

**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, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
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.¹

¹ 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

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@achusocal.org

**Admitted pro hac vice*

Attorneys for Plaintiff

