

1 Vladimir F. Kozina, SBN 95422
 2 MAYALL HURLEY, P.C.
 2453 Grand Canal Blvd.
 3 Stockton, CA 95207
 Tel. (209) 477-3833
 4 Email: vkozina@mayallaw.com

5 Jay Alan Sekulow*
 6 Stuart J. Roth*
 Jordan Sekulow*
 7 AMERICAN CENTER FOR LAW AND JUSTICE
 201 Maryland Avenue, NE
 8 Washington, DC 20002
 Tel. (202) 546-8890
 9

10 Edward L. White III*
 Erik M. Zimmerman*
 11 Geoffrey R. Surtees*
 AMERICAN CENTER FOR LAW AND JUSTICE
 12 3001 Plymouth Rd., Ste. 203
 Ann Arbor, MI 48105
 13 Tel. (734) 680-8007

14 * Not admitted in this jurisdiction

15 *Counsel for Amicus Curiae ACLJ*

16
 17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

18		
19	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Case No. 2:18-cv-490-JAM-KJN
)
20	Plaintiff,) Unopposed Motion by the American
) Center for Law and Justice for Leave
21	vs.) to File <i>Amicus Curiae</i> Brief Supporting
) Plaintiff's Motion for a Preliminary
22	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, <i>et al.</i> ,) Injunction and Incorporated
) Memorandum of Law
23	Defendants.)
) Honorable John A. Mendez
24)
25)
26)
27)
28)

1 The American Center for Law and Justice (“ACLJ”) timely moves this Court for leave to
2 file the attached *amicus curiae* brief in support of Plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction.^{1/}
3 Dkt. Entry 17 (setting March 26, 2018, as the due date for the filing of *amicus* briefs supporting
4 Plaintiff’s preliminary injunction motion). No party opposes the granting of this motion. A
5 proposed order has been submitted with this motion.

6 District courts have broad discretion regarding the appointment of an *amicus curiae*.
7 *Hoptowit v. Ray*, 682 F.2d 1237, 1260 (9th Cir. 1982). The case before this Court implicates issues
8 of general public interest. The proper resolution of this case is a matter of utmost concern to the
9 ACLJ because of its impact on the integrity of the constitutional process and the safety of
10 American citizens, many of whom are ACLJ members and supporters.

12 The ACLJ is an organization dedicated to the defense of constitutional liberties secured by
13 law. Counsel for the ACLJ have presented oral argument, represented parties, and submitted
14 *amicus curiae* briefs before the Supreme Court of the United States and other courts around the
15 country in cases involving issues of constitutional law and immigration law. *See, e.g., Trump v.*
16 *Hawaii*, No. 16-1540, 2017 U.S. LEXIS 4322 (July 19, 2017); *Trump v. Int’l Refugee Assistance*
17 *Project*, 137 S. Ct. 2080 (2017); *United States v. Texas*, 136 S. Ct. 2271 (2016); *Pleasant Grove*
18 *City v. Sumnum*, 555 U.S. 460 (2009); *FEC v. Wis. Right to Life*, 551 U.S. 449 (2007); *McConnell*
19 *v. FEC*, 540 U.S. 93 (2003); *Lamb’s Chapel v. Ctr. Moriches Union Free Sch. Dist.*, 508 U.S. 384
20 (1993); *Bd. of Educ. v. Mergens*, 496 U.S. 226 (1990); *Washington v. Trump*, 847 F.3d 1151 (9th
21 Cir. 2017); *Int’l Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump*, 857 F.3d 554 (4th Cir. 2017).
22
23
24

25
26 ^{1/} The ACLJ is a non-profit organization. It has no parent corporation and no publicly held
27 corporation owns any portion of it.

1 The ACLJ has long advocated for a robust protection of national and border security and
2 has fought to ensure government compliance with the Constitution. The attached *amicus* brief is
3 supported by more than 65,000 individuals who have joined the ACLJ's committee opposed to
4 state actions that violate the Constitution.

5 The issues presented in this case involve matters of constitutional and immigration law.
6 The ACLJ believes it can offer this Court information and perspective that will assist it in deciding
7 the pending preliminary injunction motion. As set forth more fully in the attached *amicus* brief, the
8 ACLJ will provide this Court with insight into how AB 450 violates the Supremacy Clause. AB
9 450 is an obstacle to the enforcement of federal immigration law. AB 450 prohibits employers
10 from consenting to searches and inspections by federal immigration enforcement agents and, as
11 such, places warrant and subpoena requirements on federal agents that are contrary to federal law;
12 federal law permits voluntary consent. AB 450 interferes with an immigration agent's ability to
13 locate illegal aliens because it requires employers to give their employees notice of any upcoming
14 inspection, which will cause any employee who is illegally in this country the opportunity to flee
15 before the inspection. AB 450 interferes with federal law because it prevents employers from re-
16 verifying their employee records to determine whether an employee is an alien who may not be
17 legally employed in this country under federal law. In addition, AB 450 violates well-established
18 federal public policy that encourages citizens to cooperate with law enforcement agents. Rather
19 than encourage cooperation, AB 450 prohibits cooperation.

22 Accordingly, for the above-stated reasons, the ACLJ respectfully requests that this Court
23 grant this unopposed motion and accept for filing the ACLJ's attached *amicus curiae* brief
24 supporting Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction.
25

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

Dated: March 26, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Vladimir F. Kozina

Vladimir F. Kozina, SBN 95422
MAYALL HURLEY, P.C.
2453 Grand Canal Blvd.
Stockton, CA 95207
Tel. (209) 477-3833
Email: vkozina@mayallaw.com

Jay Alan Sekulow*
Stuart J. Roth*
Jordan Sekulow*
AMERICAN CENTER FOR LAW AND JUSTICE
201 Maryland Avenue, NE
Washington, DC 20002
Tel. (202) 546-8890

Edward L. White III*
Erik M. Zimmerman*
Geoffrey R. Surtees*
AMERICAN CENTER FOR LAW AND JUSTICE
3001 Plymouth Rd., Ste. 203
Ann Arbor, MI 48105
Tel. (734) 680-8007

* Not admitted in this jurisdiction

Counsel for Amicus Curiae ACLJ

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

1
2 I hereby certify that on March 26, 2018, I electronically transmitted the foregoing
3 unopposed motion, along with the attached proposed order and *amicus curiae* brief of the ACLJ,
4 using the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California’s Electronic Document
5 Filing System (ECF) and that service on all counsel of record will be accomplished via the ECF
6 system.

7
8 Respectfully submitted,

9 */s/ Vladimir F. Kozina*

10 Vladimir F. Kozina, SBN 95422
11 MAYALL HURLEY, P.C.
12 2453 Grand Canal Blvd.
13 Stockton, CA 95207
14 Tel. (209) 477-3833
15 Email: vkozina@mayallaw.com