

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

11 Plaintiffs,

12 v.

13 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et
14 al.,

15 Defendants.

CASE NO. C18-939-MJP

ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
TRANSFER VENUE

16
17 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, Transfer, or
18 Hold the Case in Abeyance. (Dkt. No. 22.) Having reviewed the Motion, the Response (Dkt.
19 No. 46), the Reply (Dkt. No. 83) and all related papers, and having considered the submissions
20 of the parties at oral argument, the Court GRANTS the Motion to Transfer Venue and
21 TRANSFERS this case to the United States District Court for the Southern District of California
22 to be considered by the Honorable Judge Dana M. Sabraw in conjunction with the related
23 proceedings before him.
24

1 **Background**

2 Washington, California, Maryland, Oregon, New Mexico, New Jersey, New York, Iowa,
3 Illinois, Minnesota, Rhode Island, Vermont, North Carolina, Delaware, Massachusetts,
4 Pennsylvania, Virginia, and the District of Columbia (the “States”) filed this action on June 26,
5 2018, challenging the government’s “zero tolerance” policy of forcibly separating immigrant
6 families seeking asylum or other means of entry at the U.S.-Mexico border (the “Policy”).
7 (Dkt. No. 1 at ¶ 1.)

8 The States contend that, as a result of the Policy, they have received and will continue to
9 receive an influx of separated immigrant parents and children. (*Id.* at ¶ 225.) In this regard, the
10 States claim that the Policy harms their sovereign and proprietary interests by (1) interfering with
11 their licensing authority and rendering them unable to enforce their own legal mandates and
12 public policies favoring family unity and (2) burdening their legal, educational, healthcare, and
13 other state-funded programs and systems. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 164-173; 225-232.) The States further claim
14 that the Policy harms their quasi-sovereign interests in “protecting the health, safety, and well-
15 being of their residents, including protecting their residents from harms to their physical,
16 psychological, emotional, or economic health.” (*Id.* at ¶ 295.) Accordingly, they bring causes of
17 action for violations of procedural and substantive due process (Counts I and II); equal protection
18 (Count III); the Administrative Procedures Act, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2) (Count IV); and the asylum
19 laws, 8 U.S.C. § 1158 (Count V). (*Id.* at ¶¶ 342-371.)

20 On the same day the States’ filed this action, Judge Sabraw certified a class and issued a
21 nationwide preliminary injunction requiring the government to reunify separated families by July
22 26, 2018. See Ms. L. v. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 310 F. Supp. 3d 1133,
23
24

1 1149 (S.D. Cal. 2018). That order also precluded future separations without certain findings and
2 precluded parents from being removed prior to reunification. (Id.)

3 To date, more than 500 children have yet to be reunited with their parents. In many of
4 these cases, parents have either already been removed from the country, or their location within
5 the country is otherwise unknown. (See Ms. L, No. 18-428, Dkt. No. 171 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 2,
6 2018).) Under Judge Sabraw’s supervision, the government is actively working to locate those
7 parents and reunite them with their children.

8 Discussion

9 Defendants move to dismiss this action, or alternatively, to transfer venue or hold the
10 proceedings in abeyance. (Dkt. No. 22.) Defendants contend that there is a “substantial overlap”
11 between this case and Ms. L, where the class is comprised of the same individuals the States seek
12 to represent as *parens patriae*. (Id. at 4.) The States respond that their “interests, claims, and
13 requested relief are all undeniably broader than those at issue” in Ms. L, and that “the injuries to
14 their proprietary, sovereign, and quasi-sovereign interests are not addressed by a class of
15 separated parents.” (Dkt. No. 46 at 6.)

16 I. Legal Standard

17 A district court may transfer a civil action to another district “[f]or the convenience of the
18 parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice,” so long as the transferee district is one where the
19 case “might have been brought.” See 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Section 1404(a) grants the district
20 court “broad discretion” to transfer cases based upon an “individualized, case-by-case
21 consideration of convenience and fairness.” Verint Sys. Inc. v. Envision Telephony Inc., No.
22 14-1507MJP, 2015 WL 753540, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 23, 2015) (quoting Van Dusen v.
23 Barrack, 376 U.S. 612, 622 (1964)).

1 **II. Transfer to the Southern District of California**

2 The primary of import of the States’ case is to reunite families as expeditiously as
3 possible. As numerous other district courts around the country have recognized, Judge Sabraw
4 has been ably overseeing these efforts. See, e.g., M.M.M. v. Sessions, No. 18-1959PLF, Dkt.
5 No. 25 (D.D.C. Aug. 3, 2018); N.T.C. v. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, No.
6 18-6428, Dkt. No. 20 (S.D.N.Y. July 19, 2018); E.S.R.B. v. Sessions, No. 18-6654, Dkt. No. 4
7 (S.D.N.Y. July 24, 2018).

8 The Court finds that there is substantial overlap between the States’ claims and those
9 being litigated in Ms. L. The Court further finds no reason why the States’ case could not have
10 been filed in the Southern District of California, nor why it must remain in the Western District
11 of Washington. While recognizing that the States have raised several claims that are distinct
12 from those in Ms. L, and that transferring this case will cause some inconvenience to the States,
13 the Court is confident that Judge Sabraw will examine those claims and take appropriate steps to
14 mitigate any inconvenience. Much remains to be done, and in the days and weeks ahead, the
15 government must turn all of its efforts to locating and reuniting parents and children who have
16 been separated and potentially harmed by this Policy. Requiring the government to respond to
17 multiple orders by multiple district courts would only stand in the way of these efforts and, this,
18 the Court will not do.

19 Accordingly, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), the Court TRANSFERS this case to the
20 Southern District of California, to be assigned to Judge Sabraw.

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

The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

Dated August 8, 2018.



Marsha J. Pechman
United States District Judge