

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,

Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, et al.,

Defendants.

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

ERRATA TO ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Re: Dkt. No. 200


As the parties point out in their Stipulation and Order for Voluntary Dismissal of Count One of San Francisco’s Second Amended Complaint without Prejudice, Dkt. No. 201, I misidentified Count Two of San Francisco’s Second Amended Complaint in the Order Granting Motion for Summary Judgment as relating to San Francisco’s arguments concerning 8 U.S.C. 1373 in two places (Dkt. No. 200 at 2, fn.1 and 27). Count Two relates to the Executive Order, and the analysis in the Order makes clear that I have granted summary judgment with respect to it.

Accordingly, the Order Granting Motion for Summary Judgment is amended as follows:

- Footnote one now reads, “This Order addresses San Francisco’s motion with respect to Counts Two and Three of its Second Amended Complaint. Count One relates to San Francisco’s claim regarding 8 U.S.C. 1373 (“Section 1983”) and is better addressed at the time I consider upcoming motions in related litigation. *City & Cty. of San Francisco v. Sessions*, No. 17-cv-4642-WHO; *California v. Sessions*, No. 17-c-4701-WHO (“the related litigation”).”
- The last sentence on page 27, starting at line 25, is amended to read, “I will consider San Francisco’s motion for summary judgment on Count One when I address the related issues in the related litigation.”

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 7, 2017



William H. Orrick
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28