

**17-2231(L)**

17-2232(C), 17-2233(C), 17-2240(XAP)

---

**United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fourth Circuit**

---

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ASSISTANCE PROJECT, etc., et al.,

*Plaintiffs-Appellees,*

ALLAN HAKKY, et al.,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, etc., et al.,

*Defendants-Appellants.*

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Maryland at Greenbelt

---

**BRIEF FOR AMICI CURIAE STATES OF NEW YORK, CALIFORNIA,  
CONNECTICUT, DELAWARE, ILLINOIS, IOWA, MAINE,  
MARYLAND, MASSACHUSETTS, NEW MEXICO, OREGON, RHODE  
ISLAND, VERMONT, VIRGINIA, and WASHINGTON, and the  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN SUPPORT OF APPELLEES**

---

BARBARA D. UNDERWOOD  
*Solicitor General*

ANISHA S. DASGUPTA  
*Deputy Solicitor General*

ZAINAB A. CHAUDHRY  
*Assistant Solicitor General  
of Counsel*

*(Counsel list continues on signature pages.)*

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN  
*Attorney General  
State of New York*  
120 Broadway  
New York, NY 10271  
(212) 416-8921

Dated: November 16, 2017

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
INTRODUCTION AND INTERESTS OF AMICI.....	1
ARGUMENT .....	5
I. THE PROCLAMATION PERPETUATES, AND MAKES PERMANENT, THE HARM THAT ITS PREDECESSOR ORDERS INFLICTED ON THE AMICI STATES.....	5
A. Harms to the Amici States’ Proprietary Interests. ....	5
B. Harms to the Amici States’ Sovereign and Quasi- Sovereign Interests .....	22
II. THE DISTRICT COURT DID NOT ABUSE ITS DISCRETION IN GRANTING THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION. ....	25
A. Balancing the Equities and Weighing the Relative Harms Tips Decidedly in Favor of Preliminary Relief.....	26
B. The Nationwide Scope of the Injunction Is Proper in View of the Proclamation’s Violations and Actual and Threatened Harms.....	32
CONCLUSION .....	35

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Alfred L. Snapp &amp; Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico ex rel. Barez</i> , 458 U.S. 592 (1982) .....	29
<i>American Civil Liberties Union of Ky. v. McCreary County, Ky.</i> , 354 F.3d 438 (6th Cir. 2003).....	27, 34
<i>Chaplaincy of Full Gospel Churches v. England</i> , 454 F.3d 290 (D.C. Cir. 2006) .....	27
<i>East Tenn. Nat. Gas Co. v. Sage</i> , 361 F.3d 808 (4th Cir. 2004).....	32
<i>Hawaii v. Trump</i> , 859 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2017).....	6, 25
<i>International Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump</i> , 857 F.3d 554 (4th Cir. 2017).....	passim
<i>Moore v. City of East Cleveland</i> , 431 U.S. 494 (1977) .....	28
<i>Ostergren v. Cuccinelli</i> , 615 F.3d 263 (4th Cir. 2010).....	34
<i>Trump v. International Refugee Assistance Project</i> , 137 S. Ct. 2080 (2017).....	26, 29
<i>United States v. Oakland Cannabis Buyers' Coop.</i> , 532 U.S. 483 (2001) .....	32
<i>Washington v. Trump</i> , 847 F.3d 1151 (9th Cir. 2017).....	25, 30
<i>Weinberger v. Romero-Barcelo</i> , 456 U.S. 305 (1982) .....	26
<i>Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.</i> , 555 U.S. 7 (2008) .....	26, 27

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<b>Cases</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>WV Association of Club Owners &amp; Fraternal Servs., Inc. v. Musgrave</i> , 553 F.3d 292 (4th Cir. 2009).....	26
 <b>Constitutions</b>	
Cal. Const.	
art. I, § 4 .....	22
art. I, § 7 .....	22
art. I, § 8 .....	22
art. I, § 31 .....	22
N.M. Const. art. II, § 11 .....	22
Ill. Const.	
art. I, § 3 .....	22
art. I, § 17 .....	22
 <b>Statutes</b>	
8 U.S.C. § 1182 .....	31
Cal. Civ. Code § 51(b) .....	22
Cal. Gov't Code	
§§ 11135-11137.....	22
§ 12900 et seq.....	22
Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46a-60 .....	22
Del. Code § 710 et seq.....	22
Ill. Comp. Stat.	
ch. 740, § 23/5(a)(1) .....	22
ch. 775, § 5/1-102(A).....	22
ch. 775, § 5/10-104(A)(1) .....	22
Maine Rev. Stat.	
§ 784.....	22
§ 4551-4634 .....	22

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<b>Statutes</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
Md. Code, State Gov't § 20-606.....	22
Mass. Gen. L.	
ch. 93, § 102.....	22
ch. 151B, § 1.....	22
ch. 151B, § 4.....	22
N.M. Stat. § 28-1-7.....	22
Or. Rev. Stat. § 659A.006(1).....	22
R.I. Gen. Laws § 28-5-7(1)(i).....	22
Vt. Stat.	
tit. 9, §§ 4500-4507.....	22
tit. 21, § 495.....	22
Wash. Rev. Code § 49.60.030(1).....	22
<b>Executive Orders/Proclamations</b>	
Executive Order No.13,769 (Jan. 27, 2017), 82 Fed.Reg. 8,977 (Feb. 1, 2017).....	2
Executive Order No.13,780 (Mar. 6, 2017), 82 Fed.Reg. 13,209 (Mar. 9, 2017).....	2
Proclamation No. 9645 (Sept. 24, 2017), 82 Fed.Reg. 45,161 (Sept. 27, 2017).....	passim
<b>Miscellaneous Authorities</b>	
Abha Bhattarai, <i>Even Canadians are Skipping Trips to the     U.S. After Trump Travel Ban</i> , Wash. Post (Apr. 14, 2017), at <a href="http://tinyurl.com/WashPost-Bhattarai-Tourism">http://tinyurl.com/WashPost-Bhattarai-Tourism</a> .....	19

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<b>Miscellaneous Authorities</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>
Alana Wise, <i>Travel to the United States Rose in April, But Industry Remains Wary</i> , Reuters (June 6, 2017), at <a href="http://tinyurl.com/Reuters-Wise-TraveltoUS">http://tinyurl.com/Reuters-Wise-TraveltoUS</a> .....	20
Anna Maria Barry-Jester, <i>Trump’s New Travel Ban Could Affect Doctors, Especially in the Rust Belt and Appalachia</i> , FiveThirtyEight (Mar. 6, 2017), at <a href="http://goo.gl/dT2Z6h">http://goo.gl/dT2Z6h</a> .....	24
Hironao Okahana, <i>Data Sources: Admissions Yields of Prospective International Graduate Students: A First Look</i> (Council of Graduate Schools, June 2017), <a href="http://tinyurl.com/CouncilGradSchs-Okahana-Survey">http://tinyurl.com/CouncilGradSchs-Okahana-Survey</a> .....	9
Immigrant Doctors Project, <a href="https://immigrantdoctors.org">https://immigrantdoctors.org</a> .....	24
Institute of Int’l Educ., <i>Advising International Students in an Age of Anxiety</i> (Mar. 31, 2017), at <a href="http://tinyurl.com/IIE-AdvisingStudents">http://tinyurl.com/IIE-AdvisingStudents</a> .....	19
Kirk Carapezza, <i>Travel Ban’s ‘Chilling Effect’ Could Cost Universities Hundreds of Millions</i> , Nat’l Pub. Radio (Apr. 7, 2017), at <a href="http://goo.gl/CqkNEy">http://goo.gl/CqkNEy</a> .....	9, 10
Maryam Saleh, <i>Hospitals in Trump Country Suffer As Muslim Doctors Denied Visas to U.S.</i> , The Intercept (Aug. 17, 2017), at <a href="http://tinyurl.com/Intercept-Saleh-MD">http://tinyurl.com/Intercept-Saleh-MD</a> .....	25
Sam Petulla, <i>Entry Ban Could Cause Doctor Shortages in Trump Territory, New Research Finds</i> , NBC News (Mar. 7, 2017), at <a href="http://tinyurl.com/NBCNews-Petulla-MDShortages">http://tinyurl.com/NBCNews-Petulla-MDShortages</a> .....	9, 14, 16
U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, <i>Reciprocity and Civil Documents by Country</i> , at <a href="https://travel.state.gov/content/visas/en/fees/reciprocity-by-country.html/">https://travel.state.gov/content/visas/en/fees/reciprocity-by-country.html/</a> .....	11

## INTRODUCTION AND INTERESTS OF AMICI

The States of New York, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington, and the District of Columbia, submit this brief as amici curiae in support of affirmance. This appeal arises from a challenge to Presidential Proclamation No. 9645: the third in a series of presidential orders executed this year that imposed discriminatory bans on the entry into the United States of nationals from six overwhelmingly Muslim countries.<sup>1</sup> The United States District Court for the District of Maryland (Chuang, J.) issued a preliminary injunction restraining defendants from implementing those sections of the Proclamation against individuals who have a bona fide relationship with a person or entity in the United States.<sup>2</sup> *IRAP v. Trump*, 2017 WL 4674314 (D.Md. Oct. 17, 2017). The district court held that interim relief was warranted because plaintiffs would experience irreparable injury in

---

<sup>1</sup> See Proclamation No.9645, § 2(a)-(c),(e),(g)-(h) (Sept. 24, 2017), 82 Fed. Reg. 45,161 (Sept. 27, 2017).

<sup>2</sup> The injunction does not cover the provisions that bar entry of a limited number of government officials from Venezuela and all North Korean nationals, see Proclamation § 2(d),(f).

the absence of an injunction, the balance of the equities favored an injunction, and plaintiffs had made a strong showing of the likelihood of success on the merits of their claims under Immigration and Nationality Act § 1152(a) and the Establishment Clause. This Court previously affirmed an injunction entered against the similar travel ban contained in the second of two Executive Orders that preceded the Proclamation,<sup>3</sup> in an earlier stage in this case.<sup>4</sup>

This brief supplements plaintiffs' brief by providing the perspective and experience of 15 additional sovereign States and the District of Columbia. Like its predecessors, the Proclamation's entry ban gravely and irreparably harms our universities, hospitals, businesses, communities, and residents. Keeping the preliminary injunction in place will continue to provide critical protection to the state interests the ban endangers.

---

<sup>3</sup> Executive Order No.13,780, §§ 2(c),6(a)-(b) (Mar. 6, 2017), 82 Fed.Reg. 13,209 (Mar. 9, 2017); *see also* Executive Order No.13,769, §§ 3(c),5(a)-(c),5(e) (Jan. 27, 2017), 82 Fed.Reg. 8,977 (Feb. 1, 2017).

<sup>4</sup> *See IRAP v. Trump*, 857 F.3d 554 (4th Cir.) (en banc), *cert. granted*, 137 S.Ct. 2080, *vacated and remanded*, 2017 WL 4518553 (Oct. 10, 2017).



Amici thus have a strong interest in plaintiffs' challenges to the Proclamation's entry ban. Indeed, like plaintiffs here, many of the amici States have brought suits challenging the two preceding Executive Orders on the grounds that certain provisions of those Orders violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment and various other constitutional and statutory provisions.<sup>5</sup> We have also previously filed briefs amicus curiae in this and related cases, including briefs supporting the entry of preliminary injunctions against the previous Orders, and briefs opposing any stay of such injunctions.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Many of the amici States challenged the March Order in *Washington v. Trump*, No.17-cv-141 (W.D.Wash. 2017). They challenged the January Order in *Washington v. Trump*, No.17-cv-141 (W.D.Wash. 2017), *stay pending appeal denied*, 847 F.3d 1151 (9th Cir. 2017); Mass. & N.Y. Amicus Br. (15 States and D.C.), *Washington v. Trump*, No.17-35105 (9th Cir. 2017), ECF No.58-2; *Aziz v. Trump*, 2017 WL 580855 (E.D.Va. 2017).

<sup>6</sup> N.Y. Amicus Br. (17 States and D.C.), *Trump v. IRAP* and *Trump v. Hawaii*, Nos.16-1436, 16-1540 (U.S. Sept. 18, 2017); N.Y. Amicus Br. (15 States and D.C.), *Trump v. Hawaii*, No.16-1540 (U.S. July 18, 2017); Va. Amicus Br. (16 States and D.C.), *Trump v. IRAP*, Nos.16-A1190, 16A-1191 (U.S. June 12, 2017); N.Y. Amicus Br. (16 States and D.C.), *Trump v. IRAP*, Nos.16A-1190, 16A-1191 (U.S. June 12, 2017); Ill. Amicus Br. (16 States and D.C.), *Hawaii v. Trump*, No.17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No.125; Va. & Md. Amicus Br. (16 States and D.C.), *IRAP v. Trump*, No.17-1351 (4th Cir. Apr. 19, 2017), ECF No.153.

While amici States differ in many ways, all benefit from immigration, tourism, and international travel by students, academics, skilled professionals, and businesspeople. Like the previous bans, the disputed provisions of the Proclamation continue to significantly disrupt the ability of our States' public colleges and universities to recruit and retain students and faculty, impairing academic staffing and research needs, and causing the loss of tuition and tax revenues, among other costs. The Proclamation likewise continues to disrupt the provision of medical care at amici States' hospitals and further harms our science, technology, finance, and tourism industries by inhibiting—permanently—the free exchange of information, ideas, and talent between the designated countries and our States, causing long-term economic and reputational damage. In addition, the ban has made it more difficult for the States to effectuate our own constitutional and statutory policies of religious tolerance and nondiscrimination.

If this Court vacates or narrows the preliminary injunction, all amici States will face further immediate, concrete—and likely permanent—harms flowing directly from the the disputed provisions of the Proclamation. Accordingly, amici States have a strong interest in

ensuring that the protection provided by the nationwide injunction remains in place throughout the course of this litigation.

## ARGUMENT

### **I. THE PROCLAMATION PERPETUATES, AND MAKES PERMANENT, THE HARM THAT ITS PREDECESSOR ORDERS INFLICTED ON THE AMICI STATES.**

#### **A. Harms to the Amici States' Proprietary Interests.**

The disputed provisions of the Proclamation block the entry of all immigrants and most nonimmigrants from six Muslim-majority countries,<sup>7</sup> including those who seek to be students and faculty at our public universities, physicians and researchers at our medical institutions, employees of our businesses, and guests who contribute to our economies when they come here as tourists or for family visits.<sup>8</sup> The

---

<sup>7</sup> Five of these countries were covered under the previous travel bans: Iran, Libya, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen. The sixth country is Chad.

<sup>8</sup> The Proclamation bars *all* immigration from the six affected countries; the issuance of all non-immigrant visas to Syrians; all business and tourist visas for nationals of Chad, Libya, and Yemen; and all nonimmigrant visas for nationals of Iran, except certain student and exchange visas that will be subject to additional but unspecified scrutiny. See § 2(a)-(c),(e),(g)-(h).

provisions are thus irreparably harming the work of our state institutions and treasuries.<sup>9</sup> See *Washington v. Trump*, 847 F.3d 1151, 1169 (9th Cir. 2017); *Hawaii v. Trump*, 859 F.3d 741, 783 (9th Cir. 2017) (recognizing such irreparable harms), *cert. granted*, 137 S.Ct. 2080, *vacated and remanded*, 2017 WL 4782860 (Oct. 24, 2017).

***Harms to State Colleges and Universities.*** State colleges and universities rely on faculty and students from across the world. By interfering with the entry of individuals from the designated countries, the disputed provisions of the Proclamation continue to seriously disrupt our public institutions' ability to recruit and retain students and faculty—causing lost tuition revenue, increased administrative burdens, and the expenditure of additional university resources.<sup>10</sup>

As with the two previous travel bans, announcement of the Proclamation's entry ban has created serious doubt as to whether faculty

---

<sup>9</sup> All of the amici States support the legal arguments put forth in this brief, although not every specified harm occurs in every State. For example, almost all amici States operate state hospitals, but Delaware does not.

<sup>10</sup> See Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 41, 43-44, 53, 55-56, 80, 93, 105, 107-108, 125, *Washington v. Trump*, No.17-cv-141 (W.D.Wash.), ECF No.198.

from the designated countries will be able to obtain the visas they need to timely assume positions with public universities in amici States. For example, two scholars who had accepted offers at the University of Washington in 2017 were unable to enter to begin their positions due to the initial travel ban.<sup>11</sup> Similarly, officials at the University of Massachusetts—which typically hires a dozen new employees from the affected countries annually—believe that the Proclamation’s now indefinite entry ban will result in the University being “permanently unable to hire top-ranked potential faculty, lecturers or visiting scholars from the affected countries, because [the Proclamation] may preclude them from reaching the United States to fulfill their teaching obligations.”<sup>12</sup>

The Proclamation’s entry ban also continues to disrupt the ability of our public universities to recruit and retain foreign students from the designated countries, imperiling hundreds of millions of tuition dollars

---

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* ¶ 40.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* ¶ 93.

and other revenue generated from such students, as well as important academic research projects.<sup>13</sup>

Before this series of travel bans was implemented, amici States' colleges and universities had already made numerous offers of admission for the 2017-2018 academic year to students from the affected countries and—but for the bans' interference with their continuing admissions process—might have admitted many more.<sup>14</sup> Some schools are continuing to make such offers, including to students from nations designated in the Proclamation. But some of these students have withdrawn applications; others have had to abandon entirely their plans to enroll in our university programs due to the bans; and many have chosen not to apply at all, resulting in a significant decline in international student applications at many of amici States' universities.<sup>15</sup>

Indeed, in this climate of uncertainty and discrimination, forty percent of colleges surveyed across the nation reported a drop in

---

<sup>13</sup> *E.g., id.* ¶¶ 38, 43-46, 53, 57, 86, 94-95, 105, 107, 112.

<sup>14</sup> *E.g., id.* ¶¶ 43-44.

<sup>15</sup> *E.g., id.* ¶¶ 37, 46, 53, 122.

applications from foreign students in the wake of the first two travel bans.<sup>16</sup> Graduate departments in science and engineering have reported that “international student applications for many programs declined by 20 to 30 percent for 2017 programs.”<sup>17</sup> Additionally, 80 percent of college registrars and admissions officials surveyed have serious concerns about their future application yields from international students.<sup>18</sup> And 46 percent of graduate deans have reported “substantial” declines in admission yields for international students.<sup>19</sup> Not surprisingly, countries that are perceived as more welcoming—such as Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand—have already seen a jump in

---

<sup>16</sup> See Kirk Carapezza, *Travel Ban’s ‘Chilling Effect’ Could Cost Universities Hundreds of Millions*, Nat’l Pub. Radio (Apr. 7, 2017) (internet). (For authorities available on the internet, full URLs are listed in the table of authorities.)

<sup>17</sup> Sam Petulla, *Entry Ban Could Cause Doctor Shortages in Trump Territory, New Research Finds*, NBC News (Mar. 7, 2017) (internet).

<sup>18</sup> Carapezza, *supra*.

<sup>19</sup> Hironao Okahana, *Data Sources: Admissions Yields of Prospective International Graduate Students* (Council of Graduate Schs., June 2017) (internet).

applications in this same time period.<sup>20</sup> This drain of highly qualified student talent will continue under the Proclamation.

The ability of state institutions of higher education to retain their existing foreign students and faculty has also been compromised by the broad, continuing entry ban contained in the Proclamation. Amici States' public universities and colleges currently have hundreds of students and faculty members from the targeted countries. For example, at Washington State University, there are 140 students and 9 faculty members from the countries designated in the Proclamation, and 105 such graduate students at the University of Washington.<sup>21</sup> The University of Massachusetts has 180 similarly situated students and 25 employees.<sup>22</sup> There are 529 such students in the University of California system; 250 in the California State University system; 297 at the State University of New York; and 61 at Portland State University.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Carapezza, *supra*.

<sup>21</sup> Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 35-36.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.* ¶¶ 91, 94.

<sup>23</sup> *Id.* ¶¶ 53, 58, 108, 124.



Many of these students will need to apply for additional visas during the course of their academic studies because only single-entry visas are permitted from some of the affected countries, and because the required visas are valid only for relatively short periods.<sup>24</sup> And those students and faculty members whose visas are set to expire will face obstacles to renewal—if renewal of their visas is even possible under the disputed provisions of the Proclamation, which prohibit the issuance of most nonimmigrant visas for nationals of the affected countries. Thus, if enforcement of the disputed provisions of the Proclamation is permitted, certain students who are no longer eligible for student visas (e.g., Syrian students) may be required to discontinue their courses of study. And other students will face the prospect of not knowing whether they may be denied access to the U.S. institutions where they are studying, particularly if the Proclamation calls for them to be subject to heightened scrutiny and vetting procedures (e.g., Iranian and Somali students).<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, *Reciprocity and Civil Documents by Country* (internet) (search by country and visa types F, M).

<sup>25</sup> Although the Proclamation gives consular officers discretion to waive the travel ban in individual cases, it does not describe the process

Any such visa delays or denials could jeopardize not only these individuals' education or employment, but also any grant funding and scientific research projects that depend on their work.<sup>26</sup> And those whose visas remain valid for a longer duration may be unwilling to take the risk of participating in educational, professional, or personal obligations that require travel outside the United States, and will also face the hardship of being unable to receive visits from their parents, spouses, children, and other relatives.<sup>27</sup> Indeed, many faculty members and researchers at amici States' universities are contemplating leaving their current positions for opportunities in more welcoming countries in the the wake of the Proclamation's now indefinite ban.<sup>28</sup>

---

for applying for a waiver, specify a time frame for receiving a waiver, or set concrete guidelines for issuance of a waiver beyond providing a list of circumstances in which waivers "may be appropriate." § 3(c). And there is no guarantee that a waiver will be issued because the ultimate decision on whether to issue it lies solely within a consular official's discretion. *See id.*

<sup>26</sup> Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 36, 42, 55, 91, 94.

<sup>27</sup> *Id.* ¶¶ 37-38, 54, 78-79, 91, 94, 107, 109-110, 112, 123.

<sup>28</sup> *Id.* ¶¶ 38, 42, 111.

The foreign-national scholars and faculty employed by or recruited by our state universities typically have specialized expertise that cannot easily be replaced. Universities that are delayed in or prevented from recruiting international faculty and related staff thus suffer significant financial and reputational harm, including delayed or lost federal funding for research efforts.<sup>29</sup> Our educational institutions have needed to expend considerable amounts of scarce university resources to make contingency plans for filling unexpected gaps in faculty rosters caused by the exclusion or possible departure of scholars from the designated countries. Despite this effort, there is no guarantee that our universities will be able to meet all of their needs.<sup>30</sup>

While public colleges and universities are always subject to federal immigration law and policy, these successive travel bans have injured them unexpectedly, by upending with no advance notice the established

---

<sup>29</sup> *Id.* ¶¶ 38, 43-44, 55, 105-106, 112.

<sup>30</sup> *Id.* ¶ 55 (Proclamation “disrupts the ability of California’s universities and colleges to meet staffing needs”); *id.* ¶ 93 (Proclamation will “severely interfere” with ability of University of Massachusetts “to hire top-ranked” faculty).

framework around which they have designed their faculty recruitment and student enrollment processes.<sup>31</sup> As explained above, this has left seats unfilled, tuition dollars irretrievably lost, and important academic programs and research projects in peril.

The disputed provisions of the Proclamation's third ban have also harmed and will continue to harm our educational institutions' core missions of excellence in education and scholarship. The loss of students, scholars, and faculty from the affected nations not only impairs important academic and medical research at our States' universities, but also inhibits the free exchange of information, ideas, and talent that is so essential to academic life and our state universities' missions.<sup>32</sup>

***Harms to State Hospitals and Medical Institutions.*** The disputed provisions of the Proclamation, like the travel bans of the earlier Executive Orders, have created staffing disruptions in state hospitals

---

<sup>31</sup> See Petulla, *supra* (University of Massachusetts and others have had to “shift[] their recruitment strategies to avoid a talent drought”).

<sup>32</sup> Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 38, 105-106.

and medical institutions, which employ physicians, medical residents, research faculty, and other professionals from the designated countries.<sup>33</sup>

For example, foreign-national medical residents at public hospitals often provide crucial services, such as caring for some of the most underserved populations in our States.<sup>34</sup> They are assigned to our state university hospital residency programs through a computerized “match” that, after applications and interviews, ranks and assigns residency candidates to programs nationwide; programs and candidates are advised of match results in the spring of each calendar year and all new residents begin their positions on July 1.<sup>35</sup>

Many state university residency programs regularly match residents from the affected countries. If a program’s matched residents are precluded from obtaining a visa under the disputed provisions of the

---

<sup>33</sup> *E.g., id.* ¶ 127 (Oregon Health and Sciences University employs 11 such individuals from seven of the countries designated in the Proclamation).

<sup>34</sup> *E.g., id.* ¶ 115 (New York’s public safety-net hospitals employ a “significant number” of foreign-national residents in 97 medically underserved communities).

<sup>35</sup> *Id.* ¶ 116.

Proclamation, as many of them were under the predecessor travel bans, the program risks having an insufficient number of residents to meet staffing needs.<sup>36</sup> This continuing uncertainty is of particular concern in view of the indefinite duration of the Proclamation's entry ban. The practical effect of this dilemma is that our state university programs will be reluctant (or unable) to interview or rank highly-qualified residency candidates from the designated countries going forward, because there is no guarantee they will be able to begin or complete their residencies.<sup>37</sup> Indeed, residency programs are at this very moment in the process of interviewing candidates for next year's match.<sup>38</sup>

In addition, if current residents who are nationals of the designated countries cannot renew or extend their visas—as the Proclamation continues to threaten—state university residency programs will be

---

<sup>36</sup> The 2017 match took place one day after the revised Executive Order was scheduled to take effect, and there was serious doubt whether “[a]s many as several hundred doctors” from the six countries designated in that Order would be granted waivers to be able to begin the residencies for which they had matched. Petulla, *supra*.

<sup>37</sup> Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 60, 115, 127.

<sup>38</sup> *Id.* ¶ 115.

unable to continue to employ them; these multiyear programs will then be left with unfilled positions, and further staffing gaps will result.<sup>39</sup> Such disruptions will translate into uncertainty in residency training programs, as well as threats to the provision and quality of health care services.<sup>40</sup> And because patients at our medical facilities must be cared for, our facilities must quickly adapt to any staffing complications resulting from the disputed provisions of the Proclamation—and spend precious time and resources preparing to do so.<sup>41</sup>

***Diminished Tax Revenues and Broader Economic Harms.*** In addition to losing the tuition, room and board, and other fees paid by students at our public universities, amici States have suffered—and will continue to suffer—other direct and substantial economic losses as a result of the disputed provisions of the Proclamation, just as we did under the Proclamation’s predecessors. Every foreign student (whether attending a public or private college or university), every tourist, and

---

<sup>39</sup> *Id.*

<sup>40</sup> See *infra* pp. 23-25.

<sup>41</sup> Third Am. Compl. ¶ 59 (shortage of “even one physician” can have “serious implications” for safety-net hospitals in underserved areas).

every business visitor arriving in our States contributes to our economies through their purchases of our goods and services and the tax receipts that their presence generates. Despite the present preliminary injunction, and those that were issued against the Proclamation's predecessor Orders, this series of successive travel bans during the past ten months has blocked or dissuaded thousands of individuals—potential consumers all—from entering amici States, thereby eliminating the significant tax contributions those individuals would have made.<sup>42</sup> That lost revenue will never be recovered and the lasting economic damage cannot be undone, even if plaintiffs ultimately prevail.

The contribution of foreign students alone to our States' economies is immense. A survey by the Institute of International Education conducted in the months following the issuance of the initial travel ban found that “more than 15,000 students enrolled at U.S. universities during 2015-16 were from the [six] countries named in [the revised Executive Order]”; more than half of those students attended institutions in amici States and Hawaii; and, nationwide, “these students contributed

---

<sup>42</sup> *See id.* ¶¶ 31-32, 62, 75, 87-88, 120-121.



\$496 million to the U.S. economy, including tuition, room and board and other spending.”<sup>43</sup> For example, in both New York and Illinois, nearly 1,000 foreign nationals from the countries designated in the revised Order were studying on temporary visas in 2015-2016 in each State, and they collectively contributed approximately \$30 million to each State’s economy.<sup>44</sup> And such figures do not even begin to account for the indirect economic benefits to our States, such as the contributions of international students and scholars to innovation in academic and medical research.

Tourism dollars are also a critical component of amici States’ economies. As a result of the successive travel bans, including the ban announced in the Proclamation, an estimated 4.3 million fewer tourists are expected to visit the United States this year, resulting in \$7.4 billion in lost revenue; and in 2018, those numbers will increase to 6.3 million fewer tourists and \$10.8 billion in lost revenue.<sup>45</sup> This reduction results

---

<sup>43</sup> Institute of Int’l Educ., *Advising International Students in an Age of Anxiety* 3 (Mar. 31, 2017) (internet).

<sup>44</sup> *See id.* at app. 1.

<sup>45</sup> *See* Abha Bhattarai, *Even Canadians are Skipping Trips to the U.S. After Trump Travel Ban*, Wash. Post (Apr. 14, 2017) (internet); *see also* Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 30-32 (describing “chilling effect” on tourism

from trips that were prohibited by the parts of the initial bans that were not enjoined, or because individual travelers were deterred by fear that the previous injunctions would be lifted. The now indefinite ban may also lead to the loss of hundreds of thousands of tourism-related jobs held by our States' residents.<sup>46</sup>

Absent relief from the courts, including interim relief, these broad chilling effects will likely continue.<sup>47</sup> This is hardly surprising in view of defendants' clear message to the world that foreign visitors—particularly those from certain regions, countries, or religions—are unwelcome. Indeed, the disputed provisions of the Proclamation have made this message clearer and more permanent.

The disputed provisions of the Proclamation also continue the profound harms that the initial and revised travel bans have inflicted on amici States' ability to remain internationally competitive destinations

---

in Washington); *id.* ¶¶ 52, 61 (Proclamation has decreased tourist travel to California and will cause significant losses in tourism revenues).

<sup>46</sup> Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 63-64 (Los Angeles tourism board projecting a \$220 million loss in tourism revenue in 2017, which jeopardizes hundreds of thousands of tourism-related jobs held by City's residents).

<sup>47</sup> Alana Wise, *Travel to the United States Rose in April, But Industry Remains Wary*, Reuters (June 6, 2017) (internet).

for businesses in the sectors of science, technology, finance, and health care, as well as for entrepreneurs. Even a temporary disruption in our ability to attract the best-qualified individuals and entities world-wide—including from the affected countries—puts the institutions and businesses in our States at a competitive disadvantage in the global marketplace, particularly where the excluded individuals possess specialized skills or training.<sup>48</sup> And now that the initially temporary entry bans have become an indefinite ban, defendants' message of intolerance and uncertainty more deeply threatens amici States' ability to attract and retain the foreign professionals, entrepreneurs, and companies that are vital to our economies.

Thus, as the experience of amici States shows, our States and our residents have been subjected to widespread, particularized, and well-documented harm from the moment the first travel ban was announced through today—and likely for the foreseeable future.

---

<sup>48</sup> See Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 18-23, 33, 51-52, 69-70, 74, 86-87, 113, 118, 120-123.

## **B. Harms to the Amici States' Sovereign and Quasi-Sovereign Interests**

*Decreased Effectiveness of Anti-Discrimination Laws.* The amici States have exercised their sovereign prerogatives to adopt constitutional provisions and enact laws that protect their residents from discrimination. For example, our residents and businesses—and, indeed, many of the amici States ourselves—are prohibited by such state enactments from taking national origin and religion into account when determining to whom they can extend employment and other opportunities.<sup>49</sup> The disputed provisions of the Proclamation interfere with the effectiveness of these laws by encouraging discrimination against Muslims in general, and nationals of six of the designated countries in particular.

---

<sup>49</sup> See, e.g., Cal. Const. art.I, §§ 4,7-8,31; Cal. Civ. Code § 51(b); Cal. Gov't Code §§ 11135-11137,12900 et seq.; Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46a-60; 19 Del. Code § 710 et seq.; Ill. Const. art.I, §§ 3,17; 740 Ill. Comp. Stat. 23/5(a)(1); 775 Ill. Comp. Stat. 5/1-102(A); 775 Ill. Comp. Stat. 5/10-104(A)(1); 5 Me. Rev. Stat. §§ 784,4551-4634; Md. Code, State Gov't § 20-606; Mass. Gen. L. ch.93, § 102; Mass. Gen. L. ch.151B, §§ 1,4; N.M. Const. art.II, § 11; N.M. Stat. § 28-1-7; Or. Rev. Stat. § 659A.006(1); R.I. Gen. Laws § 28-5-7(1)(i); 9 Vt. Stat. §§ 4500-4507; 21 Vt. Stat. § 495; Wash. Rev. Code § 49.60.030(1).

***Harms to Residents Seeking Medical Care.*** Like its predecessors, the Proclamation's entry ban will harm residents seeking medical care in our States, particularly those in underserved communities. The countries designated in the Proclamation are important sources of physicians who provide health care to our residents, particularly in underserved areas of our States.<sup>50</sup> The current ban will thus impede the States' efforts to recruit and retain providers of essential primary care, dental health, and mental health services.<sup>51</sup> In New York, safety-net hospitals—which include all public acute care hospitals, the entire New York City Health and Hospitals system, and most of the hospitals in Brooklyn, Queens, and the Bronx—rely heavily on foreign-national physicians.<sup>52</sup> Indeed, many foreign-national physicians work in the primary care field at a time when primary care physicians are in short supply in many areas across the country.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> See Third Am. Compl. ¶ 26 (nearly 200 such physicians and medical residents in Washington); *id.* ¶ 58 (191 such physicians in California); *id.* ¶ 114 (500 such physicians in New York).

<sup>51</sup> *Id.* ¶¶ 27-28, 58, 128-129.

<sup>52</sup> *Id.* ¶¶ 114, 116.

<sup>53</sup> *Id.* ¶¶ 27, 58-59, 116, 128-129.

At least 7,000 physicians practicing in the United States attended medical school in one of the six countries designated in the previous Executive Orders (five of which remain designated in the current Proclamation), and these physicians provide 14 million appointments a year, 2.3 million of which are in areas with “a shortage of medical residents and doctors.”<sup>54</sup> When residents or physicians from the designated countries are unable to commence or continue their employment at public hospitals, those staffing disruptions will result in serious risks to the quality of our States’ health care services and put the public health of our communities at risk.<sup>55</sup> Even before defendants made permanent the latest version of the entry ban through issuance of the Proclamation at issue here, researchers had concluded that the federal government’s travel restrictions were likely to hurt the health of millions

---

<sup>54</sup> Immigrant Doctors Project, <https://immigrantdoctors.org>; *see also* Anna Maria Barry-Jester, *Trump’s New Travel Ban Could Affect Doctors, Especially in the Rust Belt and Appalachia*, *FiveThirtyEight* (Mar. 6, 2017) (internet).

<sup>55</sup> *See* Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 27, 58-59, 116, 128.

of Americans who rely on physicians trained in the designated countries.<sup>56</sup>

## II. THE DISTRICT COURT DID NOT ABUSE ITS DISCRETION IN GRANTING THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION.

This Court has previously affirmed a similar preliminary injunction issued in an earlier stage of this case challenging one of the Proclamation's predecessor travel bans. In *IRAP v. Trump*, the Court held that preliminary relief was justified to restrain a likely violation of the Establishment Clause that threatened substantial harm, and that the nationwide scope of that injunction was justified by the nationwide scope of the threatened harm. 857 F.3d at 588-606; *see also Hawaii v. Trump*, 859 F.3d at 769-88 (affirming nationwide preliminary injunction in related challenge to predecessor ban based on likelihood of success of plaintiffs' statutory challenge). Although that decision has been vacated as moot, the district court did not abuse its discretion in concluding, for

---

<sup>56</sup> See Maryam Saleh, *Hospitals in Trump Country Suffer As Muslim Doctors Denied Visas to U.S.*, The Intercept (Aug. 17, 2017) (internet) (foreign physicians "take care of the sickest of the sick and the poorest of the poor," many have pledged to work in areas designated as "medically underserved," and without them "the U.S. healthcare system would simply collapse, with the pain felt most acutely in rural areas").

similar reasons, that preliminary relief is once again justified to enjoin application of the disputed provisions of the Proclamation. *See WV Association of Club Owners & Fraternal Servs., Inc. v. Musgrave*, 553 F.3d 292, 298 (4th Cir. 2009) (factors to be considered include whether plaintiff “is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief,” and whether “the balance of equities tips in his favor, [and an] injunction is in the public interest” (quoting *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008))).

**A. Balancing the Equities and Weighing the Relative Harms Tips Decidedly in Favor of Preliminary Relief.**

As the Supreme Court recognized during an earlier stage of this case, “[c]rafting a preliminary injunction” is “often dependent as much on the equities of a given case as the substance of the legal issues it presents.” *Trump v. IRAP*, 137 S.Ct. 2080, 2087 (2017). Balancing the equities requires the Court to explore the relative harms to the parties, as well as to “pay particular regard for the public consequences.” *Weinberger v. Romero-Barcelo*, 456 U.S. 305, 312 (1982); *see also IRAP v. Trump*, 857 F.3d at 602 (considering balance of equities and public interest factors together).



Certainly, as the district court correctly found (Opinion 84-85), plaintiffs would be irreparably injured if the Proclamation's disputed provisions were permitted to go into effect, given the threat of prolonged separation from family members and the Establishment Clause violation.<sup>57</sup> This Court has previously recognized that the loss of First Amendment freedoms, including Establishment Clause violations, “for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.” *IRAP v. Trump*, 857 F.3d at 601-02 (quoting *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 373 (1976)); see also *Chaplaincy of Full Gospel Churches v. England*, 454 F.3d 290, 303 (D.C. Cir. 2006); cf. *American Civil Liberties Union of Ky. v. McCreary County, Ky.*, 354 F.3d 438, 445 (6th Cir. 2003), *aff'd*, 545 U.S. 844 (2005) (presuming irreparable harm where plaintiffs were likely to succeed on merits of Establishment Clause claim).

And in view of the widespread, particularized, and well-documented harms that have affected—and will continue to affect—amici States and our residents, the balance of the equities also requires that

---

<sup>57</sup> As to the fourth factor to be considered in evaluating the propriety of a preliminary injunction, *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 20, the plaintiffs have made a strong showing of the likelihood of success on the merits of their constitutional and statutory claims. See IRAP Br.22-25.

the district court's injunction remain in place to serve the compelling public interest in minimizing such irreparable harms. *See IRAP v. Trump*, 857 F.3d at 572 (Court noting that predecessor ban “stands to cause irreparable harm to individuals across this nation”).

As described in Point I, implementation of the disputed provisions of the Proclamation, like the previous versions of the travel ban, will result in concrete and irreparable harms to amici States' economic and proprietary interests. In addition, these provisions will indefinitely prevent our States' residents from receiving visits from family members.<sup>58</sup> Such deprivations constitute a constitutionally cognizable hardship to the affected United States–based persons.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, the exclusions at issue hinder amici States' ability to prohibit discrimination under their own constitutions and statutes,<sup>60</sup> and to protect their residents to the extent allowed under other federal laws. *See Alfred L.*

---

<sup>58</sup> *See* Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 24-25, 104-105 (examples of Washington and New York residents).

<sup>59</sup> *See, e.g., Moore v. City of East Cleveland*, 431 U.S. 494, 504 (1977) (tradition of sharing household with extended family “deserving of constitutional recognition”).

<sup>60</sup> *See supra* p. 22.

*Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico ex rel. Barez*, 458 U.S. 592, 607-08 (1982) (recognizing State's interests in ensuring that its residents are "not excluded from benefits that are to flow from participation in the federal system" and in "securing observance of the terms under which it participates in" that system).

These are some of the very same interests that the preliminary injunctions issued in the earlier travel ban litigation were designed to protect, and that the Supreme Court carefully sought to avoid when leaving certain portions of those prior injunctions in place. *See Trump v. IRAP*, 137 S.Ct. at 2088 (preserving injunction as to those having "a credible claim of a bona fide relationship with a person or entity in the United States"). Indeed, the district court here adopted the precise balancing previously struck by the Supreme Court when it modified those injunctions (Opinion 86-88; Order 2).

Defendants have not articulated any reason why this same balancing is not appropriate here, nor have they demonstrated that lifting the injunction is necessary to prevent any irreparable harm to their interests. Defendants' generalized claim of harm to their interest in maintaining national security (D.Br.53-56) is, again, abstract and

conclusory—unlike the concrete and particularized harms to amici States and their residents outlined above. *See IRAP v. Trump*, 857 F.3d at 603 (Court “unmoved by the Government’s rote invocation of harm to ‘national security interests’ as the silver bullet that defeats all other asserted injuries”). For example, defendants have identified no specific urgency warranting immediate implementation of the disputed provisions of the Proclamation, nor do they claim any disastrous result from the injunction thus far (or any of the prior related injunctions for that matter).

Indeed, defendants’ assertions of harm to national security interests are substantially undermined by several factors. First, the terms of the Proclamation itself contain internal inconsistencies that significantly undermine the national security rationale. For instance, not every country that failed to meet the Proclamation’s stated criteria is included in the entry ban—and even with respect to the some of the designated countries, not every category of travelers is presumptively barred from entry. Second, the Proclamation itself delayed implementation of its entry ban for approximately one month, undermining defendants’ suggestion that a short stay of the Proclamation would cause

irreparable harm. *See* § 7(a) (signed on September 24, but setting effective date as either October 18 or October 24 for different groups of foreign nationals). Third, as the district court correctly observed (Opinion 86), defendants’ assertions fail to account for current immigration law’s well-established, individualized vetting process, which already permits the exclusion of foreign nationals who present a national security concern or for whom the United States lacks adequate information.<sup>61</sup> As the Ninth Circuit observed in connection with its review of an injunction enjoining provisions of the initial travel ban, such an order “merely returned the nation . . . to the position it has occupied for many previous years.” *Washington v. Trump*, 847 F.3d at 1168.

In sum, while national security is a compelling government interest, it “will [not] always tip the balance of the equities in favor of the government.” *IRAP v. Trump*, 857 F.3d at 603. Rather, in a case like this, the balance of the equities here tips decidedly in favor of preserving the preliminary injunction because defendants have identified no

---

<sup>61</sup> *See, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(3) (inadmissibility of aliens for terrorist activities and other security grounds); *id.* § 1182(a)(7) (inadmissibility of aliens who fail to meet documentation requirements).

appreciable harm that the injunction will cause to their interests, but reversing the district court's order would allow further irreparable harm to be imposed on amici States and our residents. The status quo should thus be preserved while this litigation continues.

**B. The Nationwide Scope of the Injunction Is Proper in View of the Proclamation's Violations and Actual and Threatened Harms.**

The preliminary injunction entered by the district court was appropriately crafted to restrain the systemic, nationwide harm perpetuated by the disputed provisions of the Proclamation, including the harms to amici States. Although defendants' claim (D.Br.56) that any injunction here must be limited to redressing only plaintiffs' individual injuries, the numerous actual and threatened harms to amici States exemplify the public interests affected and underscore the appropriateness of the injunction's nationwide scope.

This Court has recognized that "courts of equity may go to greater lengths to give 'relief in furtherance of the public interest than...when only private interests are involved.'" *East Tenn. Nat. Gas Co. v. Sage*, 361 F.3d 808, 826 (4th Cir. 2004) (quoting *Virginian Ry. Co. v. Railway Employees*, 300 U.S. 515, 552 (1937)); see also *United States v. Oakland*

*Cannabis Buyers' Coop.*, 532 U.S. 483, 496 (2001) (district courts enjoy broad discretion “to consider the necessities of the public interest when fashioning injunctive relief” (quotation marks omitted)).

Consistent with these principles, this Court previously found no error in the district court’s issuance of a nationwide injunction enjoining the previous travel ban. *See IRAP v. Trump*, 857 F.3d at 605. The Court correctly recognized that the myriad harms flowing from such a ban would not be addressed by injunctive relief limited just to plaintiffs because that “would not cure the constitutional deficiency, which would endure in all [of the ban’s] applications” to similarly situated individuals. *Id.*; *see also id.* (citing *Richmond Tenants Org., Inc. v. Kemp*, 956 F.2d 1300, 1308-09 (4th Cir. 1992), upholding nationwide injunction “where challenged conduct caused irreparable harm in myriad jurisdictions across the country”). Thus, the Court concluded that “a nationwide injunction was necessary to provide complete relief.” *Id.* (quoting *Madsen v. Women’s Health Ctr. Inc.*, 512 U.S. 753, 778 (1994)). The district court properly made the same assessment here, finding that an Establishment Clause violation “has impacts beyond the personal interests of individual parties” (Opinion 90).

Affirmance of the preliminary injunction here is also necessary to provide continued relief to amici States from the cumulative “nationwide effect” of defendants’ policy (*id.*), including the substantial disruption and uncertainty unleashed by this entire series of discriminatory travel bans and which now has no end in sight. The disputed provisions of the Proclamation have not only exacerbated the harms that amici States, our institutions, and our residents have experienced, but the current indefinite ban may make these irreparable injuries permanent if the preliminary injunction is vacated or narrowed in any respect.

Finally, the injunction cannot be characterized as “vastly overbroad” (D.Br.56) given its applicability only to those individuals having “a bona fide relationship with a person or entity in the United States,” as explained above (*supra* p. 29). In sum, the district court did not abuse its “broad discretion [in] fashioning” the injunctive relief at issue here.<sup>62</sup> *Ostergren v. Cuccinelli*, 615 F.3d 263, 288 (4th Cir. 2010); *see also McCreary*, 545 U.S. at 867 (scope of preliminary injunction is matter within district court’s sound discretion).

---

<sup>62</sup> For all the reasons stated above, the circumstances here would support even the broader injunction that plaintiffs sought below.



## CONCLUSION

This Court should affirm the preliminary injunction.

Dated: New York, New York  
November 16, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN

*Attorney General*

*State of New York*

BARBARA D. UNDERWOOD

*Solicitor General*

ANISHA S. DASGUPTA

*Deputy Solicitor General*

ZAINAB A. CHAUDHRY

*Assistant Solicitor General*

*of Counsel*

120 Broadway, 25th Floor  
New York, New York 10271  
(212) 416-8921

*(Counsel listing continues on next page.)*

XAVIER BECERRA  
*Attorney General*  
*State of California*  
1300 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

GEORGE JEPSEN  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Connecticut*  
55 Elm Street  
Hartford, CT 06106

MATTHEW P. DENN  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Delaware*  
Carvel State Bldg., 6th Fl.  
820 N. French Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801

LISA MADIGAN  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Illinois*  
100 W. Randolph St., 12th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60601

THOMAS J. MILLER  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Iowa*  
1305 E. Walnut Street  
Des Moines, IA 50319

JANET T. MILLS  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Maine*  
6 State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333

BRIAN E. FROSH  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Maryland*  
200 Saint Paul Place  
Baltimore, MD 21202

MAURA HEALEY  
*Attorney General*  
*Commonwealth of Massachusetts*  
One Ashburton Place  
Boston, MA 02108

HECTOR BALDERAS  
*Attorney General*  
*State of New Mexico*  
408 Galisteo Street  
Santa Fe, NM 87501

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Oregon*  
1162 Court Street, N.E.  
Salem, OR 97301

PETER F. KILMARTIN  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Rhode Island*  
150 S. Main Street  
Providence, RI 02903

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Vermont*  
109 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05609

MARK R. HERRING  
*Attorney General*  
*Commonwealth of Virginia*  
202 North Ninth Street  
Richmond, VA 23219

ROBERT W. FERGUSON  
*Attorney General*  
*State of Washington*  
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98104

KARL A. RACINE  
*Attorney General*  
*District of Columbia*  
441 4th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Rules 29 and 32(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Oren L. Zeve, an employee in the Office of the Attorney General of the State of New York, hereby certifies that according to the word count feature of the word processing program used to prepare this brief, the brief contains 6,472 words and complies with the typeface requirements and length limits of Rules 29 and 32(a)(5)-(7).

/s/ Oren L. Zeve

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on November 16, 2017 the foregoing document was served on all parties or their counsel of record through the CM/ECF system, and all parties or their counsel are registered CM/ECF users.

/s/ Anisha S. Dasgupta

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT
APPEARANCE OF COUNSEL FORM

BAR ADMISSION & ECF REGISTRATION: If you have not been admitted to practice before the Fourth Circuit, you must complete and return an Application for Admission before filing this form. If you were admitted to practice under a different name than you are now using, you must include your former name when completing this form so that we can locate you on the attorney roll. Electronic filing by counsel is required in all Fourth Circuit cases. If you have not registered as a Fourth Circuit ECF Filer, please complete the required steps at Register for eFiling.

THE CLERK WILL ENTER MY APPEARANCE IN APPEAL NO. 17-2231 as

Retained Court-appointed(CJA) Court-assigned(non-CJA) Federal Defender Pro Bono Government

COUNSEL FOR: States of New York, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts,

New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington, and the District of Columbia as the

(party name)

appellant(s) appellee(s) petitioner(s) respondent(s) amicus curiae intervenor(s) movant(s)

/s/ Anisha S. Dasgupta
(signature)

/s/ Anisha S. Dasgupta
Name (printed or typed)

212-416-8921
Voice Phone

NYS Office of the Attorney General
Firm Name (if applicable)

212-416-6350
Fax Number

120 Broadway, 25th Floor

New York, NY 10271
Address

anisha.dasgupta@ag.ny.gov
E-mail address (print or type)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on 11/17/17 the foregoing document was served on all parties or their counsel of record through the CM/ECF system if they are registered users or, if they are not, by serving a true and correct copy at the addresses listed below:

Empty rectangular box for signature or name.

Empty rectangular box for date.

/s/ Anisha S. Dasgupta
Signature

Nov. 16, 2017
Date