

1 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
 Sarah M. Ray (Bar No. 229670)
 2 sarah.ray@lw.com
 Kyle A. Virgien (Bar No. 278747)
 3 kyle.virgien@lw.com
 Diana A. Aguilar (Bar No. 304427)
 4 diana.aguilar@lw.com
 Charles F. Sprague (Bar No. 313692)
 5 charles.sprague@lw.com
 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000
 6 San Francisco, California 94111-6538
 Telephone: +1.415.391.0600
 7 Facsimile: +1.415.395.8095

8 Attorneys for Proposed *Amici Curiae*
 American Civil Liberties Union, Center for Public
 9 Representation, *et al.*

10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 OAKLAND DIVISION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ET AL.

PLAINTIFFS,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND
 SECURITY, ET AL.

DEFENDANTS.

CASE NO. 4:19-cv-04975-PJH

**[PROPOSED] BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE
 THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
 UNION, CENTER FOR PUBLIC
 REPRESENTATION, ET AL. IN SUPPORT
 OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Date: October 2, 2019
 Time: 9:00 a.m.
 Judge: Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton
 Place: Courtroom 3

The Honorable Phyllis J. Hamilton

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

	Page
INTRODUCTION AND INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
FACTUAL AND LEGAL BACKGROUND	4
A. Immigrants’ Access to Public Benefits	4
B. The Final Public Charge Rule	4
C. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act	6
ARGUMENT	7
I. PLAINTIFFS ARE LIKELY TO SUCCEED ON THE MERITS BECAUSE THE FINAL RULE VIOLATES SECTION 504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT.	7
A. Under the Final Rules’ “Health” Criterion, Individuals with Disabilities Are Automatically Penalized.	7
B. The Final Rule Also Penalizes Individuals with Disabilities for Using Medicaid—the Only Provider of Necessary Services that Promote Self-Sufficiency.	8
C. The Final Rule Triple-Counts the Same Factual Circumstances against an Individual with Disabilities.	11
II. THE FINAL RULE WILL CAUSE IRREPARABLE HARM TO BOTH CITIZENS AND NON-CITIZENS WITH DISABILITIES.	11
CONCLUSION	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

1

2

3

4 *Alexander v. Choate*,

5 469 U.S. 287 (1985).....6, 7

6 *Barlin v. Rodgers*,

7 191 F. 970 (3d Cir. 1911).....3

8 *C.D. v. New York City Dep’t of Educ.*,

9 No. 05 Civ. 7945 (SHS), 2009 WL 400382 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 11, 2009)7

10 *United States ex rel. Canfora v. Williams*,

11 186 F. 354 (S.D.N.Y. 1911).....3

12 *Crowder v. Kitagawa*,

13 81 F.3d 1480 (9th Cir. 1996)6

14 *Franco-Gonzalez v. Holder*,

15 No. CV 10-02211 DMG, 2013 WL 3674492 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 23, 2013)7

16 *Lovell v. Chandler*,

17 303 F.3d 1039 (9th Cir. 2002)8, 11

18 *Ex parte Mitchell*,

19 256 F. 229 (N.D.N.Y. 1919)3

20 *Ex parte Sakaguchi*,

21 277 F. 913 (9th Cir. 1922)3

STATUTES

22 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(4)(B)5

23 29 U.S.C.

24 § 705(9)(B).....5, 8

25 § 794 (2016).....6

26 42 U.S.C.

27 § 1396-19

28 § 12102(1)(A)5

§ 12101 (a)(7).....3

Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. No. 88-352, tit. VI, 78 Stat. 2412

Immigration Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-649 § 603(a)(15), 104 Stat. 49783

1 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Pub.
 2 L. No. 104-193, 110 Stat. 2105 (1996).....4
 3 Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Pub. L. No. 93-112, § 504, 87 Stat. 355..... *passim*
 4 Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde U.S Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS,
 5 Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-293,
 122 Stat. 2918 (2008).....3

6 **REGULATIONS**

7 6 C.F.R.
 8 § 15.1 (2019).....6
 9 § 15.30(b).....6
 § 15.30(b)(4)7
 § 15.49.....6
 10 8 C.F.R.
 11 § 103.....3
 12 § 212.....3
 § 212.21(b)(5)8
 13 § 212.22(b)(2)5, 7, 8, 11
 § 212.22(c)(1)11
 14 § 212.22(c)(1)(ii).....5, 8
 § 212.22(c)(1)(iii)5
 15 § 212.22(c)(2)5
 § 213.....3
 16 § 214.....3
 17 § 245.....3
 § 248.....3
 18 28 C.F.R. § 41.51(b)(3).....6
 19 42 C.F.R. § 34.2(b) (2008).....3

20 **OTHER AUTHORITIES**

21 Alice Wong, *My Medicaid, My Life*, NEW YORK TIMES (May 3, 2017).....10
 22 Andraéa LaVant, *Congress: Medicaid Allows Me to Have a Job and Live
 23 Independently*, AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION (Mar. 22, 2017, 1:45 PM),
 24 [https://www.aclu.org/blog/disability-rights/congress-medicare-allows-me-
 25 have-job-and-live-independently](https://www.aclu.org/blog/disability-rights/congress-medicare-allows-me-have-job-and-live-independently)10
 26 Asim Dietrich, *Medicaid Cuts are a Matter of Life or Death for People with
 27 Disabilities*, ARIZ. CAP. TIMES (July 13, 2017),
[https://azcapitoltimes.com/news/2017/07/13/medicaid-cuts-are-a-matter-of-
 28 life-or-death-for-people-with-disabilities/](https://azcapitoltimes.com/news/2017/07/13/medicaid-cuts-are-a-matter-of-life-or-death-for-people-with-disabilities/)10

1 Avital Fischer, Sumeet Banker, and Claire Abraham, *Pediatricians Speak Out: A*
 2 *‘Public Charge Rule’ is Dangerous for Children*, THE HILL (Sept. 1, 2019,
 3 5:00 PM) 12

4 Chantal Da Silva, *Donald Trump Says Migrants Bring ‘Large Scale Crime and*
 5 *Disease to America’*, NEWSWEEK (Dec. 11, 2018),
 6 [https://www.newsweek.com/donald-trump-says-migrants-bring-large-scale-](https://www.newsweek.com/donald-trump-says-migrants-bring-large-scale-crime-and-disease-america-1253268)
 7 [crime-and-disease-america-1253268](https://www.newsweek.com/donald-trump-says-migrants-bring-large-scale-crime-and-disease-america-1253268) 1

8 *Congressman DeSaulnier Announces Private Bill to Protect Maria Isabel Bueso*
 9 *from Deportation*, CONGRESSMAN MARK DESAULNIER: CALIFORNIA’S 11TH
 10 CONG. DIST. (Sept. 3, 2019), [https://desaulnier.house.gov/media-center/press-](https://desaulnier.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/congressman-desaulnier-announces-private-bill-protect-maria-isabel-bueso)
 11 [releases/congressman-desaulnier-announces-private-bill-protect-maria-isabel-](https://desaulnier.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/congressman-desaulnier-announces-private-bill-protect-maria-isabel-bueso)
 12 [bueso](https://desaulnier.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/congressman-desaulnier-announces-private-bill-protect-maria-isabel-bueso) 12

13 *Disability Rights California Comments in Response to Proposed Rulemaking on*
 14 *Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds* (December 10, 2018),
 15 [https://www.disabilityrightsca.org/post/proposed-changes-to-federal-rules-for-](https://www.disabilityrightsca.org/post/proposed-changes-to-federal-rules-for-public-charge-an-immigration-policy-that-hurts-people)
 16 [public-charge-an-immigration-policy-that-hurts-people](https://www.disabilityrightsca.org/post/proposed-changes-to-federal-rules-for-public-charge-an-immigration-policy-that-hurts-people) 13

17 Douglas C. Baynton, *Defectives in the Land: Disability and American*
 18 *Immigration Policy, 1882-1924*, 24 J. AM. ETHNIC HIST. 31, 34 (2005)..... 1, 2

19 *Employment & HCBS*, MEDICAID.GOV, [https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/ltss/](https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/ltss/employment/employment-and-hcbs/index.html)
 20 [employment/employment-and-hcbs/index.html](https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/ltss/employment/employment-and-hcbs/index.html) (last visited Sept. 9, 2019) 9

21 *Field Guidance on Deportability and Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds*,
 22 64 Fed. Reg. 28,689 (May 26, 1999) 4

23 *Home & Community-Based Services*, MEDICAID.GOV,
 24 <https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/hcbs/authorities/1915-c/index.html> (last
 25 visited Sept. 5, 2019) 9

26 *Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds*, 84 Fed. Reg. 41,368 (Aug. 14, 2019)
 27 (Final Rule) *passim*

28 *Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds*, 83 Fed. Reg. 51,114 (Oct. 10, 2018) 4

Jean P. Hall, *et al.*, *Effect of Medicaid Expansion on Workforce Participation for*
People With Disabilities, 107 AM. J. OF PUB. HEALTH 262 (Feb. 2017) 9

Larisa Antonisse, *et al.*, Kaiser Family Foundation, *The Effects of Medicaid*
Expansion under the ACA: Updated Findings from a Literature Review 11
 (Sept. 2017), [http://files.kff.org/attachment/Issue-Brief-The-Effects-of-](http://files.kff.org/attachment/Issue-Brief-The-Effects-of-Medicaid-Expansion-Under-the-ACA-Updated-Findings-from-a-Literature-Review)
[Medicaid-Expansion-Under-the-ACA-Updated-Findings-from-a-Literature-](http://files.kff.org/attachment/Issue-Brief-The-Effects-of-Medicaid-Expansion-Under-the-ACA-Updated-Findings-from-a-Literature-Review)
[Review](http://files.kff.org/attachment/Issue-Brief-The-Effects-of-Medicaid-Expansion-Under-the-ACA-Updated-Findings-from-a-Literature-Review) 9

Leah Zallman, Karen Finnegan, David Himmelstein, *et al.*, *Implications of*
Changing Public Charge Immigration Rules for Children Who Need Medical
Care, 173 J. AMER. MED. ASSOC. PEDIATRICS, 1 (2019) 13

1 Leila Miller, *Trump administration’s ‘public charge’ rule has chilling effect on*
 2 *benefits for immigrants’ children*, Los Angeles Times (Sept. 3, 2019).....13

3 Mark C Weber, *Opening the Golden Door: Disability and the Law of*
 4 *Immigration*, 81, J. GENDER, RACE & JUST. 153 (2004)2

5 MaryBeth Musumeci, *et al.*, *Medicaid Home and Community-Based Services*
 6 *Enrollment and Spending*, KAISER FAMILY FOUNDATION, Apr. 04, 2019,
 7 [https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/medicaid-home-and-community-](https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/medicaid-home-and-community-based-services-enrollment-and-spending/)
 8 [based-services-enrollment-and-spending/](https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/medicaid-home-and-community-based-services-enrollment-and-spending/) (last visited Sept. 9, 2019).....9

9 *Medicaid “Buy In” Q&A*, HHS ADMIN. FOR COMMUNITY LIVING & DOL OFFICE
 10 OF DISABILITY AND EMPLOYMENT POLICY,
 11 <https://www.dol.gov/odep/topics/MedicaidBuyInQAF.pdf> (last updated July
 12 2019)10

13 *Medicaid Works for People with Disabilities*, C. ON BUDGET AND POL’Y
 14 PRIORITIES, [https://www.cbpp.org/research/health/medicaid-works-for-people-](https://www.cbpp.org/research/health/medicaid-works-for-people-with-disabilities)
 15 [with-disabilities](https://www.cbpp.org/research/health/medicaid-works-for-people-with-disabilities) (last visited Sept. 9, 2019).....9

16 Mem. for Maurice C. Inman, Jr., General Counsel, Immigration and
 17 Naturalization Service, from Robert B. Shanks, Deputy Assistant Attorney
 18 General, Office of Legal Counsel, Re: Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of
 19 1973 (Feb. 2, 1983).....6

20 Michael D. Shear & Julie Hirschfeld Davis, *Stoking Fears, Trump Defied*
 21 *Bureaucracy to Advance Immigration Agenda*, N.Y. TIMES (Dec. 23, 2017)1

22 Miriam Jordan, *Faced With Criticism, Trump Administration Reverse Abrupt End*
 23 *to Humanitarian Relief*, N.Y. TIMES (Sept. 2, 2019),
 24 [https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/02/us/trump-immigration-deferred-](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/02/us/trump-immigration-deferred-action.html)
 25 [action.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/02/us/trump-immigration-deferred-action.html)1

26 Nat’l Council on Disability, *Equal of Opportunity: The Making of the Americans*
 27 *with Disabilities Act* (July 26, 1997),
 28 <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED512697.pdf>2

INTRODUCTION AND INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*

1
2 *Amici curiae* are nineteen nonprofit organizations that represent, advocate for, and support
3 the disability community. Collectively, *amici* operate in all fifty States and six Territories and
4 represent tens of thousands of people with disabilities and their family members across the country.
5 Among other services, the *amici* provide public education, litigate, and conduct research for people
6 with disabilities and their families. All *amici* are dedicated to the liberty, equality, and integration
7 of individuals with disabilities. Individual statements of interest from each *amici* organization
8 appear in the appendix to this brief.

9 The United States is a nation shaped by immigration and founded on ideals of equality—
10 however imperfectly realized. Contrary to these values, for more than a century, immigrants with
11 disabilities were legally excluded from this country based on the flawed notion that individuals
12 with disabilities were “undesirables.” But over time, public attitudes changed as reflected in
13 various congressional acts, including the enactment of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the
14 revision of immigration laws to eliminate disability-specific exclusions. The Department of
15 Homeland Security’s Final Rule on Public Charge Ground of Inadmissibility (the “Final Rule”),
16 whether unintentionally or deliberately,¹ seeks to reinstate those exclusionary provisions.

17 In the early twentieth century, the “principal object” of immigration law was “the exclusion
18 from this country of the morally, mentally and physically deficient[.]”² Citing the “public charge”
19 requirement as authority, Ellis Island immigration inspectors would pick people out of line who

20
21 ¹ The current administration has openly displayed hostility towards immigrants with disabilities.
22 President Donald J. Trump tweeted that Central American asylum seekers waiting in Tijuana,
23 Mexico will bring “large scale crime and *disease*” to the United States. Chantal Da Silva, *Donald*
24 *Trump Says Migrants Bring ‘Large Scale Crime and Disease to America’*, NEWSWEEK (Dec. 11,
25 2018), <https://www.newsweek.com/donald-trump-says-migrants-bring-large-scale-crime-and-disease-america-1253268> (emphasis added). President Trump also falsely said that Haitians “all
26 have AIDS.” Michael D. Shear & Julie Hirschfeld Davis, *Stoking Fears, Trump Defied*
27 *Bureaucracy to Advance Immigration Agenda*, N.Y. TIMES (Dec. 23, 2017),
28 <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/23/us/politics/trump-immigration.html>. The Trump
Administration has indicated a desire to stop granting “deferred action” to people undergoing
medical treatment, often with disastrous consequences. See Miriam Jordan, *Faced With Criticism,*
Trump Administration Reverse Abrupt End to Humanitarian Relief, N.Y. TIMES (Sept. 2, 2019),
<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/09/02/us/trump-immigration-deferred-action.html>.

² Douglas C. Baynton, *Defectives in the Land: Disability and American Immigration Policy, 1882-*
1924, 24 J. AM. ETHNIC HIST. 31, 34 (2005).

1 appeared to be “disabled” or “diseased,” and deny them entry into the United States.³ While this
 2 treatment was often rationalized at the time as a matter of simple economics, contemporaneous
 3 documents reveal that these policies were rooted in eugenic considerations and the flawed notion
 4 that people with disabilities are somehow “deficient.”⁴

5 By the 1960s, spurred by the civil rights movement, the nation’s perception of individuals
 6 with disabilities had begun to change. And Congress responded. In 1973, on a bipartisan basis,
 7 Congress passed the Rehabilitation Act, which prohibits disability discrimination by the Federal
 8 government. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (“Section 504”) was modeled, in part, after
 9 Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and declared: “No otherwise qualified handicapped
 10 individual in the United States . . . shall, solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from the
 11 participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or
 12 activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Pub. L. No. 93-112,
 13 § 504, 87 Stat. 355, 394 (1973)⁵; *see also* Civil Rights Act of 1964, Pub. L. No. 88-352, tit. VI, 78
 14 Stat. 241, 252-53 (1964). This language made clear that access for people with disabilities is a
 15 matter of *equal opportunity*, not a welfare benefit or act of charity.⁶

16 In the half-century since, Congress has repeatedly reaffirmed this commitment to ensuring
 17 equal opportunity for individuals with disabilities. In 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with
 18 Disabilities Act (“ADA”), which declares that “the Nation’s proper goals regarding individuals
 19 with disabilities are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and

20 ³ *See, e.g.*, Mark C Weber, *Opening the Golden Door: Disability and the Law of Immigration*, 81,
 21 J. GENDER, RACE & JUST. 153, 156 (2004) (“Inspectors looked for any of a long list of diseases
 22 and abnormalities, including arthritis, asthma, deafness, the loss of an eye or a limb, deformities,
 poor vision, underdevelopment, and dementia.”).

23 ⁴ *See* Baynton, *supra*, at 34-35 (“In a letter to the Comm’r General, the Ellis Island Commissioner
 24 wrote that the Bureau had ‘no more important work to perform than to pick out all the mentally
 25 defective immigrants, for these are not only likely to join the criminal classes and become public
 charges, but by leaving feebleminded descendants they start vicious strains which leads to misery
 and loss in the future generation and influence unfavorably the character and lives of hundreds of
 persons.’”).

26 ⁵ The Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1992 updated the term “handicap” to individual with a
 27 “disability.” *See* PL 102–569 (HR 5482), 106 Stat 4344 (Oct. 29, 1992).

28 ⁶ *See generally* Nat’l Council on Disability, *Equal of Opportunity: The Making of the Americans
 with Disabilities Act* (July 26, 1997), <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED512697.pdf>.

1 economic self-sufficiency for such individuals.” 42 U.S.C. § 12101 (a)(7). That same year,
 2 Congress amended the Immigration Code to end the discriminatory exclusion of people with
 3 certain disabilities. *See* Immigration Act of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-649 § 603(a)(15), 104 Stat.
 4 4978, 5083-84 (1990) (the “Immigration Act”) (deleting language excluding, *inter alia*, “[a]liens
 5 who are mentally retarded” or who are “afflicted with a mental defect”). These changes
 6 marked an end to explicitly discriminatory prohibitions on individuals with disabilities in the
 7 Immigration Code, exclusions that for more than one hundred years were listed alongside the
 8 statutory public charge prohibition.⁷ Despite this clear congressional intent, the Final Rule
 9 unlawfully reverts to the categorical exclusions against people with disabilities that prevailed over
 10 a century ago.⁸

11 The Final Rule discriminates against disabled immigrants and their families with
 12 devastating effects. The confusion surrounding the Final Rule poses a serious threat of harm to
 13 the disability community, both citizens and noncitizens alike. The Department of Homeland
 14 Security (“DHS”) acknowledges these discriminatory results and makes no attempt to defend them
 15 as necessary policy or consistent with its non-discrimination obligations under Section 504.
 16 Rather, DHS contends that federal law actually *requires* it to exclude immigrants with disabilities
 17 in discriminatory fashion. As explained below, this is both legally and factually incorrect. The

18 ⁷ Congress’s support for the integration of people with disabilities has not wavered. Most recently,
 19 in 2008, Congress removed HIV and AIDS from the list of infectious diseases that would prevent
 20 an individual from immigrating to or visiting the United States. *See* Tom Lantos and Henry J.
 Hyde U.S Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act
 of 2008, Pub. L. No. 110-293, 122 Stat. 2918 (2008); 42 C.F.R. § 34.2(b) (2008).

21 ⁸ DHS has made it clear that this is exactly what it seeks to do. In its publication of the Final Rule,
 22 DHS included the following footnote as support for its assertion that it can rely on an immigrant’s
 23 disability in making the public charge determination: “*Ex parte Mitchell*, 256 F. 229 (N.D.N.Y.
 1919) (referencing disease and disability as relevant to the public charge determination); *Ex parte*
 24 *Sakaguchi*, 277 F. 913, 916 (9th Cir. 1922) (taking into consideration that the alien was an able-
 25 bodied woman, among other factors, and finding that there wasn’t evidence that she was likely to
 26 become a public charge); *Barlin v. Rodgers*, 191 F. 970, 974-977 (3d Cir. 1911) (sustaining the
 27 exclusion of three impoverished immigrants, the first because he had a ‘rudimentary’ right hand
 28 affecting his ability to earn a living, the second because of poor appearance and ‘stammering’ such
 that made the alien scarcely able to make himself understood, and the third because he was very
 small for his age); *United States ex rel. Canfora v. Williams*, 186 F. 354 (S.D.N.Y. 1911) (ruling
 that an amputated leg was sufficient to justify the exclusion of a sixty year old man even though
 the man had adult children who were able and willing to support him.)” *Inadmissibility on Public*
Charge Grounds, 84 Fed. Reg. 41,368 (Aug. 14, 2019) (to be codified at 8 CFR Parts 103, 212,
 213, 214, 245 and 248).

1 *amici curiae* respectfully urge the court to grant the Plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction.

2 **FACTUAL AND LEGAL BACKGROUND**

3 **A. Immigrants’ Access to Public Benefits**

4 In 1996, Congress passed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity
5 Reconciliation Act of 1996 (“PRWORA”) to comprehensively reform the U.S. welfare system.
6 PRWORA generally limited immigrants’ access to public benefits. Pub. L. No. 104-193, 110 Stat.
7 2105 (1996). However, recognizing the importance of certain programs, Congress specified that
8 *all* immigrants regardless of legal status would be eligible for emergency Medicaid, crisis
9 counseling, and mental health and substance use disorder treatment. As detailed below, these
10 benefits are of particular importance to immigrants with disabilities.

11 PRWORA’s changes to benefits eligibility generated considerable public confusion about
12 the extent of the “public charge” rule, which resulted in a sharp decline in the usage of non-cash
13 public benefits. The Immigration and Naturalization Service (“INS”) (now, DHS) responded by
14 issuing Field Guidance clarifying the meaning of a “public charge” “in order to reduce the negative
15 public health consequences generated by the existing confusion and to provide aliens with better
16 guidance as to the types of public benefits that will and will not be considered in public charge
17 determinations.” Field Guidance on Deportability and Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds,
18 64 Fed. Reg. 28,689 (May 26, 1999) (“1999 Field Guidance”). In this Field Guidance, INS
19 interpreted “public charge” to mean an applicant who is “*primarily dependent on the government*
20 *for subsistence*, as demonstrated by either (i) the receipt of public cash assistance for income
21 maintenance or (ii) institutionalization for long-term care at government expense.” *Id.* (emphasis
22 added). Immigrants who received non-cash benefits were not considered a public charge under
23 this rule. *Inadmissibility on Public Charge Grounds*, 83 Fed. Reg. 51,114, 51,163-64 (Oct. 10,
24 2018).

25 **B. The Final Public Charge Rule**

26 On August 14, 2019, DHS published the Final Rule, which modifies the prevailing test⁹ by

27 _____
28 ⁹ The applicable statute states that in making a public charge determination “the consular officer or the Attorney General shall at a minimum consider the alien’s—(I) age; (II) health; (III) family

1 assigning mandatory ratings (heavily weighted positive, positive, negative, or heavily weighted
2 negative) to the statutory factors to be considered: the applicant’s “age,” “health,” “family status,”
3 “assets, resources, and financial status,” and “education and skills.” 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,369. The
4 Final Rule states that, when considering an individual’s health, DHS will treat as a negative factor
5 having “a medical condition that is likely to require extensive medical treatment or
6 institutionalization or that will interfere with the alien’s ability to provide and care for himself or
7 herself, to attend school, or to work upon admission or adjustment of status.” 8 C.F.R. §
8 212.22(b)(2). Accordingly, all or almost all immigrants with disabilities would be assigned a
9 negative health factor. *Cf.* 29 U.S.C. § 705(9)(B) (defining “disability,” for purposes of Section
10 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, as having “the meaning given” the term in the ADA’s definition of
11 disability); 42 U.S.C. § 12102(1)(A) (defining a disability, under the ADA, as “a physical or mental
12 impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities of such individual”).

13 That same medical condition is considered a heavily weighted negative factor if the
14 applicant lacks private insurance. 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(c)(1)(iii). The receipt or authorization to
15 receive benefits, including Medicaid, for 12 months within 36 months of filing an application (for
16 a visa, admission, adjustment of status, extension of stay, or change of status) is also deemed a
17 heavily weighted negative factor, 8 C.F.R. §§ 212.22(c)(1)(ii).

18 The lack of a “medical condition” described above is one of a few factors that will be given
19 a positive value under the Final Rule. 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(b)(2). The only heavily weighted positive
20 factors are (1) income, assets, resources, and support that are at least 250% of the Federal Poverty
21 Level and (2) enrollment in a private insurance plan, but only if the applicant does not use tax
22 credits to offset health care premium costs under the Affordable Care Act. 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(c)(2).

23 Under the Final Rule, DHS officials may find in favor of admissibility *only if* the positive
24 factors outweigh the negative factors. 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,397-98. If an immigrant is assigned a
25 heavily weighted negative factor, she will be considered a public charge unless she has two or
26 more countervailing positive factors or one heavily weighted positive factor. *Id.*

27
28 _____
status; (IV) assets, resources, and financial status; and (V) education and skills.” 8 U.S.C. §
1182(a)(4)(B).

1 **C. Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act**

2 Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act prohibits federal executive agencies from
3 discriminating against individuals with disabilities in any program or activity.¹⁰ Section 504
4 reaches government action that, either through purpose or effect, discriminates against individuals
5 with disabilities. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 41.51(b)(3) (“A recipient [of federal funds] may not, directly or
6 through contractual or other arrangements, utilize criteria or methods of administration: (i) That
7 have *the effect* of subjecting qualified handicapped persons to discrimination on the basis of
8 handicap; (ii) That have the *purpose or effect* of defeating or substantially impairing
9 accomplishment of the objectives of the recipient’s program with respect to handicapped persons
10”) (emphasis added).

11 In *Alexander v. Choate*, the Supreme Court made clear that Congress intended Section 504
12 to forbid all forms of disability discrimination, including invidious animus and benign neglect.
13 *See* 469 U.S. 287, 294–97 (1985) (“Discrimination against the handicapped was perceived by
14 Congress to be most often the product, not of invidious animus, but rather of thoughtlessness and
15 indifference—of benign neglect. . . . [M]uch of the conduct that Congress sought to alter in passing
16 the Rehabilitation Act would be difficult if not impossible to reach were the Act construed to
17 proscribe only conduct fueled by a discriminatory intent.”); *Crowder v. Kitagawa*, 81 F.3d 1480,
18 1484 (9th Cir. 1996) (“In *Choate*, the Court concluded that Congress intended to protect disabled
19 persons from discrimination arising out of both discriminatory animus and ‘thoughtlessness,’
20 ‘indifference,’ or ‘benign neglect.’”).

21 Section 504 applies to all DHS activities and programs, including public charge
22 determinations, which means DHS cannot utilize discriminatory “criteria or methods” in making
23 public charge determinations. *See* 6 C.F.R. §§ 15.30(b), 15.49. The “criteria or methods” are
24 discriminatory if they “[s]ubject qualified individuals with a disability to discrimination on the

25 _____
26 ¹⁰ *See* 29 U.S.C. § 794 (2016); 6 C.F.R. § 15.1 (2019); DHS Directive No. 065-01 (Aug. 25, 2013);
27 DHS Instruction No: 065-01-001 (Mar. 7, 2015); DHS Guide 065-01-001-01 (“Guide”), at 23-24
28 (Jun. 6, 2016); Mem. for Maurice C. Inman, Jr., General Counsel, Immigration and Naturalization
Service, from Robert B. Shanks, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, Re:
Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Feb. 2, 1983).

1 basis of disability” or “[d]epeat or substantially impair accomplishment of the objectives of a
2 program or activity with respect to individuals with a disability.” 6 C.F.R. § 15.30(b)(4).¹¹

3 **ARGUMENT**

4 **I. PLAINTIFFS ARE LIKELY TO SUCCEED ON THE MERITS BECAUSE THE**
5 **FINAL RULE VIOLATES SECTION 504 OF THE REHABILITATION ACT.**

6 DHS admits that the Final Rule will have an “outsized” impact on people with disabilities,
7 but claims that “it is not the intent, nor is it the effect of this rule to find a person a public charge
8 solely based on his or her disability.” 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,368. DHS is wrong: the Final Rule’s
9 “health” and “resources” “criteria,” in combination, make anyone with a significant disability
10 virtually certain to be excluded in a public charge determination. Therefore, the “purpose or
11 effect” of the Final Rule is to selectively exclude immigrants with disabilities from admission into
12 the United States or adjustment of status in violation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.

13 **A. Under the Final Rules’ “Health” Criterion, Individuals with Disabilities Are**
14 **Automatically Penalized.**

15 Under the Final Rule, DHS automatically assigns a negative weight to any applicant having
16 “a medical condition that is likely to require extensive medical treatment or institutionalization *or*
17 *that will interfere with the alien’s ability to provide and care for himself or herself, to attend*
18 *school, or to work upon admission or adjustment of status.”* 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(b)(2) (emphasis
19 added). In effect, this criterion converts the “health” inquiry into a “disability” inquiry. Although
20 “disability” is not fully synonymous with “medical condition,” people with disabilities experience
21 functional limitations that often have underlying medical diagnoses. When these medical
22 diagnoses are inadequately treated or accommodated, they can interfere with an individual’s ability
23 to provide self-care, attend school, or work. Thus under this broadly defined criterion, almost
24

25 ¹¹ The government violates Section 504 when it “excludes [individuals] from a program based on
26 an eligibility criterion that impermissibly screens out [individuals] with disabilities” *C.D. v. New*
27 *York City Dep’t of Educ.*, No. 05 Civ. 7945 (SHS), 2009 WL 400382, at *13 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 11,
28 2009); *see also Franco-Gonzalez v. Holder*, No. CV 10-02211 DMG (DTBx), 2013 WL 3674492,
at *4 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 23, 2013) (finding that the government violates Section 504, even in cases
of non-intentional discrimination, if individuals with disabilities “are unable to meaningfully
access the benefit offered . . . because of their disability.”) (*citing Alexander*, 469 U.S. at 299).

1 every person with a “disability” will be assigned an automatic negative weight under the Final
2 Rule. *Cf.* 29 U.S.C. § 705(9)(B) (defining “disability” under Section 504 to mean “a physical or
3 mental impairment that substantially limits one or more life activities of the individual”). There
4 is absolutely nothing in the legislative history that suggests that this was Congress’s intent when
5 it designated “health” as one of the factor to be considered in a public charge determination. In
6 fact, it would have been contrary to congressional action at the time given that Congress had just
7 passed the ADA.

8 Not only will this criterion assign a negative weight to almost every person with a
9 disability; it will count as a heavily weighted negative factor for all of these people with disabilities
10 who lack private insurance. As explained below, *see infra* at § I.B., many people with disabilities
11 cannot receive the services they require from private insurance and thus would be subject to this
12 heavily weighted negative factor. Further, under the Final Rule the *lack* of a medical condition is
13 one of the few positive factors recognized by DHS. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(b)(2). Thus, all other
14 factors being equal, individuals with a disabilities will be severely disadvantaged by automatically
15 being assigned one or more negative factors, and automatically be disqualified from one of the few
16 positive factors DHS will consider in making a public charge determination. This sharply different
17 treatment of individuals who are similarly situated “but for their disability” amounts to
18 discrimination under Section 504. *See Lovell v. Chandler*, 303 F.3d 1039, 1053 (9th Cir. 2002)
19 (finding a Section 504 violation where, “but for their disability,” the plaintiffs would have received
20 Medicaid under the state’s QUEST program).

21 **B. The Final Rule Also Penalizes Individuals with Disabilities for Using**
22 **Medicaid—the Only Provider of Necessary Services that Promote Self-**
23 **Sufficiency.**

24 An applicant’s use of, or even approval for, Medicaid for more than 12 months in any 36
25 month period counts as a heavily weighted negative factor under the Final Rule. *See* 8 C.F.R.
26 §§ 212.22(c)(1)(ii), 212.21(b)(5). The benefits Medicaid provides are *essential* for millions of
27 people with disabilities, and a third of Medicaid’s adult recipients under the age of 65 are people
28

1 with disabilities.¹² Studies show that Medicaid is positively associated with employment and the
 2 integration of individuals with disabilities,¹³ in part because Medicaid covers employment
 3 supports¹⁴ that enable people with disabilities to work.¹⁵ Congress has specified that Medicaid
 4 services are designed to help individuals with disabilities “attain or retain [the] capability for
 5 independence or self-care.” 42 U.S.C. § 1396-1.

6 One reason Medicaid services are essential to the disability community is the lack of
 7 coverage by private insurance of services people with disabilities typically need.¹⁶ Medicaid is the
 8 *only* insurer that generally covers many home- and community-based services, including personal
 9 care services, specialized therapies and treatment, habilitative and rehabilitative services, and
 10 durable medical equipment.¹⁷ Even highly educated professionals, business owners, and other

11
 12 ¹² See *Medicaid Works for People with Disabilities*, C. ON BUDGET AND POL’Y PRIORITIES,
 13 <https://www.cbpp.org/research/health/medicaid-works-for-people-with-disabilities> (last visited
 14 Sept. 9, 2019).

15 ¹³ See e.g. Jean P. Hall, *et al.*, *Effect of Medicaid Expansion on Workforce Participation for People*
 16 *With Disabilities*, 107 AM. J. OF PUB. HEALTH 262 (Feb. 2017),
 17 <https://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/10.2105/AJPH.2016.303543>; Larisa Antonisse, *et al.*, Kaiser
 18 Family Foundation, *The Effects of Medicaid Expansion under the ACA: Updated Findings from a*
 19 *Literature Review* 11 (Sept. 2017), [http://files.kff.org/attachment/Issue-Brief-The-Effects-of-](http://files.kff.org/attachment/Issue-Brief-The-Effects-of-Medicaid-Expansion-Under-the-ACA-Updated-Findings-from-a-Literature-Review)
 20 [Medicaid-Expansion-Under-the-ACA-Updated-Findings-from-a-Literature-Review](http://files.kff.org/attachment/Issue-Brief-The-Effects-of-Medicaid-Expansion-Under-the-ACA-Updated-Findings-from-a-Literature-Review) (collecting
 21 202 studies of Medicaid expansion under the ACA, and concluding that many studies show a
 22 significant positive correlation between Medicaid expansion and employment rates and none show
 23 a negative correlation).

24 ¹⁴ Supported employment is a Medicaid-funded service to assist people with disabilities in
 25 obtaining and maintaining employment in the general workforce, including job placement, job
 26 training, job coaching, transportation, and personal care services at work.

27 ¹⁵ See *Employment & HCBS*, MEDICAID.GOV, [https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/ltss/
 28 employment/employment-and-hcbs/index.html](https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/ltss/employment/employment-and-hcbs/index.html) (last visited Sept. 9, 2019) (“Habilitation services
 are flexible in nature, and can be specifically designed to fund services and supports that assist an
 individual to obtain or maintain employment.”).

¹⁶ See *Medicaid Works for People with Disabilities*, C. ON BUDGET AND POL’Y PRIORITIES,
<https://www.cbpp.org/research/health/medicaid-works-for-people-with-disabilities> (last visited
 Sept. 9, 2019).

¹⁷ See MaryBeth Musumeci, *et al.*, *Medicaid Home and Community-Based Services Enrollment*
 and Spending, KAISER FAMILY FOUNDATION, Apr. 04, 2019, [https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-
 brief/medicaid-home-and-community-based-services-enrollment-and-spending/](https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/medicaid-home-and-community-based-services-enrollment-and-spending/) (last visited
 Sept. 9, 2019) (“Medicaid fills a gap by covering HCBS that are often otherwise unavailable and/or
 unaffordable through other payers or out-of-pocket[.]”). Home and community based services are
 services that help people with disabilities live, work and participate in their communities. See
Home & Community-Based Services, MEDICAID.GOV, [https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/hcbs/
 authorities/1915-c/index.html](https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/hcbs/authorities/1915-c/index.html) (last visited Sept. 5, 2019).

1 well-off individuals with disabilities who use private insurance *also* retain Medicaid coverage
 2 because no other insurer provides the services that they need.¹⁸ In recognition of the coverage
 3 limitations in private insurance for individuals with disabilities, Congress authorized the Medicaid
 4 Buy-In program. This program allows people to use Medicaid even when their incomes are above
 5 the standard limits for regular Medicaid eligibility by paying a premium—which thereby permits
 6 them *to remain in the workforce*.¹⁹

7 Despite congressional recognition of the importance of Medicaid to people with
 8 disabilities, and contrary to evidence showing that Medicaid services *help* individuals with
 9 disabilities avoid becoming public charges, the Final Rule treats using Medicaid as a heavily
 10 weighted negative factor. 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,298-99. An immigrant assigned a heavily weighted
 11 negative factor will be considered a public charge unless she or he has two or more countervailing
 12 positive factors or one heavily weighted positive factor. *Id.* But as explained above, immigrants
 13 with disabilities are automatically precluded by definition from a positive health factor; thus, an
 14 immigrant’s use of public benefits designed to increase self-sufficiency will almost invariably
 15 result in a public charge finding.

16
 17
 18
 19 ¹⁸ See, e.g., Andraéa LaVant, *Congress: Medicaid Allows Me to Have a Job and Live*
 20 *Independently*, AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION (Mar. 22, 2017, 1:45 PM),
 21 [https://www.aclu.org/blog/disability-rights/congress-medicaid-allows-me-have-job-and-live-](https://www.aclu.org/blog/disability-rights/congress-medicaid-allows-me-have-job-and-live-independently)
 22 [independently](https://www.aclu.org/blog/disability-rights/congress-medicaid-allows-me-have-job-and-live-independently) (“Almost immediately after starting at my new job, I learned that
 23 commercial/private insurance does not cover the services I need to live independently. I would
 24 still need to rely on the services supplied through Medicaid just to ensure that I could go to work
 25 and maintain the independence that I had worked so hard to attain.”); Asim Dietrich, *Medicaid*
 26 *Cuts are a Matter of Life or Death for People with Disabilities*, ARIZ. CAP. TIMES (July 13, 2017),
 27 [https://azcapitoltimes.com/news/2017/07/13/medicaid-cuts-are-a-matter-of-life-or-death-for-](https://azcapitoltimes.com/news/2017/07/13/medicaid-cuts-are-a-matter-of-life-or-death-for-people-with-disabilities/)
 28 [people-with-disabilities/](https://azcapitoltimes.com/news/2017/07/13/medicaid-cuts-are-a-matter-of-life-or-death-for-people-with-disabilities/) (“Even with such a severe disability, I live a full life. I am an attorney
 who works on behalf of others with disabilities, I am a board member at a local disability advocacy
 organization called Ability 360, and I have an active social life. The only reason I am able to have
 such a full life is Medicaid.”); Alice Wong, *My Medicaid, My Life*, NEW YORK TIMES (May 3,
 2017), <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/03/opinion/my-medicaid-my-life.html> (“I am
 unapologetically disabled and a fully engaged member of society. None of that would be possible
 without Medicaid.”).

¹⁹ See e.g., *Medicaid “Buy In” Q&A*, HHS ADMIN. FOR COMMUNITY LIVING & DOL OFFICE OF
 DISABILITY AND EMPLOYMENT POLICY,
<https://www.dol.gov/odep/topics/MedicaidBuyInQAF.pdf> (last updated July 2019).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

C. The Final Rule Triple-Counts the Same Factual Circumstances against an Individual with Disabilities.

As noted, under the Final Rule, an immigrant’s medical condition and his or her use of Medicaid can both be deemed a heavily weighted negative factor. 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(c)(1). And the lack of the same medical condition is a positive factor. See 8 C.F.R. § 212.22(b)(2). Also, as discussed above, many individuals with disabilities rely on Medicaid in part because it provides services not available through private insurance that allow these individuals to work. The Final Rule combines these criteria to in effect triply punish individuals with disabilities: first for having the medical condition that impedes their ability to work, second for using Medicaid’s services that they need to work and otherwise be productive members of their communities, and third by disqualifying them from a potential positive factor.

Consider an immigrant who uses Medicaid because she needs rehabilitative services. This individual will have a medical condition that interferes with her ability to work, and, if she lacks private insurance, it will count as a heavily weighted negative factor. Her use of (or approval for) Medicaid services for more than 12 months in the past 36 months would then constitute *another* heavily weighted negative factor. And regardless of how healthy she is otherwise, she cannot qualify for the “health” positive factor. Therefore, the Final Rule would invariably deem this individual a public charge by triple-counting her disability.

This example starkly demonstrates the falsity of DHS’s argument that “[u]nder the totality of the circumstances framework, the disability itself would not be the sole basis for an inadmissibility finding.” Section 504 is violated where an individual is denied a benefit on the basis of his or her disability, even if other factors are considered. See *Lovell*, 303 F.3d at 1053 (finding a Section 504 violation where other factors in a “restrictive income and assets test,” because “those disabled persons were denied QUEST coverage by the State solely because of their disabilities”).

II. THE FINAL RULE WILL CAUSE IRREPARABLE HARM TO BOTH CITIZENS AND NON-CITIZENS WITH DISABILITIES.

DHS concedes the Final Rule’s designation of Medicaid as a public benefit will have a

1 “potentially outsized impact . . . on individuals with disabilities,” 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,368, but fails
 2 to appreciate the magnitude of the harm. As explained in the preceding section, the Final Rule
 3 will cause irreparable harm to immigrants with disabilities who will either be denied admission or
 4 an adjustment of status.²⁰ Conversely, in order to avoid a public charge determination, immigrants
 5 with disabilities will be forced to forego necessary medical services.²¹ For example, imagine an
 6 immigrant who had been in the United States long enough to be eligible for a Medicaid buy-in
 7 program that he uses to get personal care services (which are unavailable through private health
 8 insurance), enabling him to work. He would have to drop out of the Medicaid Buy-In program
 9 (and thereby lose the personal care services and possibly his employment as a result) in order to
 10 minimize the risk being considered a public charge (which would prohibit him from becoming a
 11 legal permanent resident).

12 Confusion surrounding the Final Rule will cause immigrants to forego public benefits to
 13 which they are entitled and which would not result in a “negative” factor, out of fear that accessing
 14 those benefits would adversely impact their immigration status. But the harm caused by the Final
 15 Rule is not limited to non-citizen immigrants. Confusion surrounding the Final Rule is also likely
 16 to cause immigrant parents to refuse government benefits for their citizen children even though
 17 the usage of those benefits would not be counted against the parents. DHS admits that the
 18 programs named in the Final Rule will experience a 2.5% disenrollment rate and that hundreds of
 19

20 ²⁰ Mandatory exclusion from the United States can be a death sentence for some immigrants with
 21 disabilities. For example, Maria Isabel Bueso, an immigrant diagnosed with a rare life-threatening
 22 condition was denied extension of Deferred Action Status. Isabel has lived in the United States
 23 for 16 years as a legal resident. The United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS)
 24 has ordered her removal to Guatemala, where the lifesaving medical treatment she receives is not
 available. *See e.g. Congressman DeSaulnier Announces Private Bill to Protect Maria Isabel
 Bueso from Deportation*, CONGRESSMAN MARK DESAULNIER: CALIFORNIA’S 11TH CONG. DIST.
 (Sept. 3, 2019), [https://desaulnier.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/congressman-
 desaulnier-announces-private-bill-protect-maria-isabel-bueso](https://desaulnier.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/congressman-desaulnier-announces-private-bill-protect-maria-isabel-bueso).

25 ²¹ *Cf.* Avital Fischer, Sumeet Banker, and Claire Abraham, *Pediatricians Speak Out: A ‘Public
 26 Charge Rule’ is Dangerous for Children*, THE HILL (Sept. 1, 2019, 5:00 PM),
 27 [https://thehill.com/opinion/healthcare/459565-pediatricians-speak-out-a-public-charge-rule-is-
 28 dangerous-for-children](https://thehill.com/opinion/healthcare/459565-pediatricians-speak-out-a-public-charge-rule-is-dangerous-for-children) (“[O]ne in seven immigrant adults reported that they or a family member
 did not participate in benefit programs to which they were entitled, for fear of jeopardizing their
 ability to secure legal permanent residence status.”).

1 thousands of people eligible for benefits will unenroll because other members of their households
 2 are foreign-born noncitizens. 84 Fed. Reg. at 41,463, 66-69. Disability organizations have fielded
 3 countless calls, emails, and letters from people who are confused and concerned as to whether they
 4 should disenroll from benefits.²² A researcher quoted by the Los Angeles Times recently warned:
 5 “‘We’re already seeing chilling effects. . . . There are families that are stopping benefits for their
 6 U.S. citizen children. There are green card holders and naturalized citizens that stopped benefits
 7 even though they won’t be affected.’”²³ And a recently published study in the Journal of the
 8 American Medical Association Pediatrics found that between “0.8 and 1.9 million children with
 9 medical needs could be disenrolled” from health and nutrition benefits as a result of the version of
 10 the rule proposed by DHS in October, 2018.²⁴

11 CONCLUSION

12 The Final Rule seeks to turn back the clock to a shameful era of eugenic immigration
 13 policies by establishing a set of criteria ensuring that immigrants with disabilities will be
 14 considered “public charges.” This rule will irreparably harm the community of individuals with
 15 disabilities both by denying disabled immigrants admission or adjustment of status and by
 16 discouraging citizens and noncitizens from accessing the benefits that allow them to study, work,
 17 and participate fully in society. The *amici curiae* therefore respectfully urge the Court to heed the
 18 overwhelming opposition among the disability community to the Final Rule and grant Plaintiffs’
 19 request for relief.

20
 21 ²² As just one example, Disability Rights California “has received calls from families who are
 22 afraid to apply for [In-Home Supportive Services] for their children, even though their children
 23 are eligible and receipt of IHSS could prevent their costly out-of-home placement.” *Disability
 24 Rights California Comments in Response to Proposed Rulemaking on Inadmissibility on Public
 Charge Grounds* (December 10, 2018), [https://www.disabilityrightsca.org/post/proposed-
 changes-to-federal-rules-for-public-charge-an-immigration-policy-that-hurts-people](https://www.disabilityrightsca.org/post/proposed-changes-to-federal-rules-for-public-charge-an-immigration-policy-that-hurts-people).

25 ²³ Leila Miller, *Trump administration’s ‘public charge’ rule has chilling effect on benefits for
 26 immigrants’ children*, Los Angeles Times (Sept. 3, 2019),
[https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2019-09-02/trump-children-benefits-public-charge-
 rule](https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2019-09-02/trump-children-benefits-public-charge-rule).

27 ²⁴ Leah Zallman, Karen Finnegan, David Himmelstein, *et al.*, *Implications of Changing Public
 28 Charge Immigration Rules for Children Who Need Medical Care*, 173 J. AMER. MED. ASSOC.
 PEDIATRICS, 1, 2 (2019).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: September 11, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

By /s/Sarah M. Ray
Sarah M. Ray

Sarah M. Ray (CA Bar No. 229670)
sarah.ray@lw.com
Kyle A. Virgien (CA Bar No. 278747)
kyle.virgien@lw.com
Diana A. Aguilar (CA Bar No. 304427)
diana.aguilar@lw.com
Charles F. Sprague (CA Bar No. 313692)
charles.sprague@lw.com

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

*Attorneys for Proposed Amici Curiae
American Civil Liberties Union, Center for
Public Representation, et al.*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Appendix: Statements of Amici Curiae Groups

The **American Civil Liberties Union** (“ACLU”) is a nationwide, nonprofit nonpartisan organization dedicated to the principles of liberty and equality embodied in the Constitution and our nation’s civil rights laws. With more than three million members, activists, and supporters, the ACLU fights tirelessly in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and Washington, D.C. for the principle that every individual’s rights must be protected equally under the law, regardless of race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, disability, national origin, or record of arrest or conviction. The ACLU’s Disability Rights Program envisions a society in which discrimination against people with disabilities no longer exists, and in which people understand that disability is a normal part of life. This means a country in which people with disabilities are valued, integrated members of the community, and where people with disabilities have jobs, homes, education, healthcare, and families.

The **Center for Public Representation** (“CPR”) is a national, nonprofit legal advocacy organization that has been assisting people with disabilities for more forty years. CPR uses legal strategies, systemic reform initiatives, and policy advocacy to enforce civil rights, expand opportunities for inclusion and full community participation, and empower people with disabilities to exercise choice in all aspects of their lives. CPR has litigated systemic cases on behalf of people with disabilities in more than twenty states and has authored amici briefs to the United States Supreme Court and many courts of appeals. CPR is both a national and statewide legal backup center that provides assistance and support to the federally-funded protection and advocacy agencies in each state and to attorneys who represent people with disabilities in Massachusetts. CPR has helped lead the effort to educate and engage the disability community about the “public charge” rule at issue in this case.

The **American Association of People with Disabilities** (“AAPD”) works to increase the political and economic power of people with disabilities. A national cross-disability organization, AAPD advocates for full recognition of the rights of over 61 million Americans with disabilities.

1 The **Association of University Centers on Disabilities** (“AUCD”) is a nonprofit
2 membership association of 130 university centers and programs in each of the fifty States and six
3 Territories. AUCD members conduct research, create innovative programs, prepare individuals to
4 serve and support people with disabilities and their families, and disseminate information about
5 best practices in disability programming.

6 The **Autistic Self Advocacy Network** (“ASAN”) is a national, private, nonprofit
7 organization, run by and for autistic individuals. ASAN provides public education and promotes
8 public policies that benefit autistic individuals and others with developmental or other disabilities.
9 ASAN’s advocacy activities include combating stigma, discrimination, and violence against
10 autistic people and others with disabilities; promoting access to health care and long-term supports
11 in integrated community settings; and educating the public about the access needs of autistic
12 people. ASAN takes a strong interest in cases that affect the rights of autistic individuals and others
13 with disabilities to participate fully in community life and enjoy the same rights as others without
14 disabilities.

15 The **Civil Rights Education and Enforcement Center** (“CREEC”) is a national nonprofit
16 membership organization whose mission is to defend human and civil rights secured by law.
17 CREEC’s members include both people with disabilities and people who want to immigrate or
18 have immigrated to this country. CREEC’s efforts to defend human and civil include ensuring
19 that such individuals do not encounter discrimination based on disability.
20

21 The **Coelho Center for Disability Law, Policy and Innovation** (“The Coelho Center”) was
22 founded in 2018 by the Honorable Tony Coelho, primary author of the Americans with
23 Disabilities Act. Housed at Loyola Law School in Los Angeles, The Coelho Center collaborates
24 with the disability community to cultivate leadership and advocate innovative approaches to
25 advance the lives of people with disabilities. The Coelho Center brings together thought leaders,
26 advocates, and policy makers to craft agendas that center disabled voices.

27 **Disability Rights Advocates** (“DRA”) is a non-profit, public interest law firm that
28 specializes in high impact civil rights litigation and other advocacy on behalf of persons with

1 disabilities throughout the United States. DRA works to end discrimination in areas such as access
2 to public accommodations, public services, employment, transportation, education, and housing.
3 DRA’s clients, staff and board of directors include people with various types of disabilities. With
4 offices in New York City and Berkeley, California, DRA strives to protect the civil rights of people
5 with all types of disabilities nationwide.

6 **Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund** (“DREDF”) is a national cross-disability
7 law and policy center that protects and advances the civil and human rights of people with
8 disabilities through legal advocacy, training, education, and development of legislation and public
9 policy. We are committed to increasing accessible and equally effective healthcare for people with
10 disabilities and eliminating persistent health disparities that affect the length and quality of their
11 lives. DREDF’s work is based on the knowledge that people with disabilities of varying racial and
12 ethnic backgrounds, ages, genders, and sexual orientations are fully capable of achieving self-
13 sufficiency and contributing to their communities with access to needed services and supports and
14 the reasonable accommodations and modifications enshrined in U.S. law.

15 **Disability Rights California** (formerly known as Protection and Advocacy, Inc.), is a non-
16 profit agency established under federal law to protect, advocate for and advance the human, legal
17 and service rights of Californians with disabilities. Disability Rights California works in
18 partnership with people with disabilities, striving towards a society that values all people and
19 supports their rights to dignity, freedom, choice, and quality of life. Since 1978, Disability Rights
20 California has provided essential legal services to people with disabilities. In the last year,
21 Disability Rights California provided legal assistance on nearly 26,000 matters to individuals with
22 disabilities, including impact litigation and direct representation. Disability Rights California has
23 extensive policy and litigation experience securing the rights of people with disabilities to public
24 benefits.

25 The **Judge David L. Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law** is a national nonprofit
26 advocacy organization that provides legal assistance to individuals with mental disabilities. The
27 Center was founded in 1972 as the Mental Health Law Project. Through litigation, policy
28 advocacy, and public education, the Center advances the rights of individuals with mental

1 disabilities to participate equally in all aspects of society, including health care, housing,
2 employment, education, community living, parental and family rights, and other areas. The Center
3 worked with others to develop comments of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities
4 concerning the "public charge" rule at issue in this case, and has litigated cases, filed amicus briefs,
5 and engaged in other advocacy on a number of issues concerning the rights of immigrants with
6 disabilities.

7 **Little Lobbyists** is a family-led organization that seeks to protect and expand the rights of
8 children with complex medical needs and disabilities through advocacy, education, and outreach.
9 We advocate for our children to have access to the health care, education, and community inclusion
10 they need to survive and thrive.

11 **Mental Health America** ("MHA"), formerly the National Mental Health Association, is a
12 national membership organization composed of individuals with lived experience of mental
13 illnesses and their family members and advocates. The nation's oldest and leading community-
14 based nonprofit mental health organization, MHA has more than 200 affiliates dedicated to
15 improving the mental health of all Americans, especially the 54 million people who have severe
16 mental disorders. Through advocacy, education, research, and service, MHA helps to ensure that
17 people with mental illnesses are accorded respect, dignity, and the opportunity to achieve their full
18 potential. MHA is against policies that discriminate against people with mental health conditions.

19 The **National Association of Councils on Developmental Disabilities** ("NACDD") is the
20 national nonprofit membership association for the Councils on Developmental Disabilities located
21 in every State and Territory. The Councils are authorized under federal law to engage in advocacy,
22 capacity-building, and systems-change activities that ensure that individuals with developmental
23 disabilities and their families have access to needed community services, individualized supports,
24 and other assistance that promotes self-determination, independence, productivity, and integration
25 and inclusion in community life.

26 The **National Council on Independent Living** ("NCIL") is the oldest cross-disability,
27 national grassroots organization run by and for people with disabilities. NCIL's membership is
28 comprised of centers for independent living, state independent living councils, people with

1 disabilities and other disability rights organizations. NCIL advances independent living and the
2 rights of people with disabilities. NCIL envisions a world in which people with disabilities are
3 valued equally and participate fully.

4 The **National Disability Rights Network** (“NDRN”) is the non-profit membership
5 organization for the federally mandated Protection and Advocacy (P&A) and Client Assistance
6 Program (CAP) agencies for individuals with disabilities. The P&A and CAP agencies were
7 established by the United States Congress to protect the rights of people with disabilities and their
8 families through legal support, advocacy, referral, and education. There are P&As and CAPs in
9 all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Territories (American Samoa,
10 Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and the US Virgin Islands), and there is a P&A and CAP
11 affiliated with the Native American Consortium which includes the Hopi, Navajo and San Juan
12 Southern Piute Nations in the Four Corners region of the Southwest. Collectively, the P&A and
13 CAP agencies are the largest provider of legally based advocacy services to people with disabilities
14 in the United States.

15 The **National Federation of the Blind** (“NFB”) is the nation’s oldest and largest
16 organization of blind persons. The NFB has affiliates in all fifty states, Washington, DC, and
17 Puerto Rico. The NFB and its affiliates are widely recognized by the public, Congress, executive
18 agencies of state and federal governments, and the courts as a collective and representative voice
19 on behalf of blind Americans and their families. The organization promotes the general welfare of
20 the blind by assisting the blind in their efforts to integrate themselves into society on terms of
21 equality and by removing barriers that result in the denial of opportunity to blind persons in
22 virtually every sphere of life, including education, employment, family and community life,
23 transportation, and recreation.

24 The **Arc of the United States** (“The Arc”), founded in 1950, is the nation’s largest
25 community-based organization of and for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities
26 (“I/DD”). The Arc promotes and protects the human and civil rights of people with I/DD and
27 actively supports their full inclusion and participation in the community throughout their lifetimes.

28

1 The Arc has a vital interest in ensuring that all individuals with I/DD receive the appropriate
2 protections and supports to which they are entitled by law.

3 Founded in 1946 by paralyzed veterans, **United Spinal Association** is a national
4 membership organization of 56,000 persons with spinal cord injuries or disorders, the vast majority
5 of whom use wheelchairs. United Spinal Association has represented the interests of the
6 wheelchair-using community in litigation for decades. United Spinal Association was a key
7 negotiator with members of Congress regarding the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities
8 Act and the Fair Housing Amendments Act. Addressing the needs and rights of people with
9 disabilities, especially those with mobility impairments, has always been part of United Spinal
10 Association’s mission.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28