

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

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

AL OTRO LADO, INC.; ABIGAIL  
DOE, BEATRICE DOE, CAROLINA  
DOE, DINORA DOE, INGRID DOE,  
ROBERTO DOE, MARIA DOE,  
JUAN DOE, ÚRSULA DOE,  
VICTORIA DOE, BIANCA DOE,  
EMILIANA DOE, AND CÉSAR  
DOE, individually and on behalf of all  
others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KEVIN MCALEENAN, Acting  
Secretary of U.S. Department of  
Homeland Security, in his official  
capacity, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 17-cv-02366-BAS-KSC

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART  
AND DENYING IN PART  
DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO  
DISMISS THE SECOND  
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

[ECF No. 192]

In this case, Organizational Plaintiff Al Otro Lado, Inc. (“Al Otro Lado”), an organization that helps individuals seek asylum in the United States, and thirteen Individual Plaintiffs—Abigail Doe, Beatrice Doe, Carolina Doe, Dinora Doe, Ingrid Doe, Roberto Doe, Maria Doe, Juan Doe, Úrsula Doe, Victoria Doe, Bianca Doe, Emiliana Doe, and César Doe—challenge conduct that they allege is “designed to

1 serve the Trump [A]dministration’s broader, publicly proclaimed goal of deterring  
2 individuals from seeking access to the asylum process.” (ECF No. 189 Second Am.  
3 Compl. (“SAC”) ¶ 4.) According to Plaintiffs, U.S. Customs and Border Protection  
4 (“CBP”) officials “have systematically restricted the number of asylum seekers who  
5 can access the U.S. asylum process through POEs along the U.S.-Mexico border.”  
6 (*Id.* ¶ 48.) Plaintiffs seek to hold various Defendant federal officials<sup>1</sup> that have  
7 authority over immigration enforcement liable in their official capacities for an  
8 alleged pattern or practice by CBP officers of denying asylum seekers at ports of  
9 entry (“POEs”) along the U.S.-Mexico border access to the U.S. asylum process, and  
10 an alleged formalized policy designed for the same end, which Plaintiffs refer to as  
11 the Turnback Policy.

12  
13 In the months following the Court’s grant in part and denial in part of  
14 Defendants’ motion to dismiss the original complaint, *see Al Otro Lado, Inc. v.*  
15 *Nielsen*, 327 F. Supp. 3d 1284 (S.D. Cal. 2018), Plaintiffs filed the operative Second  
16 Amended Complaint (“SAC”). Like the original complaint, Plaintiffs allege in the  
17 SAC that since late 2016 there is an alleged pattern and practice amongst CBP  
18 officials at POEs along the U.S-Mexico border to “deny[] asylum seekers access to  
19 the asylum process” “through a variety of illegal tactics.” (SAC ¶ 2.) Five original  
20 Individual Plaintiffs—Plaintiffs Abigail Doe, Beatrice Doe, Carolina Doe, Dinora  
21 Doe, and Ingrid Doe (the “Original Individual Plaintiffs”)—once more allege that

22  
23 <sup>1</sup> The SAC names the following Defendants in their official capacities: (1)  
24 Kirstjen M. Nielsen, Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”),  
25 (2) Kevin McAleenan, Commissioner, U.S. Customs and Border Protection  
26 (“CBP”), and (3) Todd C. Owens, Executive Assistant Commissioner, Office of  
27 Field Operations, U.S. CBP. (SAC ¶¶ 36–39.) In the time since the SAC’s filing in  
28 November 2018, at least two defendants have changed. Pursuant to Rule 25(d), the  
Court hereby substitutes (1) Kevin McAleenan as Acting Secretary of DHS in place  
of Nielsen and (2) John P. Sanders as the Acting Commissioner of CBP. Defendants  
shall notify the Court in the event any further substitution is warranted.

1 they were subjected to these tactics when CBP officials denied them access to the  
2 U.S. asylum process at various POEs.<sup>2</sup> Unlike the original complaint, the SAC now  
3 alleges that as early as 2016, Defendants were implementing a policy to restrict the  
4 flow of asylum seekers at the San Ysidro POE. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants  
5 formalized this policy in spring 2018 in the form of the border-wide Turnback  
6 Policy, an alleged “formal policy to restrict access to the asylum process at POEs by  
7 mandating that lower-level officials directly or constructively turn back asylum  
8 seekers at the border,” including through pretextual assertions that POEs lack  
9 capacity to process asylum seekers. (*Id.* ¶¶ 3, 48–83.) Eight new Individual  
10 Plaintiffs—Roberto Doe, Maria Doe, Juan and Úrsula Doe, Victoria Doe, Bianca  
11 Doe, Emiliana Doe, and César Doe (the “New Individual Plaintiffs”)—have joined  
12 this lawsuit, alleging that they were subjected to this Turnback Policy. Both the  
13 illegal tactics and the alleged Turnback Policy have resulted in many asylum seekers,  
14 particularly those from Central America, who present themselves at POEs along the  
15 U.S.-Mexico border being “turned back by” and “at the instruction of” CBP officials.  
16 (*Id.* ¶ 58.)

17  
18 Based on the conduct alleged, Plaintiffs press claims for violations of various  
19 Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) provisions, which Plaintiffs call “the U.S.  
20 asylum process.” In connection with the alleged INA violations, Plaintiffs assert  
21 claims under the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. §§ 706(1),  
22 706(2), and claims directly under the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause for  
23 alleged procedural due process violations. All Plaintiffs further assert claims under  
24 the Alien Tort Statute (“ATS”), 28 U.S.C. § 1350, on the ground that the alleged  
25

---

26 <sup>2</sup> For reasons unknown to the Court, Original Individual Jose Doe was dropped  
27 from this suit in the First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) filed nearly two months after  
28 the Court’s prior dismissal order and he is not a plaintiff to the SAC filed a month  
after the FAC. (ECF Nos. 176, 189.)

1 conduct violates a duty of non-*refoulement*, which Plaintiffs contend is an  
 2 international law norm that “forbids a country from returning or expelling an  
 3 individual to a country where he or she has a well-founded fear of persecution and/or  
 4 torture[.]” Defendants move to dismiss the SAC under Rule 12(b)(6) for failure to  
 5 state a claim. (ECF Nos. 192, 238.) Plaintiffs oppose. (ECF No. 210.) The parties  
 6 presented oral argument to the Court. (ECF No. 259; ECF No. 260, Hr’g Tr.) In  
 7 addition to the parties’ submissions, six amicus briefs have been submitted with the  
 8 Court’s permission. (ECF Nos. 215, 216, 219, 221, 223.)<sup>3</sup>

9  
 10 For the reasons herein, the Court grants in part and denies in part Defendants’  
 11 motion to dismiss the SAC.

## 12 BACKGROUND

### 13 I. Statutory and Regulatory Background

14 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1) is this case’s statutory bedrock. It provides that:

15 Any alien who is physically present in the United States or who  
 16 arrives in the United States (whether or not at a designated port of  
 17 arrival and including an alien who is brought to the United States  
 18

19  
 20 <sup>3</sup>The briefs are: (1) *Amicus Curiae* Brief of the States of California,  
 21 Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Maryland,  
 22 Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New  
 23 York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington in  
 24 support of Plaintiffs, (ECF No. 215-1); (2) *Amicus Curiae* Brief of Amnesty  
 25 International in Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, (ECF No. 216-1); (3)  
 26 *Amicus* Brief of Certain Members of Congress in Support of Plaintiffs’ Opposition  
 27 to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Complaint, (ECF No. 219-  
 28 1); (4) Brief of Certain Immigration Law Professors as *Amici Curiae* in Support of  
 Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Partially Dismiss the Second  
 Amended Complaint, (ECF No. 221-1); (5) *Amicus Curiae* Brief of Nineteen  
 Organizations Representing Asylum Seekers, (ECF No. 223-2); and (6) Brief of  
*Amici Curiae* Kids in Need of Defense, *et al.*, in Support of Plaintiffs’ Opposition to  
 Motion to Dismiss, (ECF No. 225-1.)

1 after having been interdicted in international or United States  
2 waters), irrespective of such alien’s status, may apply for asylum  
3 in accordance with this section or . . . section 1225(b)[.]

4 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1).

5 This case turns on the Section 1225(b) asylum procedure that Section 1158  
6 incorporates. Section 1225 sets forth, in relevant part, certain inspection duties of  
7 immigration officers, which undergird additional specific duties that arise when  
8 certain aliens express an intent to seek asylum in the United States or a fear of  
9 persecution.

10 Section 1225(a) establishes the general inspection duty: “[a]ll aliens . . . who  
11 are applicants for admission or otherwise seeking admission . . . to . . . the United  
12 States shall be inspected by immigration officers.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3). In  
13 language that echoes Section 1158(a)(1), Section 1225(a) defines as an “applicant  
14 for admission” “[a]n alien present in the United States who has not been admitted or  
15 who arrives in the United States (whether or not at a designated port of arrival  
16 including an alien who is brought to the United States after having been interdicted  
17 in international or United States waters)[.]” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1). An  
18 implementing regulation more broadly defines “arriving alien” as “an applicant for  
19 admission coming or attempting to come into the United States at a port-of-entry, or  
20 an alien seeking transit through the United States at a port-of-entry, or an alien  
21 interdicted in international or United States waters and brought into the United States  
22 by any means, whether or not to a designated port-of-entry, and regardless of the  
23 means of transport.” 8 C.F.R. § 1.2. By regulation, “application to lawfully enter  
24 the United States shall be made in person to an immigration officer at a U.S. port-  
25 of-entry when the port is open for inspection, or as otherwise” provided. 8 C.F.R. §  
26 231.1(a).

27  
28 Section 1225(b) sets forth two sets of procedures that apply to aliens “arriving

1 in the United States.” First, pursuant to the procedure under Section 1225(b)(1), an  
2 arriving alien may be summarily “removed from the United States without further  
3 hearing or review” “if an immigration officer determines” that the alien “is  
4 inadmissible” for making certain fraudulent or misleading representations or for not  
5 having valid entry or travel documents. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i); *Thuraissigiam*  
6 *v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, 917 F.3d 1097, 1100 (9th Cir. 2019) (citing, *inter*  
7 *alia*, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C) and 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(7)). Section 1225(b)(1)’s  
8 removal mandate, however, does not apply if “the alien indicates either an intention  
9 to apply for asylum under section 1158 [] or a fear of persecution.” *Id.* Instead, “[i]f  
10 the immigration officer determines that an alien” is “inadmissible” for making  
11 certain fraudulent or misleading representations or for not having valid entry or  
12 travel documents “and the alien indicates either an intention to apply for asylum  
13 under section 1158 [] or a fear of persecution, the officer shall refer the alien for an  
14 interview by an asylum officer[.]” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii) (emphasis added).  
15 An implementing regulation governing this expedited removal procedure imposes  
16 an analogous obligation. 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(4). In these circumstances, the  
17 immigration officer must refer the alien to an “asylum officer,” who is statutorily  
18 required to be “an immigration officer who has had professional training in country  
19 conditions, asylum law, and interview techniques comparable to that provided to  
20 full-time adjudicators of applications under section 1158 of this title,” and “is  
21 supervised by an officer who,” *inter alia*, “has had substantial experience  
22 adjudicating asylum applications.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(E).

23  
24 In contrast with the Section 1225(b)(1) procedure, Section 1225(b)(2)  
25 establishes the procedure for “inspection of other aliens.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2).  
26 “Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), in the case of an alien who is an applicant for  
27 admission,” the alien “shall be detained for a proceeding under [8 U.S.C. §] 1229a”  
28 (the general “removal proceedings” provision) “if the examining immigration officer

1 determines that an alien seeking admission is not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled  
2 to be admitted[.]” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A). Subparagraph (C) provides that “in  
3 the case of an alien described in subparagraph (A) who is arriving on land . . . from  
4 a foreign territory contiguous to the United States, the Attorney General may return  
5 the alien to that territory pending a proceeding under section 1229a[.]” 8 U.S.C. §  
6 1225(b)(2)(C). In relevant part, Subparagraph (B) provides that “[s]ubparagraph (A)  
7 shall not apply to an alien—(ii) “to whom paragraph (1) applies”—*i.e.* aliens who  
8 are subject to the procedure in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1). 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(B)(ii).  
9 Consistent with Section 1225(b)(2)’s instruction that asylum applicants are  
10 channeled through the Section 1225(b)(1) procedure, Section 1225(b)(2) does not  
11 elaborate on any asylum procedure.

12  
13 During the Section 1225 admission process, “[a]n alien applying for  
14 admission may, in the discretion of the Attorney General and at any time, be  
15 permitted to withdraw the application for admission and depart immediately from  
16 the United States.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(4). By regulation, “the alien’s decision to  
17 withdraw his or her application for admission must be made voluntarily[.]” 8 C.F.R.  
18 § 235.4.

## 20 **II. Factual Allegations**

### 21 **A. Allegations Regarding Defendants**

22 Defendants are U.S. government officials sued in their official capacity who  
23 exercise authority over CBP in various capacities. The Defendant Secretary of  
24 Homeland Security (the “Secretary”) “has ultimate authority over all CBP policies,  
25 procedures, and practices.” (SAC ¶ 36.) The Secretary “is responsible for ensuring  
26 that all CBP officials perform their duties in accordance with the Constitution and  
27 all relevant laws.” (*Id.*) The Defendant CBP Commissioner “has direct authority  
28 over all CBP policies, procedures, and practices.” (*Id.* ¶ 37.) Defendant oversees a

1 staff of more than 60,000 employees and “exercises authority over all CBP  
2 operations.” (*Id.*) The Defendant Executive Assistant Commissioner (“EAC”) of  
3 CBP’s Office of Field Operations oversees “the largest component of CBP and is  
4 responsible for border security, including immigration and travel through U.S.  
5 POEs,” for which the EAC oversees a staff of “more than 24, 000 CBP officials and  
6 specialists[.]” (*Id.* ¶ 38.) Plaintiffs also sue 25 Doe Defendants who “were agents  
7 or alter egos of Defendants, or [who] are otherwise responsible for all of the acts”  
8 alleged. (*Id.* ¶ 39.) Defendants allegedly have denied access to the U.S. asylum  
9 process to noncitizens fleeing “grave harm in their countries to seek protection in the  
10 United States” “in contravention of U.S. and international law” pursuant to (1) “a  
11 policy initiated by Defendants”—the Turnback Policy—and (2) “practices  
12 effectively ratified by Defendants.” (*Id.* ¶ 1.) The Court describes Plaintiffs’  
13 allegations regarding each.

### 14 15 **1. Alleged Pattern and Practice of Illegal Tactics**

16 “Since 2016 and continuing to this day, CBP has engaged in an unlawful,  
17 widespread pattern and practice of denying asylum seekers access to the asylum  
18 process at POEs on the U.S.-Mexico border through a variety of illegal tactics.”  
19 (SAC ¶¶ 2, 84.) CBP officials have carried out this practice through  
20 misrepresentations, threats and intimidation, verbal and physical abuse, and  
21 coercion. (*Id.* ¶¶ 84–106.) For example, CBP officials are alleged to turn away  
22 asylum seekers by falsely informing them that the U.S. is no longer providing  
23 asylum, that President Trump signed a new law ending asylum, that a law providing  
24 asylum to Central Americans ended, that Mexican citizens are not eligible for  
25 asylum, and that the U.S. is no longer accepting mothers with children for asylum.  
26 (*Id.* ¶¶ 85–86.) CBP officials allegedly intimidate asylum seekers by threatening to  
27 take away their children if they do not renounce a claim for asylum and by  
28 threatening to deport asylum seekers. (*Id.* ¶¶ 87–88.) CBP officials allegedly force



1 asylum seekers to sign forms in English, without translation, in which the asylum  
2 seekers recant their fears of persecution. (*Id.* ¶¶ 91–92.) CBP officials are alleged  
3 to instruct some asylum seekers to recant their fears of persecution while being  
4 recorded on video. (*Id.*) In some instances, CBP officials have “simply turn[ed]  
5 asylum seekers away from POEs without any substantive explanation.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 93–  
6 94.) Other alleged tactics include: (1) CBP officers physically block access to the  
7 POE, including by “CBP sometimes enlist[ing] Mexican officials to act as their  
8 agents”; (2) CBP officials impose “a fixed number of asylum seekers” per day and  
9 place asylum seekers on a waiting list that results in “asylum-seeking men, women  
10 and children wait[ing] endlessly on or near bridges leadings to POEs in rain, cold,  
11 and blistering heat, without sufficient food or water and with limited bathroom  
12 access”; and (3) racially discriminatory denials of access by CBP officers, including  
13 by denying asylum seekers from specific countries access to POEs and allowing  
14 “lighter-skinned individuals to pass.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 95–106.) Plaintiffs point to numerous  
15 reports by non-governmental organization and “other experts working in the U.S.-  
16 Mexico border region” as corroborating the existence and use of these tactics by  
17 CBP officers. (*Id.* ¶¶ 107–08, 110–111, 113–16.)

## 18 19 **2. The Alleged “Turnback Policy”**

### 20 **a. Nascent Stages**

21 Plaintiffs allege that “evidence of a Turnback Policy” exists as early as May  
22 2016, at least insofar as it concerns the San Ysidro POE, a POE that figures  
23 prominently in the SAC and the Plaintiffs’ allegations. (SAC ¶¶ 51–53, 60; *see also*  
24 *id.* ¶¶ 16, 25–26, 28, 32–35, 48 & n.37.) Plaintiffs point to a communication from  
25 the “Watch Commander at the San Ysidro POE” indicating that “[t]he Asylee line  
26 in the pedestrian building is not being used at this time,” with a follow-up  
27 communication indicating that “it’s even more important that when the traffic is free-  
28 flowing that the limit line officers ask for and check documents to ensure that groups

1 that may be seeking asylum are directed to remain in the waiting area on the Mexican  
2 side.” (*Id.*) At the time, CBP allegedly “collaborat[ed] with the Mexican  
3 government to turn back asylum seekers at the San Ysidro POE,” collaboration that  
4 was allegedly formalized in July 2016 and confirmed in December 2016. (*Id.* ¶¶ 52–  
5 53.)

6  
7 A border-wide policy allegedly existed as early as November 2016 because  
8 the Assistant Director of Field Operations for the Laredo Field Office “instructed all  
9 Port Directors under his command to follow the mandate of the then-CBP  
10 Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner” to request that Mexico’s immigration  
11 agency “control the flow of aliens to the port of entry.” (*Id.* ¶ 55.) Under this  
12 mandate, the Commissioner allegedly directed that “if you determine that you can  
13 only process 50 aliens, you will request that [Mexico’s immigration agency] release  
14 only 50,” and if the agency “cannot or will not control the flow,” then CBP staff “is  
15 to provide the alien with a piece of paper identifying a date and time for an  
16 appointment and return then [sic] to Mexico.” (*Id.*) This directive “was promptly  
17 implemented” at POEs along the Texas-Mexico portion of the U.S.-Mexico border  
18 and “memorialized in January 2017.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 56, 57.) Plaintiffs allege that in a June  
19 13, 2017 hearing before the House Appropriations Committee, John P. Wagner, the  
20 Deputy Executive Assistant Commissioner for CBP’s Office of Field Operations,  
21 admitted that CBP officials were turning back asylum seekers at POEs along the  
22 U.S.-Mexico border and argued that “the practice was justified by a lack of capacity.”  
23 (*Id.* ¶ 59.) The CBO Field Operations Director in charge of the San Ysidro POE  
24 similarly acknowledged and defended the turnbacks in December 2017. (*Id.* ¶ 60.)  
25

26 **b. Alleged Formalization and High-Level Recognition**

27 The alleged border-wide policy to turnback asylum seekers through false  
28 assertions of lack of capacity took on a new life in spring 2018 “following an

1 arduous, widely-publicized journey” of “a group of several hundred asylum  
2 seekers”—dubbed by the press as a “caravan”—who “arrived at the San Ysidro  
3 POE.” (*Id.* ¶ 61.) “President Trump posted a series of messages on Twitter warning  
4 of the dangers posed by the group, including one indicating that he had instructed  
5 DHS ‘not to let these large Caravans of people into our Country.’” (*Id.* (citations  
6 omitted).)

7  
8         Around this time, high-level Trump Administration officials unambiguously  
9 proclaimed, “the existence of their policy to intentionally restrict access to the  
10 asylum process at POEs in violation of U.S. law.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 5, 62.) Then-U.S. Attorney  
11 General Jeff Session “characterized the caravan’s arrival as ‘a deliberate attempt to  
12 undermine our laws and overwhelm our system.’” (*Id.* ¶ 63.) Following the arrival  
13 of the “caravan,” “CBP officials indicated—in accordance with the Turnback  
14 Policy—that they had exhausted their capacity to process individuals traveling  
15 without proper documentation.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 7, 64, 67.) On May 15, 2018, then-Secretary  
16 of Homeland Security Kirstjen Nielsen “characterized the asylum process . . . as a  
17 legal ‘loophole’ and publicly announced a ‘metering’ process designed to restrict—  
18 and constructively deny—access to the asylum process through unreasonable and  
19 dangerous delay.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 5, 65.) President Trump made a number of tweets  
20 throughout June and July 2018 that further confirmed the alleged Turnback Policy,  
21 including statements that “[w]hen somebody comes in, we must immediately, with  
22 no Judges or Court Cases, bring them back from where they came from,” and “we  
23 must IMMEDIATELY escort them back without going through years of  
24 maneuvering.” (*Id.*) Plaintiffs point to numerous other confirmations of the  
25 existence of the alleged Turnback Policy, designed and implemented by U.S.  
26 officials, including statements by then-CBP Commissioner McAleenan in April  
27 2018 indicating that “individuals [without appropriate entry documentation] may  
28 need to wait in Mexico as CBP officers work to process those already within our

1 facilities”; a September 27, 2018 report from the Office of the Inspector General (the  
2 “OIG Report”); and statements by Mexican immigration officials, one of whom  
3 allegedly complained that “[CBP] was making [the Mexican immigration agency]  
4 do [CBP’s] dirty work.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 68–76 & nn. 56–71.)

5  
6 According to Plaintiffs, the asserted capacity concerns used to justify the  
7 alleged Turnback Policy are a pretextual and false “cover for a deliberate slowdown  
8 of the rate at which agency receives asylum seekers at POEs.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 3, 76–83.)  
9 They allege that “CBP’s own statistics indicate that there has not been a particular  
10 surge in [the] numbers of asylum seekers coming to POEs.” (*Id.* ¶ 76.) Amnesty  
11 International has allegedly characterized capacity concerns as “a fiction” based on  
12 the available statistics. (*Id.* (citation omitted).) Plaintiffs point to statements by  
13 “senior CBP and ICE officials in San Ysidro, California” in early 2018, in which the  
14 officials stated that “CBP has only actually reached its detention capacity a couple  
15 times per year and during ‘a very short period’ in 2017.” (*Id.* ¶ 77.) Plaintiffs further  
16 note that in the OIG Report, “the OIG team did not observe severe overcrowding at  
17 the ports of entry it visited.” (*Id.*) And “[h]uman rights researchers visiting seven  
18 POEs in Texas in June 2018 reported that ‘[t]he processing rooms visible in the  
19 [POE] . . . appeared to be largely empty.’” (*Id.* (citations omitted).) Plaintiffs  
20 otherwise point to anecdotal accounts for specific POEs, which Plaintiffs allege  
21 show “abrupt” changes in assertions of a lack of capacity at POEs and CBP officers  
22 allowing some asylum seekers to cross—sometimes in the span of a few hours. (*Id.*  
23 ¶ 78.) For example, CBP officials at the Nogales, Arizona POE abruptly switched  
24 from processing 6 asylum seekers a day, based on assertions of lack of capacity, to  
25 20 asylum seekers a day. (*Id.*) And, of course, there are the alleged experiences of  
26 the eight New Individual Plaintiffs, which provide a further gloss on the Turnback  
27 Policy. (*Id.* ¶ 83.)

28

1           **B.     The Plaintiffs**

2           The challenge to Defendants’ alleged conduct is pressed by Organizational  
3 Plaintiff Al Otro Lado and thirteen Individual Plaintiffs. For the purposes of this  
4 order, the Court refers to the Individual Plaintiffs as two groups: the Original  
5 Individual Plaintiffs and the New Individual Plaintiffs.<sup>4</sup> As the Court has noted,  
6 Organizational Plaintiff Al Otro Lado and the Original Individual Plaintiffs have  
7 been parties since this case’s inception. The Court will not retrace in great detail the  
8 allegations pertaining to these Plaintiffs. The Court, however will provide relatively  
9 more detail regarding the New Individual Plaintiffs because this order is the first  
10 occasion to do so.

11  
12                   **1.     Organizational Plaintiff Al Otro Lado**

13           Al Otro Lado is a non-profit California legal services organization established  
14 in 2014, which provides services to indigent deportees, migrants, refugees, and their  
15 families. (SAC ¶ 17.) Al Otro Lado alleges that the Defendants’ alleged conduct has  
16 frustrated its ability to advance and maintain its “central” and “organizational  
17 mission” because Al Otro Lado has had “to divert substantial” time and resources  
18 away from its programs “to counteract the effects of the Turnback Policy and  
19 Defendants’ other unlawful practices.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 12–13, 17–23.)

20  
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22           <sup>4</sup> In their present motion to dismiss, Defendants divide the Individual Plaintiffs  
23 into two groups. Defendants refer to the Original Individual Plaintiffs as “Territorial  
24 Plaintiffs” on the ground that the SAC’s allegations show that all Original Individual  
25 Plaintiffs were in a POE at the time they were allegedly denied access to the asylum  
26 process. (ECF No. 192-1 at 1–2.) In contrast, Defendants refer to all New Individual  
27 Plaintiffs as “Extraterritorial Plaintiffs,” based on Defendants’ view that these  
28 Individual Plaintiffs’ allegations show that “they experienced the purported  
‘Turnback Policy’ when they approached the border to the territorial United States  
at the San Ysidro, Laredo, or Hidalgo [POEs] but were prevented by CBP officers  
or Mexican immigration officials from physically crossing the international  
boundary.” (*Id.* at 2.) The Court declines to use Defendants’ labeling.

1                   **2. Original Individual Plaintiffs**

2           Plaintiffs Abigail Doe, Beatrice Doe, Carolina Doe are natives and citizens of  
3 Mexico, who fled to Tijuana, Mexico where they attempted to access the U.S.  
4 asylum process at various points in May 2017, due to violence they experienced at  
5 the hands of drug cartels. (SAC ¶¶ 24–26, 119–121, 125–127, 133–134.) They  
6 allege that CBP officers at the San Ysidro and Otay Mesa POEs located along the  
7 California-Mexico portion of the U.S.-Mexico border coerced them into signing  
8 English language forms in which they recanted their fears of returning to Mexico  
9 and withdrew their applications for admission. (*Id.* ¶¶ 24–26, 122–123, 128–130,  
10 135–136.) Plaintiffs Dinora Doe and Ingrid Doe are natives and citizens of  
11 Honduras, who fled to Tijuana, Mexico after violence they experienced at the hands  
12 of criminal gangs and Ingrid experienced severe abuse from her partner. (*Id.* ¶¶ 27–  
13 28, 138–140, 147–149.) Dinora presented herself at the Otay Mesa POE three times  
14 in August 2016 but was told “there was no asylum in the United States,” including  
15 specifically “for Central Americans,” and that she “would be handed over to  
16 Mexican authorities and deported to Honduras.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 27, 141–144.) Ingrid  
17 presented herself at the Otay Mesa and San Ysidro POEs, where CBP officers told  
18 her and her children that they could not seek asylum in the United States. (*Id.* ¶¶ 28,  
19 149–151.) Based on developments that occurred after the original complaint’s filing  
20 and which the Court determined did not moot this case, *Al Otro Lado*, 327 F. Supp.  
21 3d at 1295, 1302–04, the Original Individual Plaintiffs allege that “Defendants made  
22 arrangements to facilitate” their “entry . . . into the United States.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 24–28,  
23 124, 132, 137, 145, 152.)

24  
25                   **3. New Individual Plaintiffs**

26           Plaintiffs Juan and Úrsula Doe, husband and wife, are natives and citizens of  
27 Honduras, who fled Honduras “with their sons after receiving death threats from  
28 gangs.” (SAC ¶¶ 31, 171–72.) They presented themselves at the Laredo POE in late

1 September 2018, but when they “reached the middle of the bridge to the POE, CBP  
2 officials denied them access to the asylum process by telling them the POE was  
3 closed and that they could not enter.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 31, 173–74.)

4  
5 Plaintiff Roberto Doe is a native and citizen of Nicaragua, who alleges that he  
6 fled Nicaragua due to threats of violence “from the Nicaraguan government and  
7 paramilitaries allied with the government.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 29, 153.) Roberto presented  
8 himself at the Hidalgo, Texas POE in October 2018, where he encountered CBP  
9 officials in the middle of the bridge between Mexico and the United States, who he  
10 told that he wanted to seek asylum in the United States. (*Id.* ¶¶ 29, 154.) The  
11 officials “[old] him the POE was full and that he could not enter.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 29, 155.)  
12 After the FAC was filed in October 2018, Roberto returned to the Hidalgo POE  
13 “where Mexican officials detained him as he was walking onto the international  
14 bridge to seek access to the asylum process in the United States” and he “remains in  
15 the custody of the Mexican government.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 29, 159.)

16  
17 Plaintiff Maria Doe is a native and citizen of Guatemala and permanent  
18 resident of Mexico. (SAC ¶¶ 30, 160.) Maria “left her husband, who was abusive  
19 and is involved with cartels[.]” (*Id.* ¶¶ 30, 161.) Since she left him, “two different  
20 cartels have been tracking and threatening her,” and located her despite her attempts  
21 to find a “safe place to live” in both Guatemala and Mexico. (*Id.* ¶¶ 30, 161.) Maria  
22 and her two children presented themselves at the Laredo, Texas POE on September  
23 10, 2018. (*Id.* ¶¶ 30, 162.) However, “[w]hen Maria encountered CBP officials in  
24 the middle of the bridge, [and] she told them that she and her children wanted to seek  
25 asylum in the United States,” the CBP officials told them to wait on the Mexican  
26 side of the bridge. (*Id.* ¶¶ 30, 162.)

27  
28 Plaintiff Bianca Doe is a transgender woman who is a native and citizen of

1 Honduras. (*Id.* ¶¶ 33–34, 184, 191.) Bianca “has been subjected to extreme and  
2 persistent physical and sexual assault, as well as discrimination and ongoing threats  
3 of violence in Honduras and Mexico City . . . because she is a transgender woman[.]”  
4 (*Id.* ¶¶ 33, 184–85.) Bianca presented herself at the San Ysidro POE on September  
5 19, 2018, where “CBP officers . . . stat[ed] that she could not apply at that time  
6 because they were at capacity.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 33, 185.) Bianca returned the next day and  
7 “was given a piece of paper with the number ‘919,’ placed on a waiting list, and told  
8 that she would have to wait several weeks to proceed to the POE.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 33, 186.)  
9 On September 28, 2018, Bianca “attempted to enter the United States without  
10 inspection by climbing a fence on a beach in Tijuana[.]” but “once over the fence, a  
11 U.S. Border Patrol officer stopped [her]” and she “expressed her desire to seek  
12 asylum in the U.S.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 33, 187.) “The U.S. Border Patrol Officer told [her] that  
13 there was no capacity in U.S. detention centers and threatened to call Mexican police  
14 if [she] did not climb the fence back into Mexico.” Bianca did so. Bianca presented  
15 herself “again” at the San Ysidro POE on October 8, 2018. (*Id.* ¶¶ 33, 188.) “She  
16 was told, once again, that CBP had no capacity for asylum seekers.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 33, 188.)

17  
18 Plaintiff Emiliana Doe is a transgender woman and a native and citizen of  
19 Honduras. (*Id.* ¶¶ 34, 191.) She “was subjected to multiple sexual and physical  
20 assaults, kidnapping, and discrimination, as well as threats of severe harm and  
21 violence in Honduras because she is a transgender woman.” (*Id.* ¶ 34.) After fleeing  
22 Honduras in June 2018, Emiliana reached Tijuana in September 2018 and presented  
23 herself at the San Ysidro POE, where a stranger told her she would need to get on  
24 “the waiting list” to apply for asylum. (*Id.* ¶ 192.) After going to the San Ysidro  
25 POE and speaking with two women, “[s]he was given a piece of paper with the  
26 number ‘1014’ on it, placed on a waiting list, and told to return in six weeks.” (*Id.*  
27 ¶¶ 34, 192.) On October 8, 2018, “[f]eeling desperate and unsafe, Emiliana returned  
28 to the POE just a few weeks later,” but “CBP officers . . . t[old] her that there was



1 no capacity for asylum seekers and instruct[ed] her to wait for Mexican officials.”  
2 (*Id.* ¶¶ 34, 193.)

3  
4 Plaintiff César Doe is a native and citizen of Honduras. (SAC ¶¶ 35, 196.)  
5 “César has been threatened numerous times with severe harm and death and  
6 kidnapped by members of the 18th street gang.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 35, 196.) He alleges, *inter*  
7 *alia*, that on one occasion, he “present[ed] himself at the San Ysidro POE” “with  
8 two staff members from Al Otro Lado” “but CBP officers refused to accept him.”  
9 (*Id.* ¶¶ 35, 199.)

10

11 Plaintiff Victoria Doe is a 16-year old native and citizen of Honduras. (SAC  
12 ¶¶ 32, 179.) She “has been threatened with severe harm and death by members of  
13 the 18th street gang for refusing to become the girlfriend of one of the gang’s  
14 leaders.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 32, 179.) Victoria fled to Mexico where she gave birth to a son.  
15 (*Id.* ¶¶ 32, 179.) Victoria and her son arrived in Tijuana as part of a “refugee  
16 caravan” and went to the San Ysidro POE on October 8, 2018. (*Id.* ¶¶ 32, 180.)  
17 “When Victoria expressed her desire to seek asylum in the United States, CBP  
18 officers . . . stat[ed] that she could not apply for asylum at that time and t[old] her to  
19 speak to a Mexican official without providing any additional information.” (*Id.* ¶¶  
20 32, 181.) Except for Roberto Doe, all New Individual Plaintiffs allege that  
21 “following the filing of the First Amended Complaint in this case, Defendants made  
22 arrangements to facilitate the[ir] entry . . . into the United States.” (SAC ¶¶ 30–35.)

23

### 24 **III. Procedural Synopsis**

25 Organizational Plaintiff Al Otro Lado and, on behalf of themselves and a  
26 putative class, the Original Individual Plaintiffs commenced this action against  
27 Defendants on July 12, 2017 in the United States District Court for the Central  
28 District of California. (ECF No. 1 (“Compl.”).) After the Central District transferred

1 the action to this Court on November 29, 2017, Defendants renewed their motion to  
2 dismiss the original complaint in its entirety. (ECF No. 135.)

3  
4 The Court granted Defendants’ motion in part. *Al Otro Lado, Inc. v. Nielsen*,  
5 327 F. Supp. 3d 1284 (S.D. Cal. 2018). In relevant part, the Court dismissed the  
6 Section 706(1) APA claims of Plaintiffs Abigail Doe, Beatrice Doe, and Carolina  
7 Doe to the extent they sought to compel relief under 8 C.F.R. § 235.4 for allegedly  
8 being coerced into withdrawing their applications for admission. *Id.* at 1314–15.  
9 The Court also dismissed Plaintiffs’ Section 706(2) APA claims based on an alleged  
10 “pattern or practice” because the Court was not convinced that Plaintiffs had  
11 plausibly alleged facts to “support[] the inference that there is an overarching policy”  
12 and, consequently, had failed to identify a final agency action. *Id.* at 1320. The  
13 Court granted Plaintiffs leave to amend their Section 706(2) claims. *Id.* at 1321. The  
14 Court otherwise denied Defendants’ motion to dismiss on all other grounds. *Id.* at  
15 1295–1304 (rejecting Defendants’ argument that the entire case was moot because  
16 Defendants had allowed original Individual Plaintiffs to be processed for admission  
17 at a POE after filing of the case); *id.* at 1306–08 (rejecting Defendants’ argument  
18 that the United States had not waived sovereign immunity for ATS claims on the  
19 ground that Section 702 of the APA provides a “broad waiver of sovereign immunity  
20 for claims against the United States for nonmonetary relief”); *id.* at 1311–13  
21 (rejecting Defendants’ argument that Plaintiffs cannot challenge an alleged pattern  
22 or practice of alleged CBP officer denials of access to the asylum process under  
23 Section 706(1) of the APA).

24  
25 In November 2018, Plaintiffs filed the operative Second Amended Complaint,  
26 a pleading that raises claims largely identical to those in the original complaint albeit  
27 upon an expanded set of factual allegations and with some refinement. (SAC ¶¶  
28 244–303.) All Individual Plaintiffs seek to press their claims on behalf of a putative

1 class of “noncitizens who seek or will seek to access the U.S. asylum process by  
2 presenting themselves at a POE along the U.S.-Mexico border and are denied access  
3 to the U.S. asylum process by or at the instruction of CBP officials.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 1, 236–  
4 43.) Once more, Plaintiffs seek only declaratory and injunctive relief. (*Id.* at 100.)

## 6 LEGAL STANDARDS

7 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires that a complaint set forth “a  
8 short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,”  
9 in order to “give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds  
10 upon which it rests.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting  
11 *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47 (1957)). A defendant may test the sufficiency of  
12 a complaint on several grounds, including on the ground that the court lacks subject  
13 matter jurisdiction over the complaint or that the complaint fails to state a claim for  
14 relief. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1), (6).

15  
16 A Rule 12(b)(1) motion tests whether a court possesses subject matter  
17 jurisdiction to adjudicate the claims in the action. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (b)(1); *Savage*  
18 *v. Glendale Union High Sch.*, 343 F.3d 1036, 1039–40 (9th Cir. 2003), *cert. denied*,  
19 541 U.S. 1009 (2004). As is relevant here, a Rule 12(b)(6) motion that asserts lack  
20 of jurisdiction due to the alleged presence of a political question in a case is “more  
21 appropriately construed as a Rule 12(b)(1) motion[.]” *Corrie v. Caterpillar*, 503  
22 F.3d 974, 982 (9th Cir. 2007); *Yellen v. United States*, Civ. No. 14-00134 JMS-KSC,  
23 2014 WL 2532460, at \*1 (D. Haw. June 4, 2014) (same). Thus, although Defendants  
24 nominally raise a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the Court construes their motion on this  
25 issue as raised under Rule 12(b)(1). When a party asserts a Rule 12(b)(1) challenge  
26 limited to the pleadings, as Defendants do here, the Court accepts Plaintiffs’ factual  
27 allegations as true and draws all reasonable inferences in Plaintiffs’ favor to  
28 determine whether the allegations are sufficient to invoke federal jurisdiction. *Pride*

1 v. *Correa*, 719 F.3d 1130, 1133 (9th Cir. 2013).

2

3 A Rule 12(b)(6) motion tests whether the allegations, even if true, fail to state  
4 a claim upon which relief may be granted. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6); *N. Star Int'l v.*  
5 *Ariz. Corp. Comm'n*, 720 F.2d 578, 581 (9th Cir. 1983). To survive a Rule 12(b)(6)  
6 motion, a plaintiff is required to set forth “enough facts to state a claim for relief that  
7 is plausible on its face.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570. “A claim has facial plausibility  
8 when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw reasonable  
9 inferences that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*,  
10 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (citation omitted). To assess the legal sufficiency of a  
11 complaint, the court accepts as true the complaint’s factual allegations and construes  
12 them in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Hishon v. King & Spalding*, 467  
13 U.S. 69, 73 (1984). A court may consider materials properly submitted as part of  
14 the complaint. *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 688–89 (9th Cir. 2001).

15

16

## DISCUSSION

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Defendants’ motion to dismiss raises a variety of arguments for why the SAC should be dismissed in whole or in part, some of which are familiar and others of which are new. The Court distills Defendants’ arguments into four overarching parts. First, Defendants argue that the Court lacks jurisdiction under the political question doctrine to consider certain factual allegations or grant certain forms of relief. Second, and forming the bulk of Defendants’ motion to dismiss, is a set of arguments that Plaintiffs fail to state Sections 706(1) and 706(2) APA claims. Third, Defendants seek dismissal of the New Individual Plaintiffs’ Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause claims, principally on the ground that the Fifth Amendment does not apply extraterritorially. Fourth, Defendants seek dismissal of Plaintiffs’ ATS claims. The Court considers each set of arguments in turn.

1 **I. The Political Question Doctrine**

2 Defendants argue that that the political question doctrine bars judicial review  
3 of “Defendants’ coordination with a foreign nation to regulate border crossings.”  
4 (ECF No. 192-1 at 25.) Pointing to allegations in the SAC regarding interactions  
5 between U.S. and Mexican government officials, Defendants argue that granting  
6 Plaintiffs’ request to enjoin the alleged Turnback Policy “would prohibit Defendants  
7 from ‘coordinating’ with Mexican government officials as they carry out their  
8 statutory responsibility to manage the flow of traffic across the border.” (*Id.* at 25–  
9 26, 28 (citing SAC ¶¶ 3, 7, 50–83, 86–87, 96, 98–102, 108–10, 114, 116).) The  
10 Court rejects Defendants’ political question doctrine argument at this juncture.

11  
12 “In general, the Judiciary has a responsibility to decide cases properly before  
13 it, even those it ‘would gladly avoid.’” *Zivotofsky v. Clinton*, 566 U.S. 189, 194–95,  
14 (2012) (quoting *Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U.S. 264, 404 (1821)). The “political  
15 question doctrine” is a recognized “narrow exception” to the Judiciary’s Article III  
16 responsibility. *Id.* at 195 (citing *Japan Whaling Ass’n v. Am. Cetacean Soc’y*, 478  
17 U.S. 221, 230 (1986)). The doctrine “excludes from judicial review those  
18 controversies which revolve around policy choices and value determinations  
19 constitutionally committed for resolution to the halls of Congress or the confines of  
20 the Executive Branch[.]” *Japan Whaling Ass’n*, 478 U.S. at 230. As such, “[t]he  
21 political question doctrine concerns the jurisdictional ‘case or controversy  
22 requirement’ of Article III of the Constitution, . . . and the Court must address it  
23 ‘before proceeding to the merits[.]’” *Ahmed Salem Bin Ali Jaber v. United States*,  
24 861 F.3d 241, 245 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (citing first *Schlesinger v. Reservists Comm. To*  
25 *Stop the War*, 418 U.S. 208, 215 (1974) and quoting second *Tenet v. Doe*, 544 U.S.  
26 1, 6 n.4 (2005)) (emphasis added). If a political question is inextricable from a case,  
27 the doctrine “prevents a plaintiff’s claims from proceeding to the merits.” *Ahmed*  
28 *Salem Bin Ali Jaber*, 861 F.3d at 245 (citing *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 211

1 (1962)).

2  
3 There are at least six different “formulations” for determining whether a case  
4 presents a political question that is understood to deprive a federal court of subject  
5 matter jurisdiction. *Baker*, 369 U.S. at 217. As Defendants recognize, a case need  
6 only present one formulation for a political question to preclude jurisdiction. *Ahmed*  
7 *Salem Bin Ali Jaber*, 861 F.3d at 245 (citing *Schneider v. Kissinger*, 412 F.3d 190,  
8 194 (D.C. Cir. 2005)). The only formulation on which Defendant rely here is that  
9 there is a “textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issue to a  
10 coordinate political department[.]” *Baker*, 369 U.S. at 217.

11  
12 In particular, Defendants contend that this case presents the political question  
13 “whether and to what extent it is lawful for the United States to (allegedly)  
14 collaborate with the government of Mexico to control the flow of travel across the  
15 countries’ shared border[.]” (ECF No. 192-1 at 26.) Viewed in this light, Defendants  
16 contend that “Plaintiffs’ allegations and requests for relief are squarely outside the  
17 Court’s jurisdiction” under the first *Baker* formulation because “[f]oreign-relations  
18 matters are clearly committed by [the] Constitution to the Executive Branch,  
19 particularly as they relate to the United States’ efforts to manage the flow of travel  
20 across the border.” (*Id.* at 27.) For this reason, Defendants argue that “[t]he Court  
21 does not have jurisdiction to declare unlawful or enjoin [the alleged coordination  
22 with Mexican government officials][.]” (*Id.* at 28.) The Court disagrees with  
23 Defendants’ view about the questions this case presents and, thus, rejects  
24 Defendants’ argument that the political question doctrine precludes this Court from  
25 reviewing Plaintiffs’ claims or granting corresponding relief.

26  
27 The Court acknowledges that “[t]he exclusion of aliens is ‘a fundamental act  
28 of sovereignty’ by the political branches[.]” *Trump v. Hawaii*, 138 S. Ct. 2392, 2407

1 (2018) (quoting *United States ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy*, 338 U.S. 537, 542  
2 (1950)). The Executive possesses a recognized power “to regulate the entry of aliens  
3 into the United States” through its “inherent” “executive power to control the foreign  
4 affairs of the nation[.]” *Knauff*, 338 U.S. at 542; *E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v.*  
5 *Trump*, 909 F.3d 1219, 1231 (9th Cir. 2018). The Executive’s foreign affairs powers  
6 are understood to “derive from the President’s role as ‘Commander in Chief,’ [the  
7 President’s] right to ‘receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers,’ and [the  
8 President’s] general duty to ‘take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed’[.]” *E.*  
9 *Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, 909 F.3d at 1232 (citing U.S. Const. art. II, § 2, cl. 1  
10 (referring to President as “Commander in Chief”), *id.* § 3 (President’s power to  
11 receive ambassadors)) (internal citations omitted). But the Executive’s recognized  
12 power over foreign affairs under Article II of the Constitution is not exercised in a  
13 constitutional vacuum. By virtue of Article I, Congress possesses certain powers  
14 that render the admission or exclusion of aliens and foreign affairs an intimately  
15 legislative matter, including the specific constitutionally enumerated legislative  
16 powers “[t]o establish an uniform rule of Naturalization,’ to ‘regulate Commerce  
17 with foreign Nations,’ and to ‘declare War[.]’” *E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, 909  
18 F.3d at 1231 (citing U.S. Const. art. I § 8, cl. 4 (uniform naturalization rule power),  
19 *id.* § 8, cl. 3 (foreign commerce power), *id.* § 8, cl. 11 (war power)) (internal citations  
20 omitted). For this reason, it is indisputable that “‘over no conceivable subject is the  
21 legislative power of Congress more complete than it is over’ the admission of  
22 aliens.” *Fiallo v. Bell*, 430 U.S. 787, 792 (1977) (quoting *Oceanic Navigation Co.*  
23 *v. Stranahan*, 214 U.S. 320, 339 (1909)).

24  
25 The claims asserted in this case undercut Defendants’ invocation of the  
26 political question doctrine. Plaintiffs’ claims primarily concern alleged violations of  
27 various INA provisions and an implementing regulation through alleged denials of  
28 access to the U.S. asylum process and an alleged policy and pattern or practice of

1 denying asylum seekers access to the U.S. asylum process. (SAC ¶¶ 203–223  
2 (describing statutory and regulatory scheme that applies to asylum seekers); *id.* ¶¶  
3 256–69 (APA Section 706(1) claims based on certain INA provisions and  
4 implementing regulation); *id.* ¶¶ 270–82 (APA Section 706(2) claims premised on  
5 certain INA provisions and implementing regulation); *id.* ¶¶ 283–93 (Fifth  
6 Amendment Due Process Clause claims premised on certain INA provisions and  
7 implementing regulation).) Federal courts have the power to “review the political  
8 branches’ action to determine whether they exceed the constitutional or statutory  
9 scope of their authority.” *E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, 909 F.3d at 1232 (citing  
10 *Hawaii*, 138 S. Ct. at 2419).

11  
12 Although Plaintiffs’ claims concern immigration, the statutory questions the  
13 claims raise do not task the Court with, nor require the Court to engage in a  
14 freewheeling inquiry into the wisdom of immigration policy choices. *See Sale v.*  
15 *Haitian Ctrs. Council*, 509 U.S. 155, 165–66 (1993) (noting that “the wisdom of the  
16 policy choices made by Presidents Reagan, Bush, and Clinton is not a matter for our  
17 consideration. We must decide only whether Executive Order No. 12807, 57 Fed.  
18 Reg. 23133 (1992), which reflects and implements those choices, is consistent with  
19 § 243(h) of the INA.”). When “Congress has expressed its intent regarding an aspect  
20 of foreign affairs” through a legislative command and a court is asked to “evaluate  
21 the Government’s compliance” with that command, the court “is ‘not being asked to  
22 supplant a foreign policy decision of the political branches with the courts’ own  
23 unmoored determination of what United States policy . . . should be.’” *Ctr. for Bio.*  
24 *Diversity v. Mattis*, 868 F.3d 803, 823 (9th Cir. 2017) (quoting *Zivotofsky*, 566 U.S.  
25 at 196). “Instead, a court must engage in the ‘familiar judicial exercise’ of reading  
26 and applying a statute, conscious of the purpose expressed by Congress.” *Id.*  
27 (quoting *Zivotofsky*, 566 U.S. at 196). In this case, resolution of Plaintiffs’ claims  
28 turns on whether Defendants’ alleged conduct complies with or violates the relevant



1 INA provisions and implementing regulation. It is well within this Court’s Article  
2 III province and duty to resolve these claims.

3  
4 The Court acknowledges that there are some allegations that touch on alleged  
5 coordination with Mexican government officials.<sup>5</sup> (SAC ¶¶ 3, 7, 50–60.) The  
6 coordination, however, is merely an outgrowth of the alleged underlying conduct by  
7 U.S. officials. Based on the statutory claims in this case, review of such conduct  
8 does not present a nonjusticiable political question. Accordingly, the Court denies  
9 Defendants’ present motion to dismiss based on the political question doctrine.  
10 Defendants may reassert their political question doctrine challenge “[i]f it becomes  
11 clear at a later stage that resolving any of the plaintiffs’ claims requires” resolution  
12 of an asserted political question over which this Court might lack subject matter  
13 jurisdiction. *Al-Tamimi v. Adelson*, 916 F.3d 1, 14 (D.C. Cir. 2019).

14  
15  
16 <sup>5</sup> As Defendants point out (ECF No. 192-1 at 26 n.8), there are also allegations  
17 that concern alleged (mis)conduct by Mexican government officials. (SAC ¶¶ 29–  
18 31, 35, 44–45, 52–54, 74–75, 83, 96–97, 110, 156–59, 163, 166, 175–76, 197, 199–  
19 200.) Defendants argue that the act of state doctrine bars the issuance of declaratory  
20 or injunctive relief relating to these allegations. (ECF No. 192-1 at 26 n.8.) The  
21 Court does not agree. The act of state doctrine “bars a suit where ‘(1) there is an  
22 official act of a foreign sovereign performed within its own territory; and (2) the  
23 relief sought or the defense interposed [in the action would require] a court in the  
24 United States to declare invalid the [foreign sovereign’s] official act.’” *Sea Breeze  
25 Salt, Inc. v. Mitsubishi Corp.*, 899 F.3d 1064, 1069 (9th Cir. 2018) (quoting *Credit  
26 Suisse v. U.S. Dist. Court*, 130 F.3d 1342, 1346 (9th Cir. 1997)). The act of state  
27 doctrine does not bar the claims in this case because the Court is not asked to declare  
28 that any official acts of the Mexican government are unlawful. Instead, pursuant to  
U.S. law, Plaintiffs challenge the legality of conduct by U.S. officials. Although  
these officials have allegedly instructed Mexican officials to take certain conduct in  
furtherance of the challenged Turnback Policy, the Court can assess the legality of  
the U.S. officials’ alleged conduct and order any corresponding relief pursuant to the  
statutory provisions at issue in this case without contravening the act of state  
doctrine.

1 **II. Administrative Procedure Act Claims**

2 The bulk of Defendants’ motion to dismiss concerns the Plaintiffs’ APA  
3 claims. (ECF No. 192-1 at 6–18, 28–31; ECF No. 238 at 2–12.) Defendants’  
4 multipronged challenge to Plaintiffs’ APA claims consists of several arguments: (A)  
5 Organizational Plaintiff Al Otro Lado cannot state APA claims based on the INA  
6 provisions at issue as a “non-profit legal services organization,” (B) (1) the repleaded  
7 Section 706(1) claims of Plaintiffs Abigail, Beatrice, and Carolina Doe fail because  
8 they allegedly withdrew their applications for admission and (2) the Section 706(1)  
9 claims of all New Individual Plaintiffs fail because the relevant INA provisions and  
10 implementing regulation underlying their claims for relief “do not apply to  
11 individuals in Mexico,” and (C) Plaintiffs’ Section 706(2) APA claims fail because  
12 (1) Plaintiffs do not identify final agency action, (2) Plaintiffs challenge  
13 discretionary conduct over which the APA forecloses judicial review, and (3)  
14 Plaintiffs have not plausibly alleged an unlawful agency action. The Court considers  
15 Defendants’ arguments in turn and rejects each of them.

16

17 **A. Al Otro Lado’s APA Claims**

18 For a second time, Defendants challenge Al Otro Lado’s ability to assert APA  
19 claims premised on violations of the INA provisions and regulations at issue. (ECF  
20 No. 192-1 at 28; ECF No. 238 at 20.) Defendants contend that Al Otro Lado’s APA  
21 claims must be dismissed under Rule 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim because  
22 whereas the statutory and regulatory provisions pertain exclusively to aliens or  
23 refugees, Al Otro Lado is merely a “non-profit legal services organization[.]” (ECF  
24 No. 192-1 at 28; ECF No. 238 at 20.) Defendants’ argument simply reconfigures  
25 Defendants’ prior argument that Al Otro Lado falls outside the zone of interests of  
26 the relevant INA provisions. The Court squarely rejected Defendants’ argument in  
27 the prior dismissal order. *See Al Otro Lado*, 327 F. Supp. 3d at 1298–1302.  
28 Defendants identify no basis for the Court to depart from its prior decision.

1           However, in the time since the Court’s prior dismissal order, the Ninth Circuit  
2 has issued a decision that strengthens the Court’s prior rejection of Defendants’  
3 challenge to Al Otro Lado’s APA claims in this case. Specifically, in *East Bay*  
4 *Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump*, 909 F.3d 1219 (9th Cir. 2018), the government  
5 argued that various organizations, including Organizational Plaintiff Al Otro Lado  
6 who is also a plaintiff in that case, fell outside the zone of interests of certain INA  
7 provisions, including 8 U.S.C. § 1158, as “legal services organizations” and  
8 therefore could not challenge a rule promulgated by the Department of Justice and  
9 the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”), coinciding with a presidential  
10 proclamation, which together purported to make aliens who entered the United States  
11 at a place other than at a POE ineligible to apply for asylum in the United States. *Id.*  
12 at 1230–31, 1236–38. The Ninth Circuit rejected the government’s zone of interest  
13 argument, reasoning that “the Organizations’ interest in aiding immigrants seeking  
14 asylum is consistent with the INA’s purpose to ‘establish[] . . . [the] statutory  
15 procedure for granting asylum to refugees.” *Id.* at 1245 (quoting *INS v. Cardoza-*  
16 *Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421, 427 (1987)). The Court noted that “[w]ithin the asylum  
17 statute, Congress took steps to ensure that pro bono legal services of the type that the  
18 Organizations provide are available to asylum seekers.” *Id.* (citing 8 U.S.C. §  
19 1158(d)(4)(A)–(B)). The Ninth Circuit also determined that the INA, taken as a  
20 whole, otherwise supports the inference that Congress intended eligibility for  
21 organizations like the ones in *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant* to bring suit. *Id.*  
22 (identifying various INA provisions expressly referring to nongovernmental  
23 organizations as giving such organizations “a role in helping immigrants navigate  
24 the immigration process”). The Ninth Circuit’s reasoning in *East Bay Sanctuary*  
25 *Covenant* is equally applicable to this case and reinforces the Court’s prior rejection  
26 of Defendants’ challenge to Al Otro Lado’s APA claims.<sup>6</sup>

---

27  
28           <sup>6</sup> In the time since both the Court’s ruling and *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant*,

1           **B. Section 706(1) APA Claims**

2           The Court has previously discussed the principles governing Section 706(1)  
3 APA claims. Under Section 706(1), a court “shall . . . compel agency action  
4 unlawfully withheld or unreasonably delayed.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(1). A Section 706(1)  
5 claim “can only proceed where a plaintiff asserts that an agency failed to take a  
6 discrete agency action that it is required to take.” *Norton v. S. Utah Wilderness*  
7 *Alliance*, 542 U.S. 55, 64 (2004) [hereinafter “SUWA”].); *Hells Canyon*  
8 *Preservation Council v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 593 F.3d 923, 932 (9th Cir. 2010). The  
9 “limitation to required agency action rules out judicial direction of even discrete  
10 agency action that is not demanded by law.” SUWA, 542 U.S. at 65. Because of this  
11 limitation, courts “have no authority to compel agency action merely because the  
12 agency is not doing something we may think it should do.” *Zixiang Li v Kerry*, 710  
13 F.3d 995, 1004 (9th Cir. 2013).

14  
15  
16 one out-of-circuit district court has described this Court’s prior zone of interests  
17 analysis as a “limited circumstance[.]” for “organizations advocating for clients[.]”  
18 *De Dandrade v. United States Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, 367 F. Supp. 3d 174, 189  
19 (S.D.N.Y. 2019) (“In the limited circumstances in which district courts determined  
20 organizations advocating for clients fell within the INA’s zone of interest, the  
21 provisions of the INA at issue did not concern naturalization.”). The *De Dandrade*  
22 court in part misreads this Court’s prior analysis, which did not turn on whether Al  
23 Otro Lado has clients that fall within the zone of interests of the relevant INA  
24 provisions. The Court identified this as a potentially separate basis for Al Otro Lado  
25 to assert APA claims, but on which Al Otro Lado *did not rely*. *Al Otro Lado*, 327 F.  
26 Supp. 3d at 1301 n.7. In any event, as *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant* confirms, it is  
27 not necessary for an organization to premise its APA claims for the underlying INA  
28 provisions at issue in this case on the ground that the organization is representing  
specific clients seeking asylum. See *E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, 909 F.3d at 1244–  
45. Indeed, in *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, the Ninth Circuit expressly found that  
the organizations lacked third-party standing to assert claims on behalf of asylum  
seeker clients, yet concluded that the organizations possessed both Article III  
standing and fell within the INA’s zone of interests in their capacity as legal  
organizations that assist asylum seekers. Compare *id. with id.* at 1240–41.

1 Plaintiffs assert claims under Section 706(1) claims based on 8 U.S.C. §  
2 1225(a)(3), § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii), 1225(b)(2)(A), and 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(4). (SAC  
3 ¶¶ 256–69). In broad terms, Section 1225(a)(3) imposes a mandatory duty for  
4 immigration officers to inspect “[a]ll aliens . . . who are applicants for admission or  
5 otherwise seeking admission . . . to . . . the United States[.]” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3).  
6 Section 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii) imposes on an immigration officer a duty to refer an alien  
7 who indicates either an intention to apply for asylum under section 1158 or a fear of  
8 persecution for an asylum interview under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(B) with an asylum  
9 officer. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii). In turn, 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(4) imposes an  
10 analogous regulatory duty on the inspecting officer. For all other aliens, Section  
11 1225(b)(2)(A) imposes on an immigration officer a duty to detain the alien for  
12 general removal proceedings under 8 U.S.C. § 1229a. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

13  
14 Defendants raise two dismissal arguments that together concern the Section  
15 706(1) claims of ten Individual Plaintiffs. Defendants first move to dismiss the  
16 repleaded Section 706(1) claims of Original Individual Plaintiffs Abigail, Beatrice  
17 and Carolina Doe because these Plaintiffs allegedly withdrew their applications for  
18 admission. (ECF No. 192-1 at 5.) Second, Defendants argue that all New Individual  
19 Plaintiffs fail to state Section 706(1) claims because the statutory and regulatory  
20 provisions at issue “do not apply to individuals located in Mexico.” (*Id.* at 6–11.)  
21 The Court considers each argument in turn.

### 22 23 **1. Repleaded Section 706(1) Claims of Certain Plaintiffs**

24 Plaintiffs Abigail Doe, Beatrice Doe, and Carolina Doe once more each allege  
25 that, on one of the occasions they sought asylum at a POE, CBP officials coerced  
26 them into signing documents which stated that they lacked a fear of persecution and  
27 were withdrawing their applications for admission. (SAC ¶¶ 24–26, 122–23, 129–  
28 30, 136.) Carolina further alleges that CBP officers coerced her into recanting her

1 fear on video. (*Id.* ¶¶ 26, 135.)

2  
3 Based on their coercion allegations, Plaintiffs claimed in the original  
4 complaint that “CBP officials failed to take actions mandated” by, *inter alia*, 8  
5 C.F.R. § 235.4, the regulation which states that “[t]he alien’s decision to withdraw  
6 his or her application for admission must be made voluntarily.” (ECF No. 1 ¶ 153.)  
7 In the prior dismissal order, the Court dismissed Plaintiffs Abigail Doe, Beatrice  
8 Doe, and Carolina Doe’s Section 706(1) claims insofar as the claims sought to  
9 compel agency action under 8 C.F.R § 235.4, reasoning that “[t]he regulation does  
10 not require CBP officers to determine whether a withdrawal was made voluntarily,  
11 and it does not specify what CBP officers must do if a withdrawal was not.” *Al Otro*  
12 *Lado*, 327 F. Supp. 3d at 1314. The Court stated that “[t]his determination does not  
13 affect the Court’s conclusion that these Plaintiffs have otherwise stated Section  
14 706(1) claims regarding their alleged denial of access to the asylum process in the  
15 United States.” *Id.* at 1315. Plaintiffs Abigail Doe, Beatrice Doe, and Carolina Doe  
16 thus understandably replead Section 706(1) claims based on the alleged failure of  
17 immigration officers to inspect and refer them for asylum interviews or to otherwise  
18 detain them for a removal proceeding. (SAC ¶¶ 256, 260.)

19  
20 Notwithstanding the Court’s prior ruling expressly permitting Plaintiffs  
21 Abigail Doe, Beatrice Doe, and Carolina Doe’s Section 706(1) claims to proceed  
22 and the fact that no Plaintiff now alleges Section 706(1) claims based on 8 C.F.R. §  
23 235.4, (*see* SAC ¶ 260), Defendants argue that these Plaintiffs’ Section 706(1) claims  
24 must be dismissed because these Plaintiffs withdrew their applications for  
25 admission. (ECF No. 192-1 at 29–30.) Citing 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(4) and 8 C.F.R. §  
26 235.4—the statutory and regulatory provisions that authorize an alien to voluntarily  
27 withdraw an application for admission and “depart immediately from the United  
28 States”—Defendants argue that there is no continuing duty to inspect, refer, or detain

1 an alien who has withdrawn her application. (ECF No. 192-1 at 30.)

2  
3 Defendants' dismissal argument mistakes the Court's prior conclusion  
4 regarding a judicial inability to compel relief under 8 C.F.R. § 235.4 with an inability  
5 of the Court to otherwise compel discrete "agency action unlawfully withheld." 5  
6 U.S.C. § 706(1). As should have been clear from the Court's prior order, the inability  
7 to compel Section 706(1) relief under 8 C.F.R. § 235.4 does not preclude relief under  
8 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3), 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii), and 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(4) in  
9 this case. The parties agree that the mandatory duties to inspect all aliens and refer  
10 certain aliens seeking asylum are discrete actions for which this Court can compel  
11 Section 706(1) relief under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3), 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii), and  
12 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(4). In view of the parties' agreement regarding these duties, the  
13 Court does not understand Defendants' present dismissal argument.

14  
15 Under the provisions that form the basis of the repleaded Section 706(1)  
16 claims, an immigration officer must inspect an alien applying for admission and if  
17 the alien is inadmissible for making misrepresentations or lacking proper  
18 documentation and states an intent to seek or apply for asylum, the officer must refer  
19 the alien for a credible fear interview. As even Defendants do not dispute, Plaintiffs  
20 Abigail Doe, Beatrice Doe, and Carolina Doe's allegations plausibly show that CPB  
21 officers failed to take the discrete actions an immigration officer must take during  
22 the admission process for aliens like these Plaintiffs, who allege that they asserted  
23 an intent to apply for asylum and a fear of persecution. (SAC ¶¶ 24–26, 122–23,  
24 129–30, 134–36.) All parties also agree that 8 C.F.R. § 235.4 requires that an alien  
25 voluntarily withdraw an application. Taking these Plaintiffs' factual allegations of  
26 coercion as true, these Plaintiffs did not voluntarily withdraw their applications for  
27 admission. Thus, the mandatory duties to inspect and refer or detain were plausibly  
28 "unlawfully withheld" such that these Plaintiffs may seek Section 706(1) relief.

1 Accordingly, the Court denies Defendants’ latest attempt to dismiss Plaintiff Abigail  
2 Doe, Beatrice Doe, and Carolina Doe’s Section 706(1) claims.<sup>7</sup>

## 3 4 **2. New Individual Plaintiffs’ Section 706(1) Claims**

5 As noted, all Plaintiffs’ Section 706(1) claims are premised on alleged failures  
6 of CBP officers to take actions mandated by 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3), 8 U.S.C. §  
7 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii), 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2), and 8 C.F.R. § 253.3(b)(4). (SAC ¶ 260.)  
8 Two interlocking arguments are central to Defendants’ dismissal challenge to the  
9 New Individual Plaintiffs’ Section 706(1) claims. First, Defendants contend that the  
10 text of the underlying statutory and regulatory provisions “do not apply to  
11 individuals in Mexico.” (ECF No. 192-1 at 6–11; ECF No. 238 at 1–7.) Second,  
12 Defendants contend that, unlike the Original Individual Plaintiffs’ allegations, the  
13 New Individuals Plaintiffs’ allegations show that these latter Plaintiffs were in  
14 Mexico when they were allegedly turned away. (ECF No. 192-1 at 2 & n.2, 6–11;  
15 ECF No. 238 at 1–7.) The Court finds it prudent to outline the SAC’s allegations  
16 and then to address whether the allegations are sufficient to state claims for Section  
17 706(1) relief under a proper construction of the relevant INA statutory and regulatory  
18 provisions.

19  
20  
21  
22 <sup>7</sup> In opposition to Defendants’ motion to dismiss the SAC, Plaintiffs state in a  
23 footnote that they “respectfully disagree with and preserve for appeal the Court’s  
24 conclusion that it cannot compel relief under Section 706(1) based on Defendants’  
25 alleged violation of 8 C.F.R. § 235.4[.]” (ECF No. 210 at 34 n.30.) The Court does  
26 not understand how Plaintiffs have preserved an issue for appeal (1) which they  
27 chose not to replead in their Section 706(1) claims and (2) for which Plaintiffs offer  
28 no argument based on an application of the legal standards that govern a Section  
706(1) claim to the text of 8 C.F.R. § 235.4. In any event, to the extent Plaintiffs’  
assertion is animated by a concern that the Court would dismiss the repleaded  
Section 706(1) claims on the grounds Defendants raise, this Order moots that  
concern.



1 **a. New Individual Plaintiffs' Factual Allegations**

2 As a threshold matter, Plaintiffs dispute whether the Court can even resolve  
3 Defendants' challenge to the New Individual Plaintiffs' Section 706(1) claims at this  
4 juncture. (ECF No. 210 at 4–5.) Plaintiffs contend that Defendants' argument calls  
5 for the Court to improperly find facts at the pleading stage, “specifically, that the  
6 new Individual Plaintiffs were standing in Mexico when they confronted CBP  
7 officers.” (ECF No. 210 at 4.) According to Plaintiffs, the SAC “does not actually  
8 state that any Plaintiffs were in Mexico territory when CBP turned them back,” and  
9 thus the Court must “assume that all Individual Plaintiffs were on U.S. soil when  
10 Defendants turned them back.” (*Id.* at 4–5.) This argument is echoed by *Amici*  
11 Immigration law Professors. (ECF No. 221-1 at 4–5.)

12  
13 Implicit in Plaintiffs' argument is the notion that the Court should assume  
14 facts essential to their ability to state Section 706(1) claims to compel agency action  
15 pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3), § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii), 1225(b)(2)(A), and 8 C.F.R.  
16 § 235.3(b)(4). The Court cannot do this. “Dismissal is warranted under Rule  
17 12(b)(6) where the complaint lacks a cognizable theory or where the complaint  
18 presents a cognizable legal theory *yet fails to plead essential facts under that theory.*”  
19 *C.B. v. Sonora Sch. Dist.*, 691 F. Supp. 2d 1123, 1128 (E.D. Cal. 2009) (citing  
20 *Robertson v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc.*, 749 F.2d 530, 534 (9th Cir. 1984))  
21 (emphasis added). And this Court has recognized, “[d]espite the deference the Court  
22 must pay to the plaintiff's allegations, it is not proper for the Court to assume that  
23 the [plaintiff] can prove facts that [he or she] has not alleged.” *Tinoco v. San Diego*  
24 *Gas & Elec. Co.*, 327 F.R.D. 651, 657 (S.D. Cal. 2018) (quoting *Associated Gen.*  
25 *Contractors of Cal, Inc. v. Cal. State Council of Carpenters*, 459 U.S. 519,  
26 526(1983)) (alterations in original). Tellingly, both sides expressly rely on the  
27 SAC's allegations to argue whether the relevant INA provisions embrace the New  
28 Individual Plaintiffs. (ECF No. 192-1 at 7, 8, 9, 11; ECF No. 210 at 4.) Thus, the

1 Court rejects Plaintiffs’ threshold dispute.

2  
3 The Court turns to a key concession that undergirds Defendants’ argument.  
4 Defendants concede that a POE is within the U.S. (*See* ECF No. 192-1 at 11 (“[A]s  
5 the regulation says, an ‘arriving alien’ is an ‘applicant for admission’ *at a port of*  
6 *entry, all of which are located within the territorial United States.*” (quoting 8 C.F.R.  
7 §§ 1.2, 235.3(b)(4), 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1)) (emphasis added).) Defendants further  
8 argue that a POE is not a “geographic area,” but instead a discrete facility. (ECF No.  
9 238 at 5–6.) Defendants ground this argument in a Ninth Circuit decision regarding  
10 a conviction for illegal entry under 8 U.S.C. § 1325—a statutory provision that  
11 criminalizes an alien’s entry into the United States at any time or place other than as  
12 designed by immigration officers—for entry at a place other than a POE. *See United*  
13 *States v. Aldana*, 878 F.3d 877, 880–82 (9th Cir. 2017) (“[T]here is no indication  
14 that DHS intended to change the meaning of ‘port of entry’ [in 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(a)]  
15 to refer to geographical areas, as opposed to specific facilities where an alien could  
16 apply for entry.”) (upholding convictions under Section 1325(a)(1) for unlawful  
17 entry in the United States based in part on 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(a)).

18  
19 Under Defendants’ own view, any New Individual Plaintiff who has  
20 sufficiently alleged that he or she was “at a POE” has stated Section 706(1) claims  
21 for the various INA provisions and implementing regulation that form the basis of  
22 Plaintiffs’ claims. Defendants’ dismissal argument should therefore fail on its own  
23 terms for New Individual Plaintiffs Victoria Doe, Bianca Doe, Emiliana Doe, and  
24 César Doe. These four New Individual Plaintiffs offer allegations that, on one or  
25 more occasion, they were “at a POE” and requested asylum, but CBP officers  
26 refused. (SAC ¶¶ 32–35, 181, 185, 187, 193, 199.) As Plaintiffs observe, (ECF No.  
27 210 at 7), the preposition “at” is a “function word” used “to indicate presence or  
28 occurrence in, on, or near.” *See* Merriam-Webster Dictionary,

1 <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/at> (last accessed May 2, 2019).  
2 Although Defendants would like these New Individual Plaintiffs to plead additional  
3 factual allegations, the word “at” can plausibly embrace the inference that these New  
4 Individual Plaintiffs are not subject to Defendants’ challenge.<sup>8</sup>

5  
6 The remaining four New Individual Plaintiffs, however, offer allegations that  
7 defeat such an inference. New Individual Plaintiffs Roberto Doe, Maria Doe, and  
8 Juan and Úrsula Doe allege that they “sought access to the asylum process by  
9 presenting” themselves at the Hidalgo, Texas POE and Laredo, Texas POE and  
10 “encountered CBP officials in the middle of the bridge” between Mexico and the  
11 U.S. POE and “told them” they “wanted to seek asylum in the United States.” (SAC  
12 ¶¶ 29–31, 154–55, 162, 174.) The CBP officials, however, allegedly denied Roberto  
13 Doe access “by telling him the POE was full and that he could not enter,” told Maria  
14 Doe to wait on the Mexican side of the border where she was told “U.S. officials  
15 would not let her and her children cross the bridge,” and told Juan and Úrsula Doe  
16 that “the POE was closed and that they could not enter.” (*Id.* ¶¶ 155, 162, 174.)  
17 These allegations squarely call on the Court to address Defendants’ arguments  
18 regarding the proper construction of the statutory and regulatory provisions in this  
19 case and to apply that construction to the factual allegations.

#### 20 21 **b. Scope of the Relevant Provisions**

22 The starting point of statutory interpretation is the statute’s language.  
23 *Landreth Timber Co. v. Landreth*, 471 U.S. 681, 685 (1985). “[I]f the statutory  
24 language is plain,” a court “enforce[s] it according to its terms.” *King v. Burwell*,

25  
26 <sup>8</sup> Even if the Court did not draw the inference that New Individual Plaintiffs  
27 Victoria Doe, Bianca Doe, Emiliana Doe, and César Doe were sufficiently “at a  
28 POE” for the purposes of Defendants’ present motion, the Court’s analysis regarding  
the scope of the statutory and regulatory provision similarly applies to their  
allegations and Section 706(1) claims.

1 135 S. Ct. 2480, 2489 (2015) (citing *Hardt v. Reliance Standard Life Ins. Co.*, 560  
2 U.S. 242, 251 (2010)). A court interprets a statute “to give effect, if possible, to  
3 every clause and word of a statute.” *Duncan v. Walker*, 533 U.S. 167, 174 (2001)  
4 (citation omitted). This process of statutory interpretation proceeds “with reference  
5 to the statutory context, structure, history, and purpose, ‘as well as overall common  
6 sense.’” *Abramski v. United States*, 573 U.S. 169, 179 (2014) (quoting *Maracich v.*  
7 *Spears*, 570 U.S. 48, 76 (2013)). Two statutory provisions are relevant to  
8 Defendants’ motion to dismiss: 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1)’s general provision for asylum  
9 and 8 U.S.C. § 1225’s articulation of certain immigration officer duties. The Court  
10 considers the relevant statutory text in light of these principles.

11

12 **(1) 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1)**

13 Although Plaintiffs do not premise their Section 706(1) claims to compel  
14 agency action on 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1), both sides anchor their statutory analysis in  
15 this provision. Under Section 1158(a)(1)’s plain language, two classes of aliens may  
16 apply for asylum: (1) any alien “who is physically present in the United States” and  
17 (2) any alien “who arrives in the United States.” Applying the rule against  
18 surplusage, the Court must presume that the phrases “mean different things.”  
19 *Duncan*, 533 U.S. at 174.<sup>9</sup> The parties’ dispute turns on whether the New Individual  
20

20

21 <sup>9</sup> The Court recognizes that the rule against surplusage “is not absolute.”  
22 *Lamie v. U.S. Tr.*, 540 U.S. 526, 536 (2004). A court need not apply the rule when  
23 its application would be “at the expense of [the statute’s] more natural reading, the  
24 structure of the [statutory provision], and the structure of the Act.” *Tima v. AG,*  
25 *United States*, 903 F.3d 272, 278 (3d Cir. 2018). Defendants appear to argue against  
26 application of the rule and insist that Section 1158(a)(1)’s phrases are “not  
27 surplusage” but together “ensure that any alien within the United States may apply  
28 for asylum[.]” (ECF No. 238 at 4.) For reasons the will become clear, the Court  
does not agree with Defendants’ arguments regarding the full scope of the  
provisions. And the Court cannot find that application of the rule against surplusage  
contravenes Section 1158(a)(1)’s natural reading as identifying two different classes  
of aliens who may apply for asylum, one of which includes aliens who are not

1 Plaintiffs fall within the second class of aliens.

2

3 Defendants argue that any Plaintiffs on Mexican soil cannot qualify as an alien  
4 who was “arriving in the United States.” Defendants’ opening brief largely does not  
5 offer meaningful analysis regarding Section 1158(a)(1), except to contend that a  
6 plain language reading of the statute shows that it does not apply to the New  
7 Individual Plaintiffs. (ECF No. 192-1 at 7–8.) In the face of Plaintiffs’ statutory  
8 analysis, however, Defendants advance three arguments. First, Defendants contend  
9 that “the use of the present simple tense creates a nexus between the alien’s ability  
10 to apply for asylum and the alien’s current physical presence (or arrival) in the  
11 United States.” (ECF No. 238 at 2.) Defendants observe that the phrase “alien who  
12 arrives in” is still linked with the geographic location of the United States. Second,  
13 Defendants argue that the presumption against extraterritorial application of federal  
14 statutes forecloses application of Section 1158 to conduct that occurs outside the  
15 United States. (*Id.* at 3.) Third, Defendants argue that Congress has enacted a  
16 separate scheme to deal with refugee claims for persons outside the United States.  
17 (*Id.* at 3–4.) The Court rejects each of Defendants’ arguments and, in doing so, the  
18 Court concludes that Congress included aliens in the process of arriving in the United  
19 States in Section 1158(a)(1)’s general authorization to apply for asylum.

20

21 **(a) The Statute’s Present Tense (Con)Text**

22 Defendants argue that the statute’s use of the phrase “alien who arrives in” is  
23 linked with a geographic location because “use of the present simple tense creates a  
24 nexus between the alien’s ability to apply for asylum and the alien’s current physical  
25 presence (or arrival) in the United States.” (ECF No. 238 at 2.) Although Plaintiffs  
26 assert that “arrives in” “must mean something different than geographic presence in

27

28 \_\_\_\_\_  
physically in the United States but are in the process of doing so.

1 the United States[.]” (ECF No. 210 at 8), Plaintiffs do not so much dispute that  
2 Section 1158(a)(1)’s use of “arrives in” has a geographic focus. Rather, Plaintiffs’  
3 fundamental contention is that the statute’s use of the present tense embraces an alien  
4 who is in the process of arriving in the United States. (*Id.* at 7.) According to  
5 Plaintiffs, the “natural meaning” of “arrives in,” as used in the statute, encompasses  
6 “someone who is in the process of ‘arriv[ing] in’ the United States[.]” (*Id.*) Based  
7 on this reading, Plaintiffs argue that “because all Individual Plaintiffs were arriving  
8 in the United States, they are covered by” this provision. (*Id.*) The Court agrees.

9  
10 “Congress’ use of a verb tense is significant in construing statutes.” *United*  
11 *States v. Wilson*, 503 U.S. 329, 333 (1992) (collecting statutes). Although neither  
12 side raises this point, it bears noting that Congress has enacted the Dictionary Act to  
13 guide interpretation of congressional statutes. Pursuant to the Act, “[i]n determining  
14 the meaning of any Act of Congress, unless the context indicates otherwise—words  
15 used in the present tense include the future as well as the present.” 1 U.S.C. § 1.  
16 This provision of the Dictionary Act has been applied to the INA. *See Carrillo de*  
17 *Palacios v. Holder*, 651 F.3d 969, 976 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing 1 U.S.C. § 1). When  
18 accounting for the rule against surplusage, application of the Dictionary Act readily  
19 leads to the conclusion that Section 1158(a)(1)’s use of the present tense of “arrives”  
20 plainly covers an alien who may not yet be in the United States, but who is in the  
21 process of arriving in the United States through a POE.

22  
23 This reading is buttressed by statutory provisions that Section 1158(a)(1)  
24 expressly incorporates. Section 1158(a)(1) references the Section 1225 procedure  
25 for aliens seeking asylum at the border. 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1). In relevant part,  
26 Section 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii) requires an immigration officer to refer an inadmissible  
27 alien “*who is arriving* in the United States” and who expresses a fear of persecution  
28 or “an intention to apply for asylum” for an interview with an asylum officer. 8

1 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii) (emphasis added). The use of the present progressive,  
2 like use of the present participle, denotes an ongoing process. *See United States v.*  
3 *Balint*, 201 F.3d 928, 933 (7th Cir. 2000) [U]se of the present progressive tense,  
4 formed by pairing a form of the verb ‘to be’ and the present participle, or ‘-ing’ form  
5 of an action verb, generally indicates continuing action.”); *Laube v. Allen*, 506 F.  
6 Supp. 2d 969, 980 (M.D. Ala. 2007) (observing that a statute’s use of the present  
7 participle “denotes action that is continuing or progressing”); *cf. Khakhn v. Holder*,  
8 371 Fed. App’x 933, 937 (10th Cir. 2010) (finding use of the present participle  
9 phrase “applying for adjustment” in section 1104(g) of the LIFE Act as  
10 “unambiguous” that an alien who “is no longer applying for adjustment of status  
11 under the LIFE Act” cannot prevent reinstatement of a prior deportation order).  
12 Section 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii) therefore reinforces the conclusion that Congress intended  
13 to authorize aliens in the process of arriving into the United States to apply for  
14 asylum under Section 1158(a)(1). *See E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump*, 349 F.  
15 Supp. 3d 838, 844 (N.D. Cal. 2018) (observing that “[a]sylum is a protection granted  
16 to foreign nationals already in the United States *or at the border* who meet the  
17 international law definition of a ‘refugee.’” (emphasis added)).

18  
19 Although Defendants focus on the “geographic nexus” that Section 1158(a)(1)  
20 creates with the United States, they ignore its use of the present tense. In fact,  
21 Defendants’ opening briefing expressly rewrites the statutory provision into the past  
22 tense to seek dismissal of the New Individual Plaintiffs’ claims: “[n]one of the  
23 Extraterritorial Plaintiffs alleges he or she was ‘physically present in’ the United  
24 States or *had ‘arrive[d] in’ the United States* when subjected to Defendants’ alleged  
25 conduct.” (ECF No. 192-1 at 8 (brackets in original and emphasis added).) In reply,  
26 Defendants similarly argue for a past tense revision. (ECF No. 238 at 2 (purporting  
27 to argue about the meaning of the statute’s “present simple tense” yet citing *Matter*  
28 *of F-P-R*, 24 I. & N. Dec. 681, 683 (BIA 2008) for the proposition that “‘last arrival

1 in’ at 8 C.F.R. § 1208.4(a)(2)(ii) . . . mean[s] the alien’s most recent coming or  
2 crossing into the United States *after having traveled* from somewhere outside of the  
3 country.” (emphasis added).) Defendants’ argument must fail because it invites the  
4 Court to do what it cannot: “[w]e are not at liberty to rewrite the words chosen by  
5 Congress.” *United States v. Vargas-Amaya*, 389 F.3d 901, 906 (9th Cir. 2004).

6  
7       Were the statute’s text not enough, as *Amici* Immigration Law Professors  
8 observe, there is relevant legislative history on Congress’s intent in adopting the term  
9 “arriving alien,” as reflected in a statement by Representative Lamar Smith,  
10 Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee’s Subcommittee on Immigration and  
11 Claims. (ECF No. 221-1 at 11.) In particular, Representative Smith observed that  
12 the term “was selected specifically by Congress in order to provide a flexible concept  
13 that would include all aliens who are in the process of physical entry past our  
14 borders[.]. . . . ‘Arrival’ in this context should not be considered ephemeral or  
15 instantaneous but, consistent with common usage, as a process. An alien  
16 apprehended at any stage of this process, whether attempting to enter, at the point of  
17 entry, or just having made entry, should be considered an ‘arriving alien’ for the  
18 various purposes in which that term is used in the newly revised provisions of the  
19 INA.” *Implementation of Title III of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant*  
20 *Responsibility Act of 1996: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Immigration and*  
21 *Claims of the H. Comm. on the Judiciary*, 105th Cong. 17–18 (1997). Despite  
22 Defendants’ attempt to dismiss this legislative history, (ECF No. 238 at 6), it  
23 confirms the propriety of the Court’s conclusion that the statute’s use of the present  
24 tense encompasses aliens in the process of arriving. *See Daniel v. Nat’l Park Serv.*,  
25 891 F.3d 762, (9th Cir. 2018) (“[T]he legislative history ‘confirms what we have  
26 concluded from the text alone.’” (quoting *Mohamad v. Palestinian Auth.*, 566 U.S.  
27 449, 460 (2012))).

28





1 Defendants fail to actually apply the framework to Section 1158. The Court  
2 will not undertake the task of doing Defendants’ work for them, particularly when  
3 Defendants effectively seek to rely on the presumption as a bar to application of  
4 Section 1158 to the New Individual Plaintiffs. This is not how the presumption  
5 works.

6  
7 In any event, the Court finds that the presumption is rebutted in this case.  
8 First, as Plaintiffs contend (ECF No. 210 at 8–9), “[i]mmigration statutes, by their  
9 very nature, pertain to activity at or near international borders. It is natural to expect  
10 that Congress intends for laws that regulate conduct that occurs near international  
11 borders to apply to some activity that takes place on the foreign side of those  
12 borders.” *United States v. Villanueva*, 408 F.3d 193, 199 (5th Cir. 2005). A reading  
13 of Section 1158(a)(1), when placed into context, shows that Congress intended the  
14 statute to apply to asylum seekers in the process of arriving. The Court concludes  
15 that the statute’s language sufficiently displaces the presumption. *See RJR Nabisco*,  
16 *Inc.*, 136 S. Ct. at 2102 (observing that “[w]hile the presumption can be overcome  
17 only by a clear indication of extraterritorial effect, an express statement of  
18 extraterritoriality is not essential. ‘Assuredly context can be consulted as well.’”  
19 (quoting *Morrison v. Nat’l Australian Bank Ltd.*, 561 U.S. 247, 265 (2010))). Even  
20 if the Court proceeded to the second step of the extraterritoriality analysis, the factual  
21 allegations of this case concern the conduct of U.S. officials acting from within the  
22 United States or from areas over which the U.S. exercises sovereignty, whether the  
23 Court looks at the alleged Turnback Policy or the alleged acts of individual CBP  
24 officers standing on the U.S. side of the international bridge between Mexico and  
25 the United States. As the Court has discussed, Section 1158(a)(1) incorporates  
26 Section 1225, which in turns places a focus on immigration officers who process  
27 arriving aliens. Thus, even if the New Individual Plaintiffs had not crossed into the  
28 United States when they were attempting admission and expressed to CBP officers

1 an intent to seek asylum in the United States, they have alleged conduct occurring in  
2 the United States that is a focus of the relevant statutory provisions when viewed in  
3 context. Thus, this case involves a permissible territorial application of Section  
4 1158.

5  
6 **(c) 8 U.S.C. § 1157(c) Refugee Admission Process**

7 Finally, for the first time in reply, Defendants point to 8 U.S.C. § 1157(c) to  
8 argue that this Court should not read Section 1158(a)(1) to encompass aliens who  
9 are not yet in the United States. (ECF No. 238 at 3–4, 16.) According to Defendants,  
10 under Section 1157(c), “a process already exists for accepting applications for  
11 refugee status from persons outside the United States.” (ECF No. 238 at 3–4, 16.)  
12 Defendants argue that “to adopt Plaintiffs’ interpretation of Section 1158 would  
13 render section 1157 redundant.” (*Id.* at 4.) The Court does not share Defendants’  
14 view.

15  
16 Even a cursory review of Section 1157 shows that the statute establishes a  
17 fundamentally different and separate scheme for admission of refugees into the  
18 United States in the case of “humanitarian concerns” or “national interest.” 8 U.S.C.  
19 § 1157(a)(1). The number of admissions is limited to “such number as the President  
20 determines, before the beginning of the fiscal year and after appropriate consultation,  
21 is justified by humanitarian concerns or is otherwise in the national interest.” 8  
22 U.S.C. § 1157(a)(2). Section 1157(c) permits the Attorney General, subject to the  
23 numerical limitation, to “admit any refugee who is not firmly resettled in any foreign  
24 country, is determined to be of special humanitarian concern to the United States,  
25 and is admissible. . . as an immigrant.” 8 U.S.C. § 1157(c)(1). Notably, Section  
26 1157 does not refer to the asylum procedures set forth in Section 1158(a)(1), nor  
27 does Section 1157 concern Section 1225’s focus on inspection of arriving aliens.  
28 These textual differences blunt the force of Defendants’ argument that reading

1 Section 1158(a)(1) in the manner the Court has would improperly render Section  
2 1157 redundant, particularly in this case. No New Individual Plaintiff seeks relief  
3 under Section 1157. In contrast, their allegations plausibly show that they were  
4 arriving aliens and thus may avail themselves of the procedural protections available  
5 under Sections 1158 and 1225. Accordingly, the Court rejects Defendants’ Section  
6 1157(c) argument.

7

8 \* \* \*

9 In sum, the Court concludes that Section 1158(a)(1)’s plain language, properly  
10 construed, embraces any New Individual Plaintiffs whose allegations show that they  
11 were in the process of arriving in the United States at the time of the challenged  
12 conduct. With this construction in mind, the Court turns to the statutory provisions  
13 pursuant to which the New Individual Plaintiffs seek to compel Section 706(1) relief.

14

15 **(2) 8 U.S.C. § 1225**

16 The core of the New Individual Plaintiffs’ Section 706(1) APA claims lies in  
17 certain mandatory duties that 8 U.S.C. § 1225 imposes on an immigration officer.  
18 As a threshold matter, Plaintiffs’ opposition to Defendants’ motion to dismiss is  
19 silent on dismissal of the New Individual Plaintiffs’ Section 706(1) claims insofar as  
20 the claims are premised on 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A), a provision that requires  
21 detention of aliens not otherwise covered under 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1) and who have  
22 not shown that they are entitled to admission clearly and beyond a doubt. (*Compare*  
23 *ECF No. 192-1 at 9–10 with ECF No. 210 at 5–9.*) Thus, the Court construes  
24 Defendants’ motion to dismiss as unopposed insofar as Defendants seek dismissal  
25 of Plaintiffs’ Section 706(1) claims. The Court limits its analysis to the statutory  
26 and regulatory duties to inspect and refer asylum seekers under 8 U.S.C. §  
27 1225(a)(3), 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii), and 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(4). Many of the  
28 previously articulated statutory construction principles applied to Section 1158(a)(1)

1 carry over and lead the Court to a similar interpretation of these provisions.

2

3

**(a) Statutory Duty to Inspect**

4 Section 1225 establishes that “[a]ll aliens . . . who are applicants for admission  
5 or *otherwise seeking admission* or readmission to or transit through the United States  
6 shall be inspected by immigration officers.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3) (emphasis  
7 added). Section 1225(a)(3) provides a stronger textual argument that the duty to  
8 inspect applies to aliens who may not yet be in the territorial United States. Referring  
9 to the statute, albeit in passing, the Ninth Circuit has observed that “[a]ll applicants  
10 for admission, whether they are at the border or already physically present inside the  
11 country, must ‘be inspected by immigration officers’ who will determine their  
12 admissibility.” *Ortega-Cervantes v. Gonzales*, 501 F.3d 1111, 1118 (9th Cir. 2007)  
13 (quoting 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3)). This interpretation makes sense because Section  
14 1225(a)(3)’s duty to inspect reaches beyond “applicants for admission” to  
15 encompass aliens who are “otherwise seeking admission.” 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3).

16

17 Defendants fail to explain how, as a textual matter, Section 1225(a)(3)’s use  
18 of the phrase “otherwise seeking admission . . . to . . . the United States” does not  
19 include aliens who may be located outside the United States, but who are in the  
20 process of seeking admission to the United States. Instead, Defendants contend that  
21 the New Individual Plaintiffs were not seeking admission “in the manner prescribed  
22 by statute and regulation.” (ECF No. 192-1 at 8 (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1), 8  
23 C.F.R. § 235.1(a).) Defendants point to a regulation, which provides that  
24 “[a]pplication to lawfully enter the United States shall be made in person to an  
25 immigration officer at a U.S. port-of-entry when the port is open for inspection, or  
26 as otherwise designated in this section.” 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(a). All New Individual  
27 Plaintiffs, however, allege that they sought admission to the United States by  
28 presenting him or herself to a CBP officer at a U.S. POE. (SAC ¶¶ 29–35, 154–56,

1 162, 165–67, 174–75, 181, 185, 187–88, 193, 199.) Plaintiffs do not allege that the  
2 POE was not open, but rather that CBP officers told them that the POE purportedly  
3 did not have “capacity” to accept applications from asylum seekers. (*Id.* ¶¶ 83, 85–  
4 86, 93–94, 95–97, 98–102, 103–05, 153–202.) These allegations plausibly show  
5 that these Plaintiffs were seeking admission into the United States. Defendants’  
6 challenge to any Section 706(1) claims premised on the duty to inspect therefore  
7 fails.

8  
9 **(b) Statutory and Regulatory Duties to Refer**

10 Section 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii) provides that:

11 If an immigration officer determines that *an alien* (other than an  
12 alien described in subparagraph (F)) *who is arriving in the United*  
13 *States* or is described in clause (iii) is inadmissible under section  
14 1182(a)(6)(C) or 1182(a)(7) of this title and the alien indicates  
15 either an intention to apply for asylum under section 1158 of this  
16 title or a fear of persecution, the officer shall refer the alien for an  
17 interview by an asylum officer under subparagraph (B).

18 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii) (emphasis added).

19 Unlike Section 1225(a)(1), Section 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii) uses the present progressive  
20 phrase “to be arriving.” This phrase plainly encompasses aliens who are in the  
21 process of arriving in the United States. As the Court has discussed, Defendants’  
22 challenge to the New Individual Plaintiffs’ Section 706(1) claims largely turns on  
23 rewriting the statute into the past tense. Properly applying the statute’s use of the  
24 phrase alien “who is arriving in the United States” to the allegations of the New  
25 Individual Plaintiffs blunts Defendants’ argument. This is equally true for the four  
26 New Individual Plaintiffs who allege that they were crossing the international bridge  
27 to the physical POE and were stopped midway on the bridge, yet who told the CBP  
28 officers that they wanted to seek asylum in the United States.

The plain language of DHS’s own implementing regulations sweeps more

1 broadly. 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(4) imposes an analogous regulatory duty on the  
2 inspecting officer not to proceed further with removal of an alien subject to the  
3 expedited removal provisions if the alien indicates an intention to apply for asylum,  
4 expresses a fear of persecution or torture, or expresses a fear of return to his or her  
5 country. 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(4). Two additional regulations directly bear on the  
6 scope of 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(4). By regulation, the expedited removal provisions of  
7 the INA apply to “arriving aliens, as defined in 8 C.F.R. 1.2.” 8 C.F.R. §  
8 235.3(b)(1)(i). 8 C.F.R. § 1.2 in turn defines “arriving alien” to mean, in relevant  
9 part, “an applicant for admission coming or *attempting to come into the United States*  
10 *at a port-of-entry[.]*” 8 C.F.R. § 1.2 (emphasis added). “A regulation should be  
11 construed to give effect to the natural and plain meaning of its words.” *Bayview*  
12 *Hunters Point Cmty. Advocates v. Metro. Transp. Comm’n*, 366 F.3d 692, 698 (9th  
13 Cir. 2004) (quoting *Crown Pacific v. Occupational Safety & Health Review*  
14 *Comm’n*, 197 F.3d 1036, 1038 (9th Cir. 1999)). Here, by including aliens  
15 “attempting to come into the United States at a [POE],” the regulation is broader  
16 than 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1)’s definition of “applicant for admission.” And these  
17 regulations indicate that DHS—contrary to Defendants’ current position in this  
18 litigation—interprets the statutory obligations under Section 1225 to apply to aliens  
19 who have not yet come into the United States, but who are “attempting to” do so.  
20 As the Court has already determined, the New Individual Plaintiffs were in the  
21 process of seeking admission into the United States or otherwise attempting to do  
22 so. Their allegations plainly show that they expressed an intent to seek asylum in  
23 the United States to a CBP officer. Thus, the Court concludes that the New  
24 Individual Plaintiffs have stated a claim for relief under the mandatory duties  
25 reflected in 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii) and 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(4).

### 26 27 **C. Plaintiffs’ Section 706(2) APA Claims**

28 Under Section 706(2) of the APA, a reviewing court must “hold unlawful and

1 set aside agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be . . . arbitrary,  
2 capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; contrary  
3 to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; in excess of statutory  
4 jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right; [or] without  
5 observance of procedure required by law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)–(D).

6  
7 Plaintiffs assert Section 706(2) APA claims based on three sets of allegations.  
8 (SAC ¶¶ 270–82.) First, Plaintiffs challenge the alleged Turnback Policy and  
9 “sanctioning of CBP’s unlawful widespread pattern or practice of denying and  
10 unreasonably delaying asylum seekers’ access to the asylum process” under Section  
11 706(2)(C) and 706(2)(D). (*Id.* ¶¶ 272, 274.) Plaintiff allege that the Turnback Policy  
12 is a final agency action under 5 U.S.C. § 704. (*Id.* ¶ 274.) Second, Plaintiffs  
13 challenge the alleged turnbacks of Individual Plaintiffs and class members “at POEs  
14 or along the U.S.-Mexico border without following the procedures mandated by the  
15 INA and its implementing regulations” as unlawful conduct by CBP officials. (*Id.* ¶  
16 273.) Plaintiffs allege that each instance when Defendants directly or constructively  
17 deny Class Plaintiffs or purported class members access to the asylum process  
18 constitutes a final agency action under 5 U.S.C. § 704. (*Id.* ¶ 275.) Third, like the  
19 original complaint, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants have a pattern and practice of  
20 unlawfully turning back asylum seekers at POEs.

21  
22 Defendants raise three arguments for dismissal of Plaintiffs’ Section 706(2)  
23 claims. First, Defendants argue that Plaintiffs fail to identify final agency action to  
24 state APA claims for either the alleged Turnback Policy, the alleged widespread  
25 pattern or practice of denying access to the asylum process, or any individual  
26 turnbacks. Second, Defendants challenge the Section 706(2) claims of New  
27 Individual Plaintiffs allegedly in Mexico at the time of their injuries. Defendants  
28 argue that “metering is lawful” based on the Executive’s “inherent power” to control



1 the Nation’s foreign affairs and two statutory provisions that Defendants contend  
2 “authorize CBP officers to keep the [POEs] from being overwhelmed by an unsafe  
3 number of pedestrians at a given time.” (ECF No. 192-1 at 9–12 (relying on 8 U.S.C.  
4 § 1103(a)(3) and 6 U.S.C. § 202(2), (8).) Tucked into Defendants’ “metering is  
5 lawful” argument is Defendants’ third argument that the asserted breadth of  
6 Defendants’ authority under the same two statutory provisions makes Defendants’  
7 conduct unreviewable under the APA. The Court addresses the arguments and  
8 rejects them all.

### 10 1. Final Agency Action

11 The APA limits judicial review to agency action in the form of “the whole or  
12 part of an agency rule, order, license, sanction, relief, or the equivalent or denial  
13 thereof, or failure to act.” 5 U.S.C. § 551(13). An agency action must be  
14 “reviewable by statute” or be a “final agency action for which there is no other  
15 adequate remedy[.]” 5 U.S.C. § 704; *Navajo Nation v. Dep’t of the Interior*, 876  
16 F.3d 1144, 1171 (9th Cir. 2017).

17  
18 Two conditions must be satisfied for an agency action to be final: (1) “the  
19 action must mark the consummation of the agency’s decisionmaking process—it  
20 must not be of a merely tentative or interlocutory nature” and (2) “the action must  
21 be one by which rights or obligations have been determined, or from which legal  
22 consequences will flow.” *United States Army Corps of Engineers v. Hawkes Co.*,  
23 136 S. Ct. 1807, 1813 (2016) (quoting *Bennett v. Spear*, 520 U.S. 154, 177–78  
24 (1997)). “In determining whether an agency’s action is final, we look to whether [a]  
25 the action amounts to a definitive statement of the agency’s position or [b] has a  
26 direct and immediate effect on the day-to-day operations of the subject party, or [c]  
27 if immediate compliance with the terms is expected.” *Or. Nat. Desert Ass’n v.*  
28 *United States Forest Serv.*, 465 F.3d 977, 982 (9th Cir. 2006) (internal quotations

1 and citations omitted). The focus is “on the practical and legal effects of the agency  
2 action.” *Id.*

3  
4 “[A]gency action . . . need not be in writing to be final and judicially  
5 reviewable” pursuant to the APA. *Al Otro Lado, Inc.*, 327 F. Supp. 3d at 1319  
6 (quoting *R.I.L.-R v. Johnson*, 80 F. Supp. 3d 164, 184 (D.D.C. 2015)). An unwritten  
7 policy can still satisfy the APA’s pragmatic final agency action requirement. *See*  
8 *Venetian Casino Resort LLC v. EEOC*, 530 F.3d 925, 929 (D.C. Cir. 2008)  
9 (reviewing challenge to an agency’s “decision . . . to adopt [an unwritten] policy of  
10 disclosing confidential information without notice” because such a policy was  
11 “surely a consummation of the agency’s decisionmaking process” that impacted the  
12 plaintiff’s rights); *R.I.L.-R*, 80 F. Supp. 3d at 174–176 (determining that plaintiffs  
13 had shown a reviewable unwritten “DHS policy direct[ing] ICE officers to consider  
14 deterrence of mass migration as a factor in their custody determinations” as  
15 underlying the plaintiffs’ detention). “[A] contrary rule ‘would allow an agency to  
16 shield its decisions from judicial review simply by refusing to put those decisions in  
17 writing.’” *R.I.L.-R*, 80 F. Supp. 3d at 184 (quoting *Grand Canyon Tr. v. Pub. Serv.*  
18 *Co. of N.M.*, 283 F. Supp. 2d 1249, 1252 (D.N.M. 2003)); *see also Aracely, R. v.*  
19 *Nielsen*, 319 F. Supp. 3d 110, 138 (D.D.C. 2018) (“Despite Defendants’ assertions  
20 to the contrary, agency action need not be in writing to be judicially reviewable as a  
21 final action.”).

22  
23 There are, of course, limitations on whether challenged agency action is  
24 properly characterized as a policy, even if the policy is alleged to be unwritten. A  
25 plaintiff may not simply attach a policy label to disparate agency practices or  
26 conduct. *See Lujan v. Nat’l Wildlife Fed’n*, 497 U.S. 870, 890 (1990); *Bark v. U.S.*  
27 *Forest Serv.*, 37 F. Supp. 3d 41, 50 (D.D.C. 2014) (concluding that although the  
28 plaintiffs “have attached a [policy] label to their own amorphous description of the

1 [agency’s] practices,” “a final agency action requires more.”); *Lightfoot v. District*  
2 *of Columbia*, 273 F.R.D. 314, 326 (D.D.C. 2011) (“The question is not whether a  
3 constellation of disparate but equally suspect practices may be distilled from the  
4 varying experiences of the class; rather, Plaintiffs must first identify the ‘policy or  
5 custom’ they contend violates [the law] and then establish that the ‘policy or custom’  
6 is common to the class.”).

7  
8 The parties dispute whether Plaintiffs have shown the existence of final  
9 agency action for their Section 706(2) claims. Insofar as Plaintiffs seek to state  
10 Section 706(2) claims for individual turnbacks, the Court has already advised  
11 Plaintiffs that individual turnbacks—which fundamentally concern alleged failures  
12 by CBP officers to discharge certain mandatory statutory duties—are appropriately  
13 considered under Section 706(1). *See Al Otro Lado, Inc.*, 327 F. Supp. 3d at 1309  
14 (citing *Rosario v. United States Citizenship*, No. C15-0813JLR, 2017 WL 3034447,  
15 at \*7 n.6 (W.D. Wash. July 18, 2017); *Leigh v. Salazar*, No. 3:13-cv-00006-MMD-  
16 VPC, 2014 WL 4700016, at \*4 (D. Nev. Sept. 22, 2014) (construing a Section 706(2)  
17 claim regarding an agency’s alleged failure to act as in fact a Section 706(1) claim)).  
18 This admonition applies equally to individual turnbacks that allegedly occurred  
19 because of the Turnback Policy. Thus, the Court limits its present analysis to  
20 whether the Turnback Policy and the alleged pattern or practice of illegal tactics by  
21 CBP officers constitute final agency action sufficient for Plaintiffs to state an APA  
22 claim.

23  
24 **a. Alleged Turnback Policy**

25 In the wake of the Court’s dismissal of Plaintiffs’ previous Section 706(2)  
26 claims, Plaintiffs have revised their factual allegations and their Section 706(2)  
27 policy claim. Plaintiffs disavow a policy of categorical denials of access to the  
28 asylum system. (ECF No. 210 at 10–11.) Instead, Plaintiffs contend that

1 “Defendants, high-level agency officials, have adopted a policy mandating that CBP  
2 officers at POEs drastically restrict the flow of asylum seekers at POEs along the  
3 U.S.-Mexico border by turning them back to Mexico when they present themselves  
4 for inspection, based on the false claims of ‘capacity constraints.’” (*Id.*) Plaintiffs  
5 have sufficiently alleged the existence of such a policy that constitutes a final agency  
6 action.

7  
8 Plaintiffs allege that the Turnback Policy originated in 2016, was formalized  
9 in 2018 as a culmination of the agency’s decision-making process, and is being  
10 actively implemented along the border. (SAC ¶¶ 48–83 (explaining the initiation  
11 and development of the Turnback Policy, based on publicly available materials and  
12 limited discovery from CBP).) Plaintiffs point to various instances of U.S.  
13 government officials’ acknowledgement of a policy concerning the ability of  
14 noncitizens to access asylum when they present themselves at the U.S-Mexico  
15 border. The SAC cites a DHS Office of Inspector General report indicating that  
16 DHS has embraced a policy to limit access to the asylum process. (SAC ¶¶ 70–71.)  
17 The SAC identifies statements from President Trump, former U.S. Attorney General  
18 Jeff Sessions, then-DHS Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen, then-Commissioner  
19 McAleenan, and other CBP employees, all of which are plausibly read to show the  
20 existence of the alleged Turnback Policy. (SAC ¶¶ 60–66, 68–69, 71, 75.) The SAC  
21 otherwise contains extensive allegations of alleged turnbacks of asylum seekers by  
22 CBP officers at POEs along U.S.-Mexico border based on assertions of lack of  
23 capacity, all of which plausibly point to the existence of an unwritten policy. (*See*  
24 SAC ¶¶ 49, 75, 77–78, 83–201.)

25  
26 Defendants’ arguments that Plaintiffs fail to establish a final agency action  
27 miss the mark. For one, despite arguing that Plaintiffs have simply attached a  
28 “policy” label to Defendants’ alleged conduct, Defendants’ briefing leaves the

1 distinct impression that Defendants concede the existence of a policy from which  
2 Plaintiffs’ alleged injuries flow. Whereas Plaintiffs refer to this policy as the  
3 “Turnback Policy,” Defendants refer to the challenged conduct as one of “metering.”  
4 (ECF No. 192-1 at 11–15; ECF No. 238 at 9–12.) Second, Defendants recycle an  
5 argument that they raised in their first motion to dismiss Plaintiffs’ Section 706(2)  
6 claims. Defendants argue once more that Plaintiffs have not plausibly alleged a  
7 policy of categorical denials of asylum at POEs along the U.S-Mexico border. (ECF  
8 No. 192-1 at 16, 30.) The Court previously dismissed Plaintiffs’ Section 706(2)  
9 claims on this basis. But, as Plaintiffs expressly argue in opposition (ECF No. 210  
10 at 10–11), they do not claim that the Turnback Policy is a policy to categorically  
11 deny asylum seekers entry into the United States. Instead, Plaintiffs allege this is a  
12 policy aimed at deterring or limiting asylum seekers from seeking asylum in the  
13 United States. Defendants’ argument therefore lacks force based on the current  
14 pleadings. Third, Defendants challenge Plaintiffs’ reliance on statements by U.S.  
15 government officials as premised on a “limited selection of Defendants’ own  
16 statements and communications[.]” (ECF No. 192-1 at 16–17.) Defendants’  
17 argument is ostensibly based on the notion that there are other statements by U.S.  
18 government officials that would defeat or undermine Plaintiffs’ claims regarding the  
19 Turnback Policy. Such a merits challenge is inappropriate at this stage.  
20 Accordingly, the Court concludes that Plaintiffs have adequately identified a final  
21 agency action in the form of the Turnback Policy.

22  
23 **b. Alleged Pattern and Practice**

24 Defendants move to dismiss Plaintiffs’ Section 706(2) claims insofar as the  
25 claims concern the allegations that Defendants have “sanctioned” a practice and  
26 pattern of denying access to the asylum procedure in the United States. Defendants  
27 contend that “alleged misrepresentations, threats, intimidation, verbal and physical  
28 abuse, coercion, ‘unreasonable delays,’ and racially discriminatory denial of access”

1 are not final agency action because they “are not plausibly attributable to a DHS or  
2 CBP Policy.” (ECF No. 238 at 8.) In previously dismissing Plaintiffs’ Section  
3 706(2) claims, the Court observed that allegations regarding this conduct could not  
4 state a Section 706(2) claim because Plaintiffs failed to connect the conduct to any  
5 “unwritten policy” of Defendants. *Al Otro Lado*, 327 F. Supp. 3d at 1319. The  
6 Court, however, does not find that this previous conclusion controls here. Plaintiffs  
7 expressly allege that the pattern and practice of unlawful tactics and the Turnback  
8 Policy “are designed” together to serve the Trump Administration’s “broader goal”  
9 of deterring asylum seekers from accessing the asylum process and the allegations  
10 show both co-existing. (SAC ¶¶2, 4, 48, 51–60, 84–106.) Plaintiffs’ allegations  
11 regarding a “sanctioned” pattern and practice of CBP officers using certain tactics to  
12 deny access to the asylum process dovetail with Plaintiffs’ allegations that the  
13 Turnback Policy is based on false assertions of lack of capacity. Accordingly, the  
14 Court finds that Plaintiffs’ allegations of an alleged pattern and practice are directly  
15 linked with the alleged Turnback Policy such that it is not proper to dismiss  
16 Plaintiffs’ Section 706(2) claims as to the alleged pattern and practice.

## 17 18 **2. Asserted Unreviewable Agency Discretion**

19 Defendants point to 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(1) and 6 U.S.C. § 202 as “especially  
20 authoriz[ing] CBP officers to keep the ports from being overwhelmed by an unsafe  
21 number of pedestrians at a given time,” thus requiring dismissal of Plaintiffs’ Section  
22 706(2) claims. (ECF No. 192-1 at 13–14.) Defendants argue that the New Individual  
23 Plaintiffs “make no attempt . . . to square the breadth of Defendants’ authority to  
24 meter under these statutes with the APA’s prohibition on judicial review of agency  
25 action ‘committed to agency discretion by law.’” (ECF No. 192-1 at 14 (quoting 5  
26 U.S.C. § 701(a)(2)).) Because the APA precludes review of “agency action . . .  
27 committed to agency discretion by law,” 5 U.S.C. § 701(a)(2), the Court must  
28 consider this argument before addressing the merits of Plaintiffs’ claim that the

1 alleged Turnback Policy is unlawful.

2  
3 Section 1103 establishes the powers and duties of the Secretary of Homeland  
4 Security. As a general matter, “[t]he Secretary of Homeland Security shall be  
5 charged with the administration and enforcement of this chapter and all other laws  
6 relating to the immigration and naturalization of aliens[.]” 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(1).  
7 Defendants point to Section 1103(a)(3) in particular, which provides that the  
8 Secretary “shall establish such regulations; prescribe such forms of bond, reports,  
9 entries, and other papers; issue such instructions; and *perform such other acts as he*  
10 *deems necessary for carrying out his authority under the provisions of this chapter.*”  
11 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(3) (emphasis added). 6 U.S.C. § 202 in turn provides, in relevant  
12 part, that “[t]he Secretary shall be responsible for” “[s]ecuring the borders, territorial  
13 waters, ports, terminals, waterways, and air, land, and sea transportation systems of  
14 the United States, including managing and coordinating those functions transferred  
15 to the Department [of Homeland Security] at ports of entry.” 6 U.S.C. § 202(2). “In  
16 carrying out” this responsibility, the Secretary is responsible for “ensuring the  
17 speedy, orderly, and efficient flow of lawful traffic and commerce.” 6 U.S.C. §  
18 202(8). According to Defendants, Section 1103(a) and 202 are so broad, that they  
19 do not offer any standard against which the challenged conduct may be evaluated  
20 under the APA. (ECF No. 192-1 at 14–15.)

21  
22 “[A]t the outset, there is reason to be skeptical of [Defendants’] position[.]”  
23 *Weyerhaeuser Co. v. United States Fish & Wildlife Serv.*, 139 S. Ct. 361, 370 (2018)  
24 (Roberts, C.J.). There exists a “strong presumption that Congress intends judicial  
25 review of administrative action.” *Bowen v. Mich. Acad. of Family Physicians*, 476  
26 U.S. 667, 670 (1986); *Mach Mining, LLC v. EEOC*, 135 S. Ct. 1645, 1652–53 (2015)  
27 (“[L]egal lapses and violations occur, and especially so when they have no  
28 consequence. That is why this Court has so long applied a strong presumption

1 favoring judicial review of administrative action.”). “The presumption may be  
2 rebutted only if the relevant statute precludes review, 5 U.S.C. § 701(a)(1), or if the  
3 action is ‘committed to agency discretion by law,’ § 701(a)(2).” *Weyerhaeuser Co.*,  
4 139 S. Ct. at 370. The exception in Section 701(a)(2) is read “quite narrowly,  
5 restricting to ‘those rare circumstances where the relevant statute is drawn so that a  
6 court would have no meaningful standard against which to judge the agency’s  
7 exercise of discretion.” *Id.* (quoting *Lincoln v. Vigil*, 508 U.S. 182, 191 (1993));  
8 *see also Regents of the Univ. of Cal. v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, 908 F.3d 476,  
9 494 (9th Cir. 2018) (noting only “rare” agency actions fit this “narrow” committed-  
10 to-agency-discretion exception to judicial reviewability). Defendants have failed to  
11 show that judicial review is precluded under the relevant statutes.

12  
13 Sections 1158 and 1225 cannot be nullified by general statutory provisions  
14 regarding the Secretary’s authority unless Congress clearly intended so. *See BNSF*  
15 *Ry. Co. v. Cal. Dep’t of Tax & Fee Admin.*, 904 F.3d 755, 766 (9th Cir. 2018)  
16 (“[W]here there is no clear intention otherwise, a specific statute will not be  
17 controlled or nullified by a general one, regardless of the priority of enactment.”  
18 (quoting *Crawford Fitting Co. v. J.T. Gibbons, Inc.*, 482 U.S. 437, 445 (1987))).  
19 Congress has already determined how immigration officers are to “manage the flow”  
20 of arriving aliens who express to an immigration officer an intention to apply for  
21 asylum or a fear of persecution. Section 1225 imposes mandatory obligations to  
22 inspect all aliens who are applicants for admission or otherwise seeking admission  
23 and further imposes certain screening duties for asylum seekers. Notably, 8 U.S.C.  
24 § 1103(a)(1) expressly charges the Secretary with the enforcement of “all other laws  
25 relating to the immigration,” which certainly includes the provisions at issue in this  
26 case.

27  
28 In the face of these specific statutes, Defendants endeavor to argue that any



1 constraints on their authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1) and 8 U.S.C. § 1225 are  
2 not at issue in this case and thus these statutory provisions do not bear on the  
3 Secretary’s asserted exercise of discretionary authority under 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(3)  
4 and 6 U.S.C. § 202(2). Defendants first contend that because the New Individual  
5 Plaintiffs were not in the United States at the time of their alleged injuries, Plaintiffs’  
6 argument that “Sections 1158 and 1225 limit the scope of the Secretary’s authority  
7 under 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(3) and 6 U.S.C. § 202” “has no force.” (ECF No. 238 at  
8 9.) Insofar as Defendants raise this argument against the Turnback Policy, this  
9 argument fails because, at a minimum, Plaintiff Al Otro Lado—a domestic  
10 Plaintiff—joins the Individual Plaintiffs in challenging Defendants’ conduct. The  
11 argument otherwise fails because the Court has rejected Defendants’ underlying  
12 premise regarding the scope of Sections 1158 and 1225 in relation to the New  
13 Individual Plaintiffs.

14  
15 Defendants further argue that the interpretative canon that specific statutes  
16 limit general statutes “does not apply here, because the processes mandated by  
17 Section 1225 do not implicate the authority conferred by Sections 1103(a)(3) and  
18 202.” (ECF No. 238 at 10.) This argument makes no sense. There is no logical way  
19 to treat the Secretary’s asserted authority and charge to secure the border as mutually  
20 exclusive from the procedures Section 1225 mandates. Section 202(2) expressly  
21 refers to “ports.” 6 U.S.C. § 202(2). Both Sections 1185(a)(1) and 1225 refer to  
22 aliens who arrive in the United States, including at a “port of arrival.” Defendants  
23 elsewhere argue that applications for admission must be made at ports of entry. 8  
24 C.F.R. § 235.1(a) (“[a]pplication to lawfully enter the United States shall be made  
25 in person to a U.S. immigration officer at a U.S. port-of-entry.”); (ECF No. 192-1 at  
26 9 (citing 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(a)). Thus, the relevant INA provisions governing the  
27 duties of immigration officers with respect to aliens who seek admission at POEs  
28 plainly bear on how the Secretary may exercise whatever authority the Secretary has

1 to manage POEs. Defendants conspicuously do not argue that these provisions do  
2 not provide a means to assess the legality of Defendants' conduct.

3  
4 Accordingly, the Court rejects Defendants' argument that Plaintiffs' Section  
5 706(2) claims are unreviewable on the asserted basis of discretion committed to the  
6 agency. Whatever authority the Secretary may possess pursuant to the general grants  
7 of authority in Sections 1103(a)(1) and 202(2) over the "flow of traffic" across the  
8 border, Congress's general allowance for the Secretary to "perform such other acts  
9 as [she] deems necessary for carrying out" her authority to administer and enforce  
10 the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(3), cannot entail the authority to rewrite specific  
11 congressional mandates or to pretend that such mandates do not exist. "The power  
12 of executing the laws . . . does not include a power to revise clear statutory terms  
13 that turn out not to work in practice," and it is thus a "core administrative-law  
14 principle that an agency may not rewrite clear statutory terms to suit its own sense  
15 of how the statute should operate." *Util. Air Regulatory Grp. v. EPA*, 573 U.S. 302,  
16 328 (2014).

### 17 18 **3. The Unlawfulness of the Alleged Turnback Policy**

19 The core of Plaintiffs' Section 706(2) claims is that the alleged Turnback  
20 Policy is "in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations" and "without  
21 observance of procedure required by law." (SAC ¶¶ 271–72 (citing 5 U.S.C. §  
22 706(2)(C), (D)).) In particular, Plaintiffs claim that the alleged Turnback Policy  
23 contravenes the congressionally-established procedure set forth in 8 U.S.C. §  
24 1158(a)(1) and 8 U.S.C. § 1225.

25  
26 Plaintiffs offer two principal theories why the alleged policy violates the  
27 procedures that Congress established in these provisions. First, Plaintiffs contend  
28 that Defendants' alleged conduct acting pursuant to the Turnback Policy is *ultra*

1 *vires* because it “ignore[s] the mandatory procedures to inspect and process asylum  
2 seekers that Congress has put in place.” (ECF No. 210 at 17.) Second, Plaintiffs  
3 contend that the alleged Turnback Policy is unlawful because it is “impermissibly  
4 aimed at deterrence” and “based on false claims of lack of capacity.” (*Id.* at 20.)  
5 Although Plaintiffs treat these theories as distinct bases to find the alleged Turnback  
6 Policy unlawful, (*id.* at 16–22), the Court finds that they cannot be disentangled from  
7 each other. Construing them together, the Court concludes that Plaintiffs have  
8 sufficiently alleged that the Turnback Policy is unlawful.<sup>10</sup>

9  
10 As an initial matter, Defendants resist application of 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1)  
11 and 8 U.S.C. § 1225 to assess the legality of the alleged Turnback Policy.  
12 Defendants reiterate their argument that the challenged conduct is entirely lawful  
13 under 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(3) and 6 U.S.C. § 202 because 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1) and  
14 8 U.S.C. § 1225 have “no force as to the Extraterritorial Plaintiffs and the putative  
15 class members they seek to represent” who, according to Defendants, “do not allege  
16 that they were ever present in the United States.” (ECF No. 238 at 9.) These  
17 arguments falter at this juncture for reasons the Court has already discussed. 8  
18 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1) and 8 U.S.C. § 1225 qualify the authority set forth in 8 U.S.C.  
19 § 1103(a)(3) and 6 U.S.C. § 202.

20  
21 Next, relying on Sections 1103(a)(3) and 202(2), Defendants contend that  
22 there are valid reasons why CBP officers cannot unwaveringly adhere to the  
23 procedures set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1) and 8 U.S.C. § 1225. According to  
24 Defendants, “port management is a complex task[.]” (ECF No. 192-1 at 13.)  
25

---

26 <sup>10</sup> Because the Court concludes that these theories are together sufficient for  
27 Plaintiffs to state Section 706(2) claims, the Court declines to address Plaintiffs’  
28 alternative and third argument that the alleged Turnback Policy is unlawful because  
it unreasonably delays the processing of asylum seekers. (ECF No. 210 at 22–23.)

1 Defendants contend that “CBP necessarily could not ‘secure’ or ‘manage’ a port if,  
2 in addition to its other mission responsibilities, *any* alien without appropriate travel  
3 documents could cross the border whenever she chooses and immediately trigger  
4 Defendants’ statutory duties to ‘inspect[],’ ‘refer,’ or ‘detain[]’ her under section  
5 1225.” (*Id.* (emphasis in original).) Defendants argue the Sections 1103(a)(3) and  
6 202(2) authorize CBP officers “to permit an alien without appropriate travel  
7 documentation to cross the border *only if the port has the capacity to safely and*  
8 *humanely process her application for admission and hold her for further*  
9 *proceedings,*” (ECF No. 192-1 at 13 (emphasis added)), and “especially authorize  
10 CBP officers to keep ports from being overwhelmed by an unsafe number of  
11 pedestrians entering at any time,” (*id.*). Consistent with this view about their  
12 authority over “port management,” Defendants urge the Court to conclude that the  
13 alleged conduct does not occur *ultra vires*, exceed the scope of their authority, or  
14 without observance of the procedure required by law. (ECF No. 192-1 at 13.)  
15

16 The Court acknowledges that it is entirely possible that there may exist  
17 potentially legitimate factors that prevent CBP officers from immediately  
18 discharging the mandatory duties set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1) and 8 U.S.C. §  
19 1225. Even Plaintiffs acknowledge as much. (ECF No. 210 at 21.) And the Court  
20 acknowledges that federal agencies and the individuals who lead them can face co-  
21 existing obligations that Congress has chosen to place on the agency, obligations that  
22 may at times be viewed as competing with each other and competing for the  
23 resources an agency has.  
24

25 The problem with Defendants’ reliance on Sections 1103(a)(3) and 202(2) is  
26 that Plaintiffs allege that the asserted concerns over capacity are merely a pretext to  
27 avoid discharging the duties set forth in 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1) and 8 U.S.C. § 1225  
28 and deter asylum seekers from seeking asylum in the United States. Plaintiffs offer

1 numerous factual allegations on this point. (SAC ¶¶ 4–6, 48, 61, 66, 72–73, 76–78,  
2 109, 111, 274.) And, contrary to Defendants’ suggestion regarding complex port  
3 management, Plaintiffs contend that Defendants’ Turnback Policy “screen[s] out  
4 asylum seekers from other applications for admission approaching POEs and send[s]  
5 them back to an uncertain fate in Mexico[.]” (ECF No. 210 at 17.) In other words,  
6 the purported exercise of authority under Sections 1103(a)(3) and 202(2) specifically  
7 targets asylum seekers—not any other aliens who may be crossing into the United  
8 States through POEs.

9  
10 In the face of these allegations, Defendants challenge the sufficiency of  
11 Plaintiffs’ deterrence allegations as a factual matter by largely relying on materials  
12 outside of the pleadings. (ECF No. 192-1 at 15; ECF No. 238 at 10.) Indeed, in their  
13 opening brief, Defendants argue that “[t]he record before the Court shows clearly  
14 that the Secretary and her designees have deemed it necessary to manage the flow of  
15 pedestrian traffic when port resources are strained.” (ECF No. 192-1 at 15 (citing  
16 Exs. 1–6).) There is no “record” before the Court on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, but  
17 rather the Court is limited to a review of the pleadings and any documents attached  
18 to them. *United States v. Ritchie*, 342 F.3d 903, 907–09 (9th Cir. 2003). Defendants’  
19 reliance on non-pleadings materials underscores that Defendants’ arguments about  
20 the truthfulness of Plaintiffs’ deterrence allegations are fundamentally merits  
21 arguments that the Court cannot resolve at this stage.<sup>11</sup>

22  
23 Assuming the truth of Plaintiffs’ deterrence allegations, the remaining issue is  
24 whether an alleged motive to deter asylum seekers from seeking asylum in the  
25 United States is unlawful. Plaintiffs argue that it is. Plaintiffs’ fundamental  
26

---

27 <sup>11</sup> For this reason, the Court also rejects Defendants’ attempt to direct the  
28 Court to factual assertions made in a declaration filed in a different case. (ECF No.  
192-1 at 5, 13.)

1 contention is that “[t]he plain language and intent of the INA’s asylum provision  
2 unambiguously preclude Defendants from adopting a policy or otherwise engaging  
3 in a practice of denying individuals access to the U.S. asylum process at POEs, even  
4 if Defendants prevent those asylum seekers from physically crossing the U.S.-  
5 Mexico border.” (ECF No. 210 at 17.) On this issue, Defendants argue that Plaintiffs  
6 offer nothing more than a “legal conclusion.” (ECF No. 238 at 11.) The Court,  
7 however, finds nothing conclusory about Plaintiffs’ assertions of illegality.

8  
9 Congress has enacted a scheme that mandates inspection of all aliens seeking  
10 admission to the United States and mandates referral to an asylum officer of asylum  
11 seekers who present themselves at a POE and indicate their intention to apply for  
12 asylum or a fear of persecution. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3); 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(1)(A)(i).  
13 Although this statutory scheme treats asylum seekers differently, it does so only in  
14 the sense that such aliens are to be promptly identified and their asylum claims are  
15 to be appropriately considered. As Plaintiffs and *Amici* Immigration Law Professors  
16 observe (ECF No. 210 at 19; ECF No. 221-1 at 5–6), the “uniform asylum policy”  
17 driving the 1980 Refugee Act, an act which replaced the previous *ad hoc* refugee  
18 and asylum system, was “[a] fundamental belief that the granting of asylum is  
19 inherently a humanitarian act distinct from the normal operation and administration  
20 of the immigration process.” Aliens and Nationality; Asylum and Withholding of  
21 Deportation Procedures, 55 Fed. Reg. 30674-01, 30675 (July 27, 1990) (to be  
22 codified at 8 CFR Parts 3, 103, 208, 236, 242, and 253) (emphasis added); *see also*  
23 *E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, 909 F.3d at 1230 (observing that “[i]n 1980, Congress  
24 codified our obligation to receive persons who are ‘unable or unwilling to return to’  
25 their home countries ‘because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution  
26 on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or  
27 political opinion.’ (quoting 8 U.S.C. §§ 1101(a)(42), 1158(b)(1))). Congress’s intent  
28 to prescribe a uniform asylum procedure remains reflected in the current asylum

1 procedure. 8 U.S.C. § 1158; 8 U.S.C. § 1225; *see also E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant*,  
2 909 F.3d at 1230.

3  
4 Turning back prospective asylum applicants pursuant to an alleged executive  
5 policy that seeks to deter asylum seekers through false assertions of lack of capacity  
6 is plausibly inconsistent with and violative of the scheme Congress enacted. This  
7 conclusion follows from a comparison of Section 1157 and Section 1158. Although  
8 Defendants have elsewhere pointed to Section 1157 as a purported limitation on the  
9 extraterritorial scope of 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1), Defendants overlook a key distinction  
10 between Sections 1157 and 1158 that cuts against the lawfulness of adopting a policy  
11 to deter asylum seekers. Section 1157 expressly authorizes the President to set  
12 numerical limits for aliens who may be admitted as refugees into the United States  
13 on an annual basis. 8 U.S.C. § 1157(a)(2). Neither Section 1158(a)(1), nor Section  
14 1225(b), however, establishes numerical limits on the total number of aliens who  
15 may seek asylum pursuant to the asylum procedure these statutes establish. *See* 8  
16 U.S.C. § 1158; 8 U.S.C. § 1225. Pretextual assertions of “lack of capacity” to turn  
17 away asylum seekers who seek access to a POE and express an intent to apply for  
18 asylum directly to a CBP officer suggest the existence of an unlawful *de facto*  
19 numerical limit on the number of asylum applicants that finds no support in Section  
20 1158 or Section 1225. The imposition of such a limit, through false assertions of  
21 lack of capacity, surely violates the scheme Congress enacted, particularly when  
22 contrasted with the separate scheme in Section 1157. *See Util. Air Regulatory Grp.*,  
23 573 U.S. at 327 (“The power of executing the laws necessarily includes both  
24 authority and responsibility to resolve some questions left open by Congress that  
25 arise during the law’s administration. But it does not include a power to revise clear  
26 statutory terms that turn out not to work in practice.”).

27  
28 Defendants nevertheless question that even if “any alleged metering is

1 ‘motivated by deterrence,’ such an aim would not be inappropriate.” (ECF No. 238  
2 at 11–12 n.8.) Most curiously, Defendants support this assertion by citing “Aliens  
3 Subject to a Bar on Entry Under Certain Presidential Proclamations; Procedures for  
4 Protection Claims, 83 Fed. Reg. 55,934 (Nov. 9, 2018),” a rule for which the Ninth  
5 Circuit upheld a preliminary injunction barring its enforcement. *See E. Bay*  
6 *Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump*, 909 F.3d 1219, 1250 (9th Cir. 2018), *stay denied by,*  
7 *Trump v. E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, 139 S. Ct. 782, 2018 WL 6713079 (U.S.  
8 Supreme Court Dec. 21, 2018).

9

10 In *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, the Ninth Circuit affirmed a preliminary  
11 injunction barring implementation of a Rule promulgated by the Secretary of DHS  
12 and the Attorney General. The Rule provided that “[f]or applications filed after  
13 November 9, 2018, an alien shall be ineligible for asylum if the alien is subject to a  
14 presidential proclamation or other presidential order suspending or limiting the entry  
15 of aliens along the southern border with Mexico that is issued pursuant to [§  
16 1182(f)].” 83 Fed. Reg. 55,952 (to be codified at 8 C.F.R. § 208.13(c)(3) (DHS) and  
17 8 C.F.R. § 1208.13(c)(3) (DOJ)). The Rule coincided with a presidential  
18 proclamation suspending the “entry of any alien into the United States across the  
19 international boundary between the United States and Mexico,” but exempting from  
20 that suspension “any alien who enters the United States at a port of entry and properly  
21 presents for inspection.” *Addressing Mass Migration Through the Southern Border*  
22 *of the United States*, 83 Fed. Reg. 57,661, 57,663 (Nov. 9, 2018).

23

24 In relevant part, the *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant* majority found the Rule  
25 likely to be unlawful under Section 706(2)(A) because the Rule “is inconsistent with  
26 § 1158(a)(1).” *E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, 909 F.3d at 1247. Although the majority  
27 noted that “[r]ather than restricting who may apply for asylum, the rule of decision  
28 facially conditions only who is eligible to receive asylum,” the majority found this



1 to be a distinction without a difference. *Id.* at 1247. The majority concluded that:  
2 “the technical differences between applying for and eligibility for asylum are of no  
3 consequence to a refugee when the bottom line—no possibility of asylum—is the  
4 same.” *Id.* at 1247–48. The majority acknowledged that “[w]e are acutely aware of  
5 the crisis in the enforcement of our immigration laws,” but concluded that “the  
6 Attorney General may not abandon [a congressional] scheme because he thinks it is  
7 not working well. . . . but continued inaction by Congress is not a sufficient basis  
8 under our Constitution for the Executive to rewrite our immigration laws.” *Id.* at  
9 1250–51.

10  
11 The key lesson of *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant* is that the Executive cannot  
12 “amend the INA”—specifically Section 1158—through executive action to establish  
13 a procedure at variance with the scheme Congress chose. *Id.* at 1250. Much like the  
14 challenged rule in *East Bay Sanctuary Covenant*, Defendants’ alleged Turnback  
15 Policy directly concerns the statutory scheme for asylum seekers that Congress has  
16 established. The Turnback Policy directly concerns the Section 1225(b)(1) aspect  
17 of this procedure for aliens seeking admission to the United States. As Plaintiffs  
18 persuasively argue, there is no room for deterrence under the scheme Congress has  
19 enacted. An alleged policy that is premised on and implements such a motive  
20 contravenes the clear purpose, intent, and text of the statutory scheme that enables  
21 aliens arriving at POEs, including those in the process of doing so, to apply for  
22 asylum. Accordingly, the Court concludes that Plaintiffs have stated Section 706(2)  
23 claims premised on the unlawfulness of the alleged Turnback Policy.

### 24 25 **III. The New Individual Plaintiffs’ Fifth Amendment Due Process Claims**

26 The Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause provides that “[n]o person shall  
27 . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.” U.S. Const.  
28 amend. V. The Individual Plaintiffs assert a protected Fifth Amendment due process

1 interest in the various provisions of the INA that allows aliens to seek asylum in the  
2 United States. (SAC ¶¶ 225–26, 283–93.) Specifically, the Individual Plaintiffs  
3 allege that they possess “the right to be processed at a POE and granted meaningful  
4 access to the asylum process” under 8 U.S.C. §§ 1158(a)(1), 1225(a)(3),  
5 1225(b)(1)(A)(ii), 1225(b)(1)(B), and 8 C.F.R. § 235.3(b)(4). Defendants’ motion  
6 to dismiss presents two issues. First, the Court must revisit the propriety of judicial  
7 review of Plaintiffs’ constitutional claims independently of the APA. Second, the  
8 Court must turn to the merits of Defendants’ dismissal arguments, in which  
9 Defendants contend that the New Individual Plaintiffs seek to impermissibly apply  
10 the Constitution extraterritorially and, alternatively, the New Individual Plaintiffs  
11 were not denied any process that these Plaintiffs claim was due. The Court addresses  
12 each issue in turn.

#### 13 14 **A. Non-APA Judicial Review of Constitutional Claims**

15 In its prior dismissal order, the Court determined that “[w]hile a right to seek  
16 judicial review of agency action may be created by a separate statutory or  
17 constitutional provision, once created it becomes subject to the judicial review  
18 provisions of the APA unless explicitly excluded.” *Al Otro Lado*, 327 F. Supp. 3d  
19 at 1316. The parties dispute what the Court’s prior ruling should mean for the INA  
20 and Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause claims that Plaintiffs raise independently  
21 of the APA. Plaintiffs request that, to the extent the Court believes it resolved the  
22 issue of reviewability of these claims in its prior dismissal order, the Court should  
23 revise its previous order pursuant to Rule 54(b) to clarify that Plaintiffs’ INA and  
24 Fifth Amendment due process claims may be reviewed even if Plaintiffs cannot state  
25 APA claims. (ECF No. 210 at 26.) Defendants argue that Plaintiffs “offer no reason  
26 to depart from the correct application of the APA to this case” and expressly argue  
27 that the Court “should also reject Plaintiffs’ request to adjudicate their freestanding  
28 INA claims under the concept of ‘nonstatutory review’ instead of the APA.” (ECF

1 No. 238 at 18.)

2  
3 As an initial matter, the Court clarifies that its prior statement regarding the  
4 scope of judicial review flowed from the nature of the parties' prior dismissal  
5 briefing. Defendants did not move to dismiss Plaintiffs' constitutional claims on the  
6 merits, but rather limited their merits briefing to the sufficiency of Plaintiffs' APA  
7 claims. Plaintiffs in turn presented arguments regarding their APA claims, yet in  
8 doing so, relied on case law regarding liability under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Faced with  
9 this briefing, the Court's prior dismissal analysis necessarily turned on the APA's  
10 strictures.

11  
12 The present motion to dismiss briefing alters the calculus. The parties have  
13 briefed the merits of Plaintiffs' constitutional due process claims, implicitly  
14 assuming that the Court can and should review those claims independently of the  
15 APA's strictures. Although Defendants argue that Plaintiffs cannot raise  
16 freestanding INA claims independently of the APA's strictures, Defendants  
17 conspicuously do not make a similar argument with respect to Plaintiffs' Fifth  
18 Amendment Due Process claims in their opening brief. (*Compare* ECF No. 192-1  
19 at 18–22 (dismissal arguments regarding Plaintiffs' due process claims) and ECF  
20 No. 238 at 15 *with* ECF No. 192-1 at 23 (arguing that “Extraterritorial Plaintiffs’  
21 INA claims must be evaluated under the APA, as the Court described, or not at  
22 all.”).)<sup>12</sup>

23  
24  
25 <sup>12</sup> Defendants argue for the first time in their reply brief that even if the  
26 Plaintiffs state procedural due process claims, review of these claims must proceed  
27 under the APA. (ECF No. 238 at 15.) The apparent reason for this argument is the  
28 assumption that if Plaintiffs fail to state a claim in accordance with the APA's  
strictures (*i.e.*, final agency action, identification of discrete agency action for  
Section 706(1) claims, *etc.*), then this Court cannot address the merits of Plaintiffs'  
constitutional claims. This argument underscores for the Court that non-APA review

1 Guided by more recent precedent, the Court finds it necessary to clarify the  
2 propriety of judicial review independently of the APA’s strictures. The Court’s prior  
3 dismissal order observed that, at times, courts have resolved only APA claims  
4 concerning agency action, even when a plaintiff asserts constitutional claims  
5 premised on statutory provisions that underlie the APA claims. *See Graham v. Fed.*  
6 *Emergency Mgmt. Agency*, 149 F.3d 997, 1001 n.2 (9th Cir. 1998) (“declin[ing] to  
7 address the plaintiffs’ Fifth Amendment claim and affirm[ing] the district court’s  
8 denial of this claim” because “plaintiffs’ due process claim is premised on their  
9 assertion that they ‘have a statutory entitlement to the [individual and family grant]  
10 disaster assistance program”” and thus “they may obtain all the relief they request  
11 under the provisions of the APA.”); *Al Otro Lado*, 327 F. Supp. 3d at 1316 (relying  
12 on *Graham*).

13  
14 Recently, the Ninth Circuit has made clear that although “the APA is the  
15 general mechanism by which to challenge final agency action,” “this does not mean  
16 that the APA forecloses other causes of action.” *Sierra Club v. Trump*, No. 19-  
17 16102, —F.3d—, 2019 WL 2865491, at \*20 (9th Cir. July 3, 2019). And relying on  
18 *Navajo Nation v. Department of the Interior*, 876 F.3d 1144 (9th Cir. 2017)—a case  
19 that figured prominently in the Court’s prior determination that the APA waives the  
20 United States’ sovereign immunity for any claims for nonmonetary relief, whether  
21 asserted under the APA or not—*Sierra Club* instructs that *Navajo Nation* as well as  
22 an earlier Ninth Circuit decision “clearly contemplate that claims challenging agency  
23 actions—particularly constitutional claims—may exist wholly apart from the  
24 APA.”” *Sierra Club*, —F.3d—, 2019 WL 2865491, at \*20 (also relying on  
25 *Presbyterian Church v. United States*, 870 F.2d 518 (9th Cir. 1989) for this  
26 proposition). Thus, the Court concludes that review of the New Individual Plaintiffs’

27  
28  

---

of Plaintiffs’ constitutional claims is appropriate.

1 constitutional claims, independently of their APA claims, is appropriate.

2  
3 **B. The New Individual Plaintiffs State Due Process Claims**

4 The New Individual Plaintiffs' claims, like those of the other Individual  
5 Plaintiffs, are fundamentally procedural due process claims. "The requirements of  
6 procedural due process apply to the deprivation of interests encompassed by [the  
7 Due Process Clause's] protection of liberty and property." *Bd. of Regents v. Roth*,  
8 408 U.S. 564, 569 (1972). "To assert a procedural due process claim under the Fifth  
9 Amendment, [a plaintiff] must first establish a constitutionally protected interest."  
10 *Stanley v. Gonzales*, 476 F.3d 653, 660 (9th Cir. 2007); *Foss v. Nat'l Marine*  
11 *Fisheries Serv.*, 161 F.3d 584, 588 (9th Cir. 1998) (noting that "[t]he threshold  
12 question" in a procedural due process claim is whether the plaintiff has a  
13 constitutionally protectible interest). "[T]he plaintiff must have more than a  
14 unilateral expectation of it; instead, she must have a legitimate claim of entitlement."  
15 *Serra v. Lappin*, 600 F.3d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 2010). If the plaintiff shows the  
16 existence of a constitutionally protected interest, the plaintiff must further establish  
17 "a denial of adequate procedural protections." *Foss*, 161 F.3d at 588.

18  
19 Defendants do not contest that if any New Individual Plaintiff sufficiently  
20 alleges that he or she was in the United States, such a New Individual Plaintiff may  
21 assert a Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause claim against Defendants' alleged  
22 conduct. Indeed, "[i]t is well established that aliens legally within the United States  
23 may challenge the constitutionality of federal and state actions." *Ibrahim v. Dep't*  
24 *of Homeland Sec.*, 669 F.3d 983, 994 (9th Cir. 2012). Thus, to the extent any New  
25 Individual Plaintiffs sufficiently plead that they were in the United States at the time  
26 of their alleged injuries, Defendants' argument, by its own terms, does not apply.

27  
28 With respect to the remaining New Individual Plaintiffs, Defendants raise two

1 arguments for why they fail to state Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause claims.  
2 Defendants first argue that these New Individual Plaintiffs possess no protected  
3 interests under the Due Process Clause in the INA statutory and regulatory  
4 provisions in this case because “the Fifth Amendment does not apply to aliens  
5 outside the United States[.]” (ECF No. 192-1 at 18.) Second, Defendants argue that  
6 “[e]ven assuming *arguendo* that the Fifth Amendment applie[s] to [these] Plaintiffs  
7 while they were outside the United States, they still fail to state a cognizable Fifth  
8 Amendment claim.” (*Id.* at 21.)

### 10 **1. The Fifth Amendment Applies**

11 Defendants’ principal challenge to the New Individual Plaintiffs’ Fifth  
12 Amendment Due Process Clause claims is that “the Fifth Amendment does not apply  
13 to aliens outside the United States, particularly where they do not allege they have  
14 any previous voluntary connection to the United States.” (ECF No. 192-1 at 18;  
15 ECF No. 238 at 14–15.) Defendants’ challenge raises a threshold issue about the  
16 proper scope and application of the Constitution.

17  
18 As an initial matter, the Court rejects Defendants’ formalistic, territorial  
19 argument that the Due Process “Clause’s reference to ‘person[s],’ while broad, does  
20 not include non-resident aliens outside the United States.” (ECF No. 192-1 at 19  
21 (citing *Johnson v. Eisentrager*, 339 U.S. 763, 770 (1950)).) Defendants’ reliance on  
22 *Eisentrager* is understandable because there is language in the decision that places a  
23 constitutional premium on territorial presence in the United States, suggesting that  
24 such presence is the only basis for a noncitizen to receive constitutional protection  
25 that a federal court in turn has the power to enforce. *See Eisentrager*, 339 U.S. at  
26 771 (“[I]n extending constitutional protections beyond the citizenry, the Court has  
27 been at pains to point out that it was the alien’s presence within its territorial  
28 jurisdiction that gave the Judiciary power to act.”); *id.* at 777–78 (“[T]hese prisoners

1 at no relevant time were within any territory over which the United States is  
2 sovereign, and the scenes of their offense, their capture, their trial and their  
3 punishment were all beyond the territorial jurisdiction of any court of the United  
4 States.”).

5  
6 The Supreme Court, however, squarely rejected bright-line rules regarding the  
7 extraterritorial application of the Constitution in *Boumediene v. Bush*, 553 U.S. 723  
8 (2008). In *Boumediene*, the Supreme Court permitted alien plaintiffs who the U.S.  
9 government had designated as enemy combatants and who were detained at the  
10 United States Naval Station in Guantanamo, Cuba to seek habeas relief. In doing so,  
11 the Supreme Court rejected the government’s proposed bright-line rule that the  
12 plaintiffs were not entitled to seek habeas relief as aliens who had committed acts  
13 outside the United States as a “formal, sovereignty-based test.” *Id.* at 764. The  
14 Supreme Court stated that “questions of extraterritoriality turn on objective factors  
15 and practical concerns, not formalism.” *Id.* at 764. To resolve such questions, the  
16 Supreme Court directed the federal courts to examine the ““particular circumstances,  
17 the practical necessities, and the possible alternatives which Congress had before it’  
18 and, in particular, whether judicial enforcement of the provision would be  
19 ‘impracticable and anomalous.’” *Id.* at 762 (quoting *Reid v. Covert*, 354 U.S. 1, 74–  
20 75 (1957) (Harlan, J., concurring)).

21  
22 Defendants rely heavily on *United States v. Verdugo-Urquidez*, 494 U.S. 259  
23 (1990), and *Ibrahim v. Department of Homeland Security*, 669 F.3d 983 (9th Cir.  
24 2012), to argue that the New Individual Plaintiffs must nevertheless allege a “prior  
25 significant voluntary connection” with the United States to receive protection under  
26 the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause. The Court briefly discusses these cases  
27 and then explains why they do not foreclose the New Individual Plaintiffs’ claims.  
28

1           In *Verdugo-Urquidez*, the Supreme Court addressed the question “whether the  
2 Fourth Amendment applies to the search and seizure by United States agents of  
3 property that is owned by a nonresident alien and located in a foreign country.” 494  
4 U.S. at 261. The Court held that the “nonresident alien” plaintiff in that case had  
5 “no previous significant voluntary connection with the United States” and therefore  
6 had no right to assert a Fourth Amendment challenge to the searches and seizures of  
7 his property by United States agents in Mexico. *Id.* at 271 (emphasis added). In  
8 *Ibrahim*, the Ninth Circuit expressly relied on *Verdugo-Urquidez* to permit a  
9 Malaysian citizen who was precluded from entering the U.S., who had previously  
10 been in the U.S. for four years on a student visa and who alleged that she was  
11 mistakenly placed on a No-Fly List and other terrorist watchlists, to raise Fourth and  
12 Fifth Amendment claims against the federal government. The Ninth Circuit  
13 expressly observed that “the border of the United States is not a clear line that  
14 separates aliens who may bring constitutional challenges from those who may not.”  
15 *Ibrahim*, 669 F.3d at 995 (collecting cases including *Boumediene*). The Ninth  
16 Circuit held that, “[u]nder *Boumediene* and *Verdugo*, we hold that Ibrahim has  
17 ‘significant voluntary connection’ with the United States. She voluntarily  
18 established a connection to the United States during her four years at Stanford  
19 University while she pursued her Ph.D. She voluntarily departed from the United  
20 States to present the results of her research at a Stanford-sponsored conference. The  
21 purpose of her trip was to further, not to sever, her connection to the United States,  
22 and she intended her stay abroad to be brief.” *Id.* at 997. Defendants contend that  
23 because the New Individual Plaintiffs lack a “previous voluntary significant  
24 connection” with the United States, they have no protected due process interests.

25  
26           The fundamental problem with Defendants’ reliance on the “previous  
27 voluntary significant connection” test set forth in *Verdugo-Urquidez* and applied in  
28 *Ibrahim* is that the test does not constitute a ceiling on the application of the



1 Constitution to aliens. Plaintiffs direct this Court to the Ninth Circuit’s recent  
2 decision in *Rodriguez v. Swartz*, 899 F.3d 719 (9th Cir. 2018), a case in which the  
3 panel majority relied on *Boumediene* to conclude that an alien located outside the  
4 United States could press a Fourth Amendment claim against a U.S. border officer  
5 who, standing on the U.S. side of the border, allegedly shot and killed a Mexican  
6 teenager located on the Mexican side of the border. The *Rodriguez* majority  
7 underscored that “[n]either citizenship nor voluntary submission to American law is  
8 a prerequisite for constitutional rights[,]” rather, “citizenship is just one of several  
9 non-dispositive factors to consider.” 899 F.3d at 729. The *Rodriguez* majority  
10 determined that *Verdugo-Urquidez*’s “voluntary significant connection” test did not  
11 apply in the circumstances of the case because “unlike the American agents in  
12 *Verdugo-Urquidez*, who acted on Mexican soil, Swartz [the defendant U.S. border  
13 officer] acted on American soil” and “[j]ust as Mexican law controls what people do  
14 there, American law controls what people do here.” *Id.* at 731 (brackets added). The  
15 *Rodriguez* majority underscored that “[t]he practical concerns in *Verdugo-Urquidez*  
16 about regulating conduct on Mexican soil also do not apply here.” *Id.*

17  
18 Defendants passingly refer to *Boumediene* only once in their opening brief  
19 and do not acknowledge *Rodriguez*. (ECF No. 192-1 at 19–20 (observing that  
20 *Ibrahim* cites *Boumediene*); *id.* at 18–22 (full argument regarding extraterritorial  
21 application without reference to *Rodriguez*.) Faced with Plaintiffs’ opposition brief,  
22 Defendants attempt to limit the scope and application of *Boumediene* in this case.  
23 Defendants first contend that “*Boumediene* is the only case extending a  
24 constitutional right to ‘noncitizens detained by our Government in territory over  
25 which another country maintains *de jure* sovereignty.’” (ECF No. 238 at 13 (quoting  
26 *Boumediene*, 533 U.S. at 770).) Defendants then argue that “this Court must follow”  
27 “pre-*Boumediene* law holding that the Due Process Clause does not extend to aliens  
28 without property or presence in the sovereign territory of the United States[.]” (*Id.*)

1           The Court rejects both of Defendants’ arguments. For one, *Rodriguez* alone  
2 renders Defendants’ first argument factually erroneous. Defendants’ erroneous  
3 argument appears to stem from Defendants’ attempt to dismiss *Rodriguez* as  
4 irrelevant in a footnote. (ECF No. 238 at 14 n.9 (stating that “[i]f any Ninth Circuit  
5 case applies here, it is *Ibrahim*, not *Rodriguez*.”).) The Court does not understand  
6 Defendants’ dismissive argument. *Rodriguez* is as much binding precedent on this  
7 Court as is *Ibrahim*. And *Rodriguez*, applying *Boumediene*, indicates that *Verdugo-*  
8 *Urquidez*’s “previous voluntary significant connection” test—and, by extension,  
9 *Ibrahim*’s application of that test—do not alone control the question of constitutional  
10 protection for aliens, particularly when the challenged conduct concerns the conduct  
11 of U.S. officers acting on U.S. soil. *Rodriguez*, 899 F.3d at 731. Second, and more  
12 critically, Defendants’ attempt to limit *Boumediene* simply ignores *Boumediene*’s  
13 analysis. *Boumediene* expressly rejected a reading of *Eisentrager* that would  
14 establish a “formalistic, sovereignty-based test” and expressly narrowed  
15 *Eisentrager*’s reach, observing that “the United States lacked both *de jure*  
16 sovereignty and plenary control” over the area where the petitioner prisoners were  
17 located and “[n]othing in *Eisentrager* says that *de jure* sovereignty is or has ever  
18 been the only relevant consideration in determining the geographic reach of the  
19 Constitution or of habeas corpus.” *Boumediene*, 553 U.S. at 763–64. Thus, both  
20 *Boumediene* and *Rodriguez* apply here.

21  
22           Appropriately relying on both *Boumediene* and *Rodriguez*, Plaintiffs  
23 persuasively argue that there is nothing “‘impracticable [or] anomalous’ in applying  
24 elementary due process protection at the U.S. border.” (ECF No. 210 at 25.) For  
25 one, as an objective matter, the New Individual Plaintiffs’ allegations do not show  
26 conduct occurring wholly in foreign territory. Defendants attempt to argue that  
27 “[t]he United States does not have *de jure* or *de facto* sovereignty over Mexican  
28 border towns[.]” (ECF No. 238 at 14.) Insofar as Plaintiffs’ constitutional claims

1 concern the Turnback Policy, allegedly formed by high-level federal officials,  
2 Defendants’ argument falters on its own terms because surely such a policy was not  
3 developed in Mexican border towns. (*See* SAC ¶ 287 (referring to Turnback Policy  
4 as violation procedural due process rights); *id.* ¶¶ 50–60.) Insofar as the New  
5 Individual Plaintiffs’ constitutional claims concern individual turnbacks, all New  
6 Individual Plaintiffs offer allegations regarding conduct of CBP officers who  
7 presumably were located on U.S. soil.

8  
9       The allegations of the four New Individual Plaintiffs who were stopped in the  
10 middle of the international bridge between Mexico and the United States and denied  
11 access by the CBP officers on the U.S. side of the bridge also concerns conduct  
12 occurring on territory subject to U.S. sovereign authority. (SAC ¶¶ 29–31, 154, 162,  
13 173–74.) Defendants cite an 1886 U.S.-Mexico treaty, (ECF No. 238 at 14), which  
14 expressly provides that “[i]f any international bridge have been or shall be built  
15 across either of the rivers named, *the point on such bridge exactly over the middle of*  
16 *the main channel as herein determined shall be marked by a suitable monument,*  
17 *which shall denote the dividing line for all the purposes of such bridge,*  
18 *notwithstanding any change in the channel which may thereafter supervene.”*  
19 *Convention Between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico*  
20 *Touching the International Boundary Line Where It Follows the Bed of the Rio*  
21 *Grande and the Rio Colorado, U.S.-Mex., arts. I, IV, Nov. 12, 1884, 24 Stat. 1011,*  
22 *1886 WL 15138, at \*2.* New Individual Plaintiffs Roberto Doe, Maria Doe, and Juan  
23 and Úrsula Doe allege that they “sought access to the asylum process by presenting  
24 [themselves]” at the Hidalgo, Texas POE and Laredo, Texas POE and “encountered  
25 CBP officials in the middle of the bridge” between Mexico and the U.S. POE and  
26 “told them” they “wanted to seek asylum in the United States.” (SAC ¶¶ 29–31,  
27 154–55, 162, 174.) Pursuant to the very treaty on which Defendants rely, these  
28 allegations plausibly show conduct by CBP officers occurring on the U.S. side of the

1 international bridge subject to U.S. sovereignty.

2

3         Second, as Plaintiffs argue, “the practical necessities” also warrant application  
4 of the Due Process Clause in this case. (ECF No. 210 at 25–26.) The New Individual  
5 Plaintiffs’ claims concern alleged denials of procedural due process by U.S.  
6 immigration officers upon whom Congress has placed certain statutory obligations,  
7 all in furtherance of the asylum protections Congress has also chosen to extend to  
8 certain “arriving aliens” that express an intent to apply for asylum or fear of  
9 persecution. And their claims concern adoption of an alleged policy that aims to  
10 impede access to the statutorily-mandated asylum procedure. The lesson of  
11 *Boumediene* is that the political branches do not enjoy the prerogative to “switch the  
12 Constitution on or off at will.” *Boumediene*, 533 U.S. at 765. Appropriately  
13 applying *Boumediene* and *Rodriguez*, the Court rejects Defendants’ threshold  
14 argument that none of the New Individual Plaintiffs can even avail themselves of the  
15 Fifth Amendment in this case.

16

## 17                 **2. Plaintiffs Have Plausibly Alleged Denials of Procedural Due** 18                 **Process**

19

20         For the reasons set forth in the Court’s statutory analysis, the Court can swiftly  
21 reject Defendants’ second dismissal argument. Defendants concede that “[w]here  
22 plaintiffs premise their procedural due process challenge on having a protected  
23 interest in a statutory entitlement, ‘the protections of the Due Process Clause . . .  
24 extend only as far as the plaintiffs’ statutory rights.’” (ECF No. 192-1 at 21 (quoting  
25 *Graham v. Fed. Emergency Mgmt. Agency*, 149 F.3d 997, 1001 & n.2 (9th Cir.  
26 1998)).) This concession all but forecloses dismissal of the New Individual  
27 Plaintiffs’ due process claims at this juncture. Congress has the power to prescribe  
28 the terms and conditions upon which aliens may come to this country. *Kleindienst*  
*v. Mandel*, 408 U.S. 753, 766 (1972). “In the enforcement of [congressional]

1 policies, the Executive Branch of the Government must respect the procedural  
2 safeguards of due process[.]” *Id.* at 767. Here, as the Court has discussed in its  
3 construction of the relevant statutory provisions, Congress has plainly established  
4 procedural protections for aliens like the New Individual Plaintiffs in this case, who  
5 allege that they were in the process of arriving to the United States and expressed an  
6 intent to seek asylum. The New Individual Plaintiffs have plausibly alleged that  
7 immigration officers failed to discharge their mandatory duties under the relevant  
8 provisions. Consequently, the Court concludes that the New Individual Plaintiffs  
9 have stated procedural process claims and the Court denies Defendants’ motion to  
10 dismiss these claims.

#### 11 12 **IV. ATS Claims**

13 The ATS provides in full that “[t]he district courts shall have original  
14 jurisdiction of any civil action by an alien for a tort only, committed in violation of  
15 the law of nations or a treaty of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 1350. All Individual  
16 Plaintiffs and Al Otro Lado seek to raise ATS claims for Defendants’ alleged  
17 “violation of the non-*refoulement* doctrine.” (SAC ¶¶ 294–303.) Plaintiffs  
18 specifically allege that:

19 CBP officials have systematically denied, or unreasonably  
20 delayed, access to the asylum process by Class Plaintiffs, and the  
21 asylum seekers they represent, in violation of customary  
22 international law reflected in treaties which the United States has  
23 ratified and implemented: namely, the specific, universal and  
24 obligatory norm of non-*refoulement*, which has also achieved the  
25 status of a *jus cogens* norm, and which forbids a country from  
returning or expelling an individual to a country where he or she  
has a well-founded fear of persecution and/or torture . . .

26 (SAC ¶ 295.) Plaintiffs contend that Defendants’ alleged violations have caused  
27 them harm by forcing them to return to Mexico or other countries where they face  
28 threats of further persecution. (*Id.* ¶ 296.) Al Otro Lado also raises ATS claims for

1 these alleged violations on the ground that its core mission is harmed through  
2 resource diversion. (*Id.* ¶ 300.)

3  
4 As a preliminary matter, Defendants argue that Plaintiffs’ “non-*refoulement*  
5 claims are [not] actionable as presented” based on the Court’s prior ruling that  
6 “Plaintiffs ‘may not’ seek judicial review of Defendants’ conduct ‘independently’ of  
7 the APA’s judicial review framework.” (ECF No. 192-1 at 23.) Defendants misstate  
8 the Court’s prior ruling, which did not speak to the Court’s jurisdiction over  
9 Plaintiffs’ ATS claims. The ATS is a “strictly jurisdictional statute” in its own right  
10 that “creates no new causes of action.” *Sosa v. Alvarez-Machain*, 542 U.S. 692, 713,  
11 742 (2004); *Tobar v. United States*, 639 F.3d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 2011) (noting the  
12 ATS “has been interpreted as a jurisdiction statute only”). Thus, independently of  
13 the APA, the relevant issue is whether Plaintiffs can state claims under the ATS over  
14 which the Court has jurisdiction.

15  
16 **A. No Jurisdiction Exists for Al Otro Lado’s ATS Claims**

17 Insofar as Defendants move to dismiss ATS claims that Organizational  
18 Plaintiff Al Otro Lado raises, (ECF No. 192-1 at 28 (citing SAC ¶¶ 294–303)), the  
19 Court finds that such claims must be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction  
20 because “Al Otro Lado is corporation.” (ECF No. 238 at 20.) Although the fact that  
21 Al Lado Lado is a corporation does not preclude Al Otro Lado’s assertion of APA  
22 claims, its status as a corporation has jurisdictional consequences under the ATS.

23  
24 Under its plain language, the ATS provides for federal jurisdiction only over  
25 civil actions “by an alien.” 28 U.S.C. §1350. Thus, irrespective of the substantive  
26 cause of action that underlies an asserted ATS claim, a federal court lacks  
27 jurisdiction under the ATS over claims asserted by anyone or anything other than an  
28 alien. *See Serra v. Lappin*, 600 F.3d 1191, 1198 (9th Cir. 2010) (“The ATS admits

1 no cause of action by non-aliens.”); *Yousuf v. Samantar*, 552 F.3d 371, 375 n.1 (4th  
 2 Cir. 2009) (“To the extent that any of the claims under the ATS are being asserted  
 3 by plaintiffs who are American citizens, federal subject-matter jurisdiction may be  
 4 lacking.”); *Kadic v. Karadzic*, 70 F.3d 232, 238 (2d Cir. 1995) (same); *Sikhs for*  
 5 *Justice Inc. v. Indian Nat’l Cong. Party*, 17 F. Supp. 3d 334, 345 (S.D.N.Y. 2014)  
 6 (“[J]urisdiction is inapplicable because Plaintiff Sikhs is not an ‘alien’ under the  
 7 ATS[.]”); *S.K. Innovation, Inc. v. Finpol*, 854 F. Supp. 2d 99, 113 (D.D.C. 2012)  
 8 (“[T]he American corporate Plaintiffs, as non-aliens, lack standing to bring claims  
 9 under the ATS”); *Presbyterian Church of Sudan v. Talisman Energy, Inc.*, 453 F.  
 10 Supp. 2d 633, 661 (S.D.N.Y. 2006) (concluding that an institutional plaintiff that is  
 11 a United States corporation “is not an alien and may not bring suit under the ATS.”),  
 12 *aff’d*, 582 F.3d 244 (2d Cir. 2009). Al Otro Lado is concededly not an alien.  
 13 Accordingly, the Court grants Defendants’ motion to dismiss Organizational  
 14 Plaintiff Al Otro Lado’s ATS claims lack of jurisdiction.

## 15

### 16 **B. The Individual Plaintiffs’ ATS Claims**

17 Defendants initially moved to dismiss the ATS claims of only the New  
 18 Individual Plaintiffs and Al Otro Lado. (ECF No. 192-1 at 22–25.) In reply,  
 19 Defendants extend the scope of their motion to dismiss Plaintiffs’ ATS claims to  
 20 encompass the Original Individual Plaintiffs as well. (ECF No. 238 at 16–18.) To  
 21 resolve Defendants’ present motion, the Court will not venture beyond Defendants’  
 22 actual arguments. Reviewing these arguments, the Court finds that Defendants have  
 23 failed to show that the ATS claims must be dismissed at this juncture.

### 24

#### 25 **1. The Asserted Law of Nations Norm**

26 Defendants first argue that (1) the ATS “has no bearing in this case” because  
 27 Plaintiffs “have not brought a civil action for a tort[.]” (ECF No. 192-1 at 25, ECF  
 28 No. 238 at 16–17.) Defendants point to the ATS’s use of the word “tort” and argue

1 that Plaintiffs have no ATS claim here because they have not sued for a “tort.” (ECF  
2 No. 192-1 at 25, ECF No. 238 at 16–17.) Defendants’ argument misconstrues the  
3 ATS.

4  
5 By its terms, the ATS “enable[s] federal courts to hear claims in a very limited  
6 category defined by the law of nations and recognized at common law.” *Sosa*, 542  
7 U.S. at 712. For this reason, it should not be disputed that “[t]he ATS ‘grants  
8 jurisdiction over two types of claims: those for violations of a treaty of the United  
9 States, and those for violations of the law of nations.’” *Aragon v. Ku*, 277 F. Supp.  
10 3d 1055, 1064 (D. Minn. 2017) (quoting 14A Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R.  
11 Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 3661.2 (4th ed., Apr. 2017 Update)); *see*  
12 *also Al-Tamimi v. Adelson*, 916 F.3d 1, 11 (D.C. Cir. 2019) (recognizing that “[a]n  
13 ATS claim . . . incorporates the law of nations”). When a plaintiff seeks to plead an  
14 ATS claim based on an alleged violation of the law of nations, the plaintiff must  
15 identify an international norm that is “specific, universal, and obligatory.” *Sosa*, 542  
16 U.S. at 732. As a general matter, “[c]ourts ascertain customary international law ‘by  
17 consulting the works of jurists, writing professedly on public law; or by the general  
18 usage and practice of nations; or by judicial decisions recognizing and enforcing that  
19 law.’” *Siderman de Blake v. Republic of Argentina*, 965 F.2d 699, 714–15 (9th Cir.  
20 1992) (quoting *United States v. Smith*, 18 U.S. 153, 160–61 (1820)).

21  
22 Plaintiffs allege that the duty of non-*refoulement* is a *jus cogens* norm  
23 recognized by the law of nations. (SAC ¶¶ 227–35.)<sup>13</sup> And, in opposition to  
24

25 <sup>13</sup> “As defined in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a *jus cogens*  
26 norm, also known as a ‘peremptory norm’ of international law, ‘is a norm accepted  
27 and recognized by the international community of states as a whole as a norm from  
28 which no derogation is permitted and which can be modified only by a subsequent  
norm of general international law having the same character.’” *Siderman de Blake*  
*v. Republic of Argentina*, 965 F.2d 699, 714 (9th Cir. 1992) (quoting Vienna



1 dismissal, Plaintiffs elaborate on these allegations under the applicable standard,  
 2 locating the asserted *jus cogens* norm in (1) a range of fundamental international  
 3 treaties, including Article 33 of the Convention on the Status of Refugees and its  
 4 Protocol (“Refugee Convention”), Article 13 of the International Covenant on Civil  
 5 and Political Rights (“ICCPR”), and Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture  
 6 and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment or Punishment (“CAT”); (2)  
 7 statements by international law bodies, including the Executive Committee of the  
 8 United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR); and (3) international  
 9 law commentators. (ECF No. 210 at 27–30.) Defendants simply fail to grapple with  
 10 Plaintiffs’ allegations or arguments on whether non-*refoulement* is a norm that is  
 11 recognized by the law of nations.<sup>14</sup>

12 \_\_\_\_\_  
 13 Convention on the Law of Treaties, art. 53, May 23, 1969, 1155 U.N.T.S. 332, 8  
 14 I.L.M. 679). Courts determine whether a *jus cogens* norm exists by looking to the  
 15 works of jurists, writing professedly on public law; or by the general usage and  
 16 practice of nations; or by judicial decisions recognizing and enforcing that law, but  
 17 courts must make the additional determination “whether the international  
 18 community recognizes the norm as one ‘from which no derogation is permitted.’”  
*Id.* (quoting *Committee of U.S. Citizens Living in Nicaragua v. Reagan*, 859 F.2d  
 929, 940 (D.C. Cir. 1988)).

19 <sup>14</sup> None of Defendants’ dismissal arguments grapples with the Plaintiffs’  
 20 fundamental contention that non-*refoulement* is a *jus cogens* norm whose violation  
 21 is actionable. Defendants initially moved to dismiss the “non-*refoulement* claims”  
 22 of the New Individual Plaintiffs allegedly in Mexico at the time of their alleged  
 23 injuries on three grounds. First, Defendants argued that each of the treaties the SAC  
 24 identifies is not independently enforceable and separately analyzed each treaty.  
 25 (ECF No. 192-1 at 23–24.) Second, Defendants argued that the Refugee Act of 1980  
 26 does not provide Plaintiffs with any independent cause of action in this Court  
 27 because the Act only allows claims to be adjudicated defensively before an  
 28 immigration judge or affirmatively before USCIS. (*Id.* at 24.) These arguments  
 elide the ATS claims that Plaintiffs have actually pleaded. Plaintiffs’ opposition  
 brief expressly observes that Defendants’ opening brief fundamentally misconstrues  
 Plaintiffs’ ATS claims. (ECF No. 210 at 27.) And the SAC is fairly clear in alleging  
 Plaintiffs’ theory that the duty of non-*refoulement* is a *jus cogens* norm whose  
 violation is actionable—not that each individual treaty cited in the SAC is a separate

1           The only somewhat applicable argument Defendants raise is that “even if the  
2 Extraterritorial Plaintiffs had raised tort claims, Defendants’ alleged conduct does  
3 not come close to the type of egregious ‘violations of the law of nations’ even  
4 potentially within the ATS’s grant of jurisdiction.” (ECF No. 192-1 at 25 (citing  
5 *Filartiga v. Pena-Irala*, 630 F.2d 876 (2d Cir. 1980) as “allowing wrongful death  
6 claim to proceed against Paraguayan police supervisor alleged to have ‘deliberate[ly]  
7 tortured’ an individual in Paraguay ‘under color of official authority’”). The inquiry  
8 under the ATS, however, does not turn on subjective assertions about whether the  
9 challenged conduct is “egregious” or not. The Court can only understand  
10 Defendants’ current briefing to concede, at this stage, the core contention underlying  
11 Plaintiffs’ ATS claims that there exists a recognized duty of non-*refoulement* that  
12 qualifies as an international law norm under the law of nations.

## 13 14                           **2. The INA Does Not “Preempt” Plaintiffs’ ATS Claims**

15           Defendants’ second argument is that the existence of a “comprehensive and  
16 exclusive scheme of legislation” under the INA “preempt[s] the enforcement of a  
17 freestanding international law norm of non-*refoulement* in this Court.” (ECF No.  
18 238 at 17–18.) Curiously, Defendants raise this argument while arguing in the same  
19 breath that the New Individual Plaintiffs fall outside the scope of the relevant INA  
20 provisions in this case. If this latter argument is to be credited, then there is no  
21 comprehensive and exclusive scheme under which these Plaintiffs could seek relief  
22 and Defendants’ argument collapses.

23  
24           In any event, the Court has already rejected Defendants’ argument. The Court  
25 expressly stated in the prior dismissal order, “[t]o the extent that Defendants contend  
26 that the ATS claims must be dismissed because a remedy is available under domestic  
27

28 \_\_\_\_\_  
basis for Plaintiffs’ ATS claims.

1 law, the Court rejects that argument. ‘Contrary to defendants’ argument, there is no  
2 absolute preclusion of international law claims by the availability of domestic  
3 remedies for the same alleged harm.’” *Al Otro Lado*, 327 F. Supp. 3d at n.10  
4 (quoting *Hawa Abdi Jama v. United States INS*, 22 F. Supp. 2d 353, 364 (D.N.J.  
5 1998)). Defendants’ latest assertion of their prior argument under a “preemption”  
6 label overlooks *Jawa*’s express recognition that “there is nothing in the [ATS] which  
7 limits its applications to situations where there is no relief available under domestic  
8 law” and *Jawa*’s conclusion that “[t]here is no reason why plaintiffs cannot seek  
9 relief on alternative grounds.” *Jama v.*, 22 F. Supp. 2d at 364. Defendants otherwise  
10 direct the Court to cases in which federal courts rejected an alien’s attempt to rely  
11 on international law norms to seek immigration relief and, in doing so, stated that  
12 “where a controlling executive or legislative act does exist, customary international  
13 law is inapplicable.” *See Cortez-Gastelum v. Holder*, 526 Fed. App’x 747 (9th Cir.  
14 2013); *Galo-Garcia v. INS*, 86 F.3d 916, 918 (9th Cir. 1996). Defendants’ reliance  
15 on this caselaw underscores for the Court that, at a minimum, Plaintiffs may plead  
16 their ATS claims as alternative claims in the event that their INA-based claims fail.  
17 *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(3) (“A pleading that states a claim for relief must contain . .  
18 . a demand for the relief sought, which may include relief in the alternative or  
19 different types of relief.”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d)(3) (“A party may state as many  
20 separate claims . . . as it has, regardless of consistency.”). Thus, the Court rejects  
21 Defendants’ “preemption” argument.

22  
23 \* \* \*

24 Nevertheless, the Court observes that Plaintiffs do not cite a single case in  
25 which another federal court has recognized that the duty of non-*refoulement* is  
26 actionable through a federal court’s ATS jurisdiction. The paucity of such caselaw  
27 should at least give this Court pause on whether it is appropriate to recognize the  
28 particular ATS cause of action the Individual Plaintiffs raise in this case. Having

1 reviewed Defendants’ present dismissal arguments, however, the Court cannot  
2 conclude that it lacks jurisdiction over the Individual Plaintiffs’ ATS claims.  
3 Because the ATS is a jurisdictional statute, Defendants are not foreclosed from  
4 challenging the Plaintiffs’ ATS claims at a later stage. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3)  
5 (recognizing that subject matter jurisdiction can be assessed “at any time”); *see also*  
6 *Baloco v. Drummond Co.*, 767 F.3d 1229, 1234 (11th Cir. 2014) (affirming dismissal  
7 of ATS claims under Rule 12(b)(1)); *Best Med. Belg., Inc. v. Kingdom of Belg.*, 913  
8 F. Supp. 2d 230, 236 (E.D. Va. 2012) (“The [ATS] is jurisdictional in nature and  
9 also subject to challenge by a Rule 12(b)(1) motion.”); *In re Chiquita Brands Int’l,*  
10 *Inc.*, 792 F. Supp. 2d 1301, 1354 (S.D. Fla. 2011) (observing that “a complaint that  
11 fails to sufficiently plead the elements of an ATS claim is analyzed under Rule  
12 12(b)(1)”).

13  
14 **CONCLUSION & ORDER**

15 For the foregoing reasons, the Court **GRANTS IN PART AND DENIES IN**  
16 **PART** Defendants’ motion to dismiss the SAC. The Court **GRANTS** Defendants’  
17 motion as follows:

18 1. The Court **DISMISSES WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND** the  
19 Section 706(1) claims of the New Individual Plaintiffs for alleged failures to take  
20 agency action required by 8 U.S.C. § 1225(b)(2)(A).

21 2. The Court **DISMISSES WITH PREJUDICE** Organizational Plaintiff  
22 Al Otro Lado’s ATS claim for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

23 The Court otherwise **DENIES** Defendants’ motion to dismiss the SAC.  
24 Defendants **SHALL ANSWER** the SAC **no later than August 16, 2019**. Given the  
25 length of time this case has been pending at the motion to dismiss stage, the Court  
26 will not grant extensions of the deadline.

27 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

28 **DATED: July 29, 2019**

  
**Hon. Cynthia Bashant**  
**United States District Judge**