

# Litigation Tracker: Legal Challenges to Trump Administration Actions

by Just Security

April 8, 2025

This public resource tracks legal challenges to Trump administration actions. If you think we are missing anything, you can email us at [lte@justsecurity.org](mailto:lte@justsecurity.org). Special thanks to *Just Security* Student Staff Editors Anna Braverman, Isaac Buck, Rick Da, Charlotte Kahan, and Jeremy Venook, and to Matthew Fouracre and Nour Soubani.

The Tracker is part of the [Collection: Just Security's Coverage of the Trump Administration's Executive Actions](#). Readers may also be interested in [signing up](#) for our free Early Edition roundup of news and our end-of-day newsletter with *Just Security* articles from the day (We respect your privacy. We do not use your email address for any other purpose except to automatically send you the requested email.)

*The Tracker was first published on Jan. 29, 2025 and is continually updated. Last updated April 8, 2025.*

Total number of cases tracked: 178 (including 4 closed cases)

**Search:**

Topic  Executive Action  Case Name

Date Filed

Case Name	Complaint	Date Filed	Case Summary
Immigration and Citizenship			

Executive Action: Alien Enemies Act removals ([Presidential Proclamation 10903](#))

[J.G.G. v. Trump](#) (D.D.C)

Case No. 1:25-cv-00766

(D.C. Cir [No. 25-5067](#))

Supreme Court [docket 24A931](#)

[Petition](#) (Mar. 15, 2025)

[Motion for TRO](#) (Mar. 15, 2025)

2025-03-15

**Overview:** *President Trump issued a presidential proclamation alleged members of the Venezuelan Tren de Aragua (TdA) Plaintiffs filed a class action lawsuit arguing the 1798 stay temporary block to any removals until further hearings. Temporary Restraining Orders (TROs) against the govern*

**Summary:** On Mar. 14, President Trump signed a [Procl](#) deport Venezuelan nationals alleged to be members of In the early hours of Saturday, Mar. 15, five Venezuelan challenging the government’s action on the ground tha removals would be in violation of immigration statutes addition to a violation of habeas corpus. The Plaintiffs court to block any removals from the United States.

In an emergency hearing on Mar. 15, Chief Judge James custody who are subject to the Mar. 15, 2025 Presidenti block removals of any class members from the United S

**Update 1:** The same day, Mar. 15, the government subr ruling from the bench, and a [written](#) TRO that evening.

**Update 2:** On Mar. 17, Defendants [moved](#) to vacate the

**Update 3:** On Mar. 18, Chief Judge James Boasberg issu time the flights that left U.S. airspace prior to the filing the number of people aboard subject to the President’s

**Update 4:** On Mar. 19, Defendants [filed](#) a motion to sta time to invoke the state secrets privilege, avoid disclos

**Update 5:** On Mar. 19, Chief Judge Boasberg [issued](#) an expressing skepticism about their stated intention to ir

**Update 6:** On Mar. 19, Plaintiffs [filed](#) a motion in oppo

**Update 7:** On Mar. 20, Chief Judge Boasberg [issued](#) an and it also granted Defendants’ delay to invoke the stat

**Update 8:** On Mar. 24, Chief Judge Boasberg [issued](#) a m

**Update 9:** On Mar. 25, Defendants [filed](#) a notice invoki

**Update 10:** On Mar. 26, Plaintiffs filed a [Notice](#) that th incorporate “additional factual material so that there is That same day, the D.C. Circuit. in a 2-1 decision, [denie](#)

**Update 11:** On Mar. 27, the Plaintiffs filed a [motion](#) to cause exists to extend the TROs.

**Update 12:** On Mar. 28, the Defendants [appealed](#) to th administrative stay.

**Update 13:** On Mar. 28, the Defendants filed an [opposi](#) the Plaintiffs’ claims and that the Plaintiffs have failed That same day, the Court [ordered the extension](#) of the ’

**Update 14:** On Mar. 28, Plaintiffs submitted a [motion](#) a [Enemy Validation Guide,](#)” allegedly used by the govern

**Update 15:** On Mar. 31, the Plaintiffs filed a [response](#) t already has the information it needs to conclude that it of any case in which the state secrets privilege has been

**Update 16:** On Mar. 31, the Plaintiffs filed a [reply](#) to th violated the Court’s orders to return to the U.S. all airp] to the Alien Enemies Act.

**Update 17:** On Apr. 1, the Defendants filed an [oppositi](#) is procedurally barred and fails on the merits.

**Update 18:** On Apr. 4, the Plaintiffs filed a [reply](#) to the reply, Plaintiffs requested that the Court also find the F

			<p>its applicability to an individual.</p> <p><b>Update 19:</b> On Apr. 7, the Supreme Court. In a 5-4 deci brought as a habeas case where the plaintiffs were in ct reasonable time and in such a manner as will allow the</p>
<b>Executive Action: Removal to El Salvador/Fear of Persecution</b>			
<p><a href="#">Abrego Garcia v. Noem</a> (D. Md.)</p> <p>Case No. 8:25-cv-00951</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-24</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Kilmar Armando Abrego Garcia (Abrego Garc El Salvador without judicial proceedings was in violation of the Amendment of the United States Constitution. Plaintiffs a Salvador to incarcerate 261 U.S. noncitizens, including Ab the government’s actions be declared a violation of the Fif El Salvador to return Abrego Garcia to U.S. custody. At th Salvador, and the government has acknowledged his remo States, and the Court of Appeals has affirmed that order.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 15, the U.S. government depo Armando Abrego Garcia (Abrego Garcia), who had beer on the ground that he had a well-grounded fear of pers Plaintiffs allege the Department of Homeland Security El Salvador to incarcerate Abrego Garcia and the other Garcia to El Salvador constitutes a violation of the Adm and substantive due process rights safeguarded under t that the removal of Abrego Garcia was unconstitutiona El Salvador for the detention of Abrego Garcia and orde and take all reasonable measures to facilitate his return Plaintiffs immediately filed an <a href="#">emergency motion</a> seek the defendants from continuing payments to the Gover initiate efforts to secure his return to U.S. custody.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 25, Judge Paula Xinis <a href="#">denied</a> Plainti On that same day, Plaintiffs filed a second motion for a preventing Defendants from continuing to financially s the return of Abrego Garcia to U.S. custody.<b>Update 2:</b> (injunctive relief.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 31, Defendants filed their <a href="#">oppositio</a> “administrative error” to have removed Abrego Garcia t</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Apr. 4, Judge Paul Xinis <a href="#">wrote</a> that “issu ongoing irreparable harm,” and ordered the governmer published a <a href="#">memorandum opinion</a> on Apr. 6.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> The Defendants appealed the order, and on t The Defendants <a href="#">petitioned the U.S. Supreme Court</a> to v Roberts issued a temporary stay and ordered the Plaint their <a href="#">reply</a> shortly afterwards on the same day.</p>
<p><a href="#">Gil Rojas v. Venegas</a> (S.D. Tex.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00056</p>	<p><a href="#">Habeas Petition</a></p>	<p>2025-03-14</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Adrian Gil Rojas, a Venezuelan national who i detention by government officials, asserting that it is unla returned to New York and said he would not be subject to</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 21, 2025, Adrian Gil Rojas, a V Immigration and Custom Enforcement (ICE). Rojas had protected status (TPS) on Nov. 27, 2023. He was subject appointment, but on March 11, 2025 he filed a motion t On March 14, he filed a petition for writ of habeas corp 1254a (a)(1)(A). He also asserted that his submission of removal from the U.S. under 8 U.S.C. 1229a(b)(5)(C). He</p>



			<p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s executive order seeks to revoke that people in the United States illegally are not “subject” organizations CASA and ASAP, as well as individual immigrants. The Executive Order (EO) Amendment and federal statute 8 U.S.C. § 1401(a), both of which assert that the executive order exceeds presidential authority and infringes on the rights of children born to immigrants (e.g., the right to remain in the United States and destabilizes their families, potentially leaving children in foster care).</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 5, 2025, Judge Deborah Boardman is in the process of granting a preliminary injunction blocking implementation of the birthright citizenship EO.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 13, the Defendants submitted a <a href="#">notice of appeal</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 28, the Fourth Circuit <a href="#">denied</a> Defendants’ appeal.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 13, the Defendants <a href="#">appealed to the Supreme Court</a>.</p>
<p><a href="#">Franco Aleman et al. v. Trump et al.</a> (W.D. Wash.)</p> <p>Case No. 2:25-cv-00163-JCC</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	2025-01-24	<p><b>Overview:</b> A group of noncitizen pregnant women whose citizenship was revoked by the Executive Order (“EO”) ending birthright citizenship sued <i>Washington et al v. Donald J. Trump</i>, combining efforts to challenge the EO.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiffs are non-citizen pregnant women who are seeking to challenge the EO for eliminating birthright citizenship. Plaintiffs bring this suit because they believe the EO is a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment and seek injunctive relief.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Jan. 27, <i>State of Washington et al v. Donald J. Trump</i> was filed in the District of Columbia.</p>
<p><a href="#">State of Washington et al v. Donald J. Trump et al</a> (W.D. Wash.)</p> <p>Case No. 2:25-cv-00127-JCC</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	2025-01-21	<p><b>Overview:</b> The states of Washington, Arizona, Illinois and Nevada have filed a lawsuit with the court temporarily blocked the EO while the lawsuit is pending. The Fourth Circuit denied the appeal.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s executive order seeks to revoke the citizenship of children of undocumented immigrants who were born in the United States. The suit argues that the EO violates the Fourteenth Amendment (1868), which grants birthright citizenship for a child born in the United States.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Jan. 23, 2025, Judge John Coughenour of the District of Columbia granted the Executive Order.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Jan. 27, <a href="#">Franco Aleman v. Trump</a> (complaint) was filed in the District of Columbia.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 6, Judge Coughenour issued an <a href="#">opinion</a> blocking implementation of the Executive Order.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 6, defendants <a href="#">appealed</a> to the Ninth Circuit.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Feb. 12, defendants made an emergency motion for a stay of the EO.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Feb. 19, the Ninth Circuit issued an <a href="#">order</a> staying the EO and leaving the existing briefing schedule unchanged.</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 13, the Defendants <a href="#">appealed to the Supreme Court</a>.</p>
<p><a href="#">OCA–Asian Pacific American Advocates v. Marco Rubio et al</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00287</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	2025-01-30	<p><b>Overview:</b> Asian Pacific American Advocates (a non-profit organization) filed a lawsuit with the court arguing that the EO violates the Constitution, specifically the Fourteenth Amendment.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s executive order seeks to revoke the citizenship of children of parents on lawful temporary visas on the basis of their parents’ immigration status. Marco Rubio and the heads of other departments and agencies have argued that the EO denies citizenship by the order. Both women reside in the United States. The order violates the plain text of the Fourteenth Amendment and the Supreme Court’s decision in <i>U.S.C. § 706(2)</i>. The suit identifies an injured “subclass” of citizens, seeking declaratory and injunctive relief.</p>

<p><a href="#">County of Santa Clara v. Trump, et al</a> (N.D. Cal.)</p> <p>Case No. 5:25-cv-00981</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-01-30</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The County of Santa Clara sued to block President Trump's Executive Order on birthright citizenship and those with temporary visas from being deported under the Administrative Procedure Act.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump's executive order seeks to revoke birthright citizenship of children of parents on lawful temporary visas on the basis of the EO. The County of Santa Clara sued to protect residents who would lose their homes and businesses, prevent administrative burdens and loss of tax revenue, and argue that the order violates the plain text of the Fourteenth Amendment, U.S.C. § 706(2), and seeks declaratory and injunctive relief.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 5, Santa Clara County filed a <a href="#">motion</a> for a preliminary injunction enforcing the birthright citizenship EO on the basis that the EO violates the Fourteenth Amendment, the constitutional Separation of Powers, and the Administrative Procedure Act.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 14, Defendants filed an <a href="#">opposition</a> to the County's motion. The County's motion does not reach threshold grounds and is <a href="#">denied</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 19, Santa Clara County filed a <a href="#">reply</a> to the opposition.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 21, Judge Eumi Lee <a href="#">ruled</a> that both parties' motions are pending the Ninth Circuit's decision in <i>Washington v. Trump</i>. Both parties filed OSCs on Feb. 28.</p>
<p><a href="#">Le v. Trump</a> (C.D. Cal.)</p> <p>Case No. 8:25-cv-00104</p>	<p>Complaint (under seal per Privacy Act)</p>	<p>2025-01-20</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A birthright citizenship case under seal. This case is currently not being litigated.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> A birthright citizenship case under seal. On Jan. 24, 2025, Judge Maame Ewusi-Mensah Frimpong granted the County of Santa Clara's motion for preliminary injunction litigation in <i>Washington v. Trump</i>.</p>
<p><a href="#">New York Immigration Coalition v. Trump et al.</a> (S.D.N.Y.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-01309</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-13</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A New York-based coalition of immigrant and civil liberties groups sued Donald Trump's Executive Order ("EO") revoking birthright citizenship. The lawsuit argues that the EO violates the Constitution and the Administrative Procedure Act.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiffs are a nonprofit organization representing a woman pending asylum petition. She is five months pregnant. The lawsuit seeks to enforce the Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 21, 2025, plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a motion</a> for a preliminary injunction and enforcement of the Executive Order.</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Immigration policy – punishment of sanctuary cities and states (<a href="#">Executive Order 14159</a>) (DOJ "<a href="#">Sanctuary Jurisdictions</a>")</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">Organized Communities Against Deportations et al v. Benjamine Huffman (Acting Secretary of Homeland Security) et al</a> (N.D. Ill.)</p> <p>Case No. 25-cv-868</p> <p><b>CASE CLOSED</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-01-25</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Immigrant advocacy organizations in Chicago sued the Department of Justice for guidance targeting Sanctuary City policies and related immigration initiatives on the basis that it violates the Constitution and the Administrative Procedure Act.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Acting Attorney General Benjamine Huffman instructed the Civil Division of the Department of Justice to implement Executive Branch immigration initiatives and, where applicable, to target Sanctuary City based immigrant-advocacy organizations, allege that the Department's guidance targeting Sanctuary City advocacy and movement building activities. Plaintiffs' lawsuit seeks an injunction against the Department of Justice's guidance.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Jan. 29, Plaintiffs <a href="#">requested</a> the Court's preliminary injunction and Preliminary Injunction. Plaintiffs noted its motion for preliminary injunction based on immigration raids. In light of Defendants' launch of the guidance, Plaintiffs <a href="#">voluntarily dismissed</a> the case from the court to seek relief." The judge dismissed the case with prejudice.</p>

<p><a href="#">City and County of San Francisco v. Donald J. Trump, et al</a> (N.D. Cal.)</p> <p>Case No. 3:25-cv-01350</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-07</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Several cities and counties sued President Donald Trump's Department of Justice ("DOJ") memo that, together, would block the implementation of the Executive Order and the Administrative Procedure Act.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump's executive order directed the Department of Justice to block sanctuary cities, which the Department of Justice implemented. The plaintiffs include various cities and counties. They challenge the Executive Order's Amendment's reservation of unenumerated power to the Executive Order, the Fifth Amendment's due process clause, and the Administrative Procedure Act. The court granted a permanent injunction on any effort to enforce the provisions of the Executive Order.</p>
<p><a href="#">City of Chelsea v. Trump</a> (D. Mass.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10442</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-23</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Two Massachusetts cities sued President Donald Trump's Executive Order (EO) and DOJ memo that would withhold asylum status from immigrants because both violate the Administrative Procedure Act.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump's executive order directed the Department of Justice to block sanctuary cities, which the Department of Justice implemented. Plaintiffs, two Massachusetts cities that identify as a "sanctuary city," challenge the Executive Order and DOJ memo violate the Tenth Amendment's reservation of power to the states, the Fifth Amendment's due process clause, and the Administrative Procedure Act. The court granted preliminary and permanent injunctions against implementation of the Executive Order and DOJ memo.</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Immigration Policy – "Expedited Removal" (<a href="#">Executive Order 14159</a>)</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">Make the Road New York et al v. Kristi Noem (Acting Secretary of Homeland Security) et al</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00190</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-01-22</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Make the Road New York (a grassroots immigrant advocacy group) challenged the Trump administration's expedited deportation of certain immigrants without a court hearing and its implementation blocked because it violates the Constitution.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump's executive order directed the Department of Justice to implement the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) to include noncitizens who have been present for more than two years. The plaintiff, Make the Road New York, challenges the Executive Order's Process Clause, the INA, and the Administrative Procedure Act for violating procedural safeguards. The suit claims the rule is arbitrary and capricious and against wrongful removal.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 22, Plaintiff <a href="#">amended</a> the complaint to challenge their expedited removal orders under the new rule. The court granted expedited removal for noncitizens who filed affirmative asylum claims.</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Immigration Policy – Discontinuation of CBP One app (<a href="#">Executive Order 14165</a>)</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">Las Americas Immigrant Advocacy Center et al v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:24-cv-01702</p> <p>Motion for TRO: 1:24-cv-01702-RC - Dkt. No. 71</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a> <a href="#">Motion for TRO</a> (underlying case filed June 12, 2024)</p>	<p>2025-01-23</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Las Americas Immigrant Advocacy Center (a grassroots immigrant advocacy group) challenged the Trump administration to challenge a rule limiting asylum access, request asylum. After the Trump administration's directive to block the CBP One app, the court denied the motion on February 6, 2025.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The Trump administration executive order directed the Department of Justice to block the CBP One app, which was created by the Biden administration. Plaintiffs, Las Americas Immigrant Advocacy Center and the ACLU, challenge the Executive Order's access to those presenting at a port of entry or falling under the Executive Order. The CBP One app remained as a pathway by which asylum-seekers could apply for asylum. Las Americas, et al, filed a <a href="#">motion for a temporary restraining order</a> and supplemental briefings to address the government's position.</p>

			<p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 6, the court <a href="#">denied</a> the motion for a the government to parole noncitizens into the United S Secretary of Homeland Security.</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Access of Lawyers to Immigrants in Detention (<a href="#">Executive Order 14159</a>)</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">Amica Center for Immigrant Rights et al. v. U.S. Department of Justice</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00298</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-01-31</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Nine immigrant advocacy organizations filed a funding for legal resource programs for unrepresented im basis that it violates the Constitution and the Administrat</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> In 2024, Congress appropriated funds Immigration Court Helpdesk (ICH). On Jan. 22, 2025, th stop-work order that halted funding for four programs action was taken purportedly to “audit” the programs p legal services organizations sued, arguing that termina otherwise not in accordance with the law under the Ad the LOP and ICH; and violates the First Amendment by The suit seeks a temporary restraining order and prelin refusing to spend appropriated funds, preventing the p removing materials and posters the plaintiffs have post</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: DHS Revocation of Temporary Protected Status (TPS) (<a href="#">vacatur</a> of Venezuelan TPS; <a href="#">termination</a> of Venezuelan</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">National TPS Alliance et al. v. Noem</a> (N.D. Cal.)</p> <p>Case No. 25-cv-1766</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-19</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The National TPS Alliance (an organization r individuals from Venezuela who have TPS challenged the that the action was unlawful and motivated by racial bias termination of temporary protected status for Venezuelan</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 17, 2025, near the end of Presi Temporary Protected Status (TPS) for Venezuelans livir Secretary Kristi Noem <a href="#">vacated</a> that <a href="#">extension</a>, and days status in 2023.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that DHS lacks authority to “vacate” a justifications are “arbitrary and capricious, contrary to Administrative Procedure Act.” Citing Secretary Noem’ Secretary’s actions were motivated at least partly by ra declare unlawful and set aside DHS’s vacatur and termi</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 20, the Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed</a> a motion to p argued they are likely to succeed on the merits because arbitrary and capricious, and the government was moti and that, on balance, the Plaintiffs and the public inter the imposition of one.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 3, the Defendants filed a <a href="#">reply</a> to th court lacks jurisdiction to review Secretary Noem’s acti court has jurisdiction, the Plaintiffs’ claims fail on the 1</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 7, the Plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">reply</a> in supp</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 20, the Plaintiffs filed an <a href="#">amended c</a> extension for Haiti to 12 months, and asking the court 1 court held a hearing on plaintiffs’ motion to postpone t forthcoming.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 31, Judge Edward Chen <a href="#">granted</a> plai protected status for Venezuelan nationals.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Apr. 1, Defendants <a href="#">appealed</a> Judge Chen’</p>

<p><a href="#">Casa, Inc. and Make the Road New York v. Noem</a> (D. Md.)</p> <p>Case No. 8:25-cv-00525</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-20</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>CASA and Make the Road New York (two non-Temporary Protected Status for Venezuelans in the U.S., a</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 17, 2025, near the end of President Biden's term, Secretary Kristi Noem <a href="#">vacated</a> that <a href="#">extension</a>, and days status in 2023. Plaintiffs allege that Secretary Noem, in bypassing the Act. Citing Secretary Noem's references to Venezuelan that Defendants' vacatur and termination of TPS design Fifth Amendment. Plaintiffs request that the court decl prior TPS extension.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 26, 2025, Plaintiffs filed their <a href="#">reply</a> court has requisite jurisdiction and authority to grant r and termination were contrary to law and incorrectly is</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Apr. 1, 2025, the court issued an <a href="#">order</a> de <i>Alliance v. Noem</i>, 3:25-cv-01766, (N.D. Cal.) (ECF No. 93</p>
<p><a href="#">Haitian Americans United Inc. v. Trump</a> (D. Mass.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10498</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-03</p>	<p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 17, 2025, near the end of President Biden's term, Secretary Kristi Noem <a href="#">vacated</a> that <a href="#">extension</a>, and days status in 2023. Additionally, on Feb. 20, Secretary Noem status for Haitian nationals. Plaintiffs allege that Secretary Noem, in bypassing the Act as arbitrary and capricious toward both the Venezu holders as "dirtbags" and President Trump's stigmatiza TPS designation was motivated by discriminatory inter court declare unlawful and stop enforcement of the Ha</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Immigration Policy – Termination of categorical parole programs (<a href="#">Executive Order 14165</a>)</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">Doe v. Noem</a> (D. Mass.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10495</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-28</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A group of noncitizens applying for immigrati action lawsuit alleging that President Donald Trump's Ex has requested that the court block the EO on the basis tha</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The Trump administration executive c parole programs contrary to the president's executive c Parole Processes for Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Venezu Deputy Director of USCIS Andrew Davidson <a href="#">issued a m</a> officers directing them not to adjudicate immigration b under: U4U; CHNV; family reunification parole process Honduras; a family reunification parole processes for H parole process for Cubans that was created in 2007 and Plaintiffs in this class action contend that both Executi and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the status quo ante.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 17, Plaintiffs filed an <a href="#">amended com</a> part of the class; additional immigration parole prograi requests for parole, re-parole, and other immigration b and administrative stay against DHS' indefinite morato would succeed on their Administrative Procedure Act a irreparable injury.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 21, DHS <a href="#">filed</a> an opposition to Plain certification for the class action on the same day, defini</p>

			humanitarian parole processes, as well as all individual with pending applications for additional immigration b
<b>Executive Action: Proclamation Prohibiting Non-Citizens from Invoking Asylum Provisions” (<a href="#">Proclamation 10888</a>)</b>			
<p><a href="#">Refugee and Immigrant Center for Education and Legal Services v. Noem</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00306</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-03</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Three nonprofit organizations challenged a pr the U.S. while pursuing asylum claims. The lawsuit argues Trump administration agreed not to use the proclamation emergency motion to pause the implementation of the pro</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s proclamation bars immigrant Immigration and Nationality Act that would permit the three nonprofit organizations in Texas and Arizona pro seekers, argue that the order violates the following stat</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the Asylum Statute in the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1158(a)(1) ( congressional protections);</li> <li>2. the Withholding of Removal Statute, 8 U.S.C. § 1231( race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular s</li> <li>3. the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act (FA noncitizens of a meaningful opportunity to present CA</li> <li>4. the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization A non-contiguous countries their statutory right to regul</li> <li>5. the INA’s procedural protections for removal, 8 U.S.C eliminating procedural protections, including credible</li> <li>6. the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), 5 U.S.C. § 70 law) and § 706(2)(D) (by failing to follow the required r</li> <li>7. the constitutional separation of powers (by exceeding immigration protections).</li> </ol> <p>The Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment that the pro</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 19, Plaintiffs filed an <a href="#">emergency mo</a> by the Defendants and could be imminently deported u case until 12 pm on Feb. 24 to allow the government tir further ordered the Defendants to respond to Plaintiffs</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 22, Judge Moss <a href="#">denied</a> as moot the e government agreed not to use President Trump’s Janua ordered that the government must provide at least seve scheduled hearing.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 24, the Trump administration <a href="#">filed</a> standing, that presidential decisions are not reviewable an invasion is an unreviewable political question.”</p>
<b>Executive Action: Migrant Transfers to Guantanamo (<a href="#">Presidential Memorandum</a>)</b>			
<p><a href="#">Perez Parra v. Castro</a> (D. N.M.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:24-cv-00912-KG-KRS</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-09</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Three Venezuelan men sued the U.S. governm already in proceedings contesting their detention. A federu deported to Venezuela and the case was dismissed.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s Presidential Memorandum on</p>



			<p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s Presidential Memorandum on the Migrant Operations Center at Naval Station Guantánamo migrants. Plaintiffs, ten noncitizens in immigration custody at Guantánamo. They filed suit, arguing that under the Immigration and Nationality Act, the removal would constitute (1) unlawful removal; and (2) unlawful exercise of discretion under the Administrative Procedure Act; (3) violation of habeas corpus. They seek a declaratory judgment that the memorandum be vacated; a grant of a writ of habeas corpus; and have been transferred and detained, return to their home countries. The same day, Plaintiffs also filed an <a href="#">emergency motion</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On March 19, the Defendants submitted a <a href="#">motion</a> to the court in Guantánamo.</p>
--	--	--	---

**Executive Action: Suspension of the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program ([Executive Order No. 14163](#)) and Refugee Funding Suspension**

<p><a href="#">Pacito v. Trump</a> (W.D. Wash)  (2:25-cv-255)</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-10</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> Ten plaintiffs, including refugees, U.S. citizens (“EO”) and the State Department’s January 24, 2025 notice suspending the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program. The lawsuit argues that these actions violate the Constitution. A federal judge has issued a nationwide preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, President Trump issued Executive Order 14163. The State Department issued a Jan. 24 notice suspending the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program, and resettlement organizations (HIAS, Chatham House, etc.) proposed class action seeking injunctions to block implementation of the program and maintenance of refugee processing and resettlement services if granted. The lawsuit alleges that the orders violate the Administrative Procedure Act, statutory support services, and forced layoffs. The complaint asserts that the executive orders violate the Administrative Procedure Act and are arbitrary and capricious under the Administrative Procedure Act, and breach the Accardi doctrine requiring government officials to follow their own rules. The orders violate the Fifth Amendment due process rights and separation of powers principles by attempting to redistribute powers.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> Judge Jamal Whitehead, <a href="#">ruling</a> from the bench.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 25, Judge Jamal Whitehead, <a href="#">ruling</a> from the bench, vacated the executive order.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 28, Judge Whitehead <a href="#">issued</a> a writ of habeas corpus.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 3, the government submitted a <a href="#">notice of appeal</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 5, Plaintiffs filed an <a href="#">amended complaint</a> seeking injunctive relief from the suspension of the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program, the amended complaint also requests that the court grant the plaintiffs a <a href="#">preliminary injunction</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 24, the court granted a <a href="#">second preliminary injunction</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 25, the Trump administration <a href="#">filed</a> a <a href="#">motion</a> to the court.</p>
---	----------------------------------	-------------------	---

<p><a href="#">United States Conference of Catholic Bishops v. Department of State et al.</a> (D.D.C.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00465</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-18</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) and which provides refugee admissions and funding for resettlement programs. USCCB seeks to prohibit the U.S. government from suspending the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program but agreed to speed up the process for the program.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, President Trump issued Executive Order 14163. The State Department issued a Jan. 24 <a href="#">notice</a> suspending the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program, is part of a public health emergency, and was providing transitional</p>
--	----------------------------------	-------------------	--

			<p>suspended funding. USCCB brought suit, arguing the go under the Administrative Procedure Act because it (1) \ Impoundment Control Act; (2) is an arbitrary and capri required notice-and-comment rulemaking. They seek a and permanent injunctions prohibiting the governmen reimbursements pursuant to the terms of its cooperativ</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb 20, 2025, Judge Trevor N. McFadden briefing schedule for the preliminary injunction motior</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 24, Plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">supplemental r</a></p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 3, Plaintiffs filed an <a href="#">amended comp support</a> of that motion; and Judge McFadden <a href="#">ruled</a> that The amended complaint and the amended motion for a Feb. 27, the State Department terminated the cooperati nature of the dispute from a suspension of funding to a</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 5, the government filed in <a href="#">oppositio</a> plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">reply</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 11, Judge McFadden <a href="#">denied</a> Plaintiff</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 12, Plaintiffs submitted a <a href="#">notice of ;</a></p>
--	--	--	--

**Executive Action: Funding Freeze for Immigration Services ([Executive Order 14159](#)) (Sec. of Homeland Security [Memorandum I](#)**

<p><a href="#">Solutions In Hometown Connections v. Noem</a> (D. Md.)</p> <p>Case No. 8:25-cv-00885</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-17</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A group of nonprofit organizations are challer work. They argue that the freeze, implemented in respons law, and administrative procedures. They seek declaratory their operations.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiffs, a group of nonprofit organi (DHS) to indefinitely freeze grants for nonprofits that h implemented by DHS Secretary Kristi Noem, via a <a href="#">mem</a> is arbitrary and capricious, and has caused significant h funding freeze violates the Administrative Procedure A seek declaratory and injunctive relief to lift the freeze,</p> <p>Update 1: On Mar. 25, Plaintiffs submitted a <a href="#">motion</a> for</p>
---	----------------------------------	-------------------	---

**Executive Action: Contract Termination for Services to Unaccompanied Minors**

<p><a href="#">Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto v. United States Department of Health and Human Services</a> (N.D. Ca.)</p> <p>Case No. 3:25-cv-02847</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-26</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>On Mar. 21, 2025, the U.S. Department of the Human Services' (HHS) Office of Refugee Resettlement (O and ordered nonprofits that had received such funding to : immigration nonprofits brought a suit against DOI, HHS, blocking Defendants from withdrawing the services or fun</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 21, 2025, the U.S. Department funding through which the Department of Health and I for counsel for unaccompanied immigrant children and their ongoing funded representations for unaccompani HHS and ORR to provide legal representation and othe HHS, ORR, and DOI, seeking to enjoin Defendants from Defendants' actions are arbitrary and capricious and vi law appropriating funds by the William Wilberforce Tra doctrine, violating the internal 2024 Unaccompanied C</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 27, Plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion</a> for a ter for direct legal representation services for unaccompan for a TRO.</p>
---	----------------------------------	-------------------	--

			<b>Update 2:</b> On Apr. 1, the Court <a href="#">granted</a> Plaintiffs’ motion for appropriated funding (particularly for direct legal representation).
<b>Executive Action: IRS Data Sharing for Immigration Enforcement Purposes (<a href="#">Executive Order 14165</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14159</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14172</a>)</b>			
<a href="#">Centro de Trabajadores Unidos v. Bessent</a> (D.D.C.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00677	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-03-07	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Nonprofits Centro de Trabajadores Unidos and others have brought a suit against Secretary of the Treasury Scott W. Beardsley, seeking to block the disclosure of personally identifiable information to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) for immigration enforcement purposes, on the basis that no information has yet been shared.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiffs allege that the Trump administration’s “policy of potential immigration enforcement” by seeking access to tax return information “assigns ITINs to individuals who lack social security numbers and pay income taxes as required by law. Plaintiffs assert that granting access to tax return information to individuals who file using ITINs would “expose millions of Americans’ tax return information. Plaintiffs claim the government’s actions are ultra vires and violate the First Amendment, requiring confidentiality of tax return information. They seek declaratory and injunctive relief to prevent the government from disclosing, or allowing others, unless such disclosure is specifically permitted by law, tax return information.”</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 14, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed</a> a motion request for summary judgment.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 17, Defendants <a href="#">filed</a> a response to Plaintiffs’ motion.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 18, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed</a> a reply in support of their motion.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 20, following a hearing the day prior, the court granted summary judgment in favor of Plaintiffs, demonstrating standing, likelihood of success on the merits, and irreparable harm.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 26, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed</a> an amended complaint adding the City (“IAC”)–to the complaint; alleging additional violations of the First Amendment by Treasury Defendants; and requesting additional relief to prevent the government from disclosing, or allowing others, without a court order, tax return information.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 31, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed</a> a motion for a preliminary injunction, or alternatively, for summary judgment, to prevent the government from inspecting, or using tax return information for immigration enforcement purposes, under the Internal Revenue Code (IRC).</p>
<b>Executive Action: Habeas Corpus and Removal of Protestors (Protecting the United States from Foreign Terrorists and Other National Security Concerns) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14805</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14806</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14807</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14808</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14809</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14810</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14811</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14812</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14813</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14814</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14815</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14816</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14817</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14818</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14819</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14820</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14821</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14822</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14823</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14824</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14825</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14826</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14827</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14828</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14829</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14830</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14831</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14832</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14833</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14834</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14835</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14836</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14837</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14838</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14839</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14840</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14841</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14842</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14843</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14844</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14845</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14846</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14847</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14848</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14849</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14850</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14851</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14852</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14853</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14854</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14855</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14856</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14857</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14858</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14859</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14860</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14861</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14862</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14863</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14864</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14865</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14866</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14867</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14868</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14869</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14870</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14871</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14872</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14873</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14874</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14875</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14876</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14877</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14878</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14879</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14880</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14881</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14882</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14883</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14884</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14885</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14886</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14887</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14888</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14889</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14890</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14891</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14892</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14893</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14894</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14895</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14896</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14897</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14898</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14899</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14900</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14901</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14902</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14903</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14904</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14905</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14906</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14907</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14908</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14909</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14910</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14911</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14912</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14913</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14914</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14915</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14916</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14917</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14918</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14919</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14920</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14921</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14922</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14923</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14924</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14925</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14926</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14927</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14928</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14929</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14930</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14931</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14932</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14933</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14934</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14935</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14936</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14937</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14938</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14939</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14940</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14941</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14942</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14943</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14944</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14945</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14946</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14947</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14948</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14949</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14950</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14951</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14952</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14953</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14954</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14955</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14956</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14957</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14958</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14959</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14960</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14961</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14962</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14963</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14964</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14965</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14966</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14967</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14968</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14969</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14970</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14971</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14972</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14973</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14974</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14975</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14976</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14977</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14978</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14979</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14980</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14981</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14982</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14983</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14984</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14985</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14986</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14987</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14988</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14989</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14990</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14991</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14992</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14993</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14994</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14995</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14996</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14997</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14998</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14999</a>) (<a href="#">Executive Order 15000</a>)</b>			
<a href="#">Mahmoud Khalil v. William P. Joyce et al.</a> (D.N.J.)  Case no. 2:25-cv-01963 (formerly S.D.N.Y. <a href="#">Case No. 1:25-cv-01935</a> )	<a href="#">Habeas petition</a>	2025-03-09	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A green card holder and recent graduate of Central Michigan University, Khalil was arrested by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and U.S. Customs Enforcement (ICE) and other government officials on Mar. 8, 2025, while traveling to Louisiana. On the same day, the court made all court files publicly available, including attorney-client call on Mar. 12 and at least one such call on Mar. 13.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 8, 2025, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) arrested and detained Khalil, a lawful U.S. permanent resident (a green card holder), for his role in organizing pro-Palestinian demonstrations against the Trump administration. The habeas petition alleges, “At the time this proceeding was pending, Khalil was pregnant and a U.S. citizen. His legal team filed a habeas petition on Mar. 10, 2025. Khalil’s legal team also moved to compel the government to disclose attorney-client call logs. On Mar. 10, SDNY federal judge Jesse Furman temporarily granted summary judgment in favor of Khalil, which he <a href="#">extended</a> after an emergency conference hearing on Mar. 11, 2025. On Mar. 12, the government submitted an <a href="#">answer</a> to Khalil’s petition. At the time Khalil filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, he was being held at the ICE Detention Facility in Newark, New Jersey.” The government filed a <a href="#">response</a> to Khalil’s petition on Mar. 12, 2025. On Mar. 12, Judge Jesse Furman <a href="#">issued</a> an order granting summary judgment in favor of Khalil. Future filings will be made publicly available unless redacted or sealed.</p>

			<p>client call on Mar. 12 and at least one such call on Mar. 13.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 14, Petitioner Mahmoud Khalil <a href="#">filed</a> a motion arguing that, if the court concludes it is not the proper venue for the case, the Western District of Louisiana, as requested by the petitioner, is the proper venue for the case.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 15, Petitioner Mahmoud Khalil <a href="#">moved</a> for an order directing the release of Mr. Khalil for the pendency of the case. The court held that the ‘Foreign Policy Ground’ applies to him for the pendency of the case, and that the government’s arresting, detaining, and removing noncitizens who are engaged in activities that are in support of Palestinian rights or critical of Israel for the pendency of the case is not a substantial government interest.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 19, Judge Furman <a href="#">denied</a> the government’s motion to transfer the case, albeit to the District of New Jersey, not the District of Columbia.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Apr. 1, Judge Michael Farbiarz issued an order directing the parties to submit written comments soliciting the parties’ views on appealability of the order.</p>
<p><a href="#">Chung v. Trump</a> (S.D.N.Y.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-02412</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint and Habeas Petition</a></p>	<p>2025-03-24</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Yunseo Chung, a lawful permanent resident in the United States, has sued President Donald Trump for attempting to detain her under a State Department policy in violation of the First and Fifth amendments. The judge has temporarily suspended the court’s jurisdiction.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On January 29, 2025, President Donald Trump issued an executive order (EO) that would prioritize investigating “post October 7, 2023 cases of anti-Semitism.” The EO states: “Immediate action will be taken by the Department of State to investigate and punish anti-Jewish racism in leftist, anti-Israeli, and anti-American groups, and to remove resident aliens who violate our laws.”</p> <p>Following this EO, the Department of State adopted a Final Rule that would determine whether a noncitizen’s activities had “the potential to harm the national security” and permit the Department of Homeland Security to seek to detain the noncitizen. On Mar. 8, an Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officer detained Chung, a University student and lawful U.S. permanent resident, at a demonstration at Columbia on Mar. 5.</p> <p>Chung has not yet been detained and has proactively filed a lawsuit with the court to prevent government officials from taking enforcement action against her. Chung has also heard her case. She also requested that the Court vacate the EO on the basis that the policy violates the First and Fifth Amendments.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 24, Judge Naomi Reice Buchwald <a href="#">granted</a> Chung’s motion for a preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 28, Defendants submitted a <a href="#">notice of appeal</a>.</p>
<p><a href="#">Taal v. Trump</a> (N.D.N.Y.)</p> <p>Case No. 3:25-cv-00335</p> <p><b>CASE CLOSED</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-15</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Momodou Taal, a noncitizen lawfully residing in the United States, has sued Homeland Security and President Donald Trump seeking injunctive relief to prevent the authorities to detain noncitizens for participating in protests in support of the rights of free speech and due process and have asked the court to prevent deportations while the case proceeds.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, President Donald Trump issued an executive order (EO) directing the screening and vetting procedures to prevent the entry of noncitizens into the U.S. On Jan. 29, Trump issued an EO directing federal agencies to restrict access to higher education campuses. On March 14, 2025, the State Department issued an EO targeting noncitizens lawfully residing in the U.S. named Momodou Taal.</p> <p>On Mar. 15, Plaintiffs, Momodou Taal and other citizens, filed a lawsuit with the court to prevent the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and Secretaries of State and Education from enforcing parts of the EOs on the grounds that they vio</p>

			<p>and preliminary injunction, seeking to temporarily block while the case proceeds.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 22, the Government <a href="#">filed</a> an opposition.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 27, Judge Elizabeth <a href="#">Coombe denied</a> the request because it would not satisfy the high burden for a temporary restraining order. The court found that the government failed to show that the commencement of removal proceedings, Plaintiffs' removal, or the government's actions would cause irreparable harm. Judge Coombe wrote.</p> <p>The court recognized that same day the Plaintiffs had sought a preliminary injunction with the effect of the judgment. Plaintiffs also submitted a request for a briefing schedule in response.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 31, the Plaintiff submitted a notice of appeal to leave the United States.</p>
<p><a href="#">Vizguerra-Ramirez v. Choate et al</a> (D. Colorado)</p> <p>Case No. 25-cv-00881-NYW</p>	<p>Habeas petition (under seal)</p>	2025-03-18	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Jeanette Vizguerra-Ramirez, a Mexican citizen, filed a habeas petition claiming her detention is unconstitutional. On Mar. 21, Judge Wang ordered that the court vacate the order.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 17, Jeanette Vizguerra-Ramirez filed a habeas petition with the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado against U.S. Customs and Border Protection (ICE). On Mar. 18, she filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The court has not been placed in removal proceedings or subject to removal proceedings immediately and declare that her detention is unlawful.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 21, Judge Nina Wang <a href="#">ordered</a> that the U.S. District Court or court of appeals vacate the order.</p>
<p><a href="#">Ozturk v. Hyde</a> (D. Mass)</p> <p>Case no. 1:25-cv-10695</p>	<p>Habeas petition (Mar. 25, 2025) (under seal)</p> <p><a href="#">Amended habeas petition</a> (Mar. 28, 2025)</p>	2025-03-25	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Rumeysa Ozturk, a Turkish citizen and PhD student, filed a habeas petition claiming her detention is unconstitutional. Judge Talwani ordered that Ozturk not be removed from the District of Massachusetts.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 25, Rumeysa Ozturk, a citizen of Turkey, filed a habeas petition with the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts against the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The same day, she filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 25, Judge Indira Talwani issued an order granting the petition before moving Ozturk outside of the District of Massachusetts.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 28, Ozturk, now also represented by the American Association of University Professors, filed an amended petition.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Apr. 4, U.S. District Judge Denise Casper granted the petition, ordering Ozturk to Louisiana, instead ordering her transferred to the District of Columbia.</p>
<p><a href="#">American Association of University Professors v. Rubio</a> (D. Mass.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10685</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	2025-03-25	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Several academic groups have sued to block the implementation of a deportation policy of allegedly targeting non-citizens. The academic groups claim that the policy violates the Administrative Procedure Act.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, President Trump issued an executive order and vetting procedures to prevent the entry of individuals from non-citizens into the United States. On Jan. 29, the president issued an EO directing the Department of State to implement the policy on higher education campuses.</p> <p>On Mar. 25, Plaintiffs, the American Association of University Professors, the American Association of Law Schools, the Department of State, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Education, filed a complaint against the policy. Plaintiffs allege that the deportation policy creates a "chilling effect" on members of the academic groups from hearing from an individual who is not a citizen. Plaintiffs also allege that the policy is difficult for members to collaborate with noncitizen students. Plaintiffs also allege that the policy violates the First Amendment because it "entails the arrest, detention, and deportation of noncitizens" and is "not narrowly tailored to the government's interest." Plaintiffs also allege that the policy also violates the Fifth Amendment and the Administrative Procedure Act. Plaintiffs seek a court to block the agencies from further implementing the policy.</p>

			<b>Update 1:</b> On Apr. 1, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion</a> for from implementing or enforcing the policy.
<b>Executive Action: Other Habeas and Removal Actions</b>			
<a href="#">Gunaydin v. Trump</a> (D. Minn.) Case No. 0:25-CV-01151	Habeas petition (under seal)	2025-03-30	<b>Overview:</b> <i>Doğukan Günaydin, a citizen of Turkey, was re government allegedly cited an old DUI case as the reason, and continued detention.</i>  <b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 27, Doğukan Günaydin, a citizen outside of his home by plainclothes federal officers. He because his visa was canceled hours after his arrest and Department of Homeland Security has <a href="#">stated</a> that Gün:
<b>Executive Action: Deportation to a Third Country/Torture Prohibition (<a href="#">ICE Email Directive</a> on Expedited Removal and Nondeta</b>			
<a href="#">D.V.D. v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security</a> (D. Mass.) Case No. 1:25-cv-10676 First Circuit <a href="#">Case No. 25-1311</a>	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-03-23	<b>Overview:</b> <i>A group of noncitizens sued the U.S. Department country that is not their country or origin or citizenship (i. Plaintiffs claim that DHS’s practice violates multiple statu deportations on an emergency basis while the case procee</i>  <b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 18, 2025, the U.S. Department all cases of individuals previously released from immigr that differs from their countries of origin and/or citizen the practice of deporting individuals to a third country practice violates the Administrative Procedure Act, the of 1998, the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendmer  Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment stating that DHS rights; seek to enjoin Defendants from failing to provid order Defendants to return class members that have be <b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 23, the same day the complaint was (TRO) and preliminary injunction and stay of administ <b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 25, Defendants filed an <a href="#">opposition</a> t administrative action. <b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 28, Judge Brian Murphy <a href="#">granted</a> Pla a final order of removal from the United States to a thir meaningful opportunity to present a fear-based claim. <b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 28, the Defendants submitted a <a href="#">noti</a> <b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 29, Defendants <a href="#">filed</a> a Motion for pa unlawful and improper. Judge Murphy denied this moti motion for TRO. <b>Update 6:</b> On Apr. 7, the First Circuit <a href="#">denied the stay</a> o: The appeals court stated that the government’s issuanc target of their removal policy” that “only reinforces the
<b>Structure of Government/Personnel</b>			
<b>Executive Action: Reinstatement of Schedule F for Policy/Career Employees (<a href="#">Executive Order 14171</a>)</b>			
<a href="#">National Treasury Employees Union v. Donald J. Trump et al</a> (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00170	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-01-20	<b>Overview:</b> <i>National Treasury Employees Union (“NTEU” departments, sued the Trump administration to block the authorize the Director of the Office of Personnel Managen terminate them at will. NTEU argues the EO violates civil</i>  <b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s executive order authorizes th

			members of the civil service and strip them of their civil service protections at will. The National Treasury Employees Union sued to block the order and argues that the executive order violates laws Congress passed in 1978 with only limited exceptions for Senate-confirmed poli
<p><a href="#">Government Accountability Project v. Office of Personnel Management</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00347</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a> (Feb. 6, 2025)</p>	2025-02-06	<p><b>Overview:</b> A group of non-profit organizations who represent members of the Office of Personnel Management (“OPM”) alleging Trump’s Executive Order regarding career government workers. The non-profits argue that the order violates the Administrative Procedure Act.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 27, Director of the Office of Personnel Management issued an executive order, which aims to reclassify the civil service protections, enabling the president or heads of agencies to remove federal whistleblowers, federal employees, retirees and their survivors. The order, which violates the Administrative Procedure Act, violates the Civil Service Reform Act and Amendment Due Process rights. They seek a declaratory judgment and an injunction enjoining the administration from implementing the order.</p>
<p><a href="#">Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility v. Donald Trump et al</a> (D. Md.)</p> <p>Case No. 8:25-cv-00260-PX</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	2025-01-28	<p><b>Overview:</b> Non-profit organization Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (“PEER”) that would authorize the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to terminate them at will. The lawsuit seeks to block the order and argues that the executive order violates the Administrative Procedure Act and deprives civil servants of their rights under the Administrative Procedure Act.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s executive order authorizes the removal of federal employees and members of the civil service and strip them of their civil service protections at will. PEER, represented by Citizens for Responsibility and Freedom from Government Overreach, sued to block the executive order. The lawsuit argues that the executive order violates the Administrative Procedure Act by stripping them of protections guaranteed by the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>
<p><a href="#">American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO and American Federation of State, County And Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO v. Donald Trump et al</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00264</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	2025-01-29	<p><b>Overview:</b> Two major labor unions, representing over two million federal employees (“EO”) that changes workers’ job category, removing protections under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 27, Director of the Office of Personnel Management issued an executive order, which aims to reclassify the civil service protections, enabling the president or heads of agencies to remove federal, state and local employees – assert that the Trump administration violated the Administrative Procedural Act in issuing the order, 210.102(b)(3), 5 C.F.R. 210.102(b)(4), and 5 C.F.R. § 302.102(b)(3) as an injunction enjoining the Defendants from enforcing the order’s requirements.</p>
<b>Executive Action: Establishment of “Department of Government Efficiency” (DOGE) (<a href="#">Executive Order 14158</a> and <a href="#">Executive Order 14159</a>)</b>			
<p><a href="#">Public Citizen Inc et al v. Donald J. Trump and Office of Management and Budget</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00164</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	2025-01-20	<p><b>Overview:</b> Two advocacy organizations sued President Donald Trump’s Executive Order (“EO”) creating the Department of Government Efficiency and monetary power to unelected citizens without public comment. (<a href="#">American Public Health Association v. Office of Budget and Management</a>)</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s executive order renames the Department of Government Efficiency and reestablishes the office under the Executive Order. The American Federation of Government Employees sued, arguing that the order transfers decision-making authority to private citizens without public comment until it complies with the FACA’s requirements.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 18, 2025, Judge Jia M. Cobb (D.D.C.)</p>

			<p><a href="#">Lentini v. Department of Government Efficiency (complaint)</a> (complaint) must make all future filings in this case.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 3, 2025, Public Citizen Plaintiffs <a href="#">dis</a> Department of Government Efficiency and American Pt Office of Budget and Management.</p>
<p><a href="#">Jerald Lentini, Joshua Erlich, and National Security Counselors v. Department of Government Efficiency, Office of Management and Budget, Office of Personnel Management, Executive Office of the President, Elon Musk, Vivek Ramaswamy, Russell Vought, Scott Kapor, and Donald Trump</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00166</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-01-20</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>National Security Counselors (a public advoca Order (“EO”) establishing the Department of Government (FACA) by delegating regulatory and monetary power to u Citizen, Inc v. Trump.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s executive order renames the Efficiency) and reestablishes the office under the Execu Counselors, Inc., sued, arguing that the order violates t authority to private citizens without public access. The with the FACA’s requirements.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 18, 2025, Judge Jia M. Cobb (D.D.C.) } cases. Parties in <a href="#">Lentini v. Department of Government Eff</a> must make all future filings in <a href="#">Public Citizen</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 22, Plaintiffs submitted a <a href="#">notice</a> of 1 lawsuit describing his government position.</p>
<p><a href="#">American Public Health Association et al v. Office of Management and Budget, Acting Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Department of Government Efficiency</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00167</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-01-20</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Several public interest advocacy organizations Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE). The lawsui regulatory and monetary power to unelected citizens with</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s executive order renames the Efficiency) and reestablishes the office under the Execu order violates the Federal Advisory Committee Act, whi public access. The suit asks the court to enjoin the open</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 18, 2025, Judge Jia M. Cobb (D.D.C.) } cases. Parties in <a href="#">Lentini v. Department of Government Eff</a> must make all future filings in <a href="#">Public Citizen</a>.</p>
<p><a href="#">Center for Biological Diversity v. Office of Management and Budget</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00165</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-01-20</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The Center for Biological Diversity sued the O, demanding records related to communications between O information is important to the public interest.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s executive order renames the Efficiency) and reestablishes the office under the Execu Management and Budget under the Freedom of Inform leadership or those acting on its behalf.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 27, 2025, plaintiffs filed an <a href="#">amended</a> Amy Gleason. It also included a new second claim, with disclosure obligations violate the Administrative Proce</p>
<p><a href="#">J. Does 1-26 v. Musk</a> (D. Md)</p> <p>Case 8:25-cv-00462-TDC</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-13</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Twenty-six current and former employees of ti Department of Government Efficiency (“DOGE”) alleging 1 Appointments Clause and requesting that the court preven March 18, the Court ordered DOGE to halt its dismantling actions taken related to USAID. On March 21, Musk and 1</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s executive order renames the Efficiency) and reestablishes the office under the Execu</p>

			<p>contractors filed a lawsuit claiming that Elon Musk’s control of DOGE without Senate confirmation violates the Appointments Clause’s “significant authority” by controlling agency operations. The plaintiffs claim that this authority can be wielded only by properly appointed principal officers, not a principal officer while evading the constitutional requirements. This would be unconstitutional even if he were considered merely an agent of anyone to his position. The plaintiffs also argue that Musk’s “de facto command” that undermines Congress’s power to create and oversee executive branch conduct is unconstitutional. The suit asks the court to declare Musk’s government authority unless appointed by proper procedure unconstitutional.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 18, Plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion</a> for a preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 24, Defendants <a href="#">filed</a> a motion in response to the plaintiffs’ motion on Feb. 26.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 18, the Court <a href="#">granted</a> in part and denied in part the plaintiffs’ motion. Plaintiffs demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits regarding the removal of email, payments, security notifications, and other electronic communications, but did not enjoin the removal of personnel and contract terminations and closures of offices.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 19, Defendants filed a <a href="#">motion</a> for clarification on Mar. 18, claiming Jeremy Lewin should not be bound by the Court’s decision regarding USAID.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 20, the court <a href="#">denied</a> Defendant’s motion for summary judgment confirming Lewin is bound by the preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 21, Defendants <a href="#">appealed</a> the Court’s decision regarding the modification to the Fourth Circuit.</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 25, the Court <a href="#">ordered</a> that the district court’s decision on Mar. 27.</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Mar. 28, the Fourth Circuit <a href="#">granted</a> the District Court’s decision.</p>
<p><a href="#">New Mexico et al. v. Musk</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00429</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-13</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Fourteen states sued Elon Musk and the Department of Government Efficiency as head of DOGE violates the Constitution’s Appointment Clause by exercising significant authority over the executive branch action until this legal question is resolved. A federal court has acknowledged potential constitutional issues with Musk’s actions and requested by the states.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s executive order renames the Department of Government Efficiency and reestablishes the office under the Executive Order. Musk’s constitutional authority to exercise significant authority over the executive branch under the Appointments Clause. The complaint alleges that Musk’s actions, including making personnel decisions, and directing the operations of the United States. The suit asks the court to enjoin Musk and DOGE from exercising government authority and to grant preliminary and permanent injunctions to the same effect.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 17, the government submitted a <a href="#">decision</a> regarding Musk’s authority. Musk is not the head of DOGE nor an employee of DOGE.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb 18, Judge Tanya Chutkan <a href="#">denied</a> the plaintiffs’ motion for a favorable view of the Plaintiffs’ argument on the merits.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 24, plaintiff states filed a <a href="#">motion for summary judgment</a>. Defendants filed a <a href="#">memorandum in opposition</a> on Feb. 26. The plaintiffs seek to confirm public reporting about Defendants’ conduct, stop Musk from exercising unconstitutional and unlawful authority that Defendants’ actions and interrogatories generally concern DOGE’s and Musk’s authority to (1) terminating or placing federal employees on leave; (2) terminating or placing federal employees on leave; (3) suspending or cutting off funding; and (4) obtaining access, using, or making changes to government information.</p>

			<p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar 7, defendants filed a <a href="#">motion to dismiss</a> which relief can be granted.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 12, Judge Tanya Chutkan <a href="#">granted</a> Plaintiff to produce the requested documents and respond to the information.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 14, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a memorandum</a> concerning financial and programmatic harm and would continue to file.</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 19, Defendants <a href="#">filed a memorandum</a> in response.</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Mar. 20, the case <i>Japanese American Citizens League v. Musk</i> was filed.</p> <p><b>Update 9:</b> On Mar. 21, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a memorandum</a> in response.</p> <p><b>Update 10:</b> On Mar. 26, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit held that defendants “have shown a likelihood of success to dismiss before allowing discovery.”</p>
<p><a href="#">Japanese American Citizens League v. Musk</a> (D.D.C)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00643</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	2025-03-05	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A group of nonprofits filed a lawsuit against the Trump administration to block and/or reverse actions by DOGE to cut federal funding and reduce authority to take these actions.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiffs are four nonprofit organizations: Asian Pacific American Advocates, Sierra Club, and United for the People, and several executive agencies and their heads. Plaintiffs allege that they are harmed by DOGE’s cutting of funding to the National Park Service and historic sites. Plaintiffs allege that DOGE is cutting the federal budget, slash federal spending, reduce the federal workforce, terminate federal employees, and reduce the federal workforce. Defendants have acted in violation of the separation of powers, previously appropriated federal funds; terminating federal employees; working to abolish federal departments created by federal statute; and refusing to follow the Appointments Clause and the Administrative Procedure Act. Musk, DOGE, and Gleason have no legal authority to take these actions.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> This case has been consolidated with case 2:25-cv-00643. From this date forward, all pleadings shall be filed only in the lead case.</p>
<p><a href="#">Center for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Department of Interior</a> (D.D.C)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00612</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	2025-03-03	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>On Jan. 20, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Order 14176 (Department of Government Efficiency). On Feb. 19, Trump and his cabinet heads shall, in coordination with their DOGE Team Leads, review and rescind all regulations.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Order 14176 (Department of Government Efficiency). On Feb. 19, Trump and his cabinet heads shall, in coordination with their DOGE Team Leads, review and rescind all regulations. Plaintiffs, a nonprofit organization focused on habitat conservation, and the Center for Biological Diversity have violated the Administrative Procedures Act, the Freedom of Information Act, the FACA and have violated the APA and FACA, an injunction against work by DOGE employees, and an order of mandamus requiring the Department of the Interior to comply with the Administrative Procedures Act.</p>
<b>Executive Action: Solicitation of information from career employees</b>			
<p><a href="#">Jane Does 1-2 v. Office of Personnel Management</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00234</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	2025-01-27	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Two federal employees brought a class action lawsuit against the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) for an unauthorized email system to collect data on all civil servants. OPM denied the request to halt OPM’s actions and OPM has since continued to collect data.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) created a single email address, <a href="mailto:HR@opm.gov">HR@opm.gov</a>. Individuals claim that OPM is using this email address to collect data on all civil servants, which is a violation of the Privacy Act and the Freedom of Information Act.</p>

			<p>stored on an unsecure server at OPM. Plaintiffs, employees, and the public are requesting information, sued. The lawsuit alleges that it requires the Office of Personnel Management to conduct a search of records required under the law.</p> <p><b>Update 1 and 2:</b> On Feb. 4, 2025, the plaintiffs <a href="#">request</a> a TRO request and said an opinion will follow.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 11, OPM <a href="#">moved to dismiss</a> the Complaint claim upon which relief can be granted.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 17, 2025, in a <a href="#">Memorandum Opinion</a>, the court found ground that they had not shown they were likely to have the records.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 5, plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">memorandum in support of their motion</a>.</p>
--	--	--	---

**Executive Action: Disclosure of personal and financial records to DOGE**

<p><a href="#">Alliance for Retired Americans v. Scott Bessent et al</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00313</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-03</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> A group of labor unions representing federal employees and individuals affiliated with the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) sued the Treasury Department records in violation of the Privacy Act and the Freedom of Information Act to specific individuals with “read-only” access.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The complaint alleges that the Treasury Department transmitted financial information maintained by the Treasury Department to DOGE employees without an injunction and declaratory relief, as well as a <a href="#">temporary restraining order</a> and other actions in excess of legal authority under the Privacy Act.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 6, 2025, the parties in the suit mutually agreed to a <a href="#">settlement</a> regarding Treasury Department payment records and systems to provide “read-only” access, other employees who need to access the records.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 20, the court issued an order accepting the settlement.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 25, following a hearing the previous day, the court accepted the settlement underlying the decisions challenged in this case on or before Feb. 25.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 7, Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly <a href="#">denied</a> the motion to dismiss, finding that the “high standard” of showing a likelihood of success was not met. The court showed that Defendants imminently planned to make the records available to the federal government with no obligation to maintain its confidentiality, the Court found in favor of the plaintiffs.</p>
---	----------------------------------	-------------------	--

<p><a href="#">New York et al v. Donald J. Trump</a> (S.D.N.Y.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-01144-JAV</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-07</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> Nineteen state attorneys general sued President Trump and the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) for violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Privacy Act, and the Freedom of Information Act for certain payment records maintained by the Treasury Department in violation of federal law.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The complaint alleges that the Treasury Department violated the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) by its policy of giving expanded access to political appointees. The plaintiffs claim that the Treasury Department violated the APA for the unauthorized purpose of impeding payment records; for violation of the Privacy Act; and for violating the Freedom of Information Act and is ultra vires. The plaintiffs requested an emergency temporary restraining order against political appointees, special government employees, and contractors who have not received a background check, security clearance, or other required vetting.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> The case is before Judge Jeannette A. Vargas. She has granted a <a href="#">temporary restraining order</a> until Judge Vargas holds a hearing on the motion.</p>
---	----------------------------------	-------------------	---

			<p>Department’s systems and also requires prohibited per Department’s systems.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 21, Judge Vargas <a href="#">granted</a> a limited p DOGE-affiliated individuals to any payment record, pay containing personally identifiable information and/or c exists that sensitive information has already been shar court ordered the Treasury Department to submit a rep “the vetting and security clearances processes that mer authority pursuant to which each DOGE Team member reporting chains that govern the relationship between :</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 7, plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion for recon</a> personal identifying information (PII) protections of th</p>
<p><a href="#">AFL-CIO v. Dep’t of Labor</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00339</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-05</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A coalition of labor unions sued the Departme seeking to block DOGE’s access to internal DOL informati Privacy Act, the Economy Act, and other federal laws. A fe but indicated further analysis was needed in particular on</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 5, 2025, DOGE sought access t DOGE’s attempt to direct the agency and access interna unlawful under the Administrative Procedure Act as a p and Statistical Efficiency Act, violation of the Privacy A discretion. They seek temporary, preliminary, and perm DOGE, from taking adverse action against employees w Department of Labor information regarding that person On the same day as the complaint was filed, judge John DOL [Department of Labor] will not allow DOGE access</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 7, Judge Bates <a href="#">denied</a> the petition fo</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 12, Plaintiffs submitted a <a href="#">renewed r</a> access to their systems of records, except as consistent</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 14, Judge Bates <a href="#">denied</a> the renewed important for this denial of a TRO, the Court will benef</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 27, Judge Bates <a href="#">ordered</a> limited expe production of documents, and the deposition of four in Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Feb. 28, defendants filed a <a href="#">motion to disi</a> relief can be granted. Plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">memorandum in</a></p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 11, Defendants <a href="#">filed a motion</a> for re <a href="#">accompanying memorandum</a>, Defendants asserted that employees to any defendant agency, “should obviate th</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 13, Plaintiffs filed a motion opposir new employment arrangements do not “meet the excee</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Mar. 14, Defendants <a href="#">filed a memorandum</a> failed to state a claim.</p> <p><b>Update 9:</b> On Mar. 19, plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a notice of new ev</a> of DOGE in <i>Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Wasl</i> declaration supports their argument in favor of public :</p> <p><b>Update 10:</b> On Mar. 19, Judge Bates <a href="#">issued a memoran</a></p>
<p><a href="#">University of California Student Ass’n v. Carter et al</a></p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00354</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-07</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The University of California Student Associati Efficiency’s (“DOGE’s”) access to sensitive information sy: Procedure Act, the Privacy Act, and the Internal Revenue ( case proceeds.</i></p>



			<p>discovery in the case.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 8, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved for a preliminary information</a> to DOGE or its affiliates.</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 24, Judge Deborah L. Boardman <a href="#">gra</a> immediately filed a <a href="#">notice of appeal</a> and a <a href="#">motion to st</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Apr. 7, the Fourth Circuit <a href="#">granted a stay</a>.</p>
<p><a href="#">Electronic Privacy Information Center v. U.S. Office of Personnel Management</a> (E.D.V.A.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00255</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-10</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The Electronic Privacy Information Center (“E the Treasury Department, challenging the agencies’ disclo (“DOGE”) employees. The plaintiffs argue that the disclos theft, and goes beyond the agencies’ scope of authority. Th sharing and accessing the information. The court denied t speculative.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The complaint alleges that the Treasu financial information maintained by the Treasury Depa federal employee), sued, claiming that the transmissior identity theft and financial crimes. Plaintiffs also argue Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) and o declaratory relief curing the release of information and Administrative Procedure Act, Privacy Act, the Fifth An the DOGE defendants. Doe 1 also seeks an award of sta</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 12, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a TRO to en systems, to enjoin DOGE defendants from accessing inf</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 21, Judge Rossie D. Alston, Jr. issued for a preliminary injunction, and denying the motion. J would require the Court to make several leaps in reasor judge stated: “Although the Court is denying injunctive to protect their rights if, in the future, they experience evidence that unauthorized personnel accessed the BFS</p>
<p><a href="#">American Federation of Government Employees, et al. v. Office of Personnel Management et al.</a> (S.D.N.Y)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-01237</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-11</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The American Federation of Government Emp challenging the agencies’ alleging unlawful disclosure of s employees. The plaintiffs argue that the disclosure violat court to declare the disclosure unlawful, stop the agencies information disclosed.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiffs allege the Office of Personn contain sensitive personal and employment records of information, job performance information, health recor representing them, sued, arguing OPM’s disclosure of t Act; and that DOGE’s actions are ultra vires. They seek preliminary, or permanent injunctive relief; and an ord information.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 14, plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion for a ten opposition</a>. On Feb. 23, in light of a TRO issued by the I in requesting that their motion for a TRO be converted</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 27, plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion for expe</a> filed a <a href="#">reply</a> on Mar. 6. Judge Cote <a href="#">granted the motion</a> i</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 24, plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a memorandum</a> c</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 31, Defendants filed their <a href="#">Reply Me</a> argue that Plaintiffs do not have standing, that Plaintiff claims are not reviewable because they did not challeng Privacy Act.</p>

			<b>Update 5:</b> On Apr. 3, Judge Denise Cote <a href="#">denied</a> the gov claims.
<a href="#">Nemeth-Greenleaf, et al. v. Office of Personnel Management, et al.</a> (D.D.C.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00407	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-02-11	<b>Overview:</b> <i>Federal employees have sued the Office of Personal, health, and financial information to the Department. They have asked the court to stop fu</i>  <b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiffs are federal employees from allege that DOGE workers unlawfully accessed their pri Defendants are engaged in an “unlawful ongoing, syste Elon Musk and DOGE in violation of the Privacy Act, 5”
<a href="#">Gribbon et al. v. Musk</a> (D.D.C.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00422	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-02-12	<b>Overview:</b> <i>Six individuals sued Elon Musk, the Office of F The plaintiffs argue that by sharing their private informat declare Musk and the agencies’ actions unlawful, stop the identity theft and fraud protection services.</i>  <b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiffs filed a proposed class action return information with the federal government. The c security of Plaintiffs’ and Class members’” private info Abuse Act and that Defendants OPM and Treasury viol: damages “resulting from Defendants’ unlawful ongoing
<a href="#">Center for Taxpayer Rights v. IRS</a> (D.D.C.)  Case 1:25-cv-00457	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-02-17	<b>Overview:</b> <i>Several organizations, on behalf of taxpayers, private tax information the agencies gave to the Departme access, the agencies violated multiple federal laws and ex unlawful, stop DOGE’s access, and require the return or d</i>  <b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiffs filed a lawsuit challenging tl Internal Revenue Service. Plaintiffs are organizations t businesses, and public and private sector employees. Tl has violated the Federal Information Security Act, the I has engaged in “ultra vires” actions by “directing and c declaratory and injunctive relief to stop allegedly “wroi personal information in the IRS system to members of all unlawfully obtained information.
<a href="#">American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO v. Social Security Administration</a> (D. Md.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00596	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-02-21	<b>Overview:</b> <i>Three labor unions sued the Social Security A challenging the access to sensitive personal data of million multiple federal laws and the Constitution. The unions ha to delete the data, and stop any further sharing of inform</i>  <b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiffs filed a lawsuit challenging tl Administration data and systems. They allege that allo the Internal Revenue Code, the Privacy Act, the Federal Administrative Procedure Act. They further allege that nomination or confirmation violates the Appointments SSA data and systems unlawful, order DOGE to disgorg DOGE or SSA to enable DOGE to access SSA data or sys <b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 7, the plaintiffs filed an <a href="#">amended co</a> <b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 7, the plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a motion</a> for a <b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 20, Judge Ellen Lipton Hollander <a href="#">gr</a> <b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 21, Judge Ellen Lipton Hollander iss in the face of reporting that Acting SSA Commissioner

			<p>systems. The first letter <a href="#">clarifies</a> that the TRO applies to further the DOGE agenda.” The second letter <a href="#">clarifies</a> that access to redacted or anonymized data or records to the data “subject to certain conditions.”</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 24, Defendants filed a <a href="#">notice to appeal</a></p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Apr. 1, the Fourth Circuit <a href="#">denied</a> the appeal</p>
<b>Executive Action: “Fork Directive” deferred resignation offer to federal employees (<a href="#">OPM Directive</a>)</b>			
<p><a href="#">American Federation of Gov’t Employees, AFL-CIO v. Ezell</a> (D. Mass)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10276</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-04</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> Multiple labor unions sued the Office of Personnel Management program. The offer, sent to nearly all federal employees, goes back to February 6, 2025, where the unions say the implied alternative to the offer violated federal laws. The unions have asked the court to declare the February 6 deadline. The court initially suspended the offer, but the court removed the suspension and denied the unions’ request for a preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On January 28, 2025, the Office of Personnel Management described a deferred resignation program, an offer to resign in exchange for a “Fork Directive” email. A deadline for the offer was set for February 6, 2025. The unions filed suit under the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) because it is “arbitrary and capricious” and a “clear judgment that the directive violates the APA and that the directive is arbitrary and capricious.” The unions asked the court to suspend the February 6, 2025 deadline and an order that OPM suspend the directive.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 5, 2025, the plaintiffs <a href="#">requested</a> a temporary restraining order to provide written notice of the TRO to all federal employees.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 6, 2025, Judge George O’Toole issued a preliminary injunction. A hearing is scheduled.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 10, 2025, Judge O’Toole <a href="#">ordered</a> that the court hold a briefing and oral argument on the issues.” Defendants <a href="#">filed</a> a motion for summary judgment.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 12, 2025, Judge O’Toole <a href="#">dissolved</a> the preliminary injunction because the unions lacked Article III standing and that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 31, Plaintiffs <a href="#">amended their complaint</a> to add claims under the Administrative Procedure Act and ultra vires claims related to the Fork Directive.</p>
<b>Executive Action: Removal of independent agency leaders</b>			
<p><a href="#">Gwynne A. Wilcox v. Donald J. Trump et al</a> (D.C. Cir.)</p> <p>Case No. 25-5057</p> <p>Court below: D.D.C.</p> <p><a href="#">Case No. 1:25-cv-00334</a></p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-05</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> Gwynne Wilcox (a member of the National Labor Relations Board) sued the National Labor Relations Board as a violation of the National Labor Relations Act. Wilcox’s removal under federal law and that Wilcox was removed from office. The court held that Wilcox was unlawfully removed from office and that the court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> This case challenges President Trump’s removal of Gwynne Wilcox from the National Labor Relations Board. The suit alleges the removal is in violation of the National Labor Relations Act. The suit alleges that the President has no authority to remove Board members only in cases of neglect of duty under the Declaratory Judgement Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202. The suit also alleges that the President lacks authority to remove her. She also sued the President for interfering with her oversight of the termination.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 10, Plaintiff <a href="#">moved</a> for expedited summary judgment.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 21, the government <a href="#">filed</a> a cross-motion for summary judgment. The government argued that the President’s removal of Board members unconstitutionally conflicts with the President’s authority to remove Board members.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 6, Judge Beryl Howell <a href="#">granted</a> the plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment. The court issued a declaratory judgment that the President lacks authority to remove Wilcox from the NLRB; the court further ordered that Wilcox be allowed to continue her oversight of the termination. The court enjoined defendants from removing Wilcox or impeding her oversight of the termination.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 7, defendants <a href="#">appealed</a> to the D.C. Circuit.</p>

			<p>appeal. On Mar. 8, Judge Howell <a href="#">denied</a> the motion to s</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 10, the government filed an <a href="#">emerge</a> appeal. On Mar. 11, Wilcox filed her <a href="#">response</a>. On Mar.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 28, the D.C. Circuit, in a 2-1 <a href="#">decisio</a> appeal.</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 28, as well the Plaintiff submitted a</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Apr. 7, the D.C. Circuit, in a 7-4, en banc (</p>
<p><a href="#">Cathy A. Harris v. Bessent et al</a> (D.C. Cir.)</p> <p>Case No. 25-5037</p> <p>Court Below: D.D.C.</p> <p><a href="#">Case No. 1:25-cv-00412</a></p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-11</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Cathy A. Harris, a member of the Merit System MSPB without cause in violation of the Administrative Proc lawsuit proceeds and to declare her removal unlawful. A fi Trump likely did not meet the standard required for her re</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiff Cathy A. Harris challenges he agency. Plaintiff alleges that she received a one-senten of the White House Presidential Personnel Office, statin on the MSPB was set to expire in 2028, alleges that she statutory requirement that MSPB members may only b the action was ultra vires and violated the Administrati emergency temporary restraining order to reinstate he</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 11, Plaintiff <a href="#">moved</a> for a temporary the MSPB, and enjoining obstructing her access to the</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 18, Judge Rudolph Contreras <a href="#">grante</a> of the MSPB until the court rules on a preliminary inju</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 4, Judge Contreras <a href="#">granted</a> the plair Harris remains a member of the MSPB and that she ma inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. T</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 4, the government <a href="#">appealed to the I</a></p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 5, the district court <a href="#">denied</a> the gove</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 6, the government filed an <a href="#">emergen</a> On Mar. 10, Harris filed her <a href="#">response</a>. On Mar. 12, the g</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 28, the D.C. Circuit, in a 2-1 <a href="#">decisio</a> appeal.</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Mar. 28, as well the Plaintiff <a href="#">submitted</a> a</p> <p><b>Update 9:</b> On Apr. 7, the DC Circuit, in a 7-4, en banc d</p>
<p><a href="#">Grundmann v. Trump et al.</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00425</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-13</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Susan Grundmann (former Chair of the Feder from the National Labor Relations Authority as a violatio not meet the standard required for Grundmann’s removal her removal. A federal judge has ruled that her removal w</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb, 10, 2025, White House official position on the Federal Labor Relations Authority (FLR Plaintiff Susan Grundmann challenges her removal from Morse, Deputy Director of the White House Office of Pr the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statu by the President only upon notice and hearing and only declaratory relief and an injunction ordering her reinst</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 14, Plaintiff filed a <a href="#">motion</a> for preliminar</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 25, defendants filed a <a href="#">cross motion</a> i preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 12, Judge Sparkle Sooknanan <a href="#">grante</a> unlawful and granting a permanent injunction reinstat</p>

<p><a href="#">Dellinger v. Bessent</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00385-ABJ</p> <p><b>CASE CLOSED</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-10</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Hampton Dellinger, Special Counsel of the U.S. violation of a statute saying he may only be removed by th allowed him to resume his position while the case proceed decision on February 21. On March 5, 2025, the DC Circui Special Counsel of the U.S. Office of Special Counsel, and i</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiff Hampton Dellinger has been when he was nominated by the President and confirme founded by Congress as part of the Civil Service Reform come forward as whistleblowers. Once confirmed, the S for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in offic informing Dellinger that he was terminated, effective in different counts and seeks a declaratory judgment that only be removed for cause; and seeks an order that Del constitutionality of the statutory for-cause protection,</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 10, 2025, Judge Amy Berman Jackson February 13, 2025, while the parties submit their briefs</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 11, 2025, defendants appealed to th court’s administrative stay.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 12, 2025, the D.C. Circuit <a href="#">dismissed</a></p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 12, 2025, Judge Amy Berman Jackson Dellinger shall continue to serve as Special Counsel an</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Feb. 13, Defendants <a href="#">filed</a> an appeal to th pending appeal was <a href="#">denied</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Feb. 15, the D.C. Circuit <a href="#">rejected</a> the Def</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> The Government <a href="#">petitioned</a> the U.S. Suprem temporarily reinstated Dellinger.</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Feb. 21, the Supreme Court <a href="#">rejected</a> (7-2 appeal at this stage.</p> <p><b>Update 9:</b> On Feb. 26, Judge Jackson <a href="#">extended</a> the TRO she “complete[s] the written opinion on the consolidat (indicating she will rule on that day, Mar. 1).</p> <p><b>Update 10:</b> On Mar. 1, Judge Jackson issued an <a href="#">Opinion</a> DC Circuit.</p> <p><b>Update 11:</b> On Mar. 5, the DC Circuit in a 3-0 <a href="#">decision</a> the removal of [Dellinger] from his position as Special (</p> <p><b>Update 12:</b> On Mar. 6, Dellinger <a href="#">announced</a> that he wa</p>
--	----------------------------------	-------------------	---

<p><a href="#"><u>LeBlanc &amp; Felten v. United States Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board</u></a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00542</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-02-24</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>After all three Democratic members of the Pri them sued to challenge their removal. By law, the PCLOB i argue that they were dismissed unlawfully on the basis of that the Board does not have the authority to remove then the court to require the PCLOB (aside from the President) based on good cause.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan, 27, 2025, the U.S. Privacy and confirmed members of the Board. Plaintiffs represent t have Democratic and Republican members. Plaintiffs allege that the text, structure, and function o They also assert that by removing Board members solel with law.” They seek a declaration that the Defendants affiliation and for the court to “hold unlawful and set a (other than the President) from removing them from th to restore them to those positions.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Aviel v. Gor et al</u></a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00778</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-03-17</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b><i>On Mar. 17, the President and CEO of the Inte Government Efficiency (DOGE) involved in her purported i cannot be removed from her role on the basis that her rem the Constitution. The district court has provisionally orde</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 19, 2025, President Donald Tr Bureaucracy,” which mandated the reduction of the siz covered entity. After her purported removal as Presider Government Efficiency (DOGE) and several federal offic and Planning and for Management Resources for USAII alleges that she was unlawfully terminated because she Plaintiff also alleges that Trump did not follow the requ advice and consent of the Senate. Plaintiff requests the be removed from her office as President and CEO of the member of the IAF Board or the IAF President and CEC and CEO of the IAF and that Marocco has not been lawi</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 17, Plaintiff <a href="#"><u>filed a motion</u></a> for an im injunction. Plaintiff has requested that the Court order appoint any Board members without going through the act as a member of the Board of the IAF.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 26, Defendants <a href="#"><u>filed a motion</u></a> oppo: be made to post security for costs sustained by Defenda: have been wrongfully enjoined.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 31, Plaintiff <a href="#"><u>filed a reply motion</u></a> sup</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Apr. 4, Judge Loren Alikhan <a href="#"><u>granted a pr</u></a> and CEO of IAF, and enjoining Peter Marocco from serv court ordered a status report on or before Apr. 7.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Slaughter and Bedoya v. Trump</u></a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00909</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-03-27</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b><i>Rebecca Slaughter and Alvaro Bedoya, two De terminated by President Trump, have sued Trump and the removal was unconstitutional and unlawful because it wa. asked the court to order the Republican Commissioners ar</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 18, Rebecca Slaughter and Al (FTC), received a message from President Donald Trum effective immediately on the basis that their “continue Slaughter and Bedoya have sued Trump, as well as the I</p>

			the FTC’s Executive Director, David Robbins, on the basis of the separation of powers doctrine. Plaintiffs are asking the court to order the FTC to order them to treat plaintiffs as FTC Commissioners.
--	--	--	--

**Executive Action: Dismantling of USAID ([Executive Order 14169](#)) (State Dept [stop-work order](#))**

<p><a href="#">American Foreign Service Association v. Trump</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00352</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-06</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Two unions sued the Trump administration, claiming that the effort to dismantle USAID violated the separation of powers doctrine. The unions argue that the effort to dismantle USAID by appointing an independent administrator, restoring USAID to its original mission, and imposing restrictions on the administration, on the basis that the administration’s actions are unlawful and unconstitutional. The court granted the unions’ motion arguing that the court should have jurisdiction to hear the case.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration announced the suspension of foreign assistance, and the Secretary of State then issued stop-work orders for USAID employees. Later, Secretary of State Rubi Feroz was furloughed. On Feb. 3, Elon Musk posted that he had suspended USAID operations and that the State Department headquarters in Washington, D.C. was closed. On Feb. 4, the court issued a temporary restraining order (TRO) that would be placed on administrative leave as of 11:59pm on Feb. 4. The court found that the administration’s actions to dissolve USAID or merge it with the State Department violated the Administrative Procedure Act, the Appropriations Act, and the Constitution. The court also found that the administration’s actions are unlawful and unconstitutional. The court ordered the administration to halt efforts to shut down the agency, recall furloughs, and halt efforts to place more employees on administrative leave, and a permanent injunction barring the administration from such actions.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 7, Judge Carl J. Nichols <a href="#">issued</a> a temporary restraining order (TRO) preventing the administration from placing USAID employees on administrative leave or evacuating them. He rejected the administration’s argument that the plaintiffs (USAID employees) could not show sufficient harm from the TRO.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 13, the court <a href="#">extended</a> the TRO until further order of the court to allow the plaintiffs to clarify that no USAID employees can be involuntarily evacuated.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 14, the Government <a href="#">submitted</a> a declaration in support of its motion to dismiss the complaint. The declaration responds to the plaintiffs’ arguments and states that the plaintiffs are not subject to administrative leave or in the event of employment.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 21, Judge Nichols issued an <a href="#">Order</a> granting the plaintiffs’ motion for a TRO. His reasoning included that plaintiffs do not face irreparable harm and that they could pursue remedies with administrative leave.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 10, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for summary judgment, and that Defendants’ actions violate both the Constitution and the Administrative Procedure Act.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 11, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a temporary restraining order (TRO) to prevent the destruction of an internal email from Acting Executive Secretary of USAID.</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 12, the Defendants <a href="#">responded</a> to the plaintiffs’ motion. The defendants stated that the instruction to destroy documents was not intended to destroy documents occupied by USAID, and were copies “where the originals are stored.”</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Mar. 14, the Plaintiffs <a href="#">dropped</a> their Mar 10 motion for summary judgment.</p>
---	----------------------------------	-------------------	--

<p><a href="#">AIDS Vaccine Advocacy Coalition v. United States Department of State</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00400</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-10</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Two nonprofit organizations sued the Trump Development (“USAID”) funding. The organizations argue scope of authority, and violate the Constitution. The organ funding, and stop enforcement of the suspension. The cou underlying Executive Order (EO 14169) which affects emp failed to comply with the order, to which the court ordere noncompliance. The Trump administration appealed this the administration must continue to pay already appropri to pay nearly \$2 billion in foreign assistance for work perf termination of thousands of foreign aid contracts for work Mar. 10 decision to the US Court of Appeals for the Distric</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administri assistance,” and the Secretary of State then issued stop foreign assistance grants.</p> <p>Plaintiffs, AIDS Vaccine Advocacy Coalition (AVAC) and to stop the implementation of the Executive Order and grants from USAID to support their work. Both AVAC’s . Appropriations Act. Plaintiffs allege the Executive Orde staff, slashing their budgets, and impacting their ability legislative authority. They also allege the President has USAID, Secretary of State Marc Rubio, Office of Manage are arbitrary and capricious in violation of the Adminis Impoundment Control Act. Plaintiffs seek a declaratio stopping defendants from enforcing the Executive Orde</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 12, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a TRO enjoj enjoining stop-work orders, and reinstating foreign ass</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 13, the court <a href="#">granted</a> a TRO in this c The order enjoins implementation on the blanket susp of Executive Order 14169, individual personnel decisio</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 19, Plaintiffs filed an <a href="#">emergency mo</a> them in civil contempt. Plaintiffs allege that Defendant continued to suspend funding and enforce stop-work o</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 20, the court <a href="#">granted</a> in part plaintil complied with the terms of the TRO,” but did not make compliance with the order’ is required.” The granted m</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Feb. 24, plaintiffs in Global Health Coun a hearing the following day and, on Feb. 25, granted the letter of credit drawdown requests for work completed 11:59 pm on Wednesday, Feb. 26. The court further mai prompt payment of appropriated foreign assistance fur court, by Feb. 26 at noon, with all internal directives to</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Feb. 25, the Government submitted a <a href="#">noi stay</a> the court’s order pending appeal.</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Feb. 26, the district court <a href="#">rejected</a> and th</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Feb. 26, the Government <a href="#">filed</a> an applica pending) to vacate the district court’s TRO and grant an administrative stay and ordered a response by the plair</p> <p><b>Update 9:</b> On Feb. 28, the Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed its opposition</a></p> <p><b>Update 10:</b> On Mar. 5, the Supreme Court <a href="#">rejected</a> the</p> <p><b>Update 11:</b> On Mar. 6, Judge Amir H. Ali <a href="#">ruled from the</a> Mar. 10; but did not resolve the payments for foreign ai</p> <p><b>Update 12:</b> On Mar. 10, Judge Ali <a href="#">granted in part and d</a> government to pay nearly \$2 billion in foreign assistan</p>
--	----------------------------------	-------------------	--

			<p>review and termination of thousands of foreign aid con on the claim that the latter actions flowed from the ori; <b>Update 13:</b> On Apr. 1, Defendants <a href="#">appealed</a> Judge Ali’s injunction to the D.C. Circuit.</p>
<p><a href="#">Global Health Council v. Trump</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00402</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-11</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A group of organizations sued the Trump adm (“USAID”), laying off employees, and attempting to disma federal laws, and exceeded the authority of the agencies a administration, and stop the administration from implem this case up to the US Supreme Court. On March 5, 2025, appropriated foreign assistance funds. On March 10, the l work performed before Feb. 13, but it did not reject the Stc after that date. On April 1, the Trump administration app Columbia Circuit (D.C. Circuit).</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> A group of for-profit and nonprofit org actions to defund USAID, lay off or furlough employees detailed chronology of the actions, memoranda, and st; projects by freezing future funds, plaintiffs also allege t Democracy International, approximately \$120 million f Plaintiffs allege that neither the President, nor the Seci withhold already-appropriated funds, citing the Consti Control Act and the Anti-Deficiency Act. Plaintiffs also were arbitrary and capricious, and contrary to statutory defendants’ actions to implement Executive Order 141( 14169 and from “dismantling USAID.”</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 11, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a TRO enjo</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 13, the court <a href="#">granted</a> a TRO in this c narrower terms than originally requested. The order en not enjoin enforcement or implementation of Executiv contracts.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 20, the court <a href="#">granted</a> in part plainti complied with the terms of the TRO,” but did not make compliance with the order’ is required.” The granted m <i>Department of State.</i></p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 24, plaintiffs filed an <a href="#">emergency ren</a> on Feb. 25, granted the motion for a <a href="#">proposed order</a> rec for work completed prior to the TRO, as well as reimbu The court further mandated that the Administration ta foreign assistance funds going forward. The court also j internal directives to agency employees concerning cor</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Feb. 25, the Government submitted a <a href="#">no</a> <a href="#">stay</a> the court’s order pending appeal.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Feb. 26, the district court <a href="#">rejected</a> and th</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Feb. 26, the Government <a href="#">filed</a> an applica pending) to vacate the district court’s TRO and grant an administrative stay and ordered a response by the plair</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Feb. 28, the Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed its opposition</a></p> <p><b>Update 9:</b> On Mar. 5, the Supreme Court <a href="#">rejected</a> the D</p> <p><b>Update 10:</b> On Mar. 6, Judge Amir H. Ali <a href="#">ruled from the</a> Mar. 10; but did not resolve the payments for foreign ai</p> <p><b>Update 11:</b> On Mar. 10, Judge Ali <a href="#">granted in part and d</a> government to pay nearly \$2 billion in foreign assistan review and termination of thousands of foreign aid con</p>

			on the claim that the latter actions flowed from the ori; <b>Update 12:</b> On Apr. 1, Defendants <a href="#">appealed</a> Judge Ali’s injunction to the D.C. Circuit.
<a href="#">Personal Services Contractor Association v. Trump et al</a> (D.D.C.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00469	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-02-18	<b>Overview:</b> <i>The Personal Services Contractor Association, (“USAID”), challenged President Donald Trump’s Executive an immediate temporary restraining order and a permanent appropriated foreign assistance funds. On Mar. 6, a federal</i>  <b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration assistance,” and the Secretary of State then issued <a href="#">stop</a> foreign assistance grants. The Personal Services Contractor Association filed suit effectively suspended U.S. foreign aid and began disservice have caused severe disruption, including contractors being healthcare, and being unable to carry out humanitarian powers against Trump, (2) violation of the Take Care Clause arbitrary and capricious actions against all defendants (including under the Impoundment Act and Anti-Deficit temporary relief (to restore USAID contractors to their relief to prevent USAID’s dismantling, its absorption in assistance funds without congressional approval. They <b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 19, Plaintiffs submitted a <a href="#">motion</a> for <b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 6, Judge Carl Nichols <a href="#">ruled from the</a> Nichols said the complaints should be adjudicated by the plaintiffs had not established that they would suffer
<b>Executive Action: Denial of State Department Funds</b>			
<a href="#">National Endowment for Democracy v. United States</a> (D.D.C.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00648	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-03-05	<b>Overview:</b> <i>The National Endowment for Democracy (NED) lawsuit alleging that the administration withheld funds from Branch from further withholding funds while the case is in process of receiving the federal funds in question.</i>  <b>Case Summary:</b> The National Endowment for Democracy appropriated to the Endowment by Congress. The NED Congress specified that the NED would be funded by an Endowment via grants from the Department of State. The account held by the Department of Treasury on an as-needed The complaint alleges that for the past month, “the Executive appropriated funds—something that has never occurred claims it is “experiencing a devastating cash flow crisis of its core institutes and grantees.” The complaint alleges appropriated by Congress, and by not doing so, it is acting scheme creates a mandatory, non-discretionary duty for congressionally appropriated funds.” The complaint argues violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the All V and the Separation of Powers. Plaintiffs seek declaratory barring Defendants from impounding the Endowment’s <b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 6, plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion for a temporary</a>
<b>Dismantling the U.S. African Development Foundation (Executive Order 14127)</b>			

<p><a href="#">Brehm v. Marocco</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00660</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-06</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Ward Brehm, a U.S. African Development Fou appointed acting Chair of the USADF Board), DOGE, and government offices, including USADF, was unlawful. Brehm while the case proceeds and/or to block the EO in its entir on an immediate and short-term basis on March 6, on Ma case proceeds from there.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 19, President Trump issued E: functions” of four government entities, including the U actions. On Feb. 21, DOGE allegedly demanded access t requirements that DOGE employees would have to sati: Board, allegedly received notice from the White House USADF management allegedly received a letter from PI previously appointed members of the Board allegedly h unlawful. On Mar. 5, Brehm allegedly informed DOGE t him access to its offices.</p> <p>On Mar. 6, Brehm in his personal and official capacity, f actions are (1) an ultra vires violation of the African De confirmed by the Senate; (2) an ultra vires violation of law and in excess of statutory authority. Brehm seeks a appointment was unlawful; preliminary and permanen removal by any entity other than the Board.</p> <p>The same day, plaintiff filed a <a href="#">motion for a temporary r</a></p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 6, Judge Richard J. Leon <a href="#">issued</a> an a from being appointed to the Board.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 11, Judge Leon issued a <a href="#">Memorandu</a> identified any cognizable irreparable harm to himself a (emphasis in original). As an aside, Judge Leon wrote t does not permit the appointment of Marocco and “[t]he provides President Trump with the authority to appoin</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 21, the Plaintiff submitted a <a href="#">motior</a></p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 31, Defendants submitted a <a href="#">cross-r</a> preliminary injunction. Defendants contend that Brehr experienced is neither irreparable nor warrants extraor</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Dismantling of Consumer Financial Protection Bureau</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">National Treasury Employees Union v. Russell Vought</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00381</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a> (Feb. 6, 2025)</p> <p><a href="#">Amended Complaint</a> (Feb. 13, 2025)</p>	<p>2025-02-09</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>National Treasury Employees Union, represen Financial Protection Bureau (“CFPB”), challenged the Tru restraining order against the CFPB and Acting Director Ri records, terminating employees without cause, or disbursi appealed this order.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The Consumer Financial Protection B recession, to support and protect American consumers tombstone emoji on his X account. On Feb. 8, Russell V Reserve that CFPB would not take “its next draw of una In an email to CFPB employees, Vought directed the CF stakeholder engagement,” pause all pending investigat also notified the CFPB workforce that the Washington I CFPB from drawing down more funding and ordering a Congress’s decision to create CFPB, which would be a v Vought’s directives are unlawful and an injunction that enforcement work.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 13, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for an administ</p>

			<p>staff, requiring that cease work directives be lifted, and <b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 14, 2025, the court <a href="#">ordered</a> that the other than for cause or issue any notice of reduction-in-operating obligations, pending the resolution of plaintiff motion for a preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 24, the government filed a <a href="#">memorandum</a></p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 12, both parties filed a <a href="#">joint notice</a> and the court rules on Plaintiffs’ preliminary injunction, which regarding contracts during this period.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 28, Judge Amy Berman Jackson <a href="#">granted</a> the motion.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 29, the government <a href="#">appealed</a> Judge</p>
<p><a href="#">Mayor and City Council of Baltimore et al. v. CFPB</a> (D. Md.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00458-ABA</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-12</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, along with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (“CFPB”) and Acting Director Russell Vought, filed a lawsuit in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, arguing that a recent executive order from the President of the United States, which directed the Administration to stop transferring or reducing funding to the CFPB or the Department of Treasury, or otherwise reducing funding to the CFPB, is unconstitutional and violates the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 7, 2025, President Trump named Acting Director Russell Vought to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). On Feb. 8, Vought instructed the Reserve Board of Governors that he was requesting \$0.1 billion in funding for the CFPB. The Board of Governors is unable to perform its statutorily mandated functions. For the first time, the CFPB is unable to access its customer complaint database, and its ability to serve its constituents will be deprived of the CFPB’s enforcement authority. The CFPB Action Maryland Fund, a direct services nonprofit that provides financial counseling, is unable to access its complaint databases and other resources CFPB publishes. The CFPB’s actions violate the Administrative Procedure Act (including the APA), and the Acting Director to request transfer of an amount “reasonably in excess of the amount available under financial law.” Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment and injunctive relief to stop the defunding of CFPB.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 12, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a TRO enjoining the Administration from <a href="#">opposing</a> on Feb. 20.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 25, Judge Matthew J. Maddox issued an <a href="#">order</a> extending that directive for another 14 days.</p>
<b>Dismantling/Restructuring of the Department of Education (<a href="#">Executive Order</a> of Mar. 20, 2025)</b>			
<p><a href="#">State of New York v. McMahon</a> (D.Mass)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10601</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-13</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Twenty states and the District of Columbia request the court to enjoin the administration’s planned Reduction in Force (RIF) of half of the employees of the Department of Education (DOE) on claims of violations of the constitutional separation of powers and the Administrative Procedure Act.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On March 13, the Attorneys General of 20 states and the District of Columbia filed a lawsuit with the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, asking the court to enjoin the administration to halt a planned Reduction in Force (RIF) of half of the employees of the Department of Education (DOE). The RIF is itself only an announced “first step” in a “total shutdown” of the DOE. The RIF points to statutory authority that mandates DOE functions, including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act, and civil rights laws. It states the Secretary of Education is “one of the officers of the Department” or modifying “one of the functions of the Department” under 20 U.S.C. § 3473(a). Under counts alleging constitutional violations, the states move the Court to enjoin the RIF.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 24, Plaintiffs <a href="#">submitted</a> a motion for</p>

<p><a href="#"><u>Carter v. Department of Education</u></a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00744</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-03-14</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Two parents and the Council of Parent Attorn Education Linda McMahon, and Acting Assistant Secretar Department’s Office of Civil Rights (OCR) and the OCR’s j Plaintiffs allege that these actions have inhibited OCR’s a</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Shortly after President Donald Trump responsible for processing and investigating civil rights ended this “pause” on OCR complaint processing, but h the employees at the remaining offices. Plaintiffs, two j that the Trump administration’s actions violate the Ad congressional statutes including the Impoundment Act under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment. injunctive relief to restore OCR’s complaint processing</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Somerville Public Schools v. Trump</u></a> (D. Mass.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10677</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-03-24</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Public school districts in Massachusetts and u Linda McMahon, and the U.S. Department of Education, c the Department of Education without Congressional actio</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 11, Secretary of Education Lin 2,000 employees, or almost half of the Department of E issued an <a href="#"><u>Executive Order</u></a> ordering McMahon to “take : Plaintiffs, including public school districts that rely on school districts, sued, alleging that Congress has exclus government’s actions violate the Separation of Powers various prohibitions contained in the Administrative P authority; and action not in accordance with law). Plair and preliminary and permanent injunctions against the <b>Update 1:</b> On Apr. 1, Plaintiffs filed a <a href="#"><u>motion</u></a> for a prel proceeding with the plans outlined in the Mar. 11 Mass employment was terminated or otherwise eliminated b</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Morgan v. McMahon</u></a></p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00416</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-03-19</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Pro se Plaintiff Amanda Morgan filed suit cha income-based repayment student loan plans and accomp an abuse of discretion, and otherwise contrary to the High</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiff Amanda Morgan alleges that borrowers from accessing the recertification forms and website. Morgan further alleges that on or about Febru. DOE instructed the providers to stop accepting and pro income for those borrowers who were already on incom being put on a new repayment plan that more than qua Morgan alleges that Secretary McMahon’s decision is a Education Act. Morgan has requested that the court cor repayment plans, enjoin her removal from her income- and provide her with answers to questions posed in the</p>

<p><a href="#">Association for Education Finance and Policy Inc. v. McMahon</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case no. 1:25-cv-00999</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-04-04</p>	<p>[Coming soon]</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Actions Toward US Institute of Peace</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">US Institute of Peace v. Jackson</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00804</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-18</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> On Mar. 18, the United States Institute of Peace filed suit against several officials and entities within the federal government without following the process mandated by the Constitution. The plaintiffs argue that the decision by ex officio Board members Marco Rubio to appoint a new President is unlawful. Finally they challenge the forcible removal of the President's efficiency. On Mar. 19, the Court denied Plaintiffs' motion for a writ of mandamus.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 19, President Trump issued an executive order to remove the USIP from the federal government. The EO named the USIP, an independent institution. Since the EO was issued, all of USIP's Board members were removed. Ex officio Board members fired USIP's President and appointed a new President. The DOJ, with the help of law enforcement, physically took control of USIP with several Board members, filed suit against numerous Board members. The Plaintiffs argue that since Congress created the USIP, the President has no authority to take action towards USIP through the process through which Board members and the President were appointed. The Plaintiffs argue that the President's actions are unlawful and without legal effect. The Plaintiffs seek to have the President removed and also seek injunctions prohibiting trespass against USIP and control over USIP's offices, computer systems, or records. If the Plaintiffs remain members of the Board, the President's removal of Board members has not been lawfully appointed to any position.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 19, the Court <a href="#">denied</a> the Plaintiffs' motion for a writ of mandamus. The Court did not make a sufficient showing of a likelihood of success.</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Termination of Inspectors General</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">Storch et al. v. Hegseth et al.</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00415</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-12</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> Eight Inspectors General of federal departments and agencies violated the Inspector General Act and a federal judge reportedly told the Inspectors General to wait for a writ of mandamus.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 24, 2025, the White House sent termination emails to eight Inspectors General and their agencies informing them that they had been terminated. The Inspectors General argued that the termination of government email accounts and computer systems, and the removal of the Inspectors General without a substantive, case-specific rationale for removal. The Inspectors General sought a writ of mandamus compelling defendants not to obstruct the Inspectors General from taking action to prevent plaintiffs from carrying out their duties. The Inspectors General argued that termination emails are legally ineffective and that plaintiffs are entitled to a writ of mandamus to prevent plaintiffs from carrying out their duties.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 14, the judge <b>reportedly</b> told lawyers to file a temporary restraining order.</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Large-scale reductions in force (<a href="#">Executive Order 14210</a>)</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">National Treasury Employees Union v. Donald Trump</a> (D.D.C.)</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-12</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> Multiple unions have challenged President Donald Trump's "deferred resignation" program, and preparations for the program. The unions have asked the court to declare these actions unlawful.</p>

<p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00420</p>			<p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 11, 2025, President Trump issued large-scale reductions in force (RIFs).” Plaintiff “deferred resignation program,” violates separation of Procedure Act by imposing RIFs contrary to regulations unlawful, along with injunctions to prevent agency head deferred resignation program.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 14, plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion for a temporary restraining order</a></p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 17, plaintiffs filed an <a href="#">amended complaint</a></p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 20, Judge Christopher R. Cooper <a href="#">declined</a> that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction and declined</p>
<p><a href="#">Maryland et al. v. U.S. Department of Agriculture et al.</a> (D. Md.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00748-ABA</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-06</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> Plaintiff states have challenged President Donald Trump’s attempt to prepare to initiate large-scale reductions in their workforce. Plaintiffs seek to enjoin the regulatory requirements for initiating that type of workforce reductions, reinstate any employees who were fired as part of the RIF, and require the employees pursuant to a RIF before reinstating the alleged</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 11, 2025, President Trump issued large-scale reductions in force (RIFs).” Plaintiff States allege that Defendant agencies violated regulatory requirements for RIF procedures including a) adopted were arbitrary and capricious. They seek declaratory judgment; 1) reinstate any probationary employees; 2) reinstate any employees who were fired during the second inauguration; 3) refrain from separating any employees; and 4) conduct any future RIFs in accordance with the law.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 7, plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a motion for a temporary restraining order</a></p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 13, the district court <a href="#">granted</a> plaintiffs’ request for a temporary restraining order that the government said “it dismissed each one of the reasons. On the record before the Court, this isn’t true. Collectively.”</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 14, the government <a href="#">filed a notice of appeal</a></p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 20, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a motion</a> request for the court to reinstate all affected employees, and impose a preliminary injunction that would require the government to meet relevant legal requirements.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 21, plaintiffs <a href="#">moved to extend the temporary restraining order</a></p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 21, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals <a href="#">vacated</a> the resolution of an appeal.</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 24, the government <a href="#">filed a motion to dismiss</a></p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Mar. 26, Judge Breder held a <a href="#">hearing</a> on the government’s motion to dismiss</p> <p><b>Update 9:</b> On Mar. 26, Judge Breder <a href="#">ordered</a> the parties to appear in court for a hearing at 10 am on Mar. 27.</p> <p><b>Update 10:</b> On Mar. 26, the Court <a href="#">extended the TRO</a> through Mar. 27</p> <p><b>Update 11:</b> On Mar. 27, the Defendants filed a <a href="#">supplemental motion</a> arguing that the TRO should only apply to affected employees who were not</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Termination of probationary employees</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">American Federation Of Government Employees, AFL-CIO v. Office of Personnel Management and Ezell</a> (N.D. Cal.)</p> <p>Case No. 3:25-cv-01780</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a> (Feb. 19, 2025);</p> <p><a href="#">Amended Complaint</a> (Feb. 23, 2025)</p>	<p>2025-02-19</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> A group of labor and nonprofit organizations filed a lawsuit against the federal government and federal employees en masse. The organizations argue that the government’s actions violate federal law. The organizations also argue that the Office of Personnel Management’s failure to comply with the law is unlawful, void the mass termination order and ordered the government to remove that temporary block.</p>

<p>(Ninth Circuit <a href="#">Case No. 25-1677</a>)</p> <p>Supreme Court <a href="#">docket 24A904</a></p>			<p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 13, 2025, the Office of Personnel Management terminated tens of thousands of probationary employees in their first year of employment or of the excepted service in their first year who have recently been employed in a new position or promotion. Among the factual claims, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants falsely state that the terminations are for performance under the Administrative Procedure Act and separation of powers regulating agency hiring and firing. They seek a declaratory judgment and injunction setting aside OPM’s order, ceasing terminations, and enjoining the agencies to hire and rehire employees.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 23, Plaintiffs filed an <a href="#">amended complaint</a> requesting updates on their week-to-week a resignation.”</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 27, Judge William Alsup <a href="#">reportedly</a> directed the agencies to fire probationary employees. Alsup noted that the agencies (the National Park Service, National Science Foundation, Veterans Affairs, and Department of Defense), and that covered, Alsup said, “I am going to count on the government to let some of these agencies know what I have ruled.”</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 28, Judge Alsup <a href="#">issued</a> an Opinion a termination of probationary workers were “unlawful, in violation of notice of the order to the six agencies.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 13, Judge Alsup held a preliminary injunction hearing. Alsup directed counsel to file briefs by Mar. 21.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 13, the Defendants submitted a <a href="#">not</a> to file.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 17, the Ninth Circuit <a href="#">denied</a> the government’s motion.</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 24, the government <a href="#">filed an application</a> for a preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Mar. 24, Judge Alsup issued two orders on remand regarding matter jurisdiction in the case, and therefore reversed the <a href="#">order</a> <a href="#">ordered</a> the government to show cause that relief should be granted.</p> <p><b>Update 9:</b> On Mar. 26, the Ninth Circuit <a href="#">denied</a> Defendants’ motion.</p> <p><b>Update 10:</b> On Mar. 26, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed</a> a motion to compel the government to argue that Defendants have failed to reinstate terminated employees in court on Feb. 27.</p> <p><b>Update 11:</b> On Mar. 27, one Plaintiff – the State of Washington – sought to extend prior relief awarded to the class of Plaintiffs to include the order Defendants to cease unlawful terminations.</p> <p><b>Update 12:</b> On Apr. 8, the U.S. Supreme Court <a href="#">granted</a> certiorari. The decision was based solely on the allegations of the nine non-prosecuted employees are presently insufficient to support the organizations’ claims. The decision is not form the basis of the District Court’s preliminary injunction.</p>
--	--	--	--

**Executive Action: Assertion of Executive Control of Independent Agencies ([Executive Order 14215](#))**

<p><a href="#">Democratic National Committee v. Trump</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00587</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-28</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Three national committees of the Democratic National Committee sought to challenge the President’s assertion of executive control over independent regulatory agencies, specifically the Federal Election Commission, and ask the court to block the EO.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 18, 2025, President Trump issued Executive Order 14215, asserting that independent regulatory agencies such as the Federal Election Commission fall under the supervision and control of the President and Attorney General’s interpretation of the Constitution. The order applies to the Federal Election Commission’s review provisions of the Federal Election Campaign Act.</p>
--	----------------------------------	-------------------	--

			<p>the Commission with authority to interpret it (rather than a declaratory judgment that the FECA is constitutional and a preliminary and permanent injunctive relief.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 11, plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a motion</a> for a preliminary injunction under FECA and that plaintiffs will suffer irreparable harm absent the injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 14, Trump and Attorney General Pauley, in their capacity as the President and Attorney General, respectively, issued an <a href="#">executive order</a> and <a href="#">accompanying memorandum</a>, they assert that plaintiffs lack subject-matter jurisdiction to hear the case.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 21, the FEC and its individual commissioners issued an <a href="#">executive order</a> and <a href="#">accompanying memorandum</a>, they assert various deficiencies, including lack of ripeness, and subject-matter jurisdiction.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 25, Trump and Bondi, in their capacity as the President and Attorney General, respectively, issued an <a href="#">executive order</a> and <a href="#">accompanying memorandum</a> asserting that plaintiffs' claim lacks standing and ripeness.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 25, the FEC and its individual commissioners issued an <a href="#">executive order</a> and <a href="#">accompanying memorandum</a> in response to plaintiffs' motion for a PI, asserting that plaintiffs' allegations are insufficient to establish irreparable harm.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On April 1, plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">reply</a> in support of their motion for a PI, asserting that plaintiffs' allegations are sufficient to establish irreparable harm.</p>
<b>Executive Action: Disclosure of civil servant personnel records</b>			
<p><a href="#">Comans v. Department of Homeland Security</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00624</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-04</p>	<p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 11, 2025, plaintiff Mary Comans was fired from her position as a Department of Homeland Security (DHS) contractor. Her firing was announced in a Department of Homeland Security (DHS) press release. Comans and other activists to undermine the will and safety of the American people. Comans alleges that the DHS administration violated the Privacy Act by (1) unlawfully releasing her records to the public and (2) failing to make reasonable efforts to ensure her records are accurate and complete. Comans seeks monetary damages.</p>
<b>Executive Action: Layoffs within Bureau of Indian Education</b>			
<p><a href="#">Pueblo of Isleta v. Secretary of the Department of the Interior</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00696</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-07</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Three tribal nations and five Native American students sued the Department of the Interior (DOI) for allegedly overseeing the implementation of the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) schools. The lawsuit argues that these actions violated the students' rights to quality education and safe school environments.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The BIE, overseen by the Department of the Interior, has been restructured its operations, resulting in degraded educational quality and safety at Haskell Indian Nations University. The plaintiffs, three tribal nations (Pueblo of Isleta, Prairie Band of Potawatomi Nation, and the Navajo Nation) and five Native American students sued the Department of the Interior for allegedly exercising its discretion under the Administrative Procedure Act and the National Indian Education Act in 2011. The plaintiffs seek a preliminary injunction to stop further restructuring and to ensure compliance with tribal consultation requirements and the National Indian Education Act.</p>
<b>Executive Action: Rescission of Collective Bargaining (Sec. Noem <a href="#">Memorandum</a> Feb. 27, 2025) (DHS <a href="#">Statement</a> Mar. 7, 2025) (Executive Order Mar. 13, 2025)</b>			
<p><a href="#">American Federation of Government Employees AFL-CIO v. Noem</a> (W.D. Wa.)</p> <p>Case No. 2:25-cv-00451</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-13</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A coalition of unions challenges the actions of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), and the Department of Justice (DOJ) regarding the unilateral termination of a negotiated union contract with Transportation Security Officers (TSOs).</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Case Summary: On Mar. 7, DHS announced the termination of the contract with the Transportation Security Officers (TSA) Transportation Security Officer Union (TSO). On Mar. 13, 2025, a coalition of unions, including the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), the National Education Association (NEA), and the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), filed a lawsuit with the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington, challenging the termination of the contract.</p>

			<p>the Association of Flight Attendants-CWA (“AFA-CWA”)</p> <p>The plaintiffs argue that the Trump administration’s te (1) constitute unconstitutional retaliation against AFG Amendment due process, and (3) violate the Administr</p> <p>The plaintiffs seek immediate injunctive relief to preve representation, and stripping workers of their bargaini</p>
<p><a href="#">National Treasury Employees Union v Trump</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00935</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-31</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>National Treasury Employees Union (NTEU), Administration alleging President Trump’s Executive Order 12 such agreements negotiated by NTEU, is unlawful. NTEU</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 27, President Trump issued an bargaining agreements, including nearly one dozen agr representing federal workers.</p> <p>NTEU is bringing this suit against the President and th reduce the number of employees it represents, diminish alleges that the EO is unlawful and ultra vires on the gr U.S.C. § 7103(b)(1)), and violates NTEU’s First Amendr Management (OPM) Guidance on the EO are unlawful : OPM guidance on the EO.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Apr. 4, NTEU filed a motion for a prelimi the EO.</p>
<p><a href="#">American Federation Of Government Employees, AFL-CIO v. Trump</a> (N.D. Cal.)</p> <p>Case No. 4:25-cv-03070</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-04-03</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Several unions representing civilian employee. terminating the employees’ collective bargaining protectio violate the First Amendment, the Fifth Amendment, and tl</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 27, President Trump issued an bargaining agreements.</p> <p>A number of unions representing federal employees th: and numerous federal agencies at which the unionized because it was issued in retaliation for the Plaintiffs’ fil constitutes viewpoint discrimination. The Plaintiffs als that created the collective bargaining system and woul violates the Fifth Amendment’s Procedural Due Proces: declaratory and injunctive relief finding that the EO an Defendants from giving effect to the EO.</p>
<p><a href="#">American Foreign Service Association v. Trump</a></p> <p>Case No.1:25-cv-01030</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-04-04</p>	<p>[Coming soon]</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Changes to Social Security Administration</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">American Association of People With Disabilities v. Dudek</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00977</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-04-02</p>	<p>[Coming soon]</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Museums and Public Libraries (<a href="#">Executive Order 14238</a> - Continuing the Reduction of the Federal Bureaucracy</b></p>			

<p><a href="#">State of Rhode Island v. Trump</a> (D.R.I.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00128</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-04-04</p>	<p>[Coming soon]</p>
<p><a href="#">American Library Association v. Sonderling et al</a></p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-01050</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-04-07</p>	<p>[Coming soon]</p>

**Government Grants, Loans and Assistance**

**Executive Action: “Temporary Pause” of grants, loans, and assistance programs**

<p><a href="#">National Council of Nonprofits v. Office of Management and Budget</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00239-LLA</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-01-28</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Small business and nonprofit recipients of fed requiring every federal agency to pause any activities relat OMB’s memo violates the Constitution and federal law, a memo unlawful and unconstitutional, and stop the OMB f implementing the memo, OMB rescinded its memo but iss and would be implemented. The court subsequently issuec plaintiffs requested the block be extended for the duration</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The Acting Director of the Office of M agency to temporarily pause” any agency activities “the organizations, represented by Democracy Forward, are temporary restraining order to allow the Court “an opp of the Administrative Procedure Act and the First Amer</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Jan. 28, 2025, Judge Loren AliKhan of the against the OMB policy to allow arguments from the pl</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Jan. 29, 2025, the Government submitted White House Press Secretary <a href="#">stated</a>, “This is not a resc Why? To end any confusion created by the court’s injur will be rigorously implemented.”</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 3, 2025, Judge Alikhan <a href="#">issued a tem</a> finding that the Plaintiffs are likely to succeed in their post-complaint rescission of the memorandum was “di release the frozen funds, notify agencies of this TRO, an</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 11, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a preliminar freeze. The Government <a href="#">filed</a> a memorandum in opposi</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Feb. 25, the court issued a <a href="#">memorandum</a> the Trump administration from implementing, giving e of Federal funds.</p>
---	----------------------------------	-------------------	---

<p><a href="#">New York et al v. Donald J. Trump et al</a> (D.R.I.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00039</p> <p>(First Circuit <a href="#">Case No. 25-1236</a>)</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-01-28</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The attorneys general of 22 states and the Dis challenging its directive to pause federal funding as a viol later rescinded the memo referred to in the states’ compla release the funding freeze and the First Circuit of Appeals District Court’s ruling.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The Acting Director of the Office of M agency to temporarily pause” any agency activities “the general of 22 states and the District of Columbia filed a policy. The suit alleges that the policy violates the Adm</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Jan. 28, responding to National Council c</p>
---	----------------------------------	-------------------	--

			<p>District Court for the District of Columbia <a href="#">issued a temporary injunction</a> against the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the government.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Jan. 29, the Government submitted a <a href="#">Notice of Rescission</a> to the House Press Secretary <a href="#">stated</a>, “This is not a rescission of the injunction. It is intended to end any confusion created by the court’s injunction. The government will continue to rigorously implement the injunction.”</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On January 31, Judge McConnell <a href="#">issued a temporary injunction</a> for a preliminary injunction. Judge McConnell’s <a href="#">Directive</a> was in name only and may have been issued solely to delay the case. Plaintiffs are likely to succeed on the merits of some, if not all, their claims.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 10, Judge McConnell <a href="#">granted</a> Plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction. Plaintiff States presented evidence suggesting that Defendants’ “disbursement of appropriated federal funds” (<a href="#">citing the injunction</a>) is in violation of the law. The court ordered Defendants to immediately restore frozen funds.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Feb. 14, the First Circuit <a href="#">issued a voluntary injunction</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 6, Judge McConnell <a href="#">granted</a> the plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction way impeding the disbursement of appropriated federal funds.</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 10, the defendants filed a <a href="#">notice of appeal</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Mar. 24, the plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">renewed section 552</a> request as it pertains to the freezing of FEMA funds, claiming that HHS is blocking access to federal funds despite the Court’s order.</p> <p><b>Update 9:</b> On Mar. 26, the First Circuit <a href="#">denied</a> defendants’ motion for a preliminary injunction order. The First Circuit noted defendants did not show that the injunction order is necessary.</p> <p><b>Update 10:</b> On Mar. 27, defendants filed their <a href="#">oppositional motion</a> for a preliminary injunction order on Mar. 6 as it pertains to the freezing of FEMA funds is not equivalent to a pause or freeze of the funds.</p> <p><b>Update 11:</b> On Mar. 31, plaintiffs filed their <a href="#">reply in support</a> of their motion for a preliminary injunction facts regarding FEMA’s manual review of grant program.</p>
<p><a href="#">Shapiro et al. v. Department of Interior et al.</a> (E.D. Pa.)</p> <p>Case No. 2:25-cv-00763</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-13</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Pennsylvania Governor Josh Shapiro and several other plaintiffs filed a lawsuit against the federal government, alleging that the government’s freeze of federal funding implicating billions in already committed federal funds is unconstitutional, seeking to restore the suspended funding.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The Plaintiffs—Governor Josh Shapiro and five other plaintiffs—filed a lawsuit against the federal government, alleging that the government’s five Executive Orders and a subsequent OMB Directive have unlawfully frozen federal funding in Pennsylvania. The complaint describes five different communications that identify specific programs or funding that were frozen. Plaintiffs allege that, in total, the funding freeze jeopardizes at least \$1.5 billion in federal funding which had already been obligated. The plaintiffs note that the government’s actions are in violation of the Constitution – Jan. 31 TRO (D.R.I.), the Feb. 3 TRO (D.D.C.), the government’s motion for an administrative stay (1st Cir.) and the government’s motion for summary judgment (1st Cir.) are all marked as requiring further federal review because they are contrary to the Administrative Procedure Act because they are contrary to the law. Plaintiffs also claim that defendants’ actions are unconstitutional and seek a declaratory judgment that defendants’ actions are unconstitutional with congressionally appropriated funds.</p>
<p><a href="#">Catholic Charities Diocese of Fort Worth, Inc. v. DHHS</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00605</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-03</p>	<p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 27, 2025, the Acting Director of the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) issued a memo that “require every federal agency to temporarily pause all activities that require the use of appropriated federal funds.” Despite the purported rescission of the memo days later on Mar. 3, 2025, federal funding apparently remained frozen. Plaintiffs, who receive federal funding through the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), filed a lawsuit against HHS, seeking a declaratory judgment that the memo is unconstitutional and a permanent injunction against HHS from enforcing the memo.</p>

			the funding freeze violates the Constitution’s Spending Refugee Act of 1980. They seek declaratory judgment t preliminary, and permanent injunctions against enforc
<p><a href="#">Corporation for Public Broadcasting v. Federal Emergency Management Agency</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00740</p>	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-03-13	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPI broadcasting, brought a suit against the FEMA for placing weather alert system. The nonprofit is seeking to block the federal judge denied the nonprofit’s request for a tempora</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 19, 2025, FEMA placed a hold Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and FEMA to nation’s emergency alert system. FEMA has not identif submit reimbursements and receive payments owed to critical equipment for NGWS program upgrades and en Administrative Procedure Act arguing the government injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> Plaintiff filed a motion for a TRO on Mar. 13 Plaintiff filed a reply on Mar. 16.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 17, 2025, Judge Timothy Kelly denie</p>
<b>Executive Action: Denial of federal grants</b>			
<p><a href="#">City of New York v. Trump et al.</a> (S.D.N.Y.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-01510</p>	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-02-21	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>New York City sued the Trump Administratio \$80 million in previously approved migrant housing funds severely harms the City. The City has asked the court to de</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 11, 2025, FEMA clawed back \$ previously been approved by FEMA as reimbursement t housing and services for noncitizen migrants. Plaintiff issued payment, [and yet] Defendants grabbed the mon Defendants attempted to cloak their actions “with a ve City’s Office of Management and Budget with “Finding; noncompliance letter was pretextual and that Defenda purposes for which the funds were appropriated, award return the funds to the City. Plaintiff also seeks a decla and without observance of lawful procedures.In the int ordering Defendants to return certain funds and to enj</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 28, Defendants <a href="#">filed</a> a memorandum restraining order.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 3, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed</a> a reply memorand temporary restraining order.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 20, Plaintiff <a href="#">filed</a> an amended comp</p>
<p><a href="#">Climate United Fund v. Citibank</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:24-cv-00698</p>	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-03-08	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>: Climate United Fund, a nonprofit with grant the EPA and Citibank for the withholding of grant funds. I effectively terminating Climate United Fund’s grant. A fed from implementing the grant termination and transferring</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiff Climate United Fund has bro obtained from the EPA in 2024 through the National Cl (GGRF). The grant requires Climate United’s grant func and the U.S. Treasury Department, and an Account Con United, and EPA that sets forth the specific details for E Zeldin made a public statement announcing EPA’s goal</p>

			<p>pursuant to the Inflation Reduction Act. The EPA and Z Climate United’s grant. Citibank is now refusing to hon citing the need for further direction from the EPA befor compensation for some employees and will shortly run relief to order Citibank to disburse funds, enjoin the EF and Zeldin from unlawfully suspending or terminating</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 10, Plaintiff <a href="#">filed</a> a motion requesti filed motions in opposition to the TRO.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 11, the EPA <a href="#">terminated</a> Climate Uni unlawful termination of the grant.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 18, Judge Tanya Chutkan <a href="#">granted</a> in Citibank from implementing the grant termination and</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 21, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed</a> a consolidated m Defendants from (1) effectuating the EPA’s Mar. 11 tern related to Plaintiffs’ grants, and (3) impeding Citibanks</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 26, the Federal Defendants filed the</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 28, Plaintiff <a href="#">filed</a> a reply in support</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 31, the Federal Defendants <a href="#">filed</a> an On that same day, Judge Chutkan <a href="#">ordered</a> the extensio</p>
<p><a href="#">Massachusetts Fair Housing Center v. Department of Housing and Urban Development</a> (D. Mass)</p> <p>Case No. 3:25-cv-30041</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-19</p>	<p><b>Overview::</b> <i>A group of non-profit fair housing organizati (HUD) for the termination of Fair Housing Initiative Progr (DOGE), HUD terminated the funds without notice. The fa reinstate the terminated FHIP grants and prevent further temporarily blocked further terminations.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> At the direction of the Department of of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) terminated Plaintiffs to this class action are several non-profit fair congressionally-appropriated funds, and the terminati resulted in the halt of programming to groups protecte they “no longer effectuate[] the program goals or agenc unlawful action by HUD and an ultra vires action by DC</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 13, the same day the complaint was</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 21, defendants <a href="#">filed</a> an opposition t</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 24, plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">reply</a> in support against the HUD defendants only.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 26, following a hearing the day prio HUD defendants from terminating relevant FHIP grant:</p>
<p><a href="#">American Public Health Association v. National Institutes of Health</a> (D. Mass.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10787</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-04-02</p>	<p><b>Overview::</b> <i>In February 2025 the U.S. Department of Hec behavioural research at the National Institutes of Health , 2, a group of leading health research organisations and re Robert F. Kennedy, Secretary of HHS alleging that these te court to halt thee government’s actions.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> After President Trump issued Executi promote “gender ideology” or DEI, the NIH issued a ser priorities” (the “Directives”) and labelling certain topic forbidden topics. The NIH have allegedly subsequently Plaintiffs consist of four researchers who have either lo as the American Public Health Association (APHA), wh United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implen graduate students who have had grants terminated, an</p>

			The complaint alleges that the NIH violated the APA in accordance with law, in particular 2 C.F.R. §200.340 (b) statutory authority as the congressional mandates spec constitutional rights because of their failure to properl for the terminations violates Fifth Amendment due pro Plaintiffs seek to have the terminations declared unlaw awards, and order them to review all properly submitte
<b>Executive Action: Reduction of indirect cost reimbursement rate for research institutions (NIH Guidance)</b>			
<p><a href="#"><u>Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. National Institutes of Health</u></a> (D. Mass.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10338</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-02-10</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>22 state governments sued the National Instit reimbursements available in medical research grants. The The governments have requested the court declare the pol court granted their request and has blocked the policy fro</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The National Institutes of Health’s gu costs” of medical research, which research institutions whose public research institutions will face hardship u including as an “arbitrary and capricious” change that 1 an action in excess the NIH’s statutory authority and ir declaratory judgment and a temporary restraining orde the plaintiff states.</p> <p>On Feb. 10, 2025, Judge Angel Kelley granted the plaint reporting requirement on the part of the administratio</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 5, 2025: Judge Kelley <a href="#"><u>issued</u></a> a nation any form with respect to institutions nationwide.”</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Association of American Universities, et al. v. Department of Health and Human Services, et al.</u></a> (D. Mass.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10346</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-02-10</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Multiple academic institutions sued the Depar (“NIH”), challenging a new NIH policy that caps the amou the policy violates the constitution and federal law, and ex unlawful and to stop implementation of the policy. The co</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> National Institutes of Health (NIH) gu costs” of medical research, which research institutions associations representing universities and college and i immediate destructive effects on NIH-funded research. Act in that it (1) is contrary to law in that it departs fro Constitution’s Appropriation Clause; (3) is contrary to Grants Policy Statement; (4) is an arbitrary and caprici regulations and policy guidance; (6) fails to observe rec Health Service Act; and (8) is in excess of statutory autl is unlawful and preliminary and permanent injunctive to prohibit Defendants from implementing the policy.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 5, 2025: Judge Kelley <a href="#"><u>issued</u></a> a nation any form with respect to institutions nationwide.”</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Association of American Medical Colleges v. National Institutes of Health</u></a> (D. Mass.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10340</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-02-10</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Multiple nonprofit organizations sued the Dep (“NIH”), challenging a new NIH policy that caps the amou that the policy violates federal law, and exceeds NIH’s aut court has their request and has blocked the policy from im</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The National Institutes of Health’s gu costs” of medical research, which research institutions associations representing universities, hospitals, and h under the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”) and se</p>



			<p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 17, the plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion</a> for a defendants’ actions violate the Administrative Procedure Act, claiming serious and irreparable harms to the plaintiffs.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 27, the defendants filed a memorandum in support of their motion, arguing that plaintiffs’ claims are not properly before the court and that plaintiffs’ claims fail on the merits, so the motion for partial summary judgment should be granted.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 31, the plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">reply</a> in support of their motion, showing that they are likely to succeed on the merits on the claim that the funding freeze causes irreparable harm, and that the public interest favors implementation of the funding freeze.</p>
<p><a href="#">Sustainability Institute v. Trump</a> (D.S.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 2:25-cv-02152-RMG</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-19</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> A group of nonprofit organizations and municipalities filed suit against the Trump administration, arguing that the administration’s actions violate the First Amendment, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Spending Clause. Plaintiffs seek declaratory relief asserting that the funding freeze is unlawful, and the restoration of previously frozen disbursements.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20 and Feb. 26, 2025, President Trump issued executive orders that congressionally appropriated funds under the Inflation Reduction Act to nonprofit organizations and municipalities, filed suit against the administration, arguing that the orders unlawfully violate the First Amendment, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Spending Clause. Plaintiffs seek declaratory relief asserting that the funding freeze is unlawful, and the restoration of previously frozen disbursements.</p>
<p><a href="#">California Infrastructure and Economic Development v. Citibank and EPA</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00820</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-19</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> A group of banks that provide financial services to the Environmental Protection Agency. They argue that the agency’s actions stopped honoring its contracts with the banks for pollution-reducing projects, and a declaration that the freeze is unlawful.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, President Donald Trump issued executive orders that congressionally appropriated funds under the Inflation Reduction Act and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to pollution-reducing projects, filed suit against the EPA, arguing that the EPA unlawfully blocked access to \$20 billion in Green New Deal funds. Plaintiffs argue that the EPA’s pressure, Citibank is no longer honoring contract with the agency. Plaintiffs argue that the agency’s actions violate the Administrative Procedure Act, the Inflation Reduction Act, the Spending Clause and the Tenth Amendment. They seek declaratory relief, the return of funds and prevent further interference, and contractual damages.</p>
<p><a href="#">Butterbee Farm v. United States Department of Agriculture</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00737</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-13</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> Several farms and environmental organizations filed suit against the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and President Donald Trump in relation to the administration’s approved Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) grant funds. They argue that the funding freeze is unlawful.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, President Trump issued an executive order that suspended the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA). Plaintiffs include IRA-eligible farms and environmental groups. Following the EO, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) suspended all activities related to the disbursement of all federal funds to the IRA-eligible farms and environmental groups. The Department of Agriculture (USDA) allegedly continues to disburse funds to the farms. While courts have issued temporary restraining orders preventing the administration from suspending the IRA, plaintiffs have yet to receive their grants. This freeze of funds all over the country has harmed the farms and organizations. Plaintiffs allege this freeze of funds is an unconstitutional violation of the Due Process Clause and the Care Clause of the Constitution. They seek declaratory relief and prevent any further interference.</p>



			<p>Plaintiff asked the court to declare the grant terminati preliminary injunction on withholding of these funds v</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 20, Plaintiff <a href="#">filed</a> a motion requesti Plaintiff's operations and the likelihood that Plaintiff v</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 24, Defendants <a href="#">filed</a> a motion in opj and likelihood of irreparable harm.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 26, Plaintiff <a href="#">filed</a> a response opposi irreparable harm and public interest favors granting th</p>
<p><a href="#">Widakuswara v. Kari Lake</a> (S.D.N.Y.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-02390</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-21</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>On Mar. 14, President Trump signed an Execu agencies, including the U.S. Agency for Global Media (USA/ minimum. Voice of America (VOA) is a media outlet under suit against USAGM to block the dismantling of USAGM.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 14, President Trump signed a federal agencies, including the U.S. Agency for Global M the legal minimum. Voice of America (VOA) is a govern VOA journalists, a director at USAGM, Reporters witho foreign service workers brought a suit against Kari Lake USAGM, and USAGM for the dismantling of USAGM. The Plaintiffs argue that the government's conduct vio capricious" action, not in accordance with law, and unr Appointments Clause. Plaintiffs seek declaratory relief and a preliminary and grantees to their prior status and to restore all program</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 24, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed</a> a motion request: irreparable harm and are likely to succeed on their Adn</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 25, Plaintiffs <a href="#">renewed</a> their request intent to proceed with the dismantling of VOA.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 26, Plaintiffs <a href="#">reiterated</a> their reques multiple broadcasting positions. On that same day, Defendants <a href="#">requested</a> the case be tr</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 27, Defendants filed a <a href="#">memorandun</a> demonstrated irreparable harm nor established that th</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 28, Judge J. Paul Oetken <a href="#">granted</a> a t</p>
<p><a href="#">Abramowitz v. Lake</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00887</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-26</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>On Mar. 14, President Trump signed an Execu agencies, including the U.S. Agency for Global Media (USA/ minimum. Voice of America (VOA) is a media outlet under USAGM to permanently or at least temporarily block the c so that VOA's broadcasting activities can resume.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 14, President Donald Trump s seven federal agencies, including the U.S. Agency for Gl personnel to the legal minimum. Voice of America (VO. the current director of VOA, and three VOA journalists, (Senior Advisor to the Acting CEO of USAGM), Victor M USAGM was unlawful. Specifically, plaintiffs argue that of powers clause of the Constitution, the Take Care Cla Plaintiffs seek a temporary restraining order and a prel defendants from terminating VOA employees and dism so that VOA's broadcasting activities can resume.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On March 28, Defendants filed their opposit temporary restraining order (TRO) or preliminary injur</p>

			a TRO or preliminary injunction, and that the court should grant a temporary order (which Defendants suggested should be stayed). <b>Update 2:</b> On April 1, 2025, Defendants filed an <a href="#">opposi</a> moved to stay all proceedings pending the outcome of <a href="#">Case No. 1:25-cv-002390</a> (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 2025), where a temporary restraining order by Judge Widakuswara “largely provides the relief sought in this case.” Defendants to file their opposition to Plaintiff’s motion.
<a href="#">Radio Free Asia v. United States</a> (D.D.C.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00907	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-03-27	[Coming soon]
<a href="#">Middle East Broadcasting Networks v. United States</a> (D.D.C.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00966	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-04-01	[Coming soon]
<b>Executive Action: Termination of public health grants</b>			
<a href="#">State of Colorado v. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services</a> (D .R.I.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00121	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-04-01	<b>Overview:</b> Numerous states and state officials have challenged the termination of \$11 billion in public health funding. The states have asked the court to vacate and enjoin the funding terminations.  <b>Case Summary:</b> Beginning on Mar. 24, 2025, the U.S. District Court terminated health funding on the ground that the funds were not allocated during the Covid-19 pandemic. Plaintiffs are 20 states, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. District of Columbia. Plaintiffs allege that the District Court appropriated these funds to strengthen public health preparedness and that Congress and HHS continued to make these funds available in May 2023. Plaintiffs allege that these terminations of funding violate the Administrative Procedure Act (as “arbitrary and capricious” and “for cause” provisions of 42 U.S.C. § 300x-55). They request the court to implement and enforcing the terminations. <b>Update 1:</b> On Apr. 1, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion</a> for the court to enforce the public health terminations.
<b>Civil Liberties and Civil Rights</b>			
<b>Executive Action: Conditioning agriculture funds on state transgender athlete policy (<a href="#">Sec. of Agriculture letter</a> to Maine Governor Mills)</b>			
<a href="#">Maine v. US Department of Agriculture</a> (D.Me.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00131	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-04-07	[Coming soon]
<b>Executive Action: Housing of transgender inmates (<a href="#">Executive Order 14168</a>)</b>			
<a href="#">Maria Moe v. Donald Trump, et al</a> (D. Mass.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-10195-GAO	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-01-26	<b>Overview:</b> A transgender woman in federal prison sued the U.S. Department of Prisons (“BOP”) to transfer her to a facility that does not have a transgender inmate. The court granted her request and has to transfer her. The case has since been transferred to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.  <b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s Executive Order mandates the classification of transgender inmates as “male,” regardless of gender identity, and direct



			<p>14166[sic].” Plaintiff alleges that she is unsafe in any m her gender dysphoria. She brings claims alleging violat Administrative Procedure Act, and she seeks declarator</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> Feb. 21, Plaintiff filed a <a href="#">motion</a> for a TRO an two sections of Executive Order 14168: Section 4(a), wh bars federal prisons from providing medical care that w</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 24, the court <a href="#">granted</a> plaintiff’s mot enforcing Sections 4(a) and 4(c) of Executive Order 141</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 28, four additional Plaintiffs were ac preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 3, the court <a href="#">granted</a> Plaintiffs’ moti amended complaint.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Apr. 2, Defendants <a href="#">appealed</a> the Feb. 28 : injunction.</p>
<p><a href="#">Kingdom v. Trump</a> (D.D.C)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00691</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-07</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>One transgender woman and two transgender gender dysphoria, brought a class action lawsuit against 1 care for transgender individuals in federal prison custody. gender dysphoria who are receiving or would receive gend Constitution, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, and Adminis EO while litigation proceeds.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Trump’s Executive Order 14168 (“EO” sex defined as “immutable biological classification,” req funds on gender-affirming care. Plaintiffs, three transgender individuals currently incar lawsuit to represent all current and future federal inma on gender-affirming care. The lawsuit argues that the EO violates their constituti punishment), Equal Protection Clause, Rehabilitation A</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 17, Plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion</a> for a pre the purpose of emergency relief.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 28, Defendants filed a <a href="#">response</a> to P preliminary injunction and class certification.</p>
<b>Executive Action: Ban on transgender individuals serving in the military (<a href="#">Executive Order 14183</a>)</b>			
<p><a href="#">Nicolas Talbott, et al. v. Donald Trump, et al.</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00240</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-01-28</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A group of transgender service members and 1 banning transgender individuals from enlisting and servin stop implementation of the EO. The court has ordered tha implementing the EO, at which point the court will consid implementing the EO, to which the plaintiffs have renewec</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On January 27, 2025, the Trump admin in the military. The order rescinds prior policy allowing categorically prohibits both enlistment and continued : “troop readiness, lethality, cohesion, honesty, humility service members and prospective or current enlistees. 7 service violates equal protection under the Fifth Amen government interest.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 3, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a preliminary</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 4, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a TRO agains</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb, 5, the court ordered the Governmen implementing the Executive Order. If any such action i:</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> In response to the Court’s order to update ai</p>

			<p>from Gender Extremism...”) or <a href="#">Executive Order 14183</a> (Leadership Commanders of the Combatant Commands Subject: Additional Guidance on Prioritizing Military E as it relates to transgender service members and provic Current Diagnosis or History of, or Exhibit Symptoms C who have a current diagnosis or history of, or exhibit sy military service,” and orders that “steps to identify Serv consistent with, gender dysphoria within 30 days of thi reassignment or genital reconstruction surgery as treat including already-extended offers of admission to milit eligibility.</p> <p>While waivers are available, the applicant “must be will associated with the applicant's sex.”</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 18, Judge Ana Reyes <a href="#">granted</a> Plainti members facing the same irreparable harm. The Court : emergency stay with the D.C. Circuit.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 24, Plaintiffs <a href="#">amended</a> the complain Ashley Davis, and Samuel Ahearn also <a href="#">filed</a> a motion re memoranda and preserve the status quo, on the basis ti irreparable harm. The motion states: “In light of this C Military Ban, ECF No. 88, which the Court administrati Court should temporarily restrain enforcement of the M until it resolves Defendants’ Motions on the merits.”</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 26, Defendants <a href="#">filed</a> a notice of app preliminary injunction.</p>
<p><a href="#">Shilling v. Trump</a> (W.D. Wash.)</p> <p>Case No. 2:25-cv-00241</p> <p>D.C. Circuit <a href="#">Case No. 25-2039</a></p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-06</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A group of transgender service members and p banning transgender individuals from enlisting and servin declare the EO unconstitutional and stop implementation appeals has rejected an appeal of this decision.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 27, 2025, the Trump administr the military. The order rescinds prior policy allowing tr including active and prospective trans service member: ban violates the equal protection and due process guar: Amendment. They seek declaratory judgment and a pei</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 19, Plaintiffs filed <a href="#">motion</a> for a preli and other current and aspiring transgender servicemen</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 4, Plaintiffs submitted an <a href="#">amended</a></p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 4: Plaintiffs submitted a <a href="#">supplemen</a> responded with a brief in <a href="#">opposition to a preliminary ir</a></p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 27, Judge Benjamin Settle granted a evidence supporting the conclusion that military readi exclude various groups from service have in fact been a can only find that there is none.” “The government’s ar record,” Settle stated.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 28, the government <a href="#">appealed</a> the C On that same day, Trump was dismissed as a defendant</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 31, the Ninth Circuit <a href="#">denied</a> the req</p>
<p><a href="#">Ireland v. Hegseth</a> (D. N.J.)</p> <p>Case no. 1:25-cv-01918</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-17</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Two transgender U.S. Air Force service membe (EOs) banning transgender individuals from enlisting and equal treatment. On Mar. 24, a federal judge temporarily constitutional protections.</i></p>

			<p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20 and 27, 2025, President Do Forces by banning transgender people from military se: Bade are transgender men who have served as member administrative absence and have been informed that th not possible for either Plaintiff to serve as a woman bec involuntary administrative separation proceedings will given the Trump administration’s EO implementation t implementation of the EOs and related memoranda, or Fifth Amendment to not be separated from military ser</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 18, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed</a> a request for a TR their Equal Protection claim.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 20, the Government <a href="#">filed</a> an opposit support of their request for a TRO.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 24, Judge Christine O’Hearn <a href="#">granted</a> of constitutional rights and that attempting to exhaust Plaintiffs.</p>
--	--	--	---

**Executive Action: Ban on gender affirming care for individuals under the age of 19 ( [Executive Order 14168](#); [Executive Order 14](#)**

<p><a href="#">PFLAG, Inc. v. Trump</a> (D. Md.)</p> <p>Case No. 8:25-cv-00337-BAH</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-04</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Two nonprofit organizations representing LGL executive order (“EO”) which restricts gender-affirming ca gender-affirming care, and stops federal funding to institu President’s authority and violates multiple constitutional the EO unconstitutional and unlawful, and stop the imple the EO while the case proceeds. The Trump administrati the plaintiffs asserted that the government had acted in vi allegedly renewed previous threats to withhold federal fun the agencies that the funding of grants may change in the</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On January 20, 2025, the Trump admi expending federal funds to promote “gender ideology,” the Trump administration issued an executive order dir education grants, including medical schools and hospit The order also ended coverage for gender affirming car and Budget to instruct private health insurers that gov directs the Department of Justice to prioritize enforcen action against medical professionals performing gende mutilation. PFLAG and other plaintiffs filed suit, arguir authority; discriminate on the basis of sex and disabilit substantive due process guarantees; and abridge the Fi unconstitutional and unlawful, and asking for tempora</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 5, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a TRO agains</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb 13, Judge Brendan Abell Hurson issu</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 18, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a preliminar</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 26, Plaintiffs moved to extend the T</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 4, Judge Brendan Hurson <a href="#">granted</a> Pl conditioning, withholding, or terminating federal fundi affirming medical care to a patient under age 19.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 7, plaintiffs <a href="#">filed an emergency mot</a> violated the injunction by issuing notices renewing thr</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 10, the government <a href="#">filed a memorar</a> actions “do not violate this Court’s preliminary injunct enjoined provisions. In response, plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a mem</a> that federal funding recipients risk losing their federal</p>
--	----------------------------------	-------------------	---

			<p>nineteen.”</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Mar. 21, the government <a href="#">filed notice</a> that Circuit.</p> <p><b>Update 9:</b> On Mar. 28, the District Court <a href="#">denied</a> plaintiff explained that the government’s notices presently do not that grant funding could change in the future.</p>
<p><a href="#">State of Washington et al. v. Donald J. Trump et al.</a> (W.D. Wash)</p> <p>Case No. 2:25-cv-00244</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a> (Feb. 7, 2025);</p> <p><a href="#">Amended Complaint</a> (Feb. 19, 2025)</p>	2025-02-07	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Three states and three physicians sued the Trump administration for affirming care for individuals under 19 and ended government support of the Constitution, federal law, and states’ powers. The plaintiffs requested that the court grant their request and blocked the EO, but has permitted affirming procedures, as “female genital mutilation.”</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 28, 2025, the Trump administration institutes that receive research and education grants, in part for individuals under the age of 19. The order also ended court-ordered the Office of Management and Budget to instruct agencies covering such care. Finally, the order directs the Department of Health to develop legislation for a private right of action against the older statute against female genital mutilation. Three states and the Fifth Amendment equal protection by creating classifications without sufficient government interest. Plaintiffs also seek a receipt of funding by the plaintiff states’ medical institutions and medical institutions from denying individuals access to care. The plaintiffs allege that the order violates the Tenth Amendment and consensual medical practices, thus unlawfully intruding on the right of privacy.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 7, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a TRO against the EO.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 14, Judge Lauren King issued a two-page order 14187 within Plaintiff States; on Feb. 16, the court issued a stay.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 19, Plaintiffs filed an <a href="#">amended complaint</a> for vagueness. Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> separately for a TRO. The government responded in <a href="#">opposition</a> on Feb. 28.</p> <p><b>Updated 4:</b> On Feb. 28, Judge Lauren King issued an <a href="#">order</a> granting an exception involved Section 8(a) of the EO directing the Department of Health to “stop the mutilation”; but the court found “no credible threat of harm.”</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 6, plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a motion</a> for the court to grant the defendants tried to circumvent the preliminary injunction. The court found that the defendants were actually taken pursuant to other policies. In the alternative, the court found that the defendants violated the preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 13, defendants <a href="#">filed a memorandum</a> arguing that the withhold funding were based on preexisting authority and that the EO was not necessary.</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 14, plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a reply</a> in support of their motion for a TRO.</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Mar. 17, the court <a href="#">denied</a> plaintiffs’ motion for a TRO. The court found that the government’s actions were taken pursuant to the enjoined EOs.</p> <p><b>Update 9:</b> On Mar. 21, defendants <a href="#">appealed</a> the district court’s decision to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Passport policy targeting transgender people</b> (<a href="#">Executive Order 14168</a>).</p>			
<p><a href="#">Orr v. Trump</a> (D. Mass)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10313</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	2025-02-07	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Seven transgender and nonbinary individuals sued the Trump administration for violating the sex designation on US passports to male or female based on the Constitution and federal law. The plaintiffs have requested that the court permanently stop the EO from implementation, and void the EO.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration issued an executive order that required the Department of State to change the sex designation on US passports to male or female based on the sex assigned at birth. The plaintiffs argued that this order violated the Constitution and federal law. The plaintiffs have requested that the court permanently stop the EO from implementation, and void the EO.</p>

			<p>female, and that they are determined by immutable bio policies related to documents like passports to align with processing passport applications of individuals seeking represented by the ACLU, sued, arguing the policy is unconstitutional on the basis of sex and transgender status; violates the Fifth Amendment by forcing disclosure compelling the speech of transgender applicants through Administrative Procedure Act, as contrary to constitutional discretion; and by failing to observe procedures as required declaratory judgment that the policy is unconstitutional; being implemented; and an order vacating agency action.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 18, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 12, Defendants <a href="#">filed</a> an opposition to the motion.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 19, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed</a> a reply in support of the motion.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 28, Plaintiffs submitted a <a href="#">request to</a> action and for preliminary injunction. Plaintiffs' <a href="#">memo</a> order Defendants to temporarily reinstate prior passport</p>
<b>Executive Action: Ban on transgender athletes in women's sports (<a href="#">Executive Order 14168</a>; <a href="#">Executive Order 14201</a>)</b>			
<p><a href="#">Tirrell v. Edelblut</a> (D.N.H.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:24-cv-00251</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a>; <a href="#">Amended Complaint</a> (underlying case filed Aug. 16, 2024)</p>	2025-02-12	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Two transgender teenage athletes in New Hampshire banning transgender women from female sports as unconstitutional. The court had already ordered that the related state law not declare the EO unconstitutional and permanently stop its</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration female, and that they are determined by immutable biological characteristics. EO 14201, directing the federal government to interpret and apply the law which would bar transgender women and girls from competing in sports in New Hampshire, previously filed suit against the state, arguing the law is unconstitutional under the 14th Amendment and a violation of the Equal Protection Clause. On Feb. 12, following the Trump administration's amended complaint, seeking to add federal defendants and arguing that the law unconstitutionally violates Fifth Amendment equal protection. Plaintiffs vire action to withhold Congressionally appropriated funds and to declare the law and unlawful; and a permanent injunction enjoining its</p>
<b>Executive Action: Immigration enforcement against places of worship and schools (<a href="#">Policy Memo</a>)</b>			
<p><a href="#">Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, et al. v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security</a> (D. Md.)</p> <p>Case No. 8:25-cv-00243-TDC</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a> (Jan. 27, 2025) <a href="#">Amended Complaint</a> (Feb. 5, 2025)</p>	2025-01-27	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A coalition of Quaker congregations sued the Department of Homeland Security over immigration enforcement in "sensitive" areas like places of worship and has asked the court to stop its implementation. The coalition asks the court to enjoin any place of worship owned or used by the plaintiff organizations.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On January 20, 2025 the Department of Homeland Security's <a href="#">guidelines</a> for ICE and CBP enforcement near "sensitive" areas, such as places of worship, schools, and other community areas would only be subject to the enforcement officers' discretion. The <a href="#">plaintiffs</a>, a coalition of Quaker congregations, seek to enjoin any government policy permitting immigration enforcement in these areas. Plaintiffs argue the freedom of expressive association under the First Amendment, the Religious Freedom and Restoration Act and the Administrative Procedure Act.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 4, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a TRO and preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 24, the court <a href="#">granted in part</a> a preliminary injunction enjoining the place of worship owned or used by the plaintiff organizations.</p>



			<p>On Feb. 21, 2025, the AP also filed a <a href="#">motion for a TRO</a> a</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 24, in a 2-page <a href="#">order</a>, Judge Trevor N court had ordered expedited hearings for consideration</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 3, Plaintiffs <a href="#">submitted</a> an amended briefings on specific questions, and requesting that the White House press pool.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> Given the amended motion for a preliminary</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 11, the Defendants filed a <a href="#">response</a> organizations do not have a Fifth Amendment liberty in Amendment for the President to grant special media ac</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 25, the Defendants filed a <a href="#">suppleme</a> Cabinet Secretary. The declaration provides some detail to the Plaintiff.</p>
<b>Executive Action: Action Against Law Firms (<a href="#">Executive Order 14230</a>)</b>			
<p><a href="#">Perkins Coie LLP v. U.S. Department of Justice</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00716</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-11</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The law firm Perkins Coie sued the Department executive order (EO) terminating government contracts, d security clearances. A federal judge granted Perkins Coie's</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 6, President Trump issued an and maintaining illegal race-based hiring quotas. The e including: terminating the firm's government contract: ordering a review of the firm's hiring practices by the E buildings; and directing agencies not to hire Perkins Co The Plaintiff sued, alleging that the executive action is protections for freedom of speech and association, the counsel, and the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Prote and an immediate injunction stopping implementation injunctions.</p> <p>The Plaintiff also submitted a request for a temporary 1 (Contracting), and 5 (Personnel including access to Fed</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 12, Judge Beryl Howell, <a href="#">ruling from</a> Sections 1, 3, and 5 of the executive order. During the h Section 2 (Security Clearances) and Section 4 (Racial D lawsuit. She followed hours later with a written <a href="#">order</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 21, the Defendant <a href="#">filed</a> a motion to</p>
<p><a href="#">Jenner &amp; Block v. Department of Justice</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00916</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-28</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The law firm Jenner &amp; Block sued the Departn order (EO) terminating government contracts, denying me clearances. The same day, a federal judge granted the law</i></p> <p>[Summary of complaint coming soon]</p> <p>Jenner &amp; Block submitted a <a href="#">motion</a> for a temporary res</p> <p>On the same day, the court held a hearing, and Judge Jc</p>
<p><a href="#">Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr v. Executive Office of the President</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00917</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-28</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The law firm WilmerHale sued the Executive C executive order (EO) terminating government contracts, d security clearances. The same day, a federal judge grantec</i></p> <p>[Summary of complaint coming soon]</p> <p>WilmerHale submitted a <a href="#">motion</a> for a temporary restr</p>

			On the same day, the court held a hearing, and Judge R EO restricting security clearances. The court wrote that the Executive Branch,” and thus the Plaintiff did not ha
<b>Executive Action: Election Law (<a href="#">Executive Order 14248</a>)</b>			
<a href="#">Democratic National Committee v. Trump</a> (D.D.C.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00952	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-03-31	<b>Overview:</b> <i>A group of Democratic Party committees, orga that seeks to implement new requirements for federal elec changes to elections law and processes, and that the EO v permanently or at least temporarily block the EO while th</i>  <b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 25, 2025, President Trump sig American Elections.” Among its requirements, the EO c U.S. citizenship on voter registration forms and provide voter registration lists. The EO also directs the Attorne received after Election Day, and it conditions various fe The Democratic National Committee (DNC), Democrat Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCC Hakeem Jeffries challenged the EO, alleging that the Pr Constitution reserves such authority to the states and t cast a ballot, and to administer fair elections, and that i Plaintiffs brought 11 counts, alleging (1) Ultra Vires pre congressional and state authorities; (3) Administrative violations with respect to various constitutional provis Plaintiffs requested that the court declare the relevant government departments from taking any action to imp
<a href="#">League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) v. Executive Office of the President</a> (D.D.C.)  Case No. 1:25-cv-00946	<a href="#">Complaint</a>	2025-03-31	<b>Overview:</b> <i>Three nonprofits have challenged President D provide documentary proof of U.S. citizenship on voter reg various federal statutes. Plaintiffs have asked the court to</i>  <b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 25, 2025, President Trump sig American Elections,” which directs the Election Assista registration forms and conditions federal funding to st Plaintiffs are three nonprofits, the League of United La Students’ Association (ASA). They allege that the EO vi Constitution, the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Abs allegedly making “arbitrary and capricious” changes to Plaintiffs request that the Court declare that the EO is EO, and block the Department of Justice (DOJ) and Attc valid mail-in and absentee ballots.

<p><a href="#">League of Women Voters Education Fund v. Trump</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00955</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-04-01</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> Numerous voting rights organizations have challenged requirements to provide documentary proof of U.S. citizenship, arguing that the President violates the Constitution and the National Voter Registration Act.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 25, 2025, President Donald Trump signed Executive Order 14173, “American Elections,” which directs the Election Assistance Commission (EAC) to change the federal voter registration form (“Federal Form”) and to require states to provide documentary proof of U.S. citizenship on voter registration forms and provide a public assistance program. Plaintiffs are seven voting rights organizations, including the League of Women Voters, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Association of Public Employees, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Labor Union of the Graphic Arts, and the National Voter Registration Act. Plaintiffs request that the Court declare that the EO is unconstitutional and void, and to enjoin all Defendants except President Trump from implementing the EO.</p>
<p><a href="#">State of California v. Trump</a> (D. Mass.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10810</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-04-03</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> 19 States challenged six provisions of Executive Order 14173, “American Elections,” arguing that President Donald Trump lacks the authority to unilaterally change the federal voter registration form and to require states to provide a public assistance program. Plaintiffs argue that the President lacks the authority to unilaterally change the federal voter registration form and to require states to provide a public assistance program. Plaintiffs are 19 States that allege the President lacks the authority to unilaterally change the federal voter registration form and to require states to provide a public assistance program. Plaintiffs request that the Court declare the challenged provisions of the EO unconstitutional and void, and to enjoin all Defendants except President Trump from implementing the EO.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 25, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Order 14173, “American Elections.” Among its requirements, the EO (1) directs the EAC to change the federal voter registration form and to require states to provide a public assistance program; (2) Section 3(d), which requires the EAC to require documentary proof of citizenship on voter registration forms and provide a public assistance program; (3) Section 3(d), which requires the EAC to require documentary proof of citizenship on voter registration forms and provide a public assistance program; (4) Section 3(d), which requires the EAC to require documentary proof of citizenship on voter registration forms and provide a public assistance program; (5) Section 3(d), which requires the EAC to require documentary proof of citizenship on voter registration forms and provide a public assistance program; (6) Section 3(d), which requires the EAC to require documentary proof of citizenship on voter registration forms and provide a public assistance program. Plaintiffs request that the Court declare the challenged provisions of the EO unconstitutional and void, and to enjoin all Defendants except President Trump from implementing the EO.</p>

**Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility**

**Executive Action: Ban on DEIA initiatives in the executive branch and by contractors and grantees ([Executive Order 14168](#); [Executive Order 14173](#))**

<p><a href="#">Nat’l Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Ed. v. Trump</a> (D. Md.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00333-ABA</p> <p>(Fourth Circuit <a href="#">Case No. 25-1189</a>)</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-03</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> Several organizations, including the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education, have challenged President Trump’s Executive Orders 14151 and 14173 (“EOs”) that ban diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA) initiatives in the executive branch and by contractors and grantees. Plaintiffs argue that the EOs violate the First Amendment rights, including the right to free speech. The organization requests that the Court declare the EOs unconstitutional and void, and to stop enforcement of the EOs immediately and at least for the duration of the lawsuit.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration issued Executive Order 14151, “American Values,” which bans diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA) initiatives in the executive branch and by contractors and grantees. On Jan. 21, the administration issued a second executive order, Executive Order 14173, “American Elections,” which also bans DEIA initiatives in the executive branch and by contractors and grantees. Plaintiffs request that the Court declare the EOs unconstitutional and void, and to stop enforcement of the EOs immediately and at least for the duration of the lawsuit.</p>
---	----------------------------------	-------------------	---

			<p>with civil investigations to deter DEI programs. Plaintiffs argue the first order is an unconstitutional vagueness. They argue the second order unconstitutional speech clause; and the separation of powers. They seek preliminary and permanent injunctions against both.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 13, Plaintiffs <a href="#">moved</a> for a TRO and p</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 18, Defendants <a href="#">filed</a> a response agai two of four Plaintiffs lack standing and that Plaintiffs' c TRO and preliminary injunction.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 21, Judge Adam B. Abelson issued a enjoining implementation of the Termination Provision Provisions of Executive Order 14173. The court stated t protected speech." The court also denied the preliminar to Executive Order 14173 and to engage in an investiga</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Feb. 24, the Defendant submitted a <a href="#">notic</a></p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 3, Judge Abelson denied the Defend</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 10, Judge Abelson granted Plaintiff' "persons in active concert or participation with defend</p> <p><b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 14, the Fourth Circuit <a href="#">granted</a> the g</p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Mar. 21, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed</a> a motion to vacat Fourth Circuit's grant of stay of the preliminary injunct additional relief that takes into account new factual de</p> <p><b>Update 9:</b> On Apr. 1, Defendants <a href="#">filed a motion</a> opposi court lacks the jurisdiction to do so after a notice of app</p>
<p><a href="#">Doe 1 v. Office of the Director of National Intelligence</a> (E.D.Va.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00300-AJT-LRV</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-17</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A group of career U.S. intelligence officers sue administrative leave following President Donald Trump's . officers argued that the ODNI terminated them without su rights, and asked the court to immediately block ODNI's a deadline to resign voluntarily in return for additional time</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administr Attorney General and OPM, to terminate DEI programs Plaintiffs are U.S. intelligence officers who were assign CIA. The complaint alleges that Defendants placed Plai assignments to personnel functions involving DEIA." P the Administrative Leave Act by placing Plaintiffs on le been alleged. Second, Plaintiffs maintain that Defenda termination" is "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discr unsupported by any evidentiary record whatsoever." Th firing Plaintiffs on the basis of "their <i>assumed</i> beliefs al interest in their employment without due process of la The plaintiffs seek injunctive relief. The plaintiffs also</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb 18, the court <a href="#">issued</a> an administrativ leave without pay.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 20, Defendants <a href="#">filed</a> a motion in opp</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Feb. 27, the court <a href="#">vacated</a> its prior admin Anthony Trenga extended the employees' deadline to a</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 27, Plaintiffs submitted a <a href="#">motion</a> fo</p>
<p><a href="#">Doe v. Collins</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00760</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-14</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Suspended employees from the Office of Equit against the Secretary of Veteran Affairs to block the Trum programs and offices in federal agencies ("DEIA EO"). Pla ruling that the OEA is not a DEIA office.</i></p>

			<p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration, the Attorney General and OPM, to terminate DEIA program the Acting Director of U.S. Office of Personnel Management to close DEIA initiatives and programs and place employees on Administrative Disposition (“VBA”) – Office of Equity Assurance (“OEA”). Plaintiffs allege that the implementation of the EO violates the Administrative Procedure Act and the Due Process Clause. Plaintiffs seek injunctive and declaratory relief, and preliminary and permanent injunctive relief by the EO.</p>
<p><a href="#">National Urban League v. Trump</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00471</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-19</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> A group of civil rights organizations sued President Trump and his administration for violating the First Amendment and due process. The organizations are asking the court to enjoin the EO.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration, the Attorney General and OPM, to terminate DEI programs, offices and positions. The administration issued another executive order revoking the EO that placed DEI programs in place since 1965; requiring federal grant recipients and contractors to comply with anti-discrimination laws; and requiring each executive agency to conduct civil investigations to deter DEI programs. Plaintiffs allege that these three executive orders “pose a threat to vulnerable populations, allege that the executive order violates the First Amendment’s Equal Protection and Due Process guarantees. Plaintiffs seek declaratory judgment that the executive orders are unconstitutional and injunctive actions taken to enforce the executive orders.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 28, Plaintiffs submitted a <a href="#">motion</a> for summary judgment. On Mar. 12, to which Plaintiffs <a href="#">replied</a> on Mar. 17. The court granted summary judgment.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 21, Plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">notice</a> to clarify Judge Timothy J. Kelly’s wife as the Director of the Department of Justice. Plaintiffs request the parties to provide further information regarding the positions on whether Judge Kelly should recuse himself from the case.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 26, both parties submitted their responses to the court’s request for information on the matter, stating that the litigants do not believe recusal is required at this time.</p>
<p><a href="#">San Francisco AIDS Foundation et al v. Trump</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 3:25-cv-1824</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-20</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> A group of nonprofit organizations representing the LGBTQ+ community and other groups that target diversity, equity, and inclusion (“DEI”) programs have asked the court to declare the EOs unconstitutional and to enjoin the implementation and enforcement of the EOs.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration, the Attorney General and OPM, to terminate DEI programs, offices and positions. The administration issued another executive order revoking the EO that placed DEI programs in place since 1965; requiring federal grant recipients and contractors to comply with anti-discrimination laws; and requiring each executive agency to conduct civil investigations to deter DEI programs. Plaintiffs allege that these three executive orders “pose a threat to vulnerable populations, allege that the executive order violates the First Amendment’s Equal Protection and Due Process guarantees. Plaintiffs seek declaratory judgment that the executive orders are unconstitutional and injunctive actions taken to enforce the executive orders.</p>

			for their liberation.” Specifically, Plaintiffs claim that tl discrimination in violation of the First Amendment, (2) (3) exceed the President’s powers under Article II of the Amendment’s guarantee of equal protection. Plaintiffs of the EOs.
<p><a href="#">Chicago Women in Trades v. Trump</a> (N.D. Ill.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-02005</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-26</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A women’s nonprofit trade organization has s equity, and inclusion (DEI) violate the First Amendment, t has asked the judge to temporarily or permanently block t</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administri extremism and [restore] biological truth to the federal ; OMB Director, assisted by the Attorney General and OP and contracts. On Jan. 21, the administration issued a t place since 1965; requiring federal grant recipients and discrimination laws; and requiring each executive agen with civil investigations to deter DEI programs. Plaintiff, a non-profit organization that works to train v orders (1) violate the First Amendment due to (a) overt unconstitutional conditions on speech; (2) violate the I of Article I, Sec. 8 (the Spending Clause); and (4) violat orders are unconstitutional and preliminary and perma</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 5, the Plaintiff <a href="#">filed</a> a <a href="#">motion</a> for a p</p> <p>Mar. 18, the Plaintiff filed a motion for a temporary res against any recipient of federal funding resulting from</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 24, the government <a href="#">filed</a> an opposit</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 26, Judge Matthew Kennelly <a href="#">granted</a></p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Apr. 1, the court issued an <a href="#">order</a> granting employees or advisors of the Department of Labor may on the basis of the termination provision of January 20 representations under the certification provision of the</p>
<p><a href="#">American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education v. Carter</a> (D. Md.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00702-JRR</p> <p>Fourth Circuit <a href="#">Case No. ca5-2025-01281</a></p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-03</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Three organizations who receive federal fundi President Donald Trump, and the Acting Secretary of Edu going toward “gender ideology extremism” and “DEI progri proper procedures, in violation of the Administrative Proc process. The organizations asked the judge to permanentl the DOE from terminating certain grant programs on Mar</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administri extremism and [restore] biological truth to the federal ; OMB Director, assisted by the Attorney General and OP and contracts. On Jan. 21, the administration issued a t place since 1965; requiring federal grant recipients and discrimination laws; and requiring each executive agen with civil investigations to deter DEI programs. Plaintiffs are organizations whose members include hu the U.S. Department of Education’s Teacher Quality Pa (SEED), and Teacher and School Leader Incentive Progr which halted DEI initiatives, the Department of Educat procedure. Specifically, the lawsuit alleges that EO 141: arbitrary and capricious decision in violation of the Ad: ordering reinstatement of grant funds. They also <a href="#">submitted</a> a motion for a temporary restraini</p>



			<p>employees to review ongoing grants to ensure they “do Allegedly, within two days recipients of Congressional Educator Development (“SEED”) grants totaling more t conflict with the administration’s policies opposing DE Eight states filed suit, arguing that the DOE’s terminati (1) arbitrary and capricious; and (2) an agency action n states seek an order vacating and setting aside the DOE terminating the grants violated the APA; and prelimina terminating the grants.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 10, a federal judge <a href="#">issued</a> a tempora <b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 12, the Defendant submitted a <a href="#">notic <b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 21, the First Circuit <a href="#">denied</a> the Defe <b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 21, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a motion to exte injunction.</a></a></p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 24, the government <a href="#">filed a motion c <b>Update 6:</b> On Mar. 24, Judge Myong J. Joun <a href="#">granted</a> Pla preliminary injunction, not to go past Apr. 7. The heari <b>Update 7:</b> On Mar. 26, the Defendants <a href="#">appealed to the administrative stay.</a></a></p> <p><b>Update 8:</b> On Apr. 4, the Supreme Court (in a 5-4 decis likely to succeed in showing the District Court lacked ju Federal Claims.*</p>
<p><a href="#">Erie County New York v. Corporation for National and Community Service</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00783</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-17</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A municipality that was awarded a grant by A in order to continue to receive funding it must certify that requirements as arbitrary and capricious, and therefore a Spending Clause.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 20, 2025, President Donald Tr programs, offices and positions, and “equity-related” gr federal grant recipients and contractors to certify that t Plaintiff, a municipality, applied for and received a thre compliance with Americorps’ rules, the grant applicatio issuance of the two Executive Order (EOs) noted above, change the language of its grant or attest to not promo arguing the Defendant’s actions are arbitrary and capri and of the Constitution’s Spending Clause, claiming th an injunction prohibiting the Defendant from imposing</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Department of Education “Dear Colleague Letter” banning DEI-related programming (<a href="#">Dear Colleague Letter</a>)</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">American Federation of Teachers v. U.S. Department of Education</a> (D. Md.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00628-SAG</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-25</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A coalition of education interest groups sued t threatened to withhold federal funding from schools with racism. The education interest groups argue that the lette the court to declare the letter unlawful and unconstitutional also asked a federal judge to temporarily block enforce website and restore other content all while the case proces</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 14, 2025, the Department of E intentions for enforcing the Supreme Court’s decision i action. According to the complaint, the Letter threaten teach about “systemic and structural racism,” or progra Plaintiffs, professional membership associations repres Amendment’s protections for freedom of speech and as Procedure Act. They seek declaratory judgment that th</p>

			<p>steps taken to implement the Letter.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 5, Plaintiffs <a href="#">amended</a> their complaint regarding the DOE’s “End DEI” portal and Feb. 28 “FAQ”</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 28, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a motion</a> for a preliminary injunction under both the Feb. 14 Dear Colleague Letter removed from the DOE website, and to order that the Letter be removed by March 20, 2025.</p>
<p><a href="#">National Education Association v. US Department of Education</a> (D.N.H.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00091</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-05</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> A group of educational organizations have sued the Department of Education threatening to take away federal funding from schools with DEI programs. The organizations argue that a target on DEI programs is unconstitutional and that the organizations are asking the judge to declare the letter unconstitutional and to seek a temporary block while the case proceeds.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 14, 2025, the Department of Education issued a letter outlining its intentions for enforcing the Supreme Court’s decision in <i>Janus</i> in the area of DEI. According to the complaint, the Letter threatened to prohibit schools from teaching about “systemic and structural racism,” or programs that address racism. Plaintiffs, a professional association that represents approximately 100,000 members, First Amendment’s protections for freedom of speech and the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). They seek declaratory judgment, preliminary and permanent injunctions against any steps taken to enforce the Letter.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 21, Plaintiffs <a href="#">amended</a> the complaint to include additional factual allegations related to CBED, additional provisions of the Higher Education Opportunity Act—which prohibits DC from removing information from government websites. On Mar. 21, Plaintiffs also <a href="#">filed a motion</a> requesting a preliminary injunction.</p>

**Removal of Information from Government Websites**

**Executive Action: Removal of information from HHS websites under Executive Order on “Gender Ideology Extremism” ([Executive Order](#))**

<p><a href="#">Doctors for America v. Office of Personnel Management et al</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00322</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-04</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> Medical nonprofit Doctors for America sued the Department of Health and Human Services for removing health-related data and information from government websites in response to an Executive Order on Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Research. The removed webpages and datasets while the case proceeds.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 31, 2025, agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services removed information from publicly-accessible websites in response to an Office of Personnel Management memorandum titled “Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Research.” Plaintiffs, suing on behalf of doctors and scientists who rely on the information, act, thus violating the Administrative Procedure Act, and the First Amendment. They seek declaratory judgments that the OPM memorandum is unconstitutional and for further removal of information from agency websites and publicly-available datasets.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 11, 2025, Judge John D. Bates issued a preliminary injunction requiring that Defendants restore webpages and datasets removed in response to the Executive Order.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 24, the government <a href="#">filed a motion</a> opposing the preliminary injunction. The motion also cross-moves for summary judgment on the merits.</p>
<p><a href="#">Schiff v. U.S. Office of Personnel Management</a></p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-10595</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-12</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> Harvard Medical School faculty members challenged the removal of gender-related topics from online public forums managed by the Department of Health and Human Services.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 31, 2025, agencies within the Department of Health and Human Services removed information from publicly-accessible websites in response to an Office of Personnel Management memorandum titled “Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Research.” Plaintiffs, suing on behalf of doctors and scientists who rely on the information, act, thus violating the Administrative Procedure Act, and the First Amendment. They seek declaratory judgments that the OPM memorandum is unconstitutional and for further removal of information from agency websites and publicly-available datasets.</p>

			<p>accessible websites in response to an Office of Personnel Management directive titled “Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Misinformation on Social Media.”</p> <p>On Mar. 12, 2025, plaintiffs Dr. Gordon Schiff and Dr. Charles Starnes challenge actions by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management. Schiff alleges that OPM’s directive to remove content promotes gender ideology and the Administrative Procedure Act on the grounds that OPM failed to remove such content.</p> <p>The plaintiffs seek to reinstate removed materials and</p>
--	--	--	--

**Actions Against FBI/DOJ Employees**

**Executive Action: Department of Justice review of FBI personnel involved in January 6 investigations ([Executive Order 14147](#))**

<p><a href="#">John and Jane Does 1-9 v. Department of Justice</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00325</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-04</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Nine Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) employees are suing the FBI, alleging an FBI survey that seeks to identify agents’ specific roles in those investigations and expect to be against political retaliation under the Civil Service Reform Act’s Amendment Due Process protections. Plaintiffs also allege that the survey would violate the Privacy Act and place them at risk of “storage, reporting, publication or dissemination” of information. The plaintiffs also <a href="#">requested</a> a temporary restraining order against any person not subject to the Privacy Act, including the FBI.</i></p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 6, 2025, Judge Jia Cobb ordered consolidation of the case with the <i>Department of Justice</i>.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 7, 2025, Judge Jia Cobb issued a <a href="#">temporary restraining order</a> that prohibits the government from publicly releasing any information. A motion for a preliminary injunction will be filed by March 21, 2025.</p>
---	----------------------------------	-------------------	--

<p><a href="#">Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association; John Does 1-4; Jane Does 1-3 v. Department of Justice</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00328</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-04</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association of current FBI Special Agents sued the Department of Justice federal judge prohibited the government from publicly releasing consolidated with John and Jane Does 1-9 v. Department of Justice</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On January 31, 2025, Acting Deputy Attorney General who had participated in the investigations into the leadership, pursuant to a directive from Bove, instructed Plaintiffs, the union that represents FBI agents and several Department of Justice intends to use this survey for public and demoting agents who participated in the investigations, protections, and Fifth Amendment Due Process protect personally identifiable information and a writ of mandamus. The plaintiffs also <a href="#">requested</a> a <a href="#">temporary restraining order</a>.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Feb. 6, 2025, Judge Jia Cobb ordered consolidation.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Feb. 7, 2025, Judge Jia Cobb issued a <a href="#">temporary restraining order</a> prohibiting the government from publicly releasing any information. A preliminary injunction will be filed by March 21, 2025.</p>
<p><b>Federalism</b></p>			
<p><b>Executive Action: Rescission of approval for New York City congestion pricing plan</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">Metropolitan Transportation Authority v. Duffy</a> (S.D.N.Y.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-01413</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-19</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>The Metropolitan Transportation Authority attempted to rescind approval for New York City's congestion pricing laws, and exceeds executive authority.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 19, Secretary of Transportation under the Trump administration was rescinding authorization for the Administrative Procedure Act's ban on arbitrary and capricious action under the National Environmental Policy Act, and exceeds executive authority to terminate the program.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 27, Riders Alliance and the Sierra Club filed a <a href="#">Motion for Preliminary In-Intervention</a>, claiming that the declaration ending the ban on the National Environmental Policy Act, and that the Trump administration's actions violate the Riders Alliance and Sierra Club asked the Court to vacate the order.</p>
<p><b>Transparency</b></p>			
<p><b>Executive Action: Response to FOIA and Records Retention</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">CREW v. DOGE</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00511</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-20</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington filed a lawsuit against the Department of Justice and related federal officials, alleging they withheld records before a March 14 congressional funding deadline.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiff claims that the United States Department of Justice operations or assurances that it is maintaining proper records. Plaintiff requests for records and demands for records preservation relief requiring Defendants to comply with Plaintiff's FOIA requests. Plaintiff initiated enforcement action through the Attorney General's office. Plaintiff filed a <a href="#">supporting memorandum</a>, for a <a href="#">preliminary injunction</a> to halt the congressional appropriations process.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 10, Judge Christopher Cooper issued a <a href="#">granting of a preliminary injunction</a>, the judge found that the government withheld records "on an expedited timetable," but denied CREW's request for a permanent injunction.</p>

			<p>the order.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 14, USDS filed a motion requesting also requested an expedited briefing schedule on USDS</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 19, USDS <a href="#">filed a motion for summary judgment</a>. USDS does not wield substantial independent authority, it is not an agency subject to FOIA or the FRA; CREW is not subject to FOIA, the FRA, or any other statutory or regulatory requirement.</p> <p><b>Update 4:</b> On Mar. 26, USDS filed their <a href="#">answer</a> to CREW's motion. USDS is not an agency subject to FOIA or the FRA; CREW is not subject to FOIA, the FRA, or any other statutory or regulatory requirement.</p> <p><b>Update 5:</b> On Mar. 27, CREW filed a <a href="#">motion for expedited summary judgment</a> and whether it is subject to FOIA and the FRA. CREW asks for summary judgment.</p>
<p><a href="#">American Oversight v. Department of Government Efficiency</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00409</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-11</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>American Oversight, a non-profit that promotes transparency and accountability in government, and other federal agencies asking the court to compel the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) to comply with the Freedom of Information Act related to the recent firings of employees. Plaintiff requests that DOGE preserve its records while the case is pending.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On January 20, 2025, President Donald Trump signed Executive Order 14176, "Department of Government Efficiency" ("DOGE"). Plaintiff American Oversight, a nonprofit organization, filed a lawsuit under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") to DOGE seeking certain records relating to Trump's recent term. Plaintiff's records were involved in discussions surrounding the firings. Plaintiff seeks to compel DOGE and OMB to process these FOIA requests. Plaintiff also seeks compensation for the costs of this lawsuit.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 5, plaintiff filed an <a href="#">amended complaint</a> adding more FOIA violation counts.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 24, plaintiff filed a <a href="#">motion</a> for preservation of the FOIA requests and inform the Court whether such records exist.</p> <p><b>Update 3:</b> On Mar. 28, DOGE and OMB <a href="#">filed</a> an answer in support of its motion for preservation order on the same day.</p> <p><b>Update 6:</b> On Apr. 2, Judge Beryl Howell <a href="#">granted</a> Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment.</p>
<p><a href="#">Project on Government Oversight, Inc. v. Trump</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00527</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-21</p>	<p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiff alleges that DOGE has "run rampant" with its records as covered by the Presidential Records Act (rather than the Freedom of Information Act). Plaintiff, an oversight-focused nonprofit "that relies on transparency," alleges that DOGE's actions violate the Presidential Records Act. They seek declaratory judgment that DOGE's actions are unlawful and that DOGE to treat its records as subject to the Federal Records Act.</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 24, 2025, Plaintiffs <a href="#">filed a motion</a> for summary judgment on records consistent with the Federal Records Act.</p>
<p><a href="#">Democracy Forward Foundation v. Office of Personnel Management</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00567</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-26</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Democracy Forward Foundation (a nonprofit organization) for failing to disclose records taken by OPM in recent months. The nonprofit argues that the court to require OPM to comply with the outstanding requests.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The Plaintiff filed several FOIA requests on Feb. 7. Plaintiff received no further communication from OPM. The Plaintiff states that OPM failed to respond within the required time to comply with the FOIA requests.</p>

<p><a href="#"><u>Democracy Forward Foundation v. Office of Management and Budget</u></a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00586</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-02-28</p>	<p><b>Case Summary:</b> Democracy Forward filed several FOIA requests to freeze federal financial assistance. OMB acknowledged the requests. The Plaintiff states that OPM failed to respond within the deadline to comply with the FOIA requests.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Environmental Defense Fund v. United States Environmental Protection Agency</u></a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00617</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-03-03</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> A nonprofit organization focused on addressing environmental records related to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) filed a lawsuit, “<i>Endangerment Finding</i>,” which was established in 2009 and serves as the legal basis for the Endangerment Finding.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> The Endangerment Finding was established under the Clean Air Act. President Donald Trump’s Executive Order (EO) 13959, which rescinded the Endangerment Finding’s legality and applicability, potentially violates the Endangerment Finding. On Jan. 29, 2025, the Environmental Defense Fund (“EDF”) filed a lawsuit to challenge the EO. EDF’s lawsuit seeks to reverse the Endangerment Finding, to force the transition team members and political appointees to comply with the Endangerment Finding’s deadline, hence the lawsuit to compel the release of records. The Plaintiff requests a court order for the Defendant to comply with the FOIA requests.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Democracy Forward Foundation v. U.S. Department of the Treasury</u></a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00684</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-03-07</p>	<p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 31 and Feb. 6, 2025, Democracy Forward filed a lawsuit against the U.S. Department of Education, and Small Business Administration (SBA), Department of Justice (DOJ), Department of the Treasury (DOE), and Small Business Administration (DOGE) staffers and DOGE-affiliated staff “were influenced by the DOJ, SBA, and DOE Branch.” These agencies acknowledged receipt but sent no response. The Plaintiff states these agencies failed to respond within the deadline to comply with the FOIA requests.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>Democracy Forward Foundation v. U.S. Marshals Service</u></a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00749</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-03-14</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> A not-for-profit organization filed several FOIA requests to the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS).</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 27 and Feb. 7, 2025, Democracy Forward filed a lawsuit against the U.S. Marshals Service (USM) seeking records following the Government Efficiency (DOGE). Allegations include (1) the declassification of records, (2) the declassification of records, and (3) the deputizing of DOGE leader Elon Musk’s private orders, Plaintiff also filed these FOIA requests after Vice President Kamala Harris would be followed. The Plaintiff states USMS failed to respond within the deadline to comply with the FOIA requests.</p>
<p><a href="#"><u>American Oversight v. Hegseth</u></a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case no. 1:25-cv-00883</p>	<p><a href="#"><u>Complaint</u></a></p>	<p>2025-03-25</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> After reports that top administration officials at the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) nonprosecuted a whistleblower, American Oversight filed suit, alleging that using an outside communication system to store records under the Federal Records Act (FRA) and Administrative Procedure Act (APA) violates the FOIA obligations.</p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Mar. 24, The Atlantic <a href="#"><u>reported</u></a> that the U.S. Marshals Service (USMS) is using a government email addresses, and the app has a function to delete records. American Oversight, a nonprofit foundation, filed FOIA requests with the federal government, filed suit against the USMS because government use of Signal prevents Plaintiffs from accessing records. The Plaintiff states that the USMS violates the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) because the USMS is using a government email addresses, and the app has a function to delete records.</p>

			<p>and amounts to removal and destruction of agency records removed and destroyed (the acting National Archivist, in nondiscretionary actions to preserve them under the FOIA course of agency business are subject to the FRA, that for the FRA. They seek preliminary and permanent injunct</p> <p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 26, plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion for a temporary restraining order</a> to initiate actions to recover any destroyed records related to an app with an auto-delete function complies with the Federal Records Act.</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 27, after a hearing, Chief Judge James L. O’Connell promptly make best efforts to preserve all Signal communication status report by Mar. 31 “setting forth the steps that the</p>
<p><a href="#">Democracy Forward Foundation v. Department of Education</a> (D.D.C.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-00940</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-03-31</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>Democracy Forward Foundation (a nonprofit organization) v. Department of Education (DOE) for allegedly failing to promptly respond to requests for information taken by DOE in recent months regarding its research activities. The court has ruled that DOE must comply with the outstanding requests.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> Plaintiff Democracy Forward Foundation (DF) (a nonprofit organization) sent two Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests to the Department of Education (DOE) for information related to contract terminations by the InsureMyLife (IML) surrounding a Feb. 14 Dear Colleague Letter (DCL) sent to IML to withhold federal funds from institutions failing to comply with the DCL. Plaintiff alleges that DOE has failed to respond to these requests and has asked the court to compel DOE to comply with the FOIA requests.</p>
<p><b>Environment</b></p>			
<p><b>Executive Action: Rescission of Previous Executive Orders and Actions, Including on Climate and Environment</b> (<a href="#">Executive Order 14176</a>)</p>			
<p><a href="#">Northern Alaska Environmental Center v. Trump</a> (D. Alaska)</p> <p>Case No. 3:25-cv-00038</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-19</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A group of environmental organizations challenge President Joe Biden's withdrawal of certain offshore areas from the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) as a violation of the separation of powers.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> In the previous presidential term, President Biden withdrew certain offshore areas from the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) in the interest of environmental conservation under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA). On January 20, 2025, President Donald Trump rescinded those withdrawals made by President Biden and thereby reinstated the OCS. Plaintiffs argue that neither OCSLA nor any other law authorizes presidents to rescind withdrawals made by their predecessors. They claim this is a violation of the doctrine of separation of powers. They seek declaratory judgment and injunctive relief to prevent further withdrawals.</p>
<p><b>Executive Action: Deletion of climate change data from government websites</b></p>			
<p><a href="#">Northeast Organic Farming Association of New York v. U.S. Department of Agriculture</a> (S.D.N.Y.)</p> <p>Case No. 1:25-cv-01529</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-02-24</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A group of environmental and agricultural organizations challenge the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), alleging that the deletion of climate change data, prevention of further removals, and notice of reinstatement of the webpages and block USDA from making similar changes.</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Jan. 30, 2025, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) deleted climate change data from its websites. Plaintiffs, including environmental organizations, argue that the removal of data violates the Paperwork Reduction Act and the Freedom of Information Act. They seek declaratory judgment that the removal of information from the websites is unlawful and seek injunctive relief to prevent further modifications to the websites; notice of any further modifications to the websites.</p>

			<p><b>Update 1:</b> On Mar. 17, Plaintiffs filed a <a href="#">motion</a> for a pre removed on Jan. 30 and prevent USDA from removing o</p> <p><b>Update 2:</b> On Mar. 31, USDA filed its <a href="#">opposition</a> to Plai</p>
<b>Trade Law</b>			
<b>Executive Action: Tariffs</b>			
<p><a href="#">Emily Ley Paper, Inc. v Trump</a> (N.D. Fla.)</p> <p>Case No. 3:25-cv-00464</p>	<p><a href="#">Complaint</a></p>	<p>2025-04-03</p>	<p><b>Overview:</b> <i>A Florida-based corporation that sources pro Orders (EOs) imposing tariffs on China, which resulted in corporation requests that the Court declare the China EO: from implementing or enforcing the tariffs, and set aside t</i></p> <p><b>Case Summary:</b> On Feb. 1 and Mar. 3, President Donal which resulted in modifications to the Harmonized Tar specializing in office products sourced from China, alle Trump issued the EOs under the authority of the Intern President to impose sanctions in response to internatic the necessity of these tariffs to address his stated emer tariffs, that the EOs issuing the tariffs are an unconstitu Doctrine under Article I of the Constitution. Additional contravene the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) as a U.S.C. §706(2)(B)) and in excess of statutory jurisdiction Plaintiff seeks a judicial declaration that the EOs and tl requests an injunction to prevent Defendants from imp to the tariff schedule.</p>

Showing 1 to 178 of 178 entries

## About the Author(s)

### Just Security

Just Security (Bluesky - Facebook - LinkedIn - Threads - X) is a forum on law, rights, and U.S. national security.