

1 Brian J. Stretch, SBN 163973
bstretch@sidley.com
2 Naomi Igra, SBN 269095
naomi.igra@sidley.com
3 Chelsea Davis, SBN 330968
chelsea.davis@sidley.com
4 SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2000
5 San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: +1 415 772 1200
6 Facsimile: +1 415 772 7400

Jesse Bless (*pro hac vice pending*)
jbless@aila.org
AMERICAN IMMIGRATION LAWYERS
ASSOCIATION
1301 G Street, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005

Samina M. Bharmal (*pro hac vice pending*)
sbharmal@sidley.com
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: +1 202 736 8000

7 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
8 (Additional counsel listed on signature page)

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 SAN FRANCISCO

12 IMMIGRANT LEGAL RESOURCE CENTER;
13 EAST BAY SANCTUARY COVENANT;
14 COALITION FOR HUMANE IMMIGRANT
RIGHTS; CATHOLIC LEGAL IMMIGRATION
15 NETWORK, INC.; INTERNATIONAL RESCUE
COMMITTEE; ONEAMERICA; ASIAN
16 COUNSELING AND REFERRAL SERVICE;
ILLINOIS COALITION FOR IMMIGRANT
AND REFUGEE RIGHTS,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 CHAD F. WOLF, *under the title of Acting*
Secretary of Homeland Security;
20 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
SECURITY; KENNETH T. CUCCINELLI,
21 *under the title of Senior Official Performing the*
Duties of the Deputy Secretary of Homeland
22 *Security*; U.S. CITIZENSHIP & IMMIGRATION
SERVICES
23

24 Defendants.

Case No. _____

Hon. _____

**COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE
CASE**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

INTRODUCTION

1
2 1. This case challenges a final rule that drastically increases the cost of applying for
3 immigration benefits, including naturalization and asylum. 85 Fed. Reg. 46,788 (Aug. 3, 2020)
4 (“Final Rule”). For low income applicants, the Final Rule increases the cost of applying to
5 naturalize, in some cases from \$0 to \$1,170 for the lowest income applicants. It also charges a non-
6 waivable fee for asylum applications for the first time in U.S. history, even though the fee will deter
7 vulnerable people from seeking statutory protections. The Final Rule also requires asylum seekers
8 to pay \$580 to obtain their first employment authorization. In total, the Final Rule increases the
9 price of seeking asylum and work authorization from \$0 to \$630, with no possibility of a fee waiver.
10 With these and other changes, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) awards U.S.
11 Customs and Immigration Services (“USCIS”) an unexplained 21% budget increase at the expense
12 of low-income applicants.

13 2. The Final Rule is unlawful because it was proposed under Kevin McAleenan and
14 issued under Chad Wolf, both of whom assumed the title of Acting Secretary of the Department of
15 Homeland Security without constitutional or statutory authority. The Final Rule is therefore void
16 and without effect under the Homeland Security Act, the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998 and
17 the Appointments Clause of the United States Constitution. It is also procedurally invalid and
18 contrary to law under the APA. On this basis alone, the Final Rule should be set aside.

19 3. The Final Rule does all this without providing any cogent explanation for the
20 dramatic change in the financial needs of USCIS. DHS does not disclose calculations underlying its
21 skyrocketing costs, or explain why it projects a massive budget shortfall despite the agency’s recent
22 history of running at a surplus with substantial cash reserves.

23 4. The Final Rule abandons the prior practice of using an “ability to pay” model and
24 purports to adopt a “beneficiary pays” model that DHS calls more “equitable.” But merely labeling
25 a practice “equitable” does not constitute a reasoned response to comments cogently explaining the
26 inequity of the fee increases and elimination of fee waivers in the Final Rule. Nor does it explain the
27 arbitrary application of the “beneficiary pays” model to impose substantial burdens on low income
28

1 applicants for naturalization and asylum but not wealthier applicants such as immigrant investors,
2 U.S. citizens applying for overseas adoptions, or visas for religious workers.

3 5. Far from promoting equity, the Final Rule transforms the agency from one that serves
4 its statutory purpose of adjudicating immigration benefits to one that serves this Administration’s
5 goals of reducing immigration and naturalization for low-income applicants and deterring asylum
6 seekers. The Final Rule achieves this transformation by adhering to irrational and unsupported
7 financial models, abandoning longstanding ability-to-pay principles, imposing disproportionate costs
8 on those least able to pay, dramatically increasing funds for “fraud detection,” and diverting
9 resources to enforcement agencies. It does all this while ignoring data and comments that contradict
10 what DHS says it “believes.”

11 6. This is unlawful. The Final Rule is procedurally defective, contrary to law, and
12 arbitrary and capricious under Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”). It also violates the Due
13 Process Clause and the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution by denying
14 indigent people the right to access a statutory process for seeking immigration benefits, including
15 naturalization and asylum,

16 7. The Final Rule is already causing irreparable harm to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are non-
17 profit organizations that provide services benefitting low-income applicants for immigration
18 benefits. Plaintiffs have diverted resources to address the implications of the 142-page Final Rule for
19 their organizations including the threat it poses to their funding and organizational models. And
20 when the Final Rule goes into effect, it will immediately frustrate the missions of all Plaintiffs
21 because populations they serve will not be able to afford to apply for immigration benefits, even
22 with Plaintiffs’ help.

23 8. The Final Rule also causes substantial harm to individuals and the public. A vast
24 body of literature and data attests to the benefits of naturalization for families, communities, cities,
25 states and the country as a whole. These benefits include higher incomes, increased civic
26 engagement, and more stable families. The benefits of asylum are even more fundamental. Those
27 who cannot pay for an asylum application are at risk of being deported back to countries where they
28 may suffer persecution, injury, or even death. Here, DHS failed to account for how impeding access

1 to naturalization, asylum, and other immigration benefits harms the public, despite ample evidence
2 in the administrative record.

3 9. For these and other reasons, the Final Rule is unlawful and should be set aside.

4 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 10. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 5 U.S.C.
6 § 702.

7 11. Defendants’ promulgation of the Final Rule in the Federal Register on August 3, 2020
8 constitutes final agency action and is therefore subject to judicial review. 5 U.S.C. §§ 704, 706.

9 12. Plaintiffs have standing to challenge the Final Rule under 5 U.S.C. § 702 because
10 they have been and will be injured by the Final Rule’s operation. They are also within the zone of
11 interest of the INA, which established the fund into which application fees are collected. *See, e.g., E.*
12 *Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump*, 950 F.3d 1242, 1270 (9th Cir. 2020); *La Clinica de la Raza v.*
13 *Trump*, 19-CV-04980-PJH, 2020 WL 4569462, at *9 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2020).

14 13. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)(1) because
15 defendants are officers or employees of the United States or any agency thereof acting in their
16 official capacity or under color of legal authority, or are agencies of the United States, or the United
17 States. Venue is furthermore proper because Immigrant Legal Resource Center’s principal place of
18 business is in San Francisco, California, and East Bay Sanctuary Covenant’s principal place of
19 business is in Berkeley, California. Therefore, they both reside in this judicial district under 28
20 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(2).

21 **PARTIES**

22 **PLAINTIFFS**

23 14. Plaintiff Immigrant Legal Resource Center (“ILRC”) is a national non-profit
24 organization headquartered in San Francisco, California. ILRC’s mission is to collaborate with and
25 educate immigrants, community organizations, and the legal sector to build a democratic society that
26 values diversity and the rights of all people. As a key part of that mission, ILRC serves as the lead
27 agency for the New Americans Campaign (“NAC”). The NAC provides, among other things,
28 funding to national and local non-profit partners to provide naturalization assistance such as assisting

1 with paperwork and navigating fee waiver eligibility. Since the NAC began in 2011, NAC partners
2 have completed hundreds of thousands of naturalization applications. ILRC also trains attorneys,
3 paralegals, and community-based advocates who work with immigrants around the country. To
4 assist practitioners, ILRC produces manuals on naturalization, U-Visas, T-Visas, Special Immigrant
5 Juvenile Status (“SIJS”), the Violence Against Women Act (“VAWA”), Asylum, and Families and
6 Immigration as well as an annotated guide to completing fee waivers. ILRC staff also work with
7 grassroots immigrant organizations to promote civic engagement and social change.

8 15. Plaintiff East Bay Sanctuary Covenant (“EBSC”), located in Berkeley, California, is
9 part of the National Sanctuary Movement founded in 1982 to assist refugees fleeing the civil wars
10 and violence in El Salvador and Guatemala. EBSC remains dedicated to offering sanctuary, support,
11 community organizing assistance, advocacy, and legal services to people escaping war, terror,
12 political persecution, intolerance, exploitation, and other expressions of violence. Assisting
13 individuals seeking asylum and other forms of humanitarian relief in the United States is a critical
14 part of EBSC’s mission. EBSC provides legal and social services to immigrants and refugees within
15 the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Asylum Office, including applicants in California, Washington,
16 and Oregon. EBSC offers its low-income clients legal assistance in applying for affirmative asylum,
17 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (“DACA”), Temporary Protective Status (“TPS”), SIJS, U
18 and T visas, VAWA self-petitions, permanent residency, and naturalization.

19 16. Plaintiff Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (“CHIRLA”) is a non-profit,
20 membership-based organization headquartered in Los Angeles, California. CHIRLA’s mission is to
21 ensure that immigrant communities are fully integrated into our society with full rights and access to
22 resources. In furtherance of its mission, CHIRLA handles the full spectrum of immigration-related
23 needs of those who form primarily low-income immigrant communities in an area with very high
24 costs of living. CHIRLA provides immigration services, including applications for naturalization,
25 asylum, and lawful permanent residence, in addition to performing outreach and advocating on
26 behalf of its over 12,000-person dues-paying membership. CHIRLA is on the Executive Office of
27 Immigration Review (EOIR) List of Pro Bono Legal Service Providers distributed to all individuals
28 in removal proceedings. Members can receive immigration legal services at no additional cost.

1 CHIRLA brings this action on its own behalf and on behalf of its members. CHIRLA’s members
2 represent a diverse mix of people from various communities and include individuals who are
3 currently and will be eligible for the immigration benefits affected by the Final Rule. A majority of
4 CHIRLA’s members are low-income individuals who will be unable to afford the new and increased
5 fees in the Final Rule, such as the fee increase for naturalization and the new fee for asylum and
6 work authorization. CHIRLA’s low-income members are similarly situated in all relevant ways, such
7 that their due process injuries from the Final Rule or proposed remedies do not require individual
8 participation in this litigation.

9 17. Plaintiff Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc. (“CLINIC”) is a non-profit
10 organization headquartered in Silver Spring, Maryland. CLINIC’s mission is to provide immigration
11 legal services to low income and vulnerable populations. This mission is part of CLINIC’s broader
12 purpose of embracing the Gospel value of welcoming the stranger and promoting the dignity and
13 protecting the rights of immigrants. CLINIC administers a network of approximately 400 affiliated
14 immigration programs, which operate out of more than 400 offices in 48 states and the District of
15 Columbia. The network includes faith-based institutions, farmworker programs, domestic violence
16 shelters, ethnic community-focused organizations, libraries and other entities that serve immigrants.
17 Members of the network, referred to as “affiliates,” provide immigration services—including
18 applications for asylum, lawful permanent residence, the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central
19 American Relief Act (“NACARA”) relief, and naturalization—using materials, training, education,
20 best practices, and sometimes, funding provided by CLINIC. Ninety-six percent of CLINIC affiliates
21 provide legal services related to naturalization. CLINIC’s affiliate network completes 35,000 to
22 40,000 naturalization applications per year. CLINIC affiliates, including Catholic Charities of the
23 East Bay, are on the EOIR List of Pro Bono Legal Service Providers distributed to asylum
24 applicants. CLINIC also provides direct representation to asylum seekers as part of its Defending
25 Vulnerable Populations section.

26 18. Plaintiff International Rescue Committee (“IRC”) is a nonprofit organization
27 headquartered in New York City, New York. IRC responds to the world’s worst humanitarian crises
28 and helps people whose lives and livelihoods are shattered by conflict and disaster to survive,

1 recover, and gain control of their future. IRC operates in more than 40 countries and has 26 offices
2 across 15 U.S. states, including Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas,
3 Maryland, Montana, New Jersey, New York, Texas, Utah, Virginia, and Washington. The provision
4 of immigration legal services—in particular, adjustment of status, family reunification, and
5 naturalization—is an integral component of IRC’s mission in the United States. Through a paid
6 immigration staff of roughly 50 employees, as well as volunteers, IRC provides high-quality, low-
7 cost immigration legal services to clients, including by filing applications for asylum, adjustments of
8 status, DACA, and naturalization. In fiscal year 2019, IRC provided 13,719 clients with immigration
9 legal services, including by helping over 7,000 individuals become U.S. citizens and filing 2,033
10 Request for Fee Waiver (I-912) forms in conjunction with naturalization applications. In addition,
11 IRC assisted 5,595 children and parents seeking asylum in the United States through humanitarian
12 and social service programs. IRC’s immigration services are funded by a mixture of private and local
13 funding, as well as by nominal fees charged to some clients themselves. IRC also receives funding
14 through the USCIS Citizenship and Integration Grant Program. IRC’s Denver and Dallas offices
15 help potential asylees submit asylum applications through federal funding (IRC Denver), and
16 funding from the City of Dallas and the Vera Institute (IRC Dallas). IRC is one of nine nonprofit
17 agencies with federal contracts to resettle refugees in the United States.

18 19. Plaintiff OneAmerica is a non-profit organization headquartered in Seattle,
19 Washington. OneAmerica’s mission is to advance the fundamental principles of democracy and
20 justice at the local, state, and national levels by building power within immigrant communities. As
21 part of advancing its mission, OneAmerica provides free naturalization services, helping eligible
22 immigrants apply for citizenship and become civically engaged citizens. One of OneAmerica’s
23 flagship programs, Washington New Americans (WNA), receives funding from the State of
24 Washington, which shares OneAmerica’s conviction that naturalized citizens bring significant
25 economic and civic benefit to the state. WNA’s founding goal is to provide free legal counsel in
26 communities where there are few, if any, affordable immigration attorneys or Department of Justice-
27 accredited representatives. OneAmerica uses two essential methods to meet its naturalization grant
28

1 requirements: (i) hosting its own naturalization workshops; and (2) re-granting a significant amount
2 of its WNA funding to thirteen local organizations.

3 20. Plaintiff Asian Counseling and Referral Service (“ACRS”) is a nonprofit organization
4 headquartered in Seattle, Washington. ACRS serves the Asian and Pacific Islander community in
5 Washington through multiple programs that provide culturally and linguistically competent care and
6 services. ACRS provides legal services to a myriad of vulnerable groups including, but not limited
7 to, asylum seekers, TPS applicants, U and T visa applicants, SIJS applicants, VAWA petitioners, and
8 unaccompanied minors. Furthermore, it assists immigrants with adjustment of status to permanent
9 resident, and applications for naturalization. ACRS has provided citizenship and naturalization
10 services since 1997, and in 2019 helped nearly 754 individuals from 31 countries file naturalization
11 applications. Assistance to immigrants seeking to naturalize reflects ACRS’s commitment to serving
12 the well-being of its community-at-large. The benefits of citizenship include an increased sense of
13 belonging and connection with communities; increased civic engagement; higher earnings; higher
14 home-ownership; and higher voting levels. ACRS is the largest naturalization services provider in
15 Washington State. Under the conditions of ACRS’s grant funding, ACRS must submit 650
16 naturalization applications on behalf of Washington residents for fiscal year 2020. Among other
17 sources, ACRS receives funding through the USCIS Citizenship and Integration Grant Program.

18 21. Plaintiff Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights (“ICIRR”) is a nonprofit
19 organization headquartered in Chicago, Illinois, with operations extending throughout the state.
20 ICIRR is a coalition of more than 100 member organizations throughout Illinois that advocate on
21 behalf of immigrants and refugees at the local, state, and federal levels. Through its member
22 organizations, ICIRR educates and organizes immigrant and refugee communities to assert their
23 rights; promotes citizenship and civic participation; monitors, analyzes, and advocates on immigrant-
24 related issues; and informs the public about the contributions of immigrants and refugees. In
25 partnership with the Illinois Department of Human Services, ICIRR administers the New Americans
26 Initiative (“NAI”), to fund collaborations of community organizations that promote citizenship,
27 conduct outreach, and organize workshops to assist long-term legal immigrants in completing their
28 naturalization applications, as well as assisting immigrants youth in applying for and renewing

1 DACA status. ICIRR’s agreement with Illinois DHS obligates ICIRR and its forty program-partner
2 organizations to complete at least 7,278 N-400 or DACA applications on behalf of Illinois residents
3 each year; serve 3,348 distinct individuals through English-language and civic-education classes;
4 and reach 14,081 distinct individuals through community outreach services. As the NAI
5 Administrator, ICIRR also is responsible for assisting its program-partner organizations, ensuring
6 effective use of NAI funds, and helping them meet the NAI deliverable expectations.

7 **DEFENDANTS**

8 22. Defendant U.S. Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) is a cabinet-level
9 department of the United States federal government. DHS issued the Final Rule.

10 23. Defendant Chad Wolf has held the title of Acting Secretary of Homeland Security
11 since November 13, 2019. He issued the Final Rule under that purported authority. He is sued in that
12 capacity.

13 24. The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service (“USCIS”) is a sub-agency of DHS
14 and responsible for providing immigration adjudication services.

15 25. Defendant Kenneth Cuccinelli currently holds the role of Senior Official Performing
16 the Duties of the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security.

17 **LEGAL AND FACTUAL FRAMEWORK**

18 **I. CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

19 26. Article I of the Constitution gives Congress “the Power ... [t]o establish an uniform
20 Rule of Naturalization.” U.S. Const. art. I, § 8. Congress has used that power to enact legislation that
21 promotes diversity, unifies families, protects refugees and vulnerable non-citizens, and encourages
22 naturalization. Through these laws, Congress has established a detailed process for immigrants to
23 obtain status in the United States, adjust status to lawful permanent resident, and naturalize to
24 become a U.S. citizen.¹

25
26 ¹ See, e.g., Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-236, 79 Stat. 911 (“INA”);
27 Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-208, 110
28 Stat. 2009-546 (“IIRIRA”); Refugee Act of 1980, Pub. L. No. 96-212, 94 Stat. 102 (“Refugee Act”),
Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000, Pub. L. No. 106-386, 114 Stat. 1464
 (“VTVPA”).

1 **A. The INA Promotes Diversity and Family Unity**

2 27. Before 1965, the nation’s immigration laws codified discrimination against non-
3 whites. For example, the Naturalization Act of 1790 limited United States citizenship to “any alien,
4 being a free white person.” 1 Stat. 103 Chapter 3, 1 Congress, Session 2, An Act: To establish an
5 uniform rule of naturalization. (Mar. 26, 1790). And although this particular law changed, others
6 passed in the 19th and 20th centuries also expressed racist exclusionary preferences. Laws including
7 the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and the 1924 National Origins Quotas Act, created quotas in
8 favor of Northern and Western Europeans and banned most Asians from immigrating to the United
9 States.

10 28. The INA of 1952 and subsequent legislation, reversed these practices and prioritized
11 family unification and diversity. They eliminated national origin quotas that favored Northern and
12 Western European immigrants and helped level the playing field for immigrants who hailed from
13 other parts of the world.

14 29. The INA makes family unification, regardless of nationality or income, a priority. For
15 example, the INA exempts “immediate relatives,” including “children, spouses, and parents,” from
16 visa limits, or quotas. 8 U.S.C. § 1151(b)(2)(A)(i). “That exemption, and other priority given to
17 family members of U.S. residents, meant that about three-quarters of visas were set aside for
18 relatives of those already in the U.S.—putting the emphasis in U.S. immigration policy on family
19 reunification.”²

20 30. This is by design. In amending the INA, Senator Kennedy explained, “Reunification
21 of families is to be the foremost consideration.” *See* H.R. Rep. 89-748, at 13 (1965).³

23 ² City of Philadelphia, Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration
24 Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration Benefit Request Requirements at
25 Attachment 3, 34 n.15. DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-7628 (citing Pew Research Ctr., *Modern*
Immigration Wave Brings 59 Million to U.S., Driving Population Growth and Change Through 2065
at 20 (Sept. 28, 2015), <https://pewrsr.ch/3l3oneY>).

26 ³ Courts have long recognized that a central purpose of the INA is to keep families together. *See, e.g.,*
27 *Fiallo v. Bell*, 430 U.S. 787, 806 (1977) (The INA’s legislative history “establishes that congressional
28 concern was directed at ‘the problem of keeping families of United States citizens and immigrants
united.’” (quoting H.R. Rep. No. 1199, 85th Cong., 1st Sess., 7 (1957)).

1 31. The Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act of 1999, Section 654
2 requires agencies to consider the impact of proposed agency action on the well-being of all families,
3 not just the families of citizens. *See* Pub. L. No. 105-277, 112 Stat. 2681. It requires federal agencies
4 to prepare a Family Policymaking Assessment before enacting any rule that may affect family well-
5 being and enumerates seven factors the agency must assess, including whether the action erodes
6 stability or safety of the family, erodes the authority of parents in the education, nurture, and
7 supervision of their children, helps the family perform its functions, affects the disposable income or
8 poverty of families and children, and if the proposed benefits of the action justify the financial
9 impacts on the family.

10 **B. The Refugee Act Protects Asylum Seekers**

11 32. The 1951 United Nations Refugee Convention and the 1967 Protocol, to which the
12 United States acceded on November 1, 1968, were designed to prevent a recurrence of the horrors
13 refugees experienced during World War II. The United States Refugee Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-
14 212) (the “Refugee Act”) “conform[ed] United States statutory law to our obligations under Article
15 33 [of the Refugee Convention]” H.R. Rep. No. 96-608, at 17 (1979); S. Rep. No. 96-256, at 4
16 (1979) (same). The Act “imbued these international commitments with the force of law.” *R-S-C v.*
17 *Sessions*, 869 F.3d 1176, 1178 (10th Cir. 2017).

18 33. The Refugee Act thus codified a longstanding tradition of “welcoming the oppressed
19 of other nations.” H.R. Conf. Rep. 96-781, at 17–18 (1980). In the Refugee Act, Congress declared
20 that “it is the historic policy of the United States to respond to the urgent needs of persons subject to
21 persecution in their homelands, including, where appropriate, humanitarian assistance for their care
22 and maintenance in asylum areas.” Pub. L. No. 96-212, 94 Stat. 102 § 101(a).

23 34. The objective of the Refugee Act is to “provide a permanent and systematic
24 procedure for the admission ... of refugees of special humanitarian concern to the United States, and
25 to provide comprehensive and uniform provisions for the effective resettlement and absorption of
26 those refugees who are admitted.” Pub. L. No. 96-212, 94 Stat. 102 § 101(b).

27 35. The Refugee Act amended the INA to include a formal process for people fearing
28 persecution in their home country to apply for asylum and announced “the policy of the United

1 States to encourage all nations to provide assistance and resettlement opportunities to refugees to the
2 fullest extent possible.” *Id.* § 101(a) (codified as Note to 8 U.S.C. § 1521).

3 36. To request asylum in the U.S., an applicant need only be physically present in the
4 United States or have arrived at a U.S. border and apply within one year of their last arrival in the
5 U.S., or qualify for an exception to the one-year rule. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1158. Today, asylum may be
6 granted to “any person” who has suffered “persecution or who has a well-founded fear of
7 persecution” based on one of five enumerated protected grounds: “race, religion, nationality,
8 membership in a particular social group, or political opinion.” 8 U.S.C. § 1158(b)(1)(A); *id.*
9 § 1101(a)(42)(A).

10 37. Recognizing the importance of legal assistance for asylum seekers, Congress requires
11 that the Attorney General advise an asylum applicant of her right to be represented by counsel and
12 provide a list of pro bono legal service providers who are available to assist in asylum proceedings. 8
13 U.S.C. § 1158(d)(5).

14 **C. U.S. Immigration Laws Provide Additional Protections for Vulnerable People**

15 38. U.S. immigration laws also codify protections for vulnerable groups, including those
16 from countries experiencing significant hardship, battered women, trafficked individuals, and crime
17 victims.

18 39. Through the Immigration Act of 1990, Congress created TPS, which provides
19 nationals of specifically-designated countries confronting ongoing conflicts, environmental disasters,
20 or extraordinary and temporary conditions, temporary immigration status. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1254a. It
21 provides nationals of those countries who are in the United States at the time of the TPS designation
22 work permits and stay of deportation. 8 U.S.C. § 1254a(a)(1). The Secretary of Homeland Security
23 may decide when a country merits a TPS designation. Countries currently designated include: El
24 Salvador, Haiti, Honduras, Nepal, Nicaragua, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, Syria, and Yemen. *See*
25 *Ramos v. Nielsen*, 336 F. Supp. 3d 1075 (N.D. Cal. 2018); USCIS, *Temporary Protected Status*
26 (Mar. 30, 2020), <https://bit.ly/3haeGZT>.

27 40. In 2000, President Clinton signed into law the first federal law to address human
28 trafficking, the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPRA). *See* Pub. L. No. 106-386. Among

1 other things, this law established trafficking as a federal crime, provided assistance for trafficking
2 victims, and established the T visa, which affords victims of severe trafficking temporary stay in the
3 U.S., access to benefits, and a path to lawful permanent residency if they have assisted in
4 prosecuting human trafficking. *See* Pub. L. No. 106-386.

5 41. The William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act
6 (TVPRA) expanded these protections by requiring USCIS to allow applicants for these primary
7 benefits—VAWA, T (trafficked individuals), U (crime victims), VAWA Cancellation, and TPS—to
8 apply for fee waivers for associated filings up to and including the application for permanent
9 residence. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1255(l)(7); Pub. L. No. 110-457, 122 Stat. 5044 at 5054.

10 42. Similarly, the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act
11 (“NACARA”) specifically addresses certain asylum-seekers whose applications were unfairly
12 affected by changes to the immigration law enacted by the Illegal Immigration Reform and
13 Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA).

14 43. In these and other statutes, Congress has recognized that the limited financial means
15 of vulnerable populations should not block their access to immigration benefits

16 **D. The Constitution and Congress Recognize the Importance of Naturalization**

17 44. The Constitution establishes naturalization as a pathway to citizenship. U.S. Const.
18 amend. XIV, § 1. “Many invaluable benefits flow from United States citizenship, including rights to
19 vote in federal elections, to travel internationally with a U.S. passport, to convey citizenship to one’s
20 own children even if they are born abroad, to be eligible for citizen-only federal jobs, and, indeed, to
21 be free of discrimination by Congress on the basis of alienage.” *L. Xia v. Tillerson*, 865 F.3d 643,
22 650 (D.C. Cir. 2017). Citizenship is among the most momentous elements of an individual’s legal
23 status. “It would be difficult to exaggerate its value and importance.” *Schneiderman v. United States*,
24 320 U.S. 118, 122 (1943).

25 45. The United States has historically exhibited “extraordinary hospitality to those who
26 come to our country,” and “[o]ne indication of this attitude is Congress’ determination to make it
27 relatively easy for immigrants to become naturalized citizens.” *Foley v. Connelie*, 435 U.S. 291, 294
28 & n.2 (1978) (citing the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1427 (1976 ed.)).

1 46. Congress promotes the attainment of citizenship for those who are statutorily eligible
2 through the use of appropriations. Just last year, Congress appropriated \$10 million to USCIS to
3 fund its Citizenship and Integration Grant Program,⁴ Pub. L. No. 116–6, 133 Stat. 13, which awards
4 millions in grants to civic organizations that help lawful permanent residents prepare for U.S.
5 citizenship. “The main goal of the grant program has been to provide citizenship instruction and
6 application assistance to LPRs.”⁵ At least two Plaintiffs in this case receive these grants in support of
7 their naturalization work.

8 **E. The Homeland Security Act Separated Immigration Services from Enforcement**

9 47. The Homeland Security Act of 2002 reconfigured the Immigration and
10 Nationalization Service (“INS”). Homeland Security Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-296, 116 Stat.
11 2135 (Nov. 25, 2002) (“HSA”). Subtitle D of Title IV addressed “immigration enforcement
12 functions” and established the Bureau of Border Security, which now consists of Immigration and
13 Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) and Customs and Border Patrol (“CBP”). HSA §§ 441-42, 116 Stat.
14 at 2192-94. Subtitle E created the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Service to handle
15 “adjudications” of immigration applications; that bureau is now USCIS. HSA § 451, 116 Stat. at
16 2195-97.

17 48. Section 476 of the HSA is entitled “Separation of Funding.” HSA § 476, 116 Stat. at
18 2209. It specifies separate budgets for the two bureaus, requires that “fees imposed for a particular
19 service, application or benefit shall be deposited” into the account of the bureau “with jurisdiction
20 over the function to which the fee relates,” and provides that “no fee may be transferred” between
21 the separate bureaus, with only limited statutory exceptions. HSA § 476(c), (d), 116 Stat. at 2209.

22 **F. The Immigration and Examinations Fee Account (“IEFA”) Limits the Use of**
23 **Funds Raised Through Application Fees**

24 49. USCIS is funded primarily through the fees it collects for the adjudication and
25 naturalization services it provides. These fees are deposited in the IEFA. The legislation creating the
26 IEFA predates USCIS and defines the agency’s fee-setting authority. INA § 286(m) and

27 ⁴ USCIS now refers to this program as the Citizenship and Assimilation Grant Program.

28 ⁵ USCIS, *Learn About the Citizenship and Assimilation Program* (July 30, 2020),
<https://bit.ly/2FwCZ69>.

1 (n) (codified at 8 U.S.C. § 1356(m) and (n)) establish the IEFA, and provide that “fees for providing
2 adjudication and naturalization services may be set at a level that will ensure recovery of the full
3 costs of providing all such services, including the costs of similar services provided without charge
4 to asylum applicants or other immigrants.” 8 U.S.C. § 1356(m).

5 50. The legislative history confirms that Congress intended to IEFA to cover adjudication
6 and naturalization services only. The House Conference Report for the 1990 amendment states that:
7 “Examinations Fee Account–Subsection (d)(1) provides that adjudications and naturalization fees be
8 deposited into the Examinations Fee Account as offsetting receipts. Subsection (d)(2) allows the
9 Department to establish adjudications and naturalization fees at a level that will ensure recovery of
10 the full costs of the program, to include the overseas program and administration.” H.R. Conf. Rep.
11 101-909.

12 51. An opinion by the General Counsel of the INS in the years following the enactment
13 of §1356 interpreted the term “adjudication and naturalization services” to exclude enforcement. *See*
14 1994 General Counsel’s Opinions, 9 Immigration Law Service 2d PSD 1994 General Counsel
15 Opinions, Opinion 94-8 (“[F]ees which may be deposited into the Examinations Fee Account are
16 those fees which arise from applications that are processed as part of the INS’s adjudication service
17 and not its enforcement function. Funds from the Examinations Fee Account may be expended only
18 to reimburse an appropriation for expense incurred in providing adjudicative or naturalization
19 services.”).

20 52. USCIS does not have boundless authority to use fees collected through the IEFA. It
21 can only use fees to cover the cost of providing adjudication and naturalization services, in line with
22 the agency’s mandate under the HSA. *See* Pub. L. No. 107-296, § 451 (6 U.S.C. § 271).

23 53. USCIS also manages two other fee accounts funded by statutorily set fees, which the
24 agency has no authority to alter: the Fraud Prevention and Detection Account (FDNA), INA
25 § 214(c)(12)–(13), 286(v); 8 U.S.C. §§ 1184(c)(12)–(13), 1356(v), and the H-1B Nonimmigrant
26 Petitioner Account, INA §§ 214(c)(9), (11), 286(s); 8 U.S.C. §§ 1184(c)(9), (11), 1356(s).

1 54. The fees collected in the separate Fraud Prevention and Detention Account are split
2 among the Department of Homeland Security, Department of Labor, and Department of State to
3 cover the fraud-related detection and prevention work of each department.

4 55. Since its creation, the agency has adjusted fees in 2004, 2005, 2007, 2010, and 2016.
5 84 Fed. Reg. 62,280, 62,285 (Nov. 14, 2019); Supporting Material Appendix Table 7: USCIS IEFA
6 Fee History.

7 56. USCIS’s primary source of funding is the IEFA. In FY 2018, USCIS received
8 approximately 95 percent of its funding from the IEFA.

9 **G. USCIS Applies Ability-to-Pay Principles Consistent with Congressional**
10 **Directives**

11 57. Consistent with statutory goals of promoting diversity, unifying families, encouraging
12 citizenship, and protecting particularly vulnerable people, USCIS has provided mechanisms for low-
13 income applicants to access immigration benefits.

14 58. One mechanism is an “ability-to-pay” model for USCIS fees. *See* 84 Fed. Reg. at
15 62,298. “Under the ability-to-pay principle, those who are more capable of bearing the burden of
16 fees should pay more for the service than those with less ability to pay.” GAO, *Federal User Fees:
17 A Design Guide* (May 29, 2008), <https://bit.ly/33txZt3>. Applying these principles, USCIS has
18 assessed fees based on applicants’ ability to pay and has provided discretionary waivers of fees for
19 certain immigration benefit requests when an applicant is unable to pay. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.7(c).

20 59. DHS’s longtime policy has been “that individuals may apply for and be granted a fee
21 waiver for certain immigration benefits and services based on an inability-to-pay.” DHS, *USCIS Fee
22 Waiver Policies and Data*, App’x B at 2 (Sept. 27, 2017), <https://bit.ly/2DP8R5u>; *see also* 85 Fed.
23 Reg. at 46,807 (“In prior years, USCIS fees have given significant weight to the ability-to-pay
24 principle by providing relatively liberal fee waivers and exemptions and placing the costs of those
25 services on those who pay.”). This established practice aligned with express Congressional
26 instructions to keep naturalization and immigration benefits affordable. *See, e.g.*, H.R. Rep. 115-948
27 at 61 (stating that “USCIS is expected to continue the use of fee waivers for applicants who can
28

1 demonstrate an inability to pay the naturalization fee” and “encourage[ing] USCIS to maintain
2 naturalization fees at an affordable level”).

3 60. The ability-to-pay standard allows an applicant to seek a fee waiver if her household
4 income is at or below 150% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines, or on other grounds showing
5 inability to pay, such as receiving a means-tested benefit or experiencing financial hardship such as
6 medical expenses of family members, unemployment, eviction, or homelessness.⁶

7 61. For nearly two decades,⁷ USCIS has offered these waivers pursuant to 8 U.S.C.
8 § 1356(m), which authorizes the agency to collect fees for “similar services provided without charge
9 to asylum applicants or other immigrants” as part of the “full cost of providing” “adjudication and
10 naturalization services.” USCIS’s regulations expressly allow applicants who have demonstrated an
11 inability to pay to obtain fee waivers.⁸

12 62. The current fee schedule for lawful permanent resident and naturalization applications
13 also reflect ability-to-pay principles.

14 63. Immigrants in the United States who are eligible for adjustment of status may file a
15 Form I-485, Application to Register Permanent Residence—i.e., lawful permanent residence. Since
16 the FY 2008/2009 Final Rule, USCIS has allowed I-485 applicants to apply for some other benefits

17 ⁶ See current Form I-912 at Part 6 (<https://bit.ly/3h56dH7>), Instructions for Form I-912 at 8
18 (<https://bit.ly/3axT2wf>).

19 ⁷ E.g., Michael A. Pearson memorandum, Fee Waiver Relating to Employment Authorization for
20 Victims of Trafficking, dated May 25, 2001.

21 ⁸ USCIS may waive fees for the following services based on an inability to pay: Biometrics services
22 fee; Form I-90, Application to Replace Permanent Resident Card; Form I-191, Application for
23 Advance Permission to Return to Unrelinquished Domicile; Form I-751, Petition to Remove
24 Conditions on Residence; Form I-765, Application for Employment Authorization; Form I-817,
25 Application for Family Unity Benefits; Form I-821, Application for Temporary Protected Status;
26 Form I-881, Application for Suspension of Deportation or Special Rule Cancellation of Removal
27 (Pursuant to Section 203 of Public Law 105-100 (NACARA)); Form N-300, Application to File
28 Declaration of Intention; Form N-336, Request for a Hearing on a Decision in Naturalization
Proceedings (Under Section 336 of the INA); Form N-400, Application for Naturalization; Form N-
470, Application to Preserve Residence for Naturalization Purposes; Form N-565, Application for
Replacement of Naturalization/Citizenship Document; Form N-600, Application for Certification of
Citizenship; and Form N-600K, Application for Citizenship and Issuance of Certificate under
Section 322. Policy Memorandum: Fee Waiver Guidelines as Established by the Final Rule of the
USCIS Fee Schedule; Revisions to Adjudicator's Field Manual (AFM) Chapter 10.9, AFM Update
AD11-26 (Mar. 13, 2011), <https://bit.ly/3i8UZSe>. Additionally the TVPRA requires that “[t]he
Secretary of Homeland Security shall permit aliens to apply for a waiver of any fees associated with
filing an application for relief through final adjudication of the adjustment of status” for VAWA, U,
T, and TPS applicants. 8 U.S.C. § 1255.

1 without paying a fee. 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,304. Applicants who file Forms I-131, Application for
2 Travel Document, or I-765, Application for Employment Authorization, concurrently with their I-
3 485 application, or while their Form I-485 is pending before USCIS, may do so without paying a fee.
4 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,304. Furthermore, a reduced fee is available for children under the age of 14. 8
5 C.F.R. § 103.7(b)(1)(i)(U)(2).

6 64. Fees USCIS charges for Naturalization Applications, Form N-400, are \$640, and are
7 waivable based upon inability to pay. A reduced fee of \$405 is available for applicants with family
8 incomes greater than 150% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines but less than 200%. 8 C.F.R.
9 § 103.7(b)(1)(i)(BBB)(I). The biometric fee of \$85 is also waivable based on qualifying for a full
10 fee waiver of the naturalization application fee.

11 65. The “ability-to-pay” principle has also shaped our asylum fee system. Applicants use
12 Form I-589, Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal, to apply for asylum. *See id.*
13 As the agency recognizes, “[t]he U.S. Government has never charged a fee for form I–589, but rather
14 has relied on other fee-paying benefit requestors to subsidize asylum seeking applicants. Application
15 fees from other form types have always been used to fund the operation involved in processing
16 asylum claims.” 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,318.

17 66. Past fee rules have interpreted the law as directing USCIS not to charge a fee for
18 asylum. As discussed above, USCIS deposits fees from immigration applications into the IEFA. The
19 fees are specifically “for providing adjudication and naturalization services.” 8 U.S.C. § 1356(m).
20 By statute, the fees “may be set at a level that will ensure recovery of the full cost of providing all
21 such services, including the cost of similar services provided without charge to asylum applicants or
22 other immigrants.” 8 U.S.C. § 1356(m).

23 67. As USCIS previously understood, “Congress directed that the IEFA fund the cost of
24 asylum processing and other services provided to immigrants at no charge.” *See* Pub. L. No. 101-
25 515, § 210(d)(1) and (2), 104 Stat. 2101, 2121 (Nov. 5, 1990). USCIS’ understanding of that
26 Congressional directive was reflected consistently in the rulemaking proposals for the 2004, 2007,
27 and 2010 USCIS fee rules. 69 Fed. Reg. 5088 (2004); 72 Fed. Reg. 4890 (2007); 75 Fed. Reg. 33448
28 (2010). None of these proposed rules resulted in fees for asylum applicants. For the 2016 Final

1 Rule, USCIS was explicit about the adoption of this principle: “fees for each benefit type are
2 adequate to cover USCIS’ costs associated with processing applications and petitions, as well as
3 providing similar benefits to asylum and refugee applicants and certain other immigrants at no
4 charge.” 81 Fed. Reg. 26,904, 26,908 (May 4, 2016).

5 68. In addition, the agency recognizes certain statutorily required fee waivers. The
6 TVPRA requires that “[t]he Secretary of Homeland Security shall permit aliens to apply for a waiver
7 of any fees associated with filing an application for relief through final adjudication of the
8 adjustment of status” for VAWA, U, T, and TPS applicants. 8 U.S.C. § 1255.

9 69. NACARA provides for relief from deportation for qualifying asylum seekers.
10 NACARA applicants must file Form I-881, Application for Suspension of Deportation or
11 Cancellation of Removal Pursuant to NACARA, to apply for relief. The IEFA fees for these
12 applicants have remained the same since 2005, except for inflation adjustments. 84 Fed. Reg. at
13 62,323. The fee for this benefit is \$285 for individuals, with a \$570 cap for families and flat \$165
14 EOIR fee, whether an individual or family. *Id.*

15 70. Congress has repeatedly emphasized that cost should not prevent an otherwise
16 eligible lawful permanent resident from naturalizing. On February 13, 2019, Congress reiterated its
17 support of keeping naturalization affordable by making fee waivers more widely available. A
18 bipartisan, bicameral conference report published on Feb. 13, 2019 accompanying the omnibus
19 appropriations act for Fiscal Year 2019 says:

20 USCIS is expected to continue the use of fee waivers for applicants
21 who can demonstrate an inability to pay the naturalization fee. USCIS
22 is also encouraged to consider whether the current naturalization fee is
23 a barrier to naturalization for those earning between 150 percent and
24 200 percent of the federal poverty guidelines, who are not currently
25 eligible for a fee waiver. The conferees encourage USCIS to maintain
26 naturalization fees at an affordable level while also focusing on
27 reducing the backlog of applicants.

28 71. Even more recently, Congress encouraged USCIS to preserve fee waivers for
applicants who demonstrate an inability to pay. On December 16, 2019, the House Appropriations
Committee published an Explanatory statement on the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2020,
which said:

1 Fee Waivers.—USCIS is encouraged to continue the use of fee
2 waivers for applicants who demonstrate an inability to pay the
3 naturalization fee, and to consider, in consultation with the Office of
4 the Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman (CIS
5 Ombudsman), whether the current naturalization fee is a barrier to
6 naturalization for those earning between 150 percent and 200 percent
7 of the federal poverty guidelines and who are not currently eligible for
8 a fee waiver, and provide a briefing to the Committees within 60 days
9 of the date of enactment of this Act.⁹

6 72. This explanatory statement shows concern about imposing fees on vulnerable groups:

7 Further, USCIS is encouraged to refrain from imposing fees on any
8 individual filing a humanitarian petition, including, but not limited to,
9 individuals requesting asylum; refugee admission; protection under the
10 Violence Against Women Act; Special Immigrant Juvenile status; a T
11 or U visa; or requests [for] adjustment of status or petitions for another
12 benefit after receiving humanitarian protection. USCIS shall consult
13 with the CIS Ombudsman on the impact of imposing such fees and
14 provide a briefing to the Committees within 60 days of the date of
15 enactment of this Act.¹⁰

12 **H. USCIS Announces A New Mission**

13 73. In early 2018, USCIS announced a new mission.¹¹ Its mission statement had read:
14 “USCIS secures America's promise as a nation of immigrants by providing accurate and useful
15 information to our customers, granting immigration and citizenship benefits, promoting an
16 awareness and understanding of citizenship, and ensuring the integrity of our immigration system.”¹²

17 74. Its new mission statement came to read: “U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
18 administers the nation’s lawful immigration system, safeguarding its integrity and promise by
19 efficiently and fairly adjudicating requests for immigration benefits while protecting Americans,
20 securing the homeland, and honoring our values.”¹³

23 _____
24 ⁹ Committee on Appropriations, Explanatory Statement on HR 1158, Pub. L. No. 116-93,
<https://bit.ly/2EcoovN> (last visited 8/17/2020).

25 ¹⁰ *Id.*

26 ¹¹ Richard Gonzales, *America No Longer A ‘Nation of Immigrants,’ USCIS Says*, NPR (Feb. 22,
2018), <https://n.pr/316fysK>.

27 ¹² *See, e.g.*, Department of Homeland Security, Office of Inspector General, United States
Citizenship and Immigration Services’ Employment Based Fifth Preference (EB5) Regional Center
Program, OIG 14-19, at 2, <https://bit.ly/3azvE1k>.

28 ¹³ USCIS, “Mission and Core Values,” <https://www.uscis.gov/about-us/mission-and-core-values>
(last visited Aug. 20, 2020).

1 75. In 2019, Ken Cuccinelli noted that he saw “USCIS as a vetting agency, not a benefits
2 agency.” Adam Shaw, *Cuccinelli puts hardline stamp on immigration agenda, just 2 months into*
3 *USCIS job*, Fox News (Aug. 23, 2019), <https://fxn.ws/3kWAnyP>.

4 76. USCIS has assisted with ICE and CBP enforcement work in recent years. For
5 example, in response to heightened immigration levels at the U.S.-Mexico border, USCIS deputy
6 director Mark Koumans sent an email to USCIS staff in July 2019 stating that “[c]urrent conditions
7 are placing extreme stress on our colleagues at Immigration and Customs Enforcement,” and that
8 “USCIS has agreed to seek USCIS volunteers to provide ICE with support. . . . I appreciate your
9 willingness to consider helping our colleagues fulfill the DHS mission.” Hamed Aleaziz, *Civil*
10 *Servants Who Process Immigration Applications Are Being Asked To Help ICE Instead*, BuzzFeed
11 News (July 17, 2019), <https://bit.ly/3kQ1knH>. “One USCIS officer, however, . . . [said] that
12 Cuccinelli appeared focused on helping ICE with its law enforcement work, rather than adjudicating
13 immigration benefits. . . . ‘Cuccinelli is diverting resources towards enforcement.’” *Id.*; see also Eric
14 Katz, *Employees Concerned After Agency Threatens Furloughs Over Budget Shortfall*, Gov’t Exec.
15 (May 22, 2020), <https://bit.ly/3iO4qXt> (“USCIS employees employed on a volunteer basis to Border
16 Patrol and Immigration to *help conduct operations within the purview of those agencies.*” (emphasis
17 added)).¹⁴ And USCIS leadership has recently moved to expand the agency’s authority to initiate
18 removal proceedings and encourage placing applicants into removal proceedings. See USCIS Policy
19 Memorandum on Notices to Appear, No. PM-602-0050.1 (June 28, 2018); USCIS Policy
20 Memorandum on Requests for Evidence, No. PM-602-0163 (July 13, 2018).

21 **II. IRREGULAR PROPOSED RULEMAKING**

22 77. USCIS rolled out the Final Rule after an irregular and chaotic proposed rulemaking
23 process that denied the public adequate opportunity to comment.

24 **A. Inadequate Opportunity to Comment**

25 78. On November 14, 2019, USCS published a proposed rule just before the
26 Thanksgiving holiday (“November Proposal”). It specified a deadline for comments of December

27 _____
28 ¹⁴ The Final Rule explicitly takes CBP’s costs into account in setting I-192 fees. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,791, 46,792 n.4.

1 16, 2019. This allowed just 32 days for public comment, in contrast to the 45-60 days provided in
2 past fee rules.

3 79. The November Proposal included a \$207 million transfer of IEFA funds to ICE but
4 also included six alternative fee schedules, including a fee schedule with a \$0 to ICE.

5 80. On November 22, 2019, USCIS replaced the economic analysis on the regulatory
6 docket with a new economic analysis, without informing the public. As a result, some commenters
7 were drafting their comments on the basis of the old economic analysis without even realizing it was
8 obsolete.

9 81. On December 9, 2019 – just one week before the original deadline for comments –
10 USCIS published a “supplement” that included an entirely different set of budget assumptions.
11 USCIS extended the deadline for comments to December 30, 2019 (“December Proposal”). That
12 gave commenters 21 days running over the holiday season to comment on an entirely new financial
13 justification for the rule.

14 82. The December Proposal advanced new rationales for fee increases not previously
15 suggested in the November Proposal. It did not include a corresponding new fee schedule and did
16 not propose concrete adjustments of fees in accordance with the new rationales.

17 83. On January 24, 2020, and without advance notice to the public, USCIS reopened the
18 public comment period for the proposed rule for another seventeen days, with a deadline of February
19 10, 2020.

20 84. One week before that deadline, USCIS finally held a meeting to demonstrate its cost-
21 modeling to stakeholders, as promised in the November Proposal. However, the meeting was in-
22 person only, with no public telephone or virtual access, and thus only a few people could attend.

23 85. In other words, USCIS did not provide 60 days for public comment on the proposed
24 rule with its supplemental material. It provided 21 days for comment from December 9-30 and 17
25 days from January 24 to February 10. Commenters only had access to the agency’s highly technical
26 cost-modeling in the final week of that period, from February 3 to 10.

27 86. The extra days in January and February did not remedy the problem with the
28 abbreviated comment period because the additional days were given with no notice. Commenters

1 had no opportunity to make time for analyzing the new material and drafting a new comment letter.
2 Because of the disjointed comment period, commenters were not able to spend sufficient time
3 analyzing the Proposals in full and providing complete responses.

4 87. In spite of the irregular process and insufficient time to comment, regulations.gov
5 shows 39,665 comments were submitted on the November Proposal, and 4,279 comments were
6 submitted when the public comment period was reopened. The vast majority of the comments were
7 in opposition to the Proposals. Comments to the proposed rule included, among other things,
8 research showing that the proposed rule would disproportionately affect people of color and low-
9 income immigrants and research showing the benefits of increased naturalization. . The comments
10 also outlined new unjustified and wasteful practices at USCIS that increased processing times,
11 decreased efficiency, and reduced access to immigration benefits.

12 **B. Insufficient Information in the Proposal**

13 88. In addition to the timing problems, the contents of both the November Proposal and
14 the December Proposal made it impossible for the public to discern what the agency was proposing.

15 89. The narrative portion of the November Proposal proposed fees that would recover
16 USCIS projected costs, as shown in its budget. *See* 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,286-87 & Table 2. Its
17 proposed budget fell into four categories: (i) Transfer to ICE (\$207.6 million), (ii) Pay and benefits
18 adjustments for on-board staff (\$280.2 million in FY 2019 and \$89.8 million in FY 2020, or an
19 average of \$185 million), (iii) Pay and benefits for new staff (\$116.7 million in FY 2019 and \$128.8
20 million in FY 2020, or an average of \$122.75 million), (iv) Net additional costs (\$150.8 million in
21 FY 2019 and \$6.2 million in FY 2020, or an average of \$78.5 million). *See* 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,286.

22 90. These dollar figures from the narrative portion of the rule did not match the dollar
23 figures in Table 2 of the November Proposal, adding to the confusion about which amount the
24 agency was proposing to recover through applicants' fees. *See* 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,287 at Table 2
25 (depicted below).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE 2—COST PROJECTIONS
[FY 2019/2020 fee review IEFA non-premium budget (in millions)]

Total Base FY 2018 IEFA Non-Premium Budget	\$3,585.6
Plus: Spending Adjustments	217.2
Total Adjusted FY 2018 IEFA Non-Premium Budget	3,802.8
Plus: Transfer to ICE	207.6
Plus: Pay Inflation and Promotions/Within Grade Increases	280.2
Plus: Net Additional Costs	267.5
Total Adjusted FY 2019 IEFA Non-Premium Budget	4,558.1
Plus: Pay Inflation and Promotions/Within Grade Increases	218.6
Plus: Net Additional Costs	6.2
Total Adjusted FY 2020 IEFA Non-Premium Budget	4,782.9
FY 2019/2020 Average Non-Premium Budget	4,670.5

91. In addition, the explanation for each of the four categories is vague and opaque.

92. The November Proposal included a \$207.6 million transfer to ICE. That proposed transfer decreased by \$95 million in the December Proposal, without an adequate explanation of why the first amount was proposed, or what assumptions applied.

93. DHS also did not explain why it previously failed to project the need for a substantial increase in staffing.

94. Its Proposal included a 44% increase in staff above the levels set in 2016 without any adequate explanation for the enormous increase. *See* Table 6, below. The November Proposal simply provides that, “This additional staffing requirement reflects the facts that it takes USCIS longer to adjudicate many workloads than was planned for in the FY 2016/2017 Final Rule and that workload volumes, particularly for work types that do not currently generate fee revenue, have grown.” 84 Fed. Reg. at 66,286.

APPENDIX VII – AUTHORIZED IEFA POSITIONS BY USCIS OFFICE

USCIS forecasts staffing and costs based on projected workload and the existing cost baseline. The table below compared FY 2016/2017 fee rule staffing to the staffing levels in the FY 2019/2020 fee review.

Appendix Table 6: IEFA Positions by Office

Directorate	FY 2016/2017 Positions	FY 2019/2020 Positions	Difference	% Difference
Field Operations Directorate	5,946	7,305	1,359	23%
Fraud Detection and National Security Directorate	920	1,918	998	108%
Refugee Asylum and International Operations Directorate	1,648	2,147	499	30%
Service Center Operations Directorate	2,866	5,579	2,713	95%
Other Offices (External Affairs, Immigration Records and Identity Services, Management, etc.)	3,163	4,009	846	27%
USCIS Total	14,543	20,958	6,415	44%

1 95. DHS did not address policies it adopted that contribute to longer adjudication times
2 and increased backlog.

3 96. DHS did not adequately explain the Proposals’ distribution of staffing increases. For
4 example, USCIS admitted in the Final Rule that it “has experienced a continuous, sizeable increase
5 in the affirmative asylum backlog” but increased staffing for Refugee Asylum and International
6 Operations Directorate by 30%. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,846; DHS, Immigration Examinations Fee
7 Account: Fee Review Supporting Documentation with Addendum FY 2019-2020 at 42 (May 2020),
8 USCIS-2019-0010-12271. At the same time, it DHS is increasing the Fraud Detection and National
9 Security Directorate staffing by 108%, without any data to explain why “Fraud Detection” work is
10 doubling. *Id.*

11 97. DHS also describes \$150.8 million it seeks to recover from individuals and families
12 seeking immigration services as “net additional costs,” including “enhancement requests such as
13 secure mail shipping for permanent resident cards, increased background investigations,
14 headquarters consolidations, etc.” 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,286. It states these and other operations
15 expenses are “necessary for achieving USCIS’s strategic goals,” without explaining what new
16 strategic goals require this increase. 82 Fed. Reg. at 62,286. That omission prevents the public from
17 determining whether the fees are being used within the limits of the IEFA’s statutory purpose.

18 98. The November Proposal claimed an annual additional budget need of \$1.26 billion.
19 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,282. Subtracting the \$95 million from its December Proposal’s decrease for ICE
20 funding (the first category of its four identified budget components), DHS proposed recovering
21 \$1.17 billion from fees. It did not update the other three budget components in the December
22 Proposal. Thus, the following math problem emerges: \$112 million to ICE + \$185 million for
23 current staff pay + 122.75 million for new staff + \$78.5 million for net additional costs = \$498.25
24 million.

25 99. In other words, the November Proposal shows that DHS structured its fees to raise
26 \$672 million for reasons it does not disclose.

27 100. The Proposals were also deficient because it was unclear what fee schedule DHS was
28 actually proposing. The November Proposal identified 6 alternative scenarios with different assigned

1 fee amounts to address combinations of hypotheticals relating to whether DACA remained in place
2 and whether the ICE transfer was finalized. 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,328 & Table 20. It was impossible to
3 tell what formula or rationale DHS would apply, and whether the agency’s actions were reasonable
4 in light of alternatives.

5 101. In addition, the November Proposal explained the final amount would reflect fees at
6 an amount “in between” the levels proposed. 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,327. Again, the public could not
7 comment on whether the agency’s arrival at an “in between” amount was reasonable or within its
8 discretion.

9 102. Furthermore, the December Proposal, though it identified a \$95 million decrease in its
10 budget assumptions, did not propose new fees. Instead, DHS stated the resulting fee schedule would
11 be “somewhere between” the levels of full ICE transfer and no ICE transfer identified in the
12 November Proposal. Again, this was insufficient information for public comment. 84 Fed. Reg.
13 67,246.

14 103. DHS proposed allocating costs unevenly and without justification. DHS proposed
15 increasing the fees for Form I-485 (Application to Register Permanent Residence) by 17%, Form I-
16 751 (Petition to Remove Conditions on Residence) by 52%, Form N-400 (Application for
17 Naturalization) by 83%. But it would decrease the Form I-140 (Immigration Petition for Alien
18 Worker) by 9%. The November Proposal provided no adequate explanation for these variations, so
19 the public could not provide comment to help inform the agency’s decision making.

20 104. DHS also failed to provide an adequate explanation for its projected 2.1 million
21 increase in employment authorization applications. 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,289. The agency provided no
22 supporting data for this figure. Given that DHS projected that employment authorization applications
23 would account for 60% of its projected workload increase, this omission deprived the public of a
24 meaningful opportunity to comment.

25 105. The sheer breadth of the chaotic Proposals compounded the confusion. The Proposals
26 reflected changes to some 59 forms. With this volume and complexity of changes, it was unclear
27 whether the Administration was proposing consistent bases for its changes or what those bases might
28 be.


1 106. This is particularly true because the fees in the proposed rule stem from DHS’s
2 estimates of future costs and revenues but USCIS did not offer enough information for the public to
3 understand its estimates.

4 **III. BUDGET REQUESTS AND CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS**

5 107. In May 2020, DHS told Congress it would need a \$1.2 billion bailout due to the
6 COVID-19 crisis. The agency pitched this as a loan that it would pay back to the Treasury through a
7 10% surcharge on top of all other fees.¹⁵ See Camila DeChalus, *USCIS seeks \$1.2 billion from*
8 *Congress*, Roll Call (May 18, 2020), <https://bit.ly/3iW5xVo>. The agency claimed that without the
9 funding it would have to furlough some 13,400 employees by the end of August 2020 due to
10 decreased receipts during the COVID pandemic. But long before COVID, the agency had projected
11 its own financial demise.

12 108. This graphic from the April 2019 IEFA Fee Review Supporting Documentation¹⁶ tells
13 the story of how far the agency’s financial condition had deteriorated more than a year before it
14 sought the congressional bailout purportedly due to COVID:

15 Figure 3: IEFA Non-Premium Year-End Carryover Balances



25

26 ¹⁵ Testimony of Joseph B. Edlow, Deputy Director for Policy, USCIS, House Committee on the
27 Judiciary, Submissions on Immigration and Citizenship, Hearing entitled “Oversight of U.S.
28 Citizenship and Immigration Services” at 3 (July 29, 2020).

¹⁶ USCIS, FY 2019 Immigration Examinations Fee Account: Fee Review Supporting Documentation
14 (April 2019), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-0007.

1 109. After USCIS announced furloughs, members of Congress disclosed that the FY2020
2 deficit USCIS projected in the Final Rule would not come to pass.

3 110. Senators Leahy and Tester sent a letter to USCIS noting that the agency now
4 anticipated a surplus for 2020, rather than a deficit.¹⁷

5 111. DHS postponed the furloughs to August 30, 2020 after receipt of the letter from
6 Senators Leahy and Tester.

7 112. Nevertheless, USCIS's Deputy Director for Policy, Joseph Edlow, testified to the
8 U.S. House of Representatives' Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration and
9 Citizenship that the COVID-19 pandemic was responsible for USCIS insolvency.¹⁸ Yet, he also
10 explained that USCIS's revenues and receipts were increasing in recent months.¹⁹

11 113. To date, DHS still has not submitted to Congress any formal request for emergency
12 supplemental funding, even though it is still threatening furloughs. The lack of any formal funding
13 requests confirms that DHS is using the COVID-19 crisis opportunistically as pretext for crippling
14 the system of lawful immigration to the United States.

15 114. The Final Rule raises fees based on DHS projections that it publicized long before
16 COVID and that appear to conflict with information it provided to Congress in connection with the
17 hearings. In all events, the Final Rule is clear that it did not take the effects of COVID into account
18 when it issued the final rule. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,793.

19 **IV. THE FINAL RULE**

20 115. The Final Rule is irrational, arbitrary, contrary to law, and an unjustified reversal of
21 past practice. It allocates fees for the unlawful purposes of deterring applicants from seeking
22 statutory benefits, including naturalization and asylum.

23
24 ¹⁷ See Letter from Patrick Leahy, Vice Chairman, U.S. Senate Comm. on Appropriations, and Jon
25 Tester, Ranking Member, U.S. Senate Comm. on Appropriations, to Chad F. Wolf, Acting Sec'y,
26 Dep't of Homeland Sec., and Joseph Edlow, Deputy Dir. for Policy, U.S. Citizen and Immigration
27 Services (Jul. 21, 2020) (on file with U.S. Senate); see also Letter from Patrick Leahy, Vice
28 Chairman, U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations, to Chad F. Wolf, Acting Sec'y, Dep't of
Homeland Sec., and Joseph Edlow, Deputy Dir. for Policy, U.S. Citizen and Immigration Services
(Aug. 18, 2020) (on file with U.S. Senate).

¹⁸ *Id.* at 2.

¹⁹ *Id.*

1 **A. The Final Rule’s Reasoning Is Incomplete, Inconsistent, and Irrational**

2 **1. Underlying Assumptions about USCIS Budget Needs Are Incoherent**

3 116. USCIS has asserted that its financial situation necessitates the fee increases. But the
4 Final Rule does not offer a cogent explanation for how USCIS burned through surplus revenues and
5 cash reserves, why it needs a 20% budget increase now, or how it will spend the new revenue it
6 generates from higher fees.

7 117. The November Proposal predicted that even though USCIS had an \$800 million
8 carryover balance at the end of FY2019, it would be \$250 million in the red by the end of FY 2019
9 and over \$1.5 billion in the red by FY 2020. And it projected all this long before COVID-19 was a
10 concern.

11 118. The Proposals’ description of USCIS’s financial condition is puzzling because the
12 2016 Final Rule resulted in an unexpected \$400 million budget surplus. USCIS does not account for
13 how it used the surplus or explain why its finances have changed so dramatically. 85 Fed. Reg. at
14 46,794.


15 119. DHS also fails to explain how it spent the \$1 billion carryover from FY 2017.²⁰
16 USCIS’s use of all of this revenue is astonishing. Without some explanation of how it incurred
17 additional expenses of \$1 billion, DHS cannot rationally explain its decision, and the public cannot
18 meaningfully comment on whether DHS is raising its fees for a lawful purpose.

19 120. USCIS also does not explain why it is anticipating a \$1.4 billion increase in its
20 budgetary needs. The Final Rule asserts that the extra revenue generated by the Final Rule will pay
21 for new hires, pay raises, and “net additional costs,” but the numbers it provides for these items leave
22 63% of the new revenue allocation completely unexplained. The following chart illustrates the
23 point²¹:

24 ²⁰ See USCIS Budget Overview, Congressional Budget Justification FY 2019 at CIS-10,
<https://bit.ly/3g5JcTt>.

25 ²¹ See Supplemental Testimony of Douglas Rand, House Committee on the Judiciary, Submissions
26 on Immigration and Citizenship, Hearing entitled “Oversight of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration
27 Services” (July 29, 2020), Attachment at 2; see also cost breakdown in November Proposal, 84 Fed.
28 Reg. at 62,286; December Proposal reduction in proposed cost attributed to ICE diversion, 84 Fed.
Reg. 67,243 (Dec. 9, 2019); Final Rule budget, 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,794. The Final Rule updated the
“net additional costs” category to \$69,050,000, such that the final unexplained amount is in fact
\$659,148,915.


Planned Expenses (\$)



121. Similarly, USCIS asserts that its costs are skyrocketing but without any cogent explanation for the sudden and dramatic pre-COVID increase in the cost of providing adjudication services. The data show the increase in cost but not the reason for the increase.²²

²² USCIS Immigration Examination Fee Account: Fee Review Supporting Documentation FY 2019 at 6 (Apr. 2019); *see also* 81 Fed. Reg. at 73,323 (\$3.038 billion USCIS FY2016/2017 budget); 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,794 (\$4.556 billion USCIS FY2019 budget and \$4.783 FY2020 budget, or an average FY2019/2020 \$4.444 billion budget).

Figure 1: IEFA Non-Premium Cost Baseline (Dollars in Millions)



122. Meanwhile, DHS has pursued denaturalization efforts, which are by definition ICE-led efforts, by raising funds using USCIS’s fee-setting authority.²³ The Proposals sought to directly fund these efforts, none of which are led by USCIS, but instead are led by enforcement agencies such as ICE, and adjudicated by DOJ.²⁴

123. Simultaneously, DHS suggests it is pursuing policies that increase USCIS’s costs, but does not provide any supporting detail. Instead, DHS bakes in assumptions of costs for escalated

²³ See, e.g., Naturalization Working Grp., Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration Benefit Request Requirements (Feb. 10, 2020), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-12030.

²⁴ OneAmerica, Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration Benefit Request Requirements (Dec. 30, 2019), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-10310; OneAmerica, Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration Benefit Request Requirements (Feb. 10, 2020), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-12018; Naturalization Working Grp., Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration Benefit Request Requirements (Dec. 30, 2019), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-11097; Naturalization Working Grp., Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration Benefit Request Requirements (Feb. 10, 2020), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-12030.

1 vetting, in-person interviews, and unspecified policy changes, and then concludes its costs have
2 increased, requiring additional fees from applicants.²⁵

3 124. The Final Rule’s financial assumptions are also inconsistent with USCIS’s reports to
4 Congress about their anticipated surplus.

5 125. DHS cannot reasonably use the previously-projected deficit as justification for the
6 Final Rule.

7 126. The gap between DHS projections in the November Proposal and the projections
8 USCIS reported to Congress indicates there may be some underlying flaw in the calculations that
9 support the Final Rule. DHS did not disclose enough about those calculations for the public to offer
10 meaningful comments.

11 127. DHS’s data and assertions about its costs are unreliable in other respects. For
12 example, DHS has asserted that it is not changing the fee for DACA. That assertion is deceptive.
13 The DACA fee had been charged every two years and now it will be charged every year. That
14 means DHS is collecting twice as much money from DACA applicants under the Final Rule.

15 128. In the Final Rule, DHS explains it has removed all revenues generated from DACA
16 recipients’ fees from its cost modeling because it does not “rely” on revenues from DACA. 85 Fed.
17 Reg. at 46,853 n.88. In other words, DHS discounts the revenues it receives from DACA recipients
18 even though it extracts fees from them.

19 129. DHS does not adequately account for its \$10 discount for certain online applications,
20 newly introduced in the Final Rule.

21 130. DHS makes no account of any purported cost-savings measures or any measures to
22 reduce waste. It also has not stated whether the fee increases relate to the agency’s litigation costs or
23 any fees it has been required to pay opposing counsel after DHS policies have been deemed unlawful
24 by a court of law. It is unclear whether or how these costs are being allocated within DHS.

25
26
27 ²⁵ See Am. Immigr. Lawyers Ass’n and Am. Immigr. Council, Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on
28 U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration
Benefit Request Requirements at 4 (Dec. 23, 2019), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-7077.

1 2. The Final Rule Is Based on A False Premise About Inelasticity of Demand

2 131. The Final Rule is built on a faulty premise that demand for immigration services is
3 inelastic. This assumption defies common sense, ignores 200 years of free-market economic theory
4 demonstrating that when prices go up, demand usually goes down, and ignores the government’s
5 own data.

6 132. In particular, DHS ignores its own data that show applications for naturalization
7 surged before prior fee increases, and dropped after.²⁶ DHS also ignores data in the record showing
8 that the fee increases and elimination of fee waivers could decrease demand to such a degree that the
9 agency will collect *less* money as a result of the Final Rule than it does under the current fee regime.

10 133. Additional analysis by the Congressional Research Service concludes that “Empirical
11 studies suggest that the volume of naturalization petitions filed may be inversely related to the
12 naturalization fee amount.” Congressional Research Service, U.S. Naturalization Policy, Jan. 16,
13 2014, <https://bit.ly/321UXW0>.

14 134. DHS data also show that naturalization applicants are the highest beneficiaries of fee
15 waivers. The Final Rule recognizes that naturalization applications have continued under prior fee
16 rules, but refuses to consider that under those fee rules, fee waivers and reduced fees were available
17 to naturalization applicants. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,895.

18 135. DHS “acknowledges that evidence presented indicating naturalization increases when
19 previous fees were waived entirely” but asserts without explanation that this “does not support the
20 claim that immigration benefits are sensitive to the changes implemented by this rule.” *See* 85 Fed.
21 Reg. at 46,895.

22 136. The Final Rule’s claims of inelasticity also fail to account for the interplay between
23 fees. Because the Final Rule increases the N-400 fee for naturalization so significantly, from \$640 to
24 \$1,170, and slightly decreases the I-90 fee for lawful permanent residence renewal, from \$455 to
25 \$415, the Final Rule creates a significant financial incentive for renewing lawful permanent

26 ²⁶ *See* 2020 USCIS Ombudsman Report to Congress, <https://bit.ly/347JQND> (“USCIS historically
27 experiences a temporary increase in naturalization filings in presidential election years and when fee
28 increases are proposed, followed by reduced filings in the next fiscal year.”).

1 residence status instead of naturalizing. DHS offers no explanation for why it believes that those
2 faced with the choice of a \$415 renewal or a \$1,170 naturalization application would not be price
3 sensitive.

4 137. Instead, DHS says that it “did not consider any interplay between the fees for Forms
5 I-90 and N-400 in the NPRM, nor do we in the final rule.” 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,838. DHS provides no
6 reasoned explanation for failing to consider this important aspect of the problem.

7 3. Irrational Cost Modeling Results In Unjustified Conclusions

8 138. The Final Rule uses an “Activity-Based Cost” (“ABC”) model to assign fees to
9 different benefit applications, based on the average cost to USCIS to adjudicate a given type of form.
10 This modeling relies on unexplained and irrational economic assumptions that are contradicted by
11 data.

12 139. First, the agency’s total budget amount is an input into the ABC model. Nothing in
13 the model explains how USCIS arrived at the total budget number. In other words, DHS first
14 determines the total budget for the agency and then uses the ABC model to determine how to
15 allocate that budget to the various fees. But, as described above, the total budget DHS adopted in the
16 Final Rule is itself deeply flawed and unexplained. That renders the entire cost model irrational.

17 140. Second, DHS’s belief that the demand for immigration services is inelastic means that
18 the ABC model does not take into account price elasticity. Thus, the rule fails to account for the
19 likelihood that the volume of applications will go down as prices rise, rendering the model’s results
20 without analytical support.

21 141. Third, the Final Rule uses opaque and varied assumptions and inputs for different
22 benefit applications for no apparent reason. The Final Rule nowhere explains why USCIS costs have
23 changed so dramatically and inconsistently across different form types.

24 142. In particular, USCIS has not explained its source for data on hourly cost projections
25 that it entered into the ABC model, a key driver of the fees. For example, the Proposed Rule projects
26 that an N-400 takes 1.57 hours to complete at a fee of \$1,170, or \$745 per hour. But an EB-5 I-526
27 petition takes 8.65 hours at a fee of \$4,015, or \$464.16 per hour. DHS does not explain the different
28 hourly costs for different forms.

1 143. The disparate hourly rates per form is inconsistent with the agency’s purported
2 activity-based cost system. In the Final Rule, its only explanation is that “DHS uses multiple,
3 different techniques to forecast USCIS’ workloads.” 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,871.

4 144. That assertion is not a reasoned explanation of USCIS’s inputs into the cost model
5 that it says generated the fees in the Final Rule.

6 **B. The Final Rule Is Contrary to Law Because It Increases Fees Intended for the**
7 **Adjudication of Applications In Order To Fund Other Activities**

8 145. The Final Rule’s recovery of its costs for performing ICE and CBP functions is
9 contrary to law. The Final Rule is clear that USCIS now interprets its mission and functions broadly
10 to include “securing the homeland,” but it is not clear how it is allocating fees to any non-
11 adjudication efforts it has undertaken pursuant to this new mission. *See* 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,789.

12 146. Several statutory provisions provide that USCIS cannot recover through the IEFA
13 those costs it incurs in assisting ICE or engaging in enforcement.

14 147. Congress established a separate Fraud Prevention and Detection Account over which
15 the agency has no discretion to adjust fees and which is entirely separate from the IEFA. The INA
16 prescribes a fee for the Fraud Detection and Prevention Account in the amount \$500 and \$150 for
17 non-U.S. citizens applying for certain employment-related visas. 8 U.S.C. § 1184(c)(12)-(13).
18 Congress expressly provided these amounts for fraud prevention and detection services.

19 148. Despite this unambiguous statutory provision with set dollar amounts, DHS charges
20 additional fees to cover its costs for training staff on fraud detection and prevention well beyond
21 what can be recovered through these funds.

22 149. Although some fraud detection may be attendant to adjudication, the Final Rule
23 proposes a doubling of staff in the fraud detection unit without providing any evidence that this
24 increase is necessary to adjudicate applications.

25 150. The Final Rule also recovers the costs of diverting its staff to ICE and CBP under the
26 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern
27

28

1 Border Act of 2019,²⁷ despite Congress’s express and unambiguous prohibition on using IEFA
2 funds for enforcement.

3 151. The Emergency Act expressly provides that the DHS agencies could provide their
4 personnel “without reimbursement.”²⁸ But that does not mean that USCIS can recover the costs of
5 providing staff to ICE by raising fees charged to applicants.

6 152. The Final Rule indicates that USCIS administrative staff have been deployed to ICE.
7 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,871. Presumably, the work of those administrative staff members has been spread
8 distributed to the remaining USCIS staff, who are now spread thin. This may explain the sudden
9 need for additional staffing in the USCIS budget.

10 153. If USCIS is loaning staff to ICE, but continuing to pay that staff through IEFA funds,
11 USCIS is effectively diverting funds to ICE that ICE would have spent on hiring new staff.

12 154. If USCIS is itself hiring new staff to absorb the work its former staff is now doing for
13 ICE, and passing the costs of hiring new USCIS staff to applicants under the guise of the IEFA, this
14 too is contrary to law.

15 155. USCIS statements that it sent personnel but not “dollars” to the enforcement agency
16 is merely an attempt to evade Congress’s express direction. House Comm. on the Judiciary,
17 *Oversight of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services* at 1:21:15-1:22:46 (July 29, 2020),
18 <https://bit.ly/31eibZL>.

19 156. In either case, the work that USCIS staff does for ICE is by definition outside of
20 USCIS’s mission. As discussed above, Congress, the courts, and the predecessor immigration agency
21 have all understood the adjudication of immigration services is a separate and distinct concept from
22 enforcement. *See supra* section I.E. Because administrative work performed for ICE is not USCIS
23 work providing adjudication services, the related costs cannot be recovered through the IEFA under
24 INA 286(m).


25 157. In addition to being contrary to law, DHS’s attempt to explain away these questions
26 demonstrates that the Final Rule is also arbitrary and capricious. The Final Rule gives no clarity on

27 ²⁷ Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the
Southern Border Act of 2019, Pub. L. No. 116-26, 133 Stat. 1018.

28 ²⁸ Pub. L. No. 116-26, 133 Stat. 1018.

1 these points because it does not explain how staffing needs have risen by such a dramatic amount: an
2 increase of 6,277 positions, or 43% above the staffing amount identified in the 2016/2017 Final
3 Rule. *See* 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,871. Although DHS claims that the “[m]arginal costs associated with
4 this effort [to assist ICE] are not in this final rule” it is unclear based on the record how they have
5 been accounted for anywhere.

6 158. Furthermore, DHS explains the high staffing needs arise from receiving greater
7 volumes of applications, but historical figures show there is no correlation between volume of
8 applications and volume of adjudications. The below infographic, created from USCIS’s data
9 available at www.uscis.gov/data, illustrates this point²⁹:



22 159. In addition, the Final Rule states it needs additional staff because processing times
23 have increased. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,872. Yet, the agency is not specific about how the additional staff
24 will address the backlog. The agency merely reasons that additional revenue “*may* be used to fund
25 staff that will adjudicate incoming workload and potentially mitigate or stabilize future backlog
26 growth.” *Id.* (emphasis added). It is unclear what purpose the additional staffing serves and whether

27 ²⁹ *See* Immigrant Legal Res. Ctr., Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on U.S. Citizenship and
28 Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration Benefit Request
Requirements at 39 (Dec. 23, 2019), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-7084.

1 it will, in fact, improve processing times. This is particular true because so much of the increase in
2 staffing is for “Fraud Detection and National Security.”

3 160. Staffing numbers in the Final Rule that seek to recover the costs of DHS’s staff
4 shuffling despite statutory prohibitions and are without rational justification provided in the Final
5 Rule. For example, USCIS has allocated staff to assist CBP and ICE with enforcement work. *See* ¶
6 76, *supra* (citing Aleazis, *Civil Servants, supra*; Katz, *Employees Concerned, supra*). The Final Rule
7 explicitly takes CBP’s costs into account in setting I-192 fees. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,791, 46,792 n.4.
8 And USCIS has devoted significant resources to a new denaturalization unit, which seeks (in
9 diametric opposition to USCIS’s mission) to enforce immigration law to *strip* naturalized
10 immigrants of their citizenship, as well as to strip lawful permanent residents of their status.³⁰

11 **C. The Final Rule Unlawfully Allocates Costs Across Fee Categories and Places a**
12 **Disproportionate Burden on Low-Income Applicants for Naturalization or**
13 **Asylum**

14 161. The Final Rule abandons ability-to-pay principles in favor of the selective use of a
15 beneficiary-pays policy that disproportionately burdens low income applicants, without a reasoned
16 explanation.

17 162. DHS asserts that the Final Rule adopts a beneficiary-pays policy in the interests of
18 “equity” but there is nothing equitable about the way the Final Rule drastically increases fees for
19 low-income applicants for some benefits, and imposes much smaller increases for some wealthier
20 applicants. The uneven allocation of the fee increases across benefit categories confirms that DHS is
21 using the fee increase to impede access to immigration benefits for low-income applicants who are
22 seeking immigration benefits, including naturalization or asylum.

23
24 ³⁰ *See* Amy Taxin, *US launches bid to find citizenship cheaters*, Assoc. Press (June 11, 2018),
25 <https://bit.ly/3h3IJCK> (“The U.S. government agency that oversees immigration applications is
26 launching an office that will focus on identifying Americans who are accused of cheating to get their
27 citizenship and seek to strip them of it. [then-USCIS] Director L. Francis Cissna told The Associated
28 Press in an interview that his agency is hiring several dozen lawyers and immigration officers to
review cases of immigrants who were ordered deported and are suspected of using fake identities to
later get green cards [i.e., lawful permanent residence status] and citizenship through
naturalization. . . . He declined to say how much the effort would cost but said it would be covered
by the agency’s existing budget, which is funded by immigration application fees.”).

1 1. The Final Rule Dramatically Increases Fees for Low Income Applicants by
2 Eliminating or Reducing Access To Fee Waivers

3 163. The Final Rule targets low-income applicants by eliminating discretionary fee
4 waivers for naturalization, lawful permanent residence, and work authorizations for most
5 immigrants.

6 164. The Final Rule also reduces access to statutorily-required fee waivers. It limits
7 waivers to applicants with household income under 125% of the federal poverty guidelines (“FPG”)
8 instead of the current 150% FPG, and it eliminates the alternative bases for a fee waiver, receipt of a
9 means-tested benefit or demonstration of financial hardship. And it imposes significantly more
10 demanding requirements for proving income level than ever before.

11 165. The Final Rule imposes these changes even though commenters referred to studies in
12 the record showing that immigrants who would be ineligible for fee waivers under the Final Rule
13 would suffer significant hardship if forced to pay full fees for immigration filings, or might be priced
14 out of the benefits altogether.

15 166. DHS offers no cogent response, saying only that it is adopting a “beneficiary pays”
16 model that it believes to be more “equitable” than the ability to pay model.

17 167. But even this unsupported principle is inconsistently applied. DHS purports to
18 recognize the humanitarian concerns for VAWA (domestic violence), T-visa (trafficking), and U-
19 visa (other crime) nonimmigrant populations, and that such applicants would likely qualify for fee
20 waivers, in deciding to provide fee exemptions for initial employment authorization to these groups.
21 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,302. Yet, DHS gives no similar consideration to asylum applicants who have a
22 statutory right to apply for asylum. 8 U.S.C. 1158(a). Asylum applicants face the same threats that
23 justify granting fee waivers to VAWA/T-visa/U-visa applicants, but DHS nevertheless treats asylum
24 applicants differently, without a legitimate reason.

25 168. DHS also makes contradictory claims about the impact of changes to fee waivers. On
26 the one hand, it claims that it does not have data indicating that individuals will delay submitting
27 applications and petitions in response to the fee waiver policy changes. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,807.
28 Then it claims that it “does not believe” applicants will be prevented from receiving immigration

1 benefits a result of its change, without citing any basis for that belief. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,806.
 2 Elsewhere, DHS acknowledges, “Limiting fee waivers may adversely affect some applicants’ ability
 3 to apply for immigration benefits.” 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,891. However, according to DHS, the benefits
 4 of immigration “continue to outweigh the cost associated.” 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,896. With respect to
 5 asylum applications, the regulatory impact analysis expressly states, “Some applicants may not be
 6 able to afford this fee and will no longer be able to apply for asylum.” Regulatory Impact Analysis at
 7 20. The Final Rule states it believes asylum applicants “will find a way” to pay. 85 Fed. Reg. at
 8 46,882.

9 2. The Final Rule Dramatically Increases Fees for Those Seeking to Naturalize

10 169. The Final Rule does not apply the fee increase equally across all applicants. Instead,
 11 it is structured to deter naturalization by allocating a disproportionate share of USCIS costs to those
 12 seeking to become citizens. This chart summarizes the dramatic increase in the cost to naturalize:

Form	Application Type	Percentage Change	Total Cost
Form N-300	Application to File Declaration of Intention	+383%	\$1,305
Form N-336	Request for Hearing on a Decision in Naturalization Proceeding	+148%	\$1,735
Form N-400	Application for Naturalization for someone who currently qualifies for a reduced fee and must pay a biometric fee	+266% +263%	\$1,170 (paper) \$1,160 (online)
Form N-400	Application for Naturalization without a fee waiver	+83% (paper) +81% (online)	\$1,170 (paper) \$1,160 (online)
Form N-470	Application to Preserve Residence for Naturalization Purposes	+346%	\$1,585
Form I-90	Application to Replace Permanent Resident Card	-11% (paper) -9% (online)	\$405 (paper) \$415 (online)

13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25 170. For those who previously qualified for fee waivers, the increase is from \$0 to the new
 26 fee.

27 171. The Final Rule does not explain why those pursuing citizenship should shoulder such
 28 dramatic fee increases. Nor does it explain why it has increased these fees but *decreased* the fee for

1 lawful permanent resident status renewal, creating a clear financial incentive to renew permanent
2 residence for those who could naturalize instead. By renewing permanent residence rather than
3 naturalizing, these immigrants remain in peril of removal, are limited in their ability to leave the
4 country, cannot sponsor relatives in pursuit of family unification, cannot register to vote, and are
5 limited in other ways as well. DHS does not offer a reasoned explanation for setting prices in a way
6 that creates incentives *not* to naturalize.

7 172. The Final Rule also imposes these dramatic increases on naturalization without
8 consideration of the benefits of increasing naturalization rates. For example, DHS did not address
9 studies suggesting as much as \$5.7 billion earnings increase from increased naturalization in 21
10 major cities, and a \$2.03 billion increase in federal, state, city income tax and payroll tax revenue.³¹

11 173. Increased naturalization also decreases the cost of government programs as
12 individuals gain access to better employment opportunities. For example, a study of one major city
13 showed a potential net fiscal gain of \$823 million.³²

14 174. Comments to the proposed rule noted that USCIS's own data shows that the increases
15 in naturalization fees would disproportionately affect permanent residents of color. Comments to the
16 proposed rule cited to research showing that increases in naturalization fees disproportionately affect
17 Latino populations. DHS nevertheless declined to make any adjustments to mitigate these disparate
18 effects. In fact, in failing to account for the disproportionate harm on permanent residents of color,
19 DHS even ignored its own data showing that most immigrants who naturalized in 2018 were from
20 Mexico, India, Philippines, Cuba, and the People's Republic of China.

21 175. DHS did not allow for adequate consideration of the impact of these fee increases on
22 the overall rate of naturalization, how the rate of naturalization impacts the public interest, or the
23 disproportionate impact on communities of color.

24
25
26 ³¹ Immigrant Legal Res. Ctr., Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on U.S. Citizenship and
27 Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration Benefit Request
28 Requirements at 6, 19 (Dec. 23, 2019), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-7084 (citing Maria E.
Enchautegui & Linda Giannarelli, "The Economic Impact of Naturalization on Immigrants and
Cities." (Dec. 2015)).

³² *Id.*

1 176. DHS’s failure to consider the broader benefits of naturalization in setting its
2 naturalization fees is also a significant policy shift. The agency acknowledges that this is a shift in
3 policy but does not give an adequate explanation for the change:

4 DHS has historically held the fee for Form N-400, Application for
5 Naturalization, below the estimated cost to USCIS of adjudicating the
6 form in recognition of the social value of citizenship. Immigration
7 services provide varying levels of social benefit, and previously DHS
8 accounted for some aspect of the social benefit of specific services
9 through holding fees below their cost. However, in this final rule DHS
10 is emphasizing the beneficiary pays principle of user fees. Because
11 DHS has held the fee for Form N-400 below full cost in the past,
12 adjusting to full cost requires an increase in excess of the volume-
13 weighted average increase of 20 percent. If DHS did not increase the
14 fee for Form N-400 this amount, other fees would need to increase
15 further to generate the revenue necessary to recover full cost, including
16 the costs of the N-400 not covered by its fee. DHS believes the
17 increase in the fee for Form N-400 is fully justified.³³

18 177. Despite this passing acknowledgement of a major policy shift, however, the agency
19 gives no reason why departing from this previous practice would be beneficial or acceptable, or why
20 the agency’s newfound beneficiary-pays principle should take precedence over accounting for the
21 social benefits of naturalization when setting fees.

22 3. The Final Rule Unlawfully Imposes New Fees for Asylum Seekers

23 178. For the first time in U.S. history, the Final Rule imposes a non-waivable fee for
24 asylum applications. Past fee rules have interpreted the law as directing USCIS not to charge a fee
25 for asylum. *See supra* ¶ 66. The Final Rule also imposes a fee for an asylum seeker’s first
26 application for employment authorization. The fee for the asylum application is \$50 and the fee for
27 employment authorization is \$550.

28 179. In addition, the Final Rule will impose a \$30 biometric fee for asylum applicants
seeking employment authorization. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,790. This provision was not included or
alluded to in the Proposals.

 180. The \$50 fee for an asylum application makes the United States one of just four
countries in the world that charges a fee for humanitarian protection. DHS attempts to justify the fee
as “in line” with those three countries³⁴ but the United States is an outlier even in that group. Each

³³ 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,799.

³⁴ Iran, Fiji, and Australia. *See* 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,845.

1 of the other countries that charges a fee for the application also offers fee waivers or fee exemptions.
 2 The Final Rule does not, with one limited exception for unaccompanied immigrant children.

3 181. The Final Rule does not offer a reasoned explanation for the asylum fee or the lack of
 4 a waiver. It asserts without support that it would not take an asylum seeker an “unreasonable
 5 amount of time to save, would generate some revenue to offset costs, discourage frivolous filings
 6 and not be unaffordable to an indigent alien.” 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,320. Yet the agency concludes
 7 elsewhere that “[s]ome applicants may not be able to afford this fee and may not be able to apply for
 8 asylum.” 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,894, and acknowledges that the fee is set “so that it . . . may deter some
 9 filings.” Regulatory Impact Analysis at 153. Deterring asylum filings is not a lawful basis for a fee
 10 under a statute that permits fees only for cost recovery.

11 182. The \$50 asylum fee does not provide cost recovery and serves no purpose except to
 12 discourage filings. Although DHS has stated the fee will “offset” some costs, the cost-benefit
 13 analysis in the rule itself negates that statement. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,984.

14
 15 TABLE 7—SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS AND IMPACTS—COSTS, TRANSFERS, AND BENEFITS OF THIS FINAL RULE
 SUMMARY—Continued

Provision	Purpose of provision	Estimated costs or transfers of provision	Estimated benefits of provision
(q) Charge a fee for Form I-589, Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal.	DHS will require a \$50 fee for Form I-589, Application for Asylum and for Withholding of Removal.	Quantitative: Applicants— • A transfer of \$5.5 million from Asylum applicants filing Form I-589 to different fee-paying applicants. Qualitative: Applicants— • Some applicants may not be able to afford this fee and will no longer be able to apply for asylum.	Quantitative: Applicants— • \$0.74 million in transfers from the government to asylum I-589 applicants who will pay a reduced fee of \$50 for Form I-485 Application to Register Permanent Residence or Adjust Status from \$1,130 to \$1,080 because their I-589 was approved. Qualitative: Applicants— • None DHS/USCIS— • None.

16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21 183. DHS also asserts that the \$50 fee will be refunded as a discount if the asylee seeks
 22 lawful permanent residency. But the cost of the administrative burden associated with tracking and
 23 paying these refunds undermines the notion that the \$50 asylum fee provides any lawful cost-
 24 recovery. And this refund has no benefit at all to the asylum seekers who cannot afford the \$50 fee in
 25 the first place.

26 184. The Final Rule also denies asylum seekers the statutory option of paying the fee in
 27 installments. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,859. DHS does not explain why it requires a single payment except
 28

1 for a statement that “installments plans, or micro-loans would be administratively complex and
2 would require even higher costs than in the NPRM.” *Id.* DHS does not consider the potential benefits
3 to asylum seekers for offering the option of installments and the detrimental impact felt by
4 eliminating this option.

5 185. Throughout the Final Rule, Defendants assert that they had no data to indicate that the
6 \$50 fee would affect asylum applicants or impede them from seeking asylum. At one point, DHS
7 makes the baseless assertion, defying logic, that the \$50 fee’s effects are not only unknown, but also
8 unknowable: “the agency has no data describing the myriad complex and changing unobservable
9 factors that may affect each immigrant’s unique decision to file for a particular immigration benefit.”
10 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,882, 46,895; *cf. id.* at 46,797-98, 46,841, 46,906. This is false; comments
11 provided this data to DHS and the agency simply declined to address them.³⁵

12 186. Nor does the Final Rule adequately justify the fee increase. Under the Final Rule, the
13 \$50 asylum fee appears intended to deter what DHS considers ‘frivolous’ asylum applications. *See*
14 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,887, 46,844. Defendants make no effort to show, however, that refugees with
15 meritorious asylum claims are more likely to have fifty dollars than those with so-called ‘frivolous’
16 claims. Both the comments submitted to DHS as well as common sense suggest that the opposite is
17 true: the refugees most in need of asylum protections will have few or no financial resources.

18 187. In addition to the \$50 application fee, the Final Rule imposes a \$550 fee to apply for
19 employment authorization while an asylum application is pending, with a \$30 biometric fee.
20 Currently, asylum seekers are exempt from paying a fee for their initial employment authorization
21 applications.

22 ³⁵ *See, e.g.*, Bridget Crawford, Immigr. Equality, Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on U.S.
23 Citizenship and Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration
24 Benefit Request Requirements at 3 n.3 (Dec. 27, 2019), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-10794 (citing
25 Human Rights First, *Callous and Calculated: Longer Work Authorization Bar Endangers Lives of*
26 *Asylum Seekers and Their Families* (Apr. 29, 2019), <https://bit.ly/2DYyYXF>); Natasha Lycia Ora
27 Bannan, LatinoJustice PRLDEF, Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on U.S. Citizenship and
28 Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration Benefit Request
Requirements at 8 n.30 (Dec. 16, 2019), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-5755 (citing Lindsay Harris,
Asylum seekers leave everything behind. There’s no way they can pay Trump’s fee., Wash. Post
(May 1, 2019)); Elizabeth Foydel, Int’l Refugee Assist. Project, Comment Letter on Proposed Rule
on U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other
Immigration Benefit Request Requirements at 5-8 (Dec. 20, 2019), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-
6858.

1 188. By statute, USCIS must complete adjudication of an asylum application within 180
2 days after the application is filed, absent extraordinary circumstances; and the applicant is not
3 eligible for work authorization until the asylum application has been pending for 180 days. DHS
4 regulations provide that it will grant work authorization to asylum seekers whose applications have
5 been pending for 180 days and will also adjudicate employment authorizations within 30 days.

6 189. But under separate new DHS rules set to take effect on August 21, 2020 and August
7 25, 2020, DHS will require asylum applicants to wait a year after applying for asylum to apply for
8 employment authorization, will remove the 30-day regulatory deadline to render a decision on those
9 applications, and will significantly restrict asylum seekers' eligibility for employment authorization.
10 85 Fed. Reg. 37,502 (June 22, 2020); 85 Fed. Reg. 38,532 (June 26, 2020).

11 190. The interplay between the rules means that an asylum applicant must now pay \$50 to
12 submit her asylum application, could be prohibited from working in the United States for one year if
13 her application remains pending during that time, and then must pay \$580 to seek employment
14 authorization, with no assurance as to if or when that employment authorization might be granted
15 such that she can earn any income at all. And once the work authorization is granted, she would
16 need to pay another \$580 for new renewals every two years because the Final Rule eliminates fee
17 waivers for employment authorization renewals.

18 191. For context, the \$630 that asylum seekers must now pay for the previously no-cost
19 applications for asylum and initial work authorization amounts to roughly two weeks of full time
20 work at the United States minimum wage. Many asylum seekers will not be able to pay this amount.

21 192. DHS does not offer a reasoned explanation for the drastic increase from \$0 to \$630
22 for an asylum applicant seeking work authorization. Its thin responses make no sense for several
23 reasons:

24 193. First, DHS suggests that asylum seekers could use credit cards to pay the fees but this
25 ignores the information commenters provided on their financial vulnerability. Refugees often flee
26 persecution with little advance notice, abandoning their possessions and livelihoods. Without
27
28

1 material wealth, employment, or legal status, asylum seekers cannot easily obtain a credit card in the
2 United States.³⁶ DHS provides no data suggesting otherwise.

3 194. Second, DHS asserts that asylum seekers spend “thousands” of dollars to get to the
4 United States but that is irrelevant to their ability to pay once they arrive in the United States. DHS
5 ignores comments explaining that most asylum seekers spend their life savings to make the trip and
6 arrive empty-handed.³⁷

7 195. Third, DHS ignores the interplay between the Final Rule and its recently-finalized
8 rules on asylum employment authorization applications. Together, these rules will decrease the
9 volume of asylum seekers applying for employment authorization and the timing of any revenues
10 from such applications, which should have been accounted for in the cost modeling. This failing is
11 significant because the fee for employment authorization has an impact on a large population of
12 asylum seekers. In 2019, 74 percent of asylum seekers also sought employment authorization.

13 196. The Final Rule is dismissive of the inability of asylum seekers to afford the fee for
14 initial employment authorization. DHS asserts, without citation or evidence, that “[m]any asylum
15 seekers spend thousands of dollars to make the journey to the United States.” 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,853.
16 As a result, DHS believes that it is “not unduly burdensome to require asylum seekers to plan and
17 allocate their financial resources to pay a fee that all other noncitizens must pay.” *Id.* Many asylum
18 seekers have no financial resources because they are urgently fleeing dangerous situations, but even
19 if they had resources at the time of the journey, DHS ignores that they must provide for themselves
20 for at least a year in the United States without any income before applying for employment
21 authorization.

22 ³⁶ See Elizabeth Foydel, Int’l Refugee Assist. Project, Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on U.S.
23 Citizenship and Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration
24 Benefit Request Requirements at 10-11 (Dec. 20, 2019), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-6858.
(noting that asylum seekers must abandon their previous homes and possessions); *id.* at 14 (noting
25 that an EAD is often required to obtain an official state identification card or driver’s license);
26 Asylum Seeker Advoc. Project, Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on U.S. Citizenship and
Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration Benefit Request
Requirements at 4 (Dec. 30, 2019), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-7898 (noting that, without an EAD,
asylum seekers often have no government-issued identification).

27 ³⁷ See Jill Marie Bussey, Catholic Legal Immigr. Network, Inc., Comment Letter on U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration Services Fee Schedule and Changes to Certain Other Immigration Benefit Request
28 Requirements at 20 (Dec. 18, 2019), DHS No. USCIS-2019-0010-5894.

1 197. The Final Rules also contravenes the INA as amended by the Refugee Act. The INA
2 sets out the right to seek asylum in the United States for “any person” who is not a citizen of the
3 United States. 8 U.S.C. §§ 1101(a)(3), 1158(a). The word “any” is understood to have “an expansive
4 meaning, that is, one or some indiscriminately of whatever kind.” *United States v. Gonzales*, 520
5 U.S. 1, 5 (1997) (internal quotations omitted). A fee that prevents “any person” from accessing the
6 asylum process violates the statute. The only condition under which the agency has permissive
7 authority to assess such a fee is one set for cost recovery, as opposed to deterrence. 8 U.S.C. §
8 1158(d)(3). Congress evinced its concern for affordability by allowing both the assessment and
9 payment of fees to occur in installments and over time.

10 198. Because Congress has the primary role in immigration law, the Executive’s power is
11 at its “lowest ebb.” *See Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 637-40 (1952).
12 Congress’s express and implied will is to provide the right for refugees to seek asylum. Here, DHS
13 provided no sufficient explanation to support its decision to effectively deny individuals that right
14 based on whether they can afford the \$50 fee.

15 199. Nor does DHS support its contravention of international law to which the United
16 States is a signatory. Under the 1967 Protocol, which incorporates articles 2 through 34 of the 1951
17 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, the United States is required to issue identity papers
18 and travel documents to those seeking asylum absent compelling reasons of national security or
19 public order.

20 200. Under the Final Rule, asylum seekers who cannot afford the \$50 fee cannot apply for
21 asylum, and likewise cannot afford to apply for employment authorization as asylum applicants,
22 such that the United States will fail to issue identity or travel documents to these individuals. This
23 violates the United States’ obligations under international law.

24 201. DHS provides no “compelling reason” for this deviation from the norm..

25 202. The Final Rule does not consider the significant harm to asylum seekers who will be
26 unable to work as a result of increased fees. Instead, it deliberately prices out eligible asylum
27 seekers from the opportunity to support themselves and their families. *See* 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,809.
28

1 This intentional action is an unjustified end-run around statutory provisions aimed at allowing
2 asylum seekers to support themselves and their families.

3 203. As comments to the proposed rule noted, DHS's own data shows that these changes
4 to fees for asylum seekers will disproportionately affect people of color. DHS data shows that most
5 asylum applicants are from Venezuela, the People's Republic of China, Guatemala, and Mexico.
6 DHS failed to consider this disparate impact on people of color.

7 4. The Final Rule Unlawfully Increases Fees for Vulnerable Populations

8 204. The Final Rule narrows eligibility for fee waivers based on income for the world's
9 most vulnerable people, for whom Congress expressly provided fee exemptions or fee caps under the
10 INA and TVPRA. These include applicants under VAWA, U (crime victim), T (trafficked
11 individuals), and TPS provisions.

12 205. First, applicants for primary benefits that are fee exempt must obtain associated
13 benefits in order to gain access to their primary benefits. Thus, barriers to accessing those associated
14 benefits can result in barriers to statutorily provided protections.

15 206. For this reason, while the costs of primary benefits for these groups are statutorily
16 capped or exempted, the TVPRA also requires USCIS to allow applicants for these primary benefits
17 to apply for a fee waiver for associated filings up to and including the application for permanent
18 residence. Pub. L. No. 110-457, 122 Stat. 5044 at 5054.

19 207. In the Final Rule, DHS erects barriers to this statutory design by drastically narrowing
20 fee waiver eligibility. *See supra* IV.C.1. In addition to heightening the standards beyond the reach of
21 many survivors and eliminating alternate bases for qualifying for a fee waiver, the Final Rule
22 requires documentation of income that survivors are unlikely to have. In so doing, the Final Rule's
23 new requirements make it exceedingly difficult for individuals to obtain a fee waiver.

24 208. These heightened standards will prevent many applicants from qualifying for the
25 main benefit application because associated filings include applications for waivers of
26 inadmissibility, which must be approved in order to qualify for the primary benefit of VAWA, U, T
27 and TPS.

28

1 209. The result of making the fee waivers for associated filings so difficult to obtain will
2 be that many survivors will not be able to qualify for the primary benefit of VAWA, U or T status, in
3 direct contravention of the purpose of the INA in making these visas available.

4 210. Although many commenters raised this concern in detail, DHS states simply that it
5 “believes that maintaining access to fee waivers for these vulnerable populations mitigates any
6 concerns that the increase in certain fees would limit access for protected categories of individuals.”
7 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,810. This insufficiently responds to this serious issue.

8 211. Second, the Final Rule drastically increases fees for family members of these
9 vulnerable populations. The fee for Form I-929, Petition for Qualifying Family Member of a U-1
10 Nonimmigrant, which is a benefit available to the family members of crime victims, has increased
11 by \$1,255, to \$1,485. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,855.

12 212. DHS states it raises this fee because it expects many more vulnerable populations will
13 meet fee waiver criteria. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,855. DHS supplies no data to support its justification for
14 raising fees in this context.

15 213. Furthermore, DHS treats similarly situated groups differently. While the Final Rule
16 “reiterates that the rule continues to exempt the VAWA, T, and U populations from fees for the main
17 benefit forms and allows them to submit fee waiver requests for any associated forms up to and
18 including the application for adjustment of status, as provided by statute,” 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,811,
19 the Final Rule does not appear to permit fee waivers for derivatives of T and U populations. The
20 revised §106.3 expressly permits fee waivers for VAWA derivatives (§106.3(a)(1)(i)) but makes no
21 mention of derivatives in the subsections pertaining to U and T nonimmigrants (§106.3(a)(1)(ii-iii)).
22 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,920.

23 214. Even if derivatives remain eligible for fee waiver, the new requirements for those fee
24 waivers make it exceedingly difficult for individuals to obtain a fee waiver, as described above.

25 215. The heightened fee waiver standards will prevent many applicants from qualifying,
26 which creates the very real risk that individuals eligible for VAWA relief and U and T visas will stay
27 in an abusive or dangerous situation because they cannot afford to pay fees for immigration
28

1 applications to keep their family members together. The risk is even greater if U and T derivatives
2 are not fee waiver eligible.

3 216. The heightened fee waiver standards would also frustrate the important goal of
4 encouraging individuals to come forward and report when they have been the victim of a crime, in a
5 way that also protects their families. The risk is even greater if the U and T derivatives are not fee
6 waiver eligible.

7 217. Thus, more stringent requirements for fee waivers, or the lack of fee waiver
8 eligibility, contravenes Congress's intent to prioritize both public safety and family unity by creating
9 statutory fee exemptions for these vulnerable groups.

10 218. Third, the fees established for many benefits available to these statutorily protected
11 groups have skyrocketed without adequate explanation. For example, the Final Rule sets the fee for
12 I-929, Petition for Qualifying Family Member of a U-1 Nonimmigrant at \$1,485, more than 5 times
13 its current cost. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,919.

14 219. These factors combine to demonstrate that the Final Rule erects financial barriers to
15 applicants' ability to access protections that Congress expressly provided.

16 5. The Final Rule Unlawfully Increases Fees by Unbundling Applications for
17 Those Seeking Lawful Permanent Resident Status and Interim Benefits

18 220. Since 2007, DHS has charged a flat rate for a bundle of applications for those seeking
19 lawful permanent residency. The flat fee of \$1,140 covered the application for permanent residency
20 (I-485), an employment authorization application (I-765), and application for travel document (I-
21 131). A flat fee of \$750 covers the same three documents for children under 14.

22 221. DHS has explained that bundling reduces agency workload and processing costs. 72
23 Fed. Reg. 4,888, 4,894 (Feb 1, 2007).

24 222. The Final Rule unbundles these forms and applies fees for each one. As a result, the
25 Final Rule effectively doubles the fees for applying for the three previously-bundled benefits. The
26 fees for children under 14 jump nearly 200%.

1 223. Despite its prior detailed justifications in support of taking the opposite approach, the
2 Final Rule raises fees for suspending deportation (I-881) from \$285/individual, or \$570/family, to a
3 flat fee of \$1,810 (with exceptions for statutorily protected groups).

4 224. DHS charges this fee regardless of whether the applicant is a child or adult for both
5 forms, claiming these changes “reduc[e] the administrative burden.” 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,323.

6 225. DHS does not explain its reversal on bundling except to say that “USCIS did not
7 realize the operational efficiencies envisioned when it introduced the bundled filing.” 85 Fed. Reg.
8 at 46,841.

9 226. These two ambiguous statements—a general effort to reduce administration burden,
10 and an alleged failure to “realize operational efficiencies”—are not an adequate justification for the
11 agency to reverse course.

12 6. The Final Rule drastically increases fees in the NACARA process without
13 adequate justification.

14 227. NACARA was specifically enacted as “a political response to the concern that many
15 individuals had spent years in the United States, complying with the immigration laws and
16 establishing countless equities,” were nevertheless “adversely affected by the harsh changes in the
17 immigration law as amended by [IIRIRA].”³⁸ “The law permits these individuals to adjust status
18 even if they have been ordered excluded, deported, removed or have failed to depart voluntarily after
19 an order of voluntary departure.”³⁹

20 228. Nevertheless, despite Congress’s intent to make immigration benefits available to
21 nearly all eligible Guatemalans, Salvadorans, or former-Soviet-bloc nationals, the Final Rule
22 drastically increases the fees for filing Form I-881 (Application for Suspension of Deportation or
23 Cancellation of Removal). For individuals who previously paid only \$285 to file Form I-881, the
24 Final Rule would now require that they pay \$1,810—a 535 percent increase. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,791.
25 For families who previously paid only \$570 together, the Final Rule now imposes a \$1,810 fee as
26 well—a 218 percent increase. *Id.*

27 ³⁸ Lourdes A. Rodriguez, Understanding The Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief
Act at 502, <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/51091763.pdf>

28 ³⁹ *Id.* at 503 (citing NACARA §§ 202(a)(1)(A), 202(b)(1)).

1 229. The Final Rule provided only boilerplate justification for this fee increase. Several
2 commenters pointed out that the Proposed Rule “provided no explanation for the 532 percent fee
3 increase for Form I-881,” and questioned whether “adjudication had changed drastically to justify
4 the fee increase,” and pointed out that “the proposal was contrary to the purpose of [NACARA].” 85
5 Fed. Reg. at 46,854. DHS responded only that it “disagrees with the commenters’ contention that
6 DHS failed to explain or justify the fee increase for Form I-881,” and stated that it had adjusted the
7 fee to “reflect the estimated full cost of adjudication.” 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,854.

8 230. The Final Rule did not address at all whether DHS believed that the fee increase was
9 consistent with NACARA, or whether the adjudication process had changed so dramatically since
10 2005 to justify a 535 percent increase. *See* 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,323 (NACARA fees “have not
11 changed since 2005”). Nor did the Final Rule explain why adjudicating a relatively straightforward
12 statutory benefit—explained in full in a few bullet points on a single USCIS webpage⁴⁰—would
13 require USCIS to expend more resources than adjudicating N-400 naturalization applications, which
14 cost \$1,170 under the Final Rule. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,792. And USCIS’s website suggests that the
15 entirety of the NACARA Form I-881 adjudication process consists of fingerprinting and a single
16 interview with an asylum officer.⁴¹

17 231. Furthermore, the Final Rule does not attempt to explain why adjudicating an
18 individual Form I-881 would cost DHS exactly as much as adjudicating a family Form I-881 in the
19 NACARA context. *See* 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,791 (raising both the individual and family fees to
20 \$1,810). Common sense suggests this is unlikely.⁴²

21 7. The Final Rule Favors Wealthier Applicants Without Justification

22 232. In contrast to the increased fees for low-income applicants, the Final Rule applies
23 minimal or no increase to the fees paid by some wealthy applicants.

24
25 ⁴⁰ *See* USCIS, *Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act (NACARA) 203: Eligibility*
26 *to Apply with USCIS* (Sept. 21, 2017), <https://bit.ly/2PrdogP>.

27 ⁴¹ *See* USCIS, *Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act (NACARA) 203: The*
28 *Decision Making Process* (Mar. 8, 2018), <https://bit.ly/2PubKep>.

⁴² *See Dep’t of Commerce v. New York*, 139 S. Ct. 2551, 2575 (2019) (courts evaluating agency
action “are ‘not required to exhibit a naiveté from which ordinary citizens are free’” (citation
omitted)).

1 233. For example, the Final Rule reduced the fee employers pay to apply for a visa for an
2 exceptional immigrant employee. 85 Fed Reg. at 46,971.

3 234. The fees for forms used by wealthy investors also either did not increase at all or
4 increased only 9 percent. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,971.

5 235. The fees to naturalize an adopted foreign-born child increased by only 4 percent. 85
6 Fed. Reg. at 46,971.

7 236. The Final Rule also applies a minimal increase on the I-360 form used by religious
8 workers. The Proposed Rule raised the I-360 fee by just 5 percent, in contrast with triple-digit
9 increases for other fees, including the 535 percent increase for NACARA. 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,326.
10 When commenters opposed the proposed 5 percent fee on grounds that it would “harm the ability of
11 religious organizations to petition for their workers,” DHS lowered the fee to 3 percent and
12 transferred the costs to all other fee payers. The Final Rule does not offer a reasoned explanation for
13 why DHS was concerned about harm to religious employers but not harm to others.

14 **V. THE FINAL RULE MUST BE SET ASIDE BECAUSE NO AUTHORIZED DHS**
15 **OFFICIAL ISSUED OR PROPOSED THE RULE**

16 237. The Final Rule was invalidly finalized under the HSA, Federal Vacancies Reform Act
17 (“FVRA”), and APA because Defendant Wolf was not authorized to issue the Final Rule, and
18 because the Final Rule comes from an invalid proposal that no one at DHS was authorized to issue—
19 neither Defendant Wolf nor his immediate predecessor Kevin McAleenan.

20 238. The HSA requires that the DHS Secretary shall be “appointed by the President, by
21 and with advice and consent of the Senate.” 6 U.S.C. § 112(a)(1). The HSA mandates that, in the
22 event of the “absence, disability, or vacancy in office” of the Secretary, the Deputy DHS Secretary is
23 first in the order of succession as Acting Secretary and the Under Secretary of Management is
24 second. *Id.* § 113(a)(1)(A), (g)(1). After the Deputy Secretary and Under Secretary of Management,
25 the HSA allows the DHS Secretary to “designate such other officers of the Department in further
26 order of succession to serve as Acting Secretary.” *Id.* § 113(g)(2).

27 239. The DHS has established multiple orders of succession and/or delegations pertaining
28 to the Office of the Secretary and other DHS positions. Those documents are contained in a broader

1 directive, entitled *DHS Orders of Succession and Delegations of Authorities for Named Positions*,
2 Dep't of Homeland Sec., Delegation No. 00106, Revision No.08.5 (Dec. 15, 2016) (“DHS Orders”).

3 240. From at least December 15, 2016, through and beyond April 11, 2019, Section II.A of
4 the DHS Orders stated in full that: “In case of the Secretary’s death, resignation, or inability to
5 perform the functions of the Office, the orderly succession of officials is governed by Executive
6 Order 13753, amended on December 9, 2016.” *Id.* (emphases added).

7 241. Executive Order 13753, in turn, set the order of succession at DHS in cases of
8 resignation of the Secretary. Executive Order 13753 establishes in relevant part that in the event the
9 Secretary resigns, the order of succession is as follows:

- 10 • Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security;
- 11 • Under Secretary for Management;
- 12 • Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- 13 • Under Secretary for National Protection and Programs;
- 14 • Under Secretary for Science and Technology;
- 15 • Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis; and
- 16 • Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

17 242. From at least December 15, 2016, through and beyond April 11, 2019, Section II.B of
18 the DHS Orders additionally provided: “I [Secretary of Homeland Security] hereby delegate to the
19 officials occupying the identified positions *in the order listed ([at] Annex A)*, my authority to
20 exercise the powers and perform the functions and duties of my office, to the extent not otherwise
21 prohibited by law, *in the event I am unavailable to act during a disaster or catastrophic emergency.*”
22 DHS Orders § II.B (emphases added).

23 243. President Trump announced Secretary Nielsen’s departure from office on April 7,
24 2019 by tweet, and at the same time announced that her successor would be Kevin McAleenan, who
25 was then serving as Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”).

26 244. Secretary Nielsen announced her resignation later in the day on April 7, 2019 and
27 publicly submitted her resignation letter, which stated that it was “effective April 7th, 2019.”
28

1 245. A few hours later in the day on April 7, 2019, however, former Secretary Nielsen
2 announced by tweet that she “ha[d] agreed to stay on as Secretary” until April 10, 2019.⁴³

3 246. On April 10, 2019, prior to her departure, Secretary Nielsen purported to issue an
4 amendment to the DHS Orders (the “April 2019 Amendment”). The only action directed by the
5 April 2019 Amendment was to “strik[e] the text of such Annex [A] in its entirety and insert” a
6 different list of positions “in lieu thereof.” The inserted text listed the Commissioner of U.S.
7 Customs and Border Protection third behind the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security and Under
8 Secretary for Management.

9 247. Notably, the April 2019 Amendment did not change Section II.A of the DHS Orders,
10 which continued to state that in the event of the Secretary’s resignation, “the orderly succession of
11 officials [would be] governed by Executive Order 13753[.]” Consequently, consistent with Section
12 II.B of the DHS Orders, the April 2019 Amendment to Annex A governed only where the Secretary
13 was “unavailable to act during a disaster or catastrophic emergency.”

14 248. Executive Order 13753 thus governed succession following Secretary Nielsen’s
15 resignation. Notwithstanding this distinction, in apparent reliance on the April 2019 Amendment,
16 then-CBP Commissioner Kevin McAleenan purported to assume the position of Acting Secretary on
17 April 11, 2019.

18 249. On November 8, 2019, McAleenan attempted to issue a further amendment to Annex
19 A (the “November 2019 Amendment”) revising the order of succession set forth therein to elevate
20 Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans to be fourth in line to lead DHS. Unlike Secretary
21 Nielsen’s April 2019 Amendment, the November 2019 Amendment also purported to amend Section
22 II.A of the DHS Orders such that the succession of officials would be governed by Annex A “[i]n
23 case of the Secretary’s death, resignation, or inability to perform the functions of the Office.”⁴⁴

24 _____
25 ⁴³ On April 7, 2019, former Secretary Nielsen’s effective resignation date, Claire Grady served as the
26 Senate-confirmed Under Secretary for Management, and in that capacity, had been the Acting DHS
27 Deputy Secretary since April 16, 2018. Pursuant to the text of the HSA and DHS Orders in place at
28 the time of Secretary Nielsen’s resignation, Grady would have become Acting DHS Secretary as
soon as former Secretary Nielsen’s resignation was effective. Grady submitted her resignation as
Acting DHS Deputy Secretary on April 9, 2019, which became effective April 10, 2019.

⁴⁴ Had Annex A already applied in the event of a resignation, this attempted amendment would not
have been necessary.

1 250. On November 13, 2019, Defendant Wolf (who had been confirmed as Under
2 Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans on that same day) purported to become Acting Secretary of
3 DHS pursuant to McAleenan’s attempted November 2019 Amendment.

4 251. On August 14, 2020, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (“GAO”) issued a
5 decision stating that the “incorrect official assumed the title of Acting Secretary at [the time of
6 Nielsen’s resignation]” and that “subsequent amendments to the order of succession made by
7 [McAleenan] were invalid and officials who assumed their positions under such amendments,
8 including Chad Wolf and Kenneth Cuccinelli, were named by reference to an invalid order of
9 succession.” U.S. Gov’t Accountability Off., GAO- B-331650, *Department of Homeland Security—
10 Legality of Service of Acting Secretary of Homeland Security and Service of Senior Official
11 Performing the Duties of Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security at 1* (2020) (“GAO Decision”).

12 252. On November 14, 2019, DHS published the November Proposal. McAleenan signed
13 the proposal, notwithstanding that (i) the GAO decision suggests that actions he took as Acting
14 Secretary were invalid; (ii) the November Proposal was issued well beyond the 210-day limit set
15 forth in the FVRA; and (iii) he had resigned the day before. 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,280; *see also*
16 Declaration of Juliana Blackwell, *CASA de Md., Inc. v. Wolf*, No. 8:20-cv-02118-PX (D. Md. Aug.
17 3, 2020), ECF No. 41-1 (“Blackwell Decl.”).

18 253. On December 9, 2019, DHS published an extension of the comment period. 84 Fed.
19 Reg. 67,243. Then on January 24, 2020, DHS further extended the comment period until February
20 10, 2020. *See* 85 Fed. Reg. 4,243. Both were issued by Defendant Wolf under his purported
21 authority as Acting DHS Secretary.

22 254. On August 3, 2020, DHS published the Final Rule. Defendant Wolf signed the Final
23 Rule under his purported authority as Acting DHS Secretary. Specifically, Defendant Wolf, “having
24 reviewed and approved” the Final Rule, “delegat[ed] the authority to electronically sign” it to Chad
25 Mizelle, “the Senior Official Performing the Duties of the General Counsel for DHS.” 85 Fed. Reg.
26 at 46,913.

1 255. On August 17, 2020, DHS published corrections to the Final Rule, signed by Chad R.
2 Mizelle as “Senior Official Performing the Duties of the General Counsel for the Department of
3 Homeland Security.” 85 Fed. Reg. 49,941 (Aug. 17, 2020).

4 256. The Final Rule is therefore invalid for two reasons.

5 257. First, DHS did not lawfully issue the Final Rule because Defendant Wolf is not
6 validly serving as the Acting DHS Secretary. His assumption of that office was unlawful under the
7 HSA, because he was not next in the order of succession at the time that he purported to succeed to
8 that office. His succession was pursuant to McAleenan’s unlawful November 2019 Amendment to
9 the DHS Orders. *See* GAO Decision at 9-11.

10 258. Moreover, Defendant Wolf assumed the role of Acting Secretary after the office of
11 DHS Secretary had remained vacant since Secretary Nielsen’s departure, well beyond the 210-day
12 limitation for acting officers provided by the Federal Vacancies Reform Act (“FVRA”). *See* 5
13 U.S.C. § 3346(a)(1).

14 259. As such, Defendant Wolf has no valid legal claim to the Office of Acting DHS
15 Secretary, and the action he has taken in promulgating the final rule “shall have no force or effect.”⁴⁵

16 260. Second, the Final Rule arises from its invalid Proposal in violation of the APA and
17 must be set aside. As noted above, Defendant Wolf is not validly serving as the Acting Secretary of
18 DHS, and thus was not authorized to issue the December Proposal.

19 261. In addition, his immediate predecessor McAleenan was likewise not authorized to
20 issue the November Proposal. The November Proposal was signed on November 9, 2019, well after
21 the 210-day statutory limitation for acting officers under the FVRA.

22 262. In addition, McAleenan resigned the day before the November Proposal was
23 published. Thus, the November Proposal was effectively unsigned. *See Yovino v. Rizo*, 139 S. Ct.
24 706, 709 (2019) (a judge cannot participate in a decision if he becomes inactive before a decision is
25 issued (citing *United States v. Am.-Foreign S.S. Corp.*, 363 U.S. 685 (1960))). A valid proposal
26 published in the Federal Register is required under the APA. 5 U.S.C. § 553(b) (“General notice of
27 proposed rule making *shall* be published in the Federal Register”) (emphasis added); *Louis v.*

28 ⁴⁵ 5 U.S.C. § 3348.

1 *U.S. Dep’t of Labor*, 419 F.3d 970, 975 (9th Cir. 2005) (stating that the APA requires agencies to
2 publish legally sufficient notices of proposed rulemaking, which must “fairly apprise[] interested
3 persons of the subject and issues before the Agency”); *See also Cal. ex rel. Lockyer v. FERC*, 329
4 F.3d 700, 706-07 (9th Cir. 2003) (noting connection between Due Process Clause and APA notice
5 provisions).

6 263. Because McAleenan’s purported succession was unlawful, *see* GAO Decision at 11,
7 he had no valid legal claim to the Office of Acting DHS Secretary on that basis and could not
8 lawfully exercise the authority of that office, including issuing the proposed rule.

9 264. DHS issued the Final Rule in purported accordance with the rulemaking procedures
10 of the APA. For informal rulemaking such as the Final Rule—i.e., those that are not subject to
11 formal hearing procedures—the APA requires a proposed rule. Because no valid proposed rule was
12 issued, the Final Rule does not comply with the APA and must be set aside.

13 **VI. THE FINAL RULE HARMS INDIVIDUALS AND COMMUNITIES.**

14 **A. Individuals**

15 **1. Naturalization applicants and recipients**

16 265. By raising fees and practically eliminating access to fee waivers for low-income
17 applicants, the Final Rule leaves many individuals with few, grim options for becoming U.S.
18 citizens. Desperate applicants may become easier targets for predatory lenders and scams. They may
19 also be more likely to accept financial assistance from abusers at the cost of remaining in abusive
20 relationships.

21 266. Many other applicants will simply be unable to afford the cost of becoming a U.S.
22 citizen.

23 267. Because fee hikes apply to each individual applicant, families will have to make
24 tough choices about which family members become citizens, if any at all can afford to do so.

25 268. Because the Final Rule reduces the price of lawful permanent resident status renewal
26 while drastically raising naturalization fees, poorer applicants will rationally choose to remain non-
27 citizens, foregoing the right to vote, serve on juries, and run for elected office, which deprives their
28 communities of this important representation.

1 269. The Final Rule risks creating a caste system within our immigration system in which
2 the affluent gain citizenship while the poor remain permanent residents, thereby creating the kind of
3 structural inequality and unequal access to voting and representation that many immigrants came to
4 America to escape. The calculations and allocations of costs in the Final Rule operate as a poll tax,
5 and are pretext for decreasing the proportion of immigrant voters in the American electorate.

6 2. Lawful permanent resident applicants

7 270. As discussed above, *supra* IV.C.5, the Final Rule significantly increases fees for
8 immigrants who are seeking lawful permanent residence (I-485) and common interim benefits
9 (travel authorization and employment authorization), from \$1,140 and \$750 for adults and children,
10 respectively, to \$2,195 for all applicants. These staggering increases will make lawful permanent
11 residence unaffordable for many eligible foreign nationals and their United-States-citizen and
12 lawful-permanent-resident sponsors. DHS, despite receiving numerous comments and reviewing
13 substantial evidence showing that the proposed fees would be unaffordable for the immigrant
14 population, dismissively waved off these concerns: “Individuals applying for adjustment of status
15 are not required to request a travel document or employment authorization,” and “[w]ith bundled
16 interim benefits, individuals may have requested interim benefits that they did not intend to use
17 because it was already included in the bundled price.” 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,841. “Debundling,” says
18 DHS, “allows individuals to pay for only the services actually requested.” *Id.* But the portion of
19 applicants wanting to pay all three separate fees is irrelevant; the harm is that three benefits that
20 previously cost these applicants \$1,140 (or \$750 for children) now cost \$2,195, *id.* at 46,791, and (as
21 the comments submitted to DHS demonstrate) many otherwise-eligible applicants cannot afford to
22 pay that amount.

23 271. As numerous commenters pointed out to DHS during the comment period, the
24 unaffordability of the lawful permanent residence fees (and of immigration fees under the Final Rule
25 generally) will drive immigrants increasingly to predatory lenders. For example, one commenter
26 “wrote that many of its clients were ‘cut off’ from financial institutions and described the dangers of
27 borrowing from ‘predatory lending mechanisms’ or from family members who may use the debt
28 owed as ‘currency for their abusive behavior’ in some circumstances.” 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,810.

1 DHS’s nonresponse to similar concerns throughout the Final Rule remained consistent: “DHS does
2 not intend for the new fees to prevent individuals from applying for naturalization [or other benefits],
3 that they require applicants to depend on predatory financing to pay naturalization application fees,
4 and we do not believe the rule will have those effects.” 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,860. DHS offers no
5 support for that irrational belief, and presents no information to cast doubt on the numerous
6 comments DHS received showing that increased fees would be a boon for predatory lenders.

7 272. DHS repeatedly serves up the same tone-deaf suggestion that increased fees would
8 not be problematic because applicants could use credit cards to pay them, *see* 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,797,
9 46,807, 46,851, 46,877—despite having received comments identifying the fact that many
10 immigrants, particularly poor immigrants, do not have credit cards.

11 273. This unaffordable \$2,195 fee total makes it increasingly likely that families will be
12 separated simply because they cannot afford to pay for all family members to maintain status, and
13 for working parents to receive employment authorization. For example, a family of four (two
14 parents, two children) would currently pay \$3,780 in fees—already a significant sum for low- and
15 middle-income families—to adjust status and obtain employment and travel authorization for all four
16 family members. Under the Final Rule, that same family of four would have to come up with \$8,780
17 to receive the same benefits. If only the parents applied for employment authorization and nobody
18 applied for travel authorization, the family would still pay significantly more—\$5,620 versus
19 \$3,780—and all four family members would have fewer benefits than under the current regime.

20 274. When certain combinations of benefits become inaccessible due to cost, the loss of
21 those benefits leads to other harms as well. As the prices of these benefits rise, families will be
22 forced to make difficult choices about who receives immigration benefits and who does not. For
23 example, a married adult who could afford to apply for lawful permanent residence status but not
24 employment authorization would be financially dependent on his or her spouse while the lawful
25 permanent residence application is pending—even if that spouse were abusive. If a family could not
26 afford employment-authorization fees for anyone, the parents—quite understandably—would *de*
27 *facto* need to work unlawfully to provide food and housing. This would put the parents at the mercy
28 of the employer; the parents, for example, might have to accept unfair under-the-table wages,

1 exhausting schedules, and/or unsafe work environments without complaint just so that the employer
2 does not report them to immigration authorities. Everybody loses in these situations.

3 275. Perhaps the most consequential effect this might have would be to delay, interfere
4 with, or even foreclose naturalization down the road for lawful permanent residence applicants, since
5 an immigrant may file an N-400, at the earliest, after three years of lawful permanent residence
6 status. If an immigrant loses their lawful status because they cannot afford the fees, this could
7 snowball to deportation or removal, a resulting ban on reentering the United States, and difficulties
8 ultimately naturalizing.

9 3. Asylum Applicants and Asylees

10 276. The Final Rule will impose a \$50 fee on Form I-589 applications for asylum that is
11 not subject to a fee waiver. The Final Rule will irreparably harm those who need to apply for
12 asylum, but now cannot, because of the new fee without the opportunity for a waiver, and will be
13 forced to return to the dangerous conditions that brought them to the United States to seek
14 protection. *See* Regulatory Impact Analysis at 152 (“DHS recognizes that some applicants may not
15 be able to afford this new fee and will no longer be able to apply for asylum.”).

16 277. Seeking asylum is a fundamental human right and tenet of international human rights
17 law to which the United States is bound by treaty to respect, but under the Final Rule, the individuals
18 least likely to have the resources to afford USCIS’s new fee would be prevented from receiving the
19 basic protections and opportunities envisioned by the INA. The harm is patently obvious. By
20 definition, individuals and their families seeking asylum have suffered persecution or credibly fear
21 that they will suffer persecution due to their race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular
22 social group, or political opinion. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1158(b)(1)(A), (B)(i).

23 278. Individuals seeking asylum in the U.S. frequently arrive with limited resources, and
24 these scarce resources should be reserved for key expenses like food and shelter. The Final Rule
25 puts asylum applicants in danger by forcing them to choose between foregoing basic necessities and
26 the application fee.

27 279. The \$50 fee puts asylum applicants and their families in a vulnerable position with
28 respect to predatory lending practices. Because many asylum applicants cannot communicate in

1 English and have few financial resources, they are vulnerable to predatory lending practices, which
2 might seem appealing in the short term to pay the required fee.

3 280. Asylum seekers who cannot afford the filing fee but are fearful of being removed to a
4 country where they will be persecuted may be forced to remain in the United States without
5 documentation. Forced to rely on charity to survive, they are at risk of housing instability, food
6 insecurity, and lack of adequate medical care. If they work without authorization, they are also
7 vulnerable to exploitation, including trafficking, and abusive work environments.

8 281. The Final Rule will cause particular harm to families, including creating a risk of
9 family separation. The fee increase will force families to make the unconscionable choice of which
10 family member can apply for and possibly attain asylum protections, and which cannot, and who can
11 seek work to provide basic needs, if anyone.

12 282. The new fee also forces them to decide between whether to forgo basic medical care
13 and feed their families or pay their asylum application fee.

14 283. Families who cannot afford multiple filing fees may be forced to abandon
15 independent claims to asylum relief for certain family members. This will harm children in particular
16 because a child with a strong independent asylum claim cannot include her parents as derivatives, so
17 her family is likely to forego her claim in favor of having a parent serve as the principal applicant if
18 the family cannot afford multiple filing fees. Families may also end up separated because if a
19 principal asylum applicant is denied asylum but granted withholding of removal, his derivative
20 family members may still be subject to removal because that relief does not apply to those family
21 members.

22 284. The new fee will also create an obstacle to family reunification. Many asylum seekers
23 who must flee their home countries without their family members. If an asylum seeker is granted
24 asylum, she can petition to bring her immediate family members to the United States, but none of
25 that is possible if she cannot afford to apply for asylum. In addition, the fee hurts families in the U.S.
26 who are willing to receive family members fleeing from other countries. Asylum applicants who are
27 able to reunify with family in the U.S. may be financially dependent on their family, and a \$50
28 application fee puts an unexpected burden on the families of asylum applicants.

1 285. In addition to the asylum application fee, the imposition of a substantial fee of \$550
2 for an I-765 application for employment authorization and the \$30 biometric fee will negatively
3 affect asylum seekers while they wait through the asylum process that may last years and, in some
4 cases, decades. Although USCIS previously imposed a waiting period of 180 days for an asylum
5 applicant to be eligible for employment authorization, the initial application for employment
6 authorization for an asylum seeker had been free. As of August 25, 2020, asylum seekers are unable
7 to apply for employment authorization until their asylum application has been pending for 365 days.
8 That means that asylum seekers will have to sustain themselves without any income for a year and
9 then come up with \$580 per application in order to work.

10 Many asylum applicants will be unable to afford the cost of the employment authorization
11 application and will thus miss out on opportunities for legal employment in the U.S. and the benefit
12 of having identification issued by the U.S. government because of the \$580 total fee requirement.
13 The Final Rule will result in lost wages for asylum applicants.

14 Moreover, asylum seekers who cannot afford the filing fee for employment authorization will
15 be unable to provide for themselves and their families, who will likely suffer food insecurity,
16 housing instability, and lack of access to adequate medical care. The inability for many asylum
17 seekers to apply to legally work in the United States will destabilize the financial situation of
18 individuals and families already traumatized by the persecution that led them to apply for asylum.
19 The significant collateral consequences of the Final Rule on asylum seekers will be seen in the areas
20 of health, food security, and housing stability.

21 286. In the proposed Rule, DHS said that it “does not want the inability to pay the fee to be
22 an extraordinary circumstance excusing an applicant from meeting the one-year filing deadline in
23 INA 208(a)(2)(B), (D),” which indicated that the Final Rule could prohibit a potential applicant from
24 using inability to pay as a grounds for equitable tolling of the one-year asylum filing deadline.⁴⁶
25 But the Final Rule is silent on this issue. If DHS refuses to allow equitable tolling for inability to
26 pay the \$50 fee, asylum seekers face significant harm: they will be denied asylum simply due to their
27 inability to pay the filing fee, regardless of the merit of their asylum claim.

28 ⁴⁶ 84 Fed. Reg. at 62,320.

1 287. For those who are able to pay the filing fee and are granted asylum, the Final Rule
2 creates additional harms. Derivative asylees are able to adjust status to lawful permanent resident as
3 long as the principal applicant retains asylee status. The Final Rule eliminates the fee waiver for
4 asylees and the reduced filing fee for children applying for lawful permanent resident status on Form
5 I-485. As a practical matter, this means that families will be forced to complete applications as they
6 can afford them. If a principal asylee naturalizes before all of his derivatives have adjusted status,
7 those family members will lose the ability to adjust as derivatives and may put lawful permanent
8 resident status out of reach for family members of asylees.

9 4. Statutorily protected groups

10 288. Statutorily protected groups—survivors of domestic violence, victims of crime and
11 physical and mental abuse, victims of human trafficking, and those fleeing armed conflict and
12 natural disasters—are among the most vulnerable people in the world. The lawful status afforded
13 these individuals by statute can increase income and provide stability for their family members. Fee
14 waivers for associated benefits allow survivors to apply for immigration benefits without having to
15 either ask their abuser for funds or to have to forgo other necessities like food or housing in order to
16 pay immigration fees. By way of access to fee waivers, survivors are able to obtain employment
17 authorization and immigration status, work with a Social Security number, and contribute to payroll
18 and other taxes.

19 289. But the barriers to lawful status and associated benefits erected by the Final Rule
20 would significantly harm individuals in these statutorily protected groups in several ways.

21 290. Indigent survivors struggle to cover basic expenses for themselves and their children,
22 including mental and physical health care needed as a direct result of abuse or victimization. The
23 Final Rule will force survivors to choose between the immigration benefits provided to them by
24 Congress or food, shelter, and other necessities for themselves and their families.

25 291. Being forced to remain financially dependent on, and therefore at the mercy of, an
26 abuser, or to make the decision between necessities like food and shelter or immigration benefits, in
27 many cases risking homelessness and hunger, also prolongs trauma-induced mental health conditions
28 from which many survivors suffer.

1 292. In narrowing fee waiver eligibility to individuals who can prove they have a
2 household income at or below 125% of the federal poverty guidelines, USCIS will be using the same
3 lack of employment authorization and immigration status that abusers and traffickers exploit in
4 terrorizing survivors to then deny them the chance to apply for immigration status and eventually
5 obtain economic freedom, independence, and safety.

6 293. Alternatively, individuals may turn to predatory lenders to try to obtain the required
7 fees, which would victimize both individuals and their families.

8 294. Additionally, indigent survivors who do flee their abusers but cannot work due to
9 being unable to afford USCIS's employment authorization renewal fees risk losing their children to
10 the system if they are deemed unable to protect and provide for them.

11 295. Furthermore, one abuser parent can easily manipulate the child custody process in his
12 favor while the other parent waits years to secure lawful status. Thus, the abuser can often gain
13 custody of the children, thereby putting the children in further danger of being abused.

14 296. DHS received detailed comments of the physical and financial vulnerabilities these
15 groups and their families face, and how the removal of the current eligibility structure for fee
16 waivers could severely harm these groups. DHS ignored these important aspects of the problem
17 posed by its new fee waiver eligibility scheme.

18 5. Long-Term Harm

19 297. The fee increases in the Final Rule will have a chilling effect both on immigration-
20 related filings in the near term as well as immigration and naturalization in the long term.
21 Fundamentally, the Final Rule sends the message that low-income immigrants are not welcome. As
22 fewer people naturalize, communities, states, and the entire nation would lose the economic and
23 societal benefits of immigration and naturalization, including greater diversity, increased earnings,
24 increased tax revenues at all levels of government, and less costly government programs.

25 B. **Public Interest, Communities**

26 298. The fee increase and effective elimination of fee waivers will prevent permanent
27 residents who otherwise would have naturalized from doing so. By making naturalization less
28 accessible, the Final Rule harms the public interest. Controlling for all other factors, naturalized

1 citizens are more likely to access higher education, become homeowners and business owners, and
2 earn higher wages, than their non-naturalized foreign-born peers. Further, naturalized citizens are
3 less likely than U.S.-born citizens to use SNAP, TANF, and other public welfare programs in the
4 future. In addition, naturalization, on average, accounts for an 8 to 11% increase in wages, which
5 results in higher spending and more federal, state, and local taxes paid. In fact, if all eligible lawful
6 permanent residents naturalized, annual tax revenue could grow by as much as \$2 billion.

7 299. By effectively placing naturalization beyond the reach of indigent individuals, the
8 Final Rule will result in greater utilization of public benefits and diminished tax realization. Limiting
9 access to naturalization for low income people will also foster inequality in the United States.

10 300. In addition to the economic impacts, the Final Rule will keep the nation's cities,
11 states, and country from reaching their full democratic potential by decreasing civic engagement and
12 political representation. By making naturalization less accessible, the Final Rule will have the effect
13 of preventing low-income immigrants from voting, serving as jurors, and running for elected
14 positions.

15 301. By increasing the fee for I-765 applications and reducing the availability of fee
16 waivers, the Final Rule will damage state and local economies by increasing unemployment among
17 immigrant workers. When immigrants are unable to renew employment authorization, they lose their
18 jobs and associated benefits like health insurance coverage. Immigrants who are forced to leave their
19 jobs are no longer able to contribute to the local economy as homeowners, consumers, and
20 taxpayers. This also harms employers, including schools, hospitals, and state agencies, who lose
21 workers. By increasing immigrant unemployment, the Final Rule will significantly reduce the
22 potential for millions in tax revenue, to the detriment of government budgets.

23 302. By imposing a fee for asylum seekers to obtain their initial employment
24 authorization, the Final Rule harms communities by creating a barrier to asylee self-sufficiency
25 through lawful employment.

26 303. The Final Rule will keep some immigrants from obtaining permanent resident status,
27 which harms the interests of state and local governments in encouraging all eligible residents to
28 obtain lawful permanent resident status. Increased acquisition of lawful permanent resident status

1 has social and economic benefits for local communities. Acquisition of a permanent legal right to
2 reside in the United States increases household stability, increases earnings and household income,
3 and improves outcomes for children in the household. This reduces the burden on local governments
4 to address social ills created by immigrants living without status. Permanent residents also contribute
5 to the local economy and tax base.

6 304. The Final Rule will harm cities, which benefit from the contributions of immigrants,
7 by making the United States a less attractive and welcoming place to live and work.

8 305. Because of the extraordinary public harms the Rule will inflict, numerous state and
9 local governments and officials, including the states of Washington and New York, and the cities of
10 Los Angeles, Chicago, New York, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, Denver, Boston, San Diego, San
11 Francisco, San Jose, San Antonio, Seattle, and the District of Columbia, submitted comments in
12 opposition to the Rule.

13 **C. Plaintiffs are and will be irreparably harmed by the Final Rule.**

14 306. Plaintiffs are nonprofit organizations that provide and/or support programs to provide
15 legal services in connection with immigration benefit applications for low-income individuals. These
16 programs have relied on the availability of fee waivers and exemptions under Defendants' ability-to-
17 pay policy. The Final Rule's increase in fees, elimination of even the possibility of fee waivers and
18 exemptions for many forms and applicants, and more difficult standard for obtaining a fee waiver
19 will harm Plaintiffs' missions and operations. The Final Rule will make it impossible for Plaintiffs to
20 continue to provide core services benefitting low-income individuals at anywhere near the same
21 level and may cause the organizations to cease operations.

22 1. The Final Rule Frustrates Plaintiffs' Missions.

23 307. Each of the Plaintiffs shares a mission to provide services directed at assisting low-
24 income and vulnerable individuals to obtain immigration status, adjust status to lawful permanent
25 resident, and naturalize to become a U.S. citizen. Advancing immigrant rights is at the core of
26 Plaintiffs' missions. This includes ensuring that immigrants have access to naturalization, family-
27 based immigration, humanitarian relief, asylum, VAWA, U and T visas, adjustment of status, and
28 more. Contrary to Plaintiffs' missions, the Final Rule erects barriers to access to immigration

1 benefits. Plaintiffs will now serve far fewer low income and vulnerable people in completing
2 applications for asylum, permanent residence, naturalization, and for other immigration-related
3 benefits due to the increases in fees in the Final Rule, the elimination of fee waivers and exemptions,
4 and the new eligibility standard for the limited fee waivers that remain. Additionally, Plaintiffs will
5 experience a drastic reduction in the number of people who will submit applications because they
6 can no longer afford to do so.

7 2. The Final Rule Diverts Resources from Plaintiffs' Core Programs

8 308. Plaintiffs are immediately experiencing an increase in operational costs due to the
9 Final Rule. Plaintiffs have had to divert resources away from providing legal services in order for
10 their staff to understand the Final Rule, update their internal and public-facing materials to conform
11 with the Final Rule, develop materials and webinar presentations to inform and train practitioners on
12 the contours and effects of the Final Rule, develop materials to explain the Rule to the communities
13 they serve, and conduct community outreach on the Rule. The sheer number of significant changes
14 the Final Rule proposes amplifies these effects, as Plaintiffs scramble to understand the contours of
15 the complex 142 pages of the Final Rule, including changes to some 59 forms, update materials to
16 reflect the changes in the Final Rule, scramble to submit as many applications as possible before the
17 Final Rule takes effect, and make plans to address the decline in applications that will result from the
18 Final Rule.

19 309. At the same time, Plaintiffs must now attempt to submit as many applications for
20 immigration benefits as possible before the Final Rule takes effect and makes it impossible for many
21 clients to afford to apply for these benefits. The Final Rule is thus straining Plaintiffs' staffs.

22 310. Plaintiffs must also change the manner in which they deliver legal services in
23 response to the Final Rule. Plaintiffs have relied on a workshop model as an efficient means of
24 providing assistance to many applicants for immigration benefits at one time. Plaintiffs have
25 expended significant resources to develop this model. The Final Rule jeopardizes the efficacy of that
26 model, which depends on the availability of full fee waivers and reduced fees to convert applications
27 completed at the workshop into applications actually submitted. For example, half of CLINIC's
28 affiliates utilize workshop models to help Lawful Permanent Residents complete naturalization

1 applications and fee waiver requests. CLINIC anticipates that at least 40 percent of workshop
2 attendees, who currently qualify to request a full fee waivers or reduced fees, will be unable to afford
3 to submit applications once the Final Rule goes into effect.

4 311. The dramatic fee increases and the abandonment of the long-standing ability-to-pay
5 policy undermines Plaintiffs' (and other non-profits) decades of reliance interests, will render the
6 workshop model that Plaintiffs use unsustainable, and will force Plaintiffs to devote resources to
7 adapt their service models, including by transitioning to helping clients in one-to-one appointments,
8 which are the least efficient way of helping potential applicants.

9 312. Because the populations Plaintiffs serve cannot afford the fees in the Final Rule,
10 Plaintiffs will have to devote resources to try to find a way to cover these fees for applicants.
11 Covering these fees will cause Plaintiffs to expend more money per application. To cover such fees,
12 Plaintiffs will have to either redirect funds from other programs or endeavors or will have to expend
13 staff member and executive time and resources to raise additional funding. Either contingency would
14 frustrate Plaintiffs' execution of legal service and other programs. For example, Plaintiff East Bay
15 Sanctuary Covenant, would have to expend over \$270,000—or 16 percent of its 2020 budget—to
16 cover those affected by I-765, Application for Employment Authorization changes.

17 313. Furthermore, Plaintiffs have expended and will expend staff time and resources in
18 advocating against this Rule, including by submitting comments opposing the Final Rule during the
19 notice-and-comment period.

20 3. The Final Rule Threatens Plaintiffs' Funding

21 314. Plaintiffs rely on private and public funding to maintain their operations. In Plaintiffs'
22 experience, both private and public funding are dependent on the volume of services Plaintiffs can
23 provide because donors want their funds to have the greatest impact. Plaintiffs' grant funding often
24 requires that they meet specific contract deliverables. For example, ACRS has a yearly deliverable
25 requirement that ACRS submit a certain number of naturalization applications. For fiscal year 2020,
26 ACRS is obligated to help submit 650 N-400 applications. The anticipated decline in the number of
27 people who will be able to afford to submit applications because of the Final Rule will lead to a
28 marked decrease in Plaintiffs' ability to meet their deliverables and put their funding in jeopardy.

1 315. Unable to meet their contractual deliverable requirements, Plaintiffs will likely lose
2 their contracts and grant funding. Plaintiffs will have to institute hiring freezes, furlough or reduce
3 staff, or decrease salaries. Plaintiffs will thus lose irreplaceable individuals with institutional
4 knowledge and expertise, which will compound the harm to the organizations' legal services.
5 Plaintiffs will also likely have to divert resources, including funding currently used for outreach,
6 policy, and advocacy work, to fund their legal services. The Final Rule could ultimately lead to the
7 closure of Plaintiff's immigration services programs in their entirety.

8 4. The Final Rule Harms Plaintiff's Reputations and Goodwill.

9 316. The Final Rule will immediately harm the reputations that Plaintiffs have built over
10 time. Plaintiffs enjoy strong reputations among donors and grant-making entities because of their
11 robust programs and consistent ability to deliver on their contractual obligations. The Final Rule
12 makes it impossible for Plaintiffs to maintain the same level of programming at the same cost, and
13 Plaintiffs are already having to undertake difficult conversations with donors about the effects of the
14 Final Rule at the same time they are struggling to serve those seeking to apply for benefits prior to
15 the Rule's effective date. Plaintiffs also enjoy strong reputations within the communities they serve
16 because of their ability to deliver high quality legal services for free or at low cost and their robust
17 community engagement and advocacy. As fewer community members are able to afford to apply for
18 immigration benefits, Plaintiffs will experience a decline in goodwill and harm to their reputations.
19 When Plaintiffs must limit the number of clients they serve due to funding constraints, community
20 members will express their dissatisfaction, compounding the reputational harm. For example,
21 CHIRLA has provided its legal services to members for free. The Final Rule might force CHIRLA
22 to charge fees for legal services, which is not in-line with its mission and would compound the
23 reputational harm. As CHIRLA provides fewer services and engages less with the community,
24 membership will decline. This decline in membership will negatively impact CHIRLA's mission as
25 well as its financials.

26 317. The Final Rule is causing and will continue to cause a decline in morale among
27 Plaintiffs' staffs. Plaintiffs' staffs work with vulnerable, low-income individuals, which is
28 challenging on its own. The Final Rule denigrates this work. For example, the Final Rule suggests

1 that an asylum application fee is necessary to deter frivolous filings despite the statutory penalties in-
2 place for making frivolous applications. These unfounded insinuations harm the reputations of
3 Plaintiffs and their staff members. Moreover, in their comments to the proposed rule, Plaintiffs
4 provided information about the expected impact of the rule based on their substantial expertise and
5 experience. By casually dismissing the comments of Plaintiffs, the Final Rule harms Plaintiffs’
6 reputation as experts and leaders in the immigration legal services sphere.

7 **CAUSES OF ACTION**

8 **COUNT I**

9 **Violation of Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §706**

10 **Contravention of the Federal Vacancies Reform Act, Homeland Security Act, Appointments**

11 **Clause, Administrative Procedure Act**

12 318. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate by reference each allegation contained in the
13 preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

14 319. Under the APA, a court must set “aside agency action” that is “not in accordance with
15 law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

16 320. The issuance of the Final Rule was an agency action.

17 321. The Final Rule is not in accordance with the Federal Vacancies Reform Act (FVRA).
18 Under the FVRA, an “action taken by a person who is not acting” under its requirements “in the
19 performance of any function or duty of a vacant office . . . shall have no force or effect.” 5 U.S.C. §
20 3348(d).

21 322. The Secretary of Homeland Security is a principal officer of the United States whose
22 appointment requires presidential nomination and Senate confirmation. 6 U.S.C. § 112(a)(1).

23 323. Defendant Wolf issued the Final Rule purportedly in the performance of the function
24 or duty of Acting Secretary. Defendant Wolf was not validly appointed pursuant to the HSA, thus
25 the FVRA does not apply to his actions in that purported role.

26 324. Even if the FVRA did apply to Defendant Wolf’s assumption of duties, the Final Rule
27 was issued after the statutory 210-day limit on actions by acting officials.

28 325. The Final Rule should have no force or effect under the FVRA.

1 326. The Final Rule is invalid under the Appointments Clause of the Constitution because
2 Defendant Wolf is not authorized to assume the duties of Acting Secretary under the HSA and the
3 FVRA, and he was not nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate to occupy that role.
4 U.S. Const. art. II, § 2, cl. 2.

5 327. The Final Rule contravenes the APA because it arose from an invalid proposal in
6 violation of the APA.

7 328. Both Proposals signed by McAleenan and Wolf were issued after the FVRA
8 allowance period, and thus were issued in contravention of the FVRA and the Assignments Clause.
9 Defendant Wolf was not validly appointed under the HSA and thus was not authorized to issue the
10 December Proposal.

11 329. The Final Rule should be set aside under the APA for contravening the HSA, FVRA,
12 Constitution, and APA.

13 **COUNT II**

14 **Violation of Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §706**

15 **Agency Action Not in Accordance with Law**

16 330. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate by reference each allegation contained in the
17 preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

18 331. Under the APA, a court must set “aside agency action” that is “not in accordance with
19 law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A).

20 332. The Final Rule contravenes APA § 553(b)(3) because it does not adequately provide
21 the terms or substance of the Proposal or a description of the subjects and issues involved.

22 333. The Final Rule contravenes APA § 553(c) because it fails to give persons adequate
23 opportunity to participate in the rulemaking.

24 334. The Final Rule contravenes INA § 286(m) because it recovers costs for providing
25 staffing and administrative assistance to ICE that does not constitute providing adjudication and
26 naturalization services consistent with the statute’s plain language. 8 USC § 1356(m).

1 335. The Final Rule recovers costs for fraud prevention and detection above the statutory
2 limits for fraud prevention and detection as set forth in statutorily established Fraud Prevention and
3 Detection Account, INA §§ 214(c)(12)–(13), 286(v); 8 U.S.C. § 1184(c)(12)–(13), 1356(v).

4 336. The Final Rule contravenes the HSA, which keeps the accounts of USCIS and ICE
5 separate and prohibits transfers of fees for purposes not authorized by 8 USC § 1356. 6 USC § 296.

6 337. The Final Rule contravenes the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, which
7 prohibits reimbursement between agencies. Pub. L. No. 116-26, 133 Stat. 1018.

8 338. The Final Rule contravenes the INA’s prioritization of diversity through imposing
9 dramatic fee increases that disproportionately impact non-European applicants.

10 339. The Final Rule contravenes the INA’s prioritization of family unification through
11 imposing fees that will result in family separation.

12 340. The Final Rule contravenes Section 654 of the Treasury and General Government
13 Appropriations Act of 1999’s prioritization of family unification through imposing fees that will
14 result in family separation.

15 341. The Final Rule contravenes the INA, Refugee Act, and international law by imposing
16 nonwaivable fees that will result in restricting access to asylum protections.

17 342. The Final Rule contravenes the INA § 1158(d) by imposing an asylum fee based on
18 deterrence.

19 343. The Final Rule contravenes the INA and HSA by failing to separate funding for
20 adjudication and enforcement.

21 344. The Final Rule contravenes the TVPRA by erecting financial barriers between
22 TVPRA applicants and primary benefits.

23 345. The Final Rule contravenes NACARA by erecting financial barriers between eligible
24 applicants and NACARA protections.

25 346. The Final Rule was issued without lawful authority in violation of the FVRA, HSA,
26 and the United States Constitution.

27 347. The Final Rule violates the Due Process Clause and the Equal Protection Clause of
28 the United States Constitution.

1 348. The Final Rule violates the RFA.

2 349. Defendants' violation is causing ongoing harm to Plaintiffs.

3 **COUNT III**

4 **Violation of Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706**

5 **Arbitrary and Capricious Action**

6 350. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate by reference each allegation contained in the
7 preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

8 351. The APA states that a court must “hold unlawful and set aside” agency action that is
9 “arbitrary, capricious, [or] an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; . . . (C) in
10 excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right;. . . (D) without
11 observance of procedure required by law . . .” or “(E) unsupported by substantial evidence.” 5
12 U.S.C. § 706(2). Courts will invalidate agency determinations that fail to “examine the relevant data
13 and articulate a satisfactory explanation for its action including a ‘rational connection between the
14 facts found and the choice made.’” *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463
15 U.S. 29, 43 (1983) (citation omitted).

16 352. Furthermore, when an agency substantially alters a position, it must “supply a
17 reasoned analysis for the change,” *State Farm*, 463 U.S. at 42, and may not “depart from a prior
18 policy *sub silentio* or simply disregard rules that are still on the books.” *FCC v. Fox TV Stations,*
19 *Inc.*, 556 U.S. 502, 515 (2009) (citing *United States v. Nixon*, 418 U.S. 683, 696 (1974)).

20 353. The Final Rule is unlawful under the APA for several independent reasons, each of
21 which is sufficient to require that the Final Rule be set aside.

22 354. The Final Rule does not adequately provide the terms or substance of the Proposal or
23 a description of the subjects and issues involved. APA § 553(b)(3).

24 355. The Final Rule fails to give persons adequate opportunity to participate in the
25 rulemaking. APA § 553(c).

26 356. DHS fails to adequately justify the change in rationale from its historic ability-to-pay
27 policy to the Final Rule’s “beneficiary pays” policy. DHS fails to justify removal of the alternative
28 bases for establishing fee waiver eligibility.

1 357. DHS fails to adequately justify its reversal from bundled to unbundled fees for lawful
2 permanent residence applications. DHS fails to adequately justify its removal of a reduced fee for
3 minors applying for lawful permanent resident status.

4 358. DHS fails to adequately justify its changed rationale to now charge a fee for seeking
5 asylum and initial employment authorization for asylum seekers.

6 359. DHS fails to adequately justify that it is recovering costs authorized under 8 U.S.C.
7 § 1356(m). DHS’s budget for USCIS rests on unexplained assumptions, reflects an extreme increase
8 over prior budgets, is inconsistent with prior and contemporaneous representations to Congress, fails
9 to explain loss of carryover funds, and fails to account for efficiencies already realized.

10 360. The cost modeling used for setting the fees in the Final Rule suffers from arbitrary
11 and unexplained inputs, fails to account for efficiencies realized, fails to account for costs of
12 foregone benefits, fails to account for revenue from other rule changes, and fails to account for price
13 elasticity, and fails to account for the reliance interests of the affected parties.

14 361. The Final Rule fails to apply the model in a rational or objective manner, but instead
15 applies unexplained “value judgments” to different fee categories.

16 362. The Final Rule provides inconsistent or mutually exclusive justifications for certain
17 fees. The Rule states that it sets a \$50 fee for asylum applications to align with its beneficiary-pays
18 policy and to recover revenues. The Rule also states that USCIS will apply a \$50 discount to asylees
19 who apply for lawful permanent resident status, thus undercutting the asserted benefits of realizing
20 those fees. The Final Rule later states that the benefits to USCIS of the \$50 fee will be “none” in its
21 cost-benefit analysis.

22 363. The Final Rule fails to adequately address comments on the barriers to accessing
23 immigration benefits posed by the unaffordability of the fee schedule for low-income applicants and
24 particular applicant categories—including naturalization applicants, lawful permanent residence
25 applicants, asylum applicants, applicants for TVPRA benefits, NACARA applicants, and applicants
26 for employment authorization.

27 364. The Final Rule fails to adequately address comments on the harms such barriers have
28 on applicants, including family separation and loss of income, safety, health, and ability to vote.

1 365. The Final Rule fails to adequately address comments on the harms such barriers have
2 on small non-profit immigration service organizations, including Plaintiffs, in meeting their
3 missions, obtaining funding, and qualifying for grants.

4 366. The Final Rule fails to adequately address comments on harms such barriers have on
5 the public, including public health, loss of diversity, loss of tax revenue, lower gross domestic
6 product, interference with state and local initiatives to promote diversity and naturalization.

7 367. The Final Rule fails to consider the numerous studies and comments in the record
8 raising these important aspects of the problem of its fee schedule. The Final Rule instead repeats its
9 statement that it “believes” its chosen conclusions are correct, without analysis or data to support its
10 conclusions.

11 368. The Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious because it claims to have “no data” when
12 data is in the record.

13 369. The Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious because it rests on ungrounded assumptions
14 without support to justify the quantified, real harm to public health, state or local economies, or other
15 administrative burdens or adequately address the harms alleged in the record.

16 370. The Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious because DHS relied on and considered
17 factors that Congress did not intend for DHS to consider, including: elevating the so-called
18 beneficiary-pays principle above all other considerations; charging asylum fees for the purposes of
19 deterrence instead of for the only authorized reason of cost recovery; considering itself obligated to
20 cover all adjudicative costs with fee revenues; supporting President Trump’s anti-immigrant political
21 agenda; DHS “value judgments”; and elevating other considerations over Congress’s express
22 direction to keep naturalization affordable.

23 371. The Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious because DHS failed to consider factors that
24 Congress did want considered, including: the effect the fee increases would have on application
25 volume; the burden of fee increases on low-income and middle-income immigrants; and the effects
26 of fee increases on immigration and naturalization, diversity, family unification, including under the
27 INA and the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act of 1999, Section 654, and
28 vulnerable populations.

1 372. The Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious because it is not a logical outgrowth of the
2 proposal: DHS failed to propose the Final Rule provision providing a \$50 discount in some
3 circumstances for asylees who apply for lawful permanent resident status; its \$10 discount for online
4 applications; sufficient information to understand the cost modeling and budget assumptions
5 underlying the fees in the November Proposal and in the alternative Scenario D of that proposal. As
6 a result, DHS incorporates new and unexplained provisions and conclusions as to fee amounts in the
7 Final Rule.

8 373. The Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious because it is pretext for discrimination.
9 While the Final Rule's "beneficiary-pays" principle purports to be more "equitable," its application
10 of exceptions to that approach bears no reasonable relationship to USCIS's mission to provide
11 immigration adjudication services and instead demonstrates Defendants' intent to reduce
12 immigration by immigrants of color.

13 374. The Final Rule is arbitrary and capricious because Defendants have failed to consider
14 the racially disparate impact of the Final Rule.

15 375. Defendants' actions are thus arbitrary and capricious, within the meaning proscribed
16 by 5 U.S.C. §§ 705 and 706.

17 376. Defendants' violation is causing ongoing harm to Plaintiffs.

18 **COUNT IV**

19 **Violation of Regulatory Flexibility Act**

20 377. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate by reference each allegation contained in the
21 preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

22 378. The Regulatory Flexibility Act ("RFA"), as amended, requires federal administrative
23 agencies to analyze the effects on "small entities" of rules they promulgate, and to publish initial and
24 final versions of those analyses. 5 U.S.C. §§ 603-604.

25 379. Under the RFA, the court may set aside, stay, or grant other relief for agency action in
26 violation of the RFA, 5 U.S.C. §§ 601, 604, 605(b), 608, and 610. 5 U.S.C. § 611.

27 380. The RFA defines "small entities" to include small businesses, small nonprofit
28 organizations, and small governmental jurisdictions. 5 U.S.C. § 601(6).

1 381. The Final Rule is a “rule” within the meaning of the RFA. 5 U.S.C. § 601(2).

2 382. Each of the Plaintiffs is a “small entity” within the meaning of the RFA and is
3 directly affected by the Final Rule, which, inter alia, will jeopardize their funding sources, will likely
4 cause them to breach contractual requirements (including with state and local governments), will
5 require them to divert resources to address the new requirements in the Final Rule, will devalue their
6 services, and will frustrate their missions.

7 383. DHS’s final regulatory flexibility analysis does not comply with the RFA because
8 DHS concluded that the Final Rule will not have a significant impact on small business entities. This
9 conclusion is unsupported and irrational when considered in light of the record and numerous
10 comments to the Proposed Rule. 5 U.S.C. §§ 605(b), 608.

11 384. The RFA requires DHS to describe and estimate the number of small entities that
12 would be affected by the Final Rule. 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)(4).

13 385. DHS refused to include small nonprofit organizations affected by the Final Rule. 85
14 Fed. Reg. at 46,898.

15 386. The RFA requires DHS to describe “the projected reporting, recordkeeping and other
16 compliance requirements of the [Final Rule], including an estimate of the classes of small entities
17 which will be subject to the requirement and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation
18 of the report or record.” 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)(5).

19 387. DHS failed to do so. The agency asserted instead that because small nonprofit entities
20 providing immigration services are not the individuals assessed immigration fees, the RFA excludes
21 their consideration. 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,898.

22 388. DHS ignored comments identifying the requirements of the Final Rule that will
23 directly affect small nonprofit entities. DHS does not support its unexplained assertion that form fees
24 are the only direct effect of the Final Rule and its failure to consider the reliance interests of
25 Plaintiffs remains unexplained.

26 389. The RFA requires DHS to describe “the steps the agency has taken to minimize the
27 significant economic impact on small entities consistent with the stated objectives of applicable
28 statutes, including a statement of the factual, policy, and legal reasons for selecting the alternative

1 adopted in the final rule and why each one of the other significant alternatives to the rule considered
2 by the agency which affect the impact on small entities was rejected.” 5 U.S.C. § 604(a)(6).

3 390. DHS failed describe these steps with respect to small nonprofits. 85 Fed. Reg. at
4 46,898.

5 391. DHS failed to consider “the stated objectives of applicable statutes,” including the
6 INA, Refugee Act, TVPRA, Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, and HSA.

7 392. Thus, the Final Rule’s final regulatory flexibility analysis does not comply with the
8 RFA because of, as a threshold matter, DHS’s erroneous and unexplained conclusion that the Final
9 Rule does not directly affect small entities.

10 393. The Final Rule’s final regulatory flexibility analysis is also arbitrary and capricious
11 because it does not reflect reasoned decision-making, fails to respond to significant comments
12 demonstrating the critical reliance interests of affected parties, fails to consider available data about
13 the effects of the Final Rule, and fails to support its conclusions with substantial evidence.

14 394. The Final Rule is therefore unlawful and must be set aside. See 5 U.S.C. § 611; 5
15 U.S.C. § 706.

16 **COUNT V**

17 **Violation of the Due Process Clause**

18 395. Petitioner repeats and re-alleges the allegations contained in each preceding
19 paragraph.

20 396. The Due Process Clauses of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution guarantees that
21 people cannot be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

22 397. “A necessary predicate for a due process claim is a constitutionally protected
23 interest.” *Brown v. Holder*, 763 F.3d 1141, 1147 (9th Cir. 2014). Immigrants have “such a protected
24 interest in being able to apply for citizenship,” *id.*, and asylum, *see Haitian Refugee Ctr. v. Smith*,
25 676 F.2d 1023, 1037–38 (5th Cir. 1982), (finding “a clear intent to grant aliens the right to submit
26 and the opportunity to substantiate their claim for asylum”), *disapproved of by Jean v. Nelson*, 727
27 F.2d 957 (11th Cir. 1984).

1 398. The Final Rule arbitrarily and intentionally obstructs the rights to naturalization and
2 asylum for low income applicants.

3 399. DHS remains deliberately indifferent to whether low income applicants have access
4 to the naturalization and asylum processes.

5 400. Through the Final Rule, Defendants have arbitrarily and intentionally imposed
6 barriers to applying for immigration benefits for eligible individuals, unconstitutionally depriving
7 those eligible individuals of their vested interests.

8 401. Both the INA and international law give asylum seekers a right to apply for protection
9 in the United States.

10 402. The Final Rule imposes a mandatory \$50 filing fee on all asylum applications, other
11 than those submitted by unaccompanied immigrant children who are in removal proceedings.

12 403. The Final Rule prohibits asylum applicants from receiving a fee waiver.

13 404. The Final Rule prohibits USCIS from considering an asylum applicant's ability to pay
14 the \$50 fee.

15 405. DHS asserted in the Final Rule it had no data to assess the effects of the fees it was
16 imposing, but DHS received extensive comments on asylum seekers' inability to pay and the
17 substantial harms the fee would impose.

18 406. DHS inferred that substantial harm from the asylum application fee was likely,
19 stating, "Some applicants may not be able to afford this fee and may not be able to apply for
20 asylum." 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,894. DHS acknowledges that the fee is set "so that it . . . may deter
21 some filings." Regulatory Impact Analysis at 153. DHS cannot reasonably deny drawing this
22 inference, but even if it did, any reasonable DHS official would be compelled to draw that inference.
23 *Dent v. Sessions*, 243 F. Supp. 3d 1062, 1069-70 (D. Ariz. 2017).

24 407. For these reasons, the Final Rule's \$50 fee for asylum applications constitutes a due
25 process violation.

26 408. In cases where an applicant cannot afford the filing fee, failing to give any
27 consideration to an applicant's ability to pay is the equivalent of denying the relief to which an
28 applicant is entitled by law to seek.

1 409. The Final Rule fails to consider the financial circumstances of asylum applicants in
2 its decision to impose a \$50 fee on such applicants.

3 410. The Final Rule fails to consider the financial circumstances of asylum applicants in
4 its decision to prohibit USCIS from considering an applicant's ability to pay.

5 411. An asylum applicant who cannot afford the filing fee will be denied asylum solely
6 based on the inability to pay the filing fee.

7 412. The Constitution requires consideration of the financial circumstances of an asylum
8 applicant in assessing a fee to apply for relief to which the applicant is entitled to seek under the INA
9 and international law.

10 413. The Final Rule violates the Due Process Clause because due process does not
11 permit an applicant to be denied asylum solely based on lack of financial resources.

12 414. The Final Rule imposes a fee of \$1,170 for naturalization (or \$10 less if filing online).

13 415. Currently, the fee for naturalization is \$320 (not including the biometric fee) for
14 qualifying low-income applicants, or \$640 (not including the biometric fee). The \$85 biometric fee
15 is not assessed for applicants 75 or older. There is currently no fee for applicants who qualify for a
16 full fee waiver.

17 416. The Final Rule prohibits naturalization applicants from receiving a fee waiver in
18 nearly all cases.

19 417. The Final Rule prohibits USCIS from considering a naturalization applicant's ability
20 to pay the \$1,170 fee.

21 418. DHS asserted in the Final Rule it had no data to assess the effects of the fees it was
22 imposing, but DHS received extensive comments on naturalization applicants' inability to pay and
23 the substantial harms the fee would impose. See 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,799. DHS inferred that
24 substantial harm from the proposed naturalization fee combined with the elimination of fee waivers
25 and reduced fees was likely. It stated, "Limiting fee waivers may adversely affect some applicants'
26 ability to apply for immigration benefits." 85 Fed. Reg. at 46,891. Even if DHS denies making this
27 inference, any reasonable DHS official would be compelled to draw that inference. *Dent*, 243 F.
28 Supp. 3d at 1069-70.

1 419. For these reasons, the Final Rule’s naturalization fee increase, combined with the
2 elimination of the reduced fee and fee waiver eligibility, constitutes a due process violation.

3 420. In cases where an applicant cannot afford the filing fee, failing to give any
4 consideration to an applicant’s ability to pay is the equivalent of denying the relief to which an
5 applicant is entitled by law to seek.

6 421. The Final Rule fails to consider the financial circumstances of naturalization
7 applicants in its decision to impose a \$1,170 fee and eliminate access to reduced fees or fee waivers.

8 422. The Final Rule fails to consider the financial circumstances of naturalization
9 applicants in its decision to prohibit USCIS from considering an applicant’s ability to pay.

10 423. A naturalization applicant who cannot afford the filing fee will be denied citizenship
11 solely based on the inability to pay the filing fee.

12 424. The Constitution requires consideration of the financial circumstances of a
13 naturalization applicant in assessing a fee to apply for citizenship, which the applicant is entitled to
14 seek under the INA.

15 425. The Final Rule violates the Due Process Clause because due process does not
16 permit an applicant to be denied citizenship solely based on lack of financial resources.

17 426. The Final Rule violates the Due Process Clause because it is pretext for reducing
18 immigration and naturalization without a legitimate purpose.

19 427. The Final Rule violates the Due Process Clauses because it is designed to have a
20 disproportionate impact on immigrants and communities of color.

21 **COUNT VI**

22 **Violation of the Fifth Amendment – Equal Protection**

23 428. Plaintiffs repeat and incorporate by reference each allegation contained in the
24 preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.

25 429. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment prohibits the Defendants from
26 denying equal protection of laws to persons residing in the United States.

27 430. The Final Rule denies equal protection based on indigence, race, and national origin.
28

1 431. The Defendants violated the Fifth Amendment because they acted with racial animus
2 to promote policy that disproportionately affects Latin American immigrants.

3 432. Defendants were motivated by “discriminatory purpose” to disparately impact people
4 of color when they promulgated the Final Rule. Defendants not only knew of that disparate impact,
5 but that impact is also consistent with the intent made plain by the Administration’s repeated public
6 statements in support of a broader agenda to vilify persons from majority non-white countries, to
7 suppress immigration, and to discourage those individuals from seeking citizenship, exercising the
8 right to vote, and gaining access to certain careers.

9 433. The purpose of the Final Rule is to discriminate against non-white individuals and
10 families.

11 434. Defendants received many comments, including data and analyses, informing them
12 that the Final Rule would have a targeted, disproportionate impact on people and families from non-
13 white countries, and that the Final Rule departs from rulemaking history and procedure as part of a
14 pattern and practice of discriminatory animus towards persons from majority non-white countries.
15 The Defendants knew the Final Rule would have these effects.

16 435. Defendants ignore the record and use facially neutral but pre-textual concerns about
17 self-sufficiency in a thinly-veiled effort to cloak their discriminatory intent against non-white people.

18 436. Thus, the Final Rule violates the right to equal protection under the law of non-citizen
19 immigrants of color and Latino immigrants from majority non-white countries.

20 437. The Final Rule is pretext for decreasing immigration and naturalization for low-
21 income immigrants primarily from non-European countries, and does not have a legitimate purpose.

22 438. Defendants’ violation is causing ongoing harm to Plaintiffs by constructing barriers to
23 asylum, citizenship, and other immigration benefits.

24 **JURY DEMAND**

25 439. Plaintiffs demand a jury trial on all counts triable by jury.

26 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

27 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray that this Court:
28

1 A. Declare that the actions of the Defendants are arbitrary, capricious, and otherwise not
2 in accordance with the law and without observance of procedure required by law in violation of the
3 Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706.

4 B. Declare the Final Rule unlawful and invalid as a violation of the Fifth Amendment of
5 the United States Constitution.

6 C. Enter a preliminary and permanent nationwide injunction, without bond, enjoining
7 Defendants, their officials, agents, employees, and assigns from implementing or enforcing the Final
8 Rule.

9 D. Stay the implementation or enforcement of the Final Rule.

10 E. Award Plaintiffs reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2412;

11 and

12 F. Order such other relief as the Court deems just and equitable.

13
14 Respectfully submitted,

15
16 DATE: August 20, 2020

/s/ Brian J. Stetch

17 Jesse Bless (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
18 jbless@aila.org
19 AMERICAN IMMIGRATION LAWYERS
20 ASSOCIATION
1301 G Street, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005

Brian J. Stretch, SBN 163973
bstretch@sidley.com
Naomi Igra, SBN 269095
naomi.igra@sidley.com
Chelsea Davis, SBN 330968
chelsea.davis@sidley.com
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: +1 415 772 1200
Facsimile: +1 415 772 7400

24 Samina M. Bharmal (*pro hac vice pending*)
25 sbharmal@sidley.com
Emmanuel Hampton
ehampton@sidley.com
26 Katherine Olson
katherine.olson@sidley.com
27 John L. Gibbons, SBN 317720
28 jgibbons@sidley.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

David Goldenberg
dgoldenberg@sidley.com
Elizabeth MacGill
emacgill@sidley.com
Brendan Bohn
bbohn@sidley.com
William Chorba
wchorba@sidley.com
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: +1 202 736 8000
Facsimile: +1 202 736 8711

Attorneys for Plaintiffs