Plaintiffs submit this Notice of Supplemental Authority in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Enforcement of Settlement Agreement [Dkt. No. 190]. Attached as Exhibit A is a copy of the opinion from the United States District Court for the Central District of California in *Jenny L. Flores, et al. v. Jefferson B. Sessions, III, et al.*, Case No. CV 85-4544 DMG, Dkt. No. 363, 20-27 (C.D. Cal. June 27, 2017). This new and relevant authority, finding that the *Flores* Settlement Agreement regarding detention of immigrant minors extends to minors in expedited removal proceedings, supports Plaintiffs' Motion to compel the Government to uphold its obligations under the *Perez-Olano* Settlement Agreement.

In *Flores*, at issue before the court was a motion by plaintiff class members—accompanied and unaccompanied immigrant minors—to enforce a settlement agreement with the Government¹ regarding detention practices (the "*Flores* Agreement"). Exhibit A at 1. The plaintiffs identified several issues, including the Government's failure to make and record continuous efforts to release certain class members as required by the *Flores* Agreement, namely, accompanied minors in expedited removal proceedings. Exhibit A at 20.

As here, the Government argued that minors subject to expedited removal were excluded from the detention limitations in the *Flores* Agreement. Exhibit A at 20. The specific issue Judge Dolly Gee analyzed was "whether the statutes and accompanying regulations for detainees in expedited removal create an exception to the *Flores* Agreement's requirement that Defendants make and record prompt and continuous efforts toward the release of class members. The Court finds that they do not." Exhibit A at 23.

¹ The Government Defendants were Jefferson B. Sessions III and the U,S, Department of Homeland Security and its subordinate entities, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE") and U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP"). Exhibit A at 1.

1 The Court rejected the Government's arguments that children in expedited removal proceedings were not protected by the *Flores* Agreement's limits on 2 detention for minors. Exhibit A at 24. Instead, the Court found that "Defendants 3 are not absolved of their contractual obligation [under the Settlement Agreement] 4 by virtue of the expedited removal statute." Exhibit A at 27. 5 6 Such is the case here. Nothing in the Settlement Agreement at issue in the present case suggests that members of the class who are subject to expedited 7 removal are to be treated any differently than members of the class who are subject 8 to regular removal proceedings. And nothing in the federal law or regulations 9 permits the Government to exclude children in expedited removal proceedings from 10 the protections of the *Perez-Olano* Settlement Agreement. 11 12 Dated: July 13, 2017 Respectfully submitted, 13 14 By: <u>/s/ Pamela S. Palmer</u> 15 Pamela S. Palmer Anthony C. Vale Jessica A. Rickabaugh PEPPER HAMILTON LLP 16 17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs minor children D.S.R.-O, 18 V.G.R.-A., A.D.M.-L., J.E.L.-M. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28