

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

STATE OF HAWAII, et al.,

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

No. 17-17168

v.

DONALD TRUMP, et al.,

Defendants-Appellants.

**BRIEF FOR THE STATES OF NEW YORK, ILLINOIS, CALIFORNIA,
CONNECTICUT, DELAWARE, IOWA, MAINE, MARYLAND,
MASSACHUSETTS, NEW MEXICO, OREGON, RHODE ISLAND, VERMONT,
AND WASHINGTON, THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, AND
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AS AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF
APPELLEES IN OPPOSITION TO APPELLANTS' APPLICATION FOR A STAY**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTRODUCTION AND INTERESTS OF AMICI.....	1
ARGUMENT	5
I. THE PROCLAMATION PERPETUATES, AND MAKES PERMANENT, THE HARM THAT ITS PREDECESSOR ORDERS INFLICTED ON THE AMICI STATES.	5
A. Harms to the Amici States’ Proprietary Interests	5
B. Harms to the Amici States’ Sovereign and Quasi- Sovereign Interests	22
II. DEFENDANTS HAVE NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT A STAY PENDING APPEAL IS WARRANTED.	25
CONCLUSION	31

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases **Page(s)**

Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico ex rel. Barez,
458 U.S. 592 (1982) 28

Hawaii v. Trump,
2017 WL 4639560 (D. Haw. October 17, 2017)..... 2

Hawaii v. Trump,
859 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2017)..... 2, 6, 25, 28

Moore v. City of East Cleveland,
431 U.S. 494 (1977) 28

Nken v. Holder,
556 U.S. 418 (2009) 25, 26, 27

Trump v. International Refugee Assistance Project,
137 S. Ct. 2080 (2017)..... 27, 28

United States v. Oakland Cannabis Buyers’ Coop.,
532 U.S. 483 (2001) 26

Virginian Ry. Co. v. Railway Employees,
300 U.S. 515 (1937) 26

Washington v. Trump,
847 F.3d 1151 (9th Cir. 2017)..... 2, 6, 25, 30

Constitutions

Cal. Const.
art. I, § 4 22
art. I, § 7 22
art. I, § 8 22
art. I, § 31 22

N.M. Const. art. II, § 11 22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Constitutions	Page(s)
Ill. Const.	
art. I, § 3	22
art. I, § 17	22
Statutes	
Cal. Civ. Code § 51(b)	22
Cal. Gov't Code	
§§ 11135-11137.....	22
§ 12900 et seq.....	22
Conn. Gen. Stat.	
§ 46a-60	22
Ill. Comp. Stat.	
ch. 740, § 23/5(a)(1)	22
ch. 775, § 5/1-102(A).....	22
ch. 775, § 5/10-104(A)(1)	22
Maine Rev. Stat. Ann.	
§ 784.....	22
§ 4551-4634	22
Mass. Gen. L.	
ch. 93, § 102.....	22
ch. 151B, § 1	22
ch. 151B, § 4	22
Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-606.....	22
N.M. Stat. Ann. § 28-1-7.....	22
Or. Rev. Stat. § 659A.006(1).....	22
R.I. Gen. Laws § 28-5-7(1)(i)	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Statutes	Page(s)
Vt. Stat. Ann.	
tit. 9, §§ 4500-4507	22
tit. 21, § 495.....	22
Wash. Rev. Code § 49.60.030(1)	22
Executive Orders/Proclamations	
Executive Order No. 13,769 (Jan. 27, 2017), 82 Fed. Reg. 8,977 (Feb. 1, 2017)	2
Executive Order No. 13,780 (Mar. 6, 2017), 82 Fed. Reg. 13,209 (Mar. 9, 2017)	2
Proclamation No. 9645 (Sept. 24, 2017), 82 Fed. Reg. 45,161 (Sept. 27, 2017).....	passim
Miscellaneous Authorities	
Abha Bhattarai, <i>Even Canadians are Skipping Trips to the U.S. After Trump Travel Ban</i> , Wash. Post (Apr. 14, 2017), at http://tinyurl.com/WashPost-Bhattarai-Tourism	19
Alana Wise, <i>Travel to the United States Rose in April, But Industry Remains Wary</i> , Reuters (June 6, 2017), at http://tinyurl.com/Reuters-Wise-TraveltoUS	20
Anna Maria Barry-Jester, <i>Trump’s New Travel Ban Could Affect Doctors, Especially in the Rust Belt and Appalachia</i> , FiveThirtyEight (Mar. 6, 2017), at http://goo.gl/dT2Z6h	24
Congressional Research Serv., <i>Executive Orders and Proclamations</i> (Mar. 9, 1999), available at https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/95-772.pdf	2

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Miscellaneous Authorities	Page(s)
Hironao Okahana, <i>Data Sources: Admissions Yields of Prospective International Graduate Students: A First Look</i> (Council of Graduate Schools, June 2017), http://tinyurl.com/CouncilGradSchs-Okahana-Survey	9
Immigrant Doctors Project, https://immigrantdoctors.org ;	24
Institute of Int’l Educ., <i>Advising International Students in an Age of Anxiety</i> (Mar. 31, 2017), at http://tinyurl.com/IIE-AdvisingStudents	18, 19
Jeff Glueck, <i>Coming to America?</i> , Foursquare Direct, Medium (blog post) (May 24, 2017), at https://medium.com/foursquare-direct/coming-to-america-528312934221	20
Kirk Carapezza, <i>Travel Ban’s ‘Chilling Effect’ Could Cost Universities Hundreds of Millions</i> , Nat’l Pub. Radio (Apr. 7, 2017), at http://goo.gl/CqkNEy	9, 10
Maryam Saleh, <i>Hospitals in Trump Country Suffer As Muslim Doctors Denied Visas to U.S.</i> , The Intercept (Aug. 17, 2017), at http://tinyurl.com/Intercept-Saleh-MD	25
Sam Petulla, <i>Entry Ban Could Cause Doctor Shortages in Trump Territory, New Research Finds</i> , NBC News (Mar. 7, 2017), at http://tinyurl.com/NBCNews-Petulla-MDShortages	9, 13, 16
U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, <i>Reciprocity and Civil Documents by Country</i> , at https://travel.state.gov/content/visas/en/fees/reciprocity-by-country.html/	11

INTRODUCTION AND INTERESTS OF AMICI

The States of New York, Illinois, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Washington, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the District of Columbia, submit this brief as amici curiae in opposition to defendants' application for a stay pending appeal.¹ This appeal arises from a challenge by the State of Hawaii and other plaintiffs to Presidential Proclamation No. 9645: the third in a series of presidential orders executed this year that imposed discriminatory bans on the entry into the United States of nationals from six overwhelmingly Muslim countries.² The United States District Court for the District of Hawaii (Watson, J.) issued a preliminary injunction restraining defendants³

¹ Pursuant to instructions from the Clerk's Office, amici States are concurrently filing a motion requesting leave to file this brief. In addition, on October 30, 2017, six of the undersigned amici States filed a motion to intervene in this action. If the motion is granted, those six States—Washington, California, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, and Oregon—will withdraw their appearances as amici curiae in this case.

² See Proclamation No. 9645, § 2(a)-(c), (e), (g)-(h) (Sept. 24, 2017), 82 Fed. Reg. 45,161 (Sept. 27, 2017).

³ The defendants in this action are: Donald J. Trump, as President of the United States; the United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS); Elaine Duke, as Acting Secretary of DHS; the United

from implementing those sections of the Proclamation.⁴ *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-cv-50, 2017 WL 4639560 (D. Haw. October 17, 2017). The district court held that interim relief was warranted because plaintiffs would experience irreparable injury in the absence of an injunction, the balance of the equities favored an injunction, and plaintiffs had made a strong showing of the likelihood of success on the merits of their claims under the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA). This Court previously affirmed injunctions entered against the similar, but temporary, travel bans contained in the two Executive Orders that preceded the Proclamation,⁵ including in an earlier stage in this case.⁶

States Department of State; Rex Tillerson, as Secretary of State; and the United States.

⁴ The injunction does not cover the provisions that bar the entry of a limited number of government officials from Venezuela and all nationals of North Korea. *See* Proclamation § 2(d), (f).

⁵ Executive Order No. 13,769, §§ 3(c), 5(a)-(c), 5(e) (Jan. 27, 2017), 82 Fed. Reg. 8,977 (Feb. 1, 2017); Executive Order No. 13,780, §§ 2(c), 6(a)-(b) (Mar. 6, 2017), 82 Fed. Reg. 13,209 (Mar. 9, 2017). There is no substantive difference between Executive Orders and Proclamations. *See* Congressional Research Serv., *Executive Orders and Proclamations 1* (Mar. 9, 1999) (internet). (For authorities available on the internet, full URLs are listed in the table of authorities.)

⁶ *See Washington v. Trump*, 847 F.3d 1151, 1169 (9th Cir. 2017) (per curiam); *Hawaii v. Trump*, 859 F.3d 741, 755 (9th Cir. 2017) (per curiam),

This brief supplements plaintiffs' brief by providing the perspective and experience of 16 additional sovereign States and the District of Columbia, all of which have a strong interest in the outcome of the stay application. Like its two predecessors, the Proclamation's entry ban gravely and irreparably harms our universities, hospitals, businesses, communities, and residents. Allowing the preliminary injunction to remain in place will continue to provide critical protection to the state interests that the Proclamation's entry ban endangers.

Amici thus have a strong interest in plaintiffs' challenges to the Proclamation's entry ban. Indeed, like plaintiffs here, many of the amici States have brought suits challenging the two preceding Executive Orders on the grounds that certain provisions of those Orders violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment and various other constitutional and statutory provisions.⁷ We have also previously filed

cert. granted, 137 S. Ct. 2080 (2017), *vacated & remanded*, No. 16-1540, 2017 WL 4782860 (U.S. Oct. 24, 2017) (with instructions to dismiss as moot).

⁷ Many of the amici States challenged the March Order in *Washington v. Trump*, No. 17-cv-141 (W.D. Wash. 2017) (stayed pending appeal in *Hawaii v. Trump*). They challenged the January Order in *Washington v. Trump*, No. 17-cv-141 (W.D. Wash. 2017), *stay pending*

briefs amicus curiae in this case, including briefs supporting the entry of preliminary injunctions against the previous Executive Orders, and briefs opposing any stay of such injunctions.⁸

While the amici States differ in many ways, all benefit from immigration, tourism, and international travel by students, academics, skilled professionals, and businesspeople. Like the previous travel bans, the disputed provisions of the Proclamation continue to significantly disrupt the ability of our States' public colleges and universities to recruit and retain students and faculty, impairing academic staffing and research needs, and causing the loss of tuition and tax revenues, among other costs. The Proclamation likewise continues to disrupt the provision

appeal denied, 847 F.3d 1151 (9th Cir. 2017); Mass. & N.Y. Amicus Br. (15 States and D.C.), *Washington v. Trump*, No. 17-141 (9th Cir. 2017), ECF No. 58-2; *Aziz v. Trump*, No. 17-cv-116, 2017 WL 580855 (E.D. Va. 2017).

⁸ N.Y. Amicus Br. (17 States and D.C.), *Trump v. International Refugee Assistance Project (IRAP)* and *Trump v. Hawaii*, Nos. 16-1436 and 16-1540 (U.S. Sup. Ct. Sept. 18, 2017); N.Y. Amicus Br. (15 States and D.C.), *Trump v. Hawaii*, No. 16-1540 (U.S. Sup. Ct. July 18, 2017); Va. Amicus Br. (16 States and D.C.), *Trump v. IRAP*, Nos. 16-A1190, 16A-1191 (U.S. Sup. Ct. June 12, 2017); N.Y. Amicus Br. (16 States and D.C.), *Trump v. IRAP*, Nos. 16-A1190, 16A-1191 (U.S. Sup. Ct. June 12, 2017); Ill. Amicus Br. (16 States and D.C.), *Hawaii v. Trump*, No. 17-15589 (9th Cir. Apr. 20, 2017), ECF No. 125; Va. & Md. Amicus Br. (16 States and D.C.), *IRAP v. Trump*, No. 17-1351 (4th Cir. Apr. 19, 2017), ECF No. 153.

of medical care at the States' hospitals and further harms our science, technology, finance, and tourism industries by inhibiting—permanently—the free exchange of information, ideas, and talent between the designated countries and our States, causing long-term economic and reputational damage. In addition, the ban has made it more difficult for the States to effectuate our own constitutional and statutory policies of religious tolerance and nondiscrimination.

Accordingly, the amici States have a strong interest in ensuring that the protection provided by the injunction remains in place during the pendency of this appeal.

ARGUMENT

I. THE PROCLAMATION PERPETUATES, AND MAKES PERMANENT, THE HARM THAT ITS PREDECESSOR ORDERS INFLICTED ON THE AMICI STATES.

A. Harms to the Amici States' Proprietary Interests

The disputed provisions of the Proclamation block the entry of all immigrants and most non-immigrants from six Muslim-majority countries,⁹ including those who seek to be students and faculty at our

⁹ Five of these countries were covered under the previous travel bans: Iran, Libya, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen. The sixth country is Chad.

public universities, physicians and researchers at our medical institutions, employees of our businesses, and guests who contribute to our economies when they come here as tourists or for family visits.¹⁰ The provisions are thus irreparably harming the work of our state institutions and our state treasuries.¹¹ *See Washington v. Trump*, 847 F.3d at 1169; *Hawaii v. Trump*, 859 F.3d at 783 (recognizing irreparable harms caused by defendants' two prior travel bans).

Harms to State Colleges and Universities. State colleges and universities rely on faculty and students from across the world. By interfering with the entry of individuals from the designated countries, the disputed provisions of the Proclamation continue to seriously disrupt our public institutions' ability to recruit and retain students and

¹⁰ The Proclamation bars *all* immigration from the six affected countries; the issuance of all non-immigrant visas to Syrians; all business and tourist visas for nationals of Chad, Libya, and Yemen; and all non-immigrant visas for nationals of Iran, except certain student and exchange visas that will be subject to additional but unspecified scrutiny. *See* Proclamation § 2(a)-(c), (e), (g)-(h).

¹¹ All of the amici States support the legal arguments put forth in this brief, although not every specified harm occurs in every State. For example, almost all amici States operate state hospitals, but Delaware does not.

faculty—causing lost tuition revenue, increased administrative burdens, and the expenditure of additional university resources.¹²

As with the two previous travel bans, announcement of the Proclamation's entry ban has created serious doubt as to whether faculty from the designated countries will be able to obtain the visas they need to timely assume positions they have accepted with public universities in the amici States.¹³ For example, two scholars hired at the University of Washington in 2017 were unable to enter to begin their positions due to the initial travel ban, and many other faculty members and researchers at amici States' universities are contemplating leaving their current positions for positions in other countries in the the wake of the Proclamation's now indefinite ban.

The Proclamation's entry ban also continues to disrupt the ability of our public universities to recruit and retain foreign students from the designated countries, imperiling hundreds of millions of tuition dollars

¹² See Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 41, 43-44, 53, 55-56, 80, 93, 105, 107-108, 125, *Washington v. Trump*, No. 2:17-cv-141 (W.D. Wash.), ECF No. 198.

¹³ See, e.g., *id.* ¶¶ 38-40, 42, 93, 111.

and other revenue generated from such students, as well as important academic research projects.¹⁴

Before this series of travel bans was implemented, the amici States' colleges and universities had already made numerous offers of admission for the 2017-2018 academic year to students from the affected countries and—but for the bans' interference with their continuing admissions process—might have admitted many more.¹⁵ Some schools are continuing to make such offers, including to students from nations designated in the Proclamation. But some of these students have withdrawn applications; others have had to abandon entirely their plans to enroll in our university programs due to the bans; and many have chosen not to apply at all, resulting in a significant decline in international student applications at many of the amici States' universities.¹⁶

Indeed, in this climate of uncertainty and discrimination, forty percent of colleges surveyed across the nation reported a drop in

¹⁴ *See, e.g., id.* ¶¶ 38, 43-46, 53, 57, 86, 94-95, 105, 107, 112.

¹⁵ *See, e.g., id.* ¶¶ 43-44.

¹⁶ *See, e.g., id.* ¶¶ 37, 46, 53, 122.

applications from foreign students in the wake of the first two travel bans.¹⁷ Graduate departments in science and engineering have reported that “international student applications for many programs declined by 20 to 30 percent for 2017 programs.”¹⁸ Additionally, 80 percent of college registrars and admissions officials surveyed have serious concerns about their future application yields from international students.¹⁹ And 46 percent of graduate deans have reported “substantial” declines in admission yields for international students.²⁰ Not surprisingly, countries that are perceived as more welcoming—such as Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand—have already seen a jump in applications in this same time period.²¹ This drain of highly qualified student talent will continue under the Proclamation.

¹⁷ See Kirk Carapezza, *Travel Ban’s ‘Chilling Effect’ Could Cost Universities Hundreds of Millions*, Nat’l Pub. Radio (Apr. 7, 2017) (internet).

¹⁸ Sam Petulla, *Entry Ban Could Cause Doctor Shortages in Trump Territory, New Research Finds*, NBC News (Mar. 7, 2017) (internet).

¹⁹ Carapezza, *supra*.

²⁰ Hironao Okahana, *Data Sources: Admissions Yields of Prospective International Graduate Students: A First Look* (Council of Graduate Schools, June 2017) (internet).

²¹ Carapezza, *supra*.

The ability of state institutions of higher education to retain their existing foreign students and faculty has also been compromised by the broad, continuing entry ban contained in the Proclamation. The States' public universities and colleges currently have hundreds of students and faculty members from the targeted countries. For example, at Washington State University, there are 140 students and 9 faculty members from the countries designated in the Proclamation, and 105 such graduate students at the University of Washington.²² The University of Massachusetts has 180 similarly situated students and 25 employees.²³ There are 529 such students in the University of California system; 250 in the California State University system; 297 at the State University of New York; and 61 at Portland State University.²⁴

Many of these students will need to apply for additional visas during the course of their academic studies because only single-entry visas are permitted from some of the affected countries, and because the

²² Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 35-36.

²³ *Id.* ¶¶ 91, 94.

²⁴ *Id.* ¶¶ 53, 58, 108, 124.

required visas are valid only for relatively short periods.²⁵ And those students and faculty members whose visas are set to expire will face obstacles to renewal—if renewal of their visas is even possible under the disputed provisions of the Proclamation, which prohibit the issuance of most non-immigrant visas for nationals of the affected countries. Thus, if enforcement of the disputed provisions of the Proclamation is permitted, certain students who are no longer eligible for student visas (e.g., Syrian students) may be required to discontinue their courses of study. And other students will face the prospect of not knowing whether they may be denied access to the U.S. institutions where they are studying, particularly if the Proclamation calls for them to be subject to heightened scrutiny and vetting procedures (e.g., Iranian and Somali students).²⁶

²⁵ U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, *Reciprocity and Civil Documents by Country* (internet) (search by country and visa types F and M).

²⁶ Although the Proclamation gives consular officers discretion to waive the travel ban in individual cases, it does not describe the process for applying for a waiver, specify a time frame for receiving a waiver, or set concrete guidelines for issuance of a waiver beyond providing a list of circumstances in which waivers “may be appropriate.” § 3(c). And there is no guarantee that a waiver will be issued because the ultimate decision

Any such visa delays or denials could jeopardize not only these individuals' education or employment, but also any grant funding and scientific research projects that depend on their work.²⁷ And those whose visas remain valid for a longer duration may be unwilling to take the risk of participating in educational, professional, or personal obligations that require travel outside the United States, and will also face the hardship of being unable to receive visits from their parents, spouses, children, and other relatives.²⁸

The foreign-national scholars and faculty employed by or recruited by our state universities typically have specialized expertise that cannot easily be replaced. Universities that are delayed in or prevented from recruiting international faculty and related staff thus suffer significant financial and reputational harm, including delayed or lost federal funding for research efforts.²⁹ Our educational institutions have needed

on whether to issue it lies solely within a consular official's discretion. *See id.*

²⁷ Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 36, 42, 55, 91, 94.

²⁸ *Id.* ¶¶ 37-38, 54, 78-79, 91, 94, 107, 109-110, 112, 123.

²⁹ *Id.* ¶¶ 38, 43-44, 55, 105-106, 112.

to expend considerable amounts of scarce university resources to make contingency plans for filling the unexpected gaps in faculty rosters caused by the exclusion or possible departure of scholars from the designated countries. Despite this effort, there is no guarantee that our universities will be able to meet all of their needs.³⁰

While public colleges and universities are always subject to federal immigration law and policy, these successive travel bans have injured them unexpectedly, by upending with no advance notice the established framework around which they have designed their faculty recruitment and student enrollment processes.³¹ As explained above, this has left seats unfilled, tuition dollars irretrievably lost, and important academic programs and research projects in peril.

³⁰ *Id.* ¶ 55 (Proclamation “disrupts the ability of California’s universities and colleges to meet staffing needs”); *id.* ¶ 93 (each year, University of Massachusetts hires approximately 12 new employees from the countries designated in the Proclamation, which will now “severely interfere” with University’s ability to hire such individuals in the future and may render University “permanently unable to hire top-ranked” scholars and faculty).

³¹ *See* Petulla, *supra* (University of Massachusetts and others have had to “shift[] their recruitment strategies to avoid a talent drought”).

The disputed provisions of the Proclamation's third ban have also harmed and will continue to harm our educational institutions' core missions of excellence in education and scholarship. The loss of students, scholars, and faculty from the affected nations not only impairs important academic and medical research at our States' universities and colleges, but also inhibits the free exchange of information, ideas, and talent that is so essential to academic life and our state universities' missions.³²

Harms to State Hospitals and Medical Institutions. The disputed provisions of the Proclamation, like the travel bans of the earlier Executive Orders, have created staffing disruptions in state hospitals and medical institutions, which employ physicians, medical residents, research faculty, and other professionals from the designated countries.³³

For example, foreign-national medical residents at public hospitals often provide crucial services, such as caring for some of the most

³² Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 38, 105-106.

³³ See, e.g., *id.* ¶ 127 (Oregon Health and Sciences University, a public academic medical center employs 11 such individuals from seven of the countries designated in the Proclamation).

underserved populations in our States.³⁴ They are assigned to our state university hospital residency programs through a computerized “match” that, after applications and interviews, ranks and assigns residency candidates to programs nationwide; programs and candidates are advised of match results in the spring of each calendar year and all new residents begin their positions on July 1.³⁵

Many state university residency programs regularly match residents from the affected countries. If a program’s matched residents are precluded from obtaining a visa under the disputed provisions of the Proclamation, as many of them were under the predecessor travel bans, the program risks having an insufficient number of residents to meet staffing needs.³⁶ This continuing uncertainty is of particular concern in

³⁴ *See, e.g., id.* ¶ 115 (New York’s public safety-net hospitals employ a “significant number” of foreign-national residents in 97 medically underserved communities).

³⁵ *Id.* ¶ 116.

³⁶ The 2017 match took place on March 17, one day after the revised Executive Order was scheduled to take effect, and there was serious doubt whether “[a]s many as several hundred doctors” from the six countries designated in that Order would be granted waivers to be able to begin the residencies for which they had matched. Petulla, *supra* (figure reported by the Association of American Medical Colleges).

view of the indefinite duration of the Proclamation's entry ban. The practical effect of this dilemma is that our state university programs will be reluctant (or unable) to interview or rank highly-qualified residency candidates from the designated countries going forward, because there is no guarantee they will be able to begin or complete their residencies.³⁷ Indeed, residency programs are at this very moment in the process of interviewing candidates for next year's match.³⁸

In addition, if current residents who are nationals of the designated countries cannot renew or extend their visas—as the Proclamation continues to threaten—state university residency programs will be unable to continue to employ them; these multiyear programs will then be left with unfilled positions, and further staffing gaps will result.³⁹ Such disruptions will translate into uncertainty in residency training programs, as well as threats to the provision and quality of health care services.⁴⁰ And because patients at our medical facilities must be cared

³⁷ Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 60, 115, 127.

³⁸ *Id.* ¶ 115.

³⁹ *Id.*

⁴⁰ See *infra* at pp. 23-25 and accompanying notes.

for, our facilities must quickly adapt to any staffing complications resulting from the disputed provisions of the Proclamation—and spend precious time and resources preparing to do so.⁴¹

Diminished Tax Revenues and Broader Economic Harms. In addition to losing the tuition, room and board, and other fees paid by students at our public universities, amici States have suffered—and will continue to suffer—other direct and substantial economic losses as a result of the disputed provisions of the Proclamation, just as we did under the Proclamation’s predecessors. Every foreign student (whether attending a public or private college or university), every tourist, and every business visitor arriving in our States contributes to our economies through their purchases of our goods and services and the tax receipts that their presence generates. Despite the present preliminary injunction, and those that were issued against the Proclamation’s predecessor travel bans, this series of successive travel bans during the past ten months has blocked or dissuaded thousands of individuals—potential consumers all—from entering the amici States, thereby

⁴¹ Third Am. Compl. ¶ 59 (shortage of “even one physician” can have “serious implications” for safety-net hospitals in underserved areas).

eliminating the significant tax contributions those individuals would have made.⁴² That lost revenue will never be recovered and the lasting economic damage cannot be undone, even if plaintiffs ultimately prevail.

The contribution of foreign students alone to our States' economies is immense. A survey by the Institute of International Education conducted in the months following the issuance of the initial travel ban found that "more than 15,000 students enrolled at U.S. universities during 2015-16 were from the [six] countries named in [the revised Executive Order]"; more than half of those students attended institutions in the amici States and Hawaii; and, nationwide, "these students contributed \$496 million to the U.S. economy, including tuition, room and board and other spending."⁴³ For example, in both New York and Illinois, nearly 1,000 foreign nationals from the countries designated in the revised Order were studying on temporary visas in 2015-2016 in each State, and they collectively contributed approximately \$30 million to

⁴² See, e.g., *id.* ¶¶ 31-32, 62, 75, 87-88, 120-121.

⁴³ Institute of Int'l Educ., *Advising International Students in an Age of Anxiety* 3 (Mar. 31, 2017) (internet).

each State's economy.⁴⁴ And such figures do not even begin to account for the indirect economic benefits to our States, such as the contributions of international students and scholars to innovation in academic and medical research.

Tourism dollars are also a critical component of amici States' economies. As a result of the successive travel bans, including the ban announced in the Proclamation, an estimated 4.3 million fewer tourists are expected to visit the United States this year, resulting in \$7.4 billion in lost revenue; and in 2018, those numbers will increase to 6.3 million fewer tourists and \$10.8 billion in lost revenue.⁴⁵ This reduction results from trips that were prohibited by the parts of the initial bans that were not enjoined, or because individual travelers were deterred by fear that the previous injunctions would be lifted. The now indefinite ban may also

⁴⁴ See *id.* at app. 1; see also Third Am. Compl. ¶ 117 (in 2015-2016, New York served 5.7% of all international students from the countries designated in the Proclamation).

⁴⁵ See Abha Bhattarai, *Even Canadians are Skipping Trips to the U.S. After Trump Travel Ban*, Wash. Post (Apr. 14, 2017) (internet); see also Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 30-32 (describing "chilling effect" on tourism in Washington); *id.* ¶¶ 52, 61 (Proclamation has decreased tourist travel to California and will cause significant losses in tourism revenues).

lead to the loss of hundreds of thousands of tourism-related jobs held by our States' residents.⁴⁶

Absent relief from the courts, including interim relief, these broad chilling effects will likely continue.⁴⁷ This is hardly surprising in view of defendants' clear message to the world that foreign visitors—particularly those from certain regions, countries, or religions—are unwelcome. Indeed, the disputed provisions of the Proclamation have made this message clearer and more permanent.

The disputed provisions of the Proclamation also continue the profound harms that the initial and revised travel bans have inflicted on the amici States' ability to remain internationally competitive destinations for businesses in the sectors of science, technology, finance,

⁴⁶ See Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 63-64 (Los Angeles tourism board projecting a \$220 million loss in tourism revenue in 2017, which jeopardizes hundreds of thousands of tourism-related jobs held by City's residents); see also Jeff Glueck, *Coming to America?*, Foursquare Direct, Medium (blog post) (May 24, 2017) (internet) (one industry analysis concluded that the federal government's travel restrictions "could cost the U.S. economy more than \$18 billion and about 107,000 jobs").

⁴⁷ Alana Wise, *Travel to the United States Rose in April, But Industry Remains Wary*, Reuters (June 6, 2017) (internet).

and health care, as well as for entrepreneurs. Even a temporary disruption in our ability to attract the best-qualified individuals and entities world-wide—including from the affected countries—puts the institutions and businesses in our States at a competitive disadvantage in the global marketplace, particularly where the excluded individuals possess specialized skills or training.⁴⁸ And now that the initially temporary travel bans have become an indefinite ban, defendants’ message of intolerance and uncertainty more deeply threatens amici States’ ability to attract and retain the foreign professionals, entrepreneurs, and companies that are vital to our economies.

Thus, as the experience of the amici States shows, our States and our residents have been subjected to widespread, particularized, and well-documented harm from the moment the first travel ban was announced through today—and likely for the foreseeable future.

⁴⁸ See, e.g., Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 18-23, 33, 51-52, 69-70, 74, 86-87, 113, 118, 120-123.

B. Harms to the Amici States' Sovereign and Quasi-Sovereign Interests

Decreased Effectiveness of Anti-Discrimination Laws. The amici States have exercised their sovereign prerogatives to adopt constitutional provisions and enact laws that protect their residents from discrimination. For example, our residents and businesses—and, indeed, many of the amici States ourselves—are prohibited by such state enactments from taking national origin and religion into account when determining to whom they can extend employment and other opportunities.⁴⁹ The disputed provisions of the Proclamation interfere with the effectiveness of these laws by encouraging discrimination against Muslims in general, and nationals of six of the designated countries in particular.

⁴⁹ See, e.g., Cal. Const. art. I, §§ 4, 7-8, 31; Cal. Civ. Code § 51(b); Cal. Gov't Code §§ 11135-11137, 12900 et seq.; Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46a-60; Ill. Const. art. I, §§ 3, 17; 740 Ill. Comp. Stat. 23/5(a)(1); 775 Ill. Comp. Stat. 5/1-102(A); 775 ILCS 5/10-104(A)(1); 5 Maine Rev. Stat. Ann. §§ 784, 4551-4634; Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-606; Mass. Gen. L. ch. 93, § 102; Mass. Gen. L. ch. 151B, §§ 1, 4; N.M. Const. art. II, § 11; N.M. Stat. Ann. § 28-1-7; Or. Rev. Stat. § 659A.006(1); R.I. Gen. Laws § 28-5-7(1)(i); 9 Vt. Stat. Ann. §§ 4500-4507; 21 Vt. Stat. Ann. § 495; Wash. Rev. Code § 49.60.030(1).

Harms to Residents Seeking Medical Care. Like its predecessors, the Proclamation’s travel ban will harm residents seeking medical care in our States, particularly those in underserved communities. The countries designated in the Proclamation are important sources of physicians who provide health care to our residents, particularly in underserved areas of our States.⁵⁰ The current travel ban will thus impede the States’ efforts to recruit and retain providers of essential primary care, dental health, and mental health services.⁵¹ In New York, safety-net hospitals—which include all public acute care hospitals, the entire New York City Health and Hospitals system, and most of the hospitals in Brooklyn, Queens, and the Bronx—rely heavily on foreign-national physicians.⁵² Indeed, many foreign-national physicians work in the primary care field at a time when primary care physicians are in short supply in many areas across the country.⁵³

⁵⁰ See Third Am. Compl. ¶ 26 (nearly 200 such physicians and medical residents in Washington); *id.* ¶ 58 (191 such physicians in California); *id.* ¶ 114 (500 physicians trained in one of the designated countries, including 200 from Syria).

⁵¹ *Id.* ¶¶ 27-28, 58, 128-129.

⁵² *Id.* ¶¶ 114, 116.

⁵³ *Id.* ¶¶ 27, 58-59, 116, 128-129.

At least 7000 physicians practicing in the United States attended medical school in one of the six countries designated in the previous Executive Orders (five of which remain designated in the current Proclamation), and these physicians provide 14 million appointments a year, 2.3 million of which are in areas with “a shortage of medical residents and doctors.”⁵⁴ When residents or physicians from the designated countries are unable to commence or continue their employment at public hospitals, those staffing disruptions will result in serious risks to the quality of our States’ health care services and put the public health of our communities at risk.⁵⁵ Even before defendants made permanent the latest version of the travel ban through issuance of the Proclamation at issue here, researchers had concluded that the federal government’s travel restrictions were likely to hurt the health of millions

⁵⁴ Immigrant Doctors Project, <https://immigrantdoctors.org>; *see also* Anna Maria Barry-Jester, *Trump’s New Travel Ban Could Affect Doctors, Especially in the Rust Belt and Appalachia*, *FiveThirtyEight* (Mar. 6, 2017) (internet).

⁵⁵ *See* Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 27, 58-59, 116, 128.

of Americans who rely on physicians trained in the designated countries.⁵⁶

II. DEFENDANTS HAVE NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT A STAY PENDING APPEAL IS WARRANTED.

In challenges to the Proclamation’s predecessor travel bans, this Court has twice found that defendants failed to meet their burden of showing that a stay of the preliminary injunctions restraining those bans was necessary to avoid irreparable injury to the federal government’s interests. *See Washington v. Trump*, 847 F.3d at 1168; *Hawaii v. Trump*, 859 F.3d at 782-83, 789; *see also Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 434 (2009) (factors to be considered in granting a stay include whether the applicant “will be irreparably injured absent a stay” and “where the public interest lies”). Defendants once again fail to do so here.

⁵⁶ *See* Maryam Saleh, *Hospitals in Trump Country Suffer As Muslim Doctors Denied Visas to U.S.*, The Intercept (Aug. 17, 2017) (internet) (foreign physicians “take care of the sickest of the sick and the poorest of the poor,” many have pledged to work in areas designated as “medically underserved,” and without them “the U.S. healthcare system would simply collapse, with the pain felt most acutely in rural areas”).

Indeed, it is plaintiffs that would be irreparably injured if the Proclamation's disputed provisions were permitted to go into effect.⁵⁷ *See Nken*, 556 U.S. at 434 (considering whether a stay “will substantially injure” other interested parties).⁵⁸ In view of the widespread, particularized, and well-documented harms outlined above, the balance of the equities requires that the district court's injunction remain in place.

⁵⁷ The harms that the Proclamation has caused and threatens to cause amici States and their residents (see *supra* Point I) are representative of the injuries experienced by the plaintiffs here, and underscore plaintiffs' standing to sue. Indeed, defendants' stay motion rightly does not dispute plaintiffs' standing (see ECF No. 4).

Amici's harms also underscore the appropriateness of the nationwide injunction ordered by the court below. *See, e.g., United States v. Oakland Cannabis Buyers' Coop.*, 532 U.S. 483, 496 (2001) (district courts enjoy broad discretion “to consider the necessities of the public interest when fashioning injunctive relief”) (internal quotation marks omitted). *Virginian Ry. Co. v. Railway Employees*, 300 U.S. 515, 552 (1937) (“[c]ourts of equity may, and frequently do, go much farther both to give and withhold relief in furtherance of the public interest than . . . when only private interests are involved”).

⁵⁸ As to the final stay factor—the stay applicant's likelihood of success on the merits, *Nken*, 556 U.S. at 434—defendants have not met their burden of establishing a strong likelihood of success on the merits of their jurisdictional defenses or statutory arguments. *See* Pl. Stay Op. 7-20.

Balancing the equities implicated by a stay application requires the Court to explore the relative harms and determine whether the harm to other interested parties or the public outweighs the injury asserted by the applicant. *See Trump v. IRAP*, 137 S. Ct. 2080, 2087 (2017) (citing *Barnes v. E-Systems, Inc. Grp. Hosp. Med. & Surgical Ins. Plan*, 501 U.S. 1301, 1305 (1991) (Scalia, J., in chambers)). And a stay “is not a matter of right.” *Nken*, 556 U.S. at 433-34. Rather, the “party requesting the stay bears the burden of showing that the circumstances justify an exercise of that discretion.” Defendants have made no such showing here.

As described in Point I, implementation of the disputed provisions of the Proclamation, like the previous versions of the travel ban, will result in concrete and irreparable harms to amici States’ economic and proprietary interests. In addition, the disputed provisions of the Proclamation will indefinitely prevent our States’ residents from receiving visits from family members.⁵⁹ Such deprivations constitute a constitutionally cognizable hardship to the affected United States–based

⁵⁹ *See* Third Am. Compl. ¶¶ 24-25 (examples of Washington residents); *id.* ¶¶ 104-105 (examples of New York residents).

persons.⁶⁰ Moreover, the exclusions at issue hinder the amici States' ability to protect their residents' fundamental familial relationships to the extent allowed under other federal laws. *See Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico ex rel. Barez*, 458 U.S. 592, 607-08 (1982) (discussing a State's interests in ensuring that its residents are "not excluded from benefits that are to flow from participation in the federal system" and in "securing observance of the terms under which it participates in" that system).

These are some of the very same interests that the preliminary injunctions issued in the earlier travel ban litigation were designed to protect, and that the Supreme Court carefully sought to avoid when leaving certain portions of those prior injunctions in place. *See Trump v. IRAP*, 137 S. Ct. at 2088.

On the other hand, defendants have not demonstrated that a stay pending this Court's review of the district court's injunction is necessary to prevent any irreparable harm to their interests. Defendants'

⁶⁰ *See, e.g., Moore v. City of East Cleveland*, 431 U.S. 494, 504 (1977) (tradition of sharing household with extended family "deserving of constitutional recognition"); *Hawaii v. Trump*, 859 F.3d at 783 (citing *Moore*).

generalized claim of harm to their interest in maintaining national security (Mot. 8-9) is abstract and conclusory—unlike the concrete and particularized harms to the amici States and their residents outlined above. For example, defendants have identified no specific urgency warranting immediate implementation of the disputed provisions of the Proclamation, nor do they claim any disastrous result from the injunction thus far (or any of the prior related injunctions for that matter).

Indeed, defendants’ assertions of harm to national security interests are substantially undermined by several factors. First, as the district court recognized, the terms of the Proclamation itself contain internal inconsistencies that “markedly undermine its national security rationale.” (Order 29-32.) For instance, not every country that failed to meet the Proclamation’s stated criteria is included in the entry ban and, even with respect to the designated countries, certain categories of travelers from a particular country may be barred from entry while others are not. (*Id.*) Second, the Proclamation itself delayed implementation of its entry ban for approximately one month, undermining defendants’ suggestion that a short stay of the Proclamation would cause irreparable harm. *See* § 7(a) (signed on

September 24, but setting effective date as either October 18 or October 24 for different groups of foreign nationals). Third, as this Court has previously recognized, defendants' assertions fail to account for the INA's well-established vetting process, which already permits the exclusion of foreign nationals who present a national security concern or for whom the United States lacks adequate information. *See Washington v. Trump*, 847 F.3d at 1168 (observing that district court's injunction enjoining provisions of initial Executive Order's travel ban "merely returned the nation . . . to the position it has occupied for many previous years").

In sum, the balance of the equities here tips decidedly in favor of denying defendants' request for a stay. While defendants have identified no appreciable harm that the injunction will cause to its interests, a stay of the order would allow irreparable harm to be imposed on the amici States and our residents. The status quo should thus be preserved while this litigation continues.

CONCLUSION

The application for a stay pending appeal should be denied.

Dated: New York, New York
October 31, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

LISA MADIGAN
Attorney General
State of Illinois
DAVID L. FRANKLIN
Solicitor General

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
Attorney General
State of New York
BARBARA D. UNDERWOOD
Solicitor General
ANISHA S. DASGUPTA
Deputy Solicitor General
ZAINAB A. CHAUDHRY
Assistant Solicitor General
of Counsel

100 W. Randolph St., 12th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 814-5376
DFranklin@atg.state.il.us

120 Broadway, 25th Floor
New York, New York 10271
(212) 416-8020
Barbara.Underwood@ag.ny.gov

(Counsel listing continues on next page.)

XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General
State of California
1300 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

GEORGE JEPSEN
Attorney General
State of Connecticut
55 Elm Street
Hartford, CT 06106

MATTHEW P. DENN
Attorney General
State of Delaware
Carvel State Bldg., 6th Fl.
820 N. French Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

THOMAS J. MILLER
Attorney General
State of Iowa
1305 E. Walnut Street
Des Moines, IA 50319

JANET T. MILLS
Attorney General
State of Maine
6 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333

BRIAN E. FROSH
Attorney General
State of Maryland
200 Saint Paul Place
Baltimore, MD 21202

MAURA HEALEY
Attorney General
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
One Ashburton Place
Boston, MA 02108

HECTOR BALDERAS
Attorney General
State of New Mexico
408 Galisteo Street
Santa Fe, NM 87501

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
Attorney General
State of Oregon
1162 Court Street, N.E.
Salem, OR 97301

PETER F. KILMARTIN
Attorney General
State of Rhode Island
150 S. Main Street
Providence, RI 02903

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.
Attorney General
State of Vermont
109 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05609

MARK R. HERRING
Attorney General
Commonwealth of Virginia
202 North Ninth Street
Richmond, VA 23219

ROBERT W. FERGUSON
Attorney General
State of Washington
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000
Seattle, WA 98104

KARL A. RACINE
Attorney General
District of Columbia
One Judiciary Square
441 4th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Rule 32(a)(7)(C) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Oren L. Zeve, an employee in the Office of the Attorney General of the State of New York, hereby certifies that according to the word count feature of the word processing program used to prepare this brief, the brief contains 5,968 words and complies with the type-volume limitations of Rule 32(a)(7)(B).

s/ Oren L. Zeve

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit by using the CM/ECF system on October 31, 2017.

I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

Dated: October 31, 2017
New York, NY

/s/ Barbara D. Underwood
BARBARA D. UNDERWOOD