

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE
ASSISTANCE PROJECT, *a project of the
Urban Justice Center, Inc., on behalf of itself
and its clients,*
HIAS, INC., *on behalf of itself and its clients,*
MIDDLE EAST STUDIES ASSOCIATION of
North America, Inc., *on behalf of itself and its
members,*
MUHAMMED METEAB,
PAUL HARRISON,
IBRAHIM AHMED MOHOMED,
JOHN DOES Nos. 1 & 3, and
JANE DOE No. 2,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Civil Action No. TDC-17-0361

DONALD J. TRUMP, *in his official capacity
as President of the United States,*
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF
NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE,
JOHN F. KELLY, *in his official capacity as
Secretary of Homeland Security,*
REX W. TILLERSON, *in his official capacity
as Secretary of State,* and
MICHAEL DEMPSEY, *in his official capacity
as Acting Director of National Intelligence,*

Defendants.


ORDER

On April 10, 2017, this Court issued an Order staying the resolution of Plaintiffs' Motion for a Preliminary Injunction of § 5(d) of the Executive Order, ECF No. 64, during the pendency

of the nationwide preliminary injunction of Section 6 of Executive Order 13,780, "Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States" ("Second Executive Order"), 82 Fed. Reg. 13209 (Mar. 9, 2017), by the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii. ECF No. 182. On June 12, 2017, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit upheld in large part the injunction entered by the District of Hawaii, including, as relevant here, as to Section 6(b)'s adoption of the 50,000 refugee cap. *Hawaii v. Trump*, 859 F.3d 741, 789 (9th Cir. 2017). On June 26, 2017, the United States Supreme Court granted certiorari in *Hawaii* and in *International Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump*, 857 F.3d 554 (4th Cir. 2017). *Trump v. Int'l Refugee Assistance Project*, 137 S. Ct. 2080, 2086 (2017). In the same ruling, the Supreme Court granted in part the Government's application to stay the injunctions with respect to Sections 2(c), 6(a), and 6(b) of the Second Executive Order. *Id.* at 2088-89. As a result, the injunction of Section 6(b) remains partially in effect. In light of the Supreme Court's ruling, this Court will deny without prejudice Plaintiffs' Motion for a Preliminary Injunction of § 5(d) of the Executive Order, subject to renewal when appropriate.

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that Plaintiffs' Motion for a Preliminary Injunction of § 5(d) of the Executive Order, ECF No. 64, is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

Date: July 27, 2017


THEODORE D. CHUANG
United States District Judge