## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ROCHELLE GARZA, as guardian ad litem to	)
unaccompanied minor J.D., on behalf of	)
herself and others similarly situated,	)
	) No. 17-cv-02122-TSC
Plaintiff,	)
V.	)
	)
ERIC D. HARGAN, et al.,	)
	)
Defendants.	)
	)

## PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR BRIEFING ON CLASS-WIDE RELIEF AND FOR STAY PENDING SUPREME COURT APPEAL

Plaintiff opposes Defendants' attempt (ECF No. 44) to delay adjudication of Plaintiff's motion for class certification (ECF No. 18) and motion for a preliminary injunction (ECF No. 5) for the following reasons:

1. Defendants first ask this Court to stay the district court proceedings until the U.S. Supreme Court rules on their recent petition for certiorari. Defendants' petition for certiorari lacks merit, but will be pending for several months even if denied. There is no automatic stay in the meantime; the mandate has issued, and this Court has jurisdiction. Granting a "stay [of] civil proceedings in the interest of justice and 'in light of the particular circumstances of the case'" is a matter committed to this Court's discretion, *Bush v. Semyenova*, 255 F. Supp. 3d 235 (D.D.C. 2017) (quoting *SEC v. Dresser Indus., Inc.*, 628 F.2d 1368, 1375 (D.C. Cir. 1980)), and the equities do not favor a stay in these circumstances, where the members of the plaintiff class will suffer irreparable injury in far less time than it will take the Supreme Court to act on the petition.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Defendants' principal complaint in their petition is that Plaintiff thwarted their ability to seek Supreme Court review. Ironically, if this Court proceeds and rules in Plaintiff's favor,

Defendants have given no indication that they will refrain from obstructing class members' access to abortion while their petition for certiorari is pending, despite the fact that the en banc Court recognized that their policy is likely unconstitutional. In fact, all indications are to the contrary, as Defendants continue to defend their policy in their petition. As noted in Plaintiff's Motion for Class Certification, there are hundreds of pregnant unaccompanied minors in Defendants' custody each year. *See* Pls.' Mot. for Class Certification at 4, ECF No. 18 (noting that in 2016, there were 682 pregnant unaccompanied minors in ORR custody, relying on attached exhibits). Entry of a preliminary injunction to protect the class is therefore a matter of considerable magnitude and urgency, for the same reason that relief for J.D. was urgent. Defendants should not be permitted to delay this case, and inflict their unconstitutional policies on the putative class in the interim. This Court should not facilitate Defendants' desire to put this case on hold for several months while they continue to violate the constitutional rights of young women.

2. Alternatively, Defendants ask this Court to first rule on the motion for class certification, and subsequently receive additional briefing on the motion for a preliminary injunction. This approach would likewise delay adjudication of the preliminary injunction for weeks, without justification, and would cause irreparable harm to the putative class, as discussed *supra*. There is no reason why the Court cannot proceed simultaneously with the motion for class certification and preliminary injunction as to the class. Indeed, contrary to Defendants' unsupported claim that the "scope and nature" of the class is "highly relevant" to the preliminary injunction, Defs.' Mot. at 4, the class is in the same position as J.D., namely, they are subject to

Defendants will have an opportunity to seek interlocutory review from the Supreme Court by taking an appeal from the grant of a preliminary injunction as to the class and then petitioning for certiorari if the court of appeals affirms.

Defendants' unconstitutional policies that obstruct abortion access. There is nothing particular

or unique about the class that would need to be resolved prior to the preliminary injunction. If

Defendants believe there is, they can make their arguments in their simultaneously filed briefs.

At a minimum, if the Court remains uncertain about the precise "scope and nature" of the class,

it can enter an order provisionally certifying the class at the same time that it preliminarily

enjoins the Defendants from blocking class members' access to abortion. See Plaintiff's Motion

for Class Certification (ECF No. 18) at 1 n.2 (noting this Court's provisional class certification in

conjunction with granting preliminary injunction in the context of an immigration detention case

in R.I.L-R v. Johnson, 80 F. Supp. 3d 164, 179-80 (D.D.C. 2015)).

3. Lastly, Defendants ask this Court for leave to file an opposition to Plaintiff's

motion for a preliminary injunction as to the class on November 20, 2017. Plaintiff does not

object, as long as Plaintiff is allowed until November 30, 2017, to file a unified reply in further

support of both her motion for class certification and preliminary injunction.

**CONCLUSION** 

For the reasons given above, the Defendants' motion should be denied. A proposed

order is filed herewith.

Date: November 7, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Arthur B. Spitzer

Arthur B. Spitzer (D.C. Bar No. 235960)

Scott Michelman (D.C. Bar No. 1006945)

American Civil Liberties Union Foundation

of the District of Columbia

4301 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 434

Washington, D.C. 20008

Tel. 202-457-0800

Fax 202-457-0805

aspitzer@acludc.org

3

## smichelman@acludc.org

Brigitte Amiri\*
Meagan Burrows
Jennifer Dalven
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor
New York, NY 10004
Tel. (212) 549-2633
Fax (212) 549-2652
bamiri@aclu.org
mburrows@aclu.org
jdalven@aclu.org

Daniel Mach (D.C. Bar No. 461652) American Civil Liberties Union Foundation 915 15th Street NW Washington, DC 20005 Telephone: (202) 675-2330 dmach@aclu.org

Jennifer L. Chou
Mishan R. Wroe
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of
Northern California, Inc.
39 Drumm Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
Tel. (415) 621-2493
Fax (415) 255-8437
jchou@aclunc.org
mwroe@aclunc.org

Melissa Goodman American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Southern California 1313 West 8th Street Los Angeles, California 90017 Tel. (213) 977-9500 Fax (213) 977-5299 mgoodman@aclusocal.org

Attorneys for Plaintiff

<sup>\*</sup>Admitted pro hac vice

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ROCHELLE GARZA, as guardian ad litem to unaccompanied minor J.D., on behalf of herself and others similarly situated,  Plaintiff,	) ) ) No. 17-cv-02122-TSC )	
V.	)	
ERIC D. HARGAN, et al.,	) )	
Defendants.	) ) )	
[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR STAY, AND GRANTING DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO FILE ADDITIONAL BRIEFING OPPOSING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION		
Upon consideration of Defendants' Motion for Briefing on Class Wide Relief and Stay		
Pending Supreme Court Proceedings (ECF No. 44), it is hereby		
ORDERED that Defendants' motion to stay or otherwise delay adjudication of the		
preliminary injunction and class certification is denied;		
<b>ORDERED</b> that Defendants may file an opposition to Plaintiff's preliminary injunction		
as to the class on November 20, 2017, and Plain	atiff's reply in further support of her motion for	
class certification and motion for preliminary injunction is due November 30, 2017.		
Date:		
	Tanya S. Chutkan	
	United States District Judge	