

1 CHAD A. READLER
Acting Assistant Attorney General

2 MCGREGOR SCOTT
3 United States Attorney

4 AUGUST FLENTJE
5 Special Counsel

6 WILLIAM C. PEACHEY
7 Director

8 EREZ REUVENI
9 Assistant Director

10 DAVID SHELEDY
Civil Chief, Assistant United States Attorney

11 LAUREN C. BINGHAM

12 JOSEPH A. DARROW

13 JOSHUA S. PRESS

14 FRANCESCA GENOVA

Trial Attorneys

15 United States Department of Justice

16 Civil Division

17 Office of Immigration Litigation

District Court Section

18 P.O. Box 868, Ben Franklin Station

Washington, DC 20044

19 Telephone: (202) 305-1062

Facsimile: (202) 305-7000

20 Email: Francesca.M.Genova@usdoj.gov

21 *Attorneys for the United States of America*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

22 **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

23 Plaintiff,

24 v.

25 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,**

26 Defendants.

NO. 2:18-CV-00490-JAM-KJN

**PLAINTIFF'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF
PERMISSIVE INTERVENTION OF COUNTY
OF ORANGE**

Judge: Hon. John A. Mendez

1 Plaintiff the United States of America supports County of Orange and Sandra Hutchens,
2 Sheriff-Coroner for the County of Orange’s (“Orange County”) permissive intervention in this matter
3 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b). Permissive intervention is allowed in the interest of
4 efficiency when a party “has a claim or defense that shares with the main action a common question of
5 law or fact.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1)(B).
6

7 The claims of Orange County share common legal and factual issues with those brought by the
8 United States, and the United States supports the permissive intervention of Orange County. Orange
9 County presents four unique interests in this case that we think warrant permissive intervention.

10 First, SB 54 and AB 103 uniquely impact and direct the actions of local government agencies
11 like Orange County. *See* Cal. Gov’t Code § 7282(d) (“law enforcement official” subject to SB 54
12 cooperation restrictions means “any local agency or officer of a local agency authorized to enforce
13 criminal statute . . . or to operate jails or to maintain custody of individuals in jails”); § 7282(e) (“local
14 agency” subject to SB 54 cooperation restrictions means “any city, county, city and county, special
15 district, or other political subdivision of the state”); 7284.4(a) (“California law enforcement agency”
16 barred from cooperation “means a state or local law enforcement agency” but “does not include the
17 Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation”); § 12532 (AB 103 inspection regime applies to
18 “county, local, or private locked detention facilities”). Indeed, AB 103 purports to regulate Orange
19 County’s contractual relationships with the federal government. *Id.* § 12532; *see* Proposed Complaint,
20 ECF 59-2, ¶ 42. Given that Orange County is the direct subject of these laws, we think permissive
21 intervention is warranted.
22
23
24

25 Second, Orange County also has a unique perspective on the impact of SB 54 on the release of
26 aliens with criminal convictions to the public and into a local community in California. Given that
27 California claims that public safety is served by SB 54, it makes sense to also hear Orange County’s
28

1 perspective.

2 Third, Orange County has identified a valid concern with losing federal grant funds based on
3 being required to apply SB 54. *See* Proposed Complaint, ECF 59-2, ¶¶ 9-10; Mot. to Intervene of
4 County of Orange, ECF 59, at 1-2. A similar concern has formed the basis for other litigation around
5 the country and in the State.

6 Fourth, Orange County maintains that the Attorney General of California has threatened it with
7 civil or criminal liability if it cooperates with federal immigration enforcement. Mot. to Intervene, ECF
8 59, at 11.

9 In sum, Orange County has a unique interest in this case as the laws' direct subject, which
10 warrants permissive intervention. As another governmental unit with its own set of concerns, it is in a
11 unique position from both parties and the other group of proposed intervenors. Given that permissive
12 intervention is appropriate, we do not think it is necessary to address intervention as of right.

13 For the foregoing reasons, the United States supports Orange County's permissive intervention
14 in this matter.

1 DATED: May 22, 2018

CHAD A. READLER
Acting Assistant Attorney General

2 MCGREGOR SCOTT
3 United States Attorney

4 AUGUST FLENTJE
5 Special Counsel

6 WILLIAM C. PEACHEY
7 Director

8 EREZ REUVENI
9 Assistant Director

10 DAVID SHELLDY
11 Civil Chief, Asst. United States Attorney

12 LAUREN C. BINGHAM
13 JOSEPH A. DARROW
14 JOSHUA S. PRESS
15 FRANCESCA GENOVA

16 */s/ Francesca Genova*
17 FRANCESCA GENOVA
18 Trial Attorneys
19 United States Department of Justice
20 Civil Division
21 Office of Immigration Litigation
22 District Court Section
23 P.O. Box 868, Ben Franklin Station
24 Washington, DC 20044
25 Phone: (202) 305-1062
26 Francesca.M.Genova@usdoj.gov

27 *Attorneys for the United States of America*
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

I hereby certify that on May 22, 2018, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the Clerk’s Office using the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California’s Electronic Document Filing System (ECF), which will serve a copy of this document upon all counsel of record.

By: /s/ Francesca Genova
FRANCESCA GENOVA
Trial Attorney
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division