

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

NORTHWEST IMMIGRANT RIGHTS
PROJECT (“NWIRP”), a nonprofit Washington
public benefit corporation; and YUK MAN
MAGGIE CHENG, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JEFFERSON B. SESSIONS III, in his official
capacity as Attorney General of the United
States; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
JUSTICE; EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR
IMMIGRATION REVIEW; JUAN OSUNA, in
his official capacity as Director of the Executive
Office for Immigration Review; and JENNIFER
BARNES, in her official capacity as
Disciplinary Counsel for the Executive Office
for Immigration Review,

Defendants.

No. 2:17-cv-00716

COMPLAINT FOR
DECLARATORY AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

The Northwest Immigrant Rights Project (“NWIRP”) provides free and low-cost legal services to more than 10,000 immigrants each year through its 70 staff members and more than 350 volunteer attorneys. NWIRP provides these services to noncitizens in deportation (removal) proceedings before the Executive Office for Immigration Review and to those who are not in such proceedings but seek to apply for immigration benefits from U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services—benefits that include asylum, family visas, naturalization, visas for

1 survivors of trafficking and other violent crimes, and Temporary Protected Status. NWIRP
2 offers various different legal services depending on the needs of each client, the type of relief
3 sought, and the resources NWIRP has available. These services range from full representation
4 to brief counseling, and they take place on an individualized basis, in legal clinics, in group
5 assistance events, and at community outreach functions.

6 Over the past several weeks, the Executive Office for Immigration Review, the U.S.
7 Department of Justice, and the individual Defendants (collectively, “EOIR”) have set out to
8 restrict NWIRP’s ability to offer this assistance. Relying on a new and novel interpretation of
9 its 2008 rule governing attorney misconduct, EOIR now insists on a Hobson’s choice: either
10 NWIRP must commit to full legal representation of *every* immigrant in removal proceedings it
11 presently assists (which is plainly impossible), or NWIRP must refrain from providing them
12 *any* form of legal assistance—not even a brief consultation. EOIR’s cease-and-desist order to
13 NWIRP will deprive thousands of immigrants—including asylum seekers and unaccompanied
14 children—of the chance to consult with a NWIRP lawyer to evaluate their potential claims for
15 legal residence. EOIR’s interpretation will also deprive otherwise unrepresented immigrants of
16 legal advice they need to understand United States law, and assistance with navigating the
17 immigration court system.

18 EOIR’s new edict purports to control not just the appearance of attorneys in removal
19 proceedings but their communications with clients (and even potential clients) and other limited
20 assistance provided outside of an active EOIR proceeding. The vague and overbroad rule, and
21 EOIR’s application of it to NWIRP, violates (1) the First Amendment, by restricting NWIRP’s
22 rights to free speech, free association, and to petition the government, and (2) the Tenth
23 Amendment, by invading the power reserved to the State of Washington (and other states) to
24 regulate the practice of law. And, because individuals in deportation proceedings are not
25 provided with appointed counsel and most of them cannot afford to pay for private counsel,
26 EOIR’s actions will ultimately prevent many immigrants from receiving *any* legal assistance at
27 all.

1 Plaintiffs now bring this lawsuit for declaratory and injunctive relief, and respectfully
2 ask this Court to halt EOIR's unconstitutional overreach.

3 **I. PARTIES**

4 1.1 Plaintiff NWIRP is a Washington nonprofit public benefit corporation with its
5 principal place of business in Seattle, Washington, and with additional offices in Tacoma,
6 Wenatchee, and Granger, Washington. NWIRP was founded in 1984. Its mission is to
7 promote justice by defending and advancing the rights of immigrants through direct legal
8 service, systemic advocacy, and community education.

9 1.2 Plaintiff Yuk Man Maggie Cheng is a NWIRP staff attorney licensed to practice
10 law in Washington by the Washington Supreme Court. As a licensed Washington attorney, she
11 is subject to regulation and supervision by the Washington Supreme Court and by the
12 Washington State Bar Association, a state agency.

13 1.3 Defendant Jefferson Beauregard Sessions III is the United States Attorney
14 General and head of the United States Department of Justice. Sessions is sued in his official
15 capacity.

16 1.4 Defendant United States Department of Justice ("DOJ") is an executive
17 department of the United States charged with enforcing federal law.

18 1.5 Defendant Executive Office for Immigration Review is a federal office/agency
19 within and overseen by DOJ, and is responsible for adjudicating immigration cases. EOIR
20 issued the cease-and-desist letter at issue in this case.

21 1.6 Defendant Juan Osuna is the Director of EOIR. Osuna is sued in his official
22 capacity.

23 1.7 Defendant Jennifer Barnes is an employee of EOIR and holds the title of
24 Disciplinary Counsel. Barnes is sued in her official capacity.

25 **II. JURISDICTION & VENUE**

26 2.1 This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as this
27 civil action arises under the laws of the United States, and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1361, as this

1 action seeks to compel an officer or employee of the United States, or an agency thereof, to
2 perform a duty owed to Plaintiffs. The United States has waived its sovereign immunity pursuant
3 to 5 U.S.C. § 702.

4 2.2 This Court has personal jurisdiction over all Defendants, and venue is proper in
5 this district, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e).

6 III. FACTS

7 A. NWIRP Plays a Critical Role in Providing Legal Assistance to Immigrants

8 3.1 NWIRP is the primary nonprofit legal services provider for immigrants in
9 removal proceedings in Washington State and for persons detained at the Northwest Detention
10 Center (“NWDC”), an immigration prison in Tacoma, Washington. NWIRP staff attorneys
11 provide direct representation in hundreds of cases and organize pro bono representation for
12 more than 200 additional cases each year.

13 3.2 NWIRP screens more than 1,000 potential clients per year. In 2016 alone,
14 NWIRP screened 641 individuals who were potentially eligible for asylum.

15 3.3 NWIRP also provides “Know Your Rights” (“KYR”) presentations, community
16 workshops, and individual consultations to unrepresented individuals.

17 3.4 NWIRP relies on grants and charitable contributions to provide limited services
18 to unrepresented immigrants. These services include helping immigrants file motions to
19 terminate proceedings, motions to change venue, and motions to reopen old removal orders
20 before EOIR. NWIRP also assists hundreds of clients in preparing various application forms
21 seeking relief from removal, including applications for asylum, family visas, cancellation of
22 removal, special immigrant juvenile status, and U & T visas for victims of trafficking and
23 violent crimes.

24 3.5 Due to time, cost, and other resource constraints, NWIRP can provide limited or
25 full representation to clients in only a small fraction of the total screenings it performs. Full
26 representation in removal proceedings can entail the preparation and filing of a) required
27 procedural and substantive motions; b) applications and briefing for all forms of relief for

1 which the applicant is eligible; and c) extensive documentation of key facts in the case,
2 including reports on country conditions, testimony by an expert or lay witness, and evaluations
3 by psychologists or other medical professionals. Removal proceedings often involve multiple
4 hearings over the course of several years.

5 3.6 For every individual it screens, NWIRP provides personal consultations to
6 advise the individual of procedural requirements and to help identify potential defenses and
7 forms of relief.

8 3.7 Of the individuals it screens, NWIRP places, on average, over 200 cases per
9 year with pro bono attorneys. In 2016, NWIRP placed 242 cases with pro bono attorneys, with
10 103 of those cases in removal proceedings. Through the first four months of 2017, NWIRP
11 placed 137 cases for direct representation with pro bono attorneys, with 73 of those cases in
12 removal proceedings.

13 **B. EOIR Threatens NWIRP with Disciplinary Sanctions for Providing**
14 **Limited Legal Assistance to Unrepresented Immigrants**

15 3.8 On December 18, 2008, EOIR published new rules of professional conduct
16 governing “practitioners who appear before [EOIR],” creating additional categories of attorney
17 misconduct that are subject to disciplinary sanctions. *See* Professional Conduct for
18 Practitioners, 73 Fed. Reg. 76,914 (Dec. 18, 2008), codified at 8 C.F.R. §§ 1001, 1003 & 1292.
19 One of these rules, 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(t), establishes that EOIR may impose disciplinary
20 sanctions against any attorney representing noncitizens before the agency who fails to file a
21 notice of entry of appearance (on Form EOIR-27 or -28).

22 3.9 EOIR’s rule defines representation very broadly. The rule requires attorneys to
23 submit a notice of appearance where they have engaged in “practice” or “preparation,” as
24 defined in 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1:

- 25 (i) The term *practice* means the act or acts of any person
26 appearing in any case, either in person or through the preparation
27 or filing of any brief or other document, paper, application, or
petition on behalf of another person or client before or with DHS,
or any immigration judge, or the Board.

1 ...

2 (k) The term *preparation*, constituting practice, means the study
3 of the facts of a case and the applicable laws, coupled with the
4 giving of advice and auxiliary activities, including the incidental
5 preparation of papers, but does not include the lawful functions
6 of a notary public or service consisting solely of assistance in the
7 completion of blank spaces on printed Service forms by one
8 whose remuneration, if any, is nominal and who does not hold
9 himself out as qualified in legal matters or in immigration and
10 naturalization procedure.

11 3.10 Notably, the immigration court does not permit limited appearances¹ or
12 unilateral withdrawals in removal proceedings. Once an attorney files a notice of appearance,
13 the attorney must represent the immigrant for the entirety of the removal case before the
14 immigration judge (or, if on appeal, before the Board of Immigration Appeals). The attorney
15 may only withdraw with leave of the court, and leave is granted only in exceptional
16 circumstances.

17 3.11 When these new rules were adopted, NWIRP met with the local immigration
18 court administrator to discuss how the rule would impact the services NWIRP provides to pro
19 se individuals. NWIRP agreed that it would notify the court when it assisted with any pro se
20 motion or brief by including a subscript or other clear indication in the document that NWIRP
21 had prepared or assisted in preparing the motion or application. This convention was accepted,
22 and no concerns were raised by the local immigration courts or by EOIR in the intervening nine
23 years.

24 3.12 In August 2016, the EOIR's Fraud & Abuse Prevention Counsel, Brea C.
25 Burgie, contacted NWIRP to coordinate efforts on combatting "notario fraud."² Using funding
26 received from the Washington State Attorney General's Office, NWIRP had already
27 implemented a special project addressing notario fraud. NWIRP discussed with Ms. Burgie the

¹ The one exception, created in 2015, allows for a limited appearance only for the purpose of representing a respondent in a custody (bond) proceeding. *See* Separate Representation for Custody and Bond Proceedings, 80 Fed. Reg. 59,500 (Oct. 1, 2015) (amending 8 C.F.R. § 1003.17).

² The American Bar Association (ABA) describes this problem as "immigration consultants who are engaging in the unauthorized practice of law" by using "false advertising and fraudulent contacts [and] hold[ing] themselves out as qualified to help immigrants obtain lawful status, or perform[ing] legal functions such as drafting wills or other legal documents." *See* ABA, *Fight Notario Fraud*, http://www.americanbar.org/groups/public_services/immigration/projects_initiatives/fightnotariofraud.html.

1 tools it uses to combat such fraud, including community education outreach, KYR
2 presentations, and asylum workshops. The aim of these tools is to provide avenues, besides
3 notarios, for unrepresented people to seek assistance in filling out immigration applications
4 when they cannot afford the representation of an immigration attorney.

5 3.13 Ms. Burgie then requested a follow-up call with NWIRP to discuss the asylum
6 workshops. She noted that Defendant Jennifer Barnes, EOIR's Disciplinary Counsel, would
7 participate in the call. In the subsequent call on October 11, 2016, Defendant Barnes stated that
8 EOIR's regulations limit organizations, including nonprofit organizations, from assisting pro se
9 individuals in filling out asylum applications.

10 3.14 On April 13, 2017, NWIRP received a letter from Defendant Barnes on behalf
11 of EOIR's Office of General Counsel, stating EOIR was aware that NWIRP had assisted at
12 least two pro se applicants in filing motions without first filing notices of appearance with the
13 immigration court. Defendant Barnes instructed NWIRP to "cease and desist from representing
14 aliens unless and until the appropriate Notice of Entry of Appearance form is filed with each
15 client that NWIRP represents." A copy of the letter is attached hereto as *Exhibit 1*.

16 3.15 Attached to Defendant Barnes's letter were two motions to reopen that NWIRP
17 assisted pro se immigrant clients in preparing: one submitted to the Seattle Immigration Court,
18 and another submitted to the Tacoma Immigration Court at the NWDC. Both motions clearly
19 identified NWIRP as assisting the pro se individual in preparing the motion.

20 3.16 The motion filed with the Tacoma Court was a one-page template motion in
21 which a NWIRP advocate assisted the detained person by handwriting in the substance of the
22 basis for the detained person's request for a new hearing. The pro se individual later submitted
23 the motion through the internal mailing system at the detention center.

24 3.17 The motion filed with the Seattle Court was prepared and submitted on behalf of
25 a pro se individual by Plaintiff Maggie Cheng, a NWIRP staff attorney specializing in asylum
26 cases. The motion explained the reasons why the client had missed a prior hearing, which had
27 led the immigration court to issue an order of removal in absentia. In addition, the motion

1 explained that the respondent is prima facie eligible for asylum, withholding of removal, and
 2 protection under the Convention Against Torture (“CAT”). The motion stated that “Northwest
 3 Immigrant Rights Project is assisting [the respondent] in submitting this motion to reopen.”
 4 The motion included an application for asylum, withholding, and CAT protection. The motion
 5 also clearly identified Plaintiff Cheng as the attorney preparing the application, and it included
 6 Plaintiff Cheng’s contact information. After the motion to reopen was denied, Plaintiff Cheng
 7 submitted a notice of appearance with EOIR agreeing to directly represent the respondent in
 8 appealing the decision to the Board of Immigration Appeals.

9 **C. EOIR’s Threat to Impose Disciplinary Sanctions for Limited Legal**
 10 **Assistance Will Cripple Pro Bono Legal Aid to Immigrants**

11 3.18 There is no right to appointed counsel in immigration court, other than for
 12 detained individuals with serious mental illness or disorders.³ According to a recent national
 13 study, only 37 percent of individuals appearing before immigration court are represented; in
 14 Washington state, 65 percent of individuals are represented before the immigration court in
 15 Seattle, and only 8 percent in Tacoma.⁴ As of May 4, 2017, there are approximately 8,882
 16 pending cases before the Seattle and Tacoma immigration courts.⁵

17 3.19 Access to legal counsel critically affects an individual’s likelihood of success in
 18 removal proceedings. Non-detained individuals represented by counsel are five times more
 19 likely to submit applications for relief and over three times more likely to succeed than their
 20 unrepresented counterparts; even more significantly, detained individuals with representation
 21 are over ten times more likely to seek and succeed on their applications for relief when
 22 compared to their unrepresented counterparts.⁶ Yet, pro se immigrants—even those who are

23 _____
 24 ³ See INA § 240(b)(4)(A) (providing right to counsel “at no expense to the Government”); *Franco-Gonzalez v.*
 25 *Holder*, 767 F. Supp.2d 1034, 1058 (C.D. Cal. 2011) (finding that mentally disabled immigrant detainees are
 26 entitled to appointed counsel at the government’s expense).

27 ⁴ See Ingrid Eagly and Steven Shafer, American Immigration Council, *Access to Counsel in Immigration Court 5*
 (Sept. 2016), available at [https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/sites/default/files/research/
 access_to_counsel_in_immigration_court.pdf](https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/sites/default/files/research/access_to_counsel_in_immigration_court.pdf).

⁵ See TRAC Immigration, “Immigration Court Backlog Tool,” available at [http://trac.syr.edu/phptools/
 immigration/court_backlog/](http://trac.syr.edu/phptools/immigration/court_backlog/) (last visited May 4, 2017).

⁶ See Eagly & Shafer, *supra* n.3, at 10–20.

1 detained—are not entitled to any assistance in preparing and filing forms or briefs with EOIR.
2 Further, although 8 C.F.R. § 1003.33 requires that all written documents be submitted in
3 English, EOIR provides no translation assistance to persons in removal proceedings.

4 3.20 NWIRP seeks to meet the high demand for legal counsel through its staff and
5 pro bono volunteer attorneys, but there remain a vast number of individuals whom NWIRP
6 cannot represent or place with a pro bono attorney, or who require vital services before NWIRP
7 has the opportunity to evaluate their capacity for full representation.

8 3.21 NWIRP seeks to ameliorate the significant disadvantage faced by unrepresented
9 persons in removal proceedings by providing limited services to hundreds of unrepresented
10 individuals each year to whom it cannot provide full representation. Some of these services
11 include:

12 a. Provision of general information about the immigration court system,
13 such as an overview of court procedures, the elaborate procedural requirements for
14 filing applications with the immigration court, and the consequences of failing to appear
15 for a hearing;

16 b. Individual consultations to review the facts of a particular person’s case,
17 including assistance with record requests, to identify potential forms of relief and paths
18 to legal status;

19 c. Assistance in preparing applications for relief from removal, including i)
20 applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and relief under the Convention
21 Against Torture (“CAT”); ii) applications for cancellation of removal for lawful
22 permanent residents under 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(a); iii) applications for cancellation of
23 removal for non-permanent residents under § 1229b(b); iv) applications for U and T
24 non-immigrant status for victims of violent crimes and human trafficking; and v)
25 applications for family petitions;

26 d. In the case of asylum seekers in particular, expedited assistance in
27 preparing asylum applications, as immigrants are required to file asylum applications

1 with the immigration court within one year of arrival in the United States—a deadline
2 many are often unaware of until they are screened by NWIRP;

3 e. Assistance in gathering evidence and preparing packets of materials on
4 country conditions for detained individuals seeking asylum, withholding of removal,
5 and relief under CAT;

6 f. Assistance in filing motions to terminate removal proceedings where
7 DHS charges individuals as being deportable for certain criminal or immigration
8 violations that arguably do not constitute grounds of removability;

9 g. Assistance in filing motions to change venue, which require detailed
10 pleadings and statements of relief—a service that is particularly important for
11 individuals who have relocated to Washington after being detained and released near
12 the border, as their cases are still scheduled to continue at the border and most will be
13 ordered removed in absentia if they fail to travel to their court hearing; and

14 h. Assistance in filing motions to reopen cases where persons previously
15 ordered removed, often times in absentia, face imminent removal from the United States
16 unless they immediately file a motion to reopen.

17 3.22 When assisting individuals with these matters, NWIRP explains the scope of the
18 services that it will and will not provide to make sure the individual understands the nature of
19 the assistance. In every case where NWIRP is able to provide only limited services and not full
20 representation to a client, NWIRP obtains the client's informed consent to that limitation,
21 consistent with Washington Rule of Professional Conduct 1.2(c).

22 3.23 NWIRP cannot comply with EOIR's cease-and-desist letter without greatly
23 curtailing its services to immigrants. It does not have—and could not possibly be expected to
24 have—the resources to provide full representation to every person who is potentially eligible
25 for relief.

26 3.24 In fact, as written, EOIR's letter casts into doubt whether NWIRP can continue
27 to consult with unrepresented persons, screen cases for referral to volunteer attorneys, or

1 conduct workshops and presentations. Due to this uncertainty, NWIRP is now compelled to
2 choose between halting most of the services it provides to immigrants or continuing to provide
3 those services under threat of disciplinary sanctions. EOIR's letter has a considerable chilling
4 effect on NWIRP's activities, impairing NWIRP's ability to advocate for the statutory and
5 constitutional rights of immigrants.

6 3.25 EOIR's interpretation of its administrative rule fundamentally violates the First
7 Amendment rights of NWIRP and its attorneys to communicate and associate with their clients,
8 and to petition the government. It also encroaches upon the power reserved to Washington
9 (and other states) to regulate the practice of law—a power that belongs exclusively to the States
10 under the Tenth Amendment.

11 3.26 For these reasons, NWIRP now brings this lawsuit to enjoin EOIR from further
12 constitutional violations.

13 **IV. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION—VIOLATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT (AS**
14 **APPLIED)**

15 4.1 The First Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees Plaintiffs the
16 rights to free speech, to free assembly, and to petition the government.

17 4.2 Plaintiffs exercise these rights when they screen, consult with, advise, and
18 otherwise assist immigrants in need of legal services.

19 4.3 EOIR's new and overbroad interpretation of 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(i) and (k), as
20 incorporated into 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(t), violates the First Amendment by curtailing Plaintiffs'
21 exercise of their First Amendment rights.

22 4.4 This violation causes ongoing and irreparable harm to Plaintiffs, who have no
23 adequate remedy at law for EOIR's wrongful conduct. Absent immediate injunctive relief,
24 Plaintiffs will continue to suffer irreparable harm.

25 **V. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION—VIOLATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT**
26 **(FACIAL)**

27 5.1 The First Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantees Plaintiffs the
rights to free speech, to free assembly, and to petition the government.

1 federal administrative proceeding—or they may not. But these services occur outside the
2 confines of an EOIR administrative proceeding.

3 6.4 The Supreme Court of the State of Washington regulates the practice of law in
4 Washington. In furtherance of that power, the Supreme Court adopted the Washington Rules
5 of Professional Conduct (“WRPCs”), which govern the conduct of Washington-licensed
6 lawyers and their relationships with clients. Relevant here:

7 a. WRPC 1.2(c) allows lawyers to limit the scope of representation with the
8 informed consent of the client;

9 b. WRPC 1.6(a) prohibits a lawyer from revealing information relating to
10 the representation of a client absent informed consent; and

11 c. WRPC 6.5(a) provides special consideration for pro bono representation,
12 specifically where lawyers provide short-term limited legal services under the auspices
13 of a not-for-profit organization such as NWIRP.

14 6.5 EOIR’s new and overbroad interpretation of 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(i) and (k), as
15 incorporated into 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(t), violates the Tenth Amendment by purporting to
16 restrict and unduly burden Plaintiffs in their general practice of law before they have appeared
17 or agreed to represent a client in an agency proceeding. EOIR’s interpretation also violates the
18 Tenth Amendment because it conflicts with a Washington lawyer’s rights and obligations
19 established by the State as set forth in the WRPCs.

20 6.6 This violation causes ongoing and irreparable harm to Plaintiffs, who have no
21 adequate remedy at law. Absent immediate injunctive relief, Plaintiffs will continue to suffer
22 irreparable harm.

23 **VII. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION—VIOLATION OF THE TENTH**
24 **AMENDMENT (FACIAL)**

25 7.1 The Tenth Amendment prohibits the federal government from exercising powers
26 not expressly delegated to it by the Constitution, and reserves those powers to the States or to
27 the people.

1 7.2 Regulation of the practice of law is a matter reserved to the States. While the
2 federal government may regulate the conduct of attorneys who appear in federal administrative
3 proceedings, it may not promulgate or enforce general regulations affecting the conduct of
4 lawyers outside the scope of such proceedings, such as regulations that purport to prohibit
5 consulting with and/or providing limited services to pro se immigrants.

6 7.3 Many of NWIRP’s services—giving KYR presentations, consulting with
7 unrepresented persons, identifying defenses and forms of relief, advising persons regarding
8 procedural steps for obtaining relief, screening and evaluating cases, making referrals, and
9 assisting with forms and applications—are all part of the general practice of law. In the
10 performance of these services, NWIRP attorneys may agree to represent a client and appear in a
11 federal administrative proceeding—or they may not. But these services occur outside the
12 confines of an EOIR administrative proceeding.

13 7.4 The Supreme Court of the State of Washington regulates the practice of law in
14 Washington. In furtherance of that power, the Supreme Court adopted the WRPCs, which
15 govern the conduct of Washington-licensed lawyers and their relationships with clients.

16 7.5 In 1983, the American Bar Association promulgated Model Rules of
17 Professional Conduct (“MRPCs”), which have since been adopted by 49 states and the District
18 of Columbia.

19 7.6 Various WRPCs and MRPCs are implicated by EOIR’s action here, namely:

20 a. WRPC 1.2(c) and MRPC 1.2(c) allow lawyers to limit the scope of
21 representation with the informed consent of the client;

22 b. WRPC 1.6(a) and MRPC 1.6(a) prohibit a lawyer from revealing
23 information relating to the representation of a client absent informed consent; and

24 c. WRPC 6.5(a) and MRPC 6.5(a) provide special consideration for pro
25 bono representation, specifically where lawyers provide short-term limited legal
26 services under the auspices of a not-for-profit organization such as NWIRP.

27 7.7 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(k), as incorporated into 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(t), violates the

1 Tenth Amendment by restricting and unduly burdening Plaintiffs in their general practice of
2 law before they have appeared or agreed to represent a client in an agency proceeding. EOIR's
3 interpretation also violates the Tenth Amendment insofar as it conflicts with lawyers' rights
4 and duties established by the States as set forth in the WRPCs and the MRPCs.

5 7.8 This violation causes ongoing and irreparable harm to Plaintiffs, who have no
6 adequate remedy at law. Absent immediate injunctive relief, Plaintiffs will continue to suffer
7 irreparable harm.

8 **VIII. FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION—DECLARATORY JUDGMENT (28 U.S.C. § 2201)**

9 8.1 An actual controversy has arisen between Plaintiffs and EOIR. The parties have
10 genuine and opposing interests, which are direct and substantial.

11 8.2 A judicial determination of the parties' rights and other legal relations would
12 provide final and conclusive relief. Absent such a determination, Plaintiffs will continue to
13 suffer invasion of their constitutional rights due to EOIR's wrongful conduct.

14 8.3 Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that EOIR cannot lawfully enforce 8
15 C.F.R. § 1003.102(t).

16 8.4 In the alternative, Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that EOIR cannot
17 lawfully enforce 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(t) against Plaintiffs or any staff or volunteer attorney
18 under Plaintiffs' direction and control.

19 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

20 Plaintiffs respectfully pray for the following relief:

21 A. That the Court find and declare:

22 (i) 8 C.F.R. § 1001.1(k), as incorporated into 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(t), is
23 vague, overbroad, unduly burdensome, and violates the First and Tenth Amendments to the
24 United States Constitution; and

25 (ii) To the extent EOIR relies on 8 C.F.R. § 1001(i) and (k), as incorporated
26 into 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(t), to sanction, purport to sanction, or otherwise discipline Plaintiffs
27 and all other similarly situated attorneys for a) conduct unconnected with any agency

1 proceeding or b) the provision of limited services related to an agency proceeding in which the
2 attorney has not agreed to represent a client in the proceeding, EOIR violates the First and
3 Tenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;

4 B. That the Court enter an order permanently enjoining Defendants, their officers,
5 agents, representatives, servants, employees, successors and assigns, and all other persons in
6 active concert or participation with them, from:

7 (i) Enforcing the cease-and-desist letter, dated April 5, 2017, from
8 Defendant Barnes and EOIR's Office of General Counsel to NWIRP; and

9 (ii) Enforcing or threatening to enforce 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(t); or, in the
10 alternative,

11 (iii) Enforcing or threatening to enforce 8 C.F.R. § 1003.102(t) against
12 Plaintiffs and all other similarly situated attorneys for a) conduct unconnected with any
13 agency proceeding or b) the provision of limited legal services in which the attorney has
14 not appeared or otherwise agreed to represent a client in an agency proceeding;

15 C. That EOIR be required to pay to Plaintiffs both the costs of this action and
16 reasonable attorneys' fees incurred by Plaintiffs in pursuing this action, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §
17 504, 28 U.S.C. § 2412, and any other statute or other rule of law or equity which permits such
18 an award; and

19 D. That Plaintiffs be awarded such other, further, and additional relief as the Court
20 deems just and equitable.

1 DATED this 8th day of May, 2017.

2
3 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
Attorneys for Northwest Immigrant Rights Project

4 By s/ Michele Radosevich
Michele Radosevich, WSBA #24282

5
6 By s/ Jaime Drozd Allen
Jaime Drozd Allen, WSBA #35742

7 By s/ James Harlan Corning
James Harlan Corning, WSBA #45177

8
9 By s/ Robert E. Miller
Robert E. Miller, WSBA #46507

10 By s/ Laura-Lee Williams
Laura-Lee Williams, WSBA #51358

11
12 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 2200
Seattle, WA 98101-3045
13 Telephone: (206) 622-3150
Fax: (206) 757-7700
14 E-mail: micheleradosevich@dwt.com
jaimeallen@dwt.com
15 jamescorning@dwt.com
robertmiller@dwt.com
16 lauraleewilliams@dwt.com

17 NORTHWEST IMMIGRANT RIGHTS
18 PROJECT

19 By s/ Matt Adams
Matt Adams, WSBA #28287

20 By s/ Glenda M. Aldana Madrid
Glenda M. Aldana Madrid, WSBA # 46987

21
22 By s/ Leila Kang
Leila Kang, WSBA #48048

23 615 2nd Avenue, Suite 400
24 Seattle, WA 98104-2244
Phone: (206) 957-8611
25 Fax: (206) 587-4025
E-mail: matt@nwirp.org
26 glenda@nwirp.org
leila@nwirp.org