

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
)
) *Plaintiff,*)
)
) v.)
)
) BETSY DEVOS, in her official capacity as)
) Secretary of the United States Department of)
) Education; and the UNITED STATES)
) DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, a)
) federal agency)
)
) *Defendants.*)

CASE NO. 2:20-cv-1119-BJR
ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

I. INTRODUCTION

Before the Court is the State of Washington’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction, seeking to enjoin Defendants Secretary Betsy DeVos and the Department of Education from implementing an interim final rule (“Interim Final Rule”), which outlines how states may allocate funding provided by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (“CARES Act”) to private schools. The State claims that the Interim Final Rule misconstrues Congress’s intent and effectively diverts emergency relief funding from economically disadvantaged public schools to less disadvantaged private schools. Pl.’s Mot. for Prelim. Inj., Dkt. No. 8. In essence, the parties

1 dispute whether the CARES Act requires States to allocate funding to private schools using a
2 formula based on the *percentage of students from low-income families* who attend private school
3 (“poverty-based formula”), as advanced by the State, or whether, as Defendants claim, the CARES
4 Act authorized the Department to issue the Interim Final Rule, which directs States to allocate that
5 funding based on *total enrollment* in private schools (“enrollment-based formula”). Having
6 reviewed the Motion, the opposition thereto, the record of the case, the relevant legal authorities,
7 and having conducted oral argument on August 10, 2020 via video-teleconference, the Court will
8 grant the Motion and issue the injunction. The reasoning for the Court’s decision follows.
9

10 II. BACKGROUND

11 A. The COVID-19 Pandemic

12 The case before the Court is but one of many disputes being played out against the backdrop
13 of the COVID-19 pandemic. The pandemic has wreaked havoc on this nation and created novel
14 and difficult questions for the courts. One of the most pressing issues is how to provide education
15 for children at a time fraught with the dangers of a life-threatening, highly communicable disease.
16

17 On February 29, 2020, as the virus spread through the State of Washington, Governor Jay
18 Inslee declared a state of emergency. *See* Compl., Dkt. No. 1 ¶ 25; *see also* Wash. Governor’s
19 Proclamation 20-05 (Feb. 29, 2020).¹ In an effort to protect school students and stem the virus’s
20 spread, Gov. Inslee announced the closure of all public and private K-12 schools in King,
21 Snohomish, and Pierce Counties effective March 17 and lasting, at that time, through at least April
22

23
24
25 ¹ Available at <https://www.governor.wa.gov/sites/default/files/proclamations/20-05%20Coronavirus%20%28final%29.pdf>.

1 24. Compl. ¶ 26. Through repeated orders by the Governor, schools throughout the State were
2 ordered closed for the remainder of the school year, forcing educators to transition to online
3 instruction for all students. *Id.* ¶¶ 26, 30. The State reports that significant efforts have been taken
4 to provide support to students in need in particular, including serving meals, providing special
5 education and related services to students with disabilities, providing remote learning access for
6 English learners, and offering computing and connectivity technology to low-income students. *Id.*
7 Many of these efforts are on-going.
8

9 **B. The CARES Act GEER and ESSER Funds**

10 In response to the wide-ranging economic consequences of the pandemic, Congress passed
11 the CARES Act, which the President signed on March 27, 2020. *See* Pub. L. No. 116-136, 134
12 Stat. 281 (Mar. 27, 2020); Compl. ¶¶ 32–33.² The CARES Act contains a wide array of federal
13 funding designed to combat the consequences of the pandemic, including \$30.75 billion for the
14 creation of an Education Stabilization Fund (“ESF”) to address educational needs of the nation’s
15 students. *See* Compl. ¶ 34.
16

17 The CARES Act directs the Secretary of Education to allocate ESF funding to three sub-
18 funds, two of which are pertinent here.³ *See* CARES Act § 18001(b); Compl. ¶¶ 34–44. The first
19

20
21 ² Since the CARES Act was codified in scattered titles across the U.S. Code, the Court will refer to specific
22 provisions therein by their section within the CARES Act. For example, CARES Act sections 18003 and 18005,
relevant to this case, are codified in 20 U.S.C. § 3401 note.

23 ³ The third sub-fund, the Higher Education Emergency Relief (“HEER”) Fund, is not at issue in this case. *See*
24 CARES Act § 18004. Notably, however, at least two courts within the Ninth Circuit have recently granted
25 preliminary injunctions limiting the Department’s authority to impose eligibility restrictions on students who may
receive HEER funding. *See Oakley v. DeVos*, No. 20-cv-03215, 2020 WL 3268661 (N.D. Cal. June 17, 2020);
Washington v. DeVos, No. 20-cv-0182, 2020 WL 3125916 (E.D. Wash. June 12, 2020).

1 is the Governor’s Emergency Education Relief (“GEER”) Fund, for which Congress appropriated
2 approximately \$3 billion. *See* CARES Act § 18002, § 18001(b)(1). The CARES Act directs the
3 Secretary to make GEER funding available to the governor of each state based on the relative
4 population of students in that state and, in particular, the relative population of students from low-
5 income families. *Id.* § 18002(a), (b). The Act further provides that GEER funds may be used to
6 “provide emergency support through grants to local educational agencies [(“LEAs”)] that the State
7 educational agency [(“SEA”)] deems have been most significantly impacted by coronavirus to
8 support the ability of such local educational agencies to continue to provide educational services
9 to their students and to support the on-going functionality of the local educational agency.”⁴ *Id.* §
10 18002(a), (b), (c)(1).
11

12 The second ESF fund is the Elementary and Secondary School Emergency Relief
13 (“ESSER”) Fund, for which Congress appropriated approximately \$13.5 billion. *See id.* §§ 18003,
14 18001(b)(2). The CARES Act directs the Secretary of Education to make ESSER funding
15 available by grant directly to SEAs, again according to a formula based on the relative population
16 of students from low-income families. *Id.* § 18003(b). The Act then instructs SEAs to provide the
17 funding to LEAs through sub-grants. *Id.* § 18003(c). The Act specifies the uses that LEAs may
18
19
20

21
22 ⁴ An LEA is defined as “a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for
23 either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary schools or
24 secondary schools.” 34 C.F.R. § 303.23(a). In Washington, LEAs include school districts, charter schools, and
25 state-tribal education compact schools. Compl. ¶ 17. SEAs are defined as “the State board of education or other
agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary schools and secondary
schools.” 34 C.F.R. § 300.41. In Washington, the SEA is the Office of Superintendent for Public Instruction.
Compl. ¶ 39.

1 put ESSER funding towards, including “[c]oordination of preparedness and response efforts” and
2 “[p]roviding principals and others school leaders with the resources necessary to address the needs
3 of their individual schools.” *Id.* § 18003(d)(1)–(12). The statute explicitly provides that ESSER
4 funds may be used for “[a]ctivities to address the unique needs of low-income children or students,
5 children with disabilities, English learners, racial and ethnic minorities, students experiencing
6 homelessness, and foster care youth.” *Id.* § 18003(d)(4).

7
8 Critically for purposes of this dispute, Congress outlined how LEAs are to allocate GEER
9 and ESSER funding to non-public, *i.e.* private, schools. *See* Compl. ¶¶ 43–44. Specifically, Section
10 18005 provides that an LEA “receiving [GEER or ESSER] funds . . . shall provide equitable
11 services in the same manner as provided under section 1117 of the [Elementary and Secondary
12 Education Act (“ESEA”)] of 1965 to students and teachers in non-public schools, as determined
13 in consultation with representatives of non-public schools.” CARES Act § 18005(a) (emphasis
14 added).

15
16 Given the Act’s reference to Section 1117 of the ESEA, closer examination of that statute
17 is necessary. The ESEA, a central component of President Johnson’s “War on Poverty,” is the
18 statute by which Congress provides federal funding for primary and secondary education. Pub.
19 89–10, 79 Stat. 27, as amended, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 *et seq.* Title I of the ESEA created a grant
20 program designed to improve the academic achievement of disadvantaged children. *See id.* Under
21 Title I, public schools are eligible to receive funding for schoolwide programs if 40 percent or
22 more of the children in the LEA attendance area come from low-income families. *Id.* §
23 6314(a)(1)(A).

24
25 Section 1117 of Title I—specifically referenced in the CARES Act—outlines how LEAs

1 are to share Title I funding with eligible private schools, instructing LEAs to provide services to
2 private schools “on an equitable basis.” 20 U.S.C. § 6320(a)(1). More specifically, the formula
3 that determines how much Title I funding private schools are to receive is to be “equal to the
4 proportion of funds allocated to participating school attendance areas based on the number of
5 children from low-income families who attend private schools.” *Id.* § 6320(a)(4)(A)(i). This
6 formula has consistently been interpreted to mean that LEAs are to share their Title I funding in
7 proportion to the number of students from low-income families that reside in their attendance area
8 but who attend private school. This is the “poverty-based formula.”
9

10 The State of Washington submitted its application for CARES Act funding pursuant to the
11 GEER and ESSER Funds on April 27, 2020. Compl. ¶ 78; *see also* Compl., Ex. 6, Dkt. No. 1-9.
12 The State was awarded \$216.9 million in federal aid through the ESSER Fund and \$ 56.8 million
13 through the GEER Fund. Compl. ¶ 78; Pl.’s Mot. for Prelim. Inj. at 6.

14 **C. The Department’s CARES Act Guidance and Interim Final Rule**

15 On April 30, 2020, the Department published guidance purporting to interpret the provision
16 in the CARES Act pertaining to “Assistance to Non-Public Schools,” Section 18005. Compl. ¶¶
17 53–55; *see also* Compl., Ex. 1, Dkt. No. 1-4 (U.S. Dep’t of Educ., *Providing Equitable Services*
18 *to Students and Teachers in Non-Public Schools Under the CARES Act Programs* (Apr. 30, 2020)
19 (“Guidance”)).⁵ Claiming an ambiguity in the statute, the Guidance directed LEAs to provide
20 private schools with CARES Act funding according to “the proportional share based on the number
21
22

23
24
25 ⁵ Available at <https://web.archive.org/web/20200526004048/https://oese.ed.gov/files/2020/04/FAQs-Equitable-Services.pdf>.

1 of children enrolled in each non-public school whose students or teachers participate in the CARES
 2 Act programs compared to the number of students enrolled in public schools in the LEA. Compl.,
 3 Ex. 1 at 4; *see also id.* at 6. In other words, the Guidance adopted a formula for allocating ESF
 4 funding to private schools, based on the total number of enrolled students, regardless of their
 5 families' income levels. This is the "enrollment-based formula."

6 On July 1, 2020, despite objections from numerous constituencies, including the State, to
 7 the Guidance's adoption of the enrollment-based formula, the Department issued its Interim Final
 8 Rule.⁶ *See* CARES Act Programs; Equitable Services to Students and Teachers in Non-Public
 9 Schools, 85 Fed. Reg. 39,479 (codified at 34 C.F.R. § 76.665)⁷ ("Interim Final Rule"); *see also*
 10

11
 12
 13
 14 ⁶ The State was not alone in its concern that the enrollment-based formula would improperly divert funding from
 15 public to private schools. The Guidance garnered a bevy of reactions. *See* Compl. ¶¶ 56–58. For example,
 16 organizations such as the Council of Chief State School Officers ("CCSSO") and several Members of Congress
 17 wrote letters to the Department expressing their view that Section 18005's reference to Section 1117 was clear and
 18 required the use of the poverty-based formula. Compl., Ex. 2, Dkt. No. 1-5 (Letter from Carissa Moffat Miller,
 19 Exec. Dir., CCSSO, to Betsy DeVos, Sec'y, U.S. Dep't of Educ. (May 5, 2020),
 20 <https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/2020-05/DeVosESLetter050520.pdf>); Compl., Ex. 3, Dkt. No. 1-6 (Letter from
 21 Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Rosa L. DeLauro, and Patty Murray, U.S. Congress, to Betsy DeVos, Sec'y, U.S. Dep't of
 22 Educ. (May 20, 2020), [https://edlabor.house.gov/imo/media/doc/2020-5-
 23 20%20Ltr%20to%20DeVos%20re%20Equitable%20Services.pdf](https://edlabor.house.gov/imo/media/doc/2020-5-20%20Ltr%20to%20DeVos%20re%20Equitable%20Services.pdf)).

19 ⁷ The final text of the Rule reads

20 (c) Determining proportional share.

21 (1) To determine the proportional share of funds for equitable services to students and teachers in non-public
 22 elementary and secondary schools for each CARES Act program, an LEA must use one of the following
 23 measures. The LEA need not use the same measure for each CARES Act program.

24 (i) An LEA using all its funds under a CARES Act program to serve only students and teachers in public
 25 schools participating under Title I, Part A of the ESEA may calculate the proportional share in accordance
 with paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of this section or by using—

(A) The proportional share of Title I, Part A funds it calculated under section 1117(a)(4)(A) of the ESEA
 for the 2019–2020 school year; or

(B) The number of children, ages 5 through 17, who attend each non-public school in the LEA that will
 participate under a CARES Act program and are from low-income families compared to the total number
 of children, ages 5 through 17, who are from low-income families in both Title I schools and participating
 non-public elementary and secondary schools in the LEA.

1 Compl. ¶¶ 62–73.

2 Based again on a claimed ambiguity in Section 18005, the Department gave LEAs two
3 options. First, an LEA could choose to use either the enrollment-based or poverty-based formula,
4 but only if it agreed to limit CARES Act funding to schools that are qualified to participate in the
5 ESEA Title I grant program, and actually receive funding under that program. Alternatively, if
6 the LEA elected to use its CARES Act funding for all schools within its attendance area, regardless
7 of Title I participation, the Final Interim Rule required the LEA to use the enrollment-based
8 formula in apportioning funding to private schools. Interim Final Rule at 39,481; *see also* 34
9 C.F.R. § 76.665(c).

11 According to the State, this choice has the effect of increasing the proportion of CARES
12 Act funding going to its private schools, at the expense of its public schools. In Washington, as in
13 many states, not all Title I eligible schools choose to participate in Title I. The State avers that of
14 its 2,369 primary and secondary public schools, 1,594 are eligible to participate in Title I, but only
15 1,002 actually do. Compl. ¶ 74. Regardless of which option an LEA chooses, in a state like
16 Washington in which not all Title I eligible schools participate in that program, private schools
17 will receive a larger share of CARES Act funding than they would under a straight-forward
18 application of Section 1117's poverty-based formula.
19

20
21
22
23 (ii) Any other LEA must calculate the proportional share based on enrollment in participating non-public
24 elementary and secondary schools in the LEA compared to the total enrollment in both public and
25 participating non-public elementary and secondary schools in the LEA.

34 C.F.R. §76.665(c).

D. Procedural History

1
2 The State filed suit challenging the Department’s Interim Final Rule on July 20, 2020. *See*
3 Compl., Dkt. No. 1.⁸ The State’s Complaint advances five causes of action; three under the
4 Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. § 706, (Counts I to III),⁹ and one each under
5 Separation of Powers (Count IV) and the Spending Clause, U.S. CONST. art. I. § 8, cl. 1 (Count V).
6 Compl. ¶¶ 95–119. The Complaint seeks injunctive and declaratory relief, including a declaration
7 that the Interim Final Rule is contrary to law and invalid; and preliminary and permanent
8 injunctions prohibiting its implementation, compelling the issuance of the contested CARES
9 funding to the State without the restrictions imposed by the Interim Final Rule, and permitting the
10 State to use the apportionment formula provided by Section 1117 of the ESEA. *Id.* at 30, ¶¶ a–f.
11 On July 23, 2020, the State filed its Motion for Preliminary Injunction, asking the Court to
12 preliminarily enjoin Defendants from implementing or enforcing the Interim Final Rule. *See* Pl.’s
13 Mot. for Prelim. Inj., Dkt. No. 8. In its response to the motion, the Department denies that the
14 State is likely to succeed on the merits of its claims, or that the State will suffer irreparable harm
15 absent an injunction. Defs.’ Mem. in Opp’n to Pl.’s Mot. for Prelim. Inj., Dkt. No. 50. A hearing
16 on the motion took place, over video-teleconferencing, on August 10, 2020. Dkt. No. 52.
17
18
19
20

21
22 ⁸ The parties have advised the Court that this is one of four related cases challenging the same agency action. *See*
23 *Council of Parent Attorneys and Advocates, Inc. v. DeVos, et al.*, No. 20-cv-02310 (D. Md. Filed Aug. 10, 2020);
NAACP, et. al. v. Elizabeth DeVos, et. al., 20-cv-1996 (D.D.C. filed July 22, 2020); *State of Michigan, et. al. v.*
Betsy DeVos, et. al., No. 20-cv-4478 (N.D. Cal. filed July 7, 2020).

24
25 ⁹ In Count III of its Complaint, the State alleges that the Department’s promulgation of the Interim Final Rule runs
contrary to the APA’s procedural requirements because it was issued without notice and comment or sufficient
justification for foregoing notice and comment. Compl. ¶¶ 103–06. The State has not, however, raised this claim in
this Motion.

III. LEGAL STANDARD

1
2 A preliminary injunction is an extraordinary remedy. *Munaf v. Geren*, 553 U.S. 674, 689–
3 90 (2008). To demonstrate entitlement to a preliminary injunction, the movant bears the burden
4 of establishing: (1) likelihood of success on the merits; (2) likelihood of suffering irreparable harm
5 in the absence of a preliminary relief; (3) that the balance of equities tips in its favor; and (4) that
6 an injunction is in the public interest. *See E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Barr*, 964 F.3d 832, 844–
7 45 (9th Cir. 2020) (citing *Am. Trucking Ass’ns, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 559 F.3d 1046, 1052
8 (9th Cir. 2009)); *see also Pimentel-Estrada v. Barr*, No. 20-cv-495, 2020 WL 2092430, at *10
9 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 28, 2020). “When the government is a party, the[] last two factors merge.” *E.*
10 *Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, 964 F.3d at 845 (quoting *Drakes Bay Oyster Co. v. Jewell*, 747 F.3d
11 1073, 1092 (9th Cir. 2014)).

13 In weighing whether a preliminary injunction is appropriate, courts in this Circuit may use
14 a “sliding scale” approach, in which “the elements of the preliminary injunction test are balanced,
15 so that a stronger showing of one element may offset a weaker showing of another.” *Alliance for*
16 *the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1131–35 (9th Cir. 2011); *see also Al Otro Lado v.*
17 *Wolf*, 952 F.3d 999, 1007 (9th Cir. 2020); *Kater v. Churchill Downs Inc.*, 423 F. Supp. 3d 1055,
18 1061 (W.D. Wash. 2019).

IV. DISCUSSION

A. Likelihood of Success on the Merits

21 “Likelihood of success on the merits is a threshold inquiry and the most important factor.”
22 *Innovation Law Lab v. Wolf*, 951 F.3d 1073, 1080 (9th Cir. 2020). The State bears the burden of
23 showing that it is likely to succeed on the merits of its claims. *See E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant*,
24
25

1 964 F.3d at 845.

2 *I. Administrative Procedure Act Claims (Counts I and II)*

3 The State first challenges the Department’s actions under the APA, which broadly “sets
4 forth the procedures by which federal agencies are accountable to the public and their actions
5 subject to review by the courts.” *Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. Regents of the Univ. of California*,
6 140 S. Ct. 1891, 1905 (2020) (quoting *Franklin v. Massachusetts*, 505 U.S. 788, 796 (1992)).
7 Under the APA, agencies must “engage in reasoned decisionmaking,” and the Court is empowered
8 to set aside any action which runs afoul of the APA’s requirements. *Id.* (citations omitted). When
9 reviewing a claim under the APA, the Court is limited to reviewing “the grounds that the agency
10 invoked when it took the action.” *Id.* at 1907 (quoting *Michigan v. EPA*, 576 U.S. 743, 758
11 (2015)). 5 U.S.C. § 706 lays out the familiar scope of judicial review under the APA and instructs,
12 in its relevant parts, that the Court “shall . . . hold unlawful and set aside agency action . . . found
13 to be . . . (A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law;
14 [or] . . . (C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right.”
15 5 U.S.C. § 706(2). In its Motion, the State challenges the Interim Final Rule on both grounds,
16 which the Court examines in turn.

17
18
19 *a. Count I- The Agency’s Action is in Excess of Statutory Authority and Not in*
20 *Accordance with Law*

21 The State argues that the Department’s Interim Final Rule is in excess of statutory authority
22 and not in accordance with law. Compl. ¶¶ 95–98; Pl.’s Mot. for Prelim. Inj. at 8–11; Pl.’s Reply
23 in Supp. of Mot. for Prelim. Inj., Dkt. No. 51 at 2–5. Specifically, the State claims that Congress
24 did not delegate to the Department the authority to promulgate rules under Section 18005 of the
25 CARES Act. Compl. ¶ 97. Further, the State argues that Section 18005 is not ambiguous, and

1 that the Department therefore has no implicit rulemaking authority. Pl.’s Mot. for Prelim. Inj. at
2 8. The Department, in response, argues that it had general rulemaking authority to promulgate the
3 Interim Final Rule and that Section 18005 is ambiguous and, therefore, it had implicit authority to
4 interpret the statute by way of the Rule. Defs.’ Mem. in Opp’n to Pl.’s Mot. for Prelim. Inj. at 7–
5 9.

6 *i. There is No Delegation of Rulemaking Authority to the Department*

7 The Department does not, and indeed cannot, argue that Congress explicitly delegated it
8 rulemaking authority over the CARES Act, because such authority is simply absent from its text.
9 Instead, the Department argues that its authority to promulgate the Interim Final Rule is grounded
10 in the Secretary’s general rulemaking authority in 20 U.S.C. § 1221e-3 and 20 U.S.C. § 3474. *See*
11 Interim Final Rule at 39,481. Again, however, nothing in either the text or construction of Section
12 18005 of the CARES Act evidences an intent to import general rulemaking authority. *See*
13 *Washington*, 2020 WL 3125916, at *9 (“Nothing in the CARES Act grants [the Department]
14 authority to use [its] general rulemaking power . . . to impose conditions on the general allocations
15 made in the CARES Act.”). As the State observes, other sections of the CARES Act, in contrast,
16 affirmatively grant the implementing agencies such authority. *See, .e.g.*, CARES Act §§ 1114,
17 3513(f), 12003(c). Congress therefore knew how to delegate such authority but declined to do so
18 in Section 18005. The Court therefore finds that the Department did not have explicit authority—
19 either specific or general—to promulgate rules under this section of the CARES Act.
20
21

22 *ii. The Statute is Not Ambiguous*

23 The Department further argues that it was permitted to engage in rulemaking because
24 Section 18005 is ambiguous, and “ambiguities in statutes within an agency’s jurisdiction to
25

1 administer are delegations of authority to the agency to fill the statutory gap in a reasonable
2 fashion.” *Nat’l Cable & Telecommunications Ass’n v. Brand X Internet Servs.*, 545 U.S. 967, 980,
3 (2005).

4 To determine if a statute is ambiguous, the Court “must exhaust all the ‘traditional tools’
5 of construction.” *Kisor v. Wilkie*, 139 S. Ct. 2400, 2415 (2019) (citing *Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v.*
6 *Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837, 843 n.9 (1984)). This involves “‘carefully
7 consider[ing]’ the text, structure, history, and purpose of a regulation, in all the ways [the Court]
8 would if it had no agency to fall back on.” *Id.* (quoting *Pauley v. BethEnergy Mines, Inc.*, 501
9 U.S. 680, 707 (1991) (Scalia, J., dissenting)). Based on such a review, a statute is only ambiguous
10 if it is “susceptible to more than one reasonable interpretation.” *Alaska Wilderness League v. U.S.*
11 *E.P.A.*, 727 F.3d 934, 938 (9th Cir. 2013).

13 Here, the statute could hardly be less ambiguous. In Section 18005, Congress
14 unequivocally and plainly instructed the Department to allocate GEER and ESSER funding “in
15 the same manner as provided under section 1117 of the ESEA of 1965 to students and teachers in
16 non-public schools.” This directive, referring to a simple, familiar, and time-tested formula,
17 includes all the hallmarks of inflexibility, such as an explicit command in the use of “shall” and
18 an overt statutory cross-reference. Moreover, historically speaking, Congress’s reference to
19 Section 1117 of the ESEA cannot be construed as casual or incidental; it is an explicit citation to
20 a formula with which LEAs are well acquainted, grounded as it is in one of the nation’s flagship
21 educational programs, providing funding for some of the nation’s neediest students.
22

23 The Guidance and Interim Final Rule outline the Department’s claims to ambiguity, which
24 the Department repeats in response to the State’s Motion. These purported justifications do not
25

1 alter the Court’s conclusion. First, the Interim Final Rule claims ambiguity arising from an alleged
2 tension between the CARES Act’s goal of helping all students regardless of economic
3 circumstances, on the one hand, and Section 1117’s focus on economically disadvantaged students,
4 on the other. *See, e.g.*, Interim Final Rule at 39,479 (“[t]he CARES Act is a special appropriation
5 to combat the effects of . . . COVID-19. . . . Nothing in the CARES Act suggests Congress intended
6 to differentiate between students based upon the public or non-public nature of their school with
7 respect to eligibility for relief.”).

8
9 This argument is unavailing. Distribution of funds under the poverty-based formula will
10 not result in private schools receiving no ESF funding; only in receiving funding in a smaller
11 proportion than they would under the Department-created formula. This reflects Congress’s stated
12 intent in the CARES Act to distribute education funding to all, but to concentrate on those in direst
13 need. As the CARES Act explicitly provides, one of the central uses for the ESSER Fund is to
14 address “the unique needs of low-income children or students” and other disadvantaged
15 communities. CARES Act § 18003(d)(4). Furthermore, as the State notes, private schools have
16 access to other sources of relief provided by Congress to which public schools do not, such as
17 Payback Protection Program loans and benefits under the Families First Coronavirus Response
18 Act. *See* Compl. ¶ 87. There is no tension between the two statutes, and certainly not one that
19 creates ambiguity sufficient to sanction rulemaking.
20

21 The Court also rejects the Interim Final Rule’s attempt to create ambiguity from the
22 statute’s text. First, the Rule argues that in prescribing how funding should be allocated, “Congress
23 did not need to add the words ‘in the same manner’ if it simply intended to incorporate ‘[S]ection
24 1117 of the ESEA of 1965’ by reference in the CARES Act. The unqualified phrase ‘as provided
25

1 in' alone would have been sufficient." Interim Final Rule at 39,481.

2 The Department's argument that an ambiguity arises from the use of a slightly longer
3 phrase "in the same manner as provided in" rather than the more succinct "as provided in" is,
4 generously put, a stretch; its adoption would render all but the most laconic Congressional
5 directives ambiguous. Section 18005 contains a clear reference to the poverty-based formula
6 found in Section 1117, which ends the Court's inquiry. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 6320(a)(4)(A)(i); *see Judd*
7 *v. Weinstein*, No. 19-55499, 2020 WL 4343738, at *3 (9th Cir. July 29, 2020) ("[u]nless the statute
8 clearly expresses otherwise, we interpret statutory terms in accordance with their ordinary
9 meaning"). The wording choice here simply does not create an ambiguity, or otherwise evidence
10 Congressional intent to open up the funding process to agency rulemaking. *See Connecticut Nat.*
11 *Bank v. Germain*, 503 U.S. 249, 253–54 (1992) ("canons of construction are no more than rules of
12 thumb that help courts determine the meaning of legislation, and in interpreting a statute a court
13 should always turn first to one, cardinal canon before all others. We have stated time and again
14 that courts must presume that a legislature says in a statute what it means and means in a statute
15 what it says there.").

16
17
18 Second, the Interim Final Rule identifies ambiguity arising from Congress's inclusion of
19 consultation and public control of funds provisions in Section 18005 notwithstanding the fact that
20 Section 1117 already contains similar provisions. Interim Final Rule at 39,481; *compare* CARES
21 Act § 18005(a) ("as determined in consultation with representatives of non-public schools"), §
22 18005(b) (Public Control of Funds) *with* 20 U.S.C. § 6320(a)(1)(A), § 6320(b) (consultation
23 provisions), § 6320(d) (Public Control of Funds). Given the purportedly duplicative provisions,
24 according to the Department, Section 18005's broad reference to Section 1117, if taken literally,
25

1 would create redundancies requiring resolution.

2 This argument also fails. Section 18005's reference to Section 1117 does not compel, as
3 the Department argues, the importation of all of Section 1117's requirements into Section 18005.
4 A straightforward reading of Section 18005's reference to Section 1117 is that "in the same manner
5 as provided in" incorporates only Section 1117's poverty-based formula; not that it requires
6 wholesale import of all of Section 1117. The Department's convoluted reading essentially creates
7 an ambiguity to justify resolving it, thereby thwarting Congress's obvious intent. This the APA
8 does not allow. *See In re Pangang Grp. Co., LTD.*, 901 F.3d 1046, 1056 (9th Cir. 2018) ("we
9 disfavor efforts to use canons of construction to introduce ambiguity into straightforward text").
10 Thus, Congress's inclusion of separate consultation and public control of funds provisions in both
11 statutes can be more easily interpreted as purposeful. Congress instructed SEAs and LEAs
12 examining Section 18005's consultation and public control of funds provisions need look no
13 further than their familiar mirrors in Section 1117 to determine how such provisions are intended
14 to operate.
15

16 Finally, the Department relies heavily on Section 18005's statement that "[a] local
17 educational agency receiving funds under sections 18002 or 18003 of this title shall provide
18 equitable services." CARES Act § 18005(a). From use of the word "equitable," the Department
19 apparently discerns a congressional intent that funding for private schools should be "equal" or
20 close thereto. *See, e.g.*, Defs.' Mem. in Opp'n to Pl.'s Mot. for Prelim. Inj. at 1 ("Congress
21 mandated that these services be provided *equitably*—for the benefit of both public and non-public
22 students") (emphasis in original). First, it should be apparent that "equitable" does not mean the
23
24
25

1 same thing as “equal.” *Compare Equitable, Dictionary.com* (last visited Aug. 21, 2020)¹⁰
2 (“characterized by equity or fairness; just and right; fair; reasonable”) *with Equal, Dictionary.com*
3 (last visited Aug. 21, 2020)¹¹ (“as great as; the same as”). Funding can be equitable even if it is
4 not equal, which is certainly the case when Congress chooses to concentrate funding on those in
5 the most need. Further, the term “equitable” in Section 18005 modifies “services,” and does not
6 refer, as the Department would have it, to how funds should be apportioned. Thus, the context and
7 plain meaning of this term show that Congress meant “equitable services” to refer to the
8 apportioned funds themselves, *i.e.* the support LEAs must provide private schools, not to the
9 manner of apportioning that funding. For that, the Court repeats, Congress referred the LEAs to
10 Section 1117.
11

12 Based on the foregoing, the Court concludes that Congress neither explicitly, nor implicitly
13 by ambiguity, granted the Department the authority to promulgate the Interim Final Rule. The
14 Court finds that the Rule’s promulgation was in excess of statutory authority and not in accordance
15 with law, and that the State, therefore, is likely to succeed on the merits of this claim. *See* 5 U.S.C.
16 § 706(2)(A) and (C).
17

18 *b. Count II- Arbitrary and Capricious Agency Action*

19 The State also claims that the Interim Final Rule runs contrary to 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A) of
20 the APA because it is arbitrary and capricious. Compl. ¶¶ 99–102. As the Court has already
21 concluded that the Department did not have the authority to promulgate the Interim Final Rule in
22

23
24 ¹⁰ Available at <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/equitable?s=t>.

25 ¹¹ Available at <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/equal>.

1 the first instance, however, it need not visit this claim. *See Oakley*, 2020 WL 3268661, at *12
2 (declining to rule on arbitrary and capriciousness); *Washington*, 2020 WL 3125916, at *11 (same).

3 2. *Constitutional Claims (Counts IV and V)*

4 The State claims the Interim Final Rule runs afoul of two Constitutional principles, (1)
5 Separation of Powers (Count IV) and (2) the Spending Clause (Count V). Compl. ¶¶ 107–19.

6 Again, however, given the conclusion that the Department lacked authority to promulgate
7 the Rule, the Court declines to reach this question. It is well-established that courts should not
8 reach a “constitutional question if there is some other ground upon which to dispose of the case.”
9 *Nw. Austin Mun. Util. Dist. No. One v. Holder*, 557 U.S. 193, 205 (2009) (internal quotation and
10 citation omitted); *see also State v. Trump*, 441 F. Supp. 3d 1101, 1125 (W.D. Wash. 2020). As
11 the Court has already determined that the State is likely to succeed on its APA claim, it need not
12 reach the State’s constitutional claims. *See Washington*, 2020 WL 3125916, at *11.

14 **B. Irreparable Harm**

15 It is the burden of a plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction to demonstrate that
16 irreparable harm is likely in the absence of an injunction. *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*,
17 555 U.S. 7, 22 (2008) (listing cases); *see also E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, 964 F.3d at 854.
18 Irreparable harm is traditionally defined as “harm for which there is no adequate legal remedy,
19 such as an award of damages.” *Arizona Dream Act Coal. v. Brewer*, 757 F.3d 1053, 1068 (9th
20 Cir. 2014); *see also E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump*, 950 F.3d 1242, 1280 (9th Cir. 2020)
21 (“[E]conomic harm is not generally considered irreparable. But where parties cannot typically
22 recover monetary damages flowing from their injury—as is often the case in APA cases—
23 economic harm can be considered irreparable.”).

1 The State's claims to irreparable harm are myriad, and include interference with the
2 obligation enshrined in its Constitution to provide essential education to its children. *See* Pl.'s
3 Mot. for Prelim. Inj. at 19–23. The heart of the State's argument, however, is that Washington's
4 public schools, and in particular the State's poorest public school students, are irreparably harmed
5 by the Interim Final Rule's diversion of CARES Act funding to private schools. The Court agrees
6 that this potential harm is great, and irreparable.

7 The nature of this pandemic is that its consequences have fallen most heavily on the
8 nation's most vulnerable populations, including its neediest students. The funding provided
9 throughout the CARES Act, and in particular to schools, is desperately and urgently needed to
10 provide some measure of relief from the pandemic's harms, many of which cannot be undone.
11 Congress, in its wisdom and without equivocation, determined that funding to schools should be
12 distributed according to the same formula found in Section 1117 of the ESEA; to allow otherwise
13 under the guise of a manufactured ambiguity runs counter to the APA and to Congressional intent.

14 The Department's claim that the State faces only an economic injury, which ordinarily does
15 not qualify as irreparable harm, is remarkably callous, and blind to the realities of this
16 extraordinary pandemic and the very purpose of the CARES Act: to provide emergency relief
17 where it is most needed. The school year is rapidly approaching; every day that goes by in which
18 educators are denied access to these funds creates unnecessary risk, to both the health and
19 education of Washington's students. In most of the State's school districts, the percentage of low-
20 income families is significantly higher in public schools than in private schools. Compl. ¶ 55. As
21 a consequence, distribution of CARES Act funding according to an enrollment-based formula
22 ineluctably advantages private schools at the expense of public schools. Forcing the State to divert
23
24
25

1 funds from public schools ignores the extraordinary circumstances facing the State and its most
2 disadvantaged students.

3 The Court therefore concludes that not only are the State's interests harmed by the Interim
4 Final Rule's transgression of the APA; that harm is, with potentially tragic consequences in this
5 case, irreparable. *See Oakley*, 2020 WL 3268661, at *16–17 (finding irreparable injury);
6 *Washington*, 2020 WL 3125916, at *11 (same).

7 **C. Balance of Equities and Public Interest**

8 As a final consideration, “courts must balance the competing claims of injury and must
9 consider the effect on each party of the granting or withholding of the requested relief.” *Winter*,
10 555 U.S. at 24 (quotation marks and citation omitted).

11 The State argues that the balance of equities and the public interest tilts in its favor because
12 such interests disfavor the perpetuation of an unlawful agency action. Pl.'s Mot. for Prelim. Inj.
13 at 23–24; Pl.'s Reply in Supp. of Mot. for Prelim. Inj. at 8. Further, the State argues, the public
14 interest favors permitting the State to expend the emergency funds Congress allocated to serve its
15 most vulnerable students. The Department replies that the balance of equities disfavors an
16 injunction and that the State highlights only the harm to public schools and discounts the harm to
17 private schools. Defs.' Mem. in Opp'n to Pl.'s Mot. for Prelim. Inj. at 14–15.

18 The Court concludes that the balance of equities favors the issuance of a preliminary
19 injunction. “There is generally no public interest in the perpetuation of unlawful agency action.
20 To the contrary, there is a substantial public interest in having governmental agencies abide by the
21 federal laws that govern their existence and operations.” *League of Women Voters of United States*
22 *v. Newby*, 838 F.3d 1, 12 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Conversely,
23
24
25

1 public interest tips strongly in favor of permitting the State to apportion its emergency funding
2 according to Congress's express intention, "in the same manner as" Section 1117 of the ESEA.
3 See *Oakley*, 2020 WL 3268661, at *17–18 (finding the balance of equities favored the State);
4 *Washington*, 2020 WL 3125916, at *12 (same).

5
6 **V. CONCLUSION**

7 For the foregoing reasons, the Court hereby GRANTS the State's Motion for Preliminary
8 Injunction. Dkt. No. 8. The Court hereby ORDERS as follows

- 9 1) The United States Department of Education, Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos, and
10 their officers, agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and any person in active concert or
11 participation with them, are hereby preliminarily enjoined from implementing or enforcing
12 the provisions in the Guidance of April 30, 2020 or the Interim Final Rule issued July 1,
13 2020.
14 2) No bond shall be required pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(c).

15
16
17 DATED this 21st day of August, 2020.

18
19
20 

21

BARBARA J. ROTHSTEIN
22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
23
24
25