IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE	
ASSISTANCE PROJECT, et al.	
Plaintiffs-Appellees,	
V.	17-2231 (L)
DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States, et al.	
Defendants-Appellants. IRANIAN ALLIANCES ACROSS BORDERS, et al.	
Plaintiffs-Appellees,	
V.	17-2232
DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States, et al.	
Defendants-Appellants. EBLAL ZAKZOK, et al.	
Plaintiffs-Appellees,	
V.	17-2233
DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States, et al.	17 2233
Defendants-Appellants.	

IAAB AND ZAKZOK PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO ESTABLISH BRIEFING SCHEDULE REGARDING MOTION FOR STAY PENDING APPEAL

In moving to expedite briefing on its motion for a stay pending appeal, the Government proposes a briefing schedule that gives Plaintiffs two business days to respond to a 25-page stay motion. The Government has offered no good reason for providing Plaintiffs so little time to respond.

On March 22, 2017, the Government filed a motion to expedite its appeal of the district court's order enjoining enforcement of the President's second travel ban (Executive Order No. 13,780). *See* Case No. 17-1351, Dkt. No. 14. In addition to requesting an expedited briefing schedule for the appeal, the Government also requested an expedited briefing schedule for its forthcoming motion for a stay pending appeal. In response to that motion, the Court entered an expedited brief-ing schedule under which Plaintiffs had 7 days to file an opposition, and the government had 5 days for a reply. *Id.* Dkt. No. 25.

Plaintiffs have proposed that the parties proceed on a similar schedule for briefing the motion for a stay pending appeal of the district court's order enjoining enforcement of the President's third travel ban (82 Fed. Reg. 45,161 (Sept. 27, 2017)). Under that schedule, Plaintiffs' opposition would be due on October 27, 2017, and the Government's reply would be due on October 30, 2017. This sched-

1

ule would result in the motion being fully briefed in the 10 days that Plaintiffs would ordinarily have to file their opposition.

The Government objects to following the schedule previously set by the Court, arguing that it fails to account for the gravity of the issues presented and the national security concerns. *See* Case No. 2232, ECF No. 6, at 3. But the Government has not even attempted to show why there is more urgency now than there was in March. The Government's actions prove that, if anything, there is less urgency now. The Government took more than six months to produce the reports on which the Proclamation was based. After receiving the final report on September 15, 2017, the President waited 9 days to issue the Proclamation on September 24, 2017. *See* 82 Fed. Reg. 45,161, 45,163. By its terms, the Proclamation would not take effect until October 18—24 days after it was issued. *Id.* at 45,171. And after the district court entered a preliminary injunction, the Government waited more than two days to file a simple notice of appeal.

Given the President's decision to delay implementation of the Proclamation by nearly a month, the Government cannot credibly argue that allowing Plaintiffs an extra three days to file an opposition would pose a national security risk.

Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter the following scheduling order:

Plaintiffs' Opposition: Due October 27, 2017

2

Government's Reply: Due October 30, 2017

Dated: October 21, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

Johnathan Smith Sirine Shebaya MUSLIM ADVOCATES P.O. Box 66408 Washington, D.C. 20035 Tel: (202) 897-2622 Fax: (415) 765-1774 johnathan@muslimadvocates.org sirine@muslimadvocates.org

Richard B. Katskee Eric Rothschild Andrew L. Nellis^ AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPA-RATION OF CHURCH AND STATE 1310 L St. NW, Ste. 200 Washington, D.C. 2005 Tel: (202) 466-3234 Fax: (202) 466-3234 Fax: (202) 466-3353 katskee@au.org rothschild@au.org nellis@au.org

Charles E. Davidow Robert A. Atkins† Liza Velazquez† Andrew J. Ehrlich† Steven C. Herzog† PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP 1285 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10019-6064 (212) 373-3000 Tel.: (212) 373-3000 Fax: (212) 757-3990 ratkins@paulweiss.com s/ Mark W. Mosier_ Mark H. Lynch Mark W. Mosier Herbert L. Fenster José E. Arvelo John W. Sorrenti Karun Tilak **COVINGTON & BURLING LLP** One City Center 850 10th Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20001 Tel: (202) 662-6000 Fax: (202) 662-6302 mlynch@cov.com mmosier@cov.com hfenster@cov.com jarvelo@cov.com jsorrenti@cov.com ktilak@cov.com

Rebecca G. Van Tassell COVINGTON & BURLING LLP 1999 Avenue of the Stars Los Angeles, California 90067 Tel: (424) 332 4800 Fax: (424) 332-4749 RVanTassell@cov.com

Lena F. Masri Gadeir Abbas* Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) 453 New Jersey Avenue SE Washington, D.C. 20003 Tel.: (202) 488-8787 Fax: (202) 488-0833 <u>lfmasri@cair.com</u> gabbas@cair.com lvelazquez@paulweiss.com aehrlich@paulweiss.com sherzog@paulweiss.com

Faiza Patel Michael Price Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law 120 Broadway, Suite 1750 New York, NY 10271 Tel.: (646) 292-8335 Fax: (212) 463-7308 <u>faiza.patel@nyu.com</u> <u>michael.price@nyu.com</u> Jethro Eisenstein[†] Profeta & Eisenstein 45 Broadway, Suite 2200 New York, New York 10006 Tel.: (212) 577-6500 Fax: (212) 577-6702 jethro19@gmail.com

^ Admitted only in New York; supervised by Richard B. Katskee, a member of the D.C. Bar.

†Application for admission forthcoming.

*Admitted in VA; not in DC – practice limited to federal matters.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that this motion complies with the type-face requirements of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(a)(5) and the type-volume limitations of Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(2)(A). This motion contains 469 words, excluding the parts of the motion excluded by Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure 27(d)(2) and 32(f).

> <u>s/ Mark W. Mosier</u> Mark W. Mosier

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 21st day of October, 2017, I filed the foregoing motion by use of the Fourth Circuit's CM/ECF system. Participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users, and service will be accomplished by the appellate CM/ECF system.

<u>s/ Mark W. Mosier</u> Mark W. Mosier