

1 Matthew D. Benedetto (SBN #252379)
2 Matthew.Benedetto@wilmerhale.com
3 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
4 HALE & DORR LLP
5 350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2100
6 Los Angeles, CA 90071
7 Telephone: (213) 443-5300
8 Facsimile: (213) 443-5400

7 Jamie S. Dycus (*pro hac vice* pending)
8 Alexandra Hiatt (*pro hac vice* pending)
9 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
10 HALE & DORR LLP
11 7 World Trade Center
12 250 Greenwich Street
13 New York, NY 10007
14 Telephone: (212) 230-8800
15 Facsimile: (212) 230-8888

16 *Attorneys for Amici Curiae*
17 *Members of Congress*

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
19 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

20 Al Otro Lado, Inc., et al.,
21 Plaintiffs,
22 v.
23 Kirstjen M. Nielsen, et al.,
24 Defendants.

Case No.: 3:17-cv-02366-BAS-KSC
Hon. Cynthia A. Bashant
Courtroom 4B

**AMICUS BRIEF OF MEMBERS OF
CONGRESS IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
DISMISS THE SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

2 INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE* 1

3 SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 1

4 BACKGROUND 1

5 ARGUMENT 5

6

7 I. The INA Reflects the Intent of Congress to Facilitate Grants of Asylum..... 5

8 II. The INA Imposes Strict Procedural Requirements Concerning Access to the

9 Asylum Process 8

10 III. DHS’s Practice of Deterring Asylum Seekers by Limiting Access to Ports of

11 Entry and the Asylum Process Violates the INA..... 9

12 APPENDIX: LIST OF AMICI 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

1

2

3

4 *City & County of San Francisco v. Trump*, 897 F.3d 1225 (9th Cir. 2018)..... 10

5 *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump* (“*East Bay Sanctuary I*”), No. 18-

6 CV-06810-JST, 2018 WL 6053140 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2018) 8, 10

7 *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump* (“*East Bay Sanctuary II*”), 909 F.3d

8 1219 (9th Cir. 2018) 6, 8, 10

9 *INS v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919 (1983) 10

10 *Orantes-Hernandez v. Thornburgh*, 919 F.2d 549 (9th Cir. 1990) 8

11 *Trump v. Hawaii*, 138 S. Ct. 2392 (2018)..... 10

12 *Utility Air Regulatory Group v. EPA*, 573 U.S. 302 (2014)..... 10

13 *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (1952)..... 10

14

STATUTES, RULES, AND REGULATIONS

15

16 8 C.F.R. § 235.3 9

17 8 U.S.C. § 1158..... 1, 6, 8, 9

18 8 U.S.C. § 1225..... 1, 8, 9

19 8 U.S.C. § 1229a 9

20 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, Div.

21 C of Pub. L. No. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009-546..... 6

22 Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq.*..... 1

23 Refugee Act of 1980, Pub. L. No. 96–212, § 101(a), 94 Stat. 102..... 1, 5, 6, 10, 11

24

LEGISLATIVE MATERIALS

25

26 125 Cong. Rec. 23,231-32 (1979)..... 5, 6

27 126 Cong. Rec. 3,757 (1980)..... 5

28 126 Cong. Rec. 4,500 (1980)..... 5

1 126 Cong. Rec. 4,507 (1980) 10
 2 164 Cong. Rec. H5430-31 (daily ed. June 21, 2018) 7
 3 Asylum Reform and Border Protection Act of 2017, H.R. 391, 115th Cong.
 4 § 4 (2017)..... 7
 5 Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2018, H.R. 6136, 115th
 6 Cong., title IV, §§ 4101, 4108 (2018) 7
 7 H. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1 (1996) 7
 8 Hearing on S. 269 Before the S. Comm. on the Judiciary, 104th Cong. 23
 9 (1995)..... 6
 10 S. 3372, 115th Cong. § 2 (2018)..... 7
 11 Securing America’s Future Act of 2018, H.R. 4760, 115th Cong., title
 12 IV, §§ 4402, 4408 (2018) 7
 13 Senate Amendment 5 to H.R. 268, 116th Cong., Div. L § 102(2), 165 Cong.
 14 Rec. S472 (daily ed. Jan. 22, 2019)..... 8

15 **OTHER AUTHORITIES**

16 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, July 28, 1951, 189
 17 U.N.T.S. 150 6
 18 CBP, *Claims of Fear: CBP Southwest Border and Claims of Credible Fear*
 19 *Total Apprehensions/Inadmissibles (FY2017 - FY2018)* 3, 9
 20 CBP, *Southwest Border Migration FY2017* 3
 21 CBP, *Southwest Border Migration FY2018* 3
 22 CBP, *U.S. Border Patrol Monthly Apprehensions (FY 2000 – FY 2017)* 2
 23 David Shepardson, *Trump Says Family Separations Deter Illegal*
 24 *Immigration*, Reuters (Oct. 13, 2018) 5
 25 Dep’t of Homeland Sec., CBP, *Budget Overview Fiscal Year 2019*..... 4
 26 Human Rights First, *Refugee Blockade: The Trump Administration’s*
 27 *Obstruction of Asylum Claims at the Border* (December 2018) 3
 28

1 Letter from Ranking Members of House Committees on Judiciary,
2 Homeland Sec., and Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Sec. to
3 Commissioner, CBP (Dec. 17, 2018) 4
4
5 Manny Fernandez, Caitlin Dickerson & Paulina Villegas, *The Price of
6 Trump’s Migrant Deterrence Strategy: New Chaos on the Border*,
7 N.Y. Times (Jan. 4, 2019) 4
8
9 Press Release, DHS, Secretary Kirstjen M. Nielsen Announces Historic
10 Action to Confront Illegal Immigration (Dec. 20, 2018) 2
11
12 Ryan Miller, *Inhofe to Introduce New Asylum Bill to Senate*, Enid News &
13 Eagle (Aug. 8, 2018)..... 7
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 **INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE**

2 Amici are members of Congress who are familiar with the Immigration and
3 Nationality Act (“INA”), 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq.* Amici have a strong interest in
4 ensuring that the Executive Branch respects the role of Congress and faithfully
5 implements the INA. Amici are well suited to provide the Court with insights concerning
6 Congress’s intent in enacting the INA, the INA’s strict requirements in relation to asylum
7 seekers, and the conflict between the intent and requirements of the INA and the
8 Executive Branch practices challenged in this litigation. A complete list of amici is set
9 forth in the appendix to this brief.

10 **SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

11 There is reason to believe that the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”)
12 is violating the INA by attempting to deter asylum seekers through artificial limitations
13 on arriving noncitizens’ access to ports of entry and to the asylum process. The asylum
14 provisions of the INA reflect the intent of Congress to “respond to the urgent needs of
15 persons subject to persecution in their homelands.” Refugee Act of 1980, Pub. L. No.
16 96–212, § 101(a), 94 Stat. 102, 102. To that end, the INA requires that arriving
17 noncitizens be afforded specific procedural protections including, in virtually every
18 instance, an opportunity to apply for asylum. 8 U.S.C. §§ 1158, 1225. Nothing in the
19 INA permits DHS to deny arriving noncitizens those protections, even temporarily, based
20 on the policy preferences of the Executive Branch.

21 **BACKGROUND**

22 As plaintiffs allege and DHS has acknowledged, DHS is limiting access by
23 arriving noncitizens to ports of entry and to the asylum process. As explained in
24 plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint (“SAC”) and in a September 2018 report of
25 DHS’s Office of Inspector General (“OIG Report”), U.S. Customs and Border Protection
26 (“CBP”) is “regulating the flow of asylum-seekers at ports of entry through ‘metering,’ a
27 practice CBP has utilized at least as far back as 2016.” SAC ¶ 70, ECF No. 189; *see also*
28 *id.* ¶¶ 51-57 (citing internal CBP documents that discuss controlling the flow of migrants

1 at ports of entry). Specifically, “‘CBP officers stand at the international line out in the
2 middle of the footbridges,’ checking pedestrians’ travel documents, and preventing
3 asylum-seekers from crossing the international line until space is ‘available ... to hold the
4 individual while being processed.’” *Id.* ¶ 70 n.61 (quoting OIG Report).

5 The Executive Branch has argued that it lacks the capacity to deal with the “illegal
6 immigration crisis facing the United States.”¹ DHS Secretary Kirstjen M. Nielsen has
7 acknowledged that the government is “metering,” explaining that “if we don’t have the
8 resources to let [asylum-seekers] in on a particular day, they are going to have to come
9 back.” SAC ¶ 65 (quoting May 2018 Fox News interview). CBP Commissioner Kevin
10 K. McAleenan, similarly, has said that individuals arriving at the San Ysidro port of entry
11 “may need to wait in Mexico as CBP officers work to process those already within our
12 facilities.” *Id.* ¶ 68 n.56. Defendants offer the same rationale in this case, arguing that
13 “metering” is an “operational decision to control the flow of travel across the U.S.-
14 Mexico border based on operational constraints at the ports of entry.” Defs.’ Mem. Supp.
15 Mot. Dismiss 2-3 (“Defs. Mem.”), ECF No. 192-1.

16 However, CBP’s own statistics undermine the claim that it lacks sufficient capacity
17 to process arriving noncitizens. Apprehensions at the southern border dropped from
18 approximately 1.6 million in FY 2000 to approximately 300,000 in FY 2017.² The
19 number increased in FY 2018 to just under 400,000, but remains significantly below
20

21
22
23 ¹ Press Release, DHS, Secretary Kirstjen M. Nielsen Announces Historic Action to
24 Confront Illegal Immigration (Dec. 20, 2018),
[https://www.dhs.gov/news/2018/12/20/secretary-nielsen-announces-historic-action-
25 confront-illegal-immigration](https://www.dhs.gov/news/2018/12/20/secretary-nielsen-announces-historic-action-confront-illegal-immigration).

26 ² CBP, *U.S. Border Patrol Monthly Apprehensions (FY 2000 – FY 2017)*,
[https://www.cbp.gov/sites/default/files/assets/documents/2017-
27 Dec/BP%20Total%20Monthly%20Apps%20by%20Sector%20and%20Area%2C%20FY
28 2000-FY2017.pdf](https://www.cbp.gov/sites/default/files/assets/documents/2017-
27 Dec/BP%20Total%20Monthly%20Apps%20by%20Sector%20and%20Area%2C%20FY
28 2000-FY2017.pdf) (last visited Feb. 15, 2019).

1 historical levels.³ To be sure, the number of individuals arriving at ports of entry along
2 the southern border who assert a credible fear of returning to their home countries, the
3 foundation of an asylum claim, has increased over the past year from 17,284 to 38,269,
4 potentially as a result of public statements by DHS urging asylum seekers to go to ports
5 of entry.⁴ But the total number of noncitizens arriving at ports of entry who were deemed
6 inadmissible increased by a much smaller margin. In 2018, that number was 124,511,
7 compared to 111,601 in 2017, 150,825 in 2016, and 114,486 in 2015.⁵ Moreover, the
8 rate at which DHS is processing asylum seekers is below CBP's own stated processing
9 capacity. In FY 2018, DHS processed an average of only 34 asylum seekers per day in
10 the San Diego field office area, even though CBP has claimed that the San Ysidro port of
11 entry has the ability to process 90 to 100 asylum seekers daily.⁶

12 Any contention that DHS lacks sufficient capacity to process the current volume of
13 noncitizens arriving at ports of entry is further belied by the administration's failure to
14 prioritize increasing that capacity. The operations and support budget for CBP's Office
15 of Field Operations ("OFO"), which manages ports of entry, was \$3,942,479,000 in FY
16 2017. In FY 2018, the President's budget called for a *smaller* amount (\$3,900,330,000).

18 ³ CBP, *Southwest Border Migration FY2018*, [https://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/stats/sw-](https://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/stats/sw-border-migration/fy-2018)
19 [border-migration/fy-2018](https://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/stats/sw-border-migration/fy-2018) (last visited Feb. 15, 2019).

20 ⁴ CBP, *Claims of Fear: CBP Southwest Border and Claims of Credible Fear Total*
21 *Apprehensions/Inadmissibles (FY2017 - FY2018)*,
22 <https://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/stats/sw-border-migration/claims-fear> (last visited Feb.
15, 2019).

23 ⁵ CBP, *Southwest Border Migration FY2018*, *supra* note 3; CBP, *Southwest Border*
24 *Migration FY2017*, <https://www.cbp.gov/newsroom/stats/sw-border-migration-fy2017>
(last visited Feb. 15, 2019).

25 ⁶ Human Rights First, *Refugee Blockade: The Trump Administration's Obstruction of*
26 *Asylum Claims at the Border*, at 13 (December 2018),
27 https://www.humanrightsfirst.org/sites/default/files/December_Border_Report.pdf.

1 And the FY 2019 request calls for a relatively modest 4.3 percent increase
2 (\$4,067,985,000).⁷ Additionally, the amount requested in the President’s budget for
3 construction and facility improvements at OFO facilities in FY 2019 is identical to the
4 amount requested in FY 2018.⁸ And, of the five facilities at which the President’s budget
5 contemplates expenditures to expand capacity and improve operations, only two are
6 located at the southern border.⁹

7 Finally, recent statements of DHS personnel suggest that DHS is limiting arriving
8 noncitizens’ access to ports of entry not because it lacks capacity but as a means of
9 deterring asylum seekers. During a joint DHS and Department of Defense staff briefing
10 on December 6, 2018, a CBP official stated that DHS had limited processing at the San
11 Ysidro port of entry because “[t]he more we process, the more will come.”¹⁰ Other DHS
12 officials have similarly indicated that the administration’s focus at the border “has just
13 been on how can we deter, rather than how can we handle.”¹¹

14 Any attempted deterrence would be consistent with the approach taken by the
15 Executive Branch to immigration policy generally. For example, in defending the
16 administration’s now-rescinded family separation policy, former White House Chief of
17

18 ⁷ Dep’t of Homeland Sec., CBP, *Budget Overview Fiscal Year 2019*, at CBP – OS – 118,
19 [https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/U.S.%20Customs%20and%20Border
20 %20Protection.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/U.S.%20Customs%20and%20Border%20Protection.pdf).

21 ⁸ *Id.* at CBP – PC&I – 108.

22 ⁹ *Id.*

23 ¹⁰ Letter from Ranking Members of House Committees on Judiciary, Homeland Sec., and
24 Subcommittee on Immigration and Border Sec. to Commissioner, CBP (Dec. 17, 2018),
25 [https://democrats-
judiciary.house.gov/sites/democrats.judiciary.house.gov/files/documents/Nadler-Lofgren-
Thompson%2012.17%20Letter%20to%20CBP%20Commissioner.pdf](https://democrats-judiciary.house.gov/sites/democrats.judiciary.house.gov/files/documents/Nadler-Lofgren-Thompson%2012.17%20Letter%20to%20CBP%20Commissioner.pdf).

26 ¹¹ Manny Fernandez, Caitlin Dickerson & Paulina Villegas, *The Price of Trump’s*
27 *Migrant Deterrence Strategy: New Chaos on the Border*, N.Y. Times (Jan. 4, 2019),
28 <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/04/us/mexico-wall-policy-trump.html>.

1 Staff John Kelly noted that it “would be a tough deterrent. A much faster turnaround on
2 asylum seekers.”¹² Along the same lines, President Trump defended the family
3 separation policy by noting that if migrants “feel there will be separation, they don’t
4 come.”¹³ The limitations DHS has imposed on asylum seekers arriving at ports of entry
5 appear to reflect a similar deterrence-based strategy.

6 ARGUMENT

7 I. The INA Reflects the Intent of Congress to Facilitate Grants of Asylum

8 The asylum provisions of the INA reflect Congress’s intent to “give statutory
9 meaning to our national commitment to human rights and humanitarian concerns,” bring
10 federal law into conformity with the United States’s commitments under international
11 law, and address needs that “touch at the heart of America’s foreign policy.” 125 Cong.
12 Rec. 23,231-32 (1979) (statement of Sen. Kennedy).

13 Congress enacted the Refugee Act of 1980 in recognition that “[t]he refugees of
14 tomorrow, like the refugees of today, will continue to look to the United States for safe
15 haven and resettlement opportunities—and our Government will continue to be called
16 upon to help.” 126 Cong. Rec. 3,757 (1980) (statement of Sen. Kennedy). The Act set
17 out for the first time an “asylum procedure ... mandated in our immigration law.” 126
18 Cong. Rec. 4,500 (1980) (statement of Rep. Holtzman). It replaced what had been an “ad
19 hoc,” “inadequate,” and “discriminatory” administrative process, 125 Cong. Rec. 23,232
20 (1979) (statement of Sen. Kennedy), with a formal asylum application process for any
21 noncitizen “physically present in the United States or at a land border or port of entry,
22 irrespective of such alien’s status,” Refugee Act § 208(a) (current version, with similar
23

24 ¹² *Transcript: White House Chief of Staff John Kelly’s Interview With NPR*, NPR (May
25 11, 2018), <https://www.npr.org/2018/05/11/610116389/transcript-white-house-chief-of-staff-john-kellys-interview-with-npr>.

27 ¹³ David Shepardson, *Trump Says Family Separations Deter Illegal Immigration*, Reuters
28 (Oct. 13, 2018), <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-immigration-trump/trump-says-family-separations-deter-illegal-immigration-idUSKCN1MO00C>.

1 language, at 8 U.S.C. § 1158). Consistent with the statutory goal of providing refuge
2 where needed, the Act invested the Executive Branch with discretion in deciding whether
3 to grant asylum, but made access to the application process mandatory. *Id.*

4 The Refugee Act also intended to bring U.S. law “into conformity with the United
5 States’s obligations” under the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees
6 (“1951 Convention”) and the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees (“1967
7 Protocol”). *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump* (“*East Bay Sanctuary II*”), 909 F.3d
8 1219, 1233 (9th Cir. 2018); *see also* 125 Cong. Rec. 23,232 (1979) (statement of Sen.
9 Kennedy that the Act will “make our law conform to the United Nations Convention and
10 protocol relating to the status of refugees, which we signed in 1969”). The 1951
11 Convention precludes parties, including the United States, from “impos[ing] penalties, on
12 account of their illegal entry or presence, on refugees who, coming directly from a
13 territory where their life or freedom was threatened . . . , enter or are present in their
14 territory without authorization, provided they present themselves without delay to the
15 authorities and show good cause for their illegal entry or presence.” 1951 Convention,
16 art. 31, § 1, July 28, 1951, 189 U.N.T.S. 150, 174.

17 In 1996, Congress further amended the INA through the Illegal Immigration
18 Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (“IIRIRA”), Div. C of Pub. L. No.
19 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009-546. That law, which required stricter asylum procedures,
20 continued to reflect the legislative conviction that asylum was “a cherished thing.”
21 *Proposals to Reduce Illegal Immigration and Control Costs to Taxpayers: Hearing on S.*
22 *269 Before the S. Comm. on the Judiciary, 104th Cong. 23* (1995) (statement of Sen.
23 Simpson). While IIRIRA tightened asylum procedures, it also preserved the requirement
24 to permit otherwise inadmissible noncitizens to apply for asylum if they feared
25 persecution abroad. This continued protection for asylum seekers reflects Congress’s
26 long-held belief that the United States, “[a]s a nation of immigrants” and an “island of
27 freedom” to which “the world has looked as both protector and exemplar,” has a
28 “singular interest that its immigration laws encourage the admission of persons who will

1 enrich our society.” H. Rep. No. 104-469, pt. 1, at 110 (1996) (quoting in part President
2 Reagan).

3 Confirming its intent to facilitate grants of asylum where warranted, Congress has
4 repeatedly rejected efforts to limit the number of asylum applicants. In 2018, for
5 example, Senator James Inhofe introduced the Asylum Abuse Reduction Act, which
6 would have prohibited migrants from applying for asylum at the border, requiring
7 prospective applicants to instead travel to a U.S. embassy or consulate for an interview
8 with an asylum officer. S. 3372, 115th Cong. § 2 (2018). Sen. Inhofe told an Oklahoma
9 newspaper that “[t]o resolve the large numbers [of asylum-seekers at the border,] the only
10 thing you have to do is not allow them to come into the United States.”¹⁴ The bill died in
11 committee. Another set of similar bills—including one that a co-sponsor acknowledged
12 was intended to deter asylum seekers—was equally unsuccessful in the House of
13 Representatives. *See* 164 Cong. Rec. H5430-31 (daily ed. June 21, 2018) (statement of
14 Rep. McCaul) (“[H.R. 4760] protects [children seeking asylum and separated from their
15 parents] because it provides a deterrent for them not to come here in the first place.”).
16 These bills would have raised the burden of proof in credible fear interviews and
17 introduced harsh criminal penalties for making any false statements in the asylum
18 interview process. Each failed to pass. *See* Securing America’s Future Act of 2018, H.R.
19 4760, 115th Cong., title IV, §§ 4402, 4408 (2018) (defeated on the floor 193-231);
20 Border Security and Immigration Reform Act of 2018, H.R. 6136, 115th Cong., title IV,
21 §§ 4101, 4108 (2018) (failed twice on the floor 121-301 and 190-230); Asylum Reform
22 and Border Protection Act of 2017, H.R. 391, 115th Cong. § 4 (2017) (died in
23 committee). And as recently as this year, the Senate rejected a bill aimed at “reduc[ing]

24
25
26 ¹⁴ Ryan Miller, *Inhofe to Introduce New Asylum Bill to Senate*, Enid News & Eagle (Aug.
27 8, 2018) (“It’s an obvious solution to a problem Now if we don’t do anything, that’s
28 going to go right back up to the large numbers that we had under the Obama
administration.”), [https://www.enidnews.com/oklahoma/news/inhofe-to-introduce-new-
asylum-bill-to-senate/article_1d30f74d-1595-5ba5-9946-4082b68b4cc2.html](https://www.enidnews.com/oklahoma/news/inhofe-to-introduce-new-asylum-bill-to-senate/article_1d30f74d-1595-5ba5-9946-4082b68b4cc2.html).

1 the incentive ... to make the dangerous journey to the United States southern border to
2 request asylum” by, among other things, placing numerical limits on asylum processing
3 and grants. Senate Amendment 5 to H.R. 268, 116th Cong., Div. L § 102(2), 165 Cong.
4 Rec. S472 (daily ed. Jan. 22, 2019) (failed 50-47).

5 II. The INA Imposes Strict Procedural Requirements Concerning Access to the
6 Asylum Process

7 In fulfillment of the legislative purposes just described, the INA requires that an
8 opportunity to apply for asylum be afforded to nearly all arriving noncitizens, and it
9 charges immigration officers with facilitating the asylum application process.

10 With three narrow exceptions not relevant here,¹⁵ the INA states that “any alien ...
11 who arrives in the United States” may apply for asylum whether or not she arrives at a
12 designated port of entry and irrespective of her immigration status. 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1)
13 (emphasis added). Courts have recognized this legislative command “that any alien who
14 arrives in the United States, irrespective of that alien’s status, may apply for asylum.”
15 *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump* (“*East Bay Sanctuary I*”), No. 18-CV-06810-
16 JST, 2018 WL 6053140, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2018); *see also Orantes-Hernandez v.*
17 *Thornburgh*, 919 F.2d 549, 553 (9th Cir. 1990) (stating that “all aliens possess such a
18 right” to apply for asylum).

19 The INA also describes specific procedural protections that must be afforded to
20 asylum seekers. First, any noncitizen who is “seeking admission” to the United States
21 “shall be inspected by immigration officers.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3) (emphasis added).
22 Second, virtually all arriving noncitizens are entitled to an opportunity to request asylum.
23

24
25 ¹⁵ “Section 1158(a) makes three classes of aliens categorically ineligible to apply for
26 asylum: those who may be removed to a ‘safe third country’ in which their ‘life or
27 freedom would not be threatened’ and where they would have access to equivalent
28 asylum proceedings; those who fail to file an application within one year of arriving in
the United States; and those who have previously applied for asylum and been denied.”
East Bay Sanctuary II, 909 F.3d at 1234.

1 Specifically, under the expedited removal process that applies to most noncitizens
2 arriving at ports of entry along the U.S.-Mexico border without valid entry documents,
3 *see id.* § 1225(b)(1)(A), if an immigration officer determines that a noncitizen is
4 inadmissible, “the officer shall order the alien removed from the United States without
5 further hearing or review *unless* the alien indicates either an intention to apply for asylum
6 ... or a fear of persecution.” *Id.* § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i) (emphasis added). And if such a
7 noncitizen “indicates either an intention to apply for asylum ... or a fear of persecution,
8 the officer *shall* refer the alien for an interview by an asylum officer.” *Id.*
9 § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii) (emphasis added). A person placed directly into ordinary removal
10 proceedings under § 240 of the INA need not be granted an interview with an asylum
11 officer, but (with limited exceptions) must still be permitted to seek asylum. *See id.*
12 §§ 1158, 1225(b)(2)(A), 1229a(c)(4).

13 DHS has repeatedly acknowledged the mandatory nature of the asylum process.
14 DHS regulations state, for example, that if a noncitizen “subject to the expedited removal
15 provisions indicates an intention to apply for asylum, or expresses a fear of persecution or
16 torture, or a fear of return to his or her country, the inspecting officer *shall not proceed*
17 *further* with removal of the alien until the alien has been referred for an interview by an
18 asylum officer.” 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(4) (emphasis added). And public statements of
19 CBP recognize that its agents implementing the expedited removal process have “no
20 discretion as to whether or not to refer an alien for a credible fear interview.”¹⁶

21 III. DHS’s Practice of Deterring Asylum Seekers by Limiting Access to Ports of
22 Entry and the Asylum Process Violates the INA

23 The Executive Branch is bound to implement duly enacted laws, including the
24 asylum provisions articulated by Congress in the INA. “In the framework of our
25

26
27 ¹⁶ *Claims of Fear, supra* note 4 (“CBP Agents and Officers do not make any
28 determination on the validity of such claims and refer the person for an interview with
[an] Asylum Officer.”).

1 Constitution, the President’s power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the
2 idea that he is to be a lawmaker.” *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S.
3 579, 587 (1952). The Framers left it to Congress, not the Executive Branch, to exercise
4 “the legislative power of the Federal government” using the “single, finely wrought and
5 exhaustively considered, procedure” they prescribed. *INS v. Chadha*, 462 U.S. 919, 951
6 (1983). It follows that “[t]he power of executing the laws ... does not include a power to
7 revise clear statutory terms that turn out not to work in practice.” *Util. Air Regulatory*
8 *Grp. v. EPA*, 573 U.S. 302, 327 (2014). Much less may the executive “decline to follow
9 a statutory mandate or prohibition simply because of policy objections.” *City & Cnty. of*
10 *San Francisco v. Trump*, 897 F.3d 1225, 1232 (9th Cir. 2018) (quoting *In re Aiken Cnty.*,
11 725 F.3d 255, 259 (D.C. Cir. 2013)).

12 The Refugee Act “mandates a procedure for the consideration of asylum claims by
13 people who are here on our shores”—a procedure DHS is bound to follow. 126 Cong.
14 Rec. 4,507 (1980) (statement of Rep. Holtzman). Nothing in the INA permits the
15 Executive Branch to refuse to implement any aspect of the statutory scheme described
16 above based upon its own policy judgments. As recognized by the Ninth Circuit in a
17 recent case addressing one of the statutory provisions at issue here, “[w]here ‘Congress
18 itself has significantly limited executive discretion by establishing a detailed scheme that
19 the Executive must follow in [dealing with] aliens,’ the Attorney General may not
20 abandon that scheme because he thinks it is not working well.” *East Bay Sanctuary II*,
21 909 F.3d at 1250 (citation omitted). Noting that Congress “codified our obligation to
22 receive” asylum-seekers in the INA, *id.* at 1230, the court held that allowing the
23 Executive Branch to modify the asylum application process would do “indirectly what
24 the Executive cannot do directly: amend the INA,” *id.* at 1250; *see also Trump v.*
25 *Hawaii*, 138 S. Ct. 2392, 2411 (2018) (noting that the President may not “override
26 particular provisions of the INA”). The Ninth Circuit affirmed the district court’s
27 decision that the administration’s denial of asylum to migrants arriving between ports of
28 entry “irreconcilably conflicts with the INA and the expressed intent of Congress.” *East*

1 *Bay Sanctuary I*, 2018 WL 6053140, at *1. The same conclusion applies with at least
2 equal force where DHS is refusing—even temporarily—to process asylum applications
3 from noncitizens who are following DHS’s directive to go to ports of entry and seek
4 asylum there.

5 For DHS to violate the INA’s provisions concerning asylum, not based on any
6 genuine lack of capacity to comply, but as a means of *detering asylum seekers*, is
7 especially problematic. That is because doing so directly contravenes the intent of
8 Congress in enacting the INA: to make the asylum process, including specific procedural
9 protections, accessible to virtually all arriving noncitizens. The Refugee Act aimed to
10 “respond to the urgent needs of persons subject to persecution in their homelands.”
11 Refugee Act § 101(a). DHS may not flout that purpose by artificially limiting arriving
12 noncitizens’ access to ports of entry and to the asylum process in order to deter such
13 noncitizens from seeking asylum at all. To the extent DHS is doing so, it is violating the
14 letter and spirit of the INA.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DATED: February 21, 2019

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE & DORR LLP

By: /s/ Matthew D. Benedetto
Matthew D. Benedetto

*Attorney for Amici Curiae Members of
Congress*

APPENDIX: LIST OF AMICI

- 1
- 2 Jerrold Nadler, Representative of New York
- 3 Zoe Lofgren, Representative of California
- 4 Bennie G. Thompson, Representative of Mississippi
- 5 Nanette Diaz Barragán, Representative of California
- 6 Suzanne Bonamici, Representative of Oregon
- 7 Julia Brownley, Representative of California
- 8 Tony Cárdenas, Representative of California
- 9 André Carson, Representative of Indiana
- 10 Joaquin Castro, Representative of Texas
- 11 Judy Chu, Representative of California
- 12 David N. Cicilline, Representative of Rhode Island
- 13 Gilbert R. Cisneros, Jr., Representative of California
- 14 Yvette D. Clarke, Representative of New York
- 15 Steve Cohen, Representative of Tennessee
- 16 Bonnie Watson Coleman, Representative of New Jersey
- 17 Lou Correa, Representative of California
- 18 Elijah E. Cummings, Representative of Maryland
- 19 Susan A. Davis, Representative of California
- 20 Madeleine Dean, Representative of Pennsylvania
- 21 Diana DeGette, Representative of Colorado
- 22 Val B. Demings, Representative of Florida
- 23 Mark DeSaulnier, Representative of California
- 24 Theodore E. Deutch, Representative of Florida
- 25 Eliot Engel, Representative of New York
- 26 Veronica Escobar, Representative of Texas
- 27 Adriano Espaillat, Representative of New York
- 28 Bill Foster, Representative of Illinois

- 1 Marcia L. Fudge, Representative of Ohio
- 2 Jesús G. “Chuy” García, Representative of Illinois
- 3 Sylvia Garcia, Representative of Texas
- 4 Jimmy Gomez, Representative of California
- 5 Vicente Gonzalez, Representative of Texas
- 6 Al Green, Representative of Texas
- 7 Raúl Grijalva, Representative of Arizona
- 8 Deb Haaland, Representative of New Mexico
- 9 Denny Heck, Representative of Washington
- 10 Sheila Jackson Lee, Representative of Texas
- 11 Pramila Jayapal, Representative of Washington
- 12 Henry C. “Hank” Johnson, Jr., Representative of Georgia
- 13 Joseph P. Kennedy, III, Representative of Massachusetts
- 14 Dan Kildee, Representative of Michigan
- 15 Raja Krishnamoorthi, Representative of Illinois
- 16 Brenda L. Lawrence, Representative of Michigan
- 17 Andy Levin, Representative of Michigan
- 18 John Lewis, Representative of Georgia
- 19 Ted W. Lieu, Representative of California
- 20 Alan Lowenthal, Representative of California
- 21 James P. McGovern, Representative of Massachusetts
- 22 Jerry McNerney, Representative of California
- 23 Gwen Moore, Representative of Wisconsin
- 24 Debbie Mucarsel-Powell, Representative of Florida
- 25 Grace F. Napolitano, Representative of California
- 26 Joe Neguse, Representative of Colorado
- 27 Eleanor Holmes Norton, Representative of the District of Columbia
- 28 Ilhan Omar, Representative of Minnesota

- 1 Chellie Pingree, Representative of Maine
- 2 David E. Price, Representative of North Carolina
- 3 Jamie Raskin, Representative of Maryland
- 4 Kathleen M. Rice, Representative of New York
- 5 Cedric L. Richmond, Representative of Louisiana
- 6 Harley Rouda, Representative of California
- 7 Linda Sánchez, Representative of California
- 8 Mary Gay Scanlon, Representative of Pennsylvania
- 9 Jan Schakowsky, Representative of Illinois
- 10 Albio Sires, Representative of New Jersey
- 11 Darren Soto, Representative of Florida
- 12 Jackie Speier, Representative of California
- 13 Eric Swalwell, Representative of California
- 14 Dina C. Titus, Representative of Nevada
- 15 Rashida Tlaib, Representative of Michigan
- 16 Norma Torres, Representative of California
- 17 Lauren Underwood, Representative of Illinois
- 18 Juan Vargas, Representative of California
- 19 Filemon Vela, Representative of Texas
- 20 Nydia M. Velázquez, Representative of New York
- 21 Peter Welch, Representative of Vermont
- 22 John A. Yarmuth, Representative of Kentucky

23
24
25
26
27
28