

1 Jeffrey M. Davidson (Bar No. 248620)  
2 Alan Bersin (Bar No. 63874)  
3 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
4 One Front Street, 35th Floor  
5 San Francisco, CA 94111-5356  
6 Telephone: + 1 (415) 591-6000  
7 Facsimile: + 1 (415) 591-6091  
8 Email: jdavidson@cov.com,  
9 abersin@cov.com

6 Lanny A. Breuer  
7 Mark H. Lynch  
8 Alexander A. Berengaut  
9 Megan A. Crowley  
10 Ashley Anguas Nyquist  
11 Ivano M. Ventresca  
12 (*pro hac vice* applications forthcoming)  
13 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
14 One CityCenter  
15 850 Tenth Street, NW  
16 Washington, DC 20001-4956  
17 Telephone: + 1 (202) 662-6000  
18 Facsimile: +1 (202) 662-6291  
19 E-mail: lbreuer@cov.com, mlynch@cov.com,  
20 aberengaut@cov.com, mcrowley@cov.com,  
21 anyquist@cov.com, iventresca@cov.com

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
13 THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY  
14 OF CALIFORNIA and JANET NAPOLITANO,  
15 in her official capacity as President of the  
16 University of California

17 [*Additional Counsel Listed on Next Page*]

18  
19 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
20 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

21 THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF  
22 CALIFORNIA and JANET NAPOLITANO,  
23 *in her official capacity as President of the*  
24 *University of California,*

25 Plaintiffs,

26 v.

27 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND  
28 SECURITY and ELAINE DUKE, *in her*  
*official capacity as Acting Secretary of the*  
*Department of Homeland Security,*

Defendants.

Charles F. Robinson (Bar No. 113197)  
Margaret Wu (Bar No. 184167)  
Julia Friedlander (Bar No. 165767)  
Sonya Sanchez (Bar No. 247541)  
Norman Hamill (Bar No. 154272)  
Harpreet Chahal (Bar No. 233268)  
Michael Troncoso (Bar No. 221180)  
University of California  
Office of the General Counsel  
1111 Franklin Street, 8th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200  
Telephone: + 1 (510) 987-9800  
Facsimile: + 1 (510) 987-9757  
Email: charles.robinson@ucop.edu

Civil Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND  
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

**ADDITIONAL COUNSEL OF RECORD**

1  
2 Mónica Ramírez Almadani (Bar No. 234893)  
3 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
4 1999 Avenue of the Stars  
5 Los Angeles, CA 90067-4643  
6 Telephone: + 1 (424) 332-4800  
7 Facsimile: + (424) 332-4749  
8 Email: mralmadani@cov.com

9 Erika Douglas (Bar No. 314531)  
10 COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
11 333 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 700  
12 Redwood Shores, CA 94061-1418  
13 Telephone: + 1 (650) 632-4700  
14 Facsimile: + 1 (650) 632-4800  
15 Email: edouglas@cov.com

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA and JANET NAPOLITANO, in her official capacity as President of the University of California

1 Plaintiffs The Regents of the University of California (“UC” or “the University”), on its own  
2 behalf and on behalf of all students currently enrolled at the University, and Janet Napolitano, in her  
3 official capacity as President of the University of California (together “Plaintiffs”), bring this action for  
4 declaratory and injunctive relief against the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) and Acting  
5 Secretary of Homeland Security, Elaine Duke (together, “Defendants”), and allege as follows:

#### 6 INTRODUCTION

7 1. This lawsuit, brought under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the  
8 United States Constitution and the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. § 706, challenges  
9 Defendants’ unlawful decision to rescind the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (“DACA”)  
10 program, which protected from deportation nearly 800,000 individuals brought to this country as  
11 children, known as Dreamers. Under DACA, the Dreamers, who came to the United States through no  
12 choice of their own, who have clean records, and who have lived continuously in the United States since  
13 2007, were permitted to live, work, and study in this country without fear of deportation. The United  
14 States, and the University, have benefited enormously from the presence of the Dreamers, accomplished  
15 young men and women who are our students, and colleagues, and neighbors. They are Americans, a  
16 fact that Defendants’ precipitous decision cannot change.

17 2. As a result of Defendants’ actions, the Dreamers face expulsion from the only country  
18 that they call home, based on nothing more than unreasoned executive whim. The University faces the  
19 loss of vital members of its community, students and employees. It is hard to imagine a decision less  
20 reasoned, more damaging, or undertaken with less care. As explained below, Defendants’ capricious  
21 rescission of the DACA program violates both the procedural and substantive requirements of the APA,  
22 as well as the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. Accordingly, Defendants’ unconstitutional,  
23 unjust, and unlawful action must be set aside.

24 3. On June 15, 2012, former Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano announced  
25 that individuals who arrived in the United States as children and met certain criteria, and who otherwise  
26 satisfied DHS’s exercise of discretion, could apply for deferred action for two-year periods, subject to  
27 renewal. *See* Memorandum from Janet Napolitano, Sec’y of Homeland Security, to Alejandro  
28 Mayorkas, Director, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Servs. et al., Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion

1 With Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children (June 15, 2012) (“DACA  
2 Memorandum”). DACA allowed these individuals to live, study, and work in the United States without  
3 fear that they could be arrested and deported at any time. Because of the program, DACA recipients  
4 were able to pursue opportunities in higher education, to more readily obtain driver’s licenses and access  
5 lines of credit, to obtain jobs and access to certain Social Security and Medicare benefits, and to  
6 contribute to their communities and American society in countless ways.

7 4. The University directly benefited from the DACA program, in its capacities as educator  
8 and employer. UC has approximately 4,000 undocumented students, a substantial number of whom are  
9 DACA recipients. Many of its staff members are also DACA recipients. These individuals make  
10 important contributions to University life, expanding the intellectual vitality of the school, filling crucial  
11 roles as medical residents, research assistants, and student government leaders, and increasing the  
12 diversity of the community.

13 5. Over the past five years, DACA recipients have structured their lives—and the University  
14 has made significant investments—on the government’s express assurances that if they self-identified,  
15 registered with federal law enforcement agencies, and passed an extensive background investigation,  
16 they would be shielded from deportation and allowed to work in the United States for renewable two-  
17 year periods. Yet despite the substantial and well-founded reliance that these individuals and the  
18 University placed in the continuation of the DACA program, on September 5, 2017, Defendants  
19 suddenly and unilaterally rescinded it. *See* Ex. A, Memorandum on Rescission Of Deferred Action For  
20 Childhood Arrivals (Sept. 5, 2017) (hereinafter the “Rescission”).

21 6. The Rescission, which renders DACA recipients once more subject to deportation, has  
22 profound consequences for the University and its students. As a result of Defendants’ actions, DACA  
23 recipients face the loss of their livelihood, education, and country. The University and all of its students  
24 will lose the contributions of valued colleagues and employees. The University also will lose  
25 intellectual capital and productivity, as DACA recipients are deprived of the work authorizations needed  
26 to serve in the professional roles in which both they and the University have so heavily invested.

27 7. In the Rescission, Defendants offered no reasoned basis for their cancellation of DACA,  
28 instead merely pointing to the purported illegality of another program known as Deferred Action for

1 Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (“DAPA”), and stating that in light of the Fifth  
2 Circuit’s conclusion that DAPA is unlawful, “it is clear that [DACA] should be terminated.” As  
3 explained below, rescinding DACA on this specious basis was procedurally and substantively invalid  
4 under the APA and violated the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

5 8. Agency action is invalid under the APA if it is “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of  
6 discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law,” or if it is taken “without observance of procedure  
7 required by law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2). To survive judicial review under the APA, an agency must  
8 “articulate a satisfactory explanation for its action including a ‘rational connection between the facts  
9 found and the choice made.’” *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n of the U.S., Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins.*  
10 *Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983). In determining whether an agency has complied with this requirement, a  
11 court must conduct a “thorough, probing, in-depth review” of the agency’s reasoning and a “searching  
12 and careful” inquiry into the factual underpinnings of the agency’s decision. *Citizens to Preserve*  
13 *Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe*, 401 U.S. 402, 415–16 (1971). Here, in multiple respects, Defendants failed  
14 to “articulate a satisfactory explanation” for their action that would enable a court to conclude that the  
15 decision was “the product of reasoned decisionmaking.” *State Farm*, 463 U.S. at 52.

16 9. As an initial matter, Defendants’ reliance on the purported illegality of DAPA is an  
17 entirely insufficient basis on which to terminate DACA. DAPA is a separate program from DACA.  
18 The two programs were governed by different sets of rules, applied to different individuals, and  
19 conferred different benefits. Therefore, the alleged illegality of DAPA does not justify the rescission of  
20 DACA, and Defendants’ failure to recognize the many differences between the programs renders their  
21 decision unreasonable.

22 10. Because the Rescission is based on an incorrect legal premise—the purported illegality of  
23 DACA—it cannot survive judicial review under the APA. *See, e.g., Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S.  
24 497, 532 (2007) (holding that action was unlawful under the APA because agency based its decision on  
25 incorrect legal conclusion); *Safe Air For Everyone v. EPA*, 488 F.3d 1088, 1101 (9th Cir. 2007)  
26 (“Because that flawed premise is fundamental to EPA’s determination . . . EPA’s outcome on those  
27 statutory interpretation questions is arbitrary, capricious, or otherwise not in accordance with law.”).  
28

1           11.     Despite Defendants’ conclusory assertion that DACA “has the same legal and  
2 constitutional defects” as DAPA, no court has held that DACA is unlawful. Instead, DHS has  
3 previously concluded that programs like DACA are a lawful exercise of the Executive Branch’s broad  
4 statutory authority to administer and enforce the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101, *et*  
5 *seq.* See Brief for Petitioners, *United States v. Texas*, 2016 WL 836758 (2016) (No. 15-674). Similarly,  
6 the Department of Justice’s Office of Legal Counsel (“OLC”)—whose legal advice is binding on the  
7 Executive Branch—provided a thoughtful and nuanced analysis of DAPA in 2014, concluding that  
8 DAPA, as well as DACA, was a lawful exercise of the Executive Branch’s prosecutorial discretion.  
9 Dep’t of Homeland Sec.’s Auth. to Prioritize Removal of Certain Aliens Unlawfully Present in the  
10 United States & to Defer Removal of Others, 2014 WL 10788677 (O.L.C. Nov. 19, 2014).

11           12.     The Rescission fails to acknowledge—let alone explain—the government’s departure  
12 from its own prior interpretations of the law. Indeed, DHS vigorously defended the legality of DAPA in  
13 the Supreme Court less than two years ago. See Brief for Petitioners, *supra*. Yet in making the  
14 unfounded assertion that DACA is illegal for the same reasons that DAPA is illegal, Defendants neither  
15 addressed the compelling arguments set forth in DHS’s own brief before the Supreme Court and in  
16 OLC’s 2014 Opinion, nor offered a reasonable explanation for why their current view of the law is  
17 superior to the view they and OLC previously espoused. Those failures, standing alone, are enough to  
18 render their decision unlawful under the APA.

19           13.     Defendants compound the irrationality of their decision by failing to acknowledge the  
20 profound reliance interests implicated by DACA and the hundreds of thousands of individuals,  
21 employers, and universities who will be substantially harmed by the termination of the program. The  
22 Supreme Court has emphasized that the presence of serious reliance interests requires an agency to  
23 proffer a “more substantial justification” than otherwise would be required when the agency changes  
24 course. See *Perez v. Mortg. Bankers Ass’n*, 135 S. Ct. 1199, 1209 (2015); *FCC v. Fox Television*  
25 *Stations*, 556 U.S. 502, 515 (2009). Here, Defendants entirely failed to comply with that directive.

26           14.     Defendants did not analyze the actual costs and benefits of allowing DACA recipients to  
27 live and work in this country, nor did they acknowledge the manifold benefits that have resulted from  
28 the program or the harm that institutions like the University—as well as its students—would suffer as a

1 result of the Rescission. By failing to consider these factors and the interests at stake, Defendants have  
2 failed to satisfy the APA's requirement of reasoned decision-making.

3 15. The Rescission also should be set aside because it is procedurally invalid. By prohibiting  
4 DHS from granting advance parole or renewing recipients' DACA status after October 5, 2017, the  
5 Rescission circumscribes DHS's discretion and therefore constitutes a substantive rule. *See W.C. v.*  
6 *Bowen*, 807 F.2d 1502, 1505 (9th Cir. 1987), *opinion amended on denial of reh'g*, 819 F.2d 237 (9th  
7 Cir. 1987) ("Rules which substantially limit an agency's discretion are generally substantive rules.").  
8 Additionally, in contrast to the case-by-case assessment of individual applicants provided under DACA,  
9 the Rescission is a categorical rule, which applies to all DACA recipients. This too underscores the  
10 substantive nature of the Rescission, which is subject to the full range of the APA's rulemaking  
11 requirements, including the notice-and-comment requirement of 5 U.S.C. § 553. *See Paulsen v.*  
12 *Daniels*, 413 F.3d 999, 1003-04 (9th Cir. 2005) (holding that Bureau of Prisons "plainly violated the  
13 APA" by promulgating a rule that barred category of prisoners from relief without notice). Defendants'  
14 failure to abide by these mandatory procedural requirements renders their action unlawful.

15 16. Finally, in rescinding DACA, Defendants violated the Due Process Clause of the United  
16 States Constitution by failing to provide the University with any process before depriving it of the value  
17 of the public resources it invested in DACA recipients, and the benefits flowing from DACA recipients'  
18 contributions to the University. More fundamentally, they failed to provide DACA recipients with any  
19 process before depriving them of their work authorizations and DACA status, and the benefits that flow  
20 from that status.

#### 21 **THE PARTIES**

22 17. Plaintiff The Regents of the University of California is a California public corporation,  
23 authorized and empowered to administer a public trust known as the University of California, pursuant  
24 to Article IX, Section 9, subdivisions (a) and (f) of the California Constitution. Its principal place of  
25 business is in Oakland, Alameda County, California. The University brings this complaint on behalf of  
26 itself and on behalf of all students currently enrolled at the University. Approximately 4,000  
27 undocumented students are enrolled at the University, a substantial number of whom are DACA  
28 recipients. Some of these recipients are also employed by the University.

1 18. Plaintiff Janet Napolitano is a resident of California. She brings this complaint in her  
2 official capacity as President of the University of California.

3 19. Defendant DHS is a federal cabinet agency responsible for implementing and enforcing  
4 the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”). DHS is a Department of the Executive Branch of the  
5 United States Government and an agency within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 551(1). DHS, as well as its  
6 component agencies U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”), U.S. Customs and Border  
7 Protection (“CBP”), and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”), have responsibility for,  
8 among other things, administering and enforcing the nation’s immigration laws and policies, including  
9 the DACA program.

10 20. Defendant Elaine Duke is the Acting Secretary of DHS and, in the absence of a  
11 Secretary, is the senior official of DHS. She is sued in her official capacity. Acting Secretary Duke  
12 issued the Rescission on September 5, 2017.

13 **JURISDICTION**

14 21. This action arises under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, U.S. Const.  
15 amend. V; and the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 550 *et seq.* This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28  
16 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1361, and 2201–2202.

17 22. There exists an actual and justiciable controversy between Plaintiffs and Defendants  
18 requiring resolution by this Court. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.

19 **VENUE**

20 23. Venue is proper in the Northern District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e),  
21 because this is a civil action in which Defendants are an agency, or officers of an agency, of the United  
22 States, because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to this action occurred in the  
23 District, and, further, because Plaintiffs reside in this District and no real property is involved in the  
24 action.

25 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

26 24. Pursuant to Local Rule 3-2(c), intradistrict assignment is proper in San Francisco or  
27 Oakland because a substantial part of the events or omissions which give rise to the claim occurred in  
28 the County of Alameda.

**BACKGROUND****A. The DACA Program**

25. On June 15, 2012, the Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano announced that individuals who arrived in the United States as children and met certain criteria could apply for deferred action for two-year periods, subject to renewal. *See* DACA Memorandum. In establishing the program, the Secretary elected to extend deferred action to “certain young people who were brought to this country as children and know only this country as home.” *Id.* The Secretary emphasized that federal immigration laws are “not designed . . . to remove productive young people to countries where they may not have lived or even speak the language. Indeed, many of these young people have already contributed to our country in significant ways.” *Id.* This program is known as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (“DACA”).

26. Individuals were eligible for the program if they (1) came to the United States when they were under the age of sixteen; (2) continuously resided in the United States since June 15, 2007, and were present in the United States on June 15, 2012, and on the date they requested DACA; (3) were currently in school, had graduated from high school, had obtained a general education development certificate, or were an honorably discharged veteran of the Coast Guard or Armed Forces of the United States; (4) had not been convicted of a felony, a significant misdemeanor, or three or more other misdemeanors, and otherwise did not pose a threat to national security or public safety; (5) did not have lawful immigration status on June 15, 2012; and (6) were under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012. *See id.*; *see also* Ex. B, U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Servs.: Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Process (Aug. 26, 2017) (hereinafter “USCIS FAQs”). Individuals who met these criteria were then eligible for an exercise of prosecutorial discretion, following an individualized review of their applications. *See* DACA Memorandum.

27. When they applied for admission to the program, DACA recipients were required to disclose sensitive, personal information to Defendants, including their lack of lawful immigration status as of June 15, 2012, their date of initial entry into the United States, their country of birth, their current and previous mailing addresses, and other contact information. *See* USCIS Form I-821D; USCIS Form I-821D Instructions.

1           28. Continuing their longstanding practice with respect to deferred-action applications,  
2 Defendants repeatedly promised DACA applicants that the information they submitted as part of their  
3 applications would not be used for civil immigration enforcement purposes against DACA applicants or  
4 their families. *See* USCIS FAQs; Form I-821D Instructions. Because only individuals who might be  
5 subject to removal proceedings would apply for DACA, this promise was necessary for individuals to  
6 submit applications without fear that the Executive Branch was using DACA as a way to find and  
7 remove undocumented immigrants.

8           29. Individuals who received deferred action under DACA were not subject to removal for a  
9 period of two years, subject to renewal. *See* DACA Memorandum.

10           30. DACA recipients also were eligible for work authorizations that allowed them to work  
11 legally in the United States, pursuant to a long-standing federal regulation. *See id.*; 8 C.F.R. §  
12 274a.12(c)(14) (providing that “an alien who has been granted deferred action” may obtain work  
13 authorization upon demonstrating economic necessity); USCIS FAQs (“Under existing regulations, an  
14 individual whose case has been deferred is eligible to receive employment authorization for the period  
15 of deferred action, provided he or she can demonstrate ‘an economic necessity for employment.’”). An  
16 individual’s work authorization expires at the same time as his or her DACA status and could be  
17 renewed upon a renewal of DACA status.

18           31. Individuals with DACA status were “not considered to be unlawfully present during the  
19 period in which deferred action [was] in effect.” USCIS FAQs.

20           32. Since the program was first introduced in 2012, nearly 800,000 individuals received  
21 DACA status. This includes an estimated 242,339 residents of the State of California. *See* Number of I-  
22 821D, Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals by Fiscal Year, Quarter, Intake,  
23 Biometrics and Case Status: 2012-2017 (Mar. 31, 2017); Carolyn Jones, California Colleges Undaunted  
24 by Trump’s Decision to Phase out DACA, EDSOURCE (Sept. 1, 2017),  
25 <https://edsources.org/2017/california-colleges-undaunted-by-trumps-threat-to-end-daca/586746>.

26           ***B. The Many Benefits of DACA***

27           33. As noted above, DACA recipients have contributed in innumerable ways to the  
28 intellectual and social fabric of the University.

1           34. As an institution whose core mission is serving the interests of the State of California, the  
2 University seeks “to achieve diversity among its student bodies and among its employees.” *See*  
3 Academic Senate of the Univ. of Cal., *Regents Policy 4400: Policy of University of California Diversity*  
4 *Statement*, UNIV. OF CAL.: BOARD OF REGENTS, [http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/](http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/4400.html)  
5 [governance/policies/4400.html](http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/governance/policies/4400.html). The University recognizes the importance of diversity to its academic  
6 mission, as it allows “students and faculty [to] learn to interact effectively with each other, preparing  
7 them to participate in an increasingly complex and pluralistic society.” *Id.* The educational experience  
8 of all University students is fuller and more enriching when ideas are “born and nurtured in a diverse  
9 community.” *Id.* DACA students at the University are an integral part of that community. Their talent,  
10 perspectives, and experiences are invaluable contributions to University life.

11           35. DACA recipients also make significant contributions to University life in their role as  
12 employees. They work at UC campuses and in UC medical centers as teaching assistants, research  
13 assistants, post-docs, and health care providers. DACA recipients often possess valuable foreign  
14 language skills. By allowing DACA recipients to work lawfully, DACA moved recipients out of the  
15 informal economy, increasing the pool of talent from which UC could fill positions at the University.

16           36. Additional DACA recipients who are enrolled as students support themselves and cover a  
17 portion of their tuition through their part-time work for the University. For many of these students,  
18 DACA work authorization plays a significant role in their ability to attend UC and continue each year  
19 with their chosen program of study.

20           37. The University has invested considerable resources in recruiting and retaining these  
21 individuals—as students and employees. It has made scarce enrollment space available to these students  
22 on the basis of their individual achievements. It also has invested substantial time, financial aid,  
23 research dollars, housing benefits, and other resources in them on the expectation that these students will  
24 complete their course of study and become productive members of the communities in which the  
25 University operates, and other communities throughout the nation. The University has significant  
26 interests in retaining this wealth of talent and in continuing to enjoy the many benefits of their  
27 participation in University life.

28

1           38.     Furthermore, by allowing recipients to receive deferred action and obtain work  
2 authorization, DACA opened myriad opportunities to them. As noted above, DACA recipients became  
3 eligible for federal work authorization, which significantly improved their opportunities for employment  
4 and higher paying jobs. Under the program, DACA recipients received social security numbers and  
5 therefore were able to access credit more easily. DACA also enabled recipients to obtain driver's  
6 licenses in a number of states where they otherwise could not. It also protected these individuals' right  
7 to travel freely by making them eligible to receive "advance parole," which allowed them to travel  
8 abroad temporarily for humanitarian, educational, or employment purposes, and to return to the United  
9 States lawfully. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(f); USCIS FAQs.

10           ***C. Defendants Unlawfully Rescind DACA***

11           39.     As recently as February 20, 2017, Defendants had reaffirmed the administration's  
12 commitment to DACA, *see* Memorandum from John Kelly, Sec'y of Homeland Security, Enforcement  
13 of the Immigration Laws to Serve the National Interest, at 2 (Feb. 20 2017), and up until September 5,  
14 2017, Defendants had continued to approve DACA requests and renewals. Despite President Trump's  
15 claim that DACA recipients "shouldn't be very worried" and that the Administration would treat DACA  
16 recipients "with great heart," on September 5, 2017, Defendants announced that they were rescinding  
17 the program. *See* Transcript: ABC News anchor David Muir interviews President Trump, ABC NEWS  
18 (Jan. 25, 2017) [http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/transcript-abc-news-anchor-david-muir-interviews-](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/transcript-abc-news-anchor-david-muir-interviews-president/story?id=45047602)  
19 [president/story?id=45047602](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/transcript-abc-news-anchor-david-muir-interviews-president/story?id=45047602); *see also* Madeline Conway, Trump Tells Dreamers To "Rest Easy,"  
20 Politico.com (Apr. 21, 2017), [http://www.politico.com/story/2017/04/21/trump-dreamers-rest-easy-](http://www.politico.com/story/2017/04/21/trump-dreamers-rest-easy-immigration-237463)  
21 [immigration-237463](http://www.politico.com/story/2017/04/21/trump-dreamers-rest-easy-immigration-237463).

22           40.     Defendants announced their decision on the same day as a "deadline" imposed by ten  
23 states that threatened to sue the Trump administration if DACA were not rescinded. *See* Letter from  
24 Gov. Abbott to U.S. Att'y General Sessions (June 29, 2017). The Rescission expressly states that this  
25 threat—rather than any reasoned evaluation of the legality and merits of the program—provoked the  
26 decision to terminate DACA.

27           41.     Prior to DHS's issuance of the Rescission, Attorney General Jeff Sessions held a press  
28 conference in which he asserted that "[o]ur collective wisdom is that the policy is vulnerable to the same

1 legal and constitutional challenges that the courts recognized with respect to the DAPA program.” *See*  
2 Ex. C, Attorney General Sessions Delivers Remarks On DACA (Sept. 5, 2017),  
3 <https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/attorney-general-sessions-delivers-remarks-daca> (“Press  
4 Conference”). Similarly, a September 4, 2017 letter from the Attorney General to Acting Secretary of  
5 DHS Duke reiterated that DACA “was effectuated . . . without proper statutory authority” and “was an  
6 unconstitutional exercise of authority by the Executive Branch.” *See* Ex. D, Letter from Att’y General  
7 Sessions to Acting Sec’y of DHS Duke (Sept. 4, 2017). The Attorney General also noted the potential  
8 of litigation from several states and that DACA was “likely” to be enjoined in that yet-to-be-filed  
9 litigation.

10 42. In addition, in his press conference Attorney General Sessions alleged, without offering  
11 any evidence, that DACA had “denied jobs to hundreds of thousands of Americans by allowing those  
12 same jobs to go to illegal aliens.” He also made the specious claim that DACA “contributed to a surge  
13 of unaccompanied minors on the southern border that yielded terrible humanitarian consequences.” *See*  
14 Press Conference. That claim is facially false. DACA by its terms applies only to individuals resident  
15 in the United States since June 15, 2007—five years before the program began.

16 43. After the press conference, Acting Secretary of Homeland Security Duke, purporting to  
17 act “[i]n the exercise of [her] authority in establishing national immigration policies and priorities,”  
18 formally rescinded the DACA Memorandum. The Rescission states that “it is clear” that DACA  
19 “should be terminated” in light of the Fifth Circuit’s ruling in *Texas v. United States*, 809 F.3d 134 (5th  
20 Cir. 2015), regarding DAPA, the Supreme Court’s non-precedential affirmance of that ruling by an  
21 equally divided court, and the Attorney General’s September 4 letter.

22 44. The President, however, does not appear to share the views of DHS or his Attorney  
23 General regarding the legality of DACA. In direct contradiction to Defendants’ and Attorney General  
24 Sessions’ position that the prior administration had exceeded the authority of the Executive Branch in  
25 establishing DACA, *see* Ex. A and Press Conference, the President tweeted on the night of the  
26 Rescission, “Congress now has 6 months to legalize DACA (something the Obama Administration was  
27 unable to do). If they can’t, I will revisit this issue!” *See* Donald J. Trump (@realDonaldTrump),  
28 Twitter (Sep. 5, 2017, 8:38 PM), <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/905228667336499200>.

1           45.     Although the Rescission concludes that DACA is unlawful, it does not immediately  
2 revoke any individual's DACA status or work authorization. Instead, it instructs that "the Department  
3 will provide a limited window in which it will adjudicate certain requests for DACA and associated  
4 applications." Specifically, the Rescission explains that DHS will adjudicate pending DACA requests  
5 and associated work authorization applications that already had been accepted by the agency as of  
6 September 5, 2017, but will reject new requests and applications filed after September 5, 2017. It  
7 further states that DHS will adjudicate pending renewal requests and applications from current DACA  
8 recipients, as well as renewal requests and applications from current DACA recipients for grants of  
9 deferred action that expire between September 5, 2017, and March 5, 2018, and that are accepted by the  
10 agency as of October 5, 2017. Any renewal requests filed after October 5, 2017, or any renewal requests  
11 for benefits that expire after March 5, 2018, will be rejected. DHS will not terminate the current grants  
12 of deferred action to DACA recipients, but instead will allow individuals' DACA status to expire. DHS  
13 will not approve any new applications for advance parole and will administratively close all pending  
14 applications for advance parole. *See* Ex. A at 4-5.

15           46.     Defendants' decision to rescind the program will have immense and devastating effects  
16 on the University and all of its students. As a result of the termination of the program, the University  
17 and its students will lose the vital contributions that DACA recipients have made as students and  
18 employees. *See Washington v. Trump*, 847 F.3d 1151, 1160 (9th Cir. 2017) ("[S]chools have been  
19 permitted to assert the rights of their students."). The civic life of the school will be diminished, the  
20 exchange of ideas will be reduced, teaching and research will be impaired, and diversity will be more  
21 difficult to achieve. The University and its students benefit from cohesive family units, robust civic  
22 participation, and the strength of social and educational communities. The Rescission damages each of  
23 these interests, in California and nationwide.

24           47.     Moreover, UC students and employees have friends or family members who are DACA  
25 recipients, and the University will have to expend resources to address the detrimental effects that the  
26 rescission of DACA will have on these individuals' lives. The University also will lose the resources it  
27 has spent educating students who ultimately do not graduate.  
28







1 opportunities in higher education, to more readily obtain driver's licenses and access lines of credit, to  
2 obtain jobs, and to access certain Social Security and Medicare benefits.

3 71. The Rescission and actions taken by Defendants to rescind DACA unlawfully deprive the  
4 University and its students of these and other constitutionally-protected interests without due process of  
5 law. Such deprivation occurred with no notice or opportunity to be heard.

6 72. Defendants therefore have violated the Fifth Amendment to the United States  
7 Constitution.

8 73. The University and its students were harmed and continue to be harmed by these  
9 unlawful acts.

10 **RELIEF REQUESTED**

11 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court:

12 A. Vacate and set aside the Rescission and any other action taken by Defendants to  
13 rescind DACA;

14 B. Declare that the Rescission and actions taken by Defendants to rescind DACA are  
15 void and without legal force or effect;

16 C. Declare that the Rescission and actions taken by Defendants to rescind DACA are  
17 arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, otherwise not in accordance with law, and without  
18 observance of procedure required by law in violation of 5 U.S.C. §§ 702-706;

19 D. Declare that the Rescission and actions taken by Defendants to rescind DACA are  
20 in violation of the Constitution and contrary to the laws of the United States;

21 E. Preliminarily and permanently enjoin and restrain Defendants, their agents,  
22 servants, employees, attorneys, and all persons in active concert or participation with any of  
23 them, from implementing or enforcing the Rescission and from taking any other action to rescind  
24 DACA that is not in compliance with applicable law;

25 F. Grant such further relief as this Court deems just and proper.  
26  
27  
28

1 DATED: September 8, 2017

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

2 By:



3 Jeffrey M. Davidson (Bar No. 248620)  
4 One Front Street, 35th Floor  
5 San Francisco, CA 94111-5356  
6 Telephone: + 1 (415) 591-6000  
7 Facsimile: + 1 (415) 591-6091  
8 Email: [jdavidson@cov.com](mailto:jdavidson@cov.com)

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs THE REGENTS OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA and JANET  
NAPOLITANO, in her official capacity as  
President of the University of California

# EXHIBIT A



U.S. Department of  
Homeland Security

# Memorandum on Rescission Of Deferred Action For Childhood Arrivals (DACA)

**Release Date:** September 5, 2017

**MEMORANDUM FOR:**

James W. McCament  
Acting Director  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Thomas D. Homan  
Acting Director  
U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement

Kevin K. McAleenan  
Acting Commissioner  
U.S. Customs and Border Protection

Joseph B. Maher  
Acting General Counsel

Ambassador James D. Nealon  
Assistant Secretary, International Engagement

Julie M. Kirchner  
Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman

**FROM:**

Elaine C. Duke  
Acting Secretary

**SUBJECT:****Rescission of the June 15, 2012 Memorandum Entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children”**

This memorandum rescinds the June 15, 2012 memorandum entitled “Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children,” which established the program known as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (“DACA”). For the reasons and in the manner outlined below, Department of Homeland Security personnel shall take all appropriate actions to execute a wind-down of the program, consistent with the parameters established in this memorandum.

## Background

The Department of Homeland Security established DACA through the issuance of a memorandum on June 15, 2012. The program purported to use deferred action—an act of prosecutorial discretion meant to be applied only on an individualized case-by-case basis—to confer certain benefits to illegal aliens that Congress had not otherwise acted to provide by law.<sup>[1]</sup> Specifically, DACA provided certain illegal aliens who entered the United States before the age of sixteen a period of deferred action and eligibility to request employment authorization.

On November 20, 2014, the Department issued a new memorandum, expanding the parameters of DACA and creating a new policy called Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (“DAPA”). Among other things—such as the expansion of the coverage criteria under the 2012 DACA policy to encompass aliens with a wider range of ages and arrival dates, and lengthening the period of deferred action and work authorization from two years to three—the November 20, 2014 memorandum directed USCIS “to establish a process, similar to DACA, for exercising prosecutorial discretion through the use of deferred action, on a case-by-case basis,” to certain aliens who have “a son or daughter who is a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident.”

Prior to the implementation of DAPA, twenty-six states—led by Texas—challenged the policies announced in the November 20, 2014 memorandum in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas. In an order issued on February 16, 2015, the district court preliminarily enjoined the policies nationwide.<sup>[2]</sup> The district court held that the plaintiff states were likely to succeed on their claim that the DAPA program did not comply with relevant authorities.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit affirmed, holding that Texas and the other states had demonstrated a substantial likelihood of success on the merits and satisfied

the other requirements for a preliminary injunction.<sup>[3] (# ftn3)</sup> The Fifth Circuit concluded that the Department's DAPA policy conflicted with the discretion authorized by Congress. In considering the DAPA program, the court noted that the Immigration and Nationality Act "flatly does not permit the reclassification of millions of illegal aliens as lawfully present and thereby make them newly eligible for a host of federal and state benefits, including work authorization." According to the court, "DAPA is foreclosed by Congress's careful plan; the program is 'manifestly contrary to the statute' and therefore was properly enjoined."

Although the original DACA policy was not challenged in the lawsuit, both the district and appellate court decisions relied on factual findings about the implementation of the 2012 DACA memorandum. The Fifth Circuit agreed with the lower court that DACA decisions were not truly discretionary,<sup>[4] (# ftn4)</sup> and that DAPA and expanded DACA would be substantially similar in execution. Both the district court and the Fifth Circuit concluded that implementation of the program did not comply with the Administrative Procedure Act because the Department did not implement it through notice-and-comment rulemaking.

The Supreme Court affirmed the Fifth Circuit's ruling by equally divided vote (4-4).<sup>[5] (# ftn5)</sup> The evenly divided ruling resulted in the Fifth Circuit order being affirmed. The preliminary injunction therefore remains in place today. In October 2016, the Supreme Court denied a request from DHS to rehear the case upon the appointment of a new Justice. After the 2016 election, both parties agreed to a stay in litigation to allow the new administration to review these issues.

On January 25, 2017, President Trump issued Executive Order No. 13,768, "Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States." In that Order, the President directed federal agencies to "[e]nsure the faithful execution of the immigration laws . . . against all removable aliens," and established new immigration enforcement priorities. On February 20, 2017, then Secretary of Homeland Security John F. Kelly issued an implementing memorandum, stating "the Department no longer will exempt classes or categories of removable aliens from potential enforcement," except as provided in the Department's June 15, 2012 memorandum establishing DACA,<sup>[6] (# ftn6)</sup> and the November 20, 2014 memorandum establishing DAPA and expanding DACA.<sup>[7] (# ftn7)</sup>

On June 15, 2017, after consulting with the Attorney General, and considering the likelihood of success on the merits of the ongoing litigation, then Secretary John F. Kelly issued a memorandum rescinding DAPA and the expansion of DACA—but temporarily left in place the June 15, 2012 memorandum that initially created the DACA program.

Then, on June 29, 2017, Texas, along with several other states, sent a letter to Attorney General Sessions asserting that the original 2012 DACA memorandum is unlawful for the same

reasons stated in the Fifth Circuit and district court opinions regarding DAPA and expanded DACA. The letter notes that if DHS does not rescind the DACA memo by September 5, 2017, the States will seek to amend the DAPA lawsuit to include a challenge to DACA.

The Attorney General sent a letter to the Department on September 4, 2017, articulating his legal determination that DACA “was effectuated by the previous administration through executive action, without proper statutory authority and with no established end-date, after Congress’ repeated rejection of proposed legislation that would have accomplished a similar result. Such an open-ended circumvention of immigration laws was an unconstitutional exercise of authority by the Executive Branch.” The letter further stated that because DACA “has the same legal and constitutional defects that the courts recognized as to DAPA, it is likely that potentially imminent litigation would yield similar results with respect to DACA.” Nevertheless, in light of the administrative complexities associated with ending the program, he recommended that the Department wind it down in an efficient and orderly fashion, and his office has reviewed the terms on which our Department will do so.

## Rescission of the June 15, 2012 DACA Memorandum

Taking into consideration the Supreme Court’s and the Fifth Circuit’s rulings in the ongoing litigation, and the September 4, 2017 letter from the Attorney General, it is clear that the June 15, 2012 DACA program should be terminated. In the exercise of my authority in establishing national immigration policies and priorities, except for the purposes explicitly identified below, I hereby rescind the June 15, 2012 memorandum.

Recognizing the complexities associated with winding down the program, the Department will provide a limited window in which it will adjudicate certain requests for DACA and associated applications meeting certain parameters specified below. Accordingly, effective immediately, the Department:

- Will adjudicate—on an individual, case-by-case basis—properly filed pending DACA initial requests and associated applications for Employment Authorization Documents that have been accepted by the Department as of the date of this memorandum.
- Will reject all DACA initial requests and associated applications for Employment Authorization Documents filed after the date of this memorandum.
- Will adjudicate—on an individual, case by case basis—properly filed pending DACA renewal requests and associated applications for Employment Authorization Documents from current beneficiaries that have been accepted by the Department as of the date of this memorandum, and from current beneficiaries whose benefits will expire between the date of this memorandum and March 5, 2018 that have been accepted by the Department as of October 5, 2017.

- Will reject all DACA renewal requests and associated applications for Employment Authorization Documents filed outside of the parameters specified above.
- Will not terminate the grants of previously issued deferred action or revoke Employment Authorization Documents solely based on the directives in this memorandum for the remaining duration of their validity periods.
- Will not approve any new Form I-131 applications for advance parole under standards associated with the DACA program, although it will generally honor the stated validity period for previously approved applications for advance parole. Notwithstanding the continued validity of advance parole approvals previously granted, CBP will—of course—retain the authority it has always had and exercised in determining the admissibility of any person presenting at the border and the eligibility of such persons for parole. Further, USCIS will—of course—retain the authority to revoke or terminate an advance parole document at any time.
- Will administratively close all pending Form I-131 applications for advance parole filed under standards associated with the DACA program, and will refund all associated fees.
- Will continue to exercise its discretionary authority to terminate or deny deferred action at any time when immigration officials determine termination or denial of deferred action is appropriate.

This document is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any party in any administrative, civil, or criminal matter. Likewise, no limitations are placed by this guidance on the otherwise lawful enforcement or litigation prerogatives of DHS.

---

[1] (# [ftnref1](#)) Significantly, while the DACA denial notice indicates the decision to deny is made in the unreviewable discretion of USCIS, USCIS has not been able to identify specific denial cases where an applicant appeared to satisfy the programmatic categorical criteria as outlined in the June 15, 2012 memorandum, but still had his or her application denied based solely upon discretion.

[2] (# [ftnref2](#)) *Texas v. United States*, 86 F. Supp. 3d 591 (S.D. Tex. 2015).

[3] (# [ftnref3](#)) *Texas v. United States*, 809 F.3d 134 (5th Cir. 2015).

[4] (# [ftnref4](#)) *Id.*

[5] (# [ftnref5](#)) *United States v. Texas*, 136 S. Ct. 2271 (2016) (per curiam).

[6] (# [ftnref6](#)) Memorandum from Janet Napolitano, Secretary, DHS to David Aguilar, Acting Comm'r, CBP, et al., "Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children" (June 15, 2012).

[7] (# [ftnref7](#)) Memorandum from Jeh Johnson, Secretary, DHS, to Leon Rodriguez, Dir., USCIS, et al., "Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children and with Respect to Certain Individuals Whose Parents are U.S. Citizens or Permanent Residents" (Nov. 20, 2014).

Topics: [Border Security \(/topics/border-security/\)](/topics/border-security/), [Deferred Action \(/topics/deferred-action/\)](/topics/deferred-action/)

Keywords: [DACA \(/keywords/daca/\)](/keywords/daca/), [Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals \(/keywords/deferred-action-childhood-arrivals/\)](/keywords/deferred-action-childhood-arrivals/)

Last Published Date: September 5, 2017

# **EXHIBIT B**



## U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

# Frequently Asked Questions

*FAQs updated April 25, 2017*

## General Information for All Requestors

- [What is Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals?](#)
- [DACA Process](#)
- [Background Checks](#)
- [After USCIS Makes a Decision](#)

## Initial Requests for DACA

## Renewal of DACA

## Travel

## Criminal Convictions

## Miscellaneous

## I. General Information for All Requestors

### A. What is Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals?

As the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) continues to focus its enforcement resources on the removal of individuals who pose a danger to national security or a risk to public safety, DHS will exercise prosecutorial discretion as appropriate to ensure that enforcement resources are not expended on low priority cases, such as individuals who came to the United States as children and meet other key guidelines. Individuals who demonstrate that they meet the guidelines below may request consideration of deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA) for a period of two years, subject to renewal for a period of two years, and may be eligible for employment authorization.

You may request consideration of DACA if you:

1. Were under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012;
2. Came to the United States before reaching your 16th birthday;
3. Have continuously resided in the United States since June 15, 2007, up to the present time;
4. Were physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012, and at the time of making your request for consideration of deferred action with USCIS;
5. Had no lawful status on June 15, 2012, meaning that:
  - You never had a lawful immigration status on or before June 15, 2012, or
  - Any lawful immigration status or parole that you obtained prior to June 15, 2012, had expired as of June 15, 2012;

6. Are currently in school, have graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, have obtained a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or are an honorably discharged veteran of the Coast Guard or Armed Forces of the United States; and
7. Have not been convicted of a felony, a significant misdemeanor, three or more other misdemeanors, and do not otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety.

**Individuals can call U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) at 1-800-375-5283 with questions or to request more information on DACA.** Those with pending requests can also use a number of [online self-help tools](#) which include the ability to check case status and processing times, change your address, and send an inquiry about a case pending longer than posted processing times or non-delivery of a card or document.

#### **Q1: What is deferred action?**

A1: Deferred action is a discretionary determination to defer a removal action of an individual as an act of prosecutorial discretion. For purposes of future inadmissibility based upon **unlawful presence**, an individual whose case has been deferred is not considered to be unlawfully present during the period in which deferred action is in effect. An individual who has received deferred action is authorized by DHS to be present in the United States, and is therefore considered by DHS to be lawfully present during the period deferred action is in effect. However, deferred action does not confer **lawful status** upon an individual, nor does it excuse any previous or subsequent periods of unlawful presence.

Under existing regulations, an individual whose case has been deferred is eligible to receive employment authorization for the period of deferred action, provided he or she can demonstrate “an economic necessity for employment.” DHS can terminate or renew deferred action at any time, at the agency’s discretion.

#### **Q2: What is DACA?**

A2: On June 15, 2012, the Secretary of Homeland Security announced that certain people who came to the United States as children and meet several key guidelines may request consideration of deferred action for a period of two years, subject to renewal, and would then be eligible for work authorization.

Individuals who can demonstrate through verifiable documentation that they meet these guidelines will be considered for deferred action. Determinations will be made on a case-by-case basis under the DACA guidelines.

#### **Q3: Is there any difference between “deferred action” and DACA under this process?**

A3: DACA is one form of deferred action. The relief an individual receives under DACA is identical for immigration purposes to the relief obtained by any person who receives deferred action as an act of prosecutorial discretion.

#### **Q4: If my removal is deferred under the consideration of DACA, am I eligible for employment authorization?**

A4: Yes. Under existing regulations, if your case is deferred, you may obtain employment authorization from USCIS provided you can demonstrate an economic necessity for employment.

#### **Q5: If my case is deferred, am I in lawful status for the period of deferral?**

A5: No. Although action on your case has been deferred and you do not accrue unlawful presence (for admissibility purposes) during the period of deferred action, deferred action does not confer any lawful status.

The fact that you are not accruing unlawful presence does not change whether you are in lawful status while you remain in the United States. However, although deferred action does not confer a lawful immigration status, your period of stay is authorized by the Department of Homeland Security while your deferred action is in effect and, for admissibility purposes, you are considered to be lawfully present in the United States during that time. **Individuals granted deferred action are not precluded by federal law from establishing domicile in the U.S.**

Apart from the immigration laws, “lawful presence,” “lawful status” and similar terms are used in various other federal and state laws. For information on how those laws affect individuals who receive a favorable exercise of prosecutorial discretion under DACA, please contact the appropriate federal, state or local authorities.

**Q6: Can I renew my period of deferred action and employment authorization under DACA?**

A6: Yes. You may request consideration for a renewal of your DACA. Your request for a renewal will be considered on a case-by-case basis. If USCIS renews its exercise of discretion under DACA for your case, you will receive deferred action for another two years, and if you demonstrate an economic necessity for employment, you may receive employment authorization throughout that period.

[Return to top.](#)

**B. DACA Process****Q7: How do I request consideration of DACA?**

A7: To request consideration of DACA (either as an initial request or to request a renewal), you must submit [Form I-821D, Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals](#) to USCIS. Please visit [uscis.gov/i-821d](http://uscis.gov/i-821d) before you begin the process to make sure you are using the most current version of the form available. This form must be completed, properly signed and accompanied by a [Form I-765, Application for Employment Authorization](#), and a [Form I-765WS, Worksheet \(PDF, 235 KB\)](#), establishing your economic need for employment. If you fail to submit a completed Form I-765 (along with the accompanying filing fees for that form, please see the Form I-821D page for more information), USCIS will not consider your request for deferred action. Please read the form instructions to ensure that you answer the appropriate questions (determined by whether you are submitting an initial or renewal request) and that you submit all the required documentation to support your initial request.

You must file your request for consideration of DACA at the USCIS Lockbox. You can find the mailing address and instructions at [www.uscis.gov/i-821d](http://www.uscis.gov/i-821d). As of June 5, 2014, requestors must use the new version of the form. After your Form I-821D, Form I-765, and Form I-765 Worksheet have been received, USCIS will review them for completeness, including submission of the required fee, initial evidence and supporting documents (for initial filings).

If it is determined that the request is complete, USCIS will send you a receipt notice. USCIS will then send you an appointment notice to visit an Application Support Center (ASC) for biometric services, if an appointment is required. Please make sure you read and follow the directions in the notice. Failure to attend your biometrics appointment may delay processing of your request for consideration of deferred action, or may result in a denial of your request. You may also choose to receive an email and/or text message notifying you that your form has been accepted by completing a [Form G-1145, E-Notification of Application/Petition Acceptance](#).

Each request for consideration of DACA will be reviewed on an individual, case-by-case basis. USCIS may request more information or evidence from you, or request that you appear at a USCIS office. USCIS will notify you of its determination in writing.

**Note:** All individuals who believe they meet the guidelines, including those in removal proceedings, with a final removal order, or with a voluntary departure order (and not in immigration detention), may affirmatively request consideration of DACA from USCIS through this process. Individuals who are currently in immigration detention and believe they meet the guidelines may not request consideration of deferred action from USCIS but may identify themselves to their deportation officer or Jail Liaison. You may also contact the ICE Field Office Director. For more information visit ICE’s website at [www.ice.gov/daca](http://www.ice.gov/daca).

**Q8: Can I obtain a fee waiver or fee exemption for this process?**

A8: There are no fee waivers available for employment authorization applications connected to DACA. There are very limited fee exemptions available. Requests for fee exemptions must be filed and favorably

adjudicated before an individual files his/her request for consideration of DACA without a fee. In order to be considered for a fee exemption, you must submit a letter and supporting documentation to USCIS demonstrating that you meet one of the following conditions:

- You are under 18 years of age, have an income that is less than 150 percent of the U.S. poverty level, and are in foster care or otherwise lacking any parental or other familial support; or
- You are under 18 years of age and homeless; or
- You cannot care for yourself because you suffer from a serious, chronic disability and your income is less than 150 percent of the U.S. poverty level; or,
- You have, at the time of the request, accumulated **\$10,000** or more in debt in the past 12 months as a result of unreimbursed medical expenses for yourself or an immediate family member, and your income is less than 150 percent of the U.S. poverty level.

You can find additional information on our [Fee Exemption Guidance](#) Web page. Your request must be submitted and decided before you submit a request for consideration of DACA without a fee. In order to be considered for a fee exemption, you must provide documentary evidence to demonstrate that you meet any of the above conditions at the time that you make the request. For evidence, USCIS will:

- Accept affidavits from community-based or religious organizations to establish a requestor's homelessness or lack of parental or other familial financial support.
- Accept copies of tax returns, bank statement, pay stubs, or other reliable evidence of income level. Evidence can also include an affidavit from the applicant or a responsible third party attesting that the applicant does not file tax returns, has no bank accounts, and/or has no income to prove income level.
- Accept copies of medical records, insurance records, bank statements, or other reliable evidence of unreimbursed medical expenses of at least **\$10,000**.
- Address factual questions through Requests for Evidence (RFEs).

**Q9: If individuals meet the guidelines for consideration of DACA and are encountered by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), will they be placed into removal proceedings?**

A9: DACA is intended, in part, to allow CBP and ICE to focus on priority cases. Under the direction of the Secretary of Homeland Security, if an individual meets the guidelines for DACA, CBP or ICE should exercise their discretion on a case-by-case basis to prevent qualifying individuals from being apprehended, placed into removal proceedings, or removed. If individuals believe that, in light of this policy, they should not have been apprehended or placed into removal proceedings, contact the Law Enforcement Support Center's hotline at 1-855-448-6903 (staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week).

**Q10: Does this process apply to me if I am currently in removal proceedings, have a final removal order, or have a voluntary departure order?**

A10: This process is open to any individual who can demonstrate he or she meets the guidelines for consideration, including those who have never been in removal proceedings as well as those in removal proceedings, with a final order, or with a voluntary departure order (as long as they are not in immigration detention).

**Q11: If I am not in removal proceedings but believe I meet the guidelines for consideration of DACA, should I seek to place myself into removal proceedings through encounters with CBP or ICE?**

A11: No. If you are not in removal proceedings but believe that you meet the guidelines, you should submit your DACA request to USCIS under the process outlined below.

**Q12: Can I request consideration of DACA from USCIS if I am in immigration detention under the custody of ICE?**

A12: No. If you are currently in immigration detention, you may not request consideration of DACA from USCIS. If you think you may meet the guidelines of this process, you should identify yourself to your

deportation officer or Jail Liaison. You may also contact the ICE Field Office Director. For more information, visit ICE's website at [www.ice.gov/daca](http://www.ice.gov/daca).

**Q13: If I am about to be removed by ICE and believe that I meet the guidelines for consideration of DACA, what steps should I take to seek review of my case before removal?**

A13: If you believe you can demonstrate that you meet the guidelines and are about to be removed, you should immediately contact the Law Enforcement Support Center's hotline at 1-855-448-6903 (staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week).

**Q14: What should I do if I meet the guidelines of this process and have been issued an ICE detainer following an arrest by a state or local law enforcement officer?**

A14: If you meet the guidelines and have been served a detainer, you should immediately contact the Law Enforcement Support Center's hotline at 1-855-448-6903 (staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week).

**Q15: If I accepted an offer of administrative closure under the case-by-case review process or my case was terminated as part of the case-by-case review process, can I be considered for deferred action under this process?**

A15: Yes. If you can demonstrate that you meet the guidelines, you will be able to request consideration of DACA even if you have accepted an offer of administrative closure or termination under the case-by-case review process.

**Q16: If I declined an offer of administrative closure under the case-by-case review process, can I be considered for deferred action under this process?**

A16: Yes. If you can demonstrate that you meet the guidelines, you will be able to request consideration of DACA even if you declined an offer of administrative closure under the case-by-case review process.

**Q17: If my case was reviewed as part of the case-by-case review process but I was not offered administrative closure, can I be considered for deferred action under this process?**

A17: Yes. If you can demonstrate that you meet the guidelines, you will be able to request consideration of DACA even if you were not offered administrative closure following review of your case as part of the case-by-case review process.

**Q18: Can I request consideration of DACA under this process if I am currently in a nonimmigrant status (e.g. F-1, E-2, H-4) or have Temporary Protected Status (TPS)?**

A18: No. You can only request consideration of DACA under this process if you currently have no immigration status and were not in any lawful status on June 15, 2012.

**Q19: Will the information I share in my request for consideration of DACA be used for immigration enforcement purposes?**

A19: Information provided in this request is protected from disclosure to ICE and CBP for the purpose of immigration enforcement proceedings unless the requestor meets the criteria for the issuance of a Notice To Appear or a referral to ICE under the criteria set forth in USCIS' Notice to Appear guidance ([www.uscis.gov/NTA](http://www.uscis.gov/NTA)). Individuals whose cases are deferred pursuant to DACA will not be referred to ICE. The information may be shared with national security and law enforcement agencies, including ICE and CBP, for purposes other than removal, including for assistance in the consideration of DACA, to identify or prevent fraudulent claims, for national security purposes, or for the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense. The above information sharing policy covers family members and guardians, in addition to the requestor. This policy, which may be modified, superseded, or rescinded at any time without notice, is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by law by any party in any administrative, civil, or criminal matter.

**Q20: If my case is referred to ICE for immigration enforcement purposes or if I receive an NTA, will information related to my family members and guardians also be referred to ICE for immigration enforcement purposes?**

A20: If your case is referred to ICE for purposes of immigration enforcement or you receive an NTA, information related to your family members or guardians that is contained in your request will not be

referred to ICE for purposes of immigration enforcement against family members or guardians. However, that information may be shared with national security and law enforcement agencies, including ICE and CBP, for purposes other than removal, including for assistance in the consideration of DACA, to identify or prevent fraudulent claims, for national security purposes, or for the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense.

This policy, which may be modified, superseded, or rescinded at any time without notice, is not intended to, does not, and may not be relied upon to create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any party in any administrative, civil, or criminal matter.

### **Q21: Will USCIS verify documents or statements that I provide in support of a request for DACA?**

A21: USCIS has the authority to verify documents, facts, and statements that are provided in support of requests for DACA. USCIS may contact education institutions, other government agencies, employers, or other entities in order to verify information.

[Return to top.](#)

## **C. Background Checks**

### **Q22: Will USCIS conduct a background check when reviewing my request for consideration of DACA?**

A22: Yes. You must undergo biographic and biometric background checks before USCIS will consider your DACA request.

### **Q23: What do background checks involve?**

A23: Background checks involve checking biographic and biometric information provided by the individuals against a variety of databases maintained by DHS and other federal government agencies.

### **Q24: What steps will USCIS and ICE take if I engage in fraud through the new process?**

A24: If you knowingly make a misrepresentation, or knowingly fail to disclose facts, in an effort to obtain DACA or work authorization through this process, you will be treated as an immigration enforcement priority to the fullest extent permitted by law, and be subject to criminal prosecution and/or removal from the United States.

[Return to top.](#)

## **D. After USCIS Makes a Decision**

### **Q25: Can I appeal USCIS' determination?**

A25: No. You cannot file a motion to reopen or reconsider, and cannot appeal the decision if USCIS denies your request for consideration of DACA.

You may request a review of your I-821D denial by contacting USCIS' National Customer Service Center at 1-800-375-5283 to have a service request created if you believe that you actually did meet all of the DACA guidelines and you believe that your request was denied because USCIS:

- Denied the request based on abandonment, when you actually responded to a Request for Evidence (RFE) or Notice of Intent to Deny (NOID) within the prescribed time;
- Mailed the RFE or NOID to the wrong address although you had changed your address online at [www.uscis.gov](http://www.uscis.gov) or with a customer service representative on the phone and submitted a Form AR-11, Change of Address, before USCIS issued the RFE or NOID.
  - To ensure the address is updated on a pending case as quickly as possible, we recommend that customers submit a change of address request at [www.uscis.gov/addresschange](http://www.uscis.gov/addresschange). Please note that only an online change of address or a Form AR-11 submission will satisfy the legal requirements for notifying the agency of an address change. Therefore, if you called a customer

service representative to change your address, please be sure you have also submitted your address change online or with a Form AR-11.

- Denied the request on the grounds that you did not come to the United States prior to your 16th birthday, but the evidence submitted at the time of filing shows that you did arrive before reaching that age.
- Denied the request on the grounds that you were under age 15 at the time of filing but not in removal proceedings, while the evidence submitted at the time of filing show that you indeed were in removal proceedings when the request was filed;
- Denied the request on the grounds that you were 31 or older as of June 15, 2012, but the evidence submitted at the time of filing shows that you were under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012;
- Denied the request on the grounds that you had lawful status on June 15, 2012, but the evidence submitted at the time of filing shows that you indeed were in an unlawful immigration status on that date;
- Denied the request on the grounds that you were not physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012, and up through the date of filing, but the evidence submitted at the time of filing shows that you were, in fact, present;
- Denied the request due to your failure to appear at a USCIS Application Support Center (ASC) to have your biometrics collected, when you in fact either did appear at a USCIS ASC to have this done or requested prior to the scheduled date of your biometrics appointment to have the appointment rescheduled; or
- Denied the request because you did not pay the filing fees for Form I-765, Application for Employment Authorization, when you actually did pay these fees

If you believe your request was denied due to any of these administrative errors, you may contact our National Customer Service Center at 1-800-375-5283 or 1-800-767-1833 (TDD for the hearing impaired). Customer service officers are available Monday – Friday from 8 a.m. – 6 p.m. in each U.S. time zone.

**Q26: If USCIS does not exercise deferred action in my case, will I be placed in removal proceedings?**

A26: If you have submitted a request for consideration of DACA and USCIS decides not to defer action in your case, USCIS will apply its policy guidance governing the referral of cases to ICE and the issuance of Notices to Appear (NTA). If your case does not involve a criminal offense, fraud, or a threat to national security or public safety, your case will not be referred to ICE for purposes of removal proceedings except where DHS determines there are exceptional circumstances. For more detailed information on the applicable NTA policy, visit [www.uscis.gov/NTA](http://www.uscis.gov/NTA). If after a review of the totality of circumstances USCIS determines to defer action in your case, USCIS will likewise exercise its discretion and will not issue you an NTA.

**Q27: Can my deferred action under the DACA process be terminated before it expires?**

A27: Yes.

DACA is an exercise of prosecutorial discretion and deferred action may be terminated at any time, with or without a Notice of Intent to Terminate, at DHS's discretion.

[Return to top.](#)

## II. Initial Requests for DACA

**Q28: What guidelines must I meet to be considered for deferred action for childhood arrivals (DACA)?**

A28: Under the Secretary of Homeland Security's June 15, 2012 memorandum, in order to be considered for DACA, you must submit evidence, including supporting documents, showing that you:

1. Were under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012;
2. Came to the United States before reaching your 16th birthday;
3. Have continuously resided in the United States since June 15, 2007, up to the present time;
4. Were physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012, and at the time of making your request for consideration of deferred action with USCIS;
5. Had no lawful status on June 15, 2012;
6. Are currently in school, have graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, have obtained a General Educational Development (GED) certificate, or are an honorably discharged veteran of the Coast Guard or Armed Forces of the United States; and
7. Have not been convicted of a felony, significant misdemeanor, three or more other misdemeanors, and do not otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety.

These guidelines must be met for consideration of DACA. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) retains the ultimate discretion to determine whether deferred action is appropriate in any given case even if the guidelines are met.

**Q29: How old must I be in order to be considered for deferred action under this process?**

A29:

- If you have never been in removal proceedings, or your proceedings have been terminated before your request for consideration of DACA, you must be at least 15 years of age or older at the time of filing and meet the other guidelines.
- If you are in removal proceedings, have a final removal order, or have a voluntary departure order, and are not in immigration detention, you can request consideration of DACA even if you are under the age of 15 at the time of filing and meet the other guidelines.
- In all instances, you must have been under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012, to be considered for DACA.

**Q30: I first came to the United States before I turned 16 years old and have been continuously residing in the United States since at least June 15, 2007. Before I turned 16 years old, however, I left the United States for some period of time before returning and beginning my current period of continuous residence. May I be considered for deferred action under this process?**

A30: Yes, but only if you established residence in the United States during the period before you turned 16 years old, as evidenced, for example, by records showing you attended school or worked in the United States during that time, or that you lived in the United States for multiple years during that time. In addition to establishing that you initially resided in the United States before you turned 16 years old, you must also have maintained continuous residence in the United States from June 15, 2007, until the present time to be considered for deferred action under this process.

**Q31: To prove my continuous residence in the United States since June 15, 2007, must I provide evidence documenting my presence for every day, or every month, of that period?**

A31: To meet the continuous residence guideline, you must submit documentation that shows you have been living in the United States from June 15, 2007, up until the time of your request. You should provide documentation to account for as much of the period as reasonably possible, but there is no requirement that every day or month of that period be specifically accounted for through direct evidence.

It is helpful to USCIS if you can submit evidence of your residence during at least each year of the period. USCIS will review the documentation in its totality to determine whether it is more likely than not that you were continuously residing in the United States for the period since June 15, 2007. Gaps in the documentation as to certain periods may raise doubts as to your continued residence if, for example, the gaps are lengthy or the record otherwise indicates that you may have been outside the United States for a period of time that was not brief, casual or innocent.

If gaps in your documentation raise questions, USCIS may issue a Request for Evidence to allow you to submit additional documentation that supports your claimed continuous residence.

Affidavits may be submitted to explain a gap in the documentation demonstrating that you meet the five-year continuous residence requirement. If you submit affidavits related to the continuous residence requirement, you must submit two or more affidavits, sworn to or affirmed by people other than yourself who have direct personal knowledge of the events and circumstances during the period as to which there is a gap in the documentation. Affidavits may only be used to explain gaps in your continuous residence; they cannot be used as evidence that you meet the entire five-year continuous residence requirement.

**Q32: Does “currently in school” refer to the date on which the request for consideration of deferred action is filed?**

A32: To be considered “currently in school” under the guidelines, you must be enrolled in school on the date you submit a request for consideration of deferred action under this process.

**Q33: Who is considered to be “currently in school” under the guidelines?**

A33: To be considered “currently in school” under the guidelines, you must be enrolled in:

- a public, private, or charter elementary school, junior high or middle school, high school, secondary school, alternative program, or homeschool program that meets state requirements;
- an education, literacy, or career training program (including vocational training) that has a purpose of improving literacy, mathematics, or English or is designed to lead to placement in postsecondary education, job training, or employment and where you are working toward such placement; or
- an education program assisting students either in obtaining a regular high school diploma or its recognized equivalent under state law (including a certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or alternate award), or in passing a GED exam or other state-authorized exam (e.g., HiSet or TASC) in the United States.

Such education, literacy, career training programs (including vocational training), or education programs assisting students in obtaining a regular high school diploma or its recognized equivalent under state law, or in passing a GED exam or other state-authorized exam in the United States, include, but are not limited to, programs funded, in whole or in part, by federal, state, county or municipal grants or administered by non-profit organizations. Programs funded by other sources may qualify if they are programs of demonstrated effectiveness.

In assessing whether such programs not funded in whole or in part by federal, state, county or municipal grants or administered by non-profit organizations are of demonstrated effectiveness, USCIS will consider the duration of the program’s existence; the program’s track record in assisting students in obtaining a regular high school diploma or its recognized equivalent, in passing a GED or other state-authorized exam (e.g., HiSet or TASC), or in placing students in postsecondary education, job training, or employment; and other indicators of the program’s overall quality. For individuals seeking to demonstrate that they are “currently in school” through enrollment in such a program, the burden is on the requestor to show the program’s demonstrated effectiveness.

**Q34: How do I establish that I am currently in school?**

A34: Documentation sufficient for you to demonstrate that you are currently in school may include, but is not limited to:

- evidence that you are enrolled in a public, private, or charter elementary school, junior high or middle school, high school or secondary school; alternative program, or homeschool program that meets state requirements; or
- evidence that you are enrolled in an education, literacy, or career training program (including vocational training) that:

- has a purpose of improving literacy, mathematics, or English, or is designed to lead to placement in postsecondary education, job training, or employment and where you are working toward such placement; and
- is funded, in whole or in part, by federal, state, county or municipal grants or is administered by non-profit organizations, or if funded by other sources, is a program of demonstrated effectiveness; or
- evidence that you are enrolled in an education program assisting students in obtaining a high school equivalency diploma or certificate recognized under state law (such as by passing a GED exam or other such state-authorized exam [for example, HiSet or TASC]), and that the program is funded in whole or in part by federal, state, county or municipal grants or is administered by non-profit organizations or if funded by other sources, is of demonstrated effectiveness.

Such evidence of enrollment may include: acceptance letters, school registration cards, letters from a school or program, transcripts, report cards, or progress reports which may show the name of the school or program, date of enrollment, and current educational or grade level, if relevant.

**Q35: What documentation may be sufficient to demonstrate that I have graduated from high school?**

A35: Documentation sufficient for you to demonstrate that you have graduated from high school may include, but is not limited to, a high school diploma from a public or private high school or secondary school, a certificate of completion, a certificate of attendance, or an alternate award from a public or private high school or secondary school, or a recognized equivalent of a high school diploma under state law, or a GED certificate or certificate from passing another such state authorized exam (e.g., HiSet or TASC) in the United States.

**Q36: What documentation may be sufficient to demonstrate that I have obtained a GED certificate or certificate from passing another such state authorized exam (e.g., HiSet or TASC)?**

A36: Documentation may include, but is not limited to, evidence that you have passed a GED exam, or other state-authorized exam (e.g., HiSet or TASC), and, as a result, have received the recognized equivalent of a regular high school diploma under state law.

**Q37: If I am enrolled in a literacy or career training program, can I meet the guidelines?**

A37: Yes, in certain circumstances. You may meet the guidelines if you are enrolled in an education, literacy, or career training program that has a purpose of improving literacy, mathematics, or English or is designed to lead to placement in postsecondary education, job training, or employment and where you are working toward such placement. Such programs include, but are not limited to, programs funded, in whole or in part, by federal, state, county or municipal grants or administered by non-profit organizations, or if funded by other sources, are programs of demonstrated effectiveness.

**Q38: If I am enrolled in an English as a Second Language (ESL) program, can I meet the guidelines?**

A38: Yes, in certain circumstances. Enrollment in an ESL program may be used to meet the guidelines if the ESL program is funded in whole or in part by federal, state, county or municipal grants, or administered by non-profit organizations, or if funded by other sources is a program of demonstrated effectiveness. You must submit direct documentary evidence that the program is funded in whole or part by federal, state, county or municipal grants, administered by a non-profit organization, or of demonstrated effectiveness.

**Q39: Will USCIS consider evidence other than that listed in Chart #1 to show that I have met the education guidelines?**

A39: No. Evidence not listed in Chart #1 will not be accepted to establish that you are currently in school, have graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, or have obtained a GED or passed another state-authorized exam (e.g., HiSet or TASC). You must submit any of the documentary evidence listed in Chart #1 to show that you meet the education guidelines.

**Q40: Will USCIS consider evidence other than that listed in Chart #1 to show that I have met certain initial guidelines?**

A40: Evidence other than those documents listed in Chart #1 may be used to establish the following guidelines and factual showings if available documentary evidence is insufficient or lacking and shows that:

- You were physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012;
- You came to the United States before reaching your 16th birthday;
- You satisfy the continuous residence requirement, as long as you present direct evidence of your continued residence in the United States for a portion of the required period and the circumstantial evidence is used only to fill in gaps in the length of continuous residence demonstrated by the direct evidence; and
- Any travel outside the United States during the period of required continuous presence was brief, casual, and innocent.

However, USCIS will not accept evidence other than the documents listed in Chart #1 as proof of any of the following guidelines to demonstrate that you:

- Were under the age of 31 on June 15, 2012; and
- Are currently in school, have graduated or obtained a certificate of completion from high school, have obtained a GED certificate, or are an honorably discharged veteran of the Coast Guard or Armed Forces of the United States.

For example, even if you do not have documentary proof of your presence in the United States on June 15, 2012, you may still be able to satisfy the guideline. You may do so by submitting credible documentary evidence that you were present in the United States shortly before and shortly after June 15, 2012, which, under the facts presented, may give rise to an inference of your presence on June 15, 2012 as well. However, evidence other than that listed in Chart #1 will not be accepted to establish that you have graduated high school. You must submit the designated documentary evidence to satisfy that you meet this guideline.

Chart #1 provides examples of documentation you may submit to demonstrate you meet the initial guidelines for consideration of deferred action under this process. Please see the instructions of [Form I-821D, Consideration of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals](#), for additional details of acceptable documentation.

<b>Chart #1 Examples of Documents to Submit to Demonstrate You Meet the Guidelines</b>	
Proof of identity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passport or national identity document from your country of origin</li> <li>• Birth certificate with photo identification</li> <li>• School or military ID with photo</li> <li>• Any U.S. government immigration or other document bearing your name and photo</li> </ul>

**Chart #1 Examples of Documents to Submit to Demonstrate You Meet the Guidelines**

<p>Proof you came to U.S. before your 16th birthday</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Passport with admission stamp</li> <li>• Form I-94/I-95/I-94W</li> <li>• School records from the U.S. schools you have attended</li> <li>• Any Immigration and Naturalization Service or DHS document stating your date of entry (Form I-862, Notice to Appear)</li> <li>• Travel records</li> <li>• Hospital or medical records</li> <li>• Rent receipts or utility bills</li> <li>• Employment records (pay stubs, W-2 Forms, etc.)</li> <li>• Official records from a religious entity confirming participation in a religious ceremony</li> <li>• Copies of money order receipts for money sent in or out of the country</li> <li>• Birth certificates of children born in the U.S.</li> <li>• Dated bank transactions</li> <li>• Automobile license receipts or registration</li> <li>• Deeds, mortgages, rental agreement contracts</li> <li>• Tax receipts, insurance policies</li> </ul>
<p>Proof of immigration status</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Form I-94/I-95/I-94W with authorized stay expiration date</li> <li>• Final order of exclusion, deportation, or removal issued as of June 15, 2012</li> <li>• A charging document placing you into removal proceedings</li> </ul>
<p>Proof of presence in U.S. on June 15, 2012</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rent receipts or utility bills</li> <li>• Employment records (pay stubs, W-2 Forms, etc.)</li> <li>• School records (letters, report cards, etc.)</li> <li>• Military records (Form DD-214 or NGB Form 22)</li> </ul>
<p>Proof you continuously resided in U.S. since June 15, 2007</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Official records from a religious entity confirming participation in a religious ceremony</li> <li>• Copies of money order receipts for money sent in or out of the country</li> <li>• Passport entries</li> <li>• Birth certificates of children born in the U.S.</li> <li>• Dated bank transactions</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Automobile license receipts or registration</li> <li>• Deeds, mortgages, rental agreement contracts</li> <li>• Tax receipts, insurance policies</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School records (transcripts, report cards, etc.) from the school that</li> </ul>

Proof of your education status at the time of requesting consideration of	you are currently attending in the United States showing the name(s) of the school(s) and periods of school attendance and the current educational or grade level
DACA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• U.S. high school diploma, certificate of completion, or other alternate award</li> <li>• High school equivalency diploma or certificate recognized under state law</li> <li>• Evidence that you passed a state-authorized exam, including the GED or other state-authorized exam (for example, HiSet or TASC) in the United States</li> </ul>
Proof you are an honorably discharged veteran of the U.S. Armed Forces or the U.S. Coast Guard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Form DD-214, Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty</li> <li>• NGB Form 22, National Guard Report of Separation and Record of Service</li> <li>• Military personnel records</li> <li>• Military health records</li> </ul>

#### **Q41: May I file affidavits as proof that I meet the initial guidelines for consideration of DACA?**

A41: Affidavits generally will not be sufficient on their own to demonstrate that you meet the guidelines for USCIS to consider you for DACA. However, affidavits may be used to support meeting the following guidelines only if the documentary evidence available to you is insufficient or lacking:

- Demonstrating that you meet the five year continuous residence requirement; and
- Establishing that departures during the required period of continuous residence were brief, casual and innocent.

If you submit affidavits related to the above criteria, you must submit two or more affidavits, sworn to or affirmed by people other than yourself, who have direct personal knowledge of the events and circumstances. Should USCIS determine that the affidavits are insufficient to overcome the unavailability or the lack of documentary evidence with respect to either of these guidelines, it will issue a Request for Evidence, indicating that further evidence must be submitted to demonstrate that you meet these guidelines.

USCIS will not accept affidavits as proof of satisfying the following guidelines:

- You are currently in school, have graduated or obtained a certificate of completion or other alternate award from high school, have obtained a high school equivalency diploma or certificate (such as by passing the GED exam or other state-authorized exam [for example, HiSet or TASC]), or are an honorably discharged veteran from the Coast Guard or Armed Forces of the United States;
- You were physically present in the United States on June 15, 2012;
- You came to the United States before reaching your 16th birthday;
- You were under the age of 31 on June 15, 2012; and
- Your criminal history, if applicable.

If the only evidence you submit to demonstrate you meet any of the above guidelines is an affidavit, USCIS will issue a Request for Evidence, indicating that you have not demonstrated that you meet these guidelines and that you must do so in order to demonstrate that you meet that guideline.

#### **Q42: Will I be considered to be in unlawful status if I had an application for asylum or cancellation of removal pending before either USCIS or the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) on June**

**15, 2012?**

A42: Yes. If you had an application for asylum or cancellation of removal, or similar relief, pending before either USCIS or EOIR as of June 15, 2012, but had no lawful status, you may request consideration of DACA.

**Q43: I was admitted for "duration of status" or for a period of time that extended past June 14, 2012, but violated my immigration status (e.g., by engaging in unauthorized employment, failing to report to my employer, or failing to pursue a full course of study) before June 15, 2012. May I be considered for deferred action under this process?**

A43: No, unless the Executive Office for Immigration Review terminated your status by issuing a final order of removal against you before June 15, 2012.

**Q44: I was admitted for "duration of status" or for a period of time that extended past June 14, 2012 but "aged out" of my dependent nonimmigrant status as of June 15, 2012. May I be considered for deferred action under this process?**

A44: Yes. For purposes of satisfying the "had no lawful status on June 15, 2012," guideline alone, if you were admitted for "duration of status" or for a period of time that extended past June 14, 2012 but "aged out" of your dependent nonimmigrant status, on or before June 15, 2012, (meaning you turned 21 years old on or before June 15, 2012), you may be considered for deferred action under this process.

**Q45: I was admitted for "duration of status" but my status in SEVIS is listed as terminated on or before June 15, 2012. May I be considered for deferred action under this process?**

A45: Yes. For the purposes of satisfying the "had no lawful status on June 15, 2012," guideline alone, if your status as of June 15, 2012, is listed as "terminated" in SEVIS, you may be considered for deferred action under this process.

**Q46: I am a Canadian citizen who was inspected by CBP but was not issued an I-94 at the time of admission. May I be considered for deferred action under this process?**

A46: In general, a Canadian citizen who was admitted as a visitor for business or pleasure and not issued an I-94, Arrival/Departure Record, (also known as a "non-controlled" Canadian nonimmigrant) is lawfully admitted for a period of six months. For that reason, unless there is evidence, including verifiable evidence provided by the individual, that he or she was specifically advised that his or her admission would be for a different length of time, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) will consider for DACA purposes only, that the alien was lawfully admitted for a period of six months. Therefore, if DHS is able to verify from its records that your last non-controlled entry occurred on or before Dec. 14, 2011, DHS will consider your nonimmigrant visitor status to have expired as of June 15, 2012 and you may be considered for deferred action under this process.

**Q47: I used my Border Crossing Card (BCC) to obtain admission to the United States and was not issued an I-94 at the time of admission. May I be considered for deferred action under this process?**

A47: Because the limitations on entry for a BCC holder vary based on location of admission and travel, DHS will assume that the BCC holder who was not provided an I-94 was admitted for the longest period legally possible—30 days—unless the individual can demonstrate, through verifiable evidence, that he or she was specifically advised that his or her admission would be for a different length of time. Accordingly, if DHS is able to verify from its records that your last admission was using a BCC, you were not issued an I-94 at the time of admission, and it occurred on or before May 14, 2012, DHS will consider your nonimmigrant visitor status to have expired as of June 15, 2012, and you may be considered for deferred action under this process.

**Q48: Do I accrue unlawful presence if I have a pending initial request for consideration of DACA?**

A48: You will continue to accrue unlawful presence while the request for consideration of DACA is pending unless you are under 18 years of age at the time of the request. If you are under 18 years of age at the time you submit your request, you will not accrue unlawful presence while the request is pending, even if you

turn 18 while your request is pending with USCIS. If action on your case is deferred, you will not accrue unlawful presence during the period of deferred action. However, having action deferred on your case will not excuse previously accrued unlawful presence.

[Return to top.](#)

### III. Renewal of DACA

#### **Q49: When should I file my renewal request with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)?**

A49: USCIS strongly encourages you to submit your Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) renewal request between 150 days and 120 days before the expiration date located on your current Form I-797 DACA approval notice and Employment Authorization Document (EAD). Filing during this window will minimize the possibility that your current period of DACA will expire before you receive a decision on your renewal request.

USCIS' current goal is to process DACA renewal requests within 120 days. You may submit an inquiry about the status of your renewal request after it has been pending more than 105 days. To submit an inquiry online, please visit [egov.uscis.gov/e-request](http://egov.uscis.gov/e-request).

- **Please Note:** Factors that may affect the timely processing of your DACA renewal request include, but are not limited to:
  - Failure to appear at an Application Support Center (ASC) for a scheduled biometrics appointment to obtain fingerprints and photographs. No-shows or rescheduling appointments will require additional processing time.
  - Issues of national security, criminality or public safety discovered during the background check process that require further vetting.
  - Issues of travel abroad that need additional evidence/clarification.
  - Name/date of birth discrepancies that may require additional evidence/clarification.
  - The renewal submission was incomplete or contained evidence that suggests a requestor may not satisfy the DACA renewal guidelines and USCIS must send a request for additional evidence or explanation

#### **Q50: Can I file a renewal request outside the recommended filing period of 150 days to 120 days before my current DACA expires?**

A50: USCIS strongly encourages you to file your renewal request within the recommended 150-120 day filing period to minimize the possibility that your current period of DACA will expire before you receive a decision on your renewal request. Requests received earlier than 150 days in advance will be accepted; however, this could result in an overlap between your current DACA and your renewal. This means your renewal period may extend for less than a full two years from the date that your current DACA period expires..

If you file after the recommended filing period (meaning less than 120 days before your current period of DACA expires), there is an increased possibility that your current period of DACA and employment authorization will expire before you receive a decision on your renewal request. If you file after your most recent DACA period expired, but within one year of its expiration, you may submit a request to renew your DACA. If you are filing beyond one year after your most recent period of DACA expired, you may still request DACA by submitting a new initial request.

#### **Q51: How will USCIS evaluate my request for renewal of DACA:**

A51: You may be considered for renewal of DACA if you met the guidelines for consideration of Initial DACA (see above) AND you:

- Did not depart the United States on or after Aug. 15, 2012, without advance parole;

- Have continuously resided in the United States since you submitted your most recent request for DACA that was approved up to the present time; and
- Have not been convicted of a felony, a significant misdemeanor, or three or more misdemeanors, and do not otherwise pose a threat to national security or public safety.

These guidelines must be met for consideration of DACA renewal. USCIS retains the ultimate discretion to determine whether deferred action is appropriate in any given case even if the guidelines are met.

**Q52 Do I accrue unlawful presence if I am seeking renewal and my previous period of DACA expires before I receive a renewal of deferred action under DACA? Similarly, what would happen to my work authorization?**

A52: Yes, if your previous period of DACA expires before you receive a renewal of deferred action under DACA, you will accrue unlawful presence for any time between the periods of deferred action unless you are under 18 years of age at the time you submit your renewal request.

Similarly, if your previous period of DACA expires before you receive a renewal of deferred action under DACA, you will not be authorized to work in the United States regardless of your age at time of filing until and unless you receive a new employment authorization document from USCIS.

**Q53. Do I need to provide additional documents when I request renewal of deferred action under DACA?**

A53. No, unless you have *new* documents pertaining to removal proceedings or criminal history that you have not already submitted to USCIS in a previously approved DACA request. USCIS, however, reserves the authority to request at its discretion additional documents, information or statements relating to a DACA renewal request determination.

CAUTION: If you knowingly and willfully provide materially false information on Form I-821D, you will be committing a federal felony punishable by a fine, or imprisonment up to five years, or both, under 18 U.S.C. Section 1001. In addition, individuals may be placed into removal proceedings, face severe penalties provided by law, and be subject to criminal prosecution.

**Q54. If I am no longer in school, can I still request to renew my DACA?**

A54. Yes. Neither Form I-821D nor the instructions ask renewal requestors for information about continued school enrollment or graduation. The instructions for renewal requests specify that you may be considered for DACA renewal if you met the guidelines for consideration of initial DACA, including the educational guidelines and:

1. Did not depart the United States on or after August 15, 2012, without advance parole;
2. Have continuously resided in the United States, up to the present time, since you submitted your most recent request for DACA that was approved; and
3. Have not been convicted of a felony, a significant misdemeanor or three or more misdemeanors, and are not a threat to national security or public safety.

**Q55. If I initially received DACA and was under the age of 31 on June 15, 2012, but have since become 31 or older, can I still request a DACA renewal?**

A55. Yes. You may request consideration for a renewal of DACA as long as you were under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012.

## IV. Travel

**Q56: May I travel outside of the United States before I submit an initial Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) request or while my initial DACA request remains pending with the**

**Department of Homeland Security (DHS)?**

A56: Any unauthorized travel outside of the United States on or after Aug. 15, 2012, will interrupt your continuous residence and you will not be considered for deferred action under this process. Any travel outside of the United States that occurred on or after June 15, 2007, but before Aug. 15, 2012, will be assessed by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) to determine whether the travel qualifies as brief, casual and innocent. (See Chart #2.)

CAUTION: You should be aware that if you have been ordered deported or removed, and you then leave the United States, your departure will likely result in your being considered deported or removed, with potentially serious future immigration consequences.

**Q57: If my case is deferred under DACA, will I be able to travel outside of the United States?**

A57: Not automatically. If USCIS has decided to defer action in your case and you want to travel outside the United States, you must apply for advance parole by filing a [Form I-131, Application for Travel Document](#) and paying the applicable fee (\$575). USCIS will determine whether your purpose for international travel is justifiable based on the circumstances you describe in your request. Generally, USCIS will only grant advance parole if your travel abroad will be in furtherance of:

- humanitarian purposes, including travel to obtain medical treatment, attending funeral services for a family member, or visiting an ailing relative;
- educational purposes, such as semester-abroad programs and academic research, or;
- employment purposes such as overseas assignments, interviews, conferences or, training, or meetings with clients overseas.

Travel for vacation is not a valid basis for advance parole.

You may not apply for advance parole unless and until USCIS defers action in your case under the consideration of DACA. You cannot apply for advance parole at the same time as you submit your request for consideration of DACA. All advance parole requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

If USCIS has deferred action in your case under the DACA process after you have been ordered deported or removed, you may still request advance parole if you meet the guidelines for advance parole described above.

**CAUTION:** However, for those individuals who have been ordered deported or removed, before you actually leave the United States, you should seek to reopen your case before the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) and obtain administrative closure or termination of your removal proceeding. Even after you have asked EOIR to reopen your case, you should not leave the United States until after EOIR has granted your request. If you depart after being ordered deported or removed, and your removal proceeding has not been reopened and administratively closed or terminated, your departure may result in your being considered deported or removed, with potentially serious future immigration consequences. If you have any questions about this process, you may contact U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) through the local ICE Office of the Chief Counsel with jurisdiction over your case.

**CAUTION:** If you travel outside the United States on or after Aug. 15, 2012, without first receiving advance parole, your departure automatically terminates your deferred action under DACA.

**Q58: Do brief departures from the United States interrupt the continuous residence requirement?**

A58: A brief, casual and innocent absence from the United States will not interrupt your continuous residence. If you were absent from the United States, your absence will be considered brief, casual and innocent if it was on or after June 15, 2007, and before Aug. 15, 2012, and:

1. The absence was short and reasonably calculated to accomplish the purpose for the absence;
2. The absence was not because of an order of exclusion, deportation or removal;

3. The absence was not because of an order of voluntary departure, or an administrative grant of voluntary departure before you were placed in exclusion, deportation or removal proceedings; and
4. The purpose of the absence and/or your actions while outside the United States were not contrary to law.

Once USCIS has approved your request for DACA, you may file [Form I-131](#), Application for Travel Document, to request advance parole to travel outside of the United States.

CAUTION: If you travel outside the United States on or after Aug. 15, 2012, without first receiving advance parole, your departure automatically terminates your deferred action under DACA.

**Travel Guidelines (Chart #2)**

Travel Dates	Type of Travel	Does It Affect Continuous Residence
On or after June 15, 2007, but before Aug. 15, 2012	Brief, casual and innocent	No
	For an extended time  Because of an order of exclusion, deportation, voluntary departure, or removal  To participate in criminal activity	Yes
On or after Aug. 15, 2012, and before you have requested deferred action	Any	Yes. You cannot apply for advance parole unless and until DHS has determined whether to defer action in your case and you cannot travel until you receive advance parole.  In addition, if you have previously been ordered deported and removed and you depart the United States without taking additional steps to address your removal proceedings, your departure will likely result in your being considered deported or removed, with potentially serious future immigration consequences.

Travel Dates	Type of Travel	Does It Affect Continuous Residence
On or after Aug. 15, 2012, and after you have requested deferred action	Any	
On or after Aug. 15, 2012 and after receiving DACA	Any	It depends. If you travel after receiving advance parole, the travel will not interrupt your continuous residence. However, if you travel <i>without</i> receiving advance parole, the travel <i>will</i> interrupt your continuous residence.

**Q59: May I file a request for advance parole concurrently with my DACA package?**

A59: Concurrent filing of advance parole is not an option at this time. DHS is, however, reviewing its policy on concurrent filing of advance parole with a DACA request. In addition, DHS is also reviewing eligibility criteria for advance parole. If any changes to this policy are made, USCIS will update this FAQ and inform the public accordingly.

[Return to top.](#)

## V. Criminal Convictions

**Q60: If I have a conviction for a felony offense, a significant misdemeanor offense, or multiple misdemeanors, can I receive an exercise of prosecutorial discretion under this new process?**

A60: No. If you have been convicted of a felony offense, a significant misdemeanor offense, or three or more other misdemeanor offenses not occurring on the same date and not arising out of the same act, omission, or scheme of misconduct, you will not be considered for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) except where the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) determines there are exceptional circumstances.

**Q61: What offenses qualify as a felony?**

A61: A felony is a federal, state, or local criminal offense punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year.

**Q62: What offenses constitute a significant misdemeanor?**

A62: For the purposes of this process, a significant misdemeanor is a misdemeanor as defined by federal

law (specifically, one for which the maximum term of imprisonment authorized is one year or less but greater than five days) and that meets the following criteria:

1. Regardless of the sentence imposed, is an offense of domestic violence; sexual abuse or exploitation; burglary; unlawful possession or use of a firearm; drug distribution or trafficking; or, driving under the influence; or,
2. If not an offense listed above, is one for which the individual was sentenced to time in custody of more than 90 days. The sentence must involve time to be served in custody, and therefore does not include a suspended sentence.

The time in custody does not include any time served beyond the sentence for the criminal offense based on a state or local law enforcement agency honoring a detainer issued by U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). Notwithstanding the above, the decision whether to defer action in a particular case is an individualized, discretionary one that is made taking into account the totality of the circumstances. Therefore, the absence of the criminal history outlined above, or its presence, is not necessarily determinative, but is a factor to be considered in the unreviewable exercise of discretion. DHS retains the discretion to determine that an individual does not warrant deferred action on the basis of a single criminal offense for which the individual was sentenced to time in custody of 90 days or less.

### **Q63: What offenses constitute a non-significant misdemeanor?**

A63: For purposes of this process, a non-significant misdemeanor is any misdemeanor as defined by federal law (specifically, one for which the maximum term of imprisonment authorized is one year or less but greater than five days) and that meets the following criteria:

1. Is not an offense of domestic violence; sexual abuse or exploitation; burglary; unlawful possession or use of a firearm; drug distribution or trafficking; or, driving under the influence; and
2. Is one for which the individual was sentenced to time in custody of 90 days or less. The time in custody does not include any time served beyond the sentence for the criminal offense based on a state or local law enforcement agency honoring a detainer issued by ICE.

Notwithstanding the above, the decision whether to defer action in a particular case is an individualized, discretionary one that is made taking into account the totality of the circumstances. Therefore, the absence of the criminal history outlined above, or its presence, is not necessarily determinative, but is a factor to be considered in the unreviewable exercise of discretion.

### **Q64: If I have a minor traffic offense, such as driving without a license, will it be considered a non-significant misdemeanor that counts towards the “three or more non-significant misdemeanors” making me unable to receive consideration for an exercise of prosecutorial discretion under this new process?**

A64: A minor traffic offense will not be considered a misdemeanor for purposes of this process. However, your entire offense history can be considered along with other facts to determine whether, under the totality of the circumstances, you warrant an exercise of prosecutorial discretion.

It is important to emphasize that driving under the influence is a significant misdemeanor regardless of the sentence imposed.

### **Q65: What qualifies as a national security or public safety threat?**

A65: If the background check or other information uncovered during the review of your request for deferred action indicates that your presence in the United States threatens public safety or national security, you will not be able to receive consideration for an exercise of prosecutorial discretion except where DHS determines there are exceptional circumstances. Indicators that you pose such a threat include, but are not limited to, gang membership, participation in criminal activities, or participation in activities that threaten the United States.

# EXHIBIT C

## JUSTICE NEWS

### Attorney General Sessions Delivers Remarks on DACA

Washington, DC ~ Tuesday, September 5, 2017

---

#### Remarks as prepared for delivery

Good morning. I am here today to announce that the program known as DACA that was effectuated under the Obama Administration is being rescinded.

The DACA program was implemented in 2012 and essentially provided a legal status for recipients for a renewable two-year term, work authorization and other benefits, including participation in the social security program, to 800,000 mostly-adult illegal aliens.

This policy was implemented unilaterally to great controversy and legal concern after Congress rejected legislative proposals to extend similar benefits on numerous occasions to this same group of illegal aliens.

In other words, the executive branch, through DACA, deliberately sought to achieve what the legislative branch specifically refused to authorize on multiple occasions. Such an open-ended circumvention of immigration laws was an unconstitutional exercise of authority by the Executive Branch.

The effect of this unilateral executive amnesty, among other things, contributed to a surge of unaccompanied minors on the southern border that yielded terrible humanitarian consequences. It also denied jobs to hundreds of thousands of Americans by allowing those same jobs to go to illegal aliens.

We inherited from our Founders—and have advanced—an unsurpassed legal heritage, which is the foundation of our freedom, safety, and prosperity.

As the Attorney General, it is my duty to ensure that the laws of the United States are enforced and that the Constitutional order is upheld.

No greater good can be done for the overall health and well-being of our Republic, than preserving and strengthening the impartial rule of law. Societies where the rule of law is treasured are societies that tend to flourish and succeed.

Societies where the rule of law is subject to political whims and personal biases tend to become societies afflicted by corruption, poverty, and human suffering.

To have a lawful system of immigration that serves the national interest, we cannot admit everyone who would like to come here. That is an open border policy and the American people have rightly rejected it.

Therefore, the nation must set and enforce a limit on how many immigrants we admit each year and that means all can not be accepted.

This does not mean they are bad people or that our nation disrespects or demeans them in any way. It means we are properly enforcing our laws as Congress has passed them.

It is with these principles and duties in mind, and in light of imminent litigation, that we reviewed the Obama Administration's DACA policy.

Our collective wisdom is that the policy is vulnerable to the same legal and constitutional challenges that the courts recognized with respect to the DAPA program, which was enjoined on a nationwide basis in a decision affirmed by the

Fifth Circuit.

The Fifth Circuit specifically concluded that DACA had not been implemented in a fashion that allowed sufficient discretion, and that DAPA was “foreclosed by Congress’s careful plan.”

In other words, it was inconsistent with the Constitution’s separation of powers. That decision was affirmed by the Supreme Court by an equally divided vote.

If we were to keep the Obama Administration’s executive amnesty policy, the likeliest outcome is that it would be enjoined just as was DAPA. The Department of Justice has advised the President and the Department of Homeland Security that DHS should begin an orderly, lawful wind down, including the cancellation of the memo that authorized this program.

Acting Secretary Duke has chosen, appropriately, to initiate a wind down process. This will enable DHS to conduct an orderly change and fulfill the desire of this administration to create a time period for Congress to act—should it so choose. We firmly believe this is the responsible path.

Simply put, if we are to further our goal of strengthening the constitutional order and the rule of law in America, the Department of Justice cannot defend this type of overreach.

George Washington University Law School Professor Jonathan Turley [in testimony before the House Judiciary Committee](#) was clear about the enormous constitutional infirmities raised by these policies.

He said: “In ordering this blanket exception, President Obama was nullifying part of a law that he simply disagreed with. ...If a president can claim sweeping discretion to suspend key federal laws, the entire legislative process becomes little more than a pretense...The circumvention of the legislative process not only undermines the authority of this branch but destabilizes the tripartite system as a whole.”

Ending the previous Administration’s disrespect for the legislative process is an important first step. All immigration policies should serve the interests of the people of the United States—lawful immigrant and native born alike.

Congress should carefully and thoughtfully pursue the types of reforms that are right for the American people. Our nation is comprised of good and decent people who want their government’s leaders to fulfill their promises and advance an immigration policy that serves the national interest.

We are a people of compassion and we are a people of law. But there is nothing compassionate about the failure to enforce immigration laws.

Enforcing the law saves lives, protects communities and taxpayers, and prevents human suffering. Failure to enforce the laws in the past has put our nation at risk of crime, violence and even terrorism.

The compassionate thing is to end the lawlessness, enforce our laws, and, if Congress chooses to make changes to those laws, to do so through the process set forth by our Founders in a way that advances the interest of the nation.

That is what the President has promised to do and has delivered to the American people.

Under President Trump’s leadership, this administration has made great progress in the last few months toward establishing a lawful and constitutional immigration system. This makes us safer and more secure.

It will further economically the lives of millions who are struggling. And it will enable our country to more effectively teach new immigrants about our system of government and assimilate them to the cultural understandings that support it.

The substantial progress in reducing illegal immigration at our border seen in recent months is almost entirely the product of the leadership of President Trump and his inspired federal immigration officers. But the problem is not solved. And without more action, we could see illegality rise again rather than be eliminated.

As a candidate, and now in office, President Trump has offered specific ideas and legislative solutions that will protect American workers, increase wages and salaries, defend our national security, ensure the public safety, and increase

the general well-being of the American people.

He has worked closely with many members of Congress, including in the introduction of the RAISE Act, which would produce enormous benefits for our country. This is how our democratic process works.

There are many powerful interest groups in this country and every one of them has a constitutional right to advocate their views and represent whomever they choose.

But the Department of Justice does not represent any narrow interest or any subset of the American people. We represent all of the American people and protect the integrity of our Constitution. That is our charge.

We at Department of Justice are proud and honored to work to advance this vision for America and to do our best each day to ensure the safety and security of the American people.

Thank you.

---

**Speaker:**

[Attorney General Jeff Sessions](#)

**Attachment(s):**

[Download ag\\_letter\\_re\\_daca.pdf](#)

**Topic(s):**

Immigration

**Component(s):**

[Office of the Attorney General](#)

*Updated September 5, 2017*

# **EXHIBIT D**



Office of the Attorney General  
Washington, D. C. 20530

Dear Acting Secretary Duke,

I write to advise that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) should rescind the June 15, 2012, DHS Memorandum entitled "Exercising Prosecutorial Discretion with Respect to Individuals Who Came to the United States as Children," as well as any related memoranda or guidance. This policy, known as "Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals" (DACA), allows certain individuals who are without lawful status in the United States to request and receive a renewable, two-year presumptive reprieve from removal, and other benefits such as work authorization and participation in the Social Security program.

DACA was effectuated by the previous administration through executive action, without proper statutory authority and with no established end-date, after Congress' repeated rejection of proposed legislation that would have accomplished a similar result. Such an open-ended circumvention of immigration laws was an unconstitutional exercise of authority by the Executive Branch. The related Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents (DAPA) policy was enjoined on a nationwide basis in a decision affirmed by the Fifth Circuit on the basis of multiple legal grounds and then by the Supreme Court by an equally divided vote. *See Texas v. United States*, 86 F. Supp. 3d 591, 669-70 (S.D. Tex.), *aff'd*, 809 F.3d 134, 171-86 (5th Cir. 2015), *aff'd by equally divided Court*, 136 S. Ct. 2271 (2016). Then-Secretary of Homeland Security John Kelly rescinded the DAPA policy in June. Because the DACA policy has the same legal and constitutional defects that the courts recognized as to DAPA, it is likely that potentially imminent litigation would yield similar results with respect to DACA.

In light of the costs and burdens that will be imposed on DHS associated with rescinding this policy, DHS should consider an orderly and efficient wind-down process.

As Attorney General of the United States, I have a duty to defend the Constitution and to faithfully execute the laws passed by Congress. Proper enforcement of our immigration laws is, as President Trump consistently said, critical to the national interest and to the restoration of the rule of law in our country. The Department of Justice stands ready to assist and to continue to support DHS in these important efforts.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jefferson B. Sessions III".

Jefferson B. Sessions III