

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

THE HONORABLE \_\_\_\_\_

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE OF SEATTLE; JEWISH FAMILY SERVICES OF SILICON VALLEY; ALLEN VAUGHT; AFKAB MOHAMED HUSSEIN, JOHN DOE 1, JOHN DOE 2, JOHN DOE 3, JANE DOE 4, JANE DOE 5, JANE DOE 6, and JOHN DOE 7, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated;

Plaintiffs,

v.

DONALD TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY; ELAINE DUKE, in her official capacity as Acting Secretary of Homeland Security; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE; REX W. TILLERSON, in his official capacity as Secretary of State; OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE; and DANIEL COATS, in his official capacity as Acting Director of National Intelligence,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 17-1707

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

**INTRODUCTION**

1  
2           1.       This lawsuit challenges the Trump Administration’s third attempt since taking  
3 office at suspending the United States Refugee Admissions Program (the “USRAP”) and  
4 blocking Muslim refugees from reaching the safety of this country.

5           2.       For over half a century, the United States has played a leading role in helping  
6 refugees from around the world rebuild their lives. In enacting the Refugee Act of 1980, which  
7 created the USRAP as it exists today, Congress declared that “it is the historic policy of the  
8 United States to respond to the urgent needs of persons subject to persecution in their  
9 homelands,” including through resettlement to this country. Pub. L. No. 96-212 § 101(a), 94 Stat.  
10 102, 102.

11           3.       Despite this historical legacy and the currently unfolding global refugee crisis,  
12 President Trump campaigned on rhetoric of fear and hate and a promise to ban Muslim refugees  
13 from entering the United States. A week after taking office, on January 27, 2017, the President  
14 attempted to deliver on that promise through an executive order (“EO-1”) that indefinitely  
15 banned Syrian refugees, suspended the USRAP for 120 days with the exception of case-by-case  
16 waivers, ordered a review of the USRAP during the 120-day period, and directed that religious  
17 minorities be prioritized for admission once the USRAP resumes. President Trump expressly  
18 confirmed that this provision in EO-1 was intended to preference Christian refugees.

19           4.       When EO-1 was quickly enjoined, the President withdrew it and issued another  
20 executive order on March 6, 2017 (“EO-2”), which also suspended the USRAP for 120 days with  
21 the exception of case-by-case waivers, ordered a review of the USRAP during the 120-day  
22 period, and directed that after that period the USRAP may resume only for certain nationalities.  
23 This order was enjoined before it went into effect, although the Supreme Court allowed it to  
24 partially take effect pending appeal in June.

25           5.       On October 24, 2017, the day EO-2’s 120-day period expired, the President  
26 imposed his third—and most blatantly discriminatory—attempt to ban Muslim refugees. That

1 same day, the President issued the Executive Order on Resuming the United States Refugee  
2 Admissions Program with Enhanced Vetting Capabilities, and released an accompanying  
3 Memorandum (together, “Refugee Ban 3.0”). Refugee Ban 3.0 continues the suspension of the  
4 USRAP in two ways while the Administration purports to continue reviewing the USRAP: (1) it  
5 suspends all entry of refugees from 11 countries, 9 of which are majority Muslim, for a minimum  
6 of 90 days; and (2) it indefinitely suspends the process known as “follow-to-join,” which allows  
7 refugees who have already been admitted to the country to reunite with their spouses and  
8 children who remain abroad.

9         6. Refugee Ban 3.0 implements defendant Donald Trump’s and his Administration’s  
10 often repeated goal of banning Muslim refugees from the country. Of *all* Muslim refugees  
11 resettled in the United States in the last two fiscal years, 80% were from the nine Muslim-  
12 majority countries whose nationals are subject to this most recent suspension. For the six  
13 nationalities with the highest number of follow-to-join petitions in recent years, 62% of the  
14 refugees who arrived from those nationalities in the USRAP generally identified as Muslim. The  
15 Administration has not provided any reason justifying this suspension, or any specific criticisms  
16 of the current, extensive USRAP process, even after having spent months reviewing the USRAP  
17 under the mandates of the prior executive orders.

18         7. Refugee Ban 3.0 will irreparably harm the lives of the plaintiffs, their families,  
19 and their loved ones—people like John Doe 1, an Iraqi former interpreter for the U.S. Army who  
20 had been told to be ready to travel to the United States when Refugee Ban 3.0 came down and  
21 remains stranded outside the country; Allen Vaught, his former Army supervisor, who has been  
22 waiting to welcome him to the United States; and Jane Doe 4, a transgender Egyptian student  
23 whom the U.S. Embassy had expedited for travel because of grave risks to her safety in her  
24 current location.

25         8. These individual plaintiffs and others, along with Jewish resettlement agencies in  
26 Seattle and Silicon Valley, request that the Court enter a nationwide injunction against Refugee

1 Ban 3.0 to strike down yet another discriminatory attempt at banning Muslim refugees, and to  
2 restore the important, historic American tradition of protecting and aiding people fleeing  
3 persecution.

4 **PARTIES**

5 9. The Plaintiffs in this case are individuals and organizations. The individual  
6 plaintiffs are either United States residents who are unable to reunite with their family members  
7 or close friends because of Refugee Ban 3.0, or refugees in the USRAP who are in limbo as a  
8 result of Refugee Ban 3.0.

9 10. Plaintiff Jewish Family Service of Seattle (“JFS-S”) is a 501(c)(3) non-profit  
10 corporation with its principal place of business in Washington State.

11 11. Plaintiff Jewish Family Services of Silicon Valley (“JFS-SV”) is a 501(c)(3) non-  
12 profit corporation with its principal place of business in California.

13 12. Plaintiff Afkab Mohamed Hussein was admitted to the United States as a refugee  
14 from Somalia in 2015. He now lives in Columbus, Ohio. He has an approved follow-to-join  
15 petition for his wife and his nearly two-year-old son.

16 13. Plaintiff John Doe 1 is an Iraqi national in the USRAP. He currently lives in  
17 Cairo, Egypt. He served as an interpreter for the U.S. military in Iraq.

18 14. Plaintiff Allen Vaught is Doe 1’s former Army supervisor and has agreed to  
19 house and to assist in Doe 1’s resettlement once he arrives to the United States. He currently  
20 lives in Dallas, Texas.

21 15. Plaintiff John Doe 2 is an Iraqi national in the USRAP. He currently lives in Iraq.

22 16. Plaintiff John Doe 3 is Doe 2’s son-in-law and a lawful permanent resident. He  
23 currently lives in Pennsylvania with Doe 2’s daughter.

24 17. Plaintiff Jane Doe 4 is an Egyptian national in the USRAP. She currently lives in  
25 Egypt.

26 18. Plaintiff Jane Doe 5 is an Iraqi national in the USRAP. She currently lives in Iraq.

1           19. Plaintiff Jane Doe 6 is Doe 5’s sister and a United States citizen. She currently  
2 lives in Houston, Texas.

3           20. Plaintiff John Doe 7 is a lawful permanent resident who was admitted to the  
4 United States as a refugee from Iraq in 2014. He currently lives in King County, Washington. He  
5 has an approved follow-to-join petition for his nineteen-year-old son, whom he has not seen in  
6 almost six years.

7           21. Defendant Donald Trump is the President of the United States. Defendant Trump  
8 issued the Executive Order that serves as the basis for Refugee Ban 3.0. He is sued in his official  
9 capacity.

10          22. Defendant U.S. Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) is a cabinet-level  
11 department of the United States federal government. DHS jointly issued the Memorandum that  
12 serves as the basis for Refugee Ban 3.0. The Memorandum assigns DHS a variety of  
13 responsibilities for implementing and enforcing Refugee Ban 3.0.

14          23. Defendant Elaine Duke is the Acting Secretary of Homeland Security. Acting  
15 Secretary Duke has responsibility for overseeing enforcement and implementation of Refugee  
16 Ban 3.0 by all DHS staff. She is sued in her official capacity.

17          24. Defendant U.S. Department of State (“DOS”) is a cabinet-level department of the  
18 United States federal government. DOS jointly issued the Memorandum that serves as the basis  
19 for Refugee Ban 3.0. The Memorandum assigns DOS a variety of responsibilities for  
20 implementing and enforcing Refugee Ban 3.0.

21          25. Defendant Rex Tillerson is the Secretary of State and has responsibility for  
22 overseeing enforcement and implementation of Refugee Ban 3.0 by all DOS staff. He is sued in  
23 his official capacity.

24          26. Defendant Office of the Director of National Intelligence (“ODNI”) is an  
25 independent agency of the United States federal government. ODNI jointly issued the  
26

1 Memorandum that serves as the basis for Refugee Ban 3.0. The Memorandum assigns ODNI a  
2 variety of responsibilities for implementing and enforcing Refugee Ban 3.0.

3 27. Defendant Dan Coats is the Director of National Intelligence, and has  
4 responsibility for overseeing enforcement and implementation of Refugee Ban 3.0 by all ODNI  
5 staff. He is sued in his official capacity.

6 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7 28. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 over Plaintiffs’  
8 claims under the U.S. Constitution and federal statutes, as well as under 5 U.S.C. § 706. The  
9 Court has additional remedial authority under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202.

10 29. Venue is proper under 28 U.S.C. §1391(e). Defendants are officers or employees  
11 of the United States acting in their official capacities, and agencies of the United States. Plaintiff  
12 JFS-S is a Washington corporation with its principal place of business in Seattle, Washington.  
13 Plaintiff John Doe 7 is a U.S. lawful permanent resident who lives in King County, Washington.  
14 No real property is involved in this action.

15 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

16 **The United States Admitted a Record Number of Muslim Refugees in Response to the**  
17 **Current Global Refugee Crisis, Triggering Virulent Islamophobia in Some Quarters**

18 30. The world is currently experiencing the largest refugee crisis since World War II.  
19 Globally, there are nearly 22.5 million refugees who have been displaced from their homes and  
20 are seeking safety in another country. Of those refugees, fewer than 1 percent are resettled to  
21 safety. Those refugees who are referred for resettlement tend to be only the most vulnerable.

22 31. Due to the ongoing civil war in Syria, which the office of the United Nations High  
23 Commissioner for Refugees calls “one of the deadliest, most destructive conflicts in recent  
24 history,” the largest percentage of refugees in the world currently are Syrian. Over 5 million  
25 people have fled Syria, a country that is 87 percent Muslim, since the war began in 2011. In the  
26

1 first half of 2017 alone, 1.3 million Syrians were newly displaced—an average of 7,000 people  
2 per day who have been forced to flee their homes.

3 32. In response to this global refugee crisis, the United States began to accept more  
4 refugees, and in particular significantly more Syrian refugees, starting in 2015. In that year,  
5 President Obama directed his administration to accept at least 10,000 Syrian refugees. The  
6 Obama Administration also raised the ceiling on annual refugee admissions from 70,000 to  
7 85,000 in fiscal year 2016, and then to 110,000 in fiscal year 2017 in response to the scale of the  
8 current global refugee crisis. Approximately 98% of the Syrian refugees resettled in the United  
9 States were Muslim as of January 2017.

10 33. In part because of the United States' humanitarian response to the Syrian refugee  
11 crisis, the number of Muslim refugees arriving to the United States has increased. In fiscal year  
12 2016, the United States admitted the highest number of Muslim refugees of any year since data  
13 on religious affiliations of refugees became available. Nearly half of the total number of refugees  
14 who entered the country in fiscal year 2016 were Muslim; and for the first time in a decade,  
15 Muslim refugees outnumbered Christian refugees.

16 34. This increase in Muslim refugees fanned Islamophobia among some politicians, a  
17 number of whom would end up in the Trump Administration. Now Vice President Mike Pence,  
18 then-Governor of Indiana, was just one of numerous governors who attempted to refuse or  
19 otherwise suspend the resettlement of Syrian refugees in their states, based on fearmongering  
20 that Syrian refugees represented a “Trojan horse” through which radical Islam could enter the  
21 United States.

22 35. These state attempts to ban Syrian refugees were uniformly blocked by the federal  
23 courts. *See, e.g., Tex. Health & Human Servs. Comm. v. United States*, 193 F. Supp. 3d 733, 745  
24 (N.D. Tex. 2016); *Exodus Refugee Immigration, Inc. v. Pence*, 838 F.3d 902, 903-04 (7th Cir.  
25 2016). The Seventh Circuit found then-Governor Pence's actions to be discriminatory and based  
26

1 on nothing other than “nightmare speculation” of refugees posing as ISIS terrorists. *Exodus*  
2 *Refugee Immigration*, 838 F.3d at 903.

3 36. Now Attorney General Jeff Sessions, then-Senator, claimed in November 2015  
4 that “it is an unpleasant but unavoidable fact that bringing in a large unassimilated flow of  
5 migrants from the Muslim world creates the conditions possible for radicalization and extremism  
6 to take hold.” In September 2016, Sessions blamed the refugee community for “honor  
7 killings”— “a well-worn tactic for stigmatizing and demeaning Islam and painting the religion,  
8 and its men, as violent and barbaric.” *Int’l Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump*, 857 F.3d 554,  
9 596 n.17 (4th Cir. 2017), *cert. granted*, 137 S. Ct. 2080 (2017), and *vacated as moot*, No. 16-  
10 1436, 2017 WL 4518553 (U.S. Oct. 10, 2017). When the State Department official in charge of  
11 the refugee program at the time responded that there was no evidence that there were any honor  
12 killings among the refugee population resettled in the United States, Sessions retorted: “[I]t’s  
13 from the same cultural background.”

#### 14 **Responding to the Wave of Islamophobia, President Trump Campaigned on a Promise to** 15 **Ban Muslim Refugees**

16 37. Presidential candidate Donald Trump was one of the politicians who traded on  
17 this wave of Islamophobia, constantly conflating refugees—particularly Muslim refugees—with  
18 “radical Islamic terrorists” and vilifying the Muslim faith. He repeatedly asserted that refugees,  
19 particularly Syrian refugees, were a collective “Trojan horse” through which the Islamic State of  
20 Iraq and Syria (“ISIS”) would attack the United States. He campaigned on the promise to  
21 exclude Muslim refugees, as well as Muslim migrants generally, from entering the United States.

22 38. This rhetoric dates back at least to September 2015, when President Obama,  
23 pursuant to his authority under the Refugee Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1157(a), announced that the United  
24 States would resettle 10,000 Syrian refugees in the following fiscal year. Then-candidate Trump  
25 derided this decision, claiming that “[t]hey could be ISIS,” or even “a terrorist army in hiding.”  
26 If elected, Trump promised, “they’re going back.”



1           39.     Several weeks later, on November 13, 2015, ISIS claimed responsibility for  
2 coordinated attacks in Paris, France, which killed 130 people. The attackers whose identities  
3 have been confirmed were all Belgian and French nationals. While no Syrian nationals were  
4 confirmed to have taken part in the attacks, a fake Syrian passport was found near one of the  
5 attackers, whose fingerprints matched those of an individual who had entered Greece from  
6 Turkey and presented himself as an asylum seeker. Notwithstanding the dramatic differences in  
7 refugee screening and admissions to Europe and the United States, candidate Trump’s assertion  
8 after the Paris attacks that refugees could be Muslim terrorists in disguise—and therefore must  
9 be kept out—became a staple of his campaign.

10           40.     In the days after the Paris attacks, candidate Trump tweeted about how Syrian  
11 refugees, some of whom “could be ISIS,” were “now pouring into our great country,” claiming  
12 further that some “were just caught on the southern border” with Mexico, trying to enter the  
13 United States.

14           41.     Candidate Trump subsequently suggested in the same month that he would, as  
15 President, require all Muslims in the United States to register with the federal government as a  
16 way to monitor would-be terrorists. Upon receiving political and media pushback, President  
17 Trump sought to “clarify” that his proposal was rather to build a database, not for all Muslims,  
18 but just for Syrian refugees—notwithstanding that DHS already has a database of all refugees.

19           42.     As the election season progressed, candidate Trump broadened the scope of his  
20 attack on Muslim immigrants. On December 7, 2015, candidate Trump issued a statement on his  
21 campaign website entitled, “DONALD J. TRUMP STATEMENT ON PREVENTING MUSLIM  
22 IMMIGRATION.” The statement declared that “Donald J. Trump is calling for a total and  
23 complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country’s representatives can  
24 figure out what is going on.” The statement falsely suggested that all Muslims believe in “murder  
25 against non-believers who won’t convert” and “unthinkable acts” against women. It remained on  
26 President Trump’s campaign website until May 8, 2017—months after the inauguration.

1 43. Defending his proposed “Muslim ban” on December 7, 2015, candidate Trump  
2 explained on Good Morning America, “What I’m doing is I’m calling very simply for a  
3 shutdown of Muslims entering the United States—and here’s a key—until our country’s  
4 representatives can figure out what is going on.”

5 44. On March 9, 2016, candidate Trump stated, “I think Islam hates us. There’s . . . a  
6 tremendous hatred there . . . . There’s an unbelievable hatred of us . . . . We can’t allow people  
7 coming into this country who have this hatred of the United States . . . and of people that are not  
8 Muslim . . . .”

9 45. The next day, during a debate, candidate Trump said he would “stick with  
10 exactly” what he had said the night before. When asked if he was referring to all 1.6 billion  
11 Muslims worldwide, he explained, “I mean a lot of them.”

12 46. On March 22, 2016, candidate Trump told Fox Business that “we’re having  
13 problems with the Muslims, and we’re having problems with Muslims coming into the country.”

14 47. The same day, candidate Trump took to Twitter to criticize the Democratic  
15 candidate for President, Hillary Clinton, for wanting to “let the Muslims flow in.”

16 48. A few days later, candidate Trump tweeted: “Europe and the U.S. must  
17 immediately stop taking in people from Syria. This will be the destruction of civilization as we  
18 know it! So sad!”

19 49. On May 11, 2016, candidate Trump announced that he was putting together an  
20 “immigration commission,” potentially to be headed by Rudy Giuliani, that would “look at the  
21 ‘Muslim ban,’ or ‘temporary ban’ as we call it.” As Mr. Giuliani explained later, the commission  
22 was formed to devise a way to “legally” implement a “Muslim ban,” and it recommended using  
23 territory as a proxy for religion.

24 50. Presumably heeding his commission’s advice, candidate Trump began to discuss  
25 the ban as operating on the basis of geography. When pressed to name the countries that would  
26

1 be affected, candidate Trump demurred, but stated that his ban would incorporate a pre-existing  
2 list of what he called “terror nations.”

3 51. Lest there be any doubt about what he was proposing, however, candidate Trump  
4 repeatedly rejected the notion that he was backing away from the promised Muslim ban—which  
5 he continued to defend as a good idea—and instead emphasized that he was using territory as a  
6 proxy for religion. Candidate Trump also continued to denigrate the Muslim faith and conflate  
7 refugees, particularly Muslim refugees, with “Radical Islamic Terrorism.”

8 52. On June 13, 2016, for example, candidate Trump stated in a major speech on  
9 national security that “many . . . are saying that I was right” to call for a Muslim Ban in  
10 December 2015. In the same prepared speech, he promised to “suspend immigration from  
11 [certain] areas of the world.”

12 53. Later that same day, candidate Trump tweeted: “In my speech on protecting  
13 America I spoke about a temporary ban, which includes suspending immigration from nations  
14 tied to Islamic terror.”

15 54. On June 25, 2016, candidate Trump stated that he “do[esn’t] want people coming  
16 in from certain countries.” When asked which countries, candidate Trump explained to one  
17 media outlet that “they’re pretty well decided. All you have to do is look!” and to another, “I  
18 want people that have bad thoughts out. I would limit specific terrorist countries and we know  
19 who those countries are.”

20 55. In a joint interview with candidate Trump and his running mate Pence that aired  
21 on 60 Minutes on July 17, 2016, Pence confirmed that he agreed with Trump’s call for “a  
22 temporary ban on Muslims entering the United States,” referring to his own attempt to suspend  
23 the Syrian refugee program in Indiana. When Pence was asked about whether such calls are  
24 offensive and unconstitutional, candidate Trump jumped in to explain that he will be using  
25 territories as a proxy for religion, stating: “So you call it territories. OK? We’re gonna do  
26 territories. We’re gonna not let people come in from Syria that nobody knows who they are.”

1 Asked again whether Muslims would be banned, candidate Trump said, “there’s nothing like”  
2 the Constitution “[b]ut it doesn’t necessarily give us the right to commit suicide, as a country,  
3 OK?” He again reiterated: “Call it whatever you want.”

4 56. In a July 24, 2016 interview on Meet the Press, candidate Trump was asked if his  
5 plan to ban territories was a “rollback” from “[t]he Muslim Ban.” Candidate Trump responded:  
6 “I don’t think so. I actually don’t think it’s a rollback. In fact, you could say it’s an expansion.  
7 I’m looking now at territories.” Candidate Trump continued: “People were so upset when I used  
8 the word Muslim. Oh, you can’t use the word Muslim. Remember this. And I’m okay with that,  
9 because I’m talking territory instead of Muslim.”

10 57. When speaking to Sean Hannity of Fox News the next day, candidate Trump  
11 again rejected the idea that he was retreating from his proposed Muslim ban, stating that his  
12 “position’s gotten bigger now” because he is “talking about territories now.” Candidate Trump  
13 explained that “we’re talking about territories” because “[p]eople don’t want me to say Muslim.”

14 58. In a major prepared speech on immigration on August 15, 2016, candidate Trump  
15 outlined a plan to ask the Departments of State and Homeland Security to identify “a list of  
16 regions where adequate screening cannot take place” so that the United States could “stop  
17 processing visas from those areas until such time as it is deemed safe to resume based on new  
18 circumstances or new procedures.” Although he then claimed that “[t]he size of current  
19 immigration flows are too large to perform adequate screening,” the only “immigration flow” he  
20 expressed concern about was that from the Middle East: “We admit about 100,000 permanent  
21 immigrants from the Middle East every year. Beyond that, we admit hundreds of thousands of  
22 temporary workers and visitors from the same regions. Hundreds of thousands. If we don’t  
23 control the numbers, we can’t perform adequate screening.” He called for developing a new  
24 “screening test” that he called “extreme, extreme vetting,” and proposed that the United States  
25 “screen out” those who “who believe Sharia law should supplant American law.”  
26

1           59.     On August 31, 2016, candidate Trump, in another speech on immigration,  
2 explained that his immigration policy would include asking applicants “their views about honor  
3 killings, about respect for women and gays and minorities,” and their “[a]ttitudes on radical  
4 Islam,” to ensure that those we admit “share our values.”

5           60.     Throughout the summer and into the fall, candidate Trump issued press releases  
6 that baselessly attacked refugees, as a categorical group, for allegedly supporting “Radical  
7 Islamic Terrorism” and rejecting American values:

- 8           • “Hillary Clinton wants to dramatically increase admissions from the Middle East,  
9 bringing in many hundreds of thousands during a first term—and we will have no  
10 way to screen them, pay for them, or prevent the second generation from  
11 radicalizing. We need to protect all Americans, of all backgrounds and all beliefs,  
12 from Radical Islamic Terrorism—which has no place in an open and tolerant  
13 society.”
- 14           • “Why does Hillary Clinton want to bring people here—in vast numbers—who  
15 reject our values?”
- 16           • “Hillary Clinton also wants to push to bring in 620,000 refugees in her first  
17 term—a number of whom come from countries where women and gays are  
18 horribly brutalized—which will weaken our tolerant way of life.”
- 19           • “Terrorists are infiltrating our country. Now, Hillary Clinton wants a 550%  
20 increase in Syrian refugees and countless more refugees from across the Middle  
21 East. I want to keep you and your family safe.”

22           61.     In responding to a question at a presidential debate in October 2016 about the  
23 proposed Muslim ban, candidate Trump responded by referring to Muslim refugees, stating: “It’s  
24 called extreme vetting. We are going to areas like Syria where they’re coming in by the tens of  
25 thousands because of Barack Obama.”

26           62.     On October 25, 2016, candidate Trump promised that he will take actions “on the  
first day . . . to restore the rule of law,” such as “[s]uspend[ing] immigration from regions  
compromised by Radical Islamic terrorism, including the suspension of the Syrian Refugee  
Program.”

          63.     On October 27, candidate Trump warned that his opponent’s refugee plan to  
allow Syrian refugees in the country “would leave us with generations of terrorism, radicalism

1 and extremism inside of our shores.” He claimed: “I only want to admit people who will support  
2 this country and love its people.”

3 64. And on October 29, just weeks before the election, candidate Trump promised:  
4 “We are going to . . . stop the massive inflow of refugees and keep Radical Islamic Terrorist out  
5 of our country.”

6 65. On December 21, 2016, after his election, president-elect Trump was asked  
7 whether he “had cause to rethink or reevaluate [his] plans to create a Muslim register or ban  
8 Muslim immigration to the United States.” He replied: “You know my plans all along, and I’ve  
9 been proven to be right, 100 percent correct.”

10 **The Trump Administration Has Been Attempting Since Inauguration to Deliver on**  
11 **President Trump’s Campaign Promise to Ban Muslim Refugees**

12 66. After winning a campaign in which banning Muslim refugees was a key promise,  
13 President Trump attempted to deliver on that promise just a week after being inaugurated  
14 through an executive order issued on January 27, 2017 (“EO-1”). *See* Exec. Order No. 13769,  
15 Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into the United States, 82 Fed. Reg. 8977  
16 (Jan. 27, 2017).

17 67. EO-1 was the Trump Administration’s first attempt to ban Muslim refugees from  
18 the United States and favor Christian refugees. In an interview with the Christian Broadcasting  
19 Network released the same day that he signed EO-1, President Trump confirmed that he intended  
20 to change the refugee program to prioritize Christians. He explained: “If you were a Muslim you  
21 could come in [to the United States], but if you were a Christian, it was almost impossible . . . .  
22 [T]hey were chopping off the heads of everybody but more so the Christians. And I thought it  
23 was very, very unfair. So we are going to help them.”

24 68. EO-1 indefinitely blocked Syrian refugees from entering the United States. EO-1  
25 § 5(c).  
26

1           69.     EO-1 also suspended the USRAP for 120 days and directed the Secretary of State,  
2 together with the Secretary of Homeland Security and in consultation with the Director of  
3 National Intelligence, to review the USRAP during this period “to determine what additional  
4 procedures should be taken to ensure that those approved for refugee admission do not pose a  
5 threat to the security and welfare of the United States” and “to implement such additional  
6 procedures.” EO-1 § 5(a). During the 120-day period refugees could be admitted only on a  
7 discretionary case-by-case basis and only if the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security  
8 determined that “the admission of such individuals as refugees is in the national interest—  
9 including when the person is a religious minority in his country of nationality facing religious  
10 persecution.” EO-1 § 5(a) & (e). Upon the resumption of the USRAP, EO-1 further directed the  
11 Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, to make changes “to  
12 prioritize refugee claims made by individuals on the basis of religious-based persecution,  
13 provided that the religion of the individual is a minority religion in the individual’s country of  
14 nationality.” EO-1 § 5(b).

15           70.     EO-1 also slashed by more than half the annual refugee admissions allotment that  
16 was set prior to fiscal year 2017. Under 8 U.S.C. § 1157, the President has the power to  
17 determine, at the beginning of each fiscal year, the ceiling on the number of refugees that may be  
18 admitted in any fiscal year after appropriate consultation with members of Congress. For fiscal  
19 year 2017, President Obama determined that admissions of up to 110,000 refugees was justified  
20 by humanitarian concerns or was otherwise in the national interest. Three months after President  
21 Obama set this ceiling, EO-1 attempted to lower it to 50,000 refugees. EO-1 § 5(d).

22           71.     EO-1 further banned any entry for 90 days for individuals from seven countries,  
23 each of which is more than 85 percent Muslim: Syria, Sudan, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, and  
24 Yemen. EO-1 § 3(c). EO-1 and the implementation of this travel ban caused chaos throughout  
25 the country’s airports and other ports of entry.  
26

1           72.     On February 3, 2017—less than a week after EO-1 was issued—this Court issued  
2 a nationwide temporary restraining order enjoining the refugee ban in Sections 5(a)-(c) and 5(e)  
3 and travel ban in section 3(c) of EO-1. *Washington v. Trump*, No. C17-0141JLR, 2017 WL  
4 462040, at \*2 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 3, 2017).

5           73.     The Ninth Circuit, after hearing oral argument and construing the temporary  
6 restraining order as a preliminary injunction, denied the government’s motion for a stay of that  
7 injunction pending appeal. 857 F. 3d 1151, 1156 (9th Cir. 2017) (per curiam).

8           74.     Shortly after the Ninth Circuit’s opinion issued, President Trump took to Twitter  
9 to complain: “‘77% of refugees allowed into U.S. since travel reprieve hail from seven suspect  
10 countries.’ (WT) [sic] SO DANGEROUS!”

11           75.     Rather than pursuing the appeal from EO-1, on March 6, 2017, President Trump  
12 signed a new Executive Order (“EO-2”), which became effective on March 16 and rescinded and  
13 replaced EO-1. Exec. Order No. 13780, Protecting the Nation From Foreign Terrorist Entry Into  
14 the United States, 82 Fed. Reg. 13209 (Mar. 6, 2017).

15           76.     EO-2 was the Trump Administration’s second attempt to ban refugees, and it was  
16 substantially similar to EO-1. In fact, before issuing EO-2, President Trump explained why he  
17 planned to do so: “I got elected on defense of our country. And I keep my campaign promises.  
18 And our citizens will be very happy when they see the result.” In the days that followed the  
19 issuance of EO-2, Press Secretary Sean Spicer affirmed that “the principles of the executive  
20 order remain the same.” Stephen Miller, a senior advisor to President Trump, explained that  
21 EO-2 would constitute “the same basic policy outcome for the country.”

22           77.     Like EO-1, EO-2 suspended the USRAP for 120 days and directed the Secretary  
23 of State, in conjunction with the Secretary of Homeland Security and in consultation with the  
24 Director of National Intelligence, to review the USRAP during this period “to determine what  
25 additional procedures should be used to ensure that individuals seeking admission as refugees do  
26 not pose a threat to the security and welfare of the United States” and “to implement such



1 additional procedures.” EO-2 § 6(a). During the 120-day period, refugees could be admitted only  
2 on a discretionary case-by-case basis and only if the Secretaries of State and Homeland Security  
3 determined that “the entry of such individuals as refugees is in the national interest and does not  
4 pose a threat to the security or welfare of the United States.” EO-2 § 6(c). EO-2 directed that the  
5 USRAP shall resume after 120 days “only for stateless persons and nationals of countries for  
6 which the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National  
7 Intelligence have jointly determined that additional procedures implemented . . . are adequate to  
8 ensure the security and welfare of the United States.” EO-2 § 6(a).

9         78. Like EO-1, EO-2 attempted to lower the ceiling on admissions of refugees for  
10 fiscal year 2017 to 50,000. EO-2 § 6(b).

11         79. Like EO-1, EO-2 also banned entry into the United States for a new 90-day period  
12 for individuals from six of the same seven predominantly Muslim countries identified in EO-1:  
13 Syria, Sudan, Iran, Libya, Somalia, and Yemen. EO-2 § 2(c).

14         80. On March 15, 2017, before EO-2 could take effect, the District of Hawai’i issued  
15 a nationwide temporary restraining order of the refugee ban in section 6 and travel ban in  
16 section 2 of EO-2, holding that these sections likely violated the Establishment Clause. *Hawai’i*  
17 *v. Trump*, 241 F. Supp. 3d 1119, 1140 (D. Haw. 2017). On March 29, 2017, the District Court  
18 converted the Temporary Restraining Order into a preliminary injunction. *Hawai’i v. Trump*, 245  
19 F. Supp. 3d 1227, 1239 (D. Haw. 2017).

20         81. On appeal, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the Hawai’i district court’s preliminary  
21 injunction as to the refugee and travel bans, holding that those bans violate the Immigration and  
22 Nationality Act (“INA”), and that the President exceeded his statutory authority in suspending  
23 refugee admissions. *Hawai’i v. Trump*, 859 F.3d 741, 755-56 (9th Cir. 2017) (per curiam).

24         82. In a parallel proceeding, on March 16, 2017, the District of Maryland issued a  
25 nationwide preliminary injunction of the travel ban, finding that it likely violated the  
26

1 Establishment Clause. *Int'l Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump*, 241 F. Supp. 3d 539, 566 (D.  
2 Md. 2017).

3 83. Sitting en banc, the Fourth Circuit affirmed on the same basis. *Int'l Refugee*  
4 *Assistance Project v. Trump*, 857 F.3d 554, 605-06 (4th Cir. 2017) (en banc).

5 84. The government petitioned for certiorari in the Maryland and Hawai'i cases and  
6 moved for a stay of the preliminary injunctions. On June 26, 2017, the Supreme Court granted  
7 certiorari, consolidated the cases, and partially stayed both preliminary injunctions pending  
8 appeal to the extent they applied to "foreign nationals abroad who have no connection to the  
9 United States at all." *Trump v. Int'l Refugee Assistance Project*, 137 S. Ct. 2080, 2087-88 (2017)  
10 (per curiam).

11 85. President Trump expressed fury that multiple courts had enjoined EO-2, which he  
12 called the "watered down" version of EO-1 that he had agreed to only at the urging of his  
13 lawyers.

14 86. Shortly after the ruling from the District of Hawai'i preliminarily enjoining  
15 portions of EO-2, President Trump stated: "The best way to keep foreign terrorists or, as some  
16 people would say in certain instances, radical Islamic terrorists from attacking our country is to  
17 stop them from entering our country in the first place." He claimed that he had agreed to "tailor"  
18 EO-2 to resist legal challenge at the urging of "the lawyers," but asserted that "we ought to go  
19 back to the first one and go all the way, which is what I wanted to do in the first place."

20 87. On June 5, in a series of tweets, he said, "People, the lawyers and the courts can  
21 call it whatever they want, but I am calling it what we need and what it is, a TRAVEL BAN! /  
22 The Justice Dept. should have stayed with the original Travel Ban, not the watered down,  
23 politically correct version they submitted to S.C. / The Justice Dept. should ask for an expedited  
24 hearing of the watered down Travel Ban before the Supreme Court - & seek [a] much tougher  
25 version!"  
26

1           88.     On August 18, President Trump declared on Twitter that “Radical Islamic  
2 Terrorism must be stopped by whatever means necessary! The courts must give us back our  
3 protective rights. Have to be tough!”

4           89.     Despite President Trump’s displeasure with the court rulings enjoining EO-2, the  
5 Trump Administration had succeeded by the fall of 2017 to admit fewer Muslim refugees. The  
6 religious composition of refugees arriving to the United States has shifted on a monthly basis  
7 since the inauguration. In February, the first full month of the Administration, 50% of the  
8 refugees who entered the United States were Muslim and 41% were Christians. By June,  
9 Christians (57%) made up a larger share of arrivals than Muslims (31%).

10          90.     On September 24, 2017, with Supreme Court review pending and EO-2’s 90-day  
11 travel ban expiring, President Trump replaced EO-2 with a presidential proclamation (“EO-3”).  
12 Proclamation No. 9645, Enhancing Vetting Capabilities and Processes for Detecting Attempted  
13 Entry Into the United States by Terrorists or Other Public Safety Threats, 82 Fed. Reg. 45161  
14 (Sept. 24, 2017) (“EO-3”). EO-3 indefinitely banned entry to the United States of most nationals  
15 of six Muslim-majority countries—Chad, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen. Although two  
16 non-Muslim majority countries—Venezuela and North Korea—were listed in EO-3, the impact  
17 on the nationals of those countries was limited. EO-3 banned only certain Venezuelan  
18 government officials and their immediate relatives who seek to enter the United States on non-  
19 immigrant visitor and business visas, affecting at most a few hundred Venezuelans a year.  
20 Similarly, although EO-3 barred all immigrant and non-immigrant entry from North Korea, in  
21 recent years there have been only a hundred or so admissions of North Koreans each year.

22          91.     On October 17, 2017, before EO-3 could go into effect fully, the District of  
23 Hawai’i preliminarily enjoined EO-3, holding that the President again exceeded its statutory  
24 authority in banning hundreds of millions of people from the country. *Hawai’i v. Trump*, No. 17-  
25 00050 DKW-KSC, 2017 WL 4639560, at \*11-12 (D. Haw. Oct. 17, 2017).



1 refugees to enter this country, and, if so, what those actions should be,” and that the two officials  
2 “shall administer the USRAP consistent with those determinations.” *Id.*

3 99. EO-4 reported that the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security,  
4 and the Director of National Intelligence “have advised that . . . they will apply special measures  
5 to certain categories of refugees whose entry continues to pose potential threats to the security  
6 and welfare of the United States.” EO-4 § 2(a). EO-4 did not, however, state what those “special  
7 measures” were, or the “categories” to which they would apply.

8 100. On the same day that EO-4 was issued, a memorandum to the President from the  
9 Secretaries of State and Homeland Security and the Director of National Intelligence, dated  
10 October 23, 2017, with an accompanying Addendum (the “Memorandum”), was released. The  
11 Memorandum continues the refugee bans in EO-1 and EO-2 in two ways: (1) it continues to  
12 suspend the USRAP for refugees from 11 countries, 9 of which are overwhelmingly Muslim; and  
13 (2) it indefinitely suspends the follow-to-join process, through which refugees already in the  
14 United States can be reunited here with their spouses and minor children who remain abroad.

15 The Ban on Refugees from Nine Overwhelmingly Muslim Countries

16 101. The Memorandum imposes a suspension on refugee admissions for “nationals of,  
17 and stateless persons who last habitually resided in, 11 particular countries previously identified  
18 as posing a higher risk to the United States through their designation on the Security Advisory  
19 Opinion (SAO) list.”

20 102. A “Security Advisory Opinion,” or “SAO,” refers to a particular biographic  
21 security check administered for refugee applicants, including for those who are members of a  
22 group or nationality that the government has designated as requiring this additional check. An  
23 SAO is in addition to the extensive security vetting that all refugee applicants receive prior to  
24 being resettled to the United States.

25 103. Neither EO-4 nor the Memorandum identify the “11 particular countries” that are  
26 on the SAO list and therefore whose refugee nationals are now prohibited from entering, but

1 upon information, belief, and public reporting, those countries are Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Mali,  
2 Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Yemen, South Sudan, and North Korea.<sup>1</sup>

3 104. Over 40% of all refugees resettled through the USRAP in the last two fiscal years  
4 came from one of these 11 countries, with refugees from South Sudan and North Korea  
5 accounting for a miniscule percentage. Of those 11 countries, all but South Sudan and North  
6 Korea are at least 85 percent Muslim.

7 105. Over 80% of refugees resettled from these 11 countries over the last two fiscal  
8 years have been Muslim.

9 106. These countries' nationals comprise an overwhelming percentage of all Muslim  
10 refugees resettled through the USRAP. Of *all* Muslim refugees resettled in the United States in  
11 the last two fiscal years, 80% were from the 9 Muslim-majority countries whose nationals are  
12 subject to the Memorandum's suspension.

13 107. The Memorandum states that, "for countries subject to SAOs," the government  
14 will conduct "a review and analysis of each country" that is "to be completed within 90 days."  
15 The Memorandum, however, does not explain why such review and analysis is necessary.  
16 Indeed, refugees from these countries already receive heightened vetting under current  
17 procedures, but the Memorandum does not identify any deficiencies with those procedures.  
18 Instead, it inexplicably relies on the existence of those procedures to attempt to justify the need  
19 for review and analysis. Nor does the Memorandum explain why the review and analysis was not  
20 completed during the 120-day period under EO-2 when the Secretary of State, in conjunction  
21 with the Secretary of Homeland Security and in consultation with the Director of National  
22 Intelligence, was directed to conduct a review of the USRAP.

23  
24  
25 <sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Yeganeh Torbati & Mica Rosenberg, Under Trump Plan, Refugees from 11 Countries Face  
26 Additional U.S. Barriers, Reuters (Oct. 24, 2017), <http://reut.rs/2gRvoDh>; Sabrina Siddiqui, Trump Ends Refugee  
Ban With Order to Review Program For 11 Countries, The Guardian (Oct. 24, 2017), <http://bit.ly/2llufW9>; Ted  
Hesson, Trump Targets 11 Nations in Refugee Order, Politico (Oct. 24, 2017), <http://politi.co/2gJQ5NW>.

1           108. The Memorandum states further that during this new 90-day review period,  
2 refugees who are nationals of (or stateless persons who last habitually resided in) one of these 11  
3 countries will be “consider[ed] . . . for potential admission” to the United States only if their  
4 resettlement here “would fulfill critical foreign policy interests, without compromising national  
5 security and the welfare of the United States.” The Memorandum does not explain why such an  
6 assessment is necessary specifically for refugees from the 11 SAO countries. Nor does the  
7 Memorandum provide any criteria for that assessment, instead stating only that the Secretary of  
8 Homeland Security may admit refugees who meet it “on a case-by-case basis only.” This “case-  
9 by-case” exception to the Memorandum’s suspension is nearly identical to the case-by-case  
10 waiver provisions that existed in President Trump’s prior executive orders banning entry of  
11 refugees and nationals of specified Muslim-majority nations.

12           109. The Memorandum does not cite any authority for imposing this suspension on  
13 admission of nationals from the 11 SAO countries, nor does it state whether admission of  
14 refugees from the SAO countries will resume after 90 days. The Memorandum’s suspension  
15 applies even to refugees who have already obtained an SAO, passed it and all other required  
16 security checks, and had been preparing to travel to the United States.

17           110. The Memorandum further provides that, during the suspension period, “the  
18 Secretary of State and Secretary of Homeland Security will temporarily prioritize refugee  
19 applications from other non-SAO countries” by “tak[ing] resources” that would have been used  
20 to process the refugee applications of nationals from one of the 11 countries, and “reallocat[ing]  
21 them to process applicants” from countries not subject to the suspension. The Memorandum does  
22 not cite any authority for this reallocation of resources away from the SAO countries to the non-  
23 SAO countries, nor does it state whether the resources will ever be shifted back to SAO  
24 countries. The Memorandum also does not provide any rational justification for this reallocation  
25 of resources—it states only that it is necessary because processing of applications from SAO  
26 countries is “resource intensive.”

1           111. This prioritization of applications from non-SAO countries will have the effect of  
2 significantly increasing the percentage of Christian refugees resettled here while significantly  
3 decreasing the percentage of Muslim refugees. According to the Pew Research Center, a  
4 nonpartisan fact tank, “[o]ne important factor that influences the religious composition of  
5 refugee arrivals is country of origin.” In the past two fiscal years, approximately 70% of the  
6 refugees resettled from the non-SAO countries were Christian; only 16% were Muslim.

7           112. The Memorandum thus implements the Trump Administration’s oft-repeated  
8 desire to ban Muslim refugees while prioritizing the resettlement of Christian refugees, including  
9 the President’s pledge to help Christians on the day of EO-1, as well as his claim in April that he  
10 is “going to be helping the Christians big league.”

11           113. In fact, the day after EO-4 was issued and the Memorandum was released, Vice  
12 President Mike Pence gave an address at the annual dinner of In Defense of Christians, a non-  
13 profit organization that, per its website, advocates “for the protection and preservation of  
14 Christians and Christianity in the Middle East.” During his address, Vice President Pence called  
15 out “radical Islamic terrorists” who have perpetrated “vile acts of persecution animated by hatred  
16 for Christians and the Gospel of Christ” and promised Christians in the Middle East that “[h]elp  
17 is on the way.”

18           114. On October 26, 2017, in a hearing on Oversight of the United States Refugee  
19 Admissions Program, Acting Assistant Secretary Simon Henshaw of the U.S. Department of  
20 State testified that the USRAP will “continue to demonstrate America’s commitment to assisting  
21 victims of ISIS in northern Iraq and throughout the Middle East,” choosing to highlight only the  
22 USRAP’s work in Northern Iraq with “Yezidi, Christian, and members of other religious  
23 minorities,” without any mention of the Muslim refugees in need of help in the region.

24           115. Even if EO-4’s suspension on admissions of nationals of SAO countries is limited  
25 to 90 days, it will have a devastating impact on Muslim refugees. That is because refugees have a  
26 set window to complete their travel—if they miss this window, the time-consuming security and



1 medical checks that they passed will begin to expire. Once a check expires, it must be re-  
2 initiated. But because each security check can take months or even years to complete, the  
3 expiration of even one can have a cascading effect, as other clearances expire while the first is  
4 being re-processed. As a result, even relatively short-term delays in the resettlement process may  
5 reverberate for far longer. This cycle may turn even a temporary delay into a lifetime ban.

6 Suspension of the Follow-to-Join Process

7 116. The Memorandum also indefinitely suspends the follow-to-join (“FTJ”) process  
8 for refugees.

9 117. The FTJ process (also called the “Visas 93” process) is a family reunification  
10 process that allows an individual admitted to the United States as a refugee to petition for his or  
11 her spouse and unmarried minor children to come to the United States.

12 118. Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1157(c)(2)(A), a spouse or child of a refugee is entitled to  
13 the same admission status as the refugee if certain criteria are met.

14 119. There are numerous steps an FTJ-eligible family member must undergo before  
15 being able to travel to the United States.

16 120. First, the refugee in the United States must file an I-730 petition with U.S.  
17 Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”). The petitioner must establish that he or she is  
18 a refugee, and bears the burden of establishing by a preponderance of the evidence that the FTJ  
19 candidate is an eligible spouse or unmarried minor child. 8 C.F.R. § 207.7(e).

20 121. If the criteria are met, the USCIS adjudicating officer is required to approve the  
21 petition. *Id.* § 207.7(f).

22 122. Beneficiaries are then interviewed either by a Department of State consular  
23 officer or a USCIS officer at a U.S. embassy or consulate. *Id.*

24 123. Beneficiaries are conditionally approved to travel if the interviewing officer finds  
25 that: (1) the beneficiary has established by a preponderance of the evidence his or her identity,  
26 and a qualified relationship to the petitioner; (2) the beneficiary is not subject to any mandatory

1 bars or relevant inadmissibility ground; and (3) the beneficiary was not previously granted  
2 asylum or refugee status by the United States.

3 124. The beneficiary must also provide ink-free digital fingerprint scans and undergo  
4 the same medical examination required of immigrant visa applicants.

5 125. The Memorandum states that “additional security measures must be implemented  
6 promptly” for FTJ refugees, and that such measures “must be implemented before admission of  
7 following-to-join refugees can resume.”

8 126. The Memorandum claims that FTJ beneficiaries “do not undergo enhanced DHS  
9 review,” but does not assert that the current FTJ screening process is inadequate.

10 127. The Memorandum does not cite to any authority for suspending the FTJ process.

11 128. Over the last few years, approximately 2,500 refugees were annually admitted  
12 through the FTJ process to be reunited with spouses or parents already in the United States.

13 129. In recent years, the nationalities most represented in the FTJ process were Iraqi,  
14 Somali, Burmese, Congolese, Ethiopian, and Eritrean. In fiscal year 2016 and 2017, 62% of the  
15 refugees who arrived from these six countries through the USRAP generally identified as  
16 Muslim.

17 **Refugee Ban 3.0 Serves No Genuine National Security or Foreign Policy Purpose**

18 130. Even after months of reviewing the USRAP as directed under EO-2, the Trump  
19 Administration has not provided any reasoned justifications for the suspension of refugee  
20 admissions under Refugee Ban 3.0.

21 131. Refugees already receive the most thorough vetting of any travelers to the United  
22 States. The extensive screening process generally starts with the refugee registering with the  
23 United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (“UNHCR”) in the country to which he or she  
24 has fled. If the UNHCR determines after an interview and review of documents that the applicant  
25 meets the United States’ criteria for resettlement consideration and presents no disqualifying  
26 information, the UNHCR refers the case to a U.S. embassy.

1           132. The embassy then transfers the case to one of nine Resettlement Support Centers  
2 across the world for further processing. These Centers process refugee applications, prepare case  
3 files, and initiate security checks. Once the case files are prepared, the applicant interviews with  
4 the USCIS to establish eligibility for refugee status and resettlement in the United States.

5           133. If the refugee is eligible, the case proceeds through multiple layers of security and  
6 medical screening, most of which apply separately to every member of the family in the refugee  
7 application, including children.

8           134. At the final stages of refugee processing, refugees receive an “assurance” of  
9 sponsorship from one of nine private non-profit organizations that are dedicated to welcoming  
10 refugees into the country and have been designated as “resettlement agencies” by the  
11 government. An assurance is a formal, documented commitment by the resettlement agency and  
12 its affiliate to arrange for the reception of the refugee and provide individualized, specialized  
13 assistance before and after his or her arrival in the United States.

14           135. The FTJ beneficiaries are also already subjected to their own thorough vetting and  
15 security screening procedures.

16           136. The refugee vetting process is also already reviewed and enhanced on an ongoing  
17 basis in response to particular threats without the need to suspend the USRAP in order to make  
18 adjustments.

19           137. In addition, the government’s own research and analysis concludes that country-  
20 based bans, whether of refugees or other immigrants, are ineffective. After EO-1 was enjoined  
21 but before EO-2 was issued, President Trump ordered the DHS and the Department of Justice to  
22 produce an intelligence report to demonstrate that foreign nationals from particular Muslim-  
23 majority countries present a substantial security threat to the United States. In response, analysts  
24 at DHS prepared a draft report, released to the press on February 24, 2017, indicating that there  
25 was insufficient evidence that nationals of the seven Muslim-majority countries included in EO-1  
26 pose a terror threat to the United States. The draft report also found that citizenship is an

1 “unlikely indicator” of terrorism threats to the United States, and that few people from those  
2 countries identified in EO-1 have carried out attacks or been involved in terrorism-related  
3 activities in the United States since Syria’s civil war started in 2011.

4 138. During the four decades from 1975 to the end of 2015, over three million refugees  
5 have been admitted to the United States. Despite this number, according to policy analysis from  
6 the Cato Institute, only three refugees have killed people in terrorist attacks on U.S. soil during  
7 this period and none of these refugees were from the 11 listed countries in the Memorandum.  
8 Although EO-2 claimed that “more than 300 persons who had entered the United States as  
9 refugees were then the subjects of counterterrorism investigations by the Federal Bureau of  
10 Investigation,” EO-2 § 1(h), EO-2 did not acknowledge that very few FBI initial assessments of  
11 terrorism threats become intensive investigations: for example, in the four months from  
12 December 2008 to March 2009, the FBI began 11,667 “assessments” related to terrorism, only  
13 427 of which—less than 4%—led even to more intensive investigations.

#### 14 **Refugee Ban 3.0 Irreparably Harms Plaintiffs**

##### 15 Afkab Mohamed Hussein

16 139. Afkab Mohamed Hussein is a refugee from Somalia who was admitted to the  
17 United States in 2015. Mr. Hussein now lives in Columbus, Ohio and works as a truck driver.  
18 Mr. Hussein has approved follow-to-join petitions for his wife and his nearly two-year-old son.  
19 He is Muslim. Mr. Hussein is and has been represented in his follow-to-join petition by  
20 Community Refugee & Immigration Services (CRIS).

21 140. Mr. Hussein and his parents fled Somalia when Mr. Hussein was only three years  
22 old because militias were targeting people of their clan, including Mr. Hussein’s family. Mr.  
23 Hussein grew up in a refugee camp in Kenya and married his wife there. When Mr. Hussein was  
24 admitted to the United States as a refugee, a year after his marriage, his wife was pregnant with  
25 their son. Mr. Hussein has not seen his wife since then and he has never met his son, his only  
26 child. His wife and son are both nationals of Somalia.

1           141. Mr. Hussein’s follow-to-join petitions for his wife and son were approved in June  
2 2016, his wife was interviewed, and his wife and son have undergone two medical examinations  
3 because the results of their first examinations expired while they were waiting for approval to  
4 travel.

5           142. Knowing that he will be indefinitely separated from his wife and his son because  
6 of Refugee Ban 3.0 has been very difficult for Mr. Hussein. Mr. Hussein has never met his son,  
7 his only child, because his son was born after he was admitted to the United States. Mr. Hussein  
8 and his wife are very close and they speak on the phone every day. They want to have more  
9 children together, but they do not know when they will be together again. Mr. Hussein feels sad  
10 about their separation and helpless because he believes it is his responsibility to protect and care  
11 for his family and he cannot do that from so far away.

12           143. Mr. Hussein feels that Refugee Ban 3.0’s purpose was to prevent Muslims like  
13 him and his family from entering the United States. He feels that he is being personally targeted  
14 based on his religious beliefs, and he feels anxiety and stress as a result.

15           John Doe 1

16           144. John Doe 1 (“Doe 1”) is an Iraqi national who currently lives in Cairo, Egypt.  
17 Doe 1 is and has been represented in his refugee application by U.S.-based attorneys offering pro  
18 bono services through IRAP in the ordinary course of IRAP’s work as a legal services provider.  
19 Doe 1 fled Iraq in 2014 after his and his family’s lives were threatened because of his service and  
20 loyalty to the United States Army. Doe 1 is waiting to travel to the United States as a refugee  
21 through the Direct Access Program for U.S.-Affiliated Iraqis (“DAP”), which provides a path for  
22 resettlement for people like him who served the United States government. He was conditionally  
23 approved for resettlement to the United States on or around December 2016.

24           145. In early October 2017, the International Organization for Migration (“IOM”)  
25 called Doe 1 to tell him to get ready to travel to the United States. While Doe 1 was attempting  
26 to update his new passport on IOM’s advice, Refugee Ban 3.0 was issued.

1           146. When Doe 1 learned that that Refugee Ban 3.0 would effectively suspend refugee  
2 admissions for nationals from eleven countries, including Iraq, for at least 90 days, he felt scared  
3 and helpless. He had been waiting to enter the United States for almost three years in difficult  
4 and dangerous conditions, away from his family, without the ability to work. He is afraid any  
5 more delay will put him and his family in serious danger. Numerous Iraqi interpreters who  
6 served the United States have been murdered by Al Qaeda in Iraq or by ISIS, and he is afraid of  
7 meeting the same fate.

8           147. Doe 1 and his family are Sunni Muslim. He believes that the purpose of the  
9 Executive Order and Memorandum is to prevent Muslims like him from entering the United  
10 States. The anti-Muslim statements and views behind suspending admission from eleven SAO  
11 countries—nine of which are Muslim-majority countries—make him feel targeted for his  
12 religious beliefs and have caused him anxiety and stress.

13           Allen Vaught

14           148. Allen Vaught is a lawyer, veteran of the U.S. Army, and a former member of the  
15 Texas House of Representatives. He is a U.S. citizen and lives in Dallas, Texas. As a Captain in  
16 the Army, Mr. Vaught was responsible for hiring Arabic translators. Mr. Vaught hired Doe 1  
17 while stationed in Fallujah, Iraq.

18           149. After his honorable discharge from the military, Mr. Vaught has expended  
19 significant time, effort, and expense to resettle Doe 1 in the United States. Mr. Vaught submitted  
20 a letter of recommendation in support of Doe 1's DAP application and volunteered to house him  
21 and pay his expenses when he arrived in the United States. Mr. Vaught and his family held  
22 fundraisers and raised approximately \$800 to help Doe 1 get on his feet once he arrived. Upon  
23 hearing that Doe 1 was soon to travel to the U.S., Mr. Vaught rearranged his home to make room  
24 for Doe 1.

25           150. Mr. Vaught was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder, or PTSD, resulting  
26 from his service in the Army. Mr. Vaught's PTSD is exacerbated by Doe 1's inability to enter

1 the United States. Having hired Doe 1, Mr. Vaught feels responsible for the continued danger  
2 that Doe 1 is in and has trouble sleeping at night wondering if Doe 1 will be killed before he gets  
3 to the United States. Two other translators that Mr. Vaught worked with in Iraq have been  
4 murdered.

5 151. Mr. Vaught believes that Refugee Ban 3.0 is intended to target Muslims and  
6 believes that it is inconsistent with the values he fought to uphold as a commissioned officer in  
7 the Army.

8 John Doe 2

9 152. John Doe 2 (“Doe 2”) is a refugee in DAP. He is a national of, and is currently  
10 living in, Iraq. He is Muslim. Doe 2 is and has been represented in his refugee application by  
11 IRAP in the ordinary course of IRAP’s work as a legal services provider. Doe 2 worked as an  
12 interpreter for the United States Army, and later helped to promote democracy and the new Iraqi  
13 constitution. Two of his colleagues were killed for their service promoting the Iraqi constitution,  
14 and Doe 2 and his family received threats to their lives. In 2010, he came to the United States,  
15 accompanied by his wife and five children, to complete his PhD. Upon graduation in 2014, he  
16 travelled back to Mosul, his hometown, because two Iraqi colleagues had personally and  
17 financially guaranteed his return at the end of his degree. His wife and children remained in the  
18 United States and sought asylum.

19 153. Doe 2 has been unable to rejoin his family since ISIS seized control of Mosul  
20 shortly after his return to Iraq. He applied as a refugee through DAP and was conditionally  
21 approved for resettlement with his family in Pennsylvania in March 2016. He was awaiting  
22 security checks and travel booking at the time of the first, second, and fourth Executive Orders.

23 154. Doe 2 has been apart from his family for over three years now, and the separation  
24 is very painful. He is an integral member of the family, and his family worries constantly that his  
25 life is in danger in Iraq. He is devastated to miss milestones in his children’s lives and has not  
26 been able to meet his two granddaughters. He also feels betrayed because he enthusiastically

1 served the United States’ democratization efforts, endangering his life and his family’s lives in  
2 the process, and is now unable to resettle with his family in the United States.

3 John Doe 3

4 155. John Doe 3 (“Doe 3”) is a lawful permanent resident residing in Pennsylvania and  
5 is Doe 2’s son-in-law. Doe 3 has been separated from his father-in-law for over three years, and  
6 is intensely worried about his father-in-law’s safety in Iraq. He knows that his father-in-law has  
7 been targeted by extremists for his service to the United States Army, his support of the Iraqi  
8 democratic constitution, and his affiliation with a United States university. He understands that  
9 his father-in-law has completed several stages of his refugee application as part of DAP.

10 156. Doe 3’s wife is her father’s resettlement sponsor, and in April 2016 the  
11 resettlement agency told Doe 3’s wife to expect her father’s arrival by August 2016. Since then,  
12 Doe 3’s father-in-law has been awaiting travel booking to the United States.

13 157. Doe 3 is Muslim, and feels insulted and betrayed by the new refugee restrictions  
14 affecting Iraqi nationals. The new restrictions make him feel that the government views all  
15 Muslims as national security threats on the basis of their religion. He also feels it is unfair for his  
16 father-in-law to be excluded from the United States after dutifully serving U.S. military  
17 operations and democratization efforts. Doe 3 witnesses the emotional toll that the prolonged  
18 separation is taking on his wife and daughter, and on the rest of Doe 2’s family. Doe 3’s wife  
19 often cries because her father is stranded in Iraq, and fears that his life is in danger.

20 Jane Doe 4

21 158. Jane Doe 4 (“Doe 4”) is a national of, and currently lives in, Egypt. Doe 4 is and  
22 has been represented in her refugee application by IRAP in the ordinary course of IRAP’s work  
23 as a legal services provider. As a transgender woman in Egypt she faces sexual harassment,  
24 physical and sexual violence, including multiple attempted rapes, and death threats. The  
25 Egyptian government has recently targeted, detained, imprisoned, and tortured members of the  
26



1 transgender community because of their gender identity. A few months ago the Egyptian State  
2 Security came to Doe 4's home and took her away to be interrogated about her gender identity.

3 159. Before the new refugee restrictions, Doe 4's refugee application was receiving  
4 expedited processing by the USRAP because she is at high risk of persecution. She was referred  
5 for resettlement to the United States by the U.S. Embassy in Cairo on or around June 2017. Doe  
6 4 had an urgent pre-screening interview with IOM in September 2017 and completed her USCIS  
7 interview the following day. On information and belief, transgender refugee applicants  
8 presenting urgent risks typically travel to the United States between approximately six months to  
9 one year after the date of access to the USRAP. Due to the urgent nature of her case, on  
10 November 8, 2017, Doe 4's counsel requested that her application be granted a case-by-case  
11 foreign policy waiver of the suspension of refugee processing for nationals from SAO countries,  
12 but has not been given an indication of how or whether her request will be assessed.

13 160. When Doe 4 learned of the new refugee restrictions she was devastated. She is  
14 terrified for her life every day that she must remain in Egypt. She cannot flee because the gender  
15 on her identity documents does not match her current appearance. She has no financial resources  
16 or income in Egypt, and faces imminent danger due to her increased risk of homelessness. Doe 4  
17 also feels that Refugee Ban 3.0 targets her as a Muslim refugee on the basis of her religion.

18 Jane Doe 5

19 161. Jane Doe 5 ("Doe 5") is an Iraqi national currently living in Iraq. Doe 5 is and has  
20 been represented in her refugee application by IRAP in the ordinary course of IRAP's work as a  
21 legal services provider. Because of her employment as an interpreter and administrator for  
22 American companies, she is in danger every day. After receiving death threats in 2014 due to her  
23 work, in 2015 she was kidnapped by militants, who held and raped her for over a month. When  
24 she was finally released, her captors warned her to stop working for Americans, but she has  
25 refused to do so, as she has no other means of supporting herself. Doe 5's husband divorced her  
26 three weeks after her release because of the stigma associated with rape.

1           162. In 2012, Doe 5 applied to DAP and received her second interview with USCIS on  
2 July 20, 2016. She has completed multiple stages of the admissions process, including two  
3 interviews with USCIS and a medical check.

4           163. The other members of Doe 5’s immediate family have all moved to the United  
5 States, including her mother, father, two sisters and brother. She remains close to her family, and  
6 being separated from them is very painful for her.

7           164. Since Refugee Ban 3.0 was issued, Doe 5 has felt increasingly hopeless about her  
8 situation in Iraq, where her life is constantly in danger. With the refugee restrictions in place, she  
9 worries that she will never be able to travel to the United States.

10           165. Doe 5 is Muslim, and she believes that the purpose of the Refugee Ban is intended  
11 to prevent Muslims from entering the United States. She feels that she is being treated as a  
12 potential threat to the United States on the basis of her religion, and this is causing her increased  
13 anxiety and exacerbating her depression.

14           Jane Doe 6

15           166. Jane Doe 6 (“Doe 6”) is a United States citizen and is Doe 5’s sister. Doe 6 left  
16 Iraq in March 2006 and resettled in the United States in 2008. She currently lives with her  
17 husband and children in Houston, Texas, where she runs a successful limousine business.

18           167. Doe 6 is very close to her sister and took care of her sister when her sister was a  
19 child. They have been living apart since Doe 6 left Iraq, and she has only seen her sister one time  
20 since then—in the summer of 2014, when Doe 6 traveled to Turkey. When she has the  
21 opportunity to talk to her sister, the calls are emotionally difficult for both of them. Doe 6 is  
22 anxious about her sister’s fate, and feels that she cannot fully enjoy her life in the United States  
23 while her sister is in constant danger.

24           168. When Doe 6 learned of Refugee Ban 3.0, she felt brokenhearted. She tried to  
25 comfort her sister, but she now believes that it will be many years before they will see each  
26 other. Doe 6’s anxiety about her sister’s safety increases the longer her sister remains in Iraq.

1           169. Doe 6 is Muslim, and she believes that the purpose of Refugee Ban 3.0 is to  
2 prevent Muslims, like her sister, from entering the United States. She feels that the anti-Muslim  
3 policies behind suspending refugee admissions perpetuate stereotypes that all Iraqis are  
4 dangerous, and she worries that these stereotypes will impact how people treat her family, and  
5 especially her children.

6           John Doe 7

7           170. John Doe 7 (“Doe 7”) is a lawful permanent resident who was admitted to the  
8 United States as a refugee from Iraq in 2014. He currently lives in King County, Washington and  
9 recently had to stop working due to declining health. Doe 7 has an approved follow-to-join  
10 petition for his nineteen-year-old Iraqi son from his first marriage. Doe 7 is Muslim, as is his  
11 family.

12           171. Doe 7 fled Iraq in 2012 because he faced persecution and death threats from  
13 members of one of the Islamic parties in the Iraqi government. He was forced to flee to Turkey,  
14 where he applied for and was granted refugee status with the United Nations. He was  
15 subsequently joined by his wife and two of his children in Turkey, and they were able to come to  
16 the United States together.

17           172. Doe 7 filed the follow-to-join petition for his son in November 2015. The I-730  
18 petition was subsequently approved, and Doe 7’s son completed his interview and fingerprinting.  
19 In November 2016, Doe 7’s son was assured for resettlement in the United States by HIAS and  
20 Jewish Family Service of Seattle, and has been awaiting travel arrangements since that time.

21           173. Knowing that his son’s follow-to-join petition is indefinitely suspended makes  
22 Doe 7 feel hopeless and like his plan to reunite with his son in the United States is fading away.  
23 He also fears that his son’s application will be affected by the suspension of refugee admissions  
24 from SAO country nationals, including Iraq. It is clear to Doe 7 that the purpose of the Executive  
25 Order and Memorandum is to prevent Muslims like him and his family from entering the United  
26 States. Doe 7 is too scared to travel to Iraq to visit his son, even though he is able to do so,

1 because he fears he will not be readmitted to the United States. He has not bought a house in the  
2 United States because he is not sure that Muslims will be allowed to remain in the country.

3 Jewish Family Service of Seattle

4 174. Plaintiff Jewish Family Service of Seattle (“JFS-S”) is a Washington non-profit  
5 corporation with its principal place of business in Washington State. JFS-S has an uninterrupted  
6 125-year history of service to refugees—the most vulnerable Jewish and non-Jewish individuals  
7 and families from around the globe. JFS-S was founded in 1892 with a mission of helping newly  
8 arrived Jewish immigrants and refugees establish their lives in the Puget Sound Region.

9 175. The Torah commands Jewish people to “welcome the stranger,” a teaching that  
10 compels JFS-S to serve and protect refugees and to oppose the religious discrimination and  
11 unjust targeting of Muslims addressed in this lawsuit. Today, one way that JFS-S answers this  
12 command is by resettling and serving refugees from Afghanistan, Burma, the Democratic  
13 Republic of Congo, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Sudan, Somalia, and Ukraine. JFS-S’s most intensive  
14 services to refugees are delivered through its reception and placement program. One other  
15 important aspect of refugee resettlement is helping current and former resettlement clients  
16 reunite with family who remain overseas.

17 176. In federal fiscal year (“FFY”) 2016, JFS-S resettled 290 refugees. In FFY2017,  
18 JFS-S resettled 333 refugees. For FFY2018, JFS-S has allocated resources to resettle 285  
19 refugees, in plans it developed with the Department of State and HIAS, but fears that this latest  
20 executive order will result in the resettlement of far fewer refugees. Many of the refugees  
21 resettled by JFS-S are from Muslim-majority countries that Refugee Ban 3.0 will impact,  
22 including Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Mali, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen.

23 177. Refugee Ban 3.0 burdens and—as to many refugees—would directly end JFS-S’s  
24 ability to fulfill its mission in accordance with its religious values. Similarly, in light of the  
25 history of persecution that Jewish people have suffered in many times and places throughout the  
26

1 world, helping refugees is a critical part of how Jewish people (including JFS-S, its volunteers  
2 and its staff) express their religious beliefs and teachings.

3 178. If JFS-S is no longer able to provide resettlement assistance for clients who are  
4 banned by Refugee Ban 3.0, JFS-S will no longer receive funding support for these resettlement  
5 activities, and JFS-S's staff positions will be at risk. If Refugee Ban 3.0 remains in effect, JFS-S  
6 may be forced to lay off at least one employee, and possibly more, or will have to absorb this  
7 loss through attrition within the greater organization or through a decrease in quality of service,  
8 as staff will have to be reassigned to different positions to perform different duties. All of these  
9 alternatives thwart JFS-S's organizational mission and sincerely held religious beliefs, even as  
10 JFS-S must grapple with increased expenditures resulting from Refugee Ban 3.0, including  
11 devoting staff resources to address the concerns of clients and their family members.

12 179. JFS-S has diverted organizational resources to identify and counteract the  
13 negative effects of Refugee Ban 3.0. JFS-S's clients include Muslim follow-to-join refugee  
14 petitioners and beneficiaries. Several of JFS-S's clients are petitioning for their family members  
15 through follow-to-join petitions. Those clients are now unsure about whether their family  
16 members will be permitted to join them in the United States. Refugee Ban 3.0 will undoubtedly  
17 require JFS-S to divert resources to address inquiries and concerns arising out of Refugee Ban  
18 3.0's implementation. JFS-S staff have been spending at least 25% of their time responding to  
19 concerns and inquiries from Muslim and other clients since President Trump issued EO-1. JFS-S  
20 has every reason to expect that this percentage of diverted time will not only continue, but will  
21 expand significantly in the coming weeks and months as knowledge of and fear of Refugee Ban  
22 3.0 grows. These resources could have otherwise been spent on fulfilling the organization's  
23 goals.

24 180. JFS-S asserts claims on behalf of itself and its clients. The rights of clients that  
25 JFS-S seeks to vindicate here are inextricably bound up with its organizational mission and  
26 purpose, and its clients face numerous hurdles to bringing this suit in their own name. JFS-S

1 clients fear that they will never be reunited with their family members abroad, many of whom  
2 live in dangerous and life-threatening situations. But many of them are concerned about sharing  
3 the details of their situations publicly, for fear that it could affect their immigration status or  
4 applications, or those of their relatives. They are also afraid because of the current anti-refugee  
5 and anti-Muslim climate in the United States. They face multiple obstacles to asserting their  
6 legal rights, such as language barriers and unfamiliarity with American law and customs.

7 Jewish Family Services of Silicon Valley

8 181. Jewish Family Services of Silicon Valley (“JFS-SV”) is a faith-based organization  
9 that was founded in 1978. Since its founding, JFS-SV has assisted nearly 6,000 refugees with  
10 resettlement in the United States. JFS-SV’s commitment to assisting refugees with resettlement  
11 grows out of its commitment to Jewish values and Torah teachings, which compel it to “welcome  
12 the stranger.” JFS-SV serves refugees and persecuted peoples of all faiths and nationalities  
13 around the globe. Its client base includes refugees abroad and in the United States who are from  
14 Iran, Iraq, Syrian, Eritrea, Congo, Cuba, Egypt, China, Sri Lanka, Burma, Ukraine, Russia,  
15 Kyrgyzstan, and Uzbekistan.

16 182. JFS-SV is committed to empowering the individuals and families they serve by  
17 providing quality human services inspired by Jewish values. JFS-SV administers a number of  
18 programs that serve refugees and the broader community, including Refugee Resettlement and  
19 Vocational Services, Aging with Dignity Services, Adult and Family Services, and Volunteer  
20 Engagement Services. JFS-SV’s services are available without regard to race, religion, ethnicity,  
21 sexual orientation, or ability to pay.

22 183. In FFY 2016, JFS-SV resettled 118 refugees. In FFY2017, in the original plans  
23 developed with and approved by the Department of State, JFS-SV planned to resettle 165  
24 refugees and SIVs and actually resettled, due to the effect of executive orders of Donald Trump,  
25 only 67 refugees. For FFY2018, JFS-SV has allocated resources to resettle 65 refugees and 35  
26

1 SIVs, in plans it developed with the Department of State and HIAS, but fears that this latest  
2 executive order will result in the resettlement of even fewer refugees.

3 184. Implementation of Refugee Ban 3.0 has caused substantial harm to JFS-SV and  
4 its clients, and will continue to harm them. JFS-SV has clients with pending follow-to-join  
5 petitions for family members abroad who are also nationals of countries listed on the SAO list.  
6 Now these clients do not know when they can reunite with their family members.

7 185. JFS-SV projects that Refugee Ban 3.0 will have a catastrophic impact on its  
8 annual budget because a large percentage of the individuals who JFS-SV is planning to resettle  
9 will no longer be permitted to arrive in the United States. For each refugee that JFS-SV resettles,  
10 it receives certain funds from the government. Income related to refugee services constitutes  
11 36% of JFS-SV's revenue. If JFS-SV were to lose this much of its budget, it would be forced to  
12 lay off at least 6 of its 17-person staff and would lose significant support in terms of volunteers  
13 and partners that the organization has cultivated over the many decades of its work because there  
14 would no longer be JFS-SV staff persons to manage those relationships. Such a dramatic  
15 reduction in JFS-SV's staff, representing all of JFS-SV's staff working on refugee resettlement,  
16 would fundamentally alter the work that JFS-SV could undertake and would grind to a halt their  
17 refugee resettlement work, a core part of JFS-SV's mission.

18 186. JFS-SV asserts claims on behalf of itself and its clients. The rights of clients that  
19 JFS-SV seeks to vindicate here are inextricably bound up with its organizational mission and  
20 purpose. JFS-SV clients include Muslim follow-to-join refugee petitioners and beneficiaries.  
21 Moreover, many of its clients are not proficient in English, are unfamiliar with the U.S. legal  
22 system, and fear retaliation against themselves and their family members should they join a  
23 public lawsuit. Its clients therefore face numerous hurdles to bringing this suit in their own  
24 name.

**CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

1  
2 187. Plaintiffs Afkab Mohamed Hussein and Does 1-7 bring this action as a class  
3 action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(1) and (b)(2), on behalf of themselves  
4 and all other similarly situated persons for whom Refugee Ban 3.0 either interferes with their  
5 ability to resettle in the United States or impedes their family reunification. This class includes:

- 6 a. Individuals in the United States who are family members of individuals  
7 overseas in the USRAP who are nationals of (and stateless persons who  
8 last habitually resided in) SAO countries (“SAO Family Sub-Class”).  
9 b. Individuals overseas in the USRAP who are nationals of (and stateless  
10 persons who last habitually resided in) SAO countries (“SAO Sub-Class”);  
11 c. Individuals in the United States who are petitioners for pending follow-to-  
12 join petitioners (“FTJ Sub-Class”);

13 188. Separate Subclasses may be appropriate for the Class defined in the preceding  
14 paragraph.

15 189. The Plaintiff Class, including Subclasses, is so numerous that joinder is  
16 impracticable. On information and belief, the Plaintiff Class consists of well over 40 putative  
17 class members. Over the last few years, approximately 2,500 refugees were annually admitted  
18 through the FTJ process. In FY17, over 20,000 refugees from the 11 SAO countries arrived in  
19 the United States.

20 190. The claims of the Plaintiff Class and Subclass members share common issues of  
21 law, including but not limited to whether Refugee Ban 3.0 violates the Immigration and  
22 Nationality Act (“INA”), the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), the First Amendment, and  
23 the Fifth Amendment.

24 191. The claims of the Plaintiff Class and Subclass members share common issues of  
25 fact, including but not limited to whether Refugee Ban 3.0 is being or will be enforced so as to  
26 prevent them or their family members from entering the United States from abroad.





1 nationals of (and stateless persons who last habitually resided in) SAO countries, constitutes final  
2 agency action and is arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance  
3 with law; contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; and in excess of  
4 statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right, and should therefore be  
5 set aside pursuant to the APA, 5 U.S.C. §§ 706(2)(A)-(C).

6 198. Defendants' suspension of the USRAP through Refugee Ban 3.0, including the  
7 suspension of the FTJ refugee process and the suspension in processing and admission of  
8 nationals of (and stateless persons who last habitually resided in) SAO countries, is a legislative  
9 rule that violates the procedural requirements of 5 U.S.C. § 553(b) and should be set aside as  
10 issued without observance of notice and comment procedure required by law, in violation of the  
11 APA, 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(D).

12 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
13 **FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION - ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE**  
14 **(On Behalf of Hussein, Vaught, Doe 3, Doe 6, Doe 7, JFS-S, JFS-SV, the FTJ Sub-Class,**  
15 **and the SAO Family Sub-Class)**

16 199. Defendants' suspension of the USRAP through Refugee Ban 3.0, including the  
17 suspension of the FTJ refugee process and the suspension in processing and admission of  
18 nationals of (and stateless persons who last habitually resided in) SAO countries, violates the  
19 Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

20 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**  
21 **FIFTH AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION - EQUAL PROTECTION**  
22 **(On Behalf of Hussein, Doe 3, Doe 6, Doe 7, JFS-S, JFS-SV, the FTJ Sub-Class, and the**  
23 **SAO Family Sub-Class)**

24 200. Defendants' suspension of the USRAP through Refugee Ban 3.0, including the  
25 suspension of the FTJ refugee process and the suspension in processing and admission of  
26 nationals of (and stateless persons who last habitually resided in) SAO countries, violates the  
equal protection component of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the U.S.  
Constitution.



1 Respectfully submitted,

DATED: November 13, 2017

2  
3 /s/ David Burman

4 David Burman, WSBA No. 10611  
5 Lauren Watts Staniar, WSBA No. 48741  
6 Tyler Roberts, WSBA No. 52688  
7 Perkins Coie LLP  
8 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900  
9 Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
10 Telephone: 206.359.8000  
11 Facsimile: 206.359.9000  
12 dburman@perkinscoie.com  
13 lstaniar@perkinscoie.com  
14 troberts@perkinscoie.com

Justin B. Cox\*  
National Immigration Law Center  
PO Box 170208  
Atlanta, GA 30317  
Tel: (678) 279-5441  
Fax: (213) 639-3911  
cox@nilc.org

Melissa S. Keaney\*  
Esther Sung\*  
Karen C. Tumlin\*  
National Immigration Law Center  
3450 Wilshire Blvd, #108-62  
Los Angeles, CA 90010  
Tel: (213) 639-3900  
Fax: (213) 639-3911  
tumlin@nilc.org  
keaney@nilc.org  
sung@nilc.org

15 Mariko Hirose\*  
16 Deepa Alagesan\*  
17 Linda Evarts\*  
18 Kathryn C. Meyer\*  
19 International Refugee Assistance Project  
20 40 Rector Street, 9th Floor  
21 New York, NY 10006  
22 Tel: (646) 459-3044  
23 mhirose@refugeerights.org  
24 dalagesan@refugeerights.org  
25 levarts@refugeerights.org  
26 kmeyer@refugeerights.org

Lauren E. Aguiar\*  
Mollie M. Kornreich\*  
Abigail E. Davis\*  
Four Times Square  
New York, NY 10036  
Tel: (212) 735-3000  
Fax: (212) 735-2000  
lauren.aguiar@probonolaw.com  
mollie.kornreich@probonolaw.com  
abigail.sheehan@probonolaw.com

Elizabeth Sweet\*  
Mark Hetfield\*  
HIAS, Inc.  
1300 Spring Street, Suite 500  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  
Tel: 301-844-7300  
liz.sweet@hias.org  
mark.hetfield@hias.org

\* Application for admission *Pro Hac Vice*  
forthcoming

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*