL in 2017 and has been a bus driver for the  
6 last eight years. His CDL has given him the flexibility he needs to care for his severely disabled child.  
7 Prior to receiving the November 6<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter, John Doe 1 had never been told by the DMV  
8 that he needed to present evidence of his work permit renewal documents to ensure that his CDL’s  
9 expiration date did not exceed the term for his work authorization. If John Doe 1 had been made  
10 aware of this requirement, he would have provided the DMV with the requisite documentation to  
11 ensure his CDL was in compliance with state law. If John Doe 1 loses his CDL, he will lose his job  
12 and will not be able to support his family of four and their monthly expenses.

13           62.     John Doe 2 is panicked after learning that his CDL—and the towing business that he  
14 built with it—will all be taken away without any opportunity for him to contest DHS’ decision. John  
15 Doe 2’s wife is pregnant with their third child, and he does not know how they will survive if on  
16 January 5<sup>th</sup> he is forced to shut down his business. His work authorization has been automatically  
17 renewed. If John Doe 2 loses his CDL, he will not be able to pay his monthly family and business  
18 expenses.

19           63.     John Doe 3 recently purchased his first home and fears that he will now lose it because  
20 without his CDL, he cannot pay his mortgage. He has always maintained lawful work authorization  
21 and cannot understand how the DMV can suddenly terminate his CDL when both documents are  
22 valid. John Doe 3 loves being a truck driver and has dedicated himself to his profession as evidenced  
23 by the multiple awards he has received, including the 2024 Driver of the Year Award from his current  
24 employer. If John Doe 3 loses his CDL, he will not be able to afford his monthly expenses.

25           64.     John Doe 4 recently welcomed a newborn to his family. He provides essential financial  
26 support and health insurance to his wife and children. His employer has told him that, if he loses his  
27 CDL, he will not have a job waiting for him when he returns from parental bonding leave. Because  
28

1 he has spent his career as a commercial driver, it is not clear how he will continue to support his  
2 family if he loses the CDL. The threat of the imminent loss of his livelihood has caused him anguish  
3 and despair.

4 65. Jane Doe 1 depends on her job as a school bus driver to provide for herself and her  
5 family—and she loves to contribute to her community by supporting the schoolchildren she transports  
6 each day. If she loses her CDL, she will face a 50 percent drop in salary, as she is forced into an  
7 alternative, lower-paying job. Her passengers will also come back from winter break to see a stranger  
8 at the front of the bus.

9 66. While Plaintiffs are grappling with what the impending termination of their CDL  
10 means for their futures, others like John Doe 4 do not understand why the DMV identified their CDL  
11 as being out of compliance. John Doe 4 has a valid nonresident CDL where the expiration date  
12 matches the expiration date of their work authorization document. He does not understand why the  
13 DMV identified his CDL as being “not consistent with California law.”

14 67. DMV has not explained how it identified 19,999 licenses as out of compliance with  
15 state law and how it can ensure that its determinations are accurate. The agency has not explained  
16 whether it reviewed only an impacted individual’s most recent license renewal application or whether  
17 it examined the initial issuance and any later renewals or amendments. Nor has the agency released  
18 any public guidance explaining its criteria, its methodology, or the scope of its review.

19 68. For John Doe 4, like the other Individual Plaintiffs, he has no ability to challenge the  
20 DMV’s decision. He cannot request a hearing, examine the evidence DMV relied upon, nor present  
21 evidence to show why the DMV should not cancel and terminate his CDL.

22 69. The consequences of DMV’s actions and its failure to provide individuals with a  
23 modicum of due process will be felt beyond Individual Plaintiffs and the class of impacted  
24 individuals. It will extend to their families, communities, and businesses.

25 70. As of the date of this complaint, the DMV has not announced its intent to rescind the  
26 November 6<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter and December 15<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter nor resumed reissuing  
27 corrected non-resident CDLs. It has not provided any process for Plaintiffs and the class of individuals  
28

1 they represent to be able to challenge DMV’s determination or provide an avenue for relief to  
2 maintain their CDL. (See State of California Department of Motor Vehicles, *Commercial Driver’s*  
3 *Licenses* (last viewed Dec. 22, 2025) [https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/driver-licenses-identification-](https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/driver-licenses-identification-cards/commercial-driver-licenses-cdl/)  
4 [cards/commercial-driver-licenses-cdl/](https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/driver-licenses-identification-cards/commercial-driver-licenses-cdl/) (“[u]ntil further notice, the California DMV cannot issue,  
5 reissue, or renew limited-term legal presence (non-domiciled) commercial driver’s licenses (CDLs).”)  
6 DMV’s field offices continue to inform impacted individuals that they have no guidance and there is  
7 nothing they can do to assist them.

8 71. The DMV—and not the federal government—has left its constituents “out in the cold  
9 without resolution.”

10 **CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

11 72. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure § 382, the individual Plaintiffs bring this action  
12 on their own behalf and on behalf of all others similarly situated. The proposed class consists of all  
13 individuals who received a letter from the DMV informing them that their licenses will be cancelled  
14 in 60 days.

15 73. On information and belief, approximately 20,000 individuals (“Class Members”)  
16 received such a letter from the DMV, which violates the law and deprives these individuals of their  
17 right to due process.

18 74. Class members are suffering and will continue to suffer harm as a result of the DMV’s  
19 decision to cancel their licenses with prejudice.

20 75. The size of the class is so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable.

21 76. Common questions of law and fact predominate over questions affecting individual  
22 Class Members. These questions include: (a) whether the DMV has violated its ministerial duty  
23 pursuant to California Vehicle Code section 13100; (b) whether the DMV’s decision to cancel  
24 Petitioners’ license without providing an opportunity to be heard and contest the decision violate the  
25 recipients’ due process rights; and (c) whether the DMV acted beyond the scope of section 13100 by  
26 cancelling the non-domiciled CDLs with prejudice.

1 77. The prosecution of separate actions by individual Class Members would create a risk  
2 of inconsistent or varying adjudication.

3 78. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of the claims of the class as a whole in that Plaintiffs and  
4 the class all received letters from the DMV informing them that their CDLs will be cancelled within  
5 60 days without recourse. The claims arise from the DMV's cancellation.

6 79. Plaintiffs will fairly represent and adequately protect the interests of members of the  
7 class as a whole. Plaintiffs do not have any interests antagonistic to those of other Class Members.  
8 By filing this action, Plaintiffs have displayed an interest in vindicating their rights, as well as the  
9 claims of others who are similarly situated. The relief sought by Plaintiffs will inure to the benefit of  
10 members of the class generally. Plaintiffs are represented by qualified, experienced, and competent  
11 counsel.

12 80. Class Members share a common need to maintain their CDLs. A class action is  
13 superior to individual lawsuits for resolving this controversy.

14 81. Defendants' actions, as alleged herein, have resulted in, and will continue to result in  
15 irreparable injury to Plaintiffs and the class, for which they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy  
16 at law. Plaintiffs and Class Members will suffer irreparable injury in that they are at risk of losing  
17 their livelihoods, thereby exposing them and their families to severe financial and emotional  
18 hardships.

19 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

20 **Writ of Mandate to Compel Compliance with Vehicle Code**

21 **Civ. Proc. Code § 1085**

22 82. Plaintiffs incorporate all preceding allegations.

23 83. Under California Code of Civil Procedure section 1085, subdivision (a), “[a] writ of  
24 mandate may be issued by any court to any inferior tribunal, corporation, board, or person to compel  
25 the performance of an act which the law specifically enjoins, as a duty resulting from an office, trust,  
26 or station . . . .”

1           84. To obtain a writ of mandate, a plaintiff must establish three elements: (1) “the  
2 respondent has a clear, present, and ministerial duty to act in a particular way;” (2) “the petitioner has  
3 a clear, present and beneficial right to performance of that duty;” and (3) “there is no other plain,  
4 speedy, and adequate remedy.” (*California Priv. Prot. Agency v. Superior Ct.*, 99 Cal. App. 5th 705,  
5 721 (2024), review denied (Apr. 24, 2024).)

6           85. Defendants have clear ministerial duties imposed on them by California Vehicle Code  
7 § 13100, which states that:

8                         When used in reference to a driver’s license, “cancellation” means that a  
9 driver’s license certificate is terminated without prejudice and must be  
10 surrendered. Any person whose license has been canceled may immediately  
11 apply for a license. Cancellation of license may be made only when specifically  
12 authorized in this code, when application is made for a license to operate  
13 vehicles of a higher class, or when a license has been issued through error or  
14 voluntarily surrendered to the department.

15           86. The statute defines cancellation as the termination of a driver’s license “without  
16 prejudice,” and it permits an immediate application for a new license. *Id.* Therefore, if the DMV  
17 cancels a driver’s license, it triggers a “clear, present, and ministerial duty” to implement the statutory  
18 consequence—i.e., to accept an application for reissuance if the driver chooses to immediately apply  
19 for a corrected license. (See *Kavanaugh v. W. Sonoma Cnty. Union High Sch. Dist.*, 29 Cal. 4th 911,  
20 922, 926 (2003).)

21           87. The DMV’s decision to prohibit the drivers from “immediately” applying for a license  
22 following cancellation breaches this ministerial duty.

23           88. Plaintiffs have a clear, present, and beneficial interest in the DMV’s performance of  
24 that duty, which would allow Plaintiffs to maintain their CDLs, without which Plaintiffs will suffer  
25 irreparable harm in the form of financial, psychological, and emotional harm.

26           89. Plaintiffs seek to protect the public’s interest in a strong economy and governmental  
27 services that are provided by the thousands of drivers in the proposed class.

28           90. Plaintiffs have no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy. The DMV alone has  
authority to issue, cancel, and reissue CDLs in California.

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

1 **Right to Due Process**

2 **Violation of California Constitution, Art. 1, § 7**

3 **Writ of Mandate and/or Common-Law Taxpayer Suit to Compel Compliance with California**  
4 **Due Process Clause**

5 91. Plaintiffs incorporate all preceding allegations.

6 92. The California Constitution provides that “[a] person may not be deprived of life,  
7 liberty, or property without due process of law.” (Cal. Const. Art. I § 7(a).)

8 93. Defendants have an obligation to comply with the California Constitution.

9 94. The Due Process clause requires adequate procedure before a person may be deprived  
10 of any “statutorily conferred benefit or interest,” not limited to property or liberty interests. (*Barri v.*  
11 *Workers’ Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2018) 28 Cal. App. 5th 428, 463.)

12 95. Commercial drivers have a liberty, property, and statutory interest in their CDLs,  
13 particularly given their importance to drivers’ ability to pursue a livelihood.

14 96. Due process requires, at a minimum, a person must receive notice and a meaningful  
15 opportunity to be heard. (*Id.*)

16 97. The DMV’s efforts to cancel the CDLs of Plaintiffs and the putative class deprives  
17 drivers of their interest in their CDLs without any opportunity to be heard.

18 98. The DMV’s efforts to cancel the CDLs of Plaintiffs and the putative class further  
19 reflect inadequate process, given the weighty interests of the drivers, the dignitary harms of DMV’s  
20 efforts, the substantial risk of error, and the minimal interests of the State in depriving drivers of their  
21 livelihoods.

22 99. The DMV’s efforts constitute an unlawful expenditure of taxpayer funds.

23 100. Plaintiffs have a clear, present, and beneficial interest in the DMV’s performance of  
24 its constitutional duty, which would allow Plaintiffs to maintain their CDLs, without which Plaintiffs  
25 will suffer irreparable harm in the form of financial, psychological, and emotional harm.

26 101. Plaintiffs seek to protect the public’s interest in a strong economy and governmental  
27 services that are provided by the thousands of drivers in the proposed class.

28

1 102. Plaintiffs have no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy. A writ and/or any available  
2 injunctive or declaratory relief is necessary to prevent them from being unlawfully deprived of their  
3 CDLs.

4 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **Ultra Vires**

6 103. “Administrative agencies only have the power conferred upon them by statute and an  
7 act in excess of these powers is void.” (*Rich Vision Centers, Inc. v. Bd. of Med. Examiners* (1983)  
8 144 Cal. App. 3d 110, 114.)

9 104. Veh. Code §13100 authorizes the DMV to cancel a license “without prejudice.”

10 105. By purporting to cancel Plaintiffs’ and the putative class’s licenses with no opportunity  
11 for drivers to obtain corrected licenses, the DMV effectively canceled the licenses “with prejudice.”  
12 Such action is in excess of the powers conferred on the DMV by statute.

13 106. Any such action by DMV would accordingly be void and have no effect.

14 107. Plaintiffs seek to protect the public’s interest in a strong economy and governmental  
15 services that are provided by the thousands of drivers in the proposed class.

16 108. Plaintiffs have no other plain, speedy, or adequate remedy. A writ and/or any available  
17 injunctive or declaratory relief is necessary to prevent them from being unlawfully deprived of their  
18 CDLs.

19 **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

20 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs and the proposed class pray for judgment and the following relief  
21 against Defendants as follows:

- 22 1. Certify this action as a class action.
- 23 2. Issue a writ of mandate, preliminary injunction or permanent injunction requiring  
24 Defendants to perform ministerial duties as required by the Vehicle Code and take all  
25 steps necessary to ensure that Plaintiffs and the class may immediately obtain a  
26 corrected commercial driver’s license without interruption to their driving privileges.
- 27 3. Issue declaratory relief, preliminary injunction, permanent injunction, and or a writ

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

of mandate that:

- a. Respondents’ November 6<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter and December 15<sup>th</sup> Cancellation Letter are null and void and its decision to terminate Plaintiffs’ nonresident commercial driver’s licenses violates Vehicle Code Section 13100;
  - b. Respondents’ decision to terminate Plaintiffs’ commercial driving privileges without providing them with meaningful notice, opportunity to be heard, and a pathway to relief violates the Due Process Clause of the California Constitution; and
  - c. Respondents’ actions are void, as they exceed their statutory authority.
- 4. Award Petitioner the costs of this action and reasonable attorneys’ fees; and
  - 5. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED: December 29, 2025

Respectfully submitted,  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
THE SIKH COALITION  
ASIAN LAW CAUCUS

By: /s/ David R. Singh  
David R. Singh

1 MUNMEETH K. SONI (Bar No. 254854)  
2 Email: munmeeth@sikhcoalition.org  
3 SAHEL K. SRA\*  
4 Email: sahel@sikhcoalition.org  
5 THE SIKH COALITION  
6 165 Broadway, Office 2359  
7 New York, NY 10006  
8 Telephone: (917) 439-1289

9 JOSHUA ROSENTHAL (Bar No. 325949)  
10 Email: joshr@asianlawcaucus.org  
11 KATHERINE ZHAO (Bar No. 304733)  
12 Email: katherinez@asianlawcaucus.org  
13 ASIAN LAW CAUCUS  
14 55 Columbus Avenue  
15 San Francisco, CA 94111  
16 Telephone: (415) 896-1701  
17 Facsimile: (415) 896-1702

DAVID R. SINGH (Bar No. 300840)  
Email: david.singh@weil.com  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
201 Redwood Shores Parkway  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065  
Telephone: (650) 802-3000  
Facsimile: (650) 802-3100

CHARAN J. SANDHU\*  
Email: charan.sandu@weil.com  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
767 5th Avenue  
New York, NY 10153  
Telephone: (212) 310-8000  
Facsimile: (212) 310-8007

ALAA CHAKER\*  
Email: alaa.chaker@weil.com  
WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
2001 M Street NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
Telephone: (202) 682-7000  
Facsimile: (202) 857-0940

\* *Pro Hac Vice* applications forthcoming

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


**VERIFICATION**

I, Munmeeth Soni, am a Legal Director of the Sikh Coalition. I represent Plaintiffs in the underlying action. The Sikh Coalition is headquartered in New York City, and I work remotely from my office in Los Angeles. None of the Individual Plaintiffs or the Associational Plaintiff reside in Los Angeles. I am therefore submitting this verification on behalf of the Plaintiffs as permitted under California Code of Civil Procedure section 446(a).

I have read the foregoing Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate and Class Action Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, and know the contents thereof. The facts as alleged therein are true to the best of my knowledge, except as to those matters alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true. I have authorization to verify such facts on behalf of the Plaintiffs.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on December 29, 2025, in Los Angeles, California.



Munmeeth Soni

# **Exhibit A**

**DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES**

OPERATIONS DIVISION  
P.O. BOX 942890 M/S G204  
Sacramento, CA 94290-0001  
Telephone: (800) 777-0133



November 6, 2025

[REDACTED]

**Subject: Notice of Commercial Driver's License (CDL) Cancellation**

Dear [REDACTED]

This letter is to inform you that the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) recently reviewed your driver record and submitted legal presence documents. Based on this review, the DMV determined that your Commercial Driver's License (CDL) is not consistent with California law which requires that the expiration date of a CDL must be on or before the expiration of the legal presence documents provided to the DMV.

We regret to inform you that the DMV will cancel your commercial driver's license **60 days** from the date of this letter pursuant to California Vehicle Code §13100 unless you provide legal presence documents that meet new federal guidelines issued on September 26, 2025 (linked below), such as permanent residency or U.S. citizenship.

In addition to your CDL being cancelled, your noncommercial driver's license (DL) will also be cancelled. To obtain a new license, you must:

- Complete an application online,
- Schedule an appointment to visit your nearest DMV field office,
- Surrender the driver's license in your possession, and
- Bring this letter and all relevant documentation so our staff may conduct a thorough review and provide appropriate guidance.

Additional licensing requirements may apply. To start your application and schedule an appointment, please visit [edl.dmv.ca.gov](https://edl.dmv.ca.gov) or call (800) 777-0133.

On September 26, 2025, federal guidelines established by the Trump Administration imposed new restrictions on issuance of CDLs to individuals with limited-term legal presence (non-domiciled) in the United States. For more information regarding the new FMCSA requirements for non-domiciled CDLs, visit <https://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/newsroom/interim-final-ruling-restoring-integrity-issuance-non-domiciled-drivers-licenses-cdl>.

Sincerely,

California Department of Motor Vehicles

