



**DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL**

**DAVID Y. IGE**  
GOVERNOR

**DOUGLAS S. CHIN**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

For Immediate Release  
February 3, 2017

News Release 2017-12

**HAWAII V. TRUMP**

HONOLULU – Hawaii Attorney General Doug Chin announced today that the state of Hawaii has filed a lawsuit against President Donald Trump in Hawaii federal court.

The lawsuit filed today asks the court to block implementation of the January 27, 2017 Executive Order signed by President Trump entitled “Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States.” The Executive Order restricts immigration from seven Muslim-majority countries: Iraq, Iran, Syria, Somalia, Sudan, Libya, and Yemen. It suspends all refugee admission for 120 days and bars all Syrian refugees indefinitely. It grants entry preferences to minority religions. This order is the beginning of the fulfillment of President Trump’s campaign pledge to implement a “total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States.”

**Attorney General Chin** said, “What makes our country special and a beacon across the world is its inclusive democracy and the rule of law. Everyone in the United States, including the President, must follow the law and follow the Constitution.”

The complaint alleges several causes of action:

- The Executive Order is unconstitutional because it favors one religion over another in violation of the establishment clause of the First Amendment;
- The Executive Order is unconstitutional because it denies equal protection of the law on the basis of national origin;
- The Executive Order is unconstitutional because it curtails the right to travel without any legal justification;
- The Executive Order is unconstitutional because it deprives individuals of their liberty interests without due process of law; and

- The Executive Order is illegal because it violates the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Administrative Procedures Act.

Hawaii's papers filed today asked the court to block the order across the country. As the state's memo argues:

Hawaii joins the many voices that have condemned the Order. But this pleading is not about politics or rhetoric—it is about the law. The simple fact is that the Order is unlawful. By banning Muslims and creating a preference for Christian refugees, the Order violates the Establishment Clause of the United States Constitution. By those same acts, it violates the equal protection guarantee of the Fifth Amendment. By failing utterly to provide procedures or protections of any kind for people detained or turned away at our airports, it violates the Due Process Clause. And by enshrining rank discrimination on the basis of nationality and religion, it flies in the face of statutes enacted by Congress.

Hawaii has asked for a hearing on its motion for a temporary restraining order in no more than 14 days.

**Attorney General Chin added,** "Hawaii is an island state. This illegal order affects our state in a unique way. Under this order, an Iraqi permanent resident on the mainland U.S. cannot leave the country without the risk of never being allowed to return, but he still can travel throughout the continental United States. That same person here cannot so much as visit another island within our state for fear of being detained by federal agents at the airport. In the past, the people of this state experienced discrimination by the federal government based on national origin. We must speak up and not let this happen again."

Assisting the state of Hawaii in the litigation is Neal Kumar Katyal, Esq., former Acting Solicitor General of the United States during the Obama Administration. He is currently a partner at the Washington, D.C. law firm Hogan Lovells, and a law professor at Georgetown University.

Copies of the complaint, motion for a temporary restraining order, and memorandum in support of the motion for a temporary restraining order are attached.

# # #

For more information, contact:

Joshua A. Wisch

Special Assistant to the Attorney General

Phone: (808) 586-1284

Email: [joshua.A.Wisch@hawaii.gov](mailto:joshua.A.Wisch@hawaii.gov)

Web: <http://ag.hawaii.gov>

Twitter: @ATGHlgov

DOUGLAS S. CHIN (Bar No. 6465)  
Attorney General of the State of Hawai'i  
CLYDE J. WADSWORTH (Bar No. 8495)  
Solicitor General of the State of Hawai'i  
DEIRDRE MARIE-IHA (Bar No. 7923)  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL, STATE OF HAWAI'I  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
Telephone: (808) 586-1500  
Fax: (808) 586-1239  
Email: deirdre.marie-iha@hawaii.gov

NEAL K. KATYAL\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: (202) 637-5600  
Fax: (202) 637-5910  
Email:  
neal.katyal@hoganlovells.com

*\*Pro Hac Vice Application  
Forthcoming*

*Attorneys for Plaintiff, State of Hawai'i  
(See Next Page For Additional Counsel)*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAI'I

STATE OF HAWAI'I,

Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity  
as President of the United States; U.S.  
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND  
SECURITY; JOHN F. KELLY, in his official  
capacity as Secretary of the U.S. Department  
of Homeland Security; U.S. DEPARTMENT  
OF STATE; REX TILLERSON, in his  
official capacity as Acting Secretary of State;  
and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.

COMPLAINT FOR  
DECLARATORY AND  
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF;  
SUMMONS

**ADDITIONAL COUNSEL**

KIMBERLY T. GUIDRY (Bar No. 7813)  
DONNA H. KALAMA (Bar No. 6051)  
ROBERT T. NAKATSUJI (Bar No. 6743)  
Deputy Attorneys General  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL, STATE OF HAWAI‘I  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
Telephone: (808) 586-1500  
Fax: (808) 586-1239

COLLEEN ROH SINZDAK\*  
MITCHELL P. REICH\*  
ELIZABETH HAGERTY\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: (202) 637-5600  
Fax: (202) 637-5910

THOMAS P. SCHMIDT\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
875 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
Telephone: (212) 918-3000  
Fax: (212) 918-3100

SARA SOLOW\*  
ALEXANDER B. BOWERMAN\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
1835 Market St., 29th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (267) 675-4600  
Fax: (267) 675-4601

*\*Pro Hac Vice Applications  
Forthcoming*

*Attorneys for Plaintiff, State of Hawai‘i*

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. The State of Hawai‘i (the “State”) brings this action to protect its residents, its employers, its educational institutions, and its sovereignty against illegal actions of President Donald J. Trump and the federal government.

2. President Trump’s January 27, 2017 Executive Order, “Protecting the Nation From Terrorist Entry into the United States” (the “Executive Order”), blocks the entry into the United States, including Hawai‘i, of any person from seven Muslim-majority countries: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen.<sup>1</sup> The Executive Order has led to the detention of lawful permanent residents and noncitizens with valid visas seeking to enter or reenter the country. It has led to hundreds of persons overseas with valid visas—students, family members of U.S. citizens, and persons whose green card status was approved—being turned away from boarding plane flights to the United States. The Executive Order also introduces religious criteria for the admission of refugees into the United States, including Hawai‘i: After suspending *all* refugee admissions for 120 days, President Trump’s Executive Order prioritizes refugees who claim religious-based persecution where “the religion of the individual is a minority religion in the individual’s country of nationality.” In Muslim-majority countries, this means a preference for Christians.

3. President Trump’s Executive Order is tearing apart Hawai‘i families, damaging Hawaii’s economy, and wounding Hawai‘i institutions. It is subjecting a portion of Hawaii’s population to discrimination and second-class treatment, and denying them their fundamental right to travel overseas. Moreover, the Executive Order is eroding Hawaii’s sovereign interests in maintaining the separation

---

<sup>1</sup> See Executive Order No. 13769, 82 Fed. Reg. 8977 (Jan. 27, 2017). A copy of the Executive Order is attached as Exhibit 1.

between church and state and in welcoming persons from all nations around the world into the fabric of its society.

4. The State accordingly seeks an Order invalidating the portions of President Trump's Executive Order challenged here.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5. This Court has Federal Question Jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this action arises under the U.S. Constitution, the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA"), the Immigration and Nationality Act ("INA"), and other Federal statutes.

6. The Court is authorized to award the requested declaratory and injunctive relief under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202, and the APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706.

7. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) and (e)(1). A substantial part of the events giving rise to this claim occurred in this District, and each Defendant is an officer of the United States sued in his official capacity.

### **PARTIES**

8. Plaintiff is the State of Hawai'i. Hawai'i is the nation's most ethnically diverse State, and is home to more than 250,000 foreign-born residents. More than 100,000 of Hawaii's foreign-born residents are non-citizens.<sup>2</sup>

9. Estimates from the Fiscal Policy Institute show that as of 2010, Hawai'i had the fifth-highest percentage of foreign-born workers of any state (20% of the labor force). And 22.5% of Hawai'i business owners were foreign-born.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> United States Census Bureau, *2015 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates*, available at <https://goo.gl/IGwJyf>. A collection of the relevant data for Hawai'i is attached as Exhibit 2.

<sup>3</sup> The Fiscal Policy Institute, *Immigrant Small Business Owners*, at 24 (June 2012), available at <https://goo.gl/vyNK9W>.

10. Thousands of people living in Hawai‘i obtain lawful permanent resident status each year, including over 6,500 in 2015.<sup>4</sup> That includes numerous individuals from the seven designated countries. According to DHS statistics, over 100 Hawai‘i residents from Iran, Iraq, and Syria have obtained lawful permanent resident status since 2004 (DHS has withheld data pertaining to additional residents from the seven designated countries).<sup>5</sup>

11. Hawai‘i is also home to 12,000 foreign students.<sup>6</sup> That includes numerous individuals from the seven designated countries. At the University of Hawai‘i, there are at least 27 graduate students from the seven countries studying pursuant to valid visas issued by the U.S. government.

12. In 2016, Hawaii’s foreign students contributed over \$400 million to Hawaii’s economy through the payment of tuition and fees, living expenses, and other activities. These foreign students supported 7,590 jobs and generated more than \$43 million in state tax revenues.<sup>7</sup>

13. In 2009, foreign residents (i.e., non-citizens who had not obtained lawful permanent resident status) made up 42.9% of doctorate students, and 27.7%

---

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Lawful Permanent Residents Supplemental Table 1: Persons Obtaining Legal Permanent Resident Status by State or Territory of Residence and Country of Birth Fiscal Year 2015*, available at <https://goo.gl/ELYIkn>. Copies of these tables for fiscal years 2005 through 2015 are attached as Exhibit 3.

<sup>5</sup> See Exhibit 3.

<sup>6</sup> Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism, *The Economic Impact of International Students in Hawaii – 2016 Update*, at 8 (June 2016), available at <https://goo.gl/mogNMA>.

<sup>7</sup> *The Economic Impact of International Students in Hawaii – 2016 Update*, *supra*, at 10-11.

of master's students, in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics ("STEM") programs in Hawai'i.<sup>8</sup>

14. Hawaii's educational institutions have diverse faculties. At the University of Hawai'i, there are approximately 477 international faculty members legally present in the United States. There are at least 10 faculty members at the University who are legal permanent residents from one of the seven designated countries, and 30 visiting faculty members with valid visas who are from one of the seven designated countries.

15. Tourism is Hawaii's "lead economic driver."<sup>9</sup> In 2015 alone, Hawai'i welcomed 8.7 million visitors accounting for \$15 billion in spending.<sup>10</sup>

16. Hawai'i is home to several airports, including Honolulu International Airport and Kona International Airport.

17. David Yutaka Ige is the Governor of Hawai'i, the chief executive officer of the State of Hawai'i. The Governor is responsible for overseeing the operations of the State government, protecting the welfare of Hawai'i's citizens, and ensuring that the laws of the State are faithfully executed.

18. Douglas S. Chin is the Attorney General of Hawai'i, the chief legal officer of the State. The Attorney General is charged with representing the State in Federal Court on matters of public concern.

19. The Constitution of the State of Hawai'i provides that "[n]o law shall be enacted respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise

---

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Chamber of Commerce et al., *Help Wanted: The Role of Foreign Workers in the Innovation Economy*, at 21 (2013), available at <https://goo.gl/c3BYBu>.

<sup>9</sup> Hawai'i Tourism Authority, *2016 Annual Report to the Hawai'i State Legislature*, at 20, available at <https://goo.gl/T8uiWW>.

<sup>10</sup> Hawai'i Tourism Authority, *2015 Annual Visitor Research Report*, at 2, available at <https://goo.gl/u3RQmX>. A copy of the table of contents and executive summary of this report is attached as Exhibit 4.



thereof.” Haw. Const. Art. I § 4. And the State has declared that the practice of discrimination “because of race, color, religion, age, sex, including gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, marital status, national origin, ancestry, or disability” is against public policy. Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 381-1; *accord id.* §§ 489-3 & 515-3.

20. The State has an interest in protecting the health, safety, and welfare of its residents—including residents awaiting adjustment of their immigration status or naturalization—and in safeguarding its ability to enforce State law. The State also has an interest in “assuring that the benefits of the federal system,” including the rights and privileges protected by the United States Constitution and Federal statutes, “are not denied to its general population.” *Alfred L. Snapp & Sons v. Puerto Rico*, 458 U.S. 592, 608 (1982). The State’s interests extend to all of the State’s residents, including individuals who suffer indirect injuries and members of the general public.

21. Defendant Donald J. Trump is the President of the United States. He issued the January 27, 2017 Executive Order that is the subject of this Complaint.

22. Defendant U.S. Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) is a federal cabinet agency responsible for implementing and enforcing the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) and the Executive Order that is the subject of this Complaint. DHS is a Department of the Executive Branch of the United States Government, and is an agency within the meaning of 5. U.S.C. § 552(f). U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) is an Operational and Support Component agency within DHS, and is responsible for detaining and removing non-citizens from Iran, Iraq, Syria, Somalia, Sudan, Libya, and Yemen who arrive at air, land, and sea ports across the United States, including Honolulu International Airport and Kona International Airport.

23. Defendant John F. Kelly is the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. He is responsible for implementing and enforcing the INA and the Executive Order that is the subject of this Complaint, and he oversees CBP. He is sued in his official capacity.

24. Defendant U.S. Department of State is a federal cabinet agency responsible for implementing the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program and the Executive Order that is the subject of this Complaint. The Department of State is a Department of the Executive Branch of the United States Government, and is an agency within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 552(f).

25. Defendant Rex Tillerson is the Secretary of State. He oversees the Department of State's implementation of the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program and the Executive Order that is the subject of this Complaint. The Secretary of State has authority to determine and implement certain visa procedures for non-citizens. Secretary Tillerson is sued in his official capacity.

26. Defendant United States of America includes all government agencies and departments responsible for the implementation of the INA, and for detention and removal of non-citizens from Iran, Iraq, Syria, Somalia, Sudan, Libya, and Yemen who arrive at air, land, and sea ports across the United States, including Honolulu International Airport and Kona International Airport.

### **ALLEGATIONS**

#### **A. President Trump's Campaign Promises**

27. President Trump repeatedly campaigned on the promise that he would ban Muslim immigrants and refugees from entering the United States, particularly from Syria, and maintained the same rhetoric after he was elected.

28. On July 11, 2015, Mr. Trump claimed (falsely) that Christian refugees from Syria are blocked from entering the United States. In a speech in Las Vegas, Mr. Trump said, "If you're from Syria and you're a Christian, you cannot come

into this country, and they're the ones that are being decimated. If you are Islamic . . . it's hard to believe, you can come in so easily.”<sup>11</sup>

29. On September 30, 2015, while speaking in New Hampshire about the 10,000 Syrian refugees the Obama Administration had accepted for 2016, Mr. Trump said “if I win, they're going back!” He said “they could be ISIS,” and referred to Syrian refugees as a “200,000-man army.”<sup>12</sup>

30. On December 7, 2015, shortly after the terror attacks in Paris, Mr. Trump issued a press release entitled: “Donald J. Trump Statement on Preventing Muslim Immigration.”<sup>13</sup> The press release stated: “Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States . . . .” The release asserted that “there is great hatred towards Americans by large segments of the Muslim population.” The press release remains accessible on [www.donaldjtrump.com](http://www.donaldjtrump.com) as of this filing.

31. The next day, when questioned about the proposed “shutdown,” Mr. Trump compared his proposal to President Franklin Roosevelt's internment of Japanese Americans during World War II, saying, “[Roosevelt] did the same thing.”<sup>14</sup> When asked what the customs process would look like for a Muslim non-citizen attempting to enter the United States, Mr. Trump said, “[T]hey would say,

---

<sup>11</sup> Louis Jacobson, *Donald Trump says if you're from Syria and a Christian, you can't come to the U.S. as a refugee*, Politifact (July 20, 2015 10:00 AM ET), <https://goo.gl/fucYZP>.

<sup>12</sup> Ali Vitali, *Donald Trump in New Hampshire: Syrian Refugees Are 'Going Back'*, NBC News (Oct. 1, 2015 7:33 AM ET), <https://goo.gl/4XSeGX>.

<sup>13</sup> Press Release, Donald J. Trump for President, *Donald J. Trump Statement on Preventing Muslim Immigration* (Dec. 7, 2015), available at <https://goo.gl/D3OdJJ>. A copy of this press release is attached as Exhibit 5.

<sup>14</sup> Jenna Johnson, *Donald Trump says he is not bothered by comparisons to Hitler*, The Washington Post (Dec. 8, 2016), <https://goo.gl/6G0oH7>.

are you Muslim?” The interviewer responded: “And if they said ‘yes,’ they would not be allowed into the country.” Mr. Trump said: “That’s correct.”<sup>15</sup>

32. During a Republican primary debate in January 2016, Mr. Trump was asked about how his “comments about banning Muslims from entering the country created a firestorm,” and whether he wanted to “rethink this position.” He said, “No.”<sup>16</sup>

33. A few months later, in March 2016, Mr. Trump said, during an interview, “I think Islam hates us.” Mr. Trump was asked, “Is there a war between the West and radical Islam, or between the West and Islam itself?” He replied: “It’s very hard to separate. Because you don’t know who’s who.”<sup>17</sup>

34. Later, as the presumptive Republican nominee, Trump began using facially neutral language, at times, to describe the Muslim ban. Following the mass shootings at an Orlando nightclub in June 2016, Mr. Trump gave a speech promising to “suspend immigration from areas of the world where there’s a proven history of terrorism against the United States, Europe or our allies until we fully understand how to end these threats.” But he continued to link that idea to the need to stop “importing radical Islamic terrorism to the West through a failed immigration system.” He said that “to protect the quality of life for all Americans—women and children, gay and straight, Jews and Christians and all people then we need to tell the truth about radical Islam.” And he criticized Hillary Clinton for, as he described it, “her refusal to say the words ‘radical

---

<sup>15</sup> Nick Gass, *Trump not bothered by comparisons to Hitler*, Politico (Dec. 8, 2015 7:51 AM ET), <https://goo.gl/IkBzPO>.

<sup>16</sup> The American Presidency Project, *Presidential Candidates Debates: Republican Candidates Debate in North Charleston, South Carolina* (January 14, 2016), <https://goo.gl/se0aCX>.

<sup>17</sup> *Anderson Cooper 360 Degrees: Exclusive Interview With Donald Trump* (CNN television broadcast Mar. 9, 2016 8:00 PM ET), transcript available at <https://goo.gl/y7s2kQ>.

Islam,” stating: “Here is what she said, exact quote, ‘Muslims are peaceful and tolerant people, and have nothing whatsoever to do with terrorism.’ That is Hillary Clinton.” Mr. Trump further stated that the Obama administration had “put political correctness above common sense,” but said that he “refuse[d] to be politically correct.”

35. Mr. Trump’s June 2016 speech also covered refugees. He said that “[e]ach year the United States permanently admits 100,000 immigrants from the Middle East and many more from Muslim countries outside of the Middle East. Our government has been admitting ever-growing numbers, year after year, without any effective plan for our own security.”<sup>18</sup> He issued a press release stating: “We have to stop the tremendous flow of Syrian refugees into the United States.”<sup>19</sup>

36. Later, on July 24, 2016, Mr. Trump was asked: “The Muslim ban. I think you’ve pulled back from it, but you tell me.” Mr. Trump responded: “I don’t think it’s a rollback. In fact, you could say it’s an expansion. I’m looking now at territories. People were so upset when I used the word Muslim. Oh, you can’t use the word Muslim. Remember this. And I’m okay with that, because I’m talking territory instead of Muslim.”<sup>20</sup>

37. During an October 9, 2016 Presidential Debate, Mr. Trump was asked: “Your running mate said this week that the Muslim ban is no longer your position. Is that correct? And if it is, was it a mistake to have a religious test?” Mr. Trump

---

<sup>18</sup> Ryan Teague Beckwith, *Read Donald Trump’s Speech on the Orlando Shooting*, Time (June 13, 2016 4:36 PM ET), <https://goo.gl/kgHKrb>.

<sup>19</sup> Press Release, Donald J. Trump for President, *Donald J. Trump Addresses Terrorism, Immigration, and National Security* (June 13, 2016), available at <https://goo.gl/GcrFhw>.

<sup>20</sup> *Meet the Press* (NBC television broadcast July 24, 2016), transcript available at <https://goo.gl/jHc6aU>. A copy of this transcript is attached as Exhibit 6.

replied: “The Muslim ban is something that in some form has morphed into a[n] extreme vetting from certain areas of the world.” When asked to clarify whether “the Muslim ban still stands,” Mr. Trump said, “It’s called extreme vetting.”<sup>21</sup>

38. Then, on December 21, 2016, following terror attacks in Berlin, Mr. Trump was asked whether he had decided “to rethink or re-evaluate [his] plans to create a Muslim registry or ban Muslim immigration to the United States.” Mr. Trump replied: “You know my plans. All along, I’ve been proven to be right.”<sup>22</sup>

## **B. President Trump’s Executive Order**

39. Within a week of being sworn in, President Trump acted upon his ominous campaign promises to restrict Muslim immigration, curb refugee admissions, and prioritize non-Muslim refugees.

40. In an interview on January 25, 2017, Mr. Trump discussed his plans to implement “extreme vetting” of people seeking entry into the United States. He remarked: “[N]o, it’s not the Muslim ban. But it’s countries that have tremendous terror. . . . [I]t’s countries that people are going to come in and cause us tremendous problems.”<sup>23</sup>

41. Two days later, on January 27, 2017, President Trump signed the Executive Order that is the subject of this Complaint, which is entitled “Protecting the Nation From Terrorist Entry into the United States.”

42. The Executive Order was issued without a notice and comment period and without interagency review. Moreover, the Executive Order was issued with little explanation of how it could further its stated objective.

---

<sup>21</sup> The American Presidency Project, *Presidential Debates: Presidential Debate at Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri* (Oct. 9, 2016), <https://goo.gl/iLzf0A>.

<sup>22</sup> *President-Elect Trump Remarks in Palm Beach, Florida*, C-SPAN (Dec. 21, 2016), <https://goo.gl/JIMCst>.

<sup>23</sup> *Transcript: ABC News Anchor David Muir Interviews President Trump*, ABC News (Jan. 25, 2017, 10:25 PM ET), <https://goo.gl/NUzSpq>.

43. When signing the Executive Order, President Trump read the title, looked up, and said: “We all know what that means.”<sup>24</sup> President Trump said he was “establishing a new vetting measure to keep radical Islamic terrorists out of the United States of America,” and that: “We don’t want them here.”<sup>25</sup>

44. Section 3 of the Executive Order is entitled “Suspension of Issuance of Visas and Other Immigration Benefits to Nationals of Countries of Particular Concern.” Section 3(c) “suspends entry into the United States, as immigrants and nonimmigrants” of persons from countries referred to in Section 217(a)(12) of the INA [8 U.S.C. § 1187(a)(12)], that is: Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen.

45. The majority of the population in each of these seven countries is Muslim.

46. Not a single fatal terrorist attack has been perpetrated in the United States by a national of one of these seven countries since at least 1975.<sup>26</sup> Other countries whose nationals have perpetrated fatal terrorist attacks in the United States are not part of the immigration ban.<sup>27</sup>

47. Section 3(c) means that Lawful Permanent Residents, foreign students enrolled in U.S. universities (including in Hawai‘i), individuals employed in the United States on temporary work visas, and others must be halted at the border if

---

<sup>24</sup> *Trump Signs Executive Orders at Pentagon*, ABC News (Jan. 27, 2017), <https://goo.gl/7Jzird>.

<sup>25</sup> Sarah Pulliam Bailey, *Trump signs order limiting refugee entry, says he will prioritize Christian refugees*, The Washington Post (Jan. 27, 2017), <https://goo.gl/WF2hmS>.

<sup>26</sup> Alex Nowrasteh, *Little National Security Benefit to Trump’s Executive Order on Immigration*, Cato Institute Blog (Jan. 25, 2017 3:31 PM ET), <https://goo.gl/BCv6rQ>.

<sup>27</sup> Scott Schane, *Immigration Ban Is Unlikely to Reduce Terrorist Threat, Experts Say*, N.Y. Times (Jan. 28, 2017), <https://goo.gl/MBvOTk>.

they arrive in the United States (in Hawai‘i or elsewhere) from one of the seven designated countries, including if he or she leaves the country and tries to return. Section 3(g) allows the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security to make exceptions when they determine that doing so is “in the national interest.”

48. The Executive Order also provides for an expansion of the immigration ban to nationals from additional countries. Section 3(d) directs the Secretary of State to (within about 30 days) “request [that] all foreign governments” provide the United States with information to determine whether a person is a security threat. And, should any countries fail to comply, Section 3(e) directs the Secretaries of Homeland Security and State to “submit to the President a list of countries recommended for inclusion” in the ban from among any countries who do not provide the information requested.

49. Section 3(f) gives the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Homeland Security further authority to “submit to the President the names of any additional countries recommended for similar treatment” in the future.

50. Section 5 of the Executive Order is entitled “Realignment of the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program for Fiscal Year 2017.” Section 5(a) directs the Secretary of State to “suspend the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) for 120 days.” Section 5(e) permits the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security to admit individuals as refugees on a case-by-case basis, but only if they determine that admission of the refugee is in the “national interest,” including “when the person is a religious minority in his country of nationality facing religious persecution.”

51. Section 5(b) directs the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security, “[u]pon resumption of USRAP admissions,” to “prioritize refugee claims made by individuals on the basis of religious-based persecution, provided that the religion of the individual is a minority religion in the individual’s country of nationality.”



In Section 5(c), President Trump “proclaim[s] that the entry of nationals of Syria as refugees is detrimental to the interests of the United States and thus suspends any such entry” indefinitely.

52. The restrictions in Sections 3 and 5 of the Executive Order apply whether or not a non-citizen poses any individualized threat of violence, or has any connection to terrorist activities in any way.

53. In a January 27, 2017 interview with Christian Broadcasting Network, President Trump said that persecuted Christians would be given priority under the Executive Order. He said (once again, falsely): “Do you know if you were a Christian in Syria it was impossible, at least very tough to get into the United States? If you were a Muslim you could come in, but if you were a Christian, it was almost impossible and the reason that was so unfair, everybody was persecuted in all fairness, but they were chopping off the heads of everybody but more so the Christians. And I thought it was very, very unfair. So we are going to help them.”<sup>28</sup>

54. The day after signing the Executive Order, President Trump advisor Rudolph Giuliani explained on television how the Executive Order came to be. He said: “When [Mr. Trump] first announced it, he said, ‘Muslim ban.’ He called me up. He said, ‘Put a commission together. Show me the right way to do it legally.’”<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> *Brody File Exclusive: President Trump Says Persecuted Christians Will Be Given Priority as Refugees*, Christian Broadcasting Network (Jan. 27, 2017), <https://goo.gl/2GLB5q>. A printout of this webpage is attached as Exhibit 7. Additional pages including advertisements, reader comments, and other extraneous material are omitted.

<sup>29</sup> Amy B. Wang, *Trump asked for a ‘Muslim ban,’ Giuliani says – and ordered a commission to do it ‘legally’*, The Washington Post (Jan. 29, 2017), <https://goo.gl/Xog80h>. A copy of this article is attached as Exhibit 8.

### C. Effects of the Executive Order

55. Upon issuance of the Executive Order, Defendants began detaining people at U.S. airports who, but for the Executive Order, were legally entitled to enter the United States. Some were also removed from the United States. Estimates indicate that over 100 people were detained upon arrival at U.S. airports.<sup>30</sup>

56. Defendants have not afforded people an opportunity to apply for asylum, withholding of removal, or other relief before removing them, and have even prevented detained individuals from speaking with their attorneys.

57. Among others, Defendants have detained and/or removed:

- a. Lawful permanent residents, including dozens at Dulles International Airport in Virginia,<sup>31</sup> and others at Los Angeles International Airport who were pressured to sign Form I-407 to *relinquish* their green cards;<sup>32</sup>
- b. People with special immigrant visas, including an Iraqi national at John F. Kennedy International Airport who worked as an interpreter for the U.S. Army in Iraq;<sup>33</sup>
- c. A doctor at the Cleveland Clinic with a valid work visa who was trying to return home from vacation;<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Michael D. Shear et al., *Judge Blocks Trump Order on Refugees Amid Chaos and Outcry Worldwide*, N.Y. Times (Jan. 28, 2017), <https://goo.gl/OrUJEr>.

<sup>31</sup> See, e.g., Petition ¶ 2, *Aziz v. Trump*, No. 1:17-cv-116 (E.D. Va. Jan. 28, 2017).

<sup>32</sup> Leslie Berestein Rojas et al., *LAX immigration agents asks detainees to sign away their legal residency status, attorneys say*, Southern California Public Radio News (Jan. 30, 2017), <https://goo.gl/v6JoUC>; Brenda Gazzar & Cynthia Washicko, *Thousands protest Trump's immigration order at LAX*, Los Angeles Daily News (Jan. 29, 2017), <https://goo.gl/1vA37M>.

<sup>33</sup> See, e.g., Petition 2, *Darweesh v. Trump*, No. 1:17-cv-00480 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 28, 2017).

- d. People with valid visas to visit family in the United States, including a Syrian woman sent to Saudi Arabia after being convinced by officials at O'Hare International Airport to sign paperwork cancelling her visa.<sup>35</sup>

58. People overseas were blocked from boarding flights to the United States or told they could no longer come here. At a hearing in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia on February 3, 2017, an attorney for the Federal Government revealed that over 100,000 visas have been revoked since the Executive Order was signed a week earlier on January 27.<sup>36</sup> Those affected included:

- a. People with valid student, work, or visitor visas;
- b. People who could seek asylum in the United States;
- c. Syrian refugees with visas and U.S. placements lined up, including a family assisted by a church in Sheboygan, Wisconsin;<sup>37</sup>
- d. Parents seeking to reunite with children they were forced to leave behind, or have never met;<sup>38</sup> and

---

<sup>34</sup> Jane Morice, *Two Cleveland Clinic doctors vacationing in Iran detained in New York, then released*, Cleveland.com (Jan. 29, 2017), <https://goo.gl/f0EGV3>.

<sup>35</sup> John Rogers, *Longtime US residents, aspiring citizens caught up in ban*, StarTribune (Jan. 30, 2017 1:45 AM ET), <https://goo.gl/eEPAuE>.

<sup>36</sup> Rachael Revesz, *Donald Trump immigration ban: More than 100,000 visas revoked after travel restrictions imposed on seven Muslim-majority countries*, The Independent (Feb. 3, 2017 1:24 PM ET), <https://goo.gl/5KnCUh>.

<sup>37</sup> *Families, students, scientists: Faces of the immigration ban*, USA Today Network (Jan. 31, 2017 5:35 AM ET), <https://goo.gl/VKuhds>.

<sup>38</sup> *Refugees Anticipate Family Reunions, Instead Endure Doubt*, ABC News (Jan. 31, 2017 4:56 PM ET), <https://goo.gl/3JT6iC>.

- e. People caught in limbo because they cannot enter the United States, return to their native country, or stay much longer where they are on temporary visas.<sup>39</sup>

59. Confusion, backlash, and habeas corpus litigation arose in the wake of the Executive Order, including with regard to whether the Executive Order applied to lawful permanent residents. Within the first 72 hours that the Executive Order was in effect, Defendants reportedly changed their minds three times about whether it did.<sup>40</sup>

60. Hundreds of State Department officials signed a memorandum circulated through the State Department's "Dissent Channel" stating that the Executive Order "runs counter to core American values" including "nondiscrimination," and that "[d]espite the Executive Order's focus on them, a vanishingly small number of terror attacks on U.S. soil have been committed by foreign nationals" here on visas.<sup>41</sup>

61. Likewise, Senators John McCain (R-AZ) and Lindsey Graham (R-SC) stated: "This executive order sends a signal, intended or not, that America does not want Muslims coming into our country."<sup>42</sup>

62. DHS Secretary Kelly issued a press release on Sunday, January 29, 2017, stating that: "In applying the provisions of the president's executive order, I

---

<sup>39</sup> Jamie Doward, *US-bound migrants blocked from flying to JFK airport*, The Guardian (Jan. 28, 2017), <https://goo.gl/pWu0NZ>.

<sup>40</sup> Evan Perez et al., *Inside the confusion of the Trump executive order and travel ban*, CNN Politics (Jan. 30, 2017 11:29 AM ET), <https://goo.gl/Z3kYEC>. A printed copy of this article is attached as Exhibit 9.

<sup>41</sup> Jeffrey Gettleman, *State Department Dissent Cable on Trump's Ban Draws 1,000 Signatures*, N.Y. Times (Jan. 31, 2017), <https://goo.gl/svRdIw>. A copy of the Dissent Channel memorandum is attached as Exhibit 10.

<sup>42</sup> Press Release, Senator John McCain, *Statement By Senators McCain & Graham On Executive Order On Immigration* (Jan. 29, 2017), available at <https://goo.gl/EvHvmc>.

hereby deem the entry of lawful permanent residents to be in the national interest. Accordingly, absent the receipt of significant derogatory information indicating a serious threat to public safety and welfare, lawful permanent resident status will be a dispositive factor in our case-by-case determinations.”<sup>43</sup>

63. Secretary Kelly’s statement thus indicated that the Executive Order *does* apply to lawful permanent residents from the designated countries, and only the Secretary’s determination under Section 3(g) that admission of lawful permanent residents, absent certain information reviewed on a case-by-case basis, is in the national interest, allows them to enter.

64. Then, on February 1, 2017, the White House issued a Memorandum taking yet another position on green-card holders, now purporting to “clarify” that such persons were never covered by Sections 3 and 5 of the Order.

65. Because of the Executive Order, non-citizens from the seven designated countries who are legally present in the United States cannot leave the country for family, educational, religious, or business reasons if they wish to return.

66. Among others, people planning to travel overseas on *ummas*, a Muslim pilgrimage, are unsure whether they can make the trip.<sup>44</sup>

67. Defendants are enforcing the Executive Order on Hawai‘i soil, including at Honolulu and Kona International Airports.

68. Hawai‘i is home to numerous non-citizens from the seven designated countries—legal permanent residents, foreign students, and temporary workers—whose lives have now been upended by the Executive Order. Some non-citizens have been forced to cancel or postpone travel plans. Others may be forced to

---

<sup>43</sup> Press Release, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Statement By Secretary John Kelly On The Entry Of Lawful Permanent Residents Into The United States* (Jan. 29, 2017), available at <https://goo.gl/6kraf1>. A copy of this press release is attached as Exhibit 11.

<sup>44</sup> *US-bound migrants blocked from flying to JFK airport, supra.*

abandon their studies at Hawaii's universities in order to be reunited with immediate family members abroad.

69. Conversely, nationals of the seven designated countries cannot relocate to or even visit Hawai'i for family, educational, religious, or business reasons. As a result, the Executive Order is blocking Hawai'i residents—including U.S. citizens—from reunifying with their families.

70. Both citizens and non-citizens living in Hawai'i are harmed by the Executive Order.

71. As a result of the Order, the airport facilities provided by Hawaii's State Department of Transportation for international passengers coming into Hawai'i will be used by the federal government to carry out the unlawful acts required by the Executive Order.

72. As a result of the Executive Order, State universities and State agencies cannot accept qualified applicants for open positions—as students, researchers, post-docs, faculty members, or employees—if they are residents of one of the seven designated countries. This contravenes policies at the State's universities and agencies to promote diversity and recruit talent from abroad.<sup>45</sup>

73. Beyond universities and government entities, other employers within the State cannot recruit and/or hire workers from the seven designated countries.

74. The University of Hawai'i and other State learning institutions depend on the collaborative exchange of ideas, including among people of different

---

<sup>45</sup> See, e.g., State of Hawai'i, Department of Human Resources Development, Policy No. 601.001: Discrimination / Harassment-Free Workplace Policy (revised Nov. 16, 2016), *available at* <https://goo.gl/7q6yzJ>; University of Hawai'i, Mānoa, Policy M1.100: Non-Discrimination and Affirmative Action Policy, *available at* <https://goo.gl/6YqVl8> (last visited Feb. 2, 2017 8:27 PM ET); see also, e.g., *Campus Life: Diversity*, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa, <https://goo.gl/3nF5C9> (last visited Feb. 2, 2017 8:27 PM ET).

religions and national backgrounds. For this reason, the University of Hawai‘i has study abroad or exchange programs in over thirty countries, and international agreements for faculty collaboration with over 350 international institutions spanning forty different countries. The Executive Order threatens such educational collaboration and harms the ability of the University of Hawai‘i to fulfill its educational mission.

75. The Executive Order is depressing international travel to and tourism in Hawai‘i. Hawai‘i can no longer welcome tourists from the seven designated countries. This directly harms Hawai‘i businesses and, in turn, the State’s revenue. In 2015 alone, Hawai‘i welcomed over 6,800 visitors from the Middle East and over 2,000 visitors from Africa.

76. Even with respect to countries not currently targeted by the Executive Order, there is a likely “chilling effect” on tourism to the United States and to Hawai‘i. Non-citizen Muslims in the United States who would otherwise consider taking vacations will be less likely to travel using airports, and thus less likely to visit Hawai‘i. The Executive Order also contemplates an expansion of the immigration ban and in fact authorizes the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security to recommend additional countries for inclusion in the near future. This likely instills fear and a disinclination to travel to the United States among foreigners in other countries that President Trump has been hostile towards—i.e., residents of other Muslims countries, China, and Mexico.

77. The Executive Order gives rise to a global perception that the United States is an exclusionary country, and it dampens the appetite for international travel here generally.

78. A decrease in national and international tourism would have a severe impact on Hawaii’s economy.

79. The Executive Order also throttles the efforts of the State and its residents to resettle and assist refugees. Refugees from numerous countries, including Iraq, have resettled in Hawai‘i in recent years.<sup>46</sup> While the State’s refugee program is small, it is an important part of the State’s culture, and aiding refugees is central to the mission of private Hawai‘i organizations like Catholic Charities Hawai‘i and the Pacific Gateway Center.<sup>47</sup> In late 2015, as other states objected to the admission of Syrian refugees, Governor Ige issued a statement that “slamming the door in their face would be a betrayal of our values.” Governor Ige explained: “Hawai‘i and our nation have a long history of welcoming refugees impacted by war and oppression. Hawai‘i is the Aloha State, known for its tradition of welcoming all people with tolerance and mutual respect.”<sup>48</sup> But as long as the Executive Order prohibits refugee admissions, the State and its residents are prevented from helping refugees resettle in Hawai‘i.

80. In the event refugee admissions resume, the Executive Order promotes the admission of Christian refugees and impedes the admission of Muslim refugees. The Executive Order thus establishes a preference by the Federal Government for Christianity and against Islam, despite the Establishment Clauses of the Constitutions of the State of Hawai‘i and the United States.

81. President Trump’s Executive Order is antithetical to Hawai‘i’s state identity and spirit. For many in Hawai‘i, including State officials, the Executive Order conjures up the memory of the Chinese Exclusion Acts and the imposition of

---

<sup>46</sup> U.S. Department of Health & Human Servs., Office of Refugee Resettlement, *Overseas Refugee Arrival Data: Fiscal Years 2012-2015*, available at <https://goo.gl/JcgkDM>.

<sup>47</sup> *See About: Our History*, Catholic Charities Hawai‘i, <https://goo.gl/deVBla> (last visited Feb. 2, 2017 8:28 PM ET); *About: Mission*, Pacific Gateway Center, <https://goo.gl/J8bN5k> (last visited Feb. 2, 2017 8:29 PM ET).

<sup>48</sup> Press Release, Governor of the State of Hawai‘i, *Governor David Ige’s Statement On Syrian Refugees* (Nov. 16, 2015), available at <https://goo.gl/gJcMIv>.



martial law and Japanese internment after the bombing of Pearl Harbor. As Governor Ige expressed two days after President Trump issued the Executive Order, “Hawai‘i has a proud history as a place immigrants of diverse backgrounds can achieve their dreams through hard work. Many of our people also know all too well the consequences of giving in to fear of newcomers. The remains of the internment camp at Honouliuli are a sad testament to that fear. We must remain true to our values and be vigilant where we see the worst part of history about to be repeated.”<sup>49</sup>

82. If the State had the power to unilaterally address the problems raised by the Executive Order, it would. But because power over immigration is largely lodged in the Federal Government, litigation against the Federal Government is the only way for the State to vindicate its interests and those of its citizens.

## **CAUSES OF ACTION**

### **COUNT I**

#### **(First Amendment – Establishment Clause)**

83. The foregoing allegations are realleged and incorporated by reference herein.

84. The Establishment Clause of the First Amendment prohibits the Federal Government from officially preferring one religion over another.

85. Sections 3 and 5 of the Executive Order, as well as Defendants’ statements regarding the Executive Order and their actions to implement it, are intended to disfavor Islam and favor Christianity.

---

<sup>49</sup> Press Release, Governor of the State of Hawai‘i, *Statement of Governor David Ige On Immigration To The United States* (Jan. 29, 2017), available at <https://goo.gl/62w1fh>.

86. Sections 3 and 5 of the Executive Order, as well as Defendants' statements regarding the Executive Order and their actions to implement it, have the effect of disfavoring Islam and favoring Christianity.

87. Through their actions described in this Complaint, Defendants have violated the Establishment Clause. Defendants' violation inflicts ongoing harm upon Hawai'i residents and the sovereign interests of the State of Hawai'i.

## **COUNT II**

### **(Fifth Amendment – Equal Protection)**

88. The foregoing allegations are realleged and incorporated by reference herein.

89. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment prohibits the Federal Government from denying equal protection of the laws, including on the basis of religion or national origin.

90. The Executive Order was motivated by animus and a desire to discriminate on the basis of religion and/or national origin.

91. The Executive Order differentiates between people based on their religion and/or national origin and is accordingly subject to strict scrutiny. It fails that test, because it is over- and under-inclusive in restricting immigration for security reasons, and the statements by President Trump and his advisors provide direct evidence of the Executive Order's discriminatory motivations.

92. For the same reason, the Executive Order is not rationally related to a legitimate government interest.

93. Sections 3 and 5 of the Executive Order, as well as Defendants' statements regarding the Executive Order and their actions to implement it, discriminate against individuals based on their religion and/or national origin without lawful justification.

94. Through their actions described in this Complaint, Defendants have violated the Equal Protection guarantees of the Fifth Amendment. Defendants' violation inflicts ongoing harm upon Hawai'i residents and the sovereign interests of the State of Hawai'i.

### **COUNT III**

#### **(Fifth Amendment – Substantive Due Process)**

95. The foregoing allegations are realleged and incorporated by reference herein.

96. The right to international travel is protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment.

97. The Executive Order directly curtails that right, without any legal justification.

98. Through their actions described in this Complaint, Defendants have violated the Substantive Due Process guarantees of the Fifth Amendment. Defendants' violation inflicts ongoing harm upon Hawai'i residents and the sovereign interests of the State of Hawai'i.

### **COUNT IV**

#### **(Fifth Amendment – Procedural Due Process)**

99. The foregoing allegations are realleged and incorporated by reference herein.

100. The Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment prohibits the Federal Government from depriving individuals of liberty interests without due process of law.

101. Non-citizens, including lawful permanent residents and non-immigrants holding valid visas, have a liberty interest in leaving and reentering the country, and in being free from unlawful detention.

102. The Due Process Clause establishes a minimum level of procedural protection before those liberty interests can be deprived. A non-citizen must be given an opportunity to present her case effectively, which includes a hearing and some consideration of individual circumstances.

103. In addition, where Congress has granted statutory rights and authorized procedures applicable to arriving and present non-citizens, rights under the Due Process Clause attach to those statutory rights.

104. Sections 3 and 5 of the Executive Order, and Defendants' actions implementing the Executive Order, deprive non-citizens arriving in the United States, including in Hawai'i, of their statutory rights to apply for asylum and withholding of removal in the United States.

105. Through their actions described in this Complaint, Defendants have violated the Procedural Due Process guarantees of the Fifth Amendment. Defendants' violation inflicts ongoing harm upon Hawai'i residents and the sovereign interests of the State of Hawai'i.

## **COUNT V**

### **(Substantive Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act through Violations of the Constitution, Immigration and Nationality Act, and Arbitrary and Capricious Action)**

106. The foregoing allegations are realleged and incorporated by reference herein.

107. The APA requires courts to hold unlawful and set aside any agency action that is "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law"; "contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity"; or "in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A)-(C).

108. In enacting and implementing Sections 3 and 5 of the Executive Order, Defendants have acted contrary to the Establishment Clause and Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

109. In enacting and implementing Sections 3 and 5 of the Executive Order, Defendants have acted contrary to the INA and the United Nations Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees. Defendants have exceeded their statutory authority, engaged in nationality- and religion-based discrimination, and failed to vindicate statutory rights guaranteed by the INA.

110. Further, in enacting and implementing Sections 3 and 5 of the Executive Order, Defendants have acted arbitrarily and capriciously. Among other arbitrary actions and omissions, Defendants have offered no explanation for the countries that are and are not included within the scope of the Executive Order. The Executive Order purports to protect the country from terrorism, but sweeps in millions of people who have absolutely no connection to terrorism. And while Defendants have reversed course in their application of the Executive Order to lawful permanent residents, Defendants again acted without explanation, and have yet to explain how all other people with valid visas to enter the country pose a security threat.

111. Through their actions described in this Complaint, Defendants have violated the substantive requirements of the APA. Defendants' violation inflicts ongoing harm upon Hawai'i residents and the sovereign interests of the State of Hawai'i.

## **COUNT VII**

### **(Procedural Violation of the Administrative Procedure Act)**

112. The foregoing allegations are realleged and incorporated by reference herein.

113. The APA requires courts to hold unlawful and set aside any agency action taken “without observance of procedure required by law.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(D).

114. The Departments of State and Homeland Security are “agencies” under the APA. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 551(1).

115. The APA requires that agencies follow rulemaking procedures before engaging in action that impacts substantive rights. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 553.

116. In implementing Sections 3 and 5 of the Executive Order, federal agencies have changed the substantive criteria by which individuals from the seven designated countries may enter the United States. This, among other actions by Defendants, impacts substantive rights.

117. Defendants did not follow the rulemaking procedures required by the APA in enacting and implementing the Executive Order.

118. Through their actions described in this Complaint, Defendants have violated the procedural requirements of the APA. Defendants’ violation inflicts ongoing harm upon Hawai‘i residents and the sovereign interests of the State of Hawai‘i.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

119. WHEREFORE, the State of Hawai‘i prays that the Court:

- a. Declare that Sections 3(c), 5(a)-(c), and 5(e) of President Trump’s Executive Order are unauthorized by, and contrary to, the Constitution and laws of the United States;
- b. Enjoin Defendants from implementing or enforcing Sections 3(c), 5(a)-(c), and 5(e) across the nation;
- c. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)(2), set an expedited hearing within fourteen (14) days to determine

whether the Temporary Restraining Order should be extended;  
and

- d. Award such additional relief as the interests of justice may  
require.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai‘i, February 3, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Douglas S. Chin

NEAL K. KATYAL\*  
COLLEEN ROH SINZDAK\*  
MITCHELL P. REICH\*  
ELIZABETH HAGERTY\*  
THOMAS P. SCHMIDT\*  
SARA SOLOW\*  
ALEXANDER B. BOWERMAN\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP

*\*Pro Hac Vice Applications  
Forthcoming*

DOUGLAS S. CHIN (Bar No. 6465)  
Attorney General of the State of Hawai‘i  
CLYDE J. WADSWORTH (Bar No. 8495)  
Solicitor General of the State of Hawai‘i  
DEIRDRE MARIE-IHA (Bar No. 7923)  
KIMBERLY T. GUIDRY (Bar No. 7813)  
DONNA H. KALAMA (Bar No. 6051)  
ROBERT T. NAKATSUJI (Bar No. 6743)  
Deputy Attorneys General  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL, STATE OF HAWAI‘I

*Attorneys for Plaintiff, State of Hawai‘i*

DOUGLAS S. CHIN (Bar No. 6465)  
Attorney General of the State of Hawai‘i  
CLYDE J. WADSWORTH (Bar No. 8495)  
Solicitor General of the State of Hawai‘i  
DEIRDRE MARIE-IHA (Bar No. 7923)  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL, STATE OF HAWAI‘I  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
Telephone: (808) 586-1500  
Fax: (808) 586-1239  
Email: deirdre.marie-ih@hawaii.gov

NEAL K. KATYAL\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: (202) 637-5600  
Fax: (202) 637-5910  
Email:  
neal.katyal@hoganlovells.com

*\*Pro Hac Vice Application  
Forthcoming*

*Attorneys for Plaintiff, State of Hawai‘i  
(See Next Page For Additional Counsel)*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAI‘I

STATE OF HAWAI‘I,

Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as  
President of the United States; U.S.  
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY;  
JOHN F. KELLY, in his official capacity as  
Secretary of Homeland Security; U.S.  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE; REX TILLERSON,  
in his official capacity as Acting Secretary of  
State; and the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendants.

Civil Action No.

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**



**ADDITIONAL COUNSEL**

KIMBERLY T. GUIDRY (Bar No. 7813)  
DONNA H. KALAMA (Bar No. 6051)  
ROBERT T. NAKATSUJI (Bar No. 6743)  
Deputy Attorneys General  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL, STATE OF HAWAI'I  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
Telephone: (808) 586-1500  
Fax: (808) 586-1239

COLLEEN ROH SINZDAK\*  
MITCHELL P. REICH\*  
ELIZABETH HAGERTY\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: (202) 637-5600  
Fax: (202) 637-5910

THOMAS P. SCHMIDT\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
875 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
Telephone: (212) 918-3000  
Fax: (212) 918-3100

SARA SOLOW\*  
ALEXANDER B. BOWERMAN\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
1835 Market St., 29th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (267) 675-4600  
Fax: (267) 675-4601

*\*Pro Hac Vice Applications  
Forthcoming*

*Attorneys for Plaintiff, State of Hawai'i*

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**

Pursuant to Rules 7 and 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 7.2 for the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii, Plaintiff State of Hawai‘i, by and through its counsel, hereby moves this Honorable Court for a temporary restraining order prohibiting Defendants from enforcing and implementing key portions of the January 27, 2017 Executive Order issued by Defendant Donald J. Trump (the “Executive Order”), which imposes a nationwide ban on immigrants and travelers from seven Muslim-majority countries. Specifically, Sections 3(c), 5(a)-(c), and 5(e) reflect blatant state-sanctioned preference for Christian refugees and disfavor toward Muslims, in violation of the First and Fifth Amendments to the United States Constitution. They also fail to provide appropriate protections for those detained pursuant to the Executive Order and thereby violating the Fourteenth Amendment.

The foregoing harassing and discriminatory provisions of the Executive Order have no place in the State of Hawai‘i, where Defendants’ actions have caused, and continue to cause, irreparable injury to Plaintiff. As an immediate remedy, and to maintain the status quo while more permanent solutions may be considered, Plaintiff asks that the Court enter a temporary restraining order enjoining Defendants from enforcing or implementing Sections 3(c), 5(a)-(c), and

5(e) of the Executive Order nationwide. Plaintiff further requests that the Court set an expedited hearing to determine whether such order should remain in place.

This motion is supported by the attached Memorandum in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, accompanying declarations, and the records and files in this action, as well as any additional submissions and oral argument that may be considered by the Court.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, February 3, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Douglas S. Chin

NEAL K. KATYAL\*  
COLLEEN ROH SINZDAK\*  
MITCHELL P. REICH\*  
ELIZABETH HAGERTY\*  
THOMAS P. SCHMIDT\*  
SARA SOLOW\*  
ALEXANDER B. BOWERMAN\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP

*\*Pro Hac Vice Applications  
Forthcoming*

DOUGLAS S. CHIN (Bar No. 6465)  
Attorney General of the State of Hawai'i  
CLYDE J. WADSWORTH (Bar No.  
8495)  
Solicitor General of the State of Hawai'i  
DEIRDRE MARIE-IHA (Bar No. 7923)  
KIMBERLY T. GUIDRY (Bar No. 7813)  
DONNA H. KALAMA (Bar No. 6051)  
ROBERT T. NAKATSUJI (Bar No.  
6743)  
Deputy Attorneys General  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL, STATE OF HAWAI'I

*Attorneys for Plaintiff, State of Hawai'i*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII**

STATE OF HAWAII,  
Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as  
President of the United States; U.S.  
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND  
SECURITY; JOHN F. KELLY, in his official  
capacity as Secretary of Homeland Security;  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE; REX  
TILLERSON, in his official capacity as  
Secretary of State; and the UNITED STATES  
OF AMERICA,  
Defendants.

Civil Action No. \_\_\_\_\_

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT  
OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION  
FOR TEMPORARY  
RESTRAINING ORDER**

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
FACTUAL BACKGROUND .....	2
A.    Candidate Trump Calls For A Muslim Ban .....	2
B.    President Trump Implements His Discriminatory Bans .....	4
C.    The Order’s Impact .....	8
STANDARD OF REVIEW .....	11
ARGUMENT .....	11
A.    Hawai‘i Is Likely To Succeed on the Merits of Its Claims .....	12
1.    The Order Violates the Establishment Clause .....	12
2.    The Order Violates Equal Protection and the Fifth Amendment’s Due Process Clause .....	18
a.    The Order violates equal protection and the right to travel .....	19
b.    The Order violates procedural due process .....	21
c.    The plenary-power doctrine does not change the outcome .....	23
3.    The Order is Inconsistent with the Immigration and Nationality Act .....	26
a.    The order’s nationality-based classifications violate the INA .....	26

**TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued**

	<u>Page</u>
b.    The Order’s religion-based classifications violate the INA .....	28
c.    The INA does not authorize the President to impose sweeping class-based restrictions on immigration .....	29
4.    The Order’s Implementation Violates the APA .....	32
B.    Hawai‘i Will Suffer Irreparable Harm If Relief Is Not Granted .....	35
C.    The Balance of the Equities and Public Interest Favor Relief .....	38
CONCLUSION .....	39

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<b>CASES:</b>	
<i>Access Fund v. U.S. Dep’t of Agric.</i> , 499 F.3d 1036 (9th Cir. 2007) .....	13, 16
<i>Alfred L. Snapp &amp; Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico</i> , 458 U.S. 592 (1982).....	38
<i>Arizona Dream Act Coal. v. Brewer</i> , 757 F.3d 1053 (9th Cir. 2014) .....	36
<i>Bond v. United States</i> , 564 U.S. 211 (2011).....	36
<i>Casas-Castrillon v. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.</i> , 535 F.3d 942 (9th Cir. 2008) .....	22
<i>Chaplaincy of Full Gospel Churches v. England</i> , 454 F.3d 290 (D.C. Cir. 2006).....	35
<i>City of Sausalito v. O’Neill</i> , 386 F.3d 1186 (9th Cir. 2004) .....	34
<i>Clinton v. City of New York</i> , 524 U.S. 417 (1998).....	32
<i>Davis v. Passman</i> , 442 U.S. 228 (1979).....	19
<i>Edwards v. Aguillard</i> , 482 U.S. 578 (1987).....	15
<i>Employment Div. v. Smith</i> , 494 U.S. 872 (1990).....	19
<i>Farris v. Seabrook</i> , 677 F.3d 858 (9th Cir. 2012) .....	11, 35

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued**

	<u>Page</u>
<i>FDA v. Brown &amp; Williamson Tobacco Corp.</i> , 529 U.S. 120 (2000).....	32
<i>Grayned v. City of Rockford</i> , 408 U.S. 104 (1972).....	23
<i>Hampton v. Mow Sun Wong</i> , 426 U.S. 88 (1976).....	19, 24
<i>Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church &amp; Sch. v. EEOC</i> , 565 U.S. 171 (2012).....	12, 13
<i>In re Griffiths</i> , 413 U.S. 717 (1973).....	19
<i>INS v. Aguirre-Aguirre</i> , 526 U.S. 415 (1999).....	28
<i>INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca</i> , 480 U.S. 421 (1987).....	28
<i>Kent v. Dulles</i> , 357 U.S. 116 (1958).....	21
<i>Khan v. Holder</i> , 584 F.3d 773 (9th Cir. 2009) .....	28
<i>Kleindienst v. Mandel</i> , 408 U.S. 753 (1972).....	17, 23, 24, 25
<i>Kwai Fun Wong v. United States</i> , 373 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 2004) .....	24
<i>Landon v. Plasencia</i> , 459 U.S. 21 (1982).....	21, 22
<i>Larson v. Valente</i> , 456 U.S. 228 (1982).....	13, 17



**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued**

	<u>Page</u>
<i>Legal Assistance for Vietnamese Asylum Seekers v. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs</i> , 45 F.3d 469 (D.C. Cir. 1995), <i>vacated on other grounds</i> , 519 U.S. 1 (1996) .....	26
<i>Lemon v. Kurtzman</i> , 403 U.S. 602 (1971).....	13, 16, 18
<i>Lincoln v. Vigil</i> , 508 U.S. 182 (1993).....	32
<i>Mathews v. Eldridge</i> , 424 U.S. 319 (1976).....	22
<i>McCreary Cty., Ky. v. Am. Civil Liberties Union of Ky.</i> , 545 U.S. 844 (2005).....	15, 16
<i>Melendres v. Arpaio</i> , 695 F.3d 990 (9th Cir. 2012) .....	38
<i>Miller v. Johnson</i> , 515 U.S. 900 (1995).....	19, 21
<i>Missouri v. Holland</i> , 252 U.S. 416 (1920).....	36
<i>Olsen v. Albright</i> , 990 F. Supp. 31 (D.D.C. 1997).....	27
<i>Oracle USA, Inc. v. Rimini St., Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 5213917 (9th Cir. Sept. 21, 2016) .....	37
<i>Patel v. INS</i> , 811 F.2d 377 (7th Cir. 1987) .....	28
<i>Rosenberg v. Fleuti</i> , 374 U.S. 449 (1963).....	22
<i>Sacora v. Thomas</i> , 628 F.3d 1059 (9th Cir. 2010) .....	33

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued**

	<u>Page</u>
<i>Shelby Cty. v. Holder</i> , 133 S. Ct. 2612 (2013).....	36
<i>Stone v. Graham</i> , 449 U.S. 39 (1980) (per curiam).....	13, 14
<i>Time Warner Cable Inc. v. FCC</i> , 729 F.3d 137 (2d Cir. 2013) .....	33
<i>Town of Greece, N.Y. v. Galloway</i> , 134 S. Ct. 1811 (2014).....	16, 17
<i>United Dominion Indus. v. United States</i> , 532 U.S. 822 (2001).....	27, 30
<i>United States v. Juvenile Male</i> , 670 F.3d 999 (9th Cir. 2012) .....	30
<i>United States v. Windsor</i> , 133 S. Ct. 2675 (2013).....	20
<i>Utley v. Varian Assocs., Inc.</i> , 811 F.2d 1279 (9th Cir. 1987) .....	15
<i>Wallace v. Jaffree</i> , 472 U.S. 38 (1985).....	14
<i>Whitman v. Am. Trucking Ass’ns</i> , 531 U.S. 457 (2001).....	32
<i>Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council</i> , 555 U.S. 7 (2008).....	11
<i>Wong Wing Hang v. INS</i> , 360 F.2d 715 (2d Cir. 1966) (Friendly, J.) .....	28
<i>Zadvydas v. Davis</i> , 533 U.S. 678 (2001).....	21, 23, 24

# **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued**

	<u>Page</u>
<b>STATUTES:</b>	
5 U.S.C. § 553(b)-(c) .....	32
5 U.S.C. § 706(2) .....	34
8 U.S.C. § 1152(a)(1)(A) .....	26, 27, 28, 30
8 U.S.C. § 1182(f) .....	26, 29, 30, 32
8 U.S.C. § 1522(a)(5) .....	29
Haw. Rev. Stat. §§ 378-2(1) .....	35
<b>CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS</b>	
U.S. Const. amend. I .....	12, 35
U.S. Const. amend. V .....	11, 21
U.S. Const. amend. XIV .....	19
U.S. Const. art. I, § 8 .....	24
Hawai‘i Const. art. 1, §§ 2, 4 .....	35
<b>LEGISLATIVE MATERIAL:</b>	
H.R. Rep. No. 89-745 (1965) .....	26
<b>OTHER AUTHORITIES:</b>	
1 Annals of Cong. 730-731 (1789) .....	13
Cong. Research Serv., Executive Authority to Exclude Aliens: In Brief (Jan. 23, 2017) .....	30
Statement by Secretary John Kelly on the Entry of Lawful Permanent Residents Into the United States (Jan. 29, 2017) .....	31

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued**

	<u>Page</u>
United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees art. 3, July 28, 1951, 19 U.S.T. 6259 .....	26, 28

## **INTRODUCTION**

On January 27, 2017, President Donald Trump signed an Executive Order that banned immigrants from seven Muslim-majority countries and created a preference for Christian refugees. That Order has triggered an uproar across the United States and the world. And rightfully so: As many have observed, the Order is a distressing departure from an American tradition that has long celebrated immigrants and opened its arms to the homeless, the tempest-tossed.

Hawai‘i joins the many voices that have condemned the Order. But this pleading is not about politics or rhetoric—it is about the law. The simple fact is that the Order is unlawful. By banning Muslims and creating a preference for Christian refugees, the Order violates the Establishment Clause of the United States Constitution. By those same acts, it violates the equal protection guarantee of the Fifth Amendment. By failing utterly to provide procedures or protections of any kind for people detained or turned away at our airports, it violates the Due Process Clause. And by enshrining rank discrimination on the basis of nationality and religion, it flies in the face of statutes enacted by Congress.

Hawai‘i and its residents are being grievously harmed by these violations of the law. The Order is keeping Hawai‘i families apart; it is blocking Hawai‘i residents from traveling; it is using the State’s airport facilities to further discriminatory policies the State abhors; it is harming Hawaii’s critical tourism

industry; it is establishing a religion in Hawai‘i against the will of its residents; and it is blocking Hawaii’s businesses and universities from hiring as they see fit. Perhaps most importantly, it is degrading the pluralistic values Hawai‘i has worked hard to protect and subjecting an identifiable portion of its population to discrimination and second-class treatment.

Hawai‘i respectfully asks this Court to enter a temporary restraining order blocking enforcement of key portions of the Order. The test for such a remedy is met: Hawai‘i is likely to succeed in showing on the merits that the Order is unlawful several times over. The State is being irreparably harmed by the Order’s enforcement. And those harms far outweigh the non-existent interest the Executive Branch has identified in enforcing its discriminatory regime. The motion should be granted.

### **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

#### **A. Candidate Trump Calls For A Muslim Ban.**

Then-candidate Donald Trump made it crystal clear throughout his presidential campaign that if elected, he planned to bar Muslims from the United States. Shortly after the Paris attacks in December 2015, Mr. Trump issued a press release calling for “a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country’s representatives can figure out what is going on.” Compl. ¶ 30 & Ex. 5. When questioned about the idea shortly thereafter, he compared it to

President Roosevelt’s race-based internment of the Japanese during World War II, saying, “[Roosevelt] did the same thing.” Compl. ¶ 31. And when asked what the customs process would look like for a Muslim non-citizen attempting to enter the United States, Mr. Trump said: “[T]hey would say, are you Muslim?” An interviewer responded: “And if they said ‘yes,’ they would not be allowed into the country.” Mr. Trump said: “That’s correct.” *Id.*

Later, as the presumptive Republican nominee, Mr. Trump began using facially neutral language to describe the Muslim ban; he described his proposal as stopping immigration from countries “where there’s a proven history of terrorism.” Compl. ¶ 34. But he continued to link that idea to the need to stop “importing radical Islamic terrorism to the West through a failed immigration system.” *Id.* And he continued to admit, when pressed, that his plan to ban Muslims remained intact. Asked in July 2016 whether he was retracting his call for “a total and complete shut-down of Muslim” immigration, he said: “I don’t think it’s a rollback. In fact, you could say it’s an expansion.” Compl. ¶ 36 & Ex. 6. And he explained: “People were so upset when I used the word Muslim. ‘Oh, you can’t use the word Muslim \* \* \*. And I’m okay with that, because I’m talking territory instead of Muslim.” *Id.*

Indeed, it is now clear that Mr. Trump—apparently recognizing that he could not come right out and implement his Muslim ban without violating the

law—was working behind the scenes to create a suitable subterfuge. In a recent television interview, one of the President’s surrogates explained what happened: “So when [Donald Trump] first announced it, *he said, ‘Muslim ban.’ He called me up. He said, ‘Put a commission together. Show me the right way to do it legally.’*” Compl. ¶ 54 & Ex. 8. After his election, the President-Elect signaled that he would not retreat from his Muslim ban. On December 21, 2016, he was asked whether he had decided “to rethink or re-evaluate [his] plans to create a Muslim registry or ban Muslim immigration to the United States.” He replied: “You know my plans. All along, I’ve been proven to be right.” Compl. ¶ 38.

Donald Trump’s comments also targeted more specific groups. Throughout the presidential campaign, he vowed to curb refugee admissions, particularly from Syria. In June 2016, he issued a press release stating: “We have to stop the tremendous flow of Syrian refugees into the United States.” Compl. ¶ 35. At one point, he promised to deport the 10,000 Syrian refugees the Administration had accepted for 2016. Compl. ¶ 29. Meanwhile, he asserted (wrongly) that Christian refugees from Syria were being blocked. He said in July 2015: “If you’re \* \* \* a Christian, you cannot come into this country.” Compl. ¶ 28.

## **B. President Trump Implements His Discriminatory Bans.**

Within one week of being sworn in as President, Donald Trump acted upon his ominous campaign promises. On January 27, 2017, he signed an Executive



Order (“Order”), entitled “Protecting the Nation From Terrorist Entry into the United States.” Compl. ¶¶ 2, 41 & Ex. 1. When signing the Order, President Trump read its title, looked up, and said: “We all know what that means.” Compl. ¶ 43.

The Order has two dramatic effects: It categorically bans immigration from seven Muslim-majority countries for a set period; and it halts admission of any refugees, subject to a targeted carve-out for members of “minority religion[s]” in each country.

First, Section 3(c) of the Order “suspend[s the] entry into the United States, as immigrants and nonimmigrants,” of nearly all aliens from seven Muslim-majority countries—Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen—“for 90 days from the date of this order.” Exceptions are made for narrow categories of diplomats. Putting aside those diplomats, Section 3(c) means that for 90 days *all* non-U.S. citizens from those seven countries are barred. And it means that even people who have been living legally in the United States—foreign students enrolled in U.S. universities, refugees already granted asylum here, and people employed in the United States on temporary work visas, among others—will be halted at the border if they travel outside the United States. Section 3(g) gives the Secretaries of Homeland Security and State discretion to “on a case-by-case basis \* \* \* issue visas or other immigration benefits to nationals of countries for which

visas and benefits are otherwise blocked.” *Id.* However, it provides no procedure for an alien to request such an exception or for the Secretaries to process one.

By its plain terms, this order bars lawful permanent residents (LPRs) from the seven prohibited nations from reentering the country. Two days after the order was issued, Secretary of Homeland Security Kelly issued a press release purporting to categorically exempt LPRs from the travel ban. Compl. ¶ 62. Four days later, the White House changed its mind and issued a memorandum stating that, despite the order’s language, LPRs were not covered in the first place. Compl. ¶ 64.

While the Order’s immigration ban currently applies only to people from the seven designated countries, the Order indicates that more will be added to the list. It directs the Secretary of State to “request [that] all foreign governments” provide the United States with information necessary “to adjudicate any visa, admission, or other [immigration] benefit \* \* \* in order to determine that the individual \* \* \* is not a security or public-safety threat.” *Id.* § 3(a), (d). Foreign countries must “start providing such information [to the United States] regarding their nationals within 60 days of notification.” *Id.* § 3(d). If foreign countries do not comply, the Secretaries of Homeland Security and State are directed to “submit to the President a list of [those] countries recommended for inclusion” in the immigration ban. *Id.* § 3(e).

The Order also bars refugees—and it does so in a way that discriminates based on religion. Sections 5(a) and (b) impose a 120-day moratorium on the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program, and Section 5(c) suspends entry of Syrian refugees indefinitely. When refugee admissions resume, the Order directs the Secretary of State to prioritize refugees claiming religious-based persecution, “provided that the religion of the individual is a minority religion in the individual’s country of nationality.” *Id.* § 5(b). It also provides that even during the initial 120-day period, the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security can admit refugees on a case-by-case basis, but only when doing so is “in the national interest.” *Id.* § 5(e). Three circumstances automatically fulfill that criterion; one is “when the person is a religious minority in his country of nationality facing religious persecution.” *Id.*

Because all seven countries named in the Order have majority-Muslim populations, these provisions create a preference for Christians. They mean that Christians (and other non-Muslim religions) may enter the United States as refugees and may obtain priority treatment, while Muslims may not. In an interview on January 27, President Trump told the Christian Broadcasting Network that his intent was to “help” Christian refugees. Compl. ¶ 53& Ex. 7.

### **C. The Order's Impact**

President Trump's Order was greeted by widespread protests and condemnation, as well as reports of chaotic conditions at the nation's airports. Within five days, more than 100 people had been detained at U.S. airports pursuant to the Order's directives. Compl. ¶ 55. That included dozens of lawful permanent residents, an Iraqi national with Special Immigrant Visa status who had worked as an interpreter for the U.S. army in Iraq, and a doctor at the Cleveland Clinic with a work visa who was trying to return home from vacation. Compl. ¶ 57. Hundreds of others were blocked from boarding flights to the United States or have been notified that they can no longer come here—including foreign students with valid visas and Syrian refugees with visas and U.S. placements already lined up. Compl. ¶ 58. According to a Justice Department lawyer, more than 100,000 visas have been revoked since the Order was signed. *Id.*

Meanwhile, thousands of diplomats, former diplomats, and legislators from both parties spoke out against the ban, calling it inhumane and discriminatory. Hundreds of State Department officials signed a memo stating that the Order “runs counter to core American values” including “nondiscrimination,” and that “[d]espite the Executive Order's focus on them, a vanishingly small number of terror attacks on U.S. soil have been committed by foreign nationals” here on visas. Compl. ¶ 60 & Ex. 10. Senators John McCain (R-AZ) and Lindsey Graham

(R-SC) stated: “This executive order sends a signal, intended or not, that America does not want Muslims coming into our country.” Comp. ¶ 61.

The Order quickly impacted Hawai‘i too, as delineated in detail in the attached Complaint. Hawai‘i is home to numerous nationals from the seven designated countries—including foreign students, refugees, and temporary workers—whose lives have now been upended by the Order. *See* Compl. ¶¶ 10-11, 14, 68. Because of the Order, they cannot leave the country for family, educational, religious, or business reasons if they wish to return. Indeed, one State employee’s travel plans abroad have been severely disrupted by the Order. Decl. of John Doe 2 (Ex. B), ¶¶ 8-11. Conversely, nationals of the seven designated countries cannot relocate to or even visit Hawai‘i for any reason. Compl. ¶ 69. Several Hawai‘i residents are being thwarted from reuniting with their families as a result of the Order—including a U.S. citizen, and his wife and five children (all also U.S. citizens), who are being prevented from seeing or reuniting and living with their Syrian mother-in-law/mother/grandmother, Decl. of Elshikh (Ex. H), ¶¶ 4-7; and at least two others who are currently being separated from members of their immediate family but are too fearful of future government retaliation to provide details in a public filing, Decl. of John Doe 1 (Ex. A), ¶¶ 6, 10, 13; Decl. of John Doe 3 (Ex. C), ¶¶ 3-4.

Hawai‘i *qua* Hawai‘i also is being actively harmed by the Order. For example, Defendants are enforcing the Order on Hawai‘i soil, including at Honolulu and Kona International Airports. Compl. ¶ 67. As a result of the Order, the facilities provided by Hawai‘i’s State Department of Transportation for international passengers coming into Hawaii will be used by the federal government to carry out the unlawful acts required by the Order. Compl. ¶ 71; Decl. of R. Higashi (Ex. G), ¶¶ 5-7. Likewise, State universities and agencies cannot accept qualified applicants for positions if they are nationals of one of the seven designated countries; other employers within the State cannot recruit and/or hire workers from those countries; and Hawai‘i can no longer welcome their tourists—a direct harm to Hawai‘i’s critical tourism business. *See* Compl. ¶¶ 15, 72-78; Decl. of R. Dickson (Ex. D), ¶¶ 13-14; Decl. of G. Szigeti (Ex. F), ¶ 9; Decl. of L. Salaveria (Ex. E), ¶¶ 9-12.

Last but not least, the Order is harming Hawaii’s identity and most basic values. For many in Hawai‘i, including State officials, the Order conjures the memory of the Chinese Exclusion Acts and the post-Pearl Harbor imposition of martial law and Japanese internment. As Governor Ige said two days after President Trump signed the Order: “Hawai‘i has a proud history as a place immigrants of diverse backgrounds can achieve their dreams through hard work. Many of our people also know all too well the consequences of giving in to fear of

newcomers. The remains of the internment camp at Honouliuli are a sad testament to that fear. We must remain true to our values and be vigilant where we see the worst part of history about to be repeated.” Compl. ¶ 81.

### **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

To obtain a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction, a plaintiff must demonstrate that (1) it is likely to succeed on the merits; (2) it is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief; (3) the balance of equities tips in its favor; and (4) an injunction is in the public interest. *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). The Ninth Circuit has “also articulated an alternate formulation of the *Winter* test, under which ‘serious questions going to the merits and a balance of hardships that tips sharply towards the plaintiff can support issuance of a preliminary injunction, so long as the plaintiff also shows that there is a likelihood of irreparable injury and that the injunction is in the public interest.’” *Farris v. Seabrook*, 677 F.3d 858, 864 (9th Cir. 2012) (internal quotation marks omitted).

### **ARGUMENT**

Hawai‘i meets this standard. First, it has a substantial likelihood of success on the merits because the Order is unlawful several times over: Among other things, it imposes a “Muslim ban” in violation of the Establishment Clause; discriminates against particular classes of people in violation of the Fifth

Amendment; contravenes the Immigration and Nationality Act's prohibitions on nationality- and religion-based discrimination; and, through its implementation, violates the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). Second, Hawai'i will suffer irreparable harm if relief is not granted: The Order imposes religious harms on the state, imposes immeasurable costs on Hawaii's economy and tax revenues, and discriminates against a portion of the State's population. Third, the balance of equities tips in Hawai'i's favor. The United States will suffer no hardship if the Order is enjoined because the Government can achieve its national security objectives through other means, while remedying constitutional and statutory violations is in the public interest.

#### **A. Hawai'i Is Likely To Succeed on the Merits of Its Claims.**

##### **1. The Order Violates the Establishment Clause.**

Because Sections 3(c) and Sections 5(a)-(c) and 5(e) of the Order plainly conflict with the Establishment Clause, plaintiffs are likely to succeed on their constitutional claims.

The United States was settled by an ecumenically diverse set of immigrants seeking religious freedom. *See, e.g., Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church & Sch. v. EEOC*, 565 U.S. 171, 182-183 (2012). The Framers enshrined that freedom in the First Amendment's Religion Clauses. One of those Clauses, the Establishment Clause, "addressed the fear that 'one sect might obtain a pre-



eminence \* \* \* and establish a religion to which they would compel others to conform.”” *Id.* at 184 (quoting 1 Annals of Cong. 730-731 (1789) (remarks of J. Madison)). Thus “[t]he clearest command of the Establishment Clause is that one religious denomination cannot be officially preferred over another.” *Larson v. Valente*, 456 U.S. 228, 244 (1982).

To determine whether a particular policy runs afoul of that command, the Ninth Circuit typically applies the three-part test from *Lemon v. Kurtzman*, 403 U.S. 602 (1971). *See, e.g., Access Fund v. U.S. Dep’t of Agric.*, 499 F.3d 1036, 1042-43 (9th Cir. 2007). “First, the statute must have a secular legislative purpose; second, its principal or primary effect must be one that neither advances nor inhibits religion \* \* \*; finally the statute must not foster an excessive government entanglement with religion.” *Lemon*, 403 U.S. at 612-613 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). A failure to satisfy any one of these requirements establishes a constitutional violation. The Order flunks all three.

First, while the Government has asserted in the Order itself that it serves the secular purpose of protecting against terrorism, “an ‘avowed’ secular purpose is not sufficient to avoid conflict with the First Amendment” where the order’s actual aim is establishing a religious preference. *Stone v. Graham*, 449 U.S. 39, 41 (1980) (per curiam). For example, in *Stone* the Supreme Court invalidated a law requiring that the Ten Commandments be placed on classroom walls. The law

mandated that each display include a statement that “[t]he secular application of the Ten Commandments is clearly seen in its adoption as the fundamental legal code of Western Civilization and the Common Law of the United States.” *Id.* But that was not enough because the “pre-eminent purpose” of requiring the display was “plainly religious in nature.” *Id.*

The same is true here. The President and his aides have made it abundantly clear that they intend to exclude individuals of the Muslim faith, and that this Order—which bans travel only with respect to certain Muslim-majority countries—is part of that plan. *See* Compl. ¶¶ 27-43, 53-54. Sections 5(b) and 5(e) also explicitly direct the government to prioritize religious refugee claims if the “religion of the individual is a minority religion in the individual’s country”—a system of religious preference that President Trump told the media was expressly designed to favor Christians. Compl. ¶¶ 51, 53 & Ex. 7.

In the Establishment Clause context, these statements matter. Because *Lemon*’s first step is concerned with “whether [the] government’s actual purpose is to endorse or disapprove of religion,” courts routinely look to the public declarations of an act’s originator to discern its true aim. *Wallace v. Jaffree*, 472 U.S. 38, 56-57 (1985) (finding an Establishment Clause violation because “[t]he sponsor of the bill \* \* \* inserted into the legislative record—apparently without dissent—a statement indicating that the legislation was an ‘effort to return

voluntary prayer’ to the public schools”); *Edwards v. Aguillard*, 482 U.S. 578, 586-587 (1987) (examining the remarks of a bill’s sponsor during a legislative hearing to determine whether a stated secular purpose was “sincere and not a sham”). Accordingly, when a challenged policy is generated by the Executive, rather than Congress, the court may examine the statements of the President and his aides. *Cf. Utley v. Varian Assocs., Inc.*, 811 F.2d 1279, 1285 (9th Cir. 1987) (in the affirmative action context, if a program was created by the Executive, the “analysis focus[es] on executive rather than congressional intent”).

Indeed, public statements of purpose calculated to be heard by a wide audience carry particular weight. When the head of our government publicly expresses “a purpose to favor religion,” it “sends the message to nonadherents that they are outsiders, not full members of the political community.” *McCreary Cty., Ky. v. Am. Civil Liberties Union of Ky.*, 545 U.S. 844, 860-861 (2005) (internal quotation marks and ellipses omitted). Thus, the Supreme Court has explained that a policy that might otherwise pass constitutional muster may be invalidated “if the government justifies the decision with a stated desire” to promote a particular religion. *Id.*

If there were any doubt as to the actual purpose of the policy, there is no question that the President’s public statements have caused citizens to reasonably *believe* that the policy is aimed at the Muslim faith: Witness, for example, the mass

protests at airports and in cities across the country and the explicit statement of two Republican Senators. *See supra* at pp. 7-8. That in and of itself is enough to demonstrate an Establishment Clause violation under the second prong of *Lemon*. This second “prong \* \* \* asks whether, irrespective of the government’s actual purpose, the practice under review in fact conveys a message of endorsement or disapproval.” *Access Fund*, 499 F.3d at 1045 (internal quotation marks omitted); *see also McCreary*, 545 U.S. at 868 n.14 (examining how a challenged action will be perceived by an “objective observer[ ]”). One need hardly do more than articulate this inquiry to understand why the Order fails. And the same is true for *Lemon*’s third prong, which considers whether a policy “foster[s] an excessive government entanglement with religion.” 403 U.S. at 612-613 (internal quotation marks omitted). The exception for members of religious minorities alone hopelessly entangles the government in religious matters.

To be sure, courts are inconsistent in how or whether they invoke *Lemon*, and the Supreme Court has applied several different frameworks in analyzing potential Establishment Clause violations. But no framework permits the government to enact a policy that amounts to a governmental preference for or against a particular faith. *See, e.g., Town of Greece, N.Y. v. Galloway*, 134 S. Ct. 1811, 1824 (2014) (declining to apply *Lemon* but upholding a policy in part because—unlike the Order—it did not “reflect an aversion or bias on the part of

town leaders against minority faiths”); *Larson*, 456 U.S. at 246 (applying strict scrutiny and invalidating a policy because it unnecessarily “grant[ed] a denominational preference”).

Some of the Order’s defenders attempt to avoid this conclusion by pointing to older Supreme Court cases discussing Congress’s plenary power over immigration. *See, e.g., Kleindienst v. Mandel*, 408 U.S. 753, 770 (1972). That argument fails for two independent reasons. First, as discussed in greater length below, even if it is good law, the doctrine would not apply to a policy like this one. *See infra* at pp. 22-25. Second, the plenary power cases are not relevant to the Establishment Clause anyway: The Court has never applied the doctrine with respect to policies that draw religious distinctions in the immigration context. Nor could it. Allowing an immigration exception would swallow the Establishment Clause whole. After all, a primary means of establishing a national religion is to exclude members of another faith from immigrating or to privilege the entry of members of the faith one wishes to establish. Indeed, in one of the Supreme Court’s most recent Establishment Clause cases, six members of the Court agreed that requiring “an immigrant seeking naturalization \* \* \* to bow her head and recite a Christian prayer” would unquestionably violate the Establishment Clause. *Town of Greece*, 134 S. Ct. at 1834 (Alito, J., joined by Scalia, J., concurring); *id.*

at 1842 (Kagan, J., joined by Ginsburg, J., Breyer, J., and Sotomayor, J., dissenting).

The Order's defenders have also suggested that if this Order is held to violate the Establishment Clause, then all future immigration policies that disproportionately aid or exclude members of a particular faith will be foreclosed. That is simply not so. An immigration policy with a secular purpose and design that just happens to disproportionately exclude members of a particular faith likely would survive *Lemon*. But that is not this Order. Instead, the President that issued it openly announced a desire to ban Muslims, *told his advisors he wanted their help to do just that while disguising his purpose*, and then followed through by signing a Muslim ban and tossing in a transparent fig leaf. Holding that *that* practice violates the Establishment Clause will foreclose nothing more than cynical attempts to skirt core constitutional commands.

## **2. The Order Violates Equal Protection and the Fifth Amendment's Due Process Clause.**

There is little doubt that, under normal equal-protection and due-process principles, the Order is unconstitutional: It discriminates based on protected classifications, and it cannot survive strict scrutiny. The only question, then, is whether the "plenary power" doctrine excuses the constitutional violations. It does not.

***a. The Order violates equal protection and the right to travel.***

To begin, the Order violates the Constitution’s guarantee of equal protection.<sup>1</sup>

“From its inception, our Nation welcomed and drew strength from the immigration of aliens.” *In re Griffiths*, 413 U.S. 717, 719 (1973). The “contributions” of immigrants “to the social and economic life of the country” are “self-evident.” *Id.* Thus any government classification based on alienage or national origin is “objectionable.” *Hampton v. Mow Sun Wong*, 426 U.S. 88, 107 n.30 (1976). Similarly, courts must “strictly scrutinize governmental classifications based on religion.” *Employment Div. v. Smith*, 494 U.S. 872, 886 n.3 (1990). Classifications based on religion and national origin are therefore both subject to strict scrutiny, and must be “narrowly tailored to achieving a compelling \* \* \* interest.” *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900, 904 (1995)

Sections 3(c) and 3(e)-(f) of the Order plainly flunk that test. They are premised on differentiating among people based on national origin: People from certain countries can enter the United States, and people from other countries cannot. In addition, those provisions as well as Sections 5(a) and (c) treat people

---

<sup>1</sup> The Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection Clause applies only against the states, but “[i]n numerous decisions,” the Supreme Court has held that the same equal protection analysis applies to the federal government through the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. *See, e.g., Davis v. Passman*, 442 U.S. 228, 234 (1979).

differently because of their religion: They are intentionally structured in a way that blocks Muslims while allowing Christians.

The Order is nowhere near “tailored” enough to justify that differentiation. It asserts that it is meant to prevent terrorism. But if so, it is wildly over- and under-inclusive. It is over-inclusive because it ensnares countless students, tourists, businesspeople, refugees, and other travelers lacking even the remotest connection to terrorism of any sort. And it is under-inclusive because it would not have covered *any* of the perpetrators of the worst recent terrorist attacks on American soil: September 11, the Boston Marathon bombing, San Bernardino, or Orlando. Not a single fatal terrorist attack has been perpetrated in the United States by a national of one of the seven identified countries since at least 1975. Compl. ¶ 46.

Indeed, the fit between the Order’s coverage and its stated purpose is so poor that it would fail even rational-basis review. The mismatch indicates that the real purpose of the Order was simply to harm a politically unpopular group: Muslims. That is unlawful. The “Constitution’s guarantee of equality ‘must at the very least mean that a bare \* \* \* desire to harm a politically unpopular group cannot’ justify disparate treatment of that group.” *United States v. Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. 2675, 2693 (2013) (citation omitted).



Separately, the Order infringes the right to international travel. “Freedom of movement is basic in our scheme of values.” *Kent v. Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116, 126 (1958). The right to travel abroad is therefore “part of the ‘liberty’” protected by the Due Process Clause. *Id.* at 125. And because the Order curtails this right, it must be “narrowly drawn to prevent the supposed evil.” *Id.* at 904. As explained above, it does not come close.

***b. The Order violates procedural due process.***

Sections 3(c) and 3(e)-(f) of the Order also violate procedural due process requirements. “[T]he Due Process Clause applies to all ‘persons’ within the United States, including aliens, whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or permanent,” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 693 (2001), and resident foreigners have liberty interests in being able to re-enter the United States and in being free from detention at the border, *see Landon v. Plasencia*, 459 U.S. 21, 32 (1982). The Government may only take away those liberty interests by “due process of law.” U.S. Const. amend. V. The process that is “due” turns on three factors: “First, the private interest that will be affected by the official action; second, the risk of an erroneous deprivation of such interest through the procedures used, and the probable value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural safeguards; and finally, the Government’s interest, including the function involved and the fiscal and administrative burdens that the additional or substitute

procedural requirement would entail.” *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319, 335 (1976).

The procedures in place here fall far short. Denial of reentry “is, without question, a weighty” interest, and a person in that circumstance must be given “an opportunity to present her case effectively.” *Landon*, 459 U.S. at 34, 36. But the Order offers no procedural protections whatsoever: It allows for no counsel, no hearings, no inquiry, no review—no process of any sort. That will not do. At the very least, those barred from the country or detained pursuant to the Order should be given some individualized consideration of their circumstances. “[T]he returning resident alien is entitled as a matter of due process to a hearing on the charges underlying any attempt to exclude him,” a principle in keeping with “the general proposition that a resident alien who leaves this country is to be regarded as retaining certain basic rights.” *Rosenberg v. Fleuti*, 374 U.S. 449, 460 (1963).

Similarly, detention of a resident at the border is an invasion of liberty that requires the government to provide concomitant protections. “Even where detention is permissible \* \* \* due process requires ‘adequate procedural protections’ to ensure that the government’s asserted justification for physical confinement ‘outweighs the individual’s constitutionally protected interest in avoiding physical restraint.’” *Casas-Castrillon v. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, 535

F.3d 942, 950 (9th Cir. 2008) (quoting *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 690). Those protections are nonexistent here.

Moreover, while the Order authorizes executive officials to make certain case-by-case exceptions, *see, e.g.*, Order § 3(g), it creates no mechanism for processing those exceptions and no procedure to ensure they are applied consistently and fairly. That unfettered executive discretion is the antithesis of due process. *See Grayned v. City of Rockford*, 408 U.S. 104, 108-109 (1972). It is cold comfort for a resident seeking reentry to know that some provision for exceptions is made, if that power is exercised arbitrarily and unreviewably. The Due Process Clause requires more.

***c. The plenary-power doctrine does not change the outcome.***

The Order's defenders again seek refuge in the plenary-power doctrine. But that doctrine does not help them for two reasons.

First, while it is true that the plenary-power doctrine gives Congress latitude to "make rules for the admission of aliens," *Kleindienst*, 408 U.S. at 766 (citation omitted), the Order here has profound discriminatory effects on aliens *already within* the United States. And the Supreme Court has made clear that political branches' power in that area is not plenary. To the contrary, it "is subject to important constitutional limitations." *Zadvydas*, 533 U.S. at 695. Specifically, aliens who are present within the United States are entitled to the full panoply of

equal-protection and due-process protections, “whether their presence here is lawful, unlawful, temporary, or permanent.” *Id.* at 693. The Order here runs afoul of both those protections. It prevents people present in the United States from traveling and from seeing their loved ones, and it imposes that burden on the basis of religion and national origin. That is not constitutional, and the incantation of “plenary power” does not make it so. *See Hampton*, 426 U.S. at 101 (“We do not agree \* \* \* that the federal power over aliens is so plenary that any agent of the National Government may arbitrarily subject all resident aliens to different substantive rules from those applied to citizens.”).

Second, the plenary-power doctrine emphasizes the broad authority of “Congress.” *See Kleindienst*, 408 U.S. at 766 (emphasis added). Congress is, after all, constitutionally empowered to regulate immigration. U.S. Const. art. I, § 8. Even if the doctrine authorizes Congress to flatly ban a particular racial or religious group from entering the United States—a highly doubtful proposition—it certainly does not authorize the *President* to plow ahead and enact such a ban where Congress has not provided for it. Indeed, the delegation of authority to the President here is expressly subject to the INA’s antidiscrimination provision. *See Part 3, infra*. And the President surely could not take a general grant of discretion to make immigration rules and use it to decree that only whites or Christians are allowed to immigrate into the United States. *Cf. Kwai Fun Wong v. United States*,

373 F.3d 952, 974 (9th Cir. 2004) (“We cannot countenance that the Constitution would permit immigration officials to engage in such behavior as rounding up all immigration parolees of a particular race solely because of a consideration such as skin color.”).

The Supreme Court has made this clear. In *Kleindienst*, for example, the Court explained that when Congress “delegate[s]” the exercise of “plenary power” to the Executive, and “the Executive exercises this power negatively *on the basis of a facially legitimate and bona fide reason*, the courts will neither look behind the exercise of that discretion, nor test it.” 408 U.S. at 770 (emphasis added). The inverse must also be true: When the Executive *lacks* “a facially legitimate and bona fide reason” for excluding foreigners, the plenary-power doctrine is no shield for unconstitutional discrimination.

That is the case here. As explained above, the profound mismatch between the Order’s purported purpose and its scope reveals its true illegitimate purpose: to burden a politically unpopular group. Moreover, the Order’s express terms and the statements of President Trump and his advisors cast grave doubt on whether the Order’s stated purpose was in fact its “bona fide” impetus.

For this reason, too, the plenary-power doctrine does not insulate the Order from constitutional scrutiny, and the Order must fall.

### **3. The Order is Inconsistent with the Immigration and Nationality Act.**

The Order also violates the plain terms of the immigration laws three times over. It “discriminate[s]” against prospective immigrants based on “nationality,” in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1152(a)(1)(A); it “discriminat[es]” against refugees based on “religion,” in violation of the United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees art. 3, July 28, 1951, 19 U.S.T. 6259; and it grossly misapplies the President’s authority to “suspend the entry” of aliens, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(f).

#### ***a. The order’s nationality-based classifications violate the INA.***

First, the Order violates the Immigration and Nationality Act’s (INA) flat prohibition on nationality-based discrimination.

Section 202(a)(1)(A) of the INA provides:

Except as specifically provided in paragraph (2) and in sections 1101(a)(27), 1151(b)(2)(A)(i), and 1153 of this title, no person shall receive any preference or priority or be discriminated against in the issuance of an immigrant visa because of the person’s race, sex, nationality, place of birth, or place of residence.

8 U.S.C. § 1152(a)(1)(A). “Congress could hardly have chosen more explicit language.” *Legal Assistance for Vietnamese Asylum Seekers v. Dep’t of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs*, 45 F.3d 469, 473 (D.C. Cir. 1995), *vacated on other grounds*, 519 U.S. 1 (1996). It “unambiguously directed that no nationality-based discrimination shall occur,” *id.*, and so “eliminat[ed] \* \* \* the national origins system as the basis for the selection of immigrations to the United States.” H.R.

Rep. No. 89-745, at 8 (1965); *see Olsen v. Albright*, 990 F. Supp. 31, 37 (D.D.C. 1997).

The Order flouts this clear command. Section 3(c) provides that aliens “from” seven identified “countries” cannot enter the United States. Sections 3(e)-(f) authorizes the President to bar entry by “foreign nationals \* \* \* from [additional] countries” he will subsequently identify. And Section 5 prohibits “the entry of Syrian nationals as refugees,” *id.* § 5(c), and permits the Secretary of State to resume refugee admissions “only for nationals of [designated] countries,” *id.* § 5(a). Each of these provisions facially discriminates on the basis of “nationality, place of birth, or place of residence,” 8 U.S.C. § 1152(a)(1)(A)—exactly what Congress said the Executive cannot do. The Order thus unilaterally resurrects the “national origins system” that Congress ended in 1965.

The President cannot ignore Section 202(a)(1)(A) in this manner. Congress specified exactly when federal officials could take nationality into account: “as specifically provided in paragraph (2) [of Section 202(a)] and in sections 1101(a)(27), 1151(b)(2)(A)(i), and 1153 of” title 8. 8 U.S.C. § 1152(a)(1)(A). None of those narrow exceptions is even arguably relevant here; and by enumerating those few exemptions, Congress made clear it did not intend to authorize others. *See, e.g., United Dominion Indus. v. United States*, 532 U.S. 822, 836 (2001) (describing *expressio unius* canon). The fact that the immigration laws

give the President some discretion makes no difference. As courts have recognized for decades—and as Section 202(a)(1)(A) makes clear—“discretion” in enforcing the immigration laws “may not be exercised to discriminate invidiously against a particular race or group.” *Wong Wing Hang v. INS*, 360 F.2d 715, 719 (2d Cir. 1966) (Friendly, J.); *see, e.g., Patel v. INS*, 811 F.2d 377, 382 (7th Cir. 1987) (same).

***b. The Order’s religion-based classifications violate the INA.***

Sections 5(b) and 5(e) of the Order also violate the INA by discriminating against refugees on the basis of religion. In 1968, the United States ratified the United Nations Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, Jan. 31, 1967, 19 U.S.T. 6223 (“UN Protocol”), a multilateral treaty that requires signatory states to treat refugees “without discrimination as to race, religion or country of origin.” United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees art. 3, July 28, 1951, 19 U.S.T. 6259; *see* UN Protocol art. I.1 (incorporating this requirement by reference). Congress subsequently overhauled the INA “to bring United States refugee law into conformity with the Protocol.” *Khan v. Holder*, 584 F.3d 773, 783 (9th Cir. 2009). Accordingly, the Ninth Circuit (echoing the Supreme Court) has held that courts must “interpret the INA in such a way as to avoid any conflict with the Protocol, if possible.” *Id.*; *see INS v. Aguirre-Aguirre*, 526 U.S. 415, 426-427 (1999); *INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421, 437 (1987). Nothing in the



INA suggests that Congress intended to authorize immigration officials—or the President—to violate the Protocol’s straightforward prohibition on religious discrimination. Indeed, the INA expressly prohibits *States* from discriminating against refugees with “regard to race, religion, nationality, sex, or political opinion.” 8 U.S.C. § 1522(a)(5). It is inconceivable that Congress intended *federal* officials to engage in such discrimination, in clear violation of the Nation’s treaty obligations. As describe above, *see supra* at pp. 19-20, the Order does precisely that, and so cannot stand.

***c. The INA does not authorize the President to impose sweeping class-based restrictions on immigration.***

Sections 3(c), 3(e)-(f), 5(a), and 5(c) are also unlawful because the President lacks any affirmative authority to impose the Order’s sweeping, undifferentiated, and arbitrary bans on entry.

As a basis for its immigration and refugee bans, the Order relies on Section 212(f) of the INA, which states that the President may “suspend the entry of \* \* \* any class of aliens as immigrants or nonimmigrants” if he “finds that the[ir] entry \* \* \* would be detrimental to the interests of the United States.” 8 U.S.C. § 1182(f); *see* Order §§ 3(c), 5(c). But Section 212(f) provides no support for the Order.

That is so for two reasons. First—as discussed above—the INA prohibits nationality discrimination, and section 212(f) does not override that limit. *See*

8 U.S.C. § 1152(a)(1)(a). Section 202(a)(1)(A), with its focus on particular categories of protection, is more specific than Section 212(f)’s generalized grant of discretion. It also is later-enacted—1965 versus 1952. And it enumerates specific exceptions to its prohibition that do not include section 212(f). It therefore overrides any authority the President would otherwise have had under Section 212(f). *See United States v. Juvenile Male*, 670 F.3d 999 (9th Cir. 2012) (recognizing principle of statutory construction that “[w]here two statutes conflict, the later-enacted, more specific provision generally governs.”); *United Dominion*, 532 U.S. at 836.

In any event, the Order’s reliance on Section 212(f) stretches that provision far beyond its limits. Presidents have invoked Section 212(f) dozens of times since it was enacted in 1952; in every instance, they used it to suspend entry of a *discrete* set of individuals based on an *individualized* determination that *each* prohibited member of the class had engaged in conduct “detrimental to the [United States]’ interests.” *See, e.g.*, Pres. Proc. No. 8342 (Jan. 22, 2009) (suspending entry of human traffickers); Pres. Proc. No. 5887 (Oct. 26, 1988) (suspending entry of Sandinistas); *see generally* Cong. Research Serv., Executive Authority to Exclude Aliens: In Brief 6-10 (Jan. 23, 2017), <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/homsec/R44743.pdf>. Before now, no President attempted to invoke Section 212(f) to impose a *categorical* bar on admission based on a *generalized* (and unsupported) claim that

*some* members of a class *might* engage in misconduct. And no President has taken the further step of establishing an *ad hoc* scheme of exceptions that allows immigration officers to admit whomever they choose on either a “case-by-case basis,” Order § 3(g), or categorically, *see* Statement by Secretary John Kelly on the Entry of Lawful Permanent Residents Into the United States (Jan. 29, 2017) (determining, within two days of the Order’s issuance, that lawful permanent residents are entitled to a blanket exception).

If these novel assertions of authority were accepted, the immigration laws could be nullified by executive fiat. It is always possible to claim that some broad group might include dangerous individuals; many countries, for example, have worse records of terrorism than the seven the President singled out. *See* U.S. Dep’t of State, National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism: Annex of Statistical Information (2016) (showing that 7 of the 10 countries with the most terrorism were not included in the Order). The President’s logic would therefore permit him—and any future President—to abandon Congress’s immigration system at will, and replace it with his own rules of entry governed by administrative whim.

That is not the law Congress enacted. “Congress \* \* \* does not alter the fundamental details of a regulatory scheme in vague terms or ancillary provisions”—it does not, as Justice Scalia wrote, “hide elephants in mouseholes.”

*Whitman v. Am. Trucking Ass'ns*, 531 U.S. 457, 468 (2001). Enabling the President to unilaterally suspend the immigration laws would surely be an elephant; and the vague terms of Section 212(f)—never once in six decades interpreted in the manner the President now proposes—are a quintessential mousehole. *See FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 529 U.S. 120, 159-160 (2000) (declining to find that Congress “intended to delegate a decision of [substantial] economic and political significance” whether authority ran “[c]ontrary to [the Executive Branch’s] representations” for 80 years). Indeed, it is doubtful that Congress *could* delegate such unbounded authority to the President. *See Clinton v. City of New York*, 524 U.S. 417, 443 (1998) (Congress cannot authorize President “to cancel portions of a duly enacted statute”); *Whitman*, 531 U.S. at 472 (Congress cannot delegate powers without an “intelligible principle” to govern their exercise). Section 212(f) cannot be construed to authorize the Order’s sweeping and discriminatory immigration bans.

#### **4. The Order’s Implementation Violates the APA.**

Finally, the Order’s implementation violates the APA, both on procedural and substantive fronts.

***APA Procedural Requirements.*** The APA requires that agencies provide public notice and an opportunity for comment on any rule that is “legislative” or “substantive.” *Lincoln v. Vigil*, 508 U.S. 182, 196 (1993); *see* 5 U.S.C. § 553(b)-

(c). “Substantive rules” are those that “change existing rights and obligations,” *Time Warner Cable Inc. v. FCC*, 729 F.3d 137, 168 (2d Cir. 2013), and “limi[t] administrative discretion or establish a binding norm” for agency officials to follow, *Sacora v. Thomas*, 628 F.3d 1059, 1069 (9th Cir. 2010) (italics omitted).

In this case, Sections 3 and 5 of the Order are substantive because they unquestionably affect existing “rights and obligations”: Immigrants and non-immigrants living in the United States can no longer leave and re-enter the country, and nationals of designated countries who have visas can no longer use them. But more to the point, the rules that *agencies* have to create to carry out the Order also are (and will be) substantive rules. After all, the Order speaks in broad generalities and leaves it to the agencies to implement binding norms around everything from which refugees get exemptions, to who counts as “immigrants and nonimmigrants” under Section 3(c), to whether Section 5(e)’s in-the-national-interest exemptions extend beyond the enumerated examples.

Those newly-minted norms will affect existing “rights and obligations” in extraordinary ways. To take just one example, the implementing officials have changed their view as to whether lawful permanent residents fall within the Order’s national-interest prong *twice*—and have effectuated each change with no more than a *press release*. Compl. ¶¶ 62-64. That is plainly improper. The same

goes for the many similarly substantive rules that have been and will be promulgated under the Order's auspices.

***APA Substantive Requirements.*** Defendants have also committed substantive violations of the APA. The APA prohibits federal agencies from taking any action that is “arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law.” 5 U.S.C. §706(2). The Order, and agency norms promulgated under the Order, are plainly “not in accordance with law.” *See supra*, A.1-3. And Defendants’ issuance and implementation of the Order has been flagrantly arbitrary and capricious. The Order has been issued and implemented abruptly and with no reasonable explanation of how its various provisions further its stated objective. *See City of Sausalito v. O’Neill*, 386 F.3d 1186, 1206 (9th Cir. 2004) (agencies must at least articulate “a rational connection between the factors found and the choices made” (internal quotation marks omitted)). Just within the first 72 hours, Defendants are reported to have changed their minds three times about one of the Order’s essential aspects—whether it applies to green card holders. Compl. ¶ 59. A few days later, they changed their minds yet *again*. Comp. ¶ 64. If this is not arbitrary and capricious executive action, it is hard to imagine what would be.

**B. Hawai‘i Will Suffer Irreparable Harm If Relief Is Not Granted.**

Hawai‘i will be irreparably harmed if Defendants are not temporarily enjoined from enforcing Sections 3(c), 3(e)-(f), 5(a)-(c), and 5(e) of the Order. Implementation of these provisions has already caused significant religious, dignitary, and economic harms in and to Hawai‘i. If Defendants are not enjoined, the damage will be immeasurable. For these reasons, the State *a fortiori* satisfies the requirements of Article III standing as well.

*First*, the Order is creating an unconstitutional “establishment” of religion in Hawai‘i and across the country. This harm alone is sufficient to warrant injunctive relief; in Establishment Clause cases, irreparable harm is presumed. *See, e.g., Chaplaincy of Full Gospel Churches v. England*, 454 F.3d 290, 303 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (if a movant demonstrates a likelihood of success on an Establishment Clause claim, “this is sufficient, without more, to satisfy the irreparable harm prong”); *see also Farris*, 677 F.3d at 868 (9th Cir. 2012) (adopting the same rule for First Amendment claims generally).

*Second*, the Order is inflicting irreparable harm on the State’s sovereign and dignitary interests by commanding instruments of Hawaii’s government to support discriminatory conduct that is offensive to its own laws and policies. Hawaii’s Constitution protects religious freedom and the equal rights of all persons. Hawai‘i Const. art. 1, §§2, 4. Its statutes bar discrimination on the basis of ancestry. Haw.

Rev. Stat. §§ 378-2(1); 489-3; 515-3. And Hawai‘i has a number of policies that aim to further diversity. Compl. ¶ 72. Hawai‘i has a sovereign interest in seeing that its laws and policies are given effect, and in following them *itself*. See *Bond v. United States*, 564 U.S. 211, 221 (2011); *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U.S. 416, 431 (1920).

The Order commands Hawai‘i to abandon its sovereign prerogatives, and become complicit in discrimination barred by its own Constitution and statutes: The State’s universities cannot enroll qualified persons from the designated countries; state governmental entities cannot hire such persons; and the State’s Department of Transportation must provide areas inside the State’s international airports to Customs and Border Patrol to detain and deport immigrants barred by the Order. In stopping Hawaii’s governmental entities from abiding by the State’s own laws and policies, the Order inflicts dignitary harms that have no remedy. See, e.g., *Shelby Cty. v. Holder*, 133 S. Ct. 2612, 2623 (2013) (states should “retain broad autonomy in structuring their governments and pursuing legislative objectives”); *Arizona Dream Act Coal. v. Brewer*, 757 F.3d 1053, 1068 (9th Cir. 2014) (irreparable harm is threatened when “there is no adequate legal remedy”).

*Third*, the Order is inflicting permanent damage on Hawaii’s economy and tax revenues. Tourism is the “state’s lead economic driver”; in 2015 alone, Hawai‘i had 8.7 million visitor arrivals, accounting for \$15 billion in spending.



Compl. ¶ 15. The Order prevents any nationals of the designated countries from visiting the State, which will result in considerable lost revenues. Decl. of G. Szigeti (Ex. F), ¶¶ 9-11 (showing thousands of visitors in 2015 from the Middle East and Africa). The Order deters Muslim immigrants and non-immigrants across America from engaging in interstate travel that involves an airport, effectively precluding travel to Hawai‘i. And it will likely chill international tourism to Hawai‘i more broadly, as nationals of other countries fear that they too will become subject to an immigration ban. Decl. of L. Salaveria (Ex. E), ¶¶ 11-14. These consequences will drastically reduce the State’s economic output and its tax revenues, and they will inflict incalculable harm on Hawaii’s reputation as a place of welcome—a brand that it is has spent significant time and energy developing internationally. *See Oracle USA, Inc. v. Rimini St., Inc.*, 2016 WL 5213917, at \*2 (9th Cir. Sept. 21, 2016) (injunctive relief warranted when “injuries [are] difficult to quantify and compensate”).

Finally, the Order inflicts irreparable damage to Hawai‘i because it subjects a portion of its population to discrimination and marginalization, while denying all residents of the State the benefits of a pluralistic and inclusive society. Hawai‘i is home to over 6,000 legal permanent residents, including numerous individuals from the designated countries. Compl. ¶ 10. It currently has 12,000 foreign students, including 27 graduate students from the designated countries at the

University of Hawai‘i alone. Decl. of R. Dickson (Ex. D), ¶ 9. The University of Hawai‘i also has at least 10 faculty members who are legal permanent residents from the designated countries, and at least 30 faculty members with valid visas from the countries. *Id.* ¶¶ 10-11. Section 3(c) of the Order subjects these Hawaii residents to second-class treatment—denying them their fundamental right to travel overseas, preventing them from tending to important family matters, and impairing their ability to complete necessary aspects of their work or study. *Id.* ¶ 12; Decl. of John Doe 3 (Ex. C), ¶¶ 3-4 . More broadly, the Order subjects all of Hawai‘i—which prides itself on its ethnic diversity and inclusion—to a discriminatory policy that differentiates among State residents based on their national origin. *See, e.g.*, Decl. of R. Dickson (Ex. D), ¶ 13. Hawai‘i has a quasi-sovereign interest in “securing [its] residents from the harmful effects of discrimination.” *Alfred L. Snapp & Son, Inc. v. Puerto Rico*, 458 U.S. 592, 609 (1982). The Order is irreparably undermining that interest.

### **C. The Balance of the Equities and Public Interest Favor Relief.**

The balance of the equities and public interest factors tip decidedly in favor of Hawai‘i. The harms the Order inflicts are immediate and severe, and “it is always in the public interest to prevent the violation of a party’s constitutional rights.” *Melendres v. Arpaio*, 695 F.3d 990, 1002 (9th Cir. 2012).

Defendants, in contrast, have identified no exigency that demands immediate implementation of this Order. They have *no* evidence that the Order's wildly over- and under-inclusive bans will actually prevent terrorism or make the Nation more secure. Defendants can fully achieve the Order's stated goal of strengthening the country's vetting procedures without also depriving millions of people of their rights under the Constitution and federal law.

### **CONCLUSION**

The Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order should be granted, and Defendants should be restrained from continuing to enforce Sections 3(c), 5(a)-(c), and 5(e) of the Executive Order, in Hawai'i and nationwide.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, February 3, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Douglas S. Chin

NEAL K. KATYAL\*  
COLLEEN ROH SINZDAK\*  
MITCHELL P. REICH\*  
ELIZABETH HAGERTY\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Telephone: (202) 637-5600  
Fax: (202) 637-5910  
Email: neal.katyal@hoganlovells.com

THOMAS P. SCHMIDT\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
875 Third Avenue

DOUGLAS S. CHIN (Bar No. 6465)  
Attorney General of the State of Hawai'i  
CLYDE J. WADSWORTH (Bar No.  
8495)  
Solicitor General of the State of Hawai'i  
DEIRDRE MARIE-IHA (Bar No. 7923)  
KIMBERLY T. GUIDRY (Bar No. 7813)  
DONNA H. KALAMA (Bar No. 6051)  
ROBERT T. NAKATSUJI (Bar No.  
6743)  
Deputy Attorneys General

DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL, STATE OF HAWAII

New York, NY 10022  
Telephone: (212) 918-3000  
Fax: (212) 918-3100

SARA SOLOW\*  
ALEXANDER B. BOWERMAN\*  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
1835 Market St., 29th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (267) 675-4600  
Fax: (267) 675-4601

425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
Telephone: (808) 586-1500  
Fax: (808) 586-1239  
Email: deirdre.marie-iha@hawaii.gov

*\*Pro Hac Vice Applications*  
*Forthcoming*

*Attorneys for Plaintiff, State of Hawai'i*