

1 Tony West
2 Assistant Attorney General
3 Dennis K. Burke
4 United States Attorney
5 Arthur R. Goldberg
6 Assistant Director, Federal Programs Branch
7 Varu Chilakamarri (NY Bar #4324299)
8 Joshua Wilkenfeld (NY Bar #4440681)
9 U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division
10 20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
11 Washington, DC 20530
12 Tel. (202) 616-8489/Fax (202) 616-8470
13 varudhini.chilakamarri@usdoj.gov
14 *Attorneys for the United States*
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

The United States of America,
Plaintiff,

v.

The State of Arizona; and Janice K. Brewer,
Governor of the State of Arizona, in her
Official Capacity,

Defendants.

No.

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
AND MEMORANDUM OF LAW
IN SUPPORT THEREOF**

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	3
I. FEDERAL STATUTORY & REGULATORY FRAMEWORK GOVERNING IMMIGRATION	3
A. Federal Laws and Discretion Regarding the Entry, Removal, and Treatment of Aliens Within the United States	4
B. Federal Immigration Enforcement and the Cooperation of States and Localities	6
II. ARIZONA’S S.B. 1070	7
A. Section 2 – Arizona’s Mandatory Alien Inspection Scheme	7
B. Section 3 – Arizona’s Alien Registration Crime	8
C. Section 4/Ariz. Rev. Stat. 13-2319 – Arizona’s Alien Smuggling Crime	9
D. Section 5 – Arizona’s Alien Work Crime	9
E. Section 5 – Arizona’s Alien Transporting and Harboring Crime	9
F. Section 6 – Arizona’s Warrantless Arrest of “Removable” Aliens	10
LEGAL STANDARD	10
ARGUMENT	11
I. THE UNITED STATES IS LIKELY TO PREVAIL ON THE MERITS	11
A. Relevant Principles of Preemption	11
B. The Overall Statutory Scheme of S.B. 1070 is Preempted Because it Sets a State-Level Immigration Policy That Interferes with Federal Administration and Enforcement of the Immigration Laws	12
1. S.B. 1070 Represents an Unlawful Attempt to Set Immigration Policy at the State Level	13
2. S.B. 1070’s Policy of “Attrition Through Enforcement” Conflicts with the Federal Immigration Framework	15

1	3.	S.B. 1070 Interferes with U.S. Foreign Policy Objectives That Inform Federal Administration and Enforcement of the Immigration Laws	22
2			
3	C.	The Individual Sections of S.B. 1070 Are Preempted By Federal Law . .	25
4	1.	Sections 2 and 6 Are Preempted Because Their Mandatory Requirements for Determining Immigration Status Conflict with Federal Law and Priorities	25
5			
6	a.	Section 2 of S.B. 1070 Will Result in the Harassment of Lawfully Present Aliens and is Therefore at Odds with Congressional Objectives	26
7			
8	b.	Section 2 of S.B. 1070 Will Burden Federal Resources and Impede Federal Enforcement and Policy Priorities . . .	30
9			
10	c.	Section 6 of S.B. 1070 Extends Arizona’s Warrantless Arrest Authority to Out-of-State “Removable” Offenses and is Preempted Because it Will Lead to the Harassment of Aliens	32
11			
12	2.	Section 3 of S.B. 1070 – Arizona’s “Complete or Carry an Alien Registration Document” Provision – Is Preempted by Federal Law	34
13			
14	a.	Section 3 Interferes with Comprehensive Federal Alien Registration Law	34
15			
16	b.	Section 3 is Preempted Because it Seeks to Criminalize Unlawful Presence and Will Result in the Harassment of Aliens	37
17			
18	3.	Section 4 of S.B. 1070 Amends Arizona’s Alien Smuggling Statute, Which is Preempted Because it Conflicts with Federal Law	39
19			
20	4.	Section 5 of S.B. 1070 – Arizona’s New Criminal Sanction Against Unauthorized Aliens Who Solicit or Perform Work – is Preempted by the Federal Employer Sanctions Scheme	42
21			
22	5.	Section 5 of S.B. 1070 – Arizona’s Transporting, Harboring, or Concealing Provision – Violates Preemption and Dormant Commerce Clause Principles	44
23			
24	II.	THE UNITED STATES WILL SUFFER IRREPARABLE HARM ABSENT A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION	46
25			
26			
27			
28			

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

III.	A BALANCING OF EQUITIES FAVORS THE UNITED STATES AND DEMONSTRATES THAT THE PUBLIC INTEREST WOULD BE SERVED BY GRANTING INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	52
	CONCLUSION	53

1 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65, the United States hereby moves this
2 Court to preliminarily enjoin enforcement of Arizona’s S.B. 1070 (Laws 2010, Chapter 113),
3 as amended by H.B. 2162, to preserve the status quo until this matter can be adjudicated.

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5 In our constitutional system, the power to regulate immigration is exclusively vested
6 in the federal government. The immigration framework set forth by Congress and
7 administered by federal agencies reflects a careful and considered balance of national law
8 enforcement, foreign relations, and humanitarian concerns – concerns that belong to the
9 nation as a whole, not a single state. The Constitution and federal law do not permit the
10 development of a patchwork of state and local immigration policies throughout the country.
11 Although a state may adopt regulations that have an indirect or incidental effect on aliens,
12 a state may *not* establish its own immigration policy or enforce state laws in a manner that
13 interferes with federal immigration law.

14 The State of Arizona has crossed this constitutional line. In acknowledged
15 disagreement with the manner in which the federal government has regulated immigration
16 and in contravention of these constitutional principles, Arizona recently enacted S.B. 1070¹
17 – a comprehensive set of immigration provisions explicitly designed to “work together” to
18 “discourage and deter the unlawful entry and presence of aliens” by making “attrition
19 through enforcement the public policy” of Arizona. To carry out Arizona’s “public policy,”
20 S.B. 1070 creates new state crimes that penalize an alien’s failure to meet federal registration
21 requirements, an alien’s unauthorized attempt to solicit work, and the commercial
22 transportation of unlawfully present aliens. And to achieve maximum enforcement of its
23 new immigration policy, S.B. 1070 establishes a new state-wide mandatory immigration
24 status-verification system to be employed whenever practicable by every law enforcement
25 officer who, during the course of a stop, has reasonable suspicion of a person’s “unlawful
26 presence.” Further, any private citizen of Arizona may sue a local law enforcement agency

27 ¹ Throughout this memorandum, the term “S.B. 1070” refers to the statute as
28 amended by H.B. 2162.

1 for money damages if that agency fails to enforce immigration laws to the fullest extent
2 possible.

3 Both separately and in concert, S.B. 1070's provisions would subvert and interfere
4 with federal immigration laws and objectives; the law is therefore preempted. *First*, Arizona
5 impermissibly seeks to create a state-specific "attrition through enforcement" policy that is
6 expressly designed to supplant the federal government's immigration policy. As such,
7 Arizona's immigration policy does not simply provide legitimate assistance to the federal
8 government but instead exceeds a state's role with respect to aliens, interferes with the
9 federal government's balanced administration of the immigration laws, and critically
10 undermines U.S. foreign policy objectives. S.B. 1070 therefore exceeds constitutional
11 boundaries. The states are not permitted to set their own independent immigration policies,
12 with varying and potentially conflicting enforcement systems and priorities. Were a number
13 of states to act as Arizona has and strike out on their own, federal immigration policy and
14 enforcement efforts would be crippled. *Second*, individual provisions of S.B. 1070
15 separately conflict with federal law and are therefore preempted. S.B. 1070's new state-wide
16 mandatory immigration status verification scheme and warrantless arrest provision will result
17 in the harassment and incarceration of foreign nationals and lawful resident aliens – and even
18 U.S. citizens who will not have readily available documentation to demonstrate their
19 citizenship. In addition, this scheme will divert and burden federal immigration resources
20 that are needed to target high-priority aliens. The federal government has prioritized
21 enforcement against dangerous aliens who pose a threat to national security and public
22 safety, but Arizona's indiscriminate approach will stand in the way of the federal
23 government's focused efforts to get the most dangerous aliens off the streets. And S.B.
24 1070's criminal provisions are preempted because they each conflict with congressional
25 objectives underlying specific federal immigration laws.

26 A preliminary injunction against S.B. 1070 is necessary to preserve the status quo,
27 because the United States is likely to prevail on the merits of this case, and absent injunctive
28 relief, the United States will continue to suffer irreparable harm. Enforcement of S.B. 1070

1 will disrupt the constitutional order by undermining the federal government’s control over
2 the regulation of immigration and immigration policy and by interfering with its ability to
3 balance the purposes and objectives of federal law and to pursue its chosen enforcement
4 priorities. Moreover, S.B. 1070 will result in the harassment of lawfully present aliens and
5 even U.S. citizens. Implementation of the law will damage the United States’ ability to speak
6 with a single and authoritative voice to foreign governments on immigration matters and is
7 already having negative effects on long-standing and vital international relationships. S.B.
8 1070 will also impede the federal government’s ability to provide measured enforcement of
9 criminal sanctions so as to accommodate the many other objectives that Congress enacted
10 into the immigration laws. As a matter of law and in the public interest, this Court should
11 enter a preliminary injunction to prevent S.B. 1070 from going into effect.

12 **BACKGROUND**

13 **I. FEDERAL STATUTORY & REGULATORY FRAMEWORK GOVERNING** 14 **IMMIGRATION**

15 The Constitution vests the political branches with exclusive and plenary authority to
16 establish the nation’s immigration policy. *See* U.S. Const., art. I § 8, cl. 4 (Congress has the
17 authority to “establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization”); U.S. Const., art. I § 8, cl. 3
18 (Congress has the authority to “regulate Commerce with foreign Nations”); *see also* U.S.
19 Const., art. II § 3 (vesting the President with the authority to “take Care that the Laws be
20 faithfully executed”). Pursuant to this authority, over several decades, Congress has enacted
21 and refined a detailed statutory framework governing immigration – a task that has involved
22 reconciling the complex and often competing interests of national security and public safety,
23 foreign relations, and humanitarian concerns. *See, e.g.,* Declaration of James B. Steinberg,
24 Deputy Secretary of State (attached as Exhibit 1), ¶¶ 5-6. The federal immigration scheme,
25 largely enacted as part of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”), 8 U.S.C. § 1101, *et*
26 *seq.*, empowers the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”), the Department of Justice
27 (“DOJ”), and the Department of State, among other federal agencies, to administer and
28 enforce the immigration laws, and it provides for the considerable exercise of discretion to

1 direct enforcement in a manner consistent with federal policy objectives.

2 **A. Federal Laws and Discretion Regarding the Entry, Removal, and**
3 **Treatment of Aliens Within the United States**

4 The INA sets forth the conditions under which a foreign national may be admitted to
5 and remain in the United States. As part of these conditions, Congress created a
6 comprehensive alien registration system for monitoring the entry and movement of aliens
7 within the United States. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1201(b), 1301-1306; *see also* 8 C.F.R. Part 264.
8 If an alien enters the United States without inspection, presents fraudulent documents at
9 entry, violates the conditions of his admission, or engages in certain proscribed conduct, the
10 federal government (through DHS) may place him in removal proceedings. *See* 8 U.S.C.
11 §§ 1225, 1227, 1228, 1229, 1229c, 1231. In addition to removal, DHS and DOJ may employ
12 civil and criminal sanctions against the alien for particular violations of the federal
13 immigration laws.² *See, e.g.,* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1325, 1306, 1324c.

14 To prevent the unlawful entry of aliens into the United States, Congress further
15 criminalized certain activities of third parties, such as the smuggling of unlawfully present
16 aliens into the country, and the facilitation of unlawful immigration within the nation's
17 borders. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324. Critically, Congress provided for the civil removal of
18 unlawfully present aliens, but did not criminally penalize their mere presence or movement
19 within the country absent other factors. Nor did Congress impose criminal penalties on
20 aliens for solely seeking or obtaining employment in the country without authorization, *see*
21 H.R. Rep. No. 99-682(I) at 46, electing instead to prohibit employers from hiring
22 unauthorized aliens. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(a)(1).

23 Under this framework, administering agencies are empowered to exercise their
24

25 ² Under federal law, an alien's mere unlawful presence in the United States is not a
26 crime, although it may subject the alien to removal from the United States. *See* 8 U.S.C.
27 §§ 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), 1227(a)(1) (B)&(C). Unlawful presence becomes an element of a
28 criminal offense, however, when an alien is found in the United States after having been
formally removed or after voluntarily departing from the United States pending execution
of a final removal order. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1326. Unlawful *entry* into the United States is a
crime. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1325.

1 discretion not to apply a specific sanction to an alien who has unlawfully entered or remained
2 in the United States. For example, DHS has authority to permit aliens, including those who
3 would otherwise be inadmissible, to temporarily enter and remain the United States (*i.e.*,
4 “parole”) for “urgent humanitarian reasons” or “significant public benefit.” 8 U.S.C.
5 § 1182(d)(5)(A). In addition, DHS and DOJ may withhold or cancel the removal of an alien
6 under a variety of special circumstances, including those relating to family unity and
7 domestic abuse. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a)(1)(E)(iii); 8 U.S.C. §§ 1229b (providing DOJ
8 discretion to cancel the removal of an otherwise inadmissible or removable alien under
9 certain circumstances); *see also* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A) (excluding from inadmissibility
10 certain aliens who have been subjected to battery or extreme cruelty). Further, both DHS and
11 DOJ may grant an otherwise unlawfully present or removable alien relief from removal – and
12 potentially adjust that alien’s immigration status – if the alien meets certain conditions. If
13 an alien has a well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality,
14 membership in a particular social group, or political opinion, he may be eligible for asylum
15 in the United States, “irrespective of [his] status.” *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1158.³ Similarly, an alien
16 may be afforded temporary protected status and remain in the United States if he is an
17 eligible national of a country that DHS has designated as experiencing ongoing armed
18 conflict, natural disaster, or another extraordinary circumstance. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1254a.
19 Under certain circumstances, moreover, an alien may be provided employment authorization
20 while the federal government evaluates his immigration status. *See, e.g.*, 8 C.F.R.
21 § 274a.12(c)(14); Declaration of Michael Aytes, Senior Advisor to the Director of U.S.

22
23
24
25 ³ The United States is likewise bound by international treaty obligations not to
26 remove, with limited exceptions, a refugee to any country where his life or freedom would
27 be threatened on account of his race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social
28 group or political opinion (*see* 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, incorporating
by reference Art. 33(1) of the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees), and not
to remove or extradite any individual to a country where it is more likely than not that he
would be tortured (*see* Art. 3 of the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman
or Degrading Treatment or Punishment).

1 Citizenship & Immigration Services (attached as Exhibit 2), ¶¶ 6, 12, 14, 15, 18.⁴

2 Although not an exhaustive description of the complex and detailed federal
3 immigration framework, these provisions reflect that the federal immigration laws do not
4 focus on one, singular interest but instead seek to further multiple competing objectives.

5 **B. Federal Immigration Enforcement and the Cooperation of States and**
6 **Localities**

7 DHS is the federal agency primarily tasked with enforcing the immigration laws,
8 mainly through its components, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”), U.S.
9 Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”), and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
10 (“USCIS”). *See* 6 U.S.C. §§ 251–52, 271; 8 U.S.C. § 1103. DHS receives state and local
11 cooperation. *See, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(10) (authorizing DHS to empower state or local
12 law enforcement with immigration enforcement authority when an “actual or imminent mass
13 influx of aliens . . . presents urgent circumstances”). In addition, Congress prescribed by
14 statute a number of ways in which states may assist the federal government in its
15 enforcement of the immigration laws. 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g) (1)–(9) (enabling DHS to enter
16 into agreements to authorize appropriately trained and supervised state and local officers to
17 perform enumerated immigration related functions); 8 U.S.C. § 1373(a)-(b); 8 U.S.C.
18 § 1252c (authorizing state and local law enforcement to arrest aliens who are unlawfully
19 present in the United States because they were previously removed after being convicted of
20 a felony in the United States). DHS works cooperatively with states and localities through
21 a variety of programs. For example, ICE administers the Law Enforcement Support Center
22 (“LESC”), which serves as a national enforcement operations center that promptly provides

23 ⁴ In addition to formal policies that provide exceptions from removal, federal
24 authorities have discretion not to remove certain unlawfully present aliens where the exercise
25 of discretion would further one of the INA’s policy objectives. For example, in the wake of
26 the recent earthquake in Haiti – and before the institution of a formal Temporary Protected
27 Status program for Haiti – the federal government exercised discretion to suspend the
28 removal of Haitian nationals. Similarly, the President’s foreign affairs authority allows for
 “deferred enforced departure,” pursuant to which the executive branch may use its discretion
 to suspend removal proceedings where doing so would further humanitarian, foreign policy,
 or other law enforcement goals. *See, e.g.*, [http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Presidential-Memorandum-Regarding-Deferred-Enforced-Departure-for-Liberians)
 [Presidential-Memorandum-Regarding-Deferred-Enforced-Departure-for-Liberians](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Presidential-Memorandum-Regarding-Deferred-Enforced-Departure-for-Liberians).

1 immigration status and identity information to local, state, and federal law enforcement
2 agencies regarding aliens suspected of, arrested for, or convicted of criminal activity.
3 Declaration of David C. Palmatier, Unit Chief for LESC (attached as Exhibit 3), ¶¶ 3-6.
4 Further, ICE and CBP respond to requests from state and local law enforcement officers on
5 a variety of immigration matters.⁵ Palmatier Decl. ¶ 3; Declaration of David V. Aguilar,
6 Deputy Commissioner, CBP (attached as Exhibit 5), ¶ 22.

7 **II. ARIZONA’S S.B. 1070**

8 On April 23, 2010, Governor Janice Brewer signed into law S.B. 1070, a
9 comprehensive and unprecedented state effort to regulate immigration. Expressly intended
10 to make “attrition through enforcement the public policy of all state and local government
11 agencies in Arizona,” S.B. 1070 is a set of mostly criminal provisions governing police
12 procedures, immigration enforcement, alien registration, transportation, and employment –
13 all of which are intended to “work together to discourage and deter the unlawful entry and
14 presence of aliens.” S.B. 1070 § 1. One week later, Governor Brewer signed H.B. 2162,
15 which amended S.B. 1070 for the purpose of responding to those who “expressed fears that
16 the original law would somehow allow or lead to racial profiling.” Statement by Governor
17 Jan Brewer (Apr. 30, 2010), at [http://azgovernor.gov/dms/upload/PR_043010_](http://azgovernor.gov/dms/upload/PR_043010_StatementGovBrewer.pdf)
18 [StatementGovBrewer.pdf](http://azgovernor.gov/dms/upload/PR_043010_StatementGovBrewer.pdf). The law will go into effect on July 29, 2010.

19 **A. Section 2 – Arizona’s Mandatory Alien Inspection Scheme**

20 The first pillar of Arizona’s new immigration policy is a mandatory alien inspection
21 scheme. As amended by H.B. 2162, Section 2 of S.B. 1070 (adding Ariz. Rev. Stat. 11-
22 1051) mandates that for any lawful “stop, detention or arrest made by a law enforcement
23 official or . . . agency” in the enforcement of any state or local law (including civil
24 ordinances) where reasonable suspicion exists that an individual is an “unlawfully present”

25
26 ⁵ Another one of these programs is the Law Enforcement Agency Response program
27 (“LEAR”), an Arizona-specific program that is operational 24 hours a day, 7 days a week,
28 for responding to requests for assistance from ICE regarding suspected unlawfully present
aliens. Declaration of Daniel H. Ragsdale, Executive Associate Director for Management
& Administration, ICE (attached as Exhibit 4), ¶ 45.

1 alien in the United States, the officer must make a reasonable attempt to determine the
2 individual's immigration status when practicable.⁶ The officer is required to verify the
3 person's status, either through the federal government pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1373(c) or
4 through a federally qualified law enforcement officer.⁷ S.B. 1070 § 2. Section 2 also
5 requires that "[a]ny person who is arrested shall have the person's immigration status
6 determined before the person is released." *Id.* § 2. Because this clause does not depend on
7 "reasonable suspicion" of unlawful presence, it requires Arizona law enforcement to verify
8 the immigration status of every person who is arrested in the state.

9 Section 2 further provides that any legal resident of Arizona may bring a civil action
10 in a state court to challenge any official or agency that "adopts or implements a policy that
11 limits or restricts the enforcement of federal immigration laws . . . to less than the full extent
12 permitted by federal law." S.B. 1070 § 2.

13 **B. Section 3 – Arizona's Alien Registration Crime**

14 Going beyond the mandatory inspection scheme in Section 2, Section 3 of S.B. 1070
15 (adding Ariz. Rev. Stat. 13-1509), makes it a new state criminal offense for an alien in
16 Arizona to violate 8 U.S.C. § 1304(e), which requires every alien to "at all times carry with
17 him and have in his personal possession any certificate of alien registration or alien
18 registration receipt card issued to him," or 8 U.S.C. § 1306(a), which penalizes the willful
19 failure to apply for registration when required. S.B. 1070 § 3. Section 3 provides a state
20 penalty of up to \$100 and twenty days imprisonment for a first offense and thirty days

21
22 ⁶ On the same day that she signed S.B. 1070 into law, Governor Brewer issued an
23 executive order requiring law enforcement training to "provide clear guidance to law
24 enforcement officials regarding what constitutes reasonable suspicion," and to "make clear
25 that an individual's race, color or national origin alone cannot be grounds for reasonable
26 suspicion to believe any law has been violated." Arizona State Executive Order 2010-09
(Apr. 23, 2010).

27 ⁷ Section 2(B) excuses law enforcement from determining a person's immigration
28 status where the determination may hinder or obstruct an investigation. S.B. 1070 2(B).
Under Section 2, a person is presumed not to be "unlawfully present" upon showing a valid
Arizona driver's license, non-operating identification license, tribal identification, or any
other state, federal, or local identification that is only issued upon proof of legal presence in
the United States. *Id.*

1 imprisonment for any subsequent violation. *Id.* Section 3 may be enforced through an
2 immigration status determination that is triggered by Section 2. *See id.*, §§ 1-3. Section 3’s
3 focus on criminalizing unlawful presence is revealed by an exception which renders the
4 section’s criminal penalties inapplicable “to a person who maintains authorization from the
5 federal government to remain in the United States.” S.B. 1070 § 3(F).

6 **C. Section 4/Ariz. Rev. Stat. 13-2319 – Arizona’s Alien Smuggling Crime**

7 Section 4 of S.B. 1070 amends Ariz. Rev. Stat. 13-2319 (collectively, Arizona’s “alien
8 smuggling prohibition”). S.B. 1070 § 4. Arizona’s alien smuggling prohibition makes it a
9 felony for “a person to intentionally engage in the smuggling of human beings for profit or
10 commercial purpose.” Ariz. Rev. Stat. 13-2319. The statute defines “smuggling of human
11 beings” as the “transportation, procurement of transportation or use of property . . . by a
12 person or an entity that knows or has reason to know that the person or persons transported
13 . . . are not United States citizens, permanent resident aliens or persons otherwise lawfully
14 in this state or have attempted to enter, entered or remained in the United States in violation
15 of law.” *Id.* § 13-2319(F)(3). A violation of Arizona’s alien smuggling prohibition
16 constitutes at least a class 4 felony, with a presumptive sentence of 2.5 years imprisonment.
17 *See* Ariz. Rev. Stat. 13-2319(B); Ariz. Rev. Stat. 13-702(D). This provision, in conjunction
18 with Arizona’s conspiracy statute, allows for an alien to be prosecuted for “smuggl[ing]
19 oneself.” *State v. Barragan Sierra*, 196 P.3d 879, 888 (Ariz. App. Div. 2008).

20 **D. Section 5 – Arizona’s Alien Work Crime**

21 Arizona’s new immigration policy also regulates the employment of unlawfully
22 present aliens. Section 5 of S.B. 1070 adds Ariz. Rev. Stat. 13-2928, which makes it a new
23 state crime for any person who is “unauthorized” and “unlawfully present” in the United
24 States to solicit, apply for, or perform work. S.B. 1070 § 5(C)-(E). A violation of this
25 provision is a class 1 misdemeanor, with a sentence of up to six months imprisonment. S.B.
26 1070 (Ariz. Rev. Stat. 13-2928), § 5(F); Ariz. Rev. Stat. 13-707(A).

27 **E. Section 5 – Arizona’s Alien Transporting and Harboring Crime**

28 Section 5 of S.B. 1070 also adds Ariz. Rev. Stat. 13-2929, which makes it a new state

1 crime for a person committing any criminal offense to (1) “transport . . . an alien . . . , in
2 furtherance of the illegal presence of the alien in the United States, . . . if the person knows
3 or recklessly disregards” that the alien is here unlawfully; (2) “conceal, harbor or shield
4 an alien from detection . . . if the person knows or recklessly disregards the fact that the
5 alien” is here unlawfully; or (3) “encourage or induce an alien to come to or reside in
6 [Arizona] if the person knows or recklessly disregards the fact that such . . . entering or
7 residing in [Arizona] is or will be in violation of law.” S.B. 1070 § 5.

8 **F. Section 6 – Arizona’s Warrantless Arrest of “Removable” Aliens**

9 Section 6 of S.B. 1070, in keeping with S.B. 1070’s focus on “attrition through
10 enforcement,” further augments the authority of law enforcement officials to enforce
11 immigration law. Section 6 amends a preexisting Arizona criminal statute (Ariz. Rev. Stat.
12 13-3883) governing the circumstances under which law enforcement officers can make a
13 warrantless arrest, by allowing the arrest of anyone whom the officer has probable cause to
14 believe “has committed any public offense that makes the person removable from the United
15 States.” S.B. 1070 § 6. This new warrantless arrest authority applies to persons who have
16 committed an offense in another state when an Arizona law enforcement official believes that
17 offense would make the person removable from the United States. *See* Ariz. Rev. Stat. 13-
18 105(26).

19 **LEGAL STANDARD**

20 A preliminary injunction is warranted where, as here, the movant has established that:
21 (1) it is likely to succeed on the merits; (2) it is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the
22 absence of preliminary relief; (3) the balance of equities tips in its favor; and (4) a
23 preliminary injunction is in the public interest. *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 129
24 S. Ct. 365, 374 (2008); *Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky*, 586 F.3d 1109, 1127 (9th Cir. 2009); *Sierra*
25 *Forest Legacy v. Rey*, 577 F.3d 1015, 1021 (9th Cir. 2009); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 65.
26
27
28

ARGUMENT

I. THE UNITED STATES IS LIKELY TO PREVAIL ON THE MERITS

A. Relevant Principles of Preemption

The Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution provides that federal laws and treaties are “the supreme Law of the Land.” U.S. Const., art. VI, cl. 2. In some cases, the Constitution – through its own force – can preempt state action in a field exclusively reserved for the federal government. *See De Canas v. Bica*, 424 U.S. 351, 356 (1976). Statutes enacted by Congress may also preempt – either expressly or impliedly – otherwise permissible state action. *See Gade v. Nat’l Solid Waste Mgmt. Ass’n*, 505 U.S. 88, 98 (1992).

The Supreme Court has recognized two bases by which state or local laws may be impliedly preempted. “Field preemption” exists when a “scheme of federal regulation [is] so pervasive as to make reasonable the inference that Congress left no room to supplement it” because “the federal interest is so dominant that the federal system will be assumed to preclude enforcement of state laws on the same subject,” or because “the object sought to be obtained by the federal law and the character of obligations imposed by it may reveal the same purpose.” *Pacific Gas and Elec. Co. v. State Energy Res. Conservation & Dev. Comm’n*, 461 U.S. 190, 204 (1983) (internal quotations marks omitted). “Conflict preemption” occurs when a party cannot comply with both state and federal law, *Fla. Lime & Avocado Growers, Inc. v. Paul*, 373 U.S. 132, 142-43 (1963), or when the state law “stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress.” *Hines v. Davidowitz*, 312 U.S. 52, 67 (1941); *Freightliner Corp. v. Myrick*, 514 U.S. 280, 287 (1995); *see also Kobar v. Novartis Corp.*, 378 F. Supp. 2d 1166, 1169 (D. Ariz. 2005) (Bolton, J.). These bases for preemption are not “rigidly distinct,” however, and “field pre-emption may be understood as a species of conflict pre-emption.” *Crosby v. Nat’l Foreign Trade Council*, 530 U.S. 363, 373 (2000) (internal citations omitted).

Moreover, “that the supremacy of the national power in the general field of foreign affairs, including power over immigration, naturalization and deportation, is made clear by the Constitution, was pointed out by authors of *The Federalist* in 1787, and has since been

1 given continuous recognition by [the Supreme] Court.” *Hines*, 312 U.S. at 62. Although this
2 federal power does not preclude “every state enactment which in any way deals with aliens,”
3 *De Canas v. Bica*, 424 U.S. at 355, or *bona fide* state cooperation in the enforcement of the
4 federal immigration laws, *see, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g)(10); *Gonzales v. Peoria*, 722 F.2d
5 468, 474 (9th Cir. 1983), it has long been recognized that the “[p]ower to regulate
6 immigration is unquestionably exclusively a federal power.” *De Canas*, 424 U.S. at 354; *see*
7 *also Toll v. Moreno*, 458 U.S. 1, 11 (1982) (“determining what aliens shall be admitted to the
8 United States, the period they may remain, regulation of their conduct before naturalization,
9 and the terms and conditions of their naturalization” are matters exclusively reserved to the
10 federal government); *Mathews v. Diaz*, 426 U.S. 67, 84 (1976) (“[I]t is the business of the
11 political branches of the Federal Government, rather than that of either the States or the
12 Federal Judiciary, to regulate the conditions of entry and residence of aliens.”). Further, a
13 state exceeds its power to enact regulations touching on aliens generally if the regulation is
14 not passed pursuant to state “police powers” that are “focuse[d] directly upon” and “tailored
15 to combat” what are “essentially local problems.” *De Canas*, 424 U.S. at 356–57.

16 **B. The Overall Statutory Scheme of S.B. 1070⁸ is Preempted Because it**
17 **Sets a State-Level Immigration Policy That Interferes with Federal**
Administration and Enforcement of the Immigration Laws

18 As explained in detail in the next section, individual provisions of S.B. 1070 are
19 invalid under the Supremacy Clause because each separately conflicts with federal
20 immigration law and policy. But the statute, taken as a whole, also suffers from a
21 fundamental, overarching defect: It impermissibly attempts to set immigration policy at the
22

23 ⁸ Sections 7-9 of S.B. 1070 amend preexisting provisions of Arizona law at issue
24 in *Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America v. Candelaria*, 130 S. Ct. 534,
25 *cert. granted*, 78 U.S.L.W. 3065 (U.S. June 28, 2010) (No. 09-115). The instant motion
26 does not seek to enjoin those provisions of S.B. 1070; the views of the United States
27 regarding those provisions are reflected in the Government’s brief to the Supreme Court.
28 *See* Brief for the United States as Amicus Curiae, 2010 WL 2190418 (May 28,
2010). Section 10 is preempted insofar as it is based on the state law violations identified
in Sections 4 and 5, which are preempted for the reasons discussed herein. Sections 11-14
are administrative provisions which are not the subject of this dispute.

1 state level and is therefore preempted.

2 Dissatisfied with the federal government’s response to illegal immigration,⁹ Arizona
3 has sought, through S.B. 1070, to override the considered judgment of Congress regarding
4 the formulation of immigration policy, and the judgment of the executive branch regarding
5 how to balance competing objectives in implementing the federal immigration laws.
6 Arizona’s monolithic “attrition through enforcement” policy pursues only one goal of the
7 federal immigration system – maximum reduction of the number of unlawfully present aliens
8 – to the exclusion of all other objectives. To make matters worse, even in pursuing that goal,
9 Arizona’s policy will disrupt federal enforcement priorities and divert federal resources
10 needed to target dangerous aliens. S.B. 1070 is therefore preempted, because (1) it is an
11 unlawful attempt to set immigration policy at the state level, (2) the policy it advances
12 conflicts with federal objectives animating federal administration and enforcement of the
13 INA, and (3) it interferes with U.S. foreign policy objectives and foreign relations more
14 broadly. Standing alone, Arizona’s state-level immigration policy is intolerable under the
15 Constitution and federal law. But the court should also consider the consequences that would
16 follow were Arizona’s approach to be allowed. The Supremacy Clause protects the federal
17 system against the chaos that would result were states and localities across the country
18 allowed to fashion their own immigration schemes according to their own (potentially
19 conflicting) policy choices and subject the federal government to the demands of multiple
20 enforcement priorities.

21 **1. S.B. 1070 Represents an Unlawful Attempt to Set Immigration**
22 **Policy at the State Level**

23 Only the federal government may establish immigration policy – namely, the process
24 of “determin[ing] who should or should not be admitted into the country,” *De Canas*, 424
25 U.S. at 355, and the “conditions lawfully imposed by Congress upon . . . residence of aliens,”
26 *Takahashi v. Fish and Game Comm’n*, 334 U.S. 410, 419 (1948). *See also Ferreira v.*

27 ⁹ See Signing Statement by Governor Jan Brewer, April 23, 2010, available at
28 http://www.azgovernor.gov/dms/upload/PR_042310_StatementByGovernorOnSB1070.pdf
(stating that S.B. 1070 was motivated by what Arizona referred to as the federal
government’s “misguided policy” and its “refus[al] to fix” immigration problems).

1 *Ashcroft*, 382 F.3d 1045, 1050 (9th Cir. 2004) (“In the immigration context . . . the need for
2 national uniformity is paramount.”); *Arres v. IMI Cornelius Remcor, Inc.*, 333 F.3d 812, 815
3 (7th Cir. 2003) (“Federal immigration power is not just superior to that of the states; it is
4 exclusive of any state power over the subject. Illinois is not entitled to have a policy on the
5 question [of] what precautions should be taken to evaluate the credentials of aliens.”).

6 This prohibition on state formulations of immigration *policy* does not preclude a state
7 from cooperating with the federal government on immigration matters, nor does it restrict a
8 state from adopting state laws that have incidental effects on aliens. *See De Canas*, 424 U.S.
9 at 355-56 (“local regulation” with only a “purely speculative and indirect impact on
10 immigration” is not “a constitutionally proscribed regulation of immigration”). Indeed, state
11 participation in cooperative immigration enforcement is specifically contemplated by federal
12 law. *See, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g). No mechanical test defines the limit of state power to
13 promulgate, under their police powers, regulations incidentally affecting immigration. But
14 at a minimum, a state is generally barred from enacting a “comprehensive scheme” for
15 immigration, *i.e.*, a system of state laws that affects “a direct and substantial impact on
16 immigration.” *League of United Latin Am. Citizens v. Wilson*, 908 F. Supp. 755, 769–70
17 (C.D. Cal 1995).¹⁰ S.B. 1070 falls on the prohibited side of this line because, as discussed
18 below, the statute (i) explicitly refers to itself as creating “public policy” for the State of
19 Arizona on immigration issues and was intended to rival or supplant federal immigration
20 policy, (ii) establishes interlocking regulations to further the State’s policy, and (iii)
21 effectuates the “policy” through the criminal and procedural sections of the statute, which
22 include a private right of action to ensure the maximum state enforcement of immigration
23 laws. S.B. 1070 § 2(H); *see also* Part I.C, *infra*.

24 According to the statute’s statement of “intent,” S.B. 1070 is not meant to exercise

25
26 ¹⁰ *See also De Canas*, 424 U.S. at 356-59; *Hines*, 312 U.S. at 66; *League of United*
27 *Latin Am. Citizens*, 908 F. Supp. at 769-71; *Pennsylvania v. Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497,
28 507 (1956) (“Congress having thus treated seditious conduct as a matter of vital national
concern, it is in no sense a local enforcement problem. . . . [T]he [state] Statute presents a
peculiar danger of interference with the federal program.”); *cf. Am. Ins. Ass’n v. Garamendi*,
539 U.S. 396, 419& n.11 (2003).

1 traditional state police powers but rather seeks to establish an Arizona-specific immigration
2 “public policy.” S.B. 1070 § 1.¹¹ The substantive provisions of S.B. 1070 effectuate Section
3 1’s statement of intent, establishing various bases for detaining and incarcerating aliens in
4 Arizona in order to achieve the overarching goal of regulating immigration through “attrition
5 through enforcement.” Sections 2 and 6 expand the set of suspected aliens whose
6 immigration status will be verified by Arizona officials. Sections 3, 4, and 5 provide several
7 means of criminally sanctioning any alien who is unlawfully present in the state – a status
8 which is not a federal crime but which is the focus of Sections 2 and 6. And the private right
9 of action embodied in Section 2 ensures, on pain of a private lawsuit for money damages,
10 that state and local officials in Arizona maximally enforce the provisions of S.B. 1070,
11 thereby establishing an Arizona immigration policy that promotes sanctions to the exclusion
12 of other interests that animate the federal immigration laws and that disrupts federal
13 enforcement priorities, including the focus on dangerous aliens. In stated purpose and
14 necessary operation, therefore, the provisions of S.B. 1070 demand that Arizona pursue at
15 all costs a policy designed to deter unlawfully present aliens from moving into the state and
16 to inspect, investigate, detain, and in some cases criminally sanction those already in the
17 state. For these reasons, S.B. 1070 is a comprehensive and aggressive effort to set state-
18 specific immigration policy that will have a “direct and substantial impact” on immigration,
19 and it is therefore preempted as a matter of law. *See League of United Latin Am. Citizens*,
20 908 F. Supp. at 769–70.

21 **2. S.B. 1070’s Policy of “Attrition Through Enforcement” Conflicts** 22 **with the Federal Immigration Framework**

23 The Supreme Court has made clear that state laws may be preempted where they fail
24 to account for, or seek to countermand, the considered balance between competing interests
25

26 ¹¹ Legislative history confirms that S.B. 1070 was animated by the belief that
27 “citizens have a constitutional right to expect the immigration laws to be enforced” –
28 resulting in a statute in which maximal “enforcement” is the solitary concern. *See Minutes*
of Meeting of Committee on Military Affairs and Public Safety, Consideration of S.B. 1070,
March 31, 2010, at 3.

1 struck by Congress in enacting a statute,¹² or by the executive branch in enforcing that
2 statute. S.B. 1070 falls squarely within this prohibited category.

3 In *Crosby v. National Foreign Trade Council*, for example, the Court held that a
4 Massachusetts law restricting purchases from companies doing business with Burma
5 interfered with the executive branch's authority over economic sanctions against that
6 country. 530 U.S. at 376. The Court determined that Congress had not only given the
7 executive branch the authority to impose certain sanctions against Burma, but that in doing
8 so, it provided the discretion and flexibility to levy and relieve those sanctions in a manner
9 that would advance human rights and democracy in Burma and be consistent with the
10 national security interests of the United States. *Id.* at 374-75. Massachusetts's "sanction"
11 on Burma was preempted because it would have permitted the state to effectively second-
12 guess the specific balance of sanctions (whether levied or withheld) that was available to and
13 employed by the United States. *Id.* at 376. Notably, even though many aspects of the
14 Massachusetts sanction regime nominally could have been pursued by the executive branch
15 under existing law, the state law was still deemed invalid because the state's imposition of
16 sanctions necessarily impeded executive discretion as to the appropriate balance of interests
17 to be reflected in U.S. policy towards Burma.¹³

18 *Buckman Co. v. Plaintiffs' Legal Committee* supports the same conclusions. In
19 *Buckman*, the Court determined that the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FDCA) empowered
20 the FDA with a "variety of enforcement options that allow it to make a measured response

21 ¹² See, e.g., *Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats, Inc.*, 489 U.S. 141, 152 (1989)
22 ("[S]tate regulation of intellectual property must yield to the extent that it clashes with the
23 balance struck by Congress in our patent laws. . . . Where it is clear how the patent laws
24 strike that balance in a particular circumstance, that is not a judgment the States may second-
25 guess."); *Felder v. Casey*, 487 U.S. 131, 143 (1988) ("[H]owever understandable or laudable
the State's interest in controlling liability expenses might otherwise be, it is patently
incompatible with the compensatory goals of the federal legislation, as are the means the
State has chosen to effectuate it.").

26 ¹³ In fact, the Supreme Court treated the very grant of discretion as evidence that
27 Congress impliedly preempted state actions that would interfere with the executive branch's
28 exercise of enforcement discretion. *Id.* at 376 ("It is simply implausible that Congress would
have gone to such lengths to empower the President if it had been willing to compromise his
effectiveness by deference to every provision of state statute or local ordinance that might,
if enforced, blunt the consequences of discretionary Presidential action.").

1 to suspected fraud,” and that under the statutory scheme, the “FDA pursues difficult (and
2 often competing) objectives,” such as ensuring that medical devices are reasonably safe,
3 while allowing devices on the market as soon as possible, and regulating medical devices
4 without interfering with the practice of medicine. 531 U.S. 341, 349 (2001). The *Buckman*
5 Court held that the FDCA’s enforcement scheme preempted state law tort claims premised
6 on fraud committed against the FDA, noting that the relationship between the federal
7 government and those it regulates is a matter for the federal government and not part of the
8 states’ traditional police powers. The Court further reasoned that because the FDA pursues
9 a particular balance of competing objectives, states are precluded from taking action that
10 could skew the “balance sought by the Administration” through its calibrated enforcement
11 policies. *Id.* at 348. This Court has likewise interpreted *Buckman* as cautioning against the
12 “inherent difficulty” that arises when states try to “substitute their judgment for that of the”
13 federal government. *Kobar*, 378 F. Supp. 2d at 1173–74 (Bolton, J.).

14 Those principles are dispositive here. To begin with, it is beyond question that the
15 federal immigration regime established by Congress, no less than the regulatory regimes at
16 issue in *Crosby* and *Buckman*, is complex, and requires a balance among multiple and
17 sometimes competing objectives. See *U.S. ex rel. Knauff v. Shaughnessy*, 338 U.S. 537, 543
18 (1950) (immigration control and management is “a field where flexibility and the adaptation
19 of the congressional policy to infinitely variable conditions constitute the essence of the
20 program”).¹⁴ It is certainly a primary objective of federal law to prevent aliens from

21 ¹⁴ See also *New Jersey v. United States*, 91 F.3d 463, 470 (3d Cir. 1996) (“Decisions
22 about how best to enforce the nation’s immigration laws in order to minimize the number of
23 illegal aliens crossing our borders patently involve policy judgments about resource
24 allocation and enforcement methods. Such issues fall squarely within a substantive area
25 committed by the Constitution to the political branches.”); *Sale v. Haitian Ctrs. Council, Inc.*,
26 509 U.S. 155, 187-88 (1993); *I.N.S. v. Aguirre-Aguirre*, 526 U.S. 415, 425 (1999); *Rogers v.*
27 *Larson*, 563 F.2d 617, 626 (3d Cir. 1977) (finding state restrictions on employment of
28 nonresident alien workers preempted by federal law, because although the state and federal
laws “share some common purposes” of “assur[ing] an adequate labor force on the one hand
and [] protect[ing] the jobs of citizens on the other,” the “conflict arises because the Virgin
Islands and the United States strike the balance between these two goals differently”);
Lozano v. City of Hazleton, 496 F. Supp. 2d 477, 527 (M.D. Pa. 2007) (several laws that
(continued...)

1 unlawfully entering and residing in the United States, and Congress has empowered DHS and
2 DOJ with a range of enforcement options to this end. *See, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182, 1225,
3 1227, 1229, 1306, 1324, 1324c, 1325. But the federal immigration laws also take into
4 account other uniquely national interests and priorities, such as facilitating trade and
5 commerce; welcoming foreign nationals who visit or immigrate lawfully and ensuring their
6 fair and equitable treatment wherever they reside; and responding to humanitarian and
7 foreign affairs concerns at the global and individual levels. Consequently, there are
8 situations in which other congressional policy objectives weigh against removal or
9 incarceration of certain unlawfully present aliens.¹⁵ Similarly, the federal government
10 prioritizes its enforcement efforts by targeting highly threatening aliens who pose a danger
11 to national security and public safety.

12 As a result of the complexities inherent in the enforcement of the federal immigration
13 scheme, DHS and DOJ necessarily must (i) establish global policy objectives that attempt
14 to strike a balance between employing criminal sanctions and other immigration values, and
15 (ii) exercise their authority and discretion on a case-by-case basis consistent with those
16 global objectives. *See* Homeland Security Act, Pub. L. No. 107-296, 116 Stat. 2135 (2002);
17 8 U.S.C. § 1103; 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g); *see also Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination*
18 *Comm.*, 525 U.S. 471, 484 (1999) (describing deferred action as a “commendable exercise

19 ¹⁴ (...continued)
20 turned on immigration status held to be preempted because they “strike a different balance”
than that reflected in federal immigration policy).

21 ¹⁵ For example, Congress has clearly anticipated circumstances in which an alien
22 may have unlawfully entered the United States or violated the conditions of his admission,
23 but for whom the United States nonetheless has an interest in providing humanitarian relief.
24 *See, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. § 1158 (asylum); § 1254a (temporary protected status); §
1227(a)(1)(E)(iii) (humanitarian waiver of deportability to assure family unity); § 1229b
25 (cancellation of removal); § 1182 (d)(5) (parole); *see also* Ragsdale Decl. ¶¶ 18, 26, 47–50
26 (describing humanitarian aspect to immigration enforcement policy). These humanitarian
27 programs demonstrate that one of many objectives of federal immigration policy is to
welcome such individuals to the United States, notwithstanding possible temporary unlawful
28 presence. It would therefore violate federal policy to prosecute or detain these types of aliens
for unlawful presence – a situation often known to the federal government and, for
affirmative policy reasons, not used as the basis for a removal proceeding or criminal
prosecution.

1 in administrative discretion, developed without express statutory authorization”); Ragsdale
2 Decl. ¶¶ 7, 16.

3 In enacting a state policy of “attrition through enforcement,” Arizona’s S.B. 1070
4 ignores every objective of the federal immigration system, save one: the immediate
5 apprehension and criminal sanction of all unlawfully present aliens. See S.B. 1070 § 1.
6 Arizona’s one-size-fits-all approach to immigration policy and enforcement undermines the
7 federal government’s ability to balance the variety of objectives inherent in the federal
8 immigration system, including the federal government’s focus on the most dangerous aliens.
9 By requiring local police officers to engage in maximum inquiry and verification (on pain
10 of civil suit) and by providing for the conviction and incarceration of certain foreign
11 nationals in Arizona for their failure to register, for entering or traveling throughout the state
12 using commercial transportation, or for soliciting work, the “balance” struck by S.B. 1070
13 is not only different from that of the federal government, but it will *interfere* with the federal
14 government’s ability to administer and enforce the immigration laws in a manner consistent
15 with the aforementioned concerns that are reflected in the INA. Despite the statute’s self-
16 serving claim that it “shall be implemented in a manner consistent with federal laws
17 regulating immigration,” S.B. 1070 § 12, the act mandates a conflicting, Arizona-specific
18 immigration policy – “attrition through enforcement” – and prescribes various provisions that
19 implement that policy in conflict with federal priorities. To permit a hodgepodge of state
20 immigration policies, such as the one Arizona has attempted in S.B. 1070, would
21 impermissibly interfere with the federal government’s balance of uniquely national interests
22 and priorities in a number of ways.

23 *First*, Arizona’s across-the-board “attrition through enforcement” policy will interfere
24 with federal enforcement priorities. The federal government, which exercises significant
25 enforcement discretion, has prioritized for arrest and detention those “aliens who pose a
26 danger to national security or a risk to public safety” (Ragsdale Decl. ¶ 17), principally
27 targeting “aliens engaged in or suspected of terrorism or espionage; aliens convicted of
28

1 crimes, with a particular emphasis on violent criminals, felons, and repeat offenders; certain
2 gang members; and aliens subject to outstanding criminal warrants . . . [and] fugitive aliens,
3 especially those with criminal records.” *Id.* ¶¶ 17-18 (discussing need for prioritization); *Id.*
4 ¶ 27 (discussing memorandum from Assistant Secretary John Morton outlining enforcement
5 priorities) . But S.B. 1070, which requires Arizona law enforcement officials to target any
6 and all suspected aliens without regard to dangerousness, will “divert existing [federal]
7 resources from other duties, resulting in fewer resources being available to dedicate to cases
8 and aliens” that the federal government has identified as posing the greatest immediate
9 threats to the United States. *Id.* ¶ 44. “Diverting resources to cover the influx of referrals
10 from Arizona (and other states, to the extent similar laws are adopted) could, therefore, mean
11 decreasing [the federal government’s] ability to focus on priorities such as protecting national
12 security or public safety in order to pursue aliens who are in the United States illegally but
13 pose no immediate or known danger or threat to the safety and security of the public.” *Id.*;
14 *see also* Part I.C.1. *infra*. S.B. 1070 is therefore preempted because it will force a diversion
15 of federal resources away from federal priorities. *See Kobar*, 378 F. Supp. 2d at 1170,
16 1173–74 (Bolton, J.) (finding Arizona statute preempted, in part, because it would result in
17 “deluge” of information to the FDA, thereby interfering with other FDA priorities); *see also*
18 *Garrett v. City of Escondido*, 465 F. Supp. 2d 1043, 1057 (S.D. Cal. 2006) (acknowledging
19 serious concerns regarding the city’s use of federal authorities to determine the immigration
20 status of tenants because the process would “likely place burdens on the Departments of
21 Justice and Homeland Security that will impede the functions of those federal agencies”).

22 *Second*, Arizona’s new immigration policy will substantially interfere with the federal
23 government’s ability to administer and enforce the immigration laws in a manner consistent
24 with congressional objectives. Congress has clearly anticipated circumstances in which an
25 alien may have unlawfully entered the United States or violated the conditions of his
26 admission, but for whom the United States nonetheless has an interest in providing what it
27 calls humanitarian relief. *See, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. § 1158 (asylum); § 1254a (temporary protected
28

1 status); § 1227(a)(1)(E)(iii) (humanitarian waiver of deportability to assure family unity);
2 § 1229b (cancellation of removal); § 1182 (d)(5) (parole); *see also* Ragsdale Decl. ¶¶ 18, 26,
3 47–50 (describing humanitarian aspect to immigration enforcement policy). For example,
4 were DHS to come into contact with a foreign national from a specially designated country
5 (such as Nicaragua, Honduras, or El Salvador), or one who has survived the earthquake in
6 Haiti, or is a victim of trafficking or persecution, DHS might choose not to detain or penalize
7 the alien for immigration violations incidental to his entry into the United States and instead
8 permit that alien to stay in the United States under a variety of programs. *See* Ragsdale Decl.
9 ¶¶ 26, 28, 47-50. These programs demonstrate that one aspect of federal immigration policy
10 is to assist and welcome such victims in the United States, notwithstanding their possible
11 temporary unlawful presence. By contrast, under S.B. 1070, any other potential immigration
12 concern falls away in favor of Arizona’s decision to pursue “attrition through enforcement,”
13 which, as implemented through the remainder of the statute, promotes the incarceration and
14 arrest of all unlawfully present aliens, no matter what other congressionally mandated
15 concern might be implicated or whether the person’s status is known to the federal
16 government. In that way, S.B. 1070 will interfere with established federal immigration
17 priorities concerning the treatment of aliens who may be eligible for humanitarian relief. *See*
18 Declaration of Mariko Silver, Acting Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Deputy
19 Assistant Secretary for International Policy, DHS (attached as Exhibit 6), ¶ 10.

20 *Third*, Arizona’s focus on criminal sanctions is at odds with the federal policy of
21 channeling certain unlawfully present aliens into civil removal proceedings or permitting
22 them to leave the country without criminal penalty or incarceration. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1229c
23 (voluntary departure); § 1225(a)(4) (withdrawal of application for admission); Ragsdale
24 Decl. ¶ 19. There are numerous reasons why it is in the national interest not to exact criminal
25 penalties on every alien who attempts to enter or enters the country without a visa or other
26 necessary documentation. *See* Ragsdale Decl. ¶¶ 7, 16, 19 (describing DHS discretion to opt
27 for civil enforcement rather than criminal penalties where doing so would promote fair
28

1 consideration of appropriate treatment of aliens). For example, the application of criminal
2 sanctions to a particular alien who was a victim of trafficking or labor abuse may prevent
3 federal authorities from obtaining evidence against other aliens who pose a greater threat to
4 public safety or national security. See Ragsdale Decl. ¶ 33-34 (discussing reliance on
5 unlawfully present aliens in prosecutions). Similarly, the United States may deem it unduly
6 harsh or counterproductive to its humanitarian efforts or foreign relations to incarcerate a
7 woman with young children who has attempted to cross the border for the first time. See
8 *generally* Ragsdale Decl. ¶ 47.¹⁶ In addition, there may be times when civil removal is a
9 more appropriate enforcement tool because criminal sanctions would have immigration
10 consequences that would interfere with the United States' ability to provide a particular
11 immigration benefit in the future. See, e.g., 8 U.S.C. § 1254a(c)(2)(B). S.B. 1070 recognizes
12 no such nuance. As such, the law undoubtedly strikes "a different balance" than the policy
13 advanced by federal law and thereby "stands as an 'obstacle' to the accomplishment of . . .
14 federal law." See *Lozano*, 496 F. Supp. 2d at 527-28; see also *Crosby*, 530 U.S. at 378.
15 And even if S.B. 1070 could be said to promote federal immigration policy in some abstract
16 sense, the methodology chosen by Arizona conflicts with that chosen by the federal
17 government, and is therefore preempted. See *Gade*, 505 U.S. at 103; *Int'l Paper Co. v.*
18 *Ouellette*, 479 U.S. 481, 494 (1987).¹⁷

19 **3. S.B. 1070 Interferes with U.S. Foreign Relations and U.S. Foreign**
20 **Policy Objectives That Inform Federal Administration and**
Enforcement of the Immigration Laws

21 S.B. 1070 is independently preempted because it impermissibly conflicts with U.S.
22 foreign policy. Immigration policy is intimately connected with U.S. foreign affairs and

23 ¹⁶ On the other hand, it may be appropriate to exact the full panoply of federal
24 sanctions against a repeat offender, or the leader of a smuggling ring. See DHS Model
25 287(g) MOA, *available at*
<http://www.ice.gov/doclib/foia/media-requests/09foia4646moutemplate.pdf>.

26 ¹⁷ Indeed, although S.B. 1070's conflict with federal immigration policies and
27 objectives is palpable and sharp, the Supremacy Clause would nullify S.B. 1070 even for less
28 substantial conflict with federal law in light of the strong interest of the federal government
in the immigration context. See *Boyle v. United Technologies Corp.*, 487 U.S. 500, 507-08
(1988) ("[In] an area of uniquely federal interest," "[t]he conflict with federal policy need not
be as sharp as that which must exist for ordinary pre-emption").

1 diplomacy. See *Chy Lung v. Freeman*, 92 U.S. 275, 279-80 (1875); *California v. United*
2 *States*, 104 F.3d 1086, 1091 (9th Cir. 1997); see also Steinberg Decl. ¶¶ 5–6 (“U.S. federal
3 immigration law incorporates foreign relations concerns [and] is designed to
4 accommodate a range of complex and important U.S. foreign relations priorities that are
5 implicated by immigration policy.”); Silver Decl. ¶ 4. The Supreme Court has recognized
6 the “Nation’s need to ‘speak with one voice’ in immigration matters.” *Zadvydas v. Davis*,
7 533 U.S. 678, 700 (2001); *Garamendi*, 539 U.S. at 424. Because the immigration laws are
8 deeply imbued with foreign policy significance, a state immigration law can, in certain
9 situations, be preempted if it interferes with U.S. foreign policy. As the Ninth Circuit has
10 explained, “‘foreign policy’ . . . may carry . . . preemptive force ‘where . . . there is
11 evidence of clear conflict between the policies adopted by’” a state and the federal
12 government.” *Movsesian v. Victoria Versicherung AG*, 578 F.3d 1052, 1056 (9th Cir. 2009)
13 (quoting *Garamendi*, 539 U.S. at 421).

14 In addition, individual immigration enforcement decisions can have profound
15 implications for U.S. foreign policy interests. See, e.g., *Quinchia v. U.S. Att’y Gen.*, 552 F.3d
16 1255, 1259 (11th Cir. 2008) (“[I]mmigration cases often involve complex public and foreign
17 policy concerns with which the executive branch is better equipped to deal.”); *Francis v.*
18 *Immigration & Naturalization Service*, 532 F.2d 268, 272 (2d Cir. 1976) (“Enforcement of
19 the immigration laws is often related to considerations . . . of foreign policy.”); Steinberg
20 Decl. ¶¶ 6, 12, 17-20. These decisions directly implicate foreign relations and demand
21 federal control because, as the Supreme Court has explained, where a state inserts itself into
22 immigration enforcement, “a single State can, at her pleasure, embroil us in disastrous
23 quarrels with other nations.” *Chy Lung*, 92 U.S. at 280; *Hines*, 312 U.S. at 64 (“Experience
24 has shown that international controversies of the gravest moment, sometimes even leading
25 to war, may arise from real or imagined wrongs to another’s subjects inflicted, or permitted,
26 by a government.”). Foreign governments properly understand the federal government to
27 have a range of civil and criminal enforcement authorities available to it in the administration
28 of the immigration laws, and, indeed, they often raise concerns about the administration and

1 enforcement of immigration laws in bilateral and multilateral diplomatic discussions. *See*
2 Steinberg Decl. ¶¶ 22, 32.

3 S.B. 1070 is preempted under these principles because it undermines the ability of the
4 United States to speak with one voice in the immigration context and wrests primacy over
5 immigration enforcement away from the federal government.¹⁸ By imposing a mandatory
6 criminal sanctions regime against certain aliens – necessarily without any mechanism for
7 accounting for the foreign policy consequences of such criminal enforcement – S.B. 1070
8 interferes with the federal government’s ability to exercise prosecutorial discretion based on
9 diplomatic and foreign policy concerns. *See Clayco Petroleum Corp. v. Occidental*
10 *Petroleum Corp.*, 712 F.2d 404, 408-09 (9th Cir. 1983) (recognizing necessity of executive
11 control of prosecutions under the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, because “any prosecution
12 under the Act entails risks to our relations with the foreign governments involved” such that
13 “any governmental enforcement” should only result from “a judgment on the wisdom of
14 bringing a proceeding, in light of the exigencies of foreign affairs”); *see also United States*
15 *v. Delgado-Garcia*, 374 F.3d 1337, 1351 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (“The executive’s expert exercise
16 of prosecutorial discretion and foreign diplomacy” will serve as crucial safeguards for
17 “avoid[ing the] conflicts” with other nations that might arise out of the extraterritorial
18 enforcement of the federal alien smuggling laws).

19 Here, the State Department has concluded that S.B. 1070’s interference with the
20 federal government’s exclusive control over the foreign policy implications of an area of law
21 unquestionably imbued with foreign policy significance “runs counter to American foreign
22 policy interests” and, if uninterrupted, “would further undermine American foreign policy.”
23 Steinberg Decl. ¶ 58. S.B. 1070 represents an impediment to U.S. foreign policy and U.S.
24 diplomatic interests – both with Mexico and with other countries. *Id.* ¶¶ 36-51. And the law
25 “poses a risk of provoking retaliatory treatment against U.S. nationals by other states.” *Id.*

26 ¹⁸ Although not all state laws that touch upon aliens or immigration implicate these
27 principles, S.B. 1070 – especially when taken as a whole – represents an unparalleled and
28 explicit effort to establish a state policy that intensifies the enforcement of particular federal
immigration laws, while ignoring key goals of others, thereby contravening federal foreign
policy prerogatives.

¶ 57. This assessment of the effect of S.B. 1070 on U.S. foreign policy is worthy of deference. *See Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project*, 2010 U.S. LEXIS 5252, at *58 (2010); *see also Movesian*, 578 F.3d at 1061; *In re Assicurazioni Generali*, 592 F.3d 113, 119 (2d Cir. 2010).

Indeed, the impact of S.B. 1070 on U.S. foreign policy has been immediate and negative. As discussed in greater detail in Part II, *infra*, the mere passage of S.B. 1070 has resulted in numerous, specific, and serious diplomatic reactions that threaten multiple United States interests – both in the immigration field and elsewhere. *See Steinberg Decl.* ¶¶ 34–58. This substantial effect on U.S. foreign policy interests is not surprising. In enacting (out of disagreement with existing federal policy) a comprehensive, novel, and aggressive set of immigration provisions, Arizona has predictably provoked the ire of those foreign nations whose citizens are being targeted for detention and criminalization – and has thereby damaged the United States’ broader set of diplomatic relations with those same nations. *See Steinberg Decl.* ¶ 57 (“S.B. 1070 . . . threatens ongoing adverse consequences for important and sensitive bilateral relationships with U.S. allies.”). S.B. 1070 is therefore preempted.

C. The Individual Sections of S.B. 1070 Are Preempted By Federal Law

1. Sections 2 and 6 Are Preempted Because Their Mandatory Requirements for Determining Immigration Status Conflict with Federal Law and Priorities

S.B. 1070 effectively creates an immigration status verification scheme that is unprecedented in breadth, mandatory in nature, and necessarily works toward the singular goal of criminally prosecuting aliens suspected of being unlawfully present. Before passage of S.B. 1070, Arizona police had the same discretion to decide whether to verify immigration status during the course of a lawful stop as any other state or federal law enforcement officer. Sections 2 and 6, however, do not merely authorize state officers to assist in the federal enforcement of the immigration laws. Instead, these new provisions *mandate* that state and local law enforcement officers effectuate an immigration status verification scheme as the first step toward arrest, detention, incarceration (utilizing Sections 3, 4, and 5), or removal, in a manner that is indifferent to the federal government’s enforcement priorities (such as

1 prioritizing dangerous aliens). And these provisions are likewise indifferent to the risk of
2 harassment of lawful aliens (and even citizens) and the burdens placed on the federal
3 government that inevitably follow from S.B. 1070's regime of unrestrained enforcement of
4 particular criminal provisions.¹⁹

5 **a. Section 2 of S.B. 1070 Will Result in the Harassment of**
6 **Lawfully Present Aliens and is Therefore at Odds with**
7 **Congressional Objectives**

8 Section 2 effectively removes the existing discretion of law enforcement officers by
9 requiring that they verify immigration status whenever "reasonable suspicion" that a person
10 is unlawfully present arises during a stop and it is practicable to do so; they must also verify
11 status during any arrest. This unprecedented mandatory verification scheme conflicts with
12 federal law because it necessarily imposes substantial burdens on lawful immigrants in a way
13 that frustrates the concern of Congress for nationally-uniform rules governing the treatment
14 of aliens throughout the country – rules designed to ensure "our traditional policy of not
15 treating aliens as a thing apart." *Hines*, 312 U.S. at 73-74. As the Court held in *Hines*,
16 Congress has "plainly manifested a purpose to . . . protect the personal liberties of law-
17 abiding aliens . . . and to *leave them free from the possibility of inquisitorial practices and*
18 *police surveillance* that might not only affect our international relations but might also
19 generate the very disloyalty which the law has intended guarding against." *Id.* at 74
20 (emphasis added). It is for the federal government, not the individual states, to determine the
21 relationship between the Nation and aliens, and the federal government has long rejected a
22 system by which aliens' papers are routinely demanded and checked. Section 2 is at odds
23 with this longstanding federal policy and practice.

24 Although the intent of Arizona's new statute may be to deter unauthorized aliens from
25 entering or remaining in Arizona, Section 2 necessarily places lawfully present aliens (and
26 even U.S. citizens) in continual jeopardy of having to demonstrate their lawful status to non-
27 federal officials, and having their liberty restricted while their status is verified. There are

28 ¹⁹ The discussion herein is not meant to foreclose state authority to verify immigration
status in a manner that is consistent with federal priorities and that will not unduly burden
either federal resources or the interests of lawfully present aliens.

1 numerous categories of individuals who will be lawfully present but who will not have
2 readily available documentation to demonstrate that fact. For example, some lawful foreign
3 travelers visiting from countries participating in the Visa Waiver Program will not have a
4 form of identification sufficient to demonstrate lawful presence under Section 2. *See* Aytes
5 Decl. ¶¶ 2, 20-21. Several categories of individuals who have applied for asylum, temporary
6 protected status, U or T non-immigrant visas for victims of crimes who are providing
7 assistance to law enforcement,²⁰ or abused women petitioning for immigration relief under
8 the Violence Against Woman Act, will also not have a form of identification sufficient to
9 demonstrate lawful presence under Section 2. *Id.* ¶¶ 2, 5, 9, 13, 17, 19; *see also* S.B. 1070
10 § 2(B). Moreover, United States citizens are of course not required to carry proof of
11 citizenship and some will not have easy access to documents that readily satisfy Arizona.
12 Many U.S. citizens do not have or carry a government-issued photo identification, such as
13 minor children and others who do not have a driver's license.²¹ And if Arizona officers
14 contact DHS about a citizen's immigration status, DHS may not be able to confirm the
15 person's citizenship, as many citizens have no entries in DHS databases. *See* Palmatier Decl.
16 ¶ 19.

17 Lawfully present individuals will inevitably be swept within Section 2's broad
18 "reasonable suspicion" provision and subject to the state's inquisitorial burdens. While
19 Section 2 is triggered by an officer's "reasonable suspicion" of unlawful presence, "the
20 requirement of reasonable suspicion is not a requirement of absolute certainty," *N.J. v.*
21 *T.L.O.*, 469 U.S. 325, 346 (1985), meaning that many lawful aliens will be directly subjected

22
23
24 ²⁰ U and T visas are available for victims of certain enumerated crimes – such as
trafficking and other violent crimes – and their families. *See* Aytes Dec. ¶¶ 14-17.

25 ²¹ Arizona does not necessarily accept out-of-state drivers licenses as proof of lawful
26 residency. For example, New Mexico does not require proof of citizenship to obtain a
27 driver's license. *See* N.M. STAT. ANN. § 66-5-9(B). So if a U.S. citizen from New Mexico
28 is stopped while driving in Arizona, that citizen might be subject to lengthy detention while
Arizona seeks to verify the citizen's "immigration status." Estrada Decl. ¶¶ 7, 14 (discussing
categories of aliens and citizens who likely will not be able to produce documentation
necessary to avoid detention, including minors and visitors from other states).

1 to Section 2.²² What is more, many factors used to support a “reasonable suspicion” that an
2 alien is unlawfully present could also apply to lawfully present aliens. *See* Declaration of
3 Tony Estrada, Sheriff of Santa Cruz County (attached as Exhibit 8), ¶ 7.²³

4 The breadth of Arizona’s mandatory immigration verification scheme is unparalleled
5 and serves to exacerbate the conflict with federal law. The constant threat of police
6 inquisition is not limited to persons who are suspected of serious criminal offenses because
7 S.B. 1070 mandates immigration status inquiries, when practicable, for every lawful stop
8 where there is “reasonable suspicion” of unlawful presence – regardless of the seriousness
9 of the underlying alleged state offense. Immigration status verifications accordingly are
10 mandated even for suspected minor, non-criminal infractions of state or local law – such as
11 a minor traffic offense, jaywalking, *see* Ariz. Rev. Stat. 28-793, failing to have a dog on a
12 leash, *see* Ariz. Rev. Stat. 11-1012, or riding a bicycle on a sidewalk, *see* City of Flagstaff
13 Ord. 9-05-001-0013 – or suspected violations of Sections 3-5 of S.B. 1070. A lawfully
14 present alien may also be subjected to an immigration status inquiry where he is lawfully
15 stopped, but the underlying justification for the initial stop has ceased, or when the alien is
16 merely a passenger in a car whose driver is stopped for a traffic offense. *See* S.B. 1070 § 2.

17 The substantial impact on lawfully present aliens is compounded by the fact that S.B.
18 1070 provides no assurance that the duration for which a lawfully present alien may be
19 detained during the pendency of an immigration status verification will be limited. S.B.
20 1070, standing alone, does not suggest that the alien will be released, or that any detention
21 would be of only minimal duration; indeed, the only assurance that is provided is that a

22 ²² *See also Safford Unified School Dist. No. 1 v. Redding*, 129 S.Ct. 2633, 2647
23 (2009) (“[R]easonable suspicion does not deal with hard certainties, but with probabilities.
24 To satisfy this standard, more than a mere hunch of wrongdoing is required, but considerably
25 less suspicion is needed than would be required to satisf[y] a preponderance of the evidence
standard.” (internal citations omitted)).

26 ²³ Even under Arizona’s own training standards, factors that apply equally to
27 lawfully- and unlawfully-present aliens would bring them within the ambit of Section 2’s
28 “reasonable suspicion” standard. *See, e.g.,* Arizona Peace Officers Standards & Training
Board, Arizona S.B. 1070 Training Video, available at
<http://www.azpost.state.az.us/SB1070infocenter.htm> (stating that inability to speak English
and dress can be factors in determining reasonable suspicion).

1 private citizen of Arizona can sue a local law enforcement agency for money damages if that
2 agency *fails* to enforce the immigration laws to the fullest extent possible.²⁴ Thus, if forced
3 to decide between holding and releasing a lawfully present alien during the pendency of a
4 status verification, the statute is clearly designed to encourage Arizona police authorities to
5 opt for continued detention. *See, e.g.*, Estrada Decl. ¶¶ 4, 6. There is also no assurance that
6 if a lawfully present alien is subjected to an immigration status verification under Section 2,
7 he will not be subjected to another inspection the very next time he is stopped by the police
8 for any reason – raising the specter that the same lawfully present residents will be subject
9 to repeated police intrusion.²⁵ Moreover, if a lawfully present alien is arrested for any reason,
10 S.B. 1070 forbids his release – irrespective of whether he has been cleared of any
11 wrongdoing – until *state and local authorities* are satisfied as to his immigration status.

12 Section 2 will therefore necessarily increase police intrusion into the lives of lawfully
13 present aliens and compel them to prove their lawful status to the satisfaction of state or local
14 authorities, which is exactly the type of inquisition and special burden cautioned against by
15 *Hines*.²⁶ *See also De Canas*, 424 U.S. at 358 n.6 (“Of course, state regulation not
16 congressionally sanctioned that discriminates against aliens lawfully admitted to the country
17 is impermissible if it imposes additional burdens not contemplated by Congress”).

18
19
20
21 ²⁴ Indeed, DHS advises that there will be times where it will be unable to verify
22 whether an individual is unlawfully present in the United States without taking significant
time to consult a variety of databases and even paper files. *See* Palmatier Decl. ¶¶ 11, 19;
Declaration of Dominick Gentile, Division Chief, USCIS (attached as Exhibit 7), ¶¶ 6–7.

23 ²⁵ Some of the criteria that would support a “reasonable suspicion” would not
24 fluctuate over time. *See* Estrada Decl. ¶ 7 (“[F]actors that we might consider in a ‘reasonable
25 suspicion’ determination with respect to immigration status. . . . are likely to apply both to
lawfully present aliens and unlawfully present aliens.”).

26 ²⁶ *See Hines*, 312 U.S. 65-66 (“Legal imposition[s] . . . upon aliens – such as
27 subjecting them alone, though perfectly law-abiding, to indiscriminate and repeated
28 interception and interrogation by public officials – thus bears an inseparable relationship to
the welfare and tranquillity of all the states, and not merely to the welfare and tranquillity of
one.”); *see also Mathews v. Diaz*, 426 U.S. 67, 81-82 (1976); *League of United Latin Am.*
Citizens, 908 F. Supp. at 769.

1 **b. Section 2 of S.B. 1070 Will Burden Federal Resources and**
2 **Impede Federal Enforcement and Policy Priorities**

3 A state law is preempted where it imposes a burden on a federal agency's resources
4 that impedes the agency's functions. *See, e.g., Buckman*, 531 U.S. at 349-51 (preempting
5 state law cause of action in part because it would encourage third parties to submit a deluge
6 of unnecessary information to the FDA, thereby burdening the agency's ability to evaluate
7 drug applications in a timely fashion); *Garrett*, 465 F. Supp. at 1057 (acknowledging serious
8 concerns regarding the city's use of federal authorities in determining immigration status);
9 *Kobar*, 378 F. Supp. 2d at 1170, 1173-74. S.B. 1070 is preempted under this standard
10 because it will create an unprecedented quantity of verification demands directed to the
11 federal government (or federally qualified officials) and will impermissibly shift the
12 allocation of federal resources away from federal priorities.

13 Section 2 requires local law enforcement officers to obtain immigration status
14 information from the federal government, which will primarily be accomplished by making
15 a request to LESC under 8 U.S.C. § 1373(c).²⁷ *See* Palmatier Decl. ¶¶ 3, 6, 15. Because
16 Arizona has imposed an across-the-board requirement that its law enforcement officers verify
17 the immigration status of *every* person stopped who is reasonably suspected to be unlawfully
18 present and *every* person arrested in the state, the number of requests made to DHS will
19 undoubtedly be significant. *See* Estrada Decl. ¶ 6; Declaration of Jack Harris, Phoenix Police
20 Chief (attached as Exhibit 10), at 6. But LESC resources are currently dedicated in part to
21 critical national security and law enforcement functions. Palmatier Decl. ¶ 4. LESC's
22 mission is broad. It includes processing FBI requests for immigration-related background
23 information on individuals seeking to purchase firearms, U.S. Secret Service requests for
24 individuals seeking access to a protected area (*e.g.*, the White House Complex), and requests
25 related to employment issues at sensitive locations that could be vulnerable to sabotage,

26
27 ²⁷ 8 U.S.C. § 1373(c) provides that DHS "shall respond to an inquiry by a Federal,
28 State, or local government agency, seeking to verify or ascertain the citizenship or
immigration status . . . for any purpose authorized by law, by providing the requested
verification or status information."

1 attack, or exploitation. *Id.* LESC also analyzes information received from the public about
2 suspicious or criminal activity and then disseminates that information to ICE field offices for
3 investigation. *Id.* ¶ 14. With respect to inquiries from law enforcement agencies, “the LESC
4 prioritizes its efforts in order to focus on criminal aliens and those most likely to pose a threat
5 to their communities.” *Id.* ¶ 7. DHS has advised that “SB 1070 will inevitably result in a
6 significant increase in the number of” immigration verification queries, and that such an
7 increase will “reduc[e] [LESC’s] ability to provide timely responses to law enforcement on
8 serious criminal aliens.” *Palmatier Decl.* ¶¶ 15–16, 7. This increase in requests therefore
9 creates a significant risk that the federal government will be forced to shift resources away
10 from its chosen priorities. *See id.* ¶¶ 15–18; *Ragsdale Decl.* ¶ 44. DHS’s resources will
11 further be strained by increased demands for testimony by DHS officials at criminal
12 proceedings implicating immigration status. *See Gentile Decl.* ¶ 9. In light of DHS’s fixed
13 resources, this dramatic surge in verification requests as a result of Section 2 (as well as some
14 of the other provisions of S.B. 1070) will necessitate a shift away from other federal priorities
15 so as to accommodate the workload generated by Section 2. *See Palmatier Decl.* ¶¶ 15-16;
16 *Ragsdale Decl.* ¶ 44.²⁸

17 In assessing the scope of the conflict between Section 2 and federal priorities,
18 moreover, the Court must consider the impact that would result if other states follow suit
19 with similar laws. *See, e.g., North Dakota v. United States*, 495 U.S. 423, 458 (1990)
20 (Brennan, J., concurring in the judgment in part and dissenting in part) (considering that the
21 difficulties presented by state requirement would “increase exponentially if additional States
22 adopt[ed] equivalent rules,” and noting that such a nation-wide consideration was
23 “dispositive” in *Public Utility Commission of the State of California v. United States*, 355
24 U.S. 534, 546 (1958)). In this case, this aggregation of effects is not purely speculative:

26 ²⁸ Additionally, under the terms of the statute, Arizona will not release those arrested
27 while the immigration status check is ongoing. Accordingly, Arizona’s new law places DHS
28 in the impossible dilemma of choosing between prioritizing Arizona’s § 1373(c) requests
over the various law enforcement requests of other states and federal entities or risking that
aliens (and even U.S. citizens) in Arizona will be subjected to prolonged detentions.

1 several states have already begun considering similar measures.²⁹ Enactments by additional
2 states of Section 2-like mandates will only further burden DHS's ability to pursue its
3 immigration policy objectives and other law enforcement objectives. *Palmatier Decl.* ¶ 20;
4 *Ragsdale Decl.* ¶ 44; *see also Geier v. Am. Honda Motor Co., Inc.*, 529 U.S. 861, 863 (2000)
5 (granting deference to expert agency's views on conflict between state law and statutory
6 objectives); *Chae v. SLM Corp.*, 593 F.3d 936, 948-49 (9th Cir. 2010) (similar).

7 Accordingly, as informed by DHS's determination that S.B. 1070's mandatory
8 verification requirement will "reduc[e DHS's] ability to provide timely responses to law
9 enforcement on serious criminal aliens," thereby potentially allowing "very serious violators
10 [to] escape scrutiny and be released before the LESC can respond to police and inform them
11 of the serious nature of the [unlawfully present] alien they have encountered," (*Palmatier*
12 *Decl.* ¶ 17), this Court should hold that Section 2 of S.B. 1070 represents an impermissible
13 burden on federal resources.

14 **c. Section 6 of S.B. 1070 Extends Arizona's Warrantless Arrest**
15 **Authority to Out-of-State "Removable" Offenses and is**
16 **Preempted Because it Will Lead to the Harassment of Aliens**

17 Section 6 is similarly preempted under the principles articulated in *Hines*, because
18 Section 6 will also lead to further harassment of lawfully present aliens. Section 6 expands
19 the circumstances under which law enforcement officers can make warrantless arrests by
20 allowing Arizona peace officers to arrest anyone whom they have probable cause to believe
21 "has committed any public offense that makes the person removable from the United States."
22 Arizona law defines "public offense" to mean "conduct for which a sentence to a term of
23 imprisonment or of a fine is provided by any law of the state in which it occurred." *Ariz.*
24 *Rev. Stat.* § 13-105(26). Because, prior to the enactment of Section 6, Arizona law already
25 allowed for warrantless arrests for misdemeanors and felonies committed in Arizona, the

26 ²⁹ *See, e.g.,* Kirk Adams, *The Truth Behind the Arizona Law*, *Wash. Post*, May 28,
27 2010 (Bus. Sec.) ("[A]t least 18 other states are considering adopting similar immigration
28 laws."); Ginger Rough, *Arizona Immigration Law: Other States Mull Over Versions of*
Migrant Law, May 13, 2010, available at
<http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/news/articles/2010/05/13/20100513arizona-immigration-law-followers.html>.

1 effect of Section 6 is to allow warrantless arrests based on (i) out-of-state crimes which (ii)
2 the police officer determines would subject the alien to removal. Notably, warrantless arrest
3 authority under Section 6 does not depend on coordination with DHS to verify removability.

4 This provision is preempted because it will result in the arrest and harassment of
5 lawfully present aliens. Section 6 depends on a threshold determination of whether a “public
6 offense makes [a] person removable,” S.B. 1070 § 6, a determination that requires expertise
7 regarding a complex corpus of immigration law. As Justice Alito has explained, the
8 removability consequences “for a particular offense . . . [are] often quite complex” in that
9 “determining whether a particular crime” will potentially render an alien removable “is not
10 an easy task.” *See Padilla v. Kentucky*, 130 S. Ct. 1473, 1488 (2010) (Alito, J., concurring).
11 For this reason, the federal government has exclusive authority to determine whether the
12 commitment of a crime by a lawfully present alien – state or federal – would render the alien
13 removable from the United States. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(2) (setting forth certain criminal
14 convictions as grounds for inadmissibility); 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a)(2) (same for deportation).

15 Nonetheless, Arizona now demands that local law enforcement officers engage in this
16 complicated analysis of removability by folding such warrantless arrest authority into its
17 scheme of “attrition through enforcement.” But this is an analysis which Arizona’s peace
18 officers are ill prepared to make. Almost by definition, Section 6 is triggered only by non-
19 Arizona crimes (with which Arizona police are unlikely to be familiar), and will demand an
20 instantaneous judgment on the highly contextual and fact specific removability calculus – a
21 matter which is the subject of intense training for federal officers and which lies squarely
22 outside of Arizona peace officers’ general expertise.³⁰ Adding to the complexity of this
23 determination, various federal officers are empowered to order reprieves from the

24 ³⁰ *See* Estrada Decl. ¶¶ 8-9 (“[M]y officers are not experts in immigration matters.
25 . . . I am concerned that the state training will not equip my officers with the necessary
26 knowledge and expertise that would allow them to reasonably suspect when someone is in
27 the country unlawfully or has committed a public offense that makes them removable.”);
28 Declaration of Roberto Villaseñor, Chief of Police, Tucson Police Department (attached as
Exhibit 9), ¶ 6 (“While my officers are comfortable establishing the existence or
non-existence of reasonable suspicion as to criminal conduct, they are not at all familiar with
reasonable suspicion as to immigration status, not being trained in Federal immigration
law.”); Harris Decl. at 7.

1 immigration consequences of state crimes. *See, e.g.*, 8 U.S.C. §§ 1229b(a), 1253(a)(3). For
2 that reason alone, not every alien who has committed a “public offense” that might make him
3 removable will actually be removed from the United States. Arizona police officers will
4 undoubtedly erroneously arrest many aliens who could not legitimately be subject to removal
5 – whether because the Arizona police mistakenly identify an out-of-state crime as a removal
6 predicate, the Arizona police wrongfully assess whether an out-of-state crime will result in
7 a conviction, the Arizona police wrongly assess the removability calculus, or the particular
8 immigration consequence of the alien’s conduct has already been resolved by the federal
9 government.³¹ That outcome cannot be squared with the Supreme Court’s concern for the
10 imposition of distinct and extraordinary state burdens on aliens. *See Hines*, 312 U.S. at
11 65–66. The impropriety of Arizona’s action is underscored by the fact that Section 6 is not
12 “focuse[d] directly upon” a legitimate state criminal law function. *De Canas*, 424 U.S. at
13 357. The statute’s exclusive concern for crimes that give rise to removability consequences
14 belies a focus on the conduct of aliens, and not an effort “tailored to combat” local problems.
15 *Id.*

16 **2. Section 3 of S.B. 1070 – Arizona’s “Complete or Carry an Alien**
17 **Registration Document” Provision – Is Preempted by Federal Law**

18 Arizona’s new alien registration requirement, codified in Section 3 of S.B. 1070, is
19 preempted because it legislates in an area fully occupied by Congress and conflicts with
20 federal law and enforcement priorities in that field.

21 **a. Section 3 Interferes with Comprehensive Federal Alien**
22 **Registration Law**

23 Through the federal alien registration scheme, Congress has created a comprehensive
24 system for monitoring the entry and location of aliens within the United States. Congress has
25 provided very specific measures ranging from which aliens must register, *see* 8 U.S.C.
26 §§ 1201, 1301, when they must register, *see* 8 U.S.C. § 1302, the content of the registration
27 forms and what special circumstances may require deviation, 8 U.S.C. § 1303, the

28 ³¹ The risk of harassment is not limited to aliens who have committed out-of-state crimes. Section 6 also allows for arrest for Arizona crimes.

1 confidential nature of registration information, 8 U.S.C. § 1304, the circumstances under
2 which an already-registered alien must report his change of address to the government, 8
3 U.S.C. § 1305, and the penalties for failing to register or failing to notify the government of
4 a change in address, 8 U.S.C. § 1306. Registered aliens are required to carry their
5 “certificate[s] of alien registration” or “alien registration receipt card[s],” subject to
6 punishment of up to thirty days of imprisonment and a monetary fine. 8 U.S.C. § 1304(e);
7 18 U.S.C. § 3571. Willful failure to apply for registration is a federal misdemeanor,
8 punishable under the registration statute by up to six months of imprisonment and a monetary
9 fine. 8 U.S.C. § 1306(a); 18 U.S.C. § 3571; *see also* 8 C.F.R. Part 264.

10 This registration system is a quintessential example of a pervasive and comprehensive
11 scheme of federal regulation that leaves no room for state legislation. Indeed, in *Hines*, the
12 Supreme Court recognized that federal alien registration law manifests Congress’s intent to
13 monitor aliens through a system that would be “uniform,” “single,” “integrated,” and “all-
14 embracing.” *Id.* at 74. The Court considered the precursor to the current federal alien
15 registration system,³² and held that it precluded Pennsylvania from enforcing its own alien
16 registration requirements, because:

17 [T]he federal government, in the exercise of its superior authority in this field, has
18 enacted a complete scheme of regulation and has therein provided a standard for the
19 registration of aliens, [and] states cannot, inconsistently with the purpose of Congress,
conflict or interfere with, curtail or complement, the federal law, or enforce additional
or auxiliary regulations.

20 *Hines*, 312 U.S. at 66-67. Put simply, *Hines* held that Congress intended the federal
21 government to exercise exclusive control over all issues related to alien registration.

22 Arizona’s new alien registration provision conflicts with the federal goal, recognized
23 in *Hines*, of uniformity and singularity in registration (a field which so closely touches on
24 foreign relations). Section 3 removes federal control of prosecution for registration
25 violations by creating state-specific crimes based on federal alien registration requirements.

26 ³² *Hines* considered the alien registration requirements imposed by the Alien
27 Registration Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 670. Sections 1304 and 1306 were adopted in 1953 as part
28 of the INA, which “incorporate[d] in substance the provisions of the Alien Registration Act,
1940, relating to the registration of aliens,” and added additional registration requirements.
H.R. Rep. 82-1365, 2d Session, 1952, 1952 U.S.C.C.A.N. 1653, 1723.

1 Arizona’s criminal sanctions apply to aliens who violate either 8 U.S.C. § 1304(e), because
2 they failed to carry their registration cards, or § 1306(a), because they failed to register with
3 the federal government. S.B. 1070 § 3. But *Hines* held that states were precluded from
4 supplementing the federal immigration scheme, even if such regulations appear to
5 complement that scheme. *See, e.g., Hines*, 312 U.S. at 66-67; *Garamendi*, 539 U.S. at 420
6 n.11. Having piggybacked on the requirements of federal law, Arizona imposes its own
7 corresponding set of state imprisonment terms and fines for federal registration violations.
8 S.B. 1070 § 3(H). These state penalties can be imposed on an alien regardless of whether the
9 alien has already been punished by the federal government under the federal alien registration
10 scheme, and they therefore allow for increased and varied punishment for registration
11 violations that happen to occur in Arizona. *Id.*³³ Arizona’s creation of a state-specific
12 criminal scheme for individuals who violate the federal alien registration laws directly
13 contravenes the choices made by Congress in providing uniform standards under federal
14 control. *See Hines*, 312 U.S. at 74. Arizona’s auxiliary penalties for violations of the federal
15 alien registration laws are therefore preempted.

16 What Arizona has done is no different from what the Supreme Court prohibited in
17 *Wisconsin Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations v. Gould, Inc.*, 475 U.S.
18 282 (1986), where the Supreme Court struck down a Wisconsin law that prohibited certain
19 violators of the National Labor Relations Act (“NLRA”) from doing business with the State.
20 *Id.* at 283-84. The Court held that where states had no independent authority to “regulate
21 activity that the NLRA protects, prohibits, or arguably protects or prohibits,” so, too, are
22 states prohibited from “*providing their own regulatory or judicial remedies* for conduct
23 prohibited or arguably prohibited by the Act.” *Id.* at 286 (“The rule is designed to prevent
24 ‘conflict in its broadest sense’ with the ‘complex and interrelated federal scheme of law,
25 remedy, and administration,’ . . . and this Court has recognized that ‘[c]onflict in technique

26
27 ³³ Unlike S.B. 1070, Congress carefully calibrated and imposed *different* penalties
28 for each specific alien registration violation. *Compare* 8 U.S.C. § 1304, *with* § 1306, *and*
with S.B. 1070 § 3(H).

1 can be fully as disruptive to the system Congress erected as conflict in overt policy.”
2 (emphasis added)). Undoubtedly, under *Hines*, Arizona is barred from establishing its own
3 registration standards. So, just as in *Gould*, Section 3 “functions unambiguously as a
4 supplemental sanction for [federal] violations” over which the state is powerless to control.
5 *Id.* at 288; *see also Kobar*, 378 F. Supp. 2d at 1174-75 (Bolton, J.) (finding state fraud claims
6 preempted where proving a violation of federal law was an essential element of the claim).

7 Here, if Arizona’s supplemental sanctions were deemed valid, aliens in Arizona and
8 any other state that imposed similar sanctions would be penalized in a different manner than
9 aliens who were subjected solely to the federal penal system – causing the inconsistent
10 treatment of aliens across the United States. Such a result, *Hines* held, would violate the
11 congressional demand for uniform treatment of alien registration. *See Hines*, 312 U.S. at 72;
12 *see also Nelson*, 350 U.S. at 505-06. Moreover, the enforcement of obligations arising from
13 the relationship between the federal government and persons it regulates – here, aliens
14 required to register under the INA – is for the federal government itself, and not an area of
15 traditional state regulation. *See Buckman*, 531 U.S. at 347; *Nelson*, 350 U.S. at 515 (“Alien
16 registration is not directly related to control of undesirable conduct; consequently there is no
17 imperative problem of local law enforcement.”).

18 **b. Section 3 is Preempted Because it Seeks to Criminalize**
19 **Unlawful Presence and Will Result in the Harassment of**
Aliens

20 Finally, Section 3 of S.B. 1070 is preempted because it is a thinly veiled and
21 impermissible attempt to criminalize unlawful presence. Section 3 is termed a “registration”
22 law, but on its face seeks to criminalize only those aliens who are unlawfully present, by
23 providing an exception for any “person who maintains authorization from the federal
24 government to remain in the United States.” S.B. 1070 § 3(F). The existence of this
25 exception makes clear that, although Section 3 superficially tracks federal registration
26 provisions (which is itself impermissible, as described above), its aim is to criminalize
27 unlawful presence, thus affording a basis for stopping and inspecting aliens (Section 2) and
28 criminally prosecuting them. The legislators who enacted S.B. 1070 have routinely

1 confirmed that the goal of the statute was to “mak[e] it a state crime to be in this country
2 illegally.”³⁴

3 Whatever powers a state may have to enact laws that incidentally or indirectly touch
4 on aliens, a state may not criminalize unlawful presence – an immigration status created by
5 the federal scheme and of purely federal concern. *See De Canas*, 424 U.S. at 356–57.
6 Further, this focus on criminalizing unlawful presence is at odds with the policy objectives
7 underlying the federal scheme, in which Congress has repeatedly considered and rejected
8 attempts to criminalize unlawful presence. *See* S. 2454, 109th Cong. §§ 206, 275 (2006);
9 H.R. 4437, 109th Cong. § 203 (2005); *see also* Steinberg Decl. ¶ 34 (“United States
10 immigration law – and our uniform foreign policy regarding treatment of foreign nationals
11 – has been that the mere unlawful presence of a foreign national, without more, ordinarily
12 will not lead to that foreign national’s criminal arrest or incarceration. . . . This is a policy
13 that is understood internationally and one which is both important to and supported by
14 foreign governments.”).

15 Moreover, in pursuing this improper goal, the scheme imposed by Arizona is
16 inconsistent with federal immigration laws and would result in the harassment of aliens who
17 are lawfully present or whose presence is known and accepted by the federal government.
18 As noted above, in many cases, aliens who are lawfully in the United States or seeking lawful
19 status will not be provided documentation that satisfies federal regulations governing

20 ³⁴ Kirk Adams, *The Truth Behind the Arizona Law*, Wash. Post, May 28, 2010 (Bus.
21 Sec.) (editorial from speaker of the Arizona House of Representatives). Section 3’s
22 legislative history also confirms that the statute was crafted specifically out of concern for
23 unlawfully present aliens. The section criminalizing violations of federal registration law
24 was originally referred to as a “Trespassing” provision. Although Arizona has since changed
25 the title for this statutory section, the labeling was not accompanied by any change to the
26 substance of the provision that might suggest a changed intent for the statute. In fact, the
27 sponsors of S.B. 1070 continued to refer to Section 3 as the “trespassing” provision even
28 after amending the section’s heading. *See* Minutes of Meeting of Committee on Military
Affairs and Public Safety, Consideration of S.B. 1070, March 31, 2010, at 2 (referring to the
registration requirements as constituting a “trespassing” provision). And one sponsor of S.B.
1070, Arizona Senator Russell Pearce, made clear that the changed label simply represented
a “change [to] the title to reflect a federal issue” and that, notwithstanding the changed label,
the purpose of this section was to “say[] that if you’re in Arizona . . . in violation of federal
law, that you can be arrested under state law.” *See* Recording of Meeting of House
Committee on Military Affairs and Public Safety, March 31, 2010, 18:15–18:39, available
at http://azleg.granicus.com/MediaPlayer.php?view_id=13&clip_id=7286.

1 registration, and the federal government properly takes that fact into account in its
2 enforcement of the registration statute. *See* Aytes Decl. ¶¶ 2, 5, 13, 17, 19.³⁵ Section 3 thus
3 conflicts with and otherwise stands as an obstacle to the provisions of federal law and policy
4 allowing for certain types of humanitarian relief. For these reasons, Arizona’s attempt to
5 utilize the federal registration scheme to incarcerate those who are unlawfully present will
6 necessarily result in the broad harassment and detention of many aliens who have a
7 legitimate immigration claim and whom the United States would not punish, *see* Aytes Decl.
8 ¶¶ 2, 7, 12; Ragsdale Decl. ¶¶ 46, 47, 49. Section 3 is therefore independently preempted.

9 **3. Section 4 of S.B. 1070 Amends Arizona’s Alien Smuggling Statute,
Which is Preempted Because it Conflicts with Federal Law**

10 Although ostensibly crafted to resemble the federal smuggling statute, Section 4 of
11 S.B. 1070 and the provisions of Arizona law it amends conflict with Congress’s scheme
12 concerning smuggling and regulation of the unlawful presence of aliens. Arizona’s
13 smuggling laws will also result in the harassment of lawfully present aliens.³⁶ They are
14 therefore preempted.

15 The INA embodies Congress’s considered judgment as to the appropriate punishments
16 for the commercial facilitation of unlawful immigration. In particular, the federal alien
17 smuggling provisions of the INA criminalize knowing attempts to bring an alien into the
18 United States “at a place other than a designated port of entry or place other than as
19 designated by [DHS]” and also penalizes a person who, in “*knowing or in reckless disregard*
20 of the fact that an alien has come to, entered, or remains in the United States in violation of
21

22 ³⁵ For example, those aliens who are lawfully visiting the United States from
23 countries participating in the Visa Waiver Program will not have evidence of registration.
24 Aytes Decl. ¶ 21. Similarly, aliens who are seeking humanitarian relief by submitting
25 applications for asylum, temporary protected status, or other forms of relief based on victim
status, will not have completed or received a document evidencing “registration,” despite
having a legitimate claim and application in process.

26 ³⁶ Although several Arizona decisions have analyzed preemption challenges to the
27 smuggling provision, none have addressed the specific issues addressed herein. *See We*
28 *Are America/Somos America, Coalition of Arizona v. Maricopa County Board of*
Supervisors, 594 F. Supp. 2d 1104 (D. Ariz. 2009) (appeal pending); *Arizona v. Flores*,
188 P.3d 706 (Ariz. App. Div. 1 2008); *State v. Barragan Sierra*, 196 P.3d 879 (Ariz.
App. Div. 1 2008).

1 law,” attempts to “transport or move such alien within” the United States “*in furtherance of*
2 *such violation of law.*” 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a) (emphasis added). Thus, in enacting this
3 provision, Congress decided that “smuggling” occurs only when transportation *further*s an
4 alien’s illegal entry or unlawful presence in the country. *See United States v. Rodriguez*, 587
5 F.3d 573, 584 (2d Cir. 2009); *United States v. Angwin*, 271 F.3d 786, 805 (9th Cir. 2001);
6 *see also United States v. Barajas-Chavez*, 162 F.3d 1285, 1288 (10th Cir. 1999). In addition,
7 the federal smuggling scheme allows for prosecution of the transportation provider, and *not*
8 of the unlawfully present alien. *See United States v. Hernandez-Rodriguez*, 975 F.2d 622,
9 626 (9th Cir. 1992).

10 Arizona’s smuggling provision differs from and conflicts with the federal smuggling
11 statute in several critical respects. *First*, Arizona’s smuggling provision is not related to
12 transportation that is provided “in furtherance” of unlawful immigration, as in the federal
13 alien smuggling statute. Indeed, a state prosecution under this provision would not require
14 that the state even prove, as an element of the crime, that the travel was “in furtherance” of
15 an immigration violation. Instead, Arizona law criminalizes the provision of *any* commercial
16 transportation services – including taxis and buses – to an unlawfully present alien so long
17 as some objective basis should trigger the driver’s suspicion that the passenger is unlawfully
18 present. *See Az. Rev. Stat. § 13-2319(A)*; *see Flores*, 218 Ariz. at 412. *Second*, Arizona’s
19 smuggling laws, coupled with Arizona’s conspiracy statute, diverges from federal smuggling
20 law by imposing criminal sanctions on the alien “smugglee” himself. *See Barragan Sierra*,
21 196 P.3d at 888. *Third*, Arizona’s smuggling provision is not targeted at smuggling across
22 the United States’ international borders or at facilitation of an immigration crime, thus
23 widening the reach of the state law smuggling crime.

24 In addition to significantly expanding the scope of criminality far beyond the careful
25 balance that Congress struck in the INA, these variances from federal law operate both
26 separately and in tandem to establish an anti-smuggling scheme that allows Arizona to punish
27 mere unlawful presence in the country by criminalizing the use of paid transportation
28 services. This conflicts with federal law. As evidenced by the fact that the Arizona laws

1 allow for the punishment of “self smuggling” and broadly target the use of commercial
2 transportation, the real purpose and effect of Arizona law is to criminally punish unlawful
3 presence. *See De Canas*, 424 U.S. at 356–57; *see Oxygenated Fuels Ass’n v. Davis*, 331 F.3d
4 665, 672 (9th Cir. 2003) (“In analyzing conflict preemption, however, we examine not only
5 the purpose of [a state law]; we also examine its effects. Whatever the purpose . . . of the
6 state law, preemption analysis cannot ignore the effect of the challenged state action on the
7 pre-empted field.”); *see also Anderson v. Mullaney*, 191 F.2d 123, 127 (9th Cir. 1951)
8 (preemption concerns judged by effect of state law in addition to claimed intent of state law).
9 But Congress, which controls the sanctions available for unlawful presence, chose *not* to
10 subject an unlawfully present alien to incarceration for merely using commercial
11 transportation where such use has no bearing on the alien’s unlawful presence. *See De*
12 *Canas*, 424 U.S. at 355-56. Arizona’s criminalization of unlawful presence coupled with
13 the natural byproducts of unlawful presence – *e.g.*, use of commercial transportation and
14 “self-smuggling” – is directly at odds with Congress’s calibrated scheme of sanctions.

15 The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that state action is preempted if it seeks to
16 impose additional burdens on aliens beyond those authorized by Congress. *See, e.g., Chy*
17 *Lung*, 92 U.S. at 281 (statute regulating arrival of passengers from foreign port); *Henderson*
18 *v. Mayor of the City of N.Y.*, 92 U.S. 259 (1875) (same); *cf. De Canas*, 424 U.S. at 357
19 (distinguishing state law as non-preempted where it is “focus[ed]” and “tailored” on local
20 problem). Arizona’s smuggling laws conflict with Congress’s manifest intent to deter and
21 penalize unlawful immigration through a very specific set of mechanisms. *See Crosby*, 530
22 U.S. at 380 (internal citations omitted); *cf. Wells Fargo Bank N.A. v. Boutris*, 419 F.3d 949,
23 966 (9th Cir. 2005) (“Where such a decision not to regulate represents . . . a considered
24 determination that no regulation is appropriate, that choice preempts contrary state law
25 imposing governing standards.” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

26 If that were not enough, Arizona’s smuggling statute will also result in the harassment
27 of lawful alien residents, conflicting with the federal immigration laws’ careful balance of
28 enforcement and civil liberties articulated by the Court in *Hines*. By criminalizing the

1 provision of transportation services based on immigration status (as opposed to conduct), and
2 by subjecting transportation providers to the statute’s criminal penalties upon a showing of
3 simple negligence,³⁷ Arizona’s smuggling provisions will necessarily result in special and
4 unique burdens on and discrimination against lawful aliens. Because, under Arizona law, a
5 transportation provider can be charged with a felony for the merely negligent transportation
6 of unlawfully present aliens (*i.e.*, for providing transportation to an alien who one *might*
7 objectively believe to be unlawfully present), risk-averse transportation providers will
8 inevitably (i) reject business from lawfully present aliens so as to protect themselves against
9 a charge that they “should have known” that a passenger was an unlawfully present alien, or
10 (ii) demand that lawfully present aliens provide documentation to prove their immigration
11 status prior to using paid transportation services. The smuggling provision thus subjects
12 lawfully present aliens to specialized burdens of the type rejected in *Hines*. 312 U.S. at
13 73–74.

14 **4. Section 5 of S.B. 1070 – Arizona’s New Criminal Sanction Against**
15 **Unauthorized Aliens Who Solicit or Perform Work – is Preempted**
by the Federal Employer Sanctions Scheme

16 Section 5 of S.B. 1070, which establishes criminal penalties for unlawfully present
17 aliens who solicit or perform work in Arizona, is preempted by Congress’s comprehensive
18 scheme, set forth in the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (“IRCA”), for
19 regulating the employment of aliens.

20 IRCA reflects Congress’s deliberate choice *not* to criminally penalize unlawfully
21 present aliens for performing work, much less for attempting to perform it.³⁸ IRCA’s

22 ³⁷ Whereas Congress has opted to only criminalize intentional smuggling, Arizona’s
23 statute is triggered by the transportation provider’s simple negligence in evaluating
24 immigration status. *Compare* 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(1)(A) (federal alien smuggling statute is
25 only implicated where transportation provider “know[s] or . . . reckless[ly] disregard[s] the
26 fact that an alien” has unlawfully entered the United States), *with* Az. Rev. Stat. § 13-
27 2319(E)(3) (state smuggling statute is triggered wherever a transportation provider “knows
28 or has reason to know” that the persons transported have unlawfully entered or remained in
the United States (emphasis added)); *see also generally* *United States v. Townsend*, 924 F.2d
1385, 1391 n.2 (7th Cir. 1991) (“[U]sually in the law to say that someone has ‘reason to
know’ something means that he would be *negligent* in not knowing it.” (emphasis added)).

³⁸ *See Puerto Rico Dept. of Consumer Affairs v. Isla Petroleum Corp.*, 485 U.S. 495,
(continued...)

1 “comprehensive scheme” places a primary emphasis on employer sanctions. *See Hoffman*
2 *Plastic Compounds v. NLRB*, 535 U.S. 137, 147 (2002); *Lozano*, 496 F. Supp. 2d at 477,
3 524-25. IRCA provides robust penalties for employers of unlawfully present aliens, and no
4 criminal penalties for unlawfully present aliens who simply perform or solicit employment.
5 *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324a, *et seq.* Among its many provisions targeting employers, IRCA
6 punishes employers for knowingly hiring unauthorized workers, 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(a)(1)(A);
7 prohibits employers from recruiting or referring for a fee such workers, *id.*; prohibits
8 continuing employment by employers of unauthorized workers, *id.* § 1324a(a)(2); sanctions
9 employers who use contracts or subcontracts to hire unauthorized workers, *id.* § 1324a(a)(4);
10 and requires employers to comply with a new “employment verification system,” *id.*
11 § 1324a(b). IRCA also created a detailed compliance scheme to enforce an employer’s
12 obligations under the new law, with various monetary penalties for initial violations, larger
13 monetary penalties for subsequent violations, as well as the prospect of injunctive sanctions.
14 *See id.* § 1324a(e)(4); 8 C.F.R. § 274a.10. While IRCA’s primary focus is on employer
15 sanctions, Congress has demonstrated what sanctions would be appropriate for employees,
16 by providing very targeted sanctions against certain conduct of unauthorized aliens, such as
17 the presentation of fraudulent documents to demonstrate work eligibility. *See* 8 U.S.C.
18 § 1324c.

19 But beyond these penalties linked to specific acts, IRCA does not criminalize the mere
20 performance or solicitation of work by an unlawfully present alien. Congress’s focus on
21 employers was intentional, and reflected its belief that sanctions on employees were

22 ³⁸ (...continued)
23 503 (1988) (“Where a comprehensive federal scheme intentionally leaves a portion of the
24 regulated field without controls, then the pre-emptive inference can be drawn – not from
25 federal inaction alone, but from inaction joined with action.”); *Adkins v. Mireles*, 526 F.3d
26 531, 539 (9th Cir. 2008) (“State law may constitute an impermissible obstacle to the
27 accomplishment of purposes of Congress by regulating conduct that federal law has chosen
28 to leave unregulated.” (internal quotation marks omitted)); *accord Transcontinental Gas Pipe*
Line Corp. v. State Oil & Gas Bd. of Miss., 474 U.S. 409, 422 (1986) (“To the extent that
Congress denied FERC the power to regulate affirmatively particular aspects of the first sale
of gas, it did so because it wanted to leave determination of supply and first-sale price to the
market. A federal decision to forgo regulation in a given area may imply an authoritative
federal determination that the area is best left unregulated, and in that event would have as
much preemptive force as a decision to regulate.” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

1 inappropriate. As the Ninth Circuit has explained, although Congress “discussed the merits
2 of fining, detaining or adopting criminal sanctions against the *employee*, it ultimately rejected
3 all such proposals. . . . Instead, it deliberately adopted sanctions with respect to the *employer*
4 only.” See *Nat’l Ctr. for Immigrants’ Rights v. INS*, 913 F.2d 1350, 1368 (9th Cir. 1990)
5 (rev’d on other grounds, 502 U.S. 183 (1991)) (emphasis in original). IRCA therefore
6 embodied a “congressional policy choice [that was] clearly elaborated” in favor of sanctions
7 only for the employer. *Id.* at 1370. IRCA’s legislative history further confirms that Congress
8 affirmatively rejected criminal penalties for the unlawfully present employee for important
9 policy reasons. Congress’s concern about the humanitarian consequences of criminally
10 punishing employees prompted it to exclusively enact punishments for the employer and
11 reject such punishments for the employee.³⁹

12 By attempting to override Congress’s conscious choice not to criminally punish
13 unlawful aliens for soliciting or performing work, Arizona has created a clear conflict with
14 federal law. See *Crosby*, 530 U.S. at 380; *Puerto Rico Dept. of Consumer Affairs*, 485 U.S.
15 at 503. But the Supremacy Clause does not permit Arizona to second-guess Congress’s
16 decision not to impose sanctions on employees. See, e.g., *Thunder Craft Boats, Inc.*, 489
17 U.S. at 152; *Felder*, 487 U.S. at 143.

18 **5. Section 5 of S.B. 1070 – Arizona’s Transporting, Harboring, or**
19 **Concealing Provision – Violates Preemption and Dormant**
Commerce Clause Principles

20 The second provision of Section 5 of S.B. 1070 makes it illegal for a person, who is
21 in violation of a criminal offense, to (1) transport an alien in Arizona in furtherance of the
22 unlawful presence of the alien in the United States; (2) conceal, harbor, or shield an alien
23 from detection in any place in the state; and (3) encourage or induce an alien to come to or

24 ³⁹ See H.R. Rep. No. 99-682(I) at 46 (“Now, as in the past, the Committee remains
25 convinced that legislation containing employer sanctions is the most humane, credible and
26 effective way to respond to the large-scale influx of undocumented aliens.”); see also *Nat’l*
27 *Ctr. for Immigrants’ Rights*, 913 F.2d at 1366, 1369 (“The emphasis on employer sanctions
28 in IRCA militates against reading in the authority to detain individuals to prevent them from
working.”); *Ragsdale Decl.* ¶ 21. And Congress’s intent not to punish unauthorized aliens
for seeking employment was further evidenced through the simultaneous passage of other
sections of IRCA, which coupled new employer sanctions with the adjustment of status for
certain alien workers present in the United States. See 8 U.S.C. §§ 1160, 1255a.

1 reside in this state if the person knows that such coming to, entering or residing in this state
2 is or will be in violation of law. S.B. 1070 § 5(A) (§ 13-2929). This provision represents
3 an invalid incursion on federal authority for two reasons.

4 *First*, to the extent that Section 5 is not a restriction of interstate movement, it is
5 necessarily a restriction on unlawful entry into the United States. As a border state,
6 Arizona’s boundaries are in part the boundaries of the United States. Section 5 represents
7 an attempt to regulate entry into the *nation* – a definitively federal area of concern in which
8 state regulations are barred by the U.S. Constitution. *See De Canas*, 424 U.S. at 355 (a state
9 may not attempt to regulate “who should or should not be admitted into the country, and the
10 conditions under which a legal entrant may remain”). The degree of Arizona’s intrusion into
11 the uniquely federal area of unlawful entry is further underscored by the fact that Arizona
12 construes such prohibitions on immigration conduct to apply to the alien himself. *See, e.g.,*
13 *Barragan-Sierra*, 196 P.3d at 888.

14 *Second*, this provision offends the Dormant Commerce Clause by restricting the
15 interstate movement of aliens. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution grants Congress the
16 right to regulate commerce between the states – a positive grant of power that forbids state
17 regulations that intentionally interfere with interstate commerce. The “Dormant Commerce
18 Clause” forbids certain state regulations attempting to discourage or otherwise restrict the
19 movement of people between states. *See Edwards v. California*, 314 U.S. 160, 172-73
20 (1941). *Edwards* involved a challenge to a depression-era California statute prohibiting “the
21 ‘bringing’ or transportation of indigent persons into California.” *Id.* at 173. The Supreme
22 Court invalidated the statute under the Dormant Commerce Clause, which “prohibit[s]
23 attempts on the part of any single State to isolate itself from difficulties common to all of
24 them by restraining the transportation of persons and property across its borders.” *Id.*; *see*
25 *also Camps Newfound/Owatonna v. Town of Harrison*, 520 U.S. 564, 584 (1997)
26 (reaffirming that the Dormant Commerce Clause prohibits certain limitations on the interstate
27 transportation of persons); *Anderson v. Mullaney*, 191 F.2d 123, 127 (9th Cir. 1951) (holding
28 that Alaska violated the Dormant Commerce Clause in enacting a scheme of regulations that

discouraged the movement of out-of-state fishermen into Alaska).

Arizona’s prohibition on encouraging movement into the state similarly violates the Dormant Commerce Clause. The prohibition on “encourag[ing] an alien to come to or reside in” Arizona aims to restrict the movement of unlawfully present aliens from other states into Arizona. Although the statute claims only to apply where an alien’s “entering or residing in [Arizona] is or will be in violation of law,” S.B. 1070 § 5(A), unlawfully present aliens who are subject to Section 3 of S.B. 1070 will usually meet this condition. Even though Arizona’s statute is phrased in similar terms as the federal alien smuggling statute, the latter deals with actual immigration – the movement across an international border – whereas the former also regulates movements *within* the United States. This restriction on movement within the states is prohibited by the Dormant Commerce Clause.⁴⁰

II. THE UNITED STATES WILL SUFFER IRREPARABLE HARM ABSENT A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Upon demonstrating a likelihood of success on the merits, a plaintiff must also establish that, absent the preliminary injunction, there is a likelihood that the defendant’s conduct will cause irreparable harm. *See Winter*, 129 S. Ct. at 375. Preliminary injunctive relief is necessary here because S.B. 1070 is causing irreparable harm to the United States, and this harm will only be magnified if the law goes into effect.⁴¹ If not enjoined, S.B. 1070 will continue to cause irreparable harm to the United States in at least three significant ways.

First, S.B. 1070 irreparably undermines the federal government’s control over the

⁴⁰ Additionally, Section 5 of S.B. 1070 directly conflicts with a section of the federal alien smuggling statute (8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(1)(C)), which provides a distinct carve-out for certain religious organizations which would now be punishable under Arizona law. Certain religious organizations that meet the requirements of § 1324(a)(1)(C) and which conceal, harbor, or shield an alien whom they know to have illegally entered or remained in the United States, would be in violation of Section 5 of the Arizona law, despite an express command from Congress that such behavior not be subject to criminal sanctions.

⁴¹ The Ninth Circuit has traditionally used a “sliding scale” approach to the irreparable harm standard, pursuant to which the burden for demonstrating irreparable harm decreases as the likelihood of success on the merits increases. *See Stormans*, 526 F.3d at 412. The Supreme Court has recently held that this approach may not allow preliminary relief upon a showing of only a “possibility” of irreparable harm. *Winter*, 129 S.Ct. at 375–76. However, regardless of whether a “sliding scale” is employed here, injunctive relief is appropriate because, as discussed below, the United States will suffer irreparable harm absent an injunction.

1 regulation of immigration and immigration policy and thereby interferes with the federal
2 government's ability to achieve the purposes and objectives of federal law and to pursue its
3 chosen enforcement priorities. If S.B. 1070 is permitted to become effective on July 29,
4 2010, the federal government's chosen policy balance with respect to immigration
5 enforcement will be altered and, during the pendency of this action, the federal government's
6 ability to balance the various interests that animate the federal immigration laws will be
7 seriously damaged. Among other things, as discussed above, S.B. 1070 seeks to override,
8 and would impair the ability of DHS to execute, the federal enforcement priority to locate,
9 detain, prosecute and remove violent criminal aliens who pose significant risks to the safety
10 and security of our Nation's citizens. This assault on federal priorities is not speculative; it
11 is the avowed purpose of S.B. 1070. *See* S.B. 1070 § 1. By violating the Constitution's
12 structural reservation of authority to the federal government to set immigration policy, S.B.
13 1070 effects ongoing irreparable harm to the constitutional order. Indeed, the Supreme Court
14 has suggested that irreparable harm inherently results from the enforcement of a preempted
15 state law. *See New Orleans Pub. Serv., Inc. v. Council of New Orleans*, 491 U.S. 350, 366-
16 67 (1989) (suggesting that "irreparable injury may possibly be established . . . by a showing
17 that the challenged state statute is flagrantly and patently violative . . . of the express
18 constitutional prescription of the Supremacy Clause").

19 *Second*, the enforcement of S.B. 1070 will inflict irreparable injury on the United
20 States' ability to manage foreign policy. The mere existence of Arizona's "attrition through
21 enforcement" policy – with its concomitant promise of the sweeping criminalization of
22 immigrant populations – has already had negative effects on U.S. foreign policy interests,
23 and these consequences will intensify if S.B. 1070 is permitted to operate. *See* Steinberg
24 Decl. ¶ 34-44. Harm to the federal government's ability to address issues of concern to the
25 United States and its citizens in foreign affairs – such as immigration, national security, and
26 economic policy – cannot be undone by court order.

27 Foreign leaders from around the Western Hemisphere and elsewhere, including the
28 government of Mexico, have criticized S.B. 1070, and that has undermined the United States'

1 ability to pursue various diplomatic objectives. See Steinberg Decl. ¶¶ 34-40. In one
2 instance, because of the passage of S.B. 1070, Mexico postponed consideration of a bilateral
3 agreement with the United States for coordinating responses to natural disasters and
4 accidents. See *id.* ¶ 43. In another case, at least five of six Mexican governors have
5 announced their refusal to participate in the U.S.-Mexico Border Governors' conference,
6 wherein significant cross-border issues would have been discussed. See *id.* ¶ 42. And
7 Mexico has further limited its participation in the Merida initiative, a partnership aimed at
8 confronting violent transnational gangs. See Silver Decl. ¶ 7. Mexican President Calderón
9 has publicly stated that he views S.B. 1070 as undermining Mexican popular goodwill toward
10 the United States, and complicating his country's ability to remain focused on a positive
11 bilateral agenda of critical importance to U.S. national interests. See, e.g., Travel Alert,
12 Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores, Mexico, Apr. 27, 2010; Mexican President Calderón's
13 Address to Joint Meeting of Congress, May 20, 2010.⁴² Such reactions are the predictable
14 result of a state immigration policy whose exclusive aim is "attrition" of foreign nationals
15 in Arizona through a policy of maximum "enforcement" of particular criminal sanctions –
16 a policy given teeth by a mandatory, discretion-less verification scheme that enforces a series
17 of interlocking and virtually automatic criminal penalties. Steinberg Decl. ¶ 22 ("The
18 exercise of immigration functions can quickly provoke a significant bilateral or multilateral
19 problem that harms U.S. interests if handled without appropriate consideration of relevant
20 foreign policy impacts."), ¶¶ 20, 32 ("[D]omestic processes for arrest, detention, and removal
21 . . . are of great interest to foreign governments," and as a "matter of international law and
22 practice, the federal government is held accountable . . . for the actions of state and local
23 authorities regarding our treatment of foreign nationals."). These foreign policy
24 consequences, which will only be magnified by S.B. 1070's implementation, are paradigmatic
25 examples of irreparable harm: Once opportunities for cooperation are lost, they cannot be

26
27 ⁴² See also Brief of the United Mexican States as *amicus curiae*, *Friendly House v.*
28 *Whiting*, No. 10-CV-1061 (D. Ariz.) (describing Mexico's objections to S.B. 1070 and
impediments that S.B. 1070 will create to certain cooperative arrangements with the United
States).

1 recovered by a favorable judgment at the conclusion of this case.

2 More generally, the State Department has advised that S.B. 1070 represents an
3 impediment to U.S. foreign policy and diplomatic interests – both with Mexico and with
4 other countries. See Steinberg Decl. ¶ 58 (“I have concluded that S.B. 1070 runs counter to
5 American foreign policy interests, and that its enforcement would further undermine
6 American foreign policy.”). And such damage to foreign relations will have an adverse
7 effect on federal immigration enforcement. See Ragsdale Decl. ¶ 54 (“Should there be any
8 decreased cooperation from foreign governments in response to Arizona’s enforcement of
9 SB 1070, the predictable result . . . would be an adverse impact on the effectiveness and
10 efficiency of ICE’s enforcement activities”); *id.* ¶¶ 29-32 (cooperation with Mexico is critical
11 to border security and for effectuating removal of dangerous or criminal aliens from the
12 United States). The State Department carefully cultivates relationships with foreign
13 governments so as to enable maximum cooperation on issues of concern to the United States
14 and its citizens – such as immigration, national security, and economic policy. Damage that
15 is done to these relationships is irreparable, as it cannot be undone by court order. Nor is this
16 damage speculative; it has already manifested itself due to the passage of S.B. 1070, and it
17 will only increase significantly if S.B. 1070 is allowed to be enforced. Indeed, with the
18 deepest understanding of these complex foreign relationships, the State Department advises
19 that S.B. 1070 “is likely to hinder our ability to secure the cooperation of other states in
20 efforts to promote U.S. interests internationally across a range of trade, security, [and]
21 tourism,” is “likely to undermine the United States’ ability to engage effectively with the
22 international community to promote the advancement and protection of human rights,” and
23 “risk[s] provoking retaliatory treatment against U.S. nationals by other states.” Steinberg
24 Decl. ¶ 57. This ongoing and expected irreparable harm to weighty foreign policy interests
25 alone warrants preliminary injunctive relief. See *Garamendi*, 539 U.S. 396 (upholding
26 district court’s injunction due to interference with foreign policy).

27 Similarly, for the multiple reasons discussed above, S.B. 1070 will result in the
28 harassment of lawfully present aliens, which frustrates the United States’ relationship with

1 immigrant communities and damages the United States' reputation as a welcoming country
2 for lawfully admitted aliens. *See* Steinberg Decl. ¶ 20 (explaining that foreign governments
3 take great interest in domestic processes for arrest and detention of aliens, because of "the
4 impact these processes have on foreign nationals and their families."); *see generally* *Rent-A-*
5 *Center, Inc. v. Canyon Television & Appliance Rental, Inc.*, 944 F.2d 597, 603 (9th Cir.
6 1991) (recognizing that injuries to reputation constitute irreparable harm); *Apple Computer,*
7 *Inc. v. Formula Int'l, Inc.*, 725 F.2d 521, 526 (9th Cir. 1984) (same).

8 In addition, DHS, which "maintains the primary interest in the humane treatment of
9 aliens and the fair administration of federal immigration laws," has advised that such
10 "humanitarian interests would be undermined" if certain aliens or categories of aliens are
11 "detained or arrested by Arizona authorities for being illegally present in the United States,"
12 Ragsdale Decl. ¶ 47, including aliens eligible for or seeking asylum, *id.* ¶ 48, aliens seeking
13 protection under the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading
14 Treatment or Punishment, *id.* ¶ 50, and aliens in various other circumstances which require
15 individualized discretion, *id.* ¶¶ 47, 49. However, because it is impossible for the state to
16 know when ICE would apply such discretion, and because S.B. 1070's blanket and
17 mandatory "attrition through enforcement" policy makes any such knowledge irrelevant, it
18 is all but guaranteed that S.B. 1070 will work a very real and irreparable interference with
19 Congress's humanitarian objectives and enforcement priorities, which are now carried out
20 by ICE's measured exercise of discretion. *See* Ragsdale Decl. ¶¶ 18, 24, 25 (explaining uses
21 of discretion for humanitarian interests). A court cannot undo the interference with federal
22 enforcement priorities, nor can it undo the effect of a victimized alien's detention or
23 incarceration, or the message that such treatment would convey abroad.

24 *Finally*, irreparable harm will result because the enforcement of S.B. 1070 will, as
25 discussed above, place a significant burden on DHS resources and force DHS to react to
26 Arizona's enforcement of S.B. 1070 at the expense of its own policy priorities – namely,
27 aliens presenting threats to national security and public safety. *See* Ragsdale Decl. ¶ 41
28 ("[T]he burdens placed by SB 1070 on the Federal Government will impair ICE's ability to

1 pursue its enforcement priorities.”); Palmatier Decl. ¶ 15-17. Section 2 of S.B. 1070 will
2 result in a dramatic increase in verification requests to DHS. Such an increase is not
3 speculative; it is the exact point of the law. *See* Palmatier Decl. ¶ 15 (“Arizona’s new law
4 will result in an increase in the number [of queries] . . . reducing our ability to provide timely
5 responses to law enforcement on serious criminal aliens.”); Ragsdale Decl. ¶ 44 (“[T]o
6 respond to the number of referrals likely to be generated by enforcement of SB 1070 would
7 require ICE to divert existing resources from other duties.”); *id.* ¶ 52 (noting that without
8 diverting resources from federal priorities, ICE is not staffed to provide testimony in
9 additional hearings against aliens in Arizona). And, as explained above, the greater share of
10 DHS’s attention that Arizona receives as a result will reduce the federal ability to pursue
11 highly dangerous aliens. If S.B. 1070 is not enjoined, every day the federal government is
12 forced to focus on managing the output of S.B. 1070 rather than on these dangerous aliens
13 will constitute an irreparably lost opportunity to focus on higher priority targets. This, in
14 turn, poses significant and irreparable risks to the safety and security of our Nation’s citizens.

15 Enforcement of S.B. 1070's mandatory attrition provisions will similarly interfere with
16 ICE’s outreach program, which ensures the assistance of unlawfully present aliens in the
17 prosecution of higher priority threats and will also endanger federal immigration authorities’
18 capacity to apprehend highly dangerous targets. *See id.* ¶ 33 (S.B. 1070 “would . . . interfere
19 with ICE’s ability to pursue the prosecution or removal of aliens who pose particularly
20 significant threats to public safety or national security.”); ¶ 38 (“[V]ictims and witnesses of
21 crime may hesitate to come forward to speak to law enforcement officials”); Palmatier Decl.
22 ¶ 17 (predicting that, as a result of S.B. 1070, “serious violators may well escape scrutiny and
23 be released before the LESC can respond to police and inform them of the serious nature of
24 the [unlawfully present] alien they have encountered.”). Once this type of damage is done
25 to ICE’s enforcement priorities during the period in which “attrition through enforcement”
26 supplants the federal government’s balanced set of values, no final judgment can undo it.

1 **III. A BALANCING OF EQUITIES FAVORS THE UNITED STATES AND**
2 **DEMONSTRATES THAT THE PUBLIC INTEREST WOULD BE SERVED**
3 **BY GRANTING INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

4 Finally, injunctive relief is necessary because a consideration of the public interest and
5 the balance of hardships between the parties favors enjoining S.B. 1070. *See Stormans*, 586
6 F.3d at 1127. In this action, which seeks to protect the interests of the United States as a
7 whole, the burdens that will result absent injunctive relief are directly tied to the public
8 benefits that will be protected if this Court issues the requested injunction. *Cf. Nken v.*
9 *Holder*, 129 S. Ct. 1749, 1762 (2009) (stating, in the related context of criteria governing stay
10 of removal, that the criteria of “harm to the opposing party” and “the public interest” “merge
11 when the Government is the opposing party” because harm to the Government is harm to the
12 public interest). That is particularly the case given that this lawsuit seeks to vindicate the
13 supremacy of federal law. *See California Pharmacists Ass’n v. Maxwell-Jolly*, 563 F.3d 847,
14 853 (9th Cir. 2009) (noting, in considering the balance of equities in the context of
15 preliminary injunction, that “the interest of preserving the Supremacy Clause is paramount”
16 and citing Ninth Circuit precedent “considering the public interest represented by the
17 Constitution’s declaration that federal law is to be supreme” (internal quotation marks
18 omitted)).

19 As discussed throughout this memorandum, a variety of national, public interests are
20 endangered by the operation of S.B. 1070, and will be promoted by the issuance of the
21 requested injunction. Preliminary injunctive relief will help relieve federal immigration
22 authorities of the burdens created by S.B. 1070, thereby allowing them to focus on high
23 priority issues of national security and public safety. The prospect of interference with
24 federal priorities is a clear burden on the United States, just as the ability to pursue these
25 priorities without interruption from S.B. 1070 would benefit the public interest.
26 Additionally, absent an injunction, S.B. 1070’s damage to foreign policy will continue
27 unabated – thereby limiting the federal government’s ability to productively cooperate with
28 other countries on issues of public importance, such as national security, trade, tourism, and
 the environment. The operation of S.B. 1070 will also harm U.S. interests by imposing

1 special burdens on lawfully present aliens – thereby endangering cooperative relationships
2 with this community while directly injuring the reputation and goodwill of the United States.
3 Injunctive relief will serve the public interest by helping to prevent these burdens to aliens
4 specifically and American goodwill generally.

5 By contrast, a preliminary injunction will not meaningfully burden Arizona. S.B.
6 1070 has not yet gone into effect, so an injunction in this context would have the effect of
7 merely preserving the status quo. *See U.S. Philips Corps. v. KBC Bank*, 590 F.3d 1091, 1094
8 (9th Cir. 2010) (“[T]he very purpose of a preliminary injunction . . . is to preserve the status
9 quo and the rights of the parties until a final judgment issues in the cause.”). Were this Court
10 ultimately to conclude that S.B. 1070 does not offend the Supremacy Clause, Arizona would
11 then be able to implement and enforce S.B. 1070 without having suffered any substantial
12 burden. What is more, given that this litigation largely concerns immigration law and policy
13 – in which, by any plausible account, the federal interest is paramount and the state interest
14 is (at most) minimal, *see, e.g., De Canas*, 424 U.S. at 355 – the burden on Arizona from a
15 preliminary injunction would be modest. Indeed, Arizona has no legitimate interest in the
16 enforcement of a law that likely violates the Supremacy Clause. *See Chamber of Commerce*
17 *of U.S. v. Edmonson*, 594 F.3d 742, 771 (10th Cir. 2010) (“Oklahoma does not have an
18 interest in enforcing a law that is likely constitutionally infirm.”).

19 20 CONCLUSION

21 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant the United States’ Motion for a
22 Preliminary Injunction.

23 DATED: July 6, 2010

24 Respectfully Submitted,

25 Tony West
26 Assistant Attorney General

27 Dennis K. Burke
28 United States Attorney

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

Arthur R. Goldberg
Assistant Director, Federal Programs Branch

/s/ Varu Chilakamarri

Varu Chilakamarri (NY Bar #4324299)
Joshua Wilkenfeld (NY Bar #4440681)
U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division
20 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530
Tel. (202) 616-8489/Fax (202) 616-8470
varudhini.chilakamarri@usdoj.gov
Attorneys for the United States