

United States District Court
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

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,

Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the United States, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, JOHN F. KELLY, Secretary of United States Department of Homeland Security, JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, Attorney General of the United States, DOES 1-100,

Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-00485-WHO](#)

ORDER RELATING CASES

Re: Dkt. No. 238

On February 7, 2025, plaintiffs City and County of San Francisco and County of Santa Clara filed a motion for administrative relief to consider whether their case, *City and County of San Francisco v. Trump*, No. 25-cv-1350 (N.D. Cal.), should be related to the above-captioned case. *See* Civil L.R. 3-12. The time for filing an opposition or statement of support has passed.

Previously, the cases below have been related to the above-captioned action:

- *County of Santa Clara v. Trump*, No. 3:17-cv-00574-WHO (N.D. Cal.);
- *City of Richmond Police Department v. Trump*, No. 3:17-cv-01535-WHO (N.D. Cal.);
- *City and County of San Francisco v. Sessions*, No. 3:17-cv-04642-WHO (N.D. Cal.);

United States District Court
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

- *State of California v. Sessions*, No. 3:17-cv-04701-WHO (N.D. Cal.);
- *City and County of San Francisco v. Sessions*, No. 3:18-cv-05146-WHO (N.D. Cal.);
- *State of California v. Sessions*, No. 3:18-cv-05169-WHO (N.D. Cal.); and
- *State of California v. Barr*, No. 3:19-cv-06189-WHO (N.D. Cal.).


The above-captioned case is the earliest filed of the cases listed above.

I find that *City and County of San Francisco v. Trump*, No. 25-cv-1350 (N.D. Cal.) is related to the cases assigned to me, and therefore that it shall be reassigned to me.

Counsel are instructed that all future filings in any reassigned case are to bear my initials (WHO) immediately after the case number. The previously scheduled case management conference will be rescheduled. The parties shall adjust the dates for the conference, disclosures and report required by FRCivP 16 and 26 accordingly. Unless otherwise ordered, any dates for hearing noticed motions are vacated and must be re-noticed by the moving party before the newly assigned judge; any deadlines set by the ADR Local Rules remain in effect; and any deadlines established in a case management order continue to govern, except dates for appearance in court, which will be rescheduled by the newly assigned judge.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 12, 2025


William H. Orrick
United States District Judge