

The Honorable Barbara J. Rothstein

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

NO. 2:25-cv-814

MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. COUNTY, *et al.*,  
Plaintiffs,

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS’  
SECOND MOTION FOR  
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING  
ORDER**

vs.

SCOTT TURNER in his official capacity as  
Secretary of the U.S. Department of Housing  
and Urban Development, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs’ Second Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (“Second TRO”).<sup>1</sup> Dkt. No. 72. Several Plaintiffs, among the many who were added to this lawsuit pursuant to the Amended Complaint, have moved the Court for a Second TRO, raising issues materially indistinguishable from those raised in the TRO this Court entered on May 7, 2021 (the “First TRO”).<sup>2</sup> The Court ordered Defendants to file a brief outlining in what

<sup>1</sup> Simultaneously with this Second Motion for a TRO, all Plaintiffs added to this lawsuit by operation of the Amended Complaint have moved for a preliminary injunction. The Court has ordered responsive briefing on the merits of the new plaintiffs’ request for a preliminary injunction, and an order on that motion will be forthcoming.  
<sup>2</sup> The Plaintiffs moving for entry of a Second TRO are City of Columbus, Intercity Transit, Martin Luther King, Jr. County, City of Minneapolis, City of New York, Port of Seattle, and City of Tucson (collectively, “DOT Plaintiffs”), as to the DOT Grant Conditions, and City of Cambridge and City of Pasadena (collectively, “HUD Plaintiffs”) as to the CoC Grant Conditions.

ORDER GRANTING  
SECOND TRO

1 ways, if any, the new Plaintiffs’ request for a Second TRO might differ from the claims that the  
2 Court has already temporarily adjudicated in entering the First TRO. In that response, Defendants  
3 acknowledge that they “oppose the New Plaintiffs’ TRO and preliminary injunction motion for  
4 the same reasons they opposed the first.” Dkt. No. 151, p. 4.

5 Therefore, having reviewed the parties’ briefs and exhibits filed in support of and  
6 opposition to the Second Motion, the Court finds that the Second Motion for TRO raises  
7 questions of law and fact that are materially identical to the First Motion for TRO, and for the  
8 reasons articulated in the Court’s First TRO, the Court hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs’ Second  
9 Motion for TRO as follows:

- 10 1. HUD and its officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys, and any other  
11 persons who are in active concert or participation with them (collectively “Enjoined  
12 HUD Parties”), are enjoined from (1) imposing or enforcing the CoC Grant  
13 Conditions, as defined in the Motion, or any materially similar terms or conditions  
14 with respect to any CoC funds awarded to HUD Plaintiffs or members of their  
15 Continuums; (2) as to HUD Plaintiffs, rescinding, withholding, or cancelling any CoC  
16 Grant Agreements, or pausing, freezing, impeding, blocking, cancelling, terminating,  
17 delaying, withholding, or conditioning CoC funds, based on such terms or conditions;  
18 or (3) requiring HUD Plaintiffs to make any “certification” or other representation  
19 related to compliance with such terms or conditions;
- 20 2. The Enjoined HUD Parties shall immediately treat any actions taken to implement or  
21 enforce the CoC Grant Conditions or any materially similar terms or conditions as to  
22 HUD Plaintiffs, including any delays or withholding of funds based on such

23 ORDER GRANTING  
24 SECOND TRO

1 conditions, as null, void, and rescinded, and may not retroactively apply such  
2 conditions to grant agreements executed during the effective period of this TRO. The  
3 Enjoined HUD Parties shall immediately take every step necessary to effectuate this  
4 order, including clearing any administrative, operational, or technical hurdles to  
5 implementation;

6 3. DOT, the DOT OAs, and their officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys,  
7 and any other persons who are in active concert or participation with them  
8 (collectively “Enjoined DOT Parties”), are enjoined from (1) imposing or enforcing  
9 the DOT Grant Conditions, as defined in the Motion, or any materially similar terms  
10 or conditions to any DOT funds awarded, directly or indirectly, to the DOT Plaintiffs  
11 or their subrecipients; (2) as to the DOT Plaintiffs or their subrecipients, rescinding,  
12 withholding, or cancelling DOT grant awards, or pausing, freezing, impeding,  
13 blocking, canceling, terminating, delaying, withholding, or conditioning DOT funds,  
14 based on such terms or conditions; or (3) requiring the DOT Plaintiffs or their  
15 subrecipients to make any “certification” or other representation related to compliance  
16 with such terms or conditions;

17 4. The Enjoined DOT Parties shall immediately treat any actions taken to implement or  
18 enforce the DOT Grant Conditions or any materially similar terms or conditions as to  
19 DOT funds awarded, directly or indirectly, to the DOT Plaintiffs or their subrecipients,  
20 including any delays or withholding of funds based on such conditions, as null, void,  
21 and rescinded, and may not retroactively apply such conditions to grant agreements  
22 executed during the effective period of this TRO. The Enjoined DOT Parties shall

23 ORDER GRANTING  
24 SECOND TRO

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

immediately take every step necessary to effectuate this order, including clearing any administrative, operational, or technical hurdles to implementation.

Plaintiffs are not required to post a bond under Federal Rule 65(c).

This Second TRO will remain in effect through June 4, 2025 or until further order from the Court.

It is so ordered, this 23rd day of May, 2025.



---

Barbara Jacobs Rothstein  
U.S. District Court Judge

ORDER GRANTING  
SECOND TRO