

1 PETER A. SCHEY (CAL. BAR NO. 58232)  
 2 CARLOS R. HOLGUIN (CAL. BAR NO. 90754)  
 3 CENTER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND CONSTITUTIONAL LAW  
 4 256 S. Occidental Blvd.  
 5 Los Angeles, CA 90057  
 6 Telephone: (213) 388-8693  
 7 Facsimile: (213) 386-9484  
 8 email: pschey@centerforhumanrights.org  
 9 crholguin@centerforhumanrights.org

10 AMY KAIZUKA (CAL. BAR NO. 224279)  
 11 JULIA R. WILSON (CAL. BAR NO. 196829)  
 12 ONEJUSTICE  
 13 1055 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 166  
 14 Los Angeles, CA 90017  
 15 Telephone: (213) 784-3937  
 16 email: akaizuka@one-justice.org  
 17 jwilson@one-justice.org  
 18 *Attorney for Plaintiffs (listing continues on following page)*

19 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

20 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION

21	COALITION FOR HUMANE IMMIGRANT	)	CASE No. 2:18-CV-08034
22	RIGHTS, NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP FOR	)	
23	NEW AMERICANS, UNIDOSUS, CASA,	)	COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND
24	EL RESCATE, MICHIGAN UNITED, MI	)	DECLARATORY RELIEF (FREEDOM OF
25	FAMILIA VOTA, NEW YORK	)	INFORMATION ACT).
26	IMMIGRATION COALITION,	)	
27	ONEAMERICA,	)	
28		)	
	Plaintiffs,	)	
	- vs -	)	
		)	
	UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP AND	)	
	IMMIGRATION SERVICES, DEPARTMENT	)	
	OF HOMELAND SECURITY,	)	
		)	
	Defendant.	)	

\_\_\_\_\_

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

*Plaintiffs' counsel continued:*

ERIN C. GANGITANO (CAL. BAR NO. 229824)  
ASIAN PACIFIC ISLANDER LEGAL OUTREACH  
1121 Mission St.  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
Telephone: (415) 567-6255  
Facsimile: (415) 567-6248  
email: ecgangitano@apilegaloutreach.org

LUIS A. PEREZ JIMENEZ (CAL. BAR NO. 319857)  
CINTHIA NATALY FLORES (CAL. BAR NO. 304025)  
COALITION FOR HUMANE IMMIGRANT RIGHTS  
2533 W. Third St., Suite 101  
Los Angeles, CA 90057  
Telephone: (213) 353-1333  
Facsimile: (213) 353-1344  
email: lperez@chirla.org  
cflores@chirla.org

///

I

INTRODUCTION

1  
2  
3  
4 1. This is an action under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552  
5 (FOIA), to compel the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”),  
6 to disclose public records of general, non-commercial value. Plaintiffs seek access to  
7 USCIS records which will further Plaintiffs’ study and assessment of the federal  
8 Government’s costs, budget allocations for, policies and practices relating to the  
9 adjudication of and delays in processing N-400 naturalization applications. In response  
10 to Plaintiffs’ FOIA requests, the USCIS has failed to provide an actual determination  
11 within the time limits prescribed by law, as to whether it will furnish or withhold  
12 requested records, and has refused to waive fees for processing Plaintiffs’ FOIA  
13 Request. Plaintiffs sue to enforce their rights to access to non-commercial public  
14 documents without fee, or at a reduced fee, and without further delay. Defendant’s  
15 extreme vetting of naturalization applications and delays in the processing of these  
16 applications denies thousands of lawful permanent residents the opportunity to more  
17 fully participate in civic life and to vote in important upcoming elections.  
18  
19  
20  
21

II

JURISDICTION

22  
23  
24  
25 2. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §  
26 552(a)(4)(B) and 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Venue is properly in this judicial district pursuant  
27 to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(B) because several of the plaintiffs, including the Coalition for  
28

1 Humane Immigrant Rights and El Rescate have their principal places of business  
2 within the jurisdiction of the Central District of California. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(B)  
3 (“Under the FOIA, an agency may be sued in the district where the plaintiff resides or  
4 has his principal place of business, or in the district where the records are located, or in  
5 the District of Columbia”).  
6

7  
8 III

9 PARTIES

10 3. Plaintiff Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA) is headquartered  
11 in Los Angeles, California and is a non-profit organization working to achieve a  
12 society inclusive of immigrants. CHIRLA organizes and serves individuals, institutions  
13 and coalitions to build power, transform public opinion, and change policies to achieve  
14 full human, civil and labor rights for immigrants. CHIRLA is a “person” within the  
15 meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 551(2), and is one of the organizations that requested access to  
16 Defendant’s records as alleged herein.  
17  
18

19 4. Plaintiff National Partnership for New Americans (NPNA) is a partnership  
20 representing the collective power and resources of the country’s 37 regional immigrant  
21 and refugee rights organizations in 31 states. Its members provide services—including  
22 naturalization, DACA renewal application processing, voter registration and health  
23 care enrollment—for their communities, and they combine service delivery with  
24 organizing tactics to advance local, state and federal policies. NPNA is a “person”  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 551(2), and is one of the organizations that requested  
2 access to Defendant's records as alleged herein.

3  
4 5. Plaintiff UnidosUS (previously known as National Council of La Raza  
5 (NCLR)) is headquartered in Washington, D.C. and is the nation's largest Hispanic  
6 civil rights and advocacy organization. Through its combination of research,  
7 advocacy, programs, and an Affiliate Network of nearly 300 community-based  
8 organizations UnidosUS challenges the social, economic, and political barriers that  
9 affect Latinos at the national and local levels. UnidosUS is a "person" within the  
10 meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 551(2), and is one of the organizations that requested access to  
11 Defendant's records as alleged herein.  
12

13  
14 6. Plaintiff CASA is headquartered in Maryland and is working to organize,  
15 advocate for, and expand opportunities for Latino and immigrant people in the state of  
16 Maryland. CASA does this by providing employment placement, workforce  
17 development and training, health education, citizenship and legal services, and  
18 financial, language, and literacy training to Latino and immigrant communities  
19 throughout the state. CASA is a "person" within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 551(2),  
20 and is one of the organizations that requested access to Defendant's records as alleged  
21 herein.  
22  
23

24  
25 7. Plaintiff El Rescate is headquartered in Los Angeles, CA and is a non-profit  
26 corporation dedicated to empowering immigrants to improve their political and  
27 economic well-being in order to promote their full participation as citizens. El Rescate  
28

1 is a “person” within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 551(2), and is one of the organizations  
2 that requested access to Defendant’s records as alleged herein.

3  
4 8. Plaintiff Michigan United is headquartered in Michigan and is an organization  
5 of community members and institutions fighting for the dignity and potential of every  
6 person. Michigan United is committed to participatory democracy at every level, an  
7 economy that works for the many, and society that dismantles racism while uplifting  
8 our common humanity. Michigan United is a “person” within the meaning of 5 U.S.C.  
9 § 551(2), and is one of the organizations that requested access to Defendant’s records  
10 as alleged herein.  
11

12  
13 9. Plaintiff Mi Familia Vota has locations in Arizona, California, Texas,  
14 Colorado, Nevada, and Florida and is a national civic engagement organization that  
15 unites Latino, immigrant, and allied communities to promote social and economic  
16 justice through citizenship workshops, voter registration, and voter participation. Mi  
17 Familia Vota is a “person” within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 551(2), and is one of the  
18 organizations that requested access to Defendant’s records as alleged herein.  
19

20  
21 10. Plaintiff New York Immigration Coalition (NYIC) is headquartered in New  
22 York and is a policy and advocacy organization that represents immigrant and refugee  
23 rights groups throughout New York. The NYIC membership base includes  
24 grassroots and nonprofit community organizations, religious and academic  
25 institutions, labor unions, as well as legal and socioeconomic justice  
26 organizations. NYIC is an “organization” within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 551(2),  
27  
28

1 and is one of the organizations that requested access to Defendant’s records as alleged  
2 herein.

3  
4 11. Plaintiff OneAmerica is headquartered in Washington and is the largest  
5 immigration and refugee advocacy organization in the state of Washington, organizing  
6 with and advocating for diverse communities including Latin, African, and Asian.  
7 OneAmerica advances the fundamental principles of democracy and justice at the  
8 local, state, and national level by building power within immigrant communities in  
9 collaboration with key allies. OneAmerica is a “person” within the meaning of 5  
10 U.S.C. § 551(2), and is one of the organizations that requested access to Defendant’s  
11 records as alleged herein.  
12  
13

14 12. Defendant United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) is a  
15 component agency of the United States Department of Homeland Security charged  
16 with setting and implementing policies around naturalization and processing and  
17 adjudicating naturalization applications. Defendant USCIS also has custody and  
18 control of the public records Plaintiffs requested pursuant to the FOIA, as alleged  
19 herein.  
20  
21

## 22 IV

### 23 FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

24  
25 13. On August 6, 2018, Plaintiffs submitted a written request pursuant to 5  
26 U.S.C. § 552 (“FOIA Request”) to defendant USCIS seeking access to the following  
27 categories of documents:  
28

- 1 • All documents that report to USCIS Headquarters and those generated by  
2 USCIS Headquarters on numbers of approvals and denials of N-400 naturalization  
3 applications including but not limited to data compilations that in any way provide the  
4 reasons for denials of N-400 naturalization applications.  
5
- 6 • All documents compiling data submitted by one or more of the agency's  
7 locations processing or adjudicating N-400 naturalization applications or produced by  
8 USCIS Headquarters related to the volume of or reasons for RFEs ("Requests For  
9 Evidence") and NOID ("Notices of Intent to Deny") notifications issued in N-400  
10 cases.  
11
- 12 • All documents compiling data submitted by one or more of the agency's  
13 locations processing or adjudicating N-400 naturalization applications or produced by  
14 USCIS Headquarters related to the delay in processing N-400 applications.  
15
- 16 • All documents relating to funds allocated by Congress for the processing and/or  
17 adjudication of N-400 applications.  
18
- 19 • All documents compiling data that show the fees received with naturalization  
20 applications, excluding documents relating to individual cases such as receipts,  
21 deposits, etc.  
22
- 23 • All documents regarding USCIS's allocation of funds to its various facilities and  
24 field offices for the processing or adjudication of N-400 applications.  
25  
26  
27  
28

- 1 • All documents relating in whole or in part to decisions by USCIS officials  
2 regarding allocations of funds to the processing centers and field offices for the  
3 adjudication of N-400 applications.
- 4
- 5 • All documents that address or concern delays or backlogs in the processing time  
6 for naturalization applications.
- 7
- 8 • To the extent not provided in response to Request Number 8, all data  
9 compilations and spreadsheets addressing in whole or in part delays or backlogs in the  
10 processing or adjudication of naturalization applications.
- 11
- 12 • To the extent not provided in response to a separate request, all documents  
13 reporting on: (a) the volume of naturalization applications received; (b) where the  
14 applications were received; (c) where the applications were processed and adjudicated;  
15 and (d) how long it took to fully process and adjudicate the naturalization applications.
- 16
- 17 • All documents relating to inquiries from or responses to members of Congress  
18 relating to the delays in processing N-400 applications.
- 19
- 20 • All documents including but not limited to memoranda, guidance, instructions,  
21 or directives issued to facilities, centers, or field offices discussing policy or  
22 procedures to be followed in the processing or adjudication of N-400 applications.
- 23
- 24 • All documents and data compilations sent to or prepared by the Administrative  
25 Appeals Office addressing the number of pending and decided appeals of denials of N-  
26 400 applications and the outcome of those appeals. This request does not seek copies  
27 of the individual appeals or decisions.
- 28

- 1 • All documents sent to or prepared by USCIS regarding delays in naturalization  
2 applications due to problems implementing or using the Electronic Immigration  
3 System (“ELIS”).
- 4
- 5 • All documents and data relied upon in The Department of Homeland Security  
6 Ombudsman 2017 Annual Report To Congress regarding the USCIS (at  
7 [https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/DHS%20Annual%20Report%202017\\_0.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/DHS%20Annual%20Report%202017_0.pdf)).  
8
- 9
- 10 • All documents and data relied upon in The Department of Homeland Security  
11 Office of Inspector General Report “USCIS Has Been Unsuccessful in Automating  
12 Naturalization Benefits Delivery,” dated November 30, 2017 (at  
13 [https://www.oig.dhs.gov/reports/2018/uscis-has-been-unsuccessful-automating-](https://www.oig.dhs.gov/reports/2018/uscis-has-been-unsuccessful-automating-naturalization-benefits-delivery/oig-18-23)  
14 [naturalization-benefits-delivery/oig-18-23](https://www.oig.dhs.gov/reports/2018/uscis-has-been-unsuccessful-automating-naturalization-benefits-delivery/oig-18-23)).  
15
- 16
- 17 • All complaints filed by naturalization applicants or those acting on behalf of  
18 naturalization applicants regarding inappropriate, abusive, or discriminatory treatment  
19 of naturalization applicants by USCIS employees.
- 20
- 21 • All documents related to a review, update, or revision of the USCIS Fee Review  
22 Study described here: [https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/05/04/2016-](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/05/04/2016-10297/us-citizenship-and-immigration-services-fee-schedule)  
23 [10297/us-citizenship-and-immigration-services-fee-schedule](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/05/04/2016-10297/us-citizenship-and-immigration-services-fee-schedule).
- 24
- 25 • All documents relied upon, issued in response to, or to implement the change in  
26 the mission of USCIS announced on February 22, 2018 described here:  
27  
28

1 <https://www.uscis.gov/news/news-releases/uscis-director-l-francis-cissna-new-agency->  
2 mission-statement

3 • All documents received by USCIS from the White House or forwarded by  
4 USCIS to the White House regarding in whole or in part the processing or adjudication  
5 of naturalization applications.  
6

7  
8 14. The FOIA Request asked Defendant USCIS to waive fees for processing  
9 Plaintiffs' request pursuant to 6 C.F.R. § 5.11(k) on the grounds (i) that Plaintiffs are  
10 non-profit organizations, and (ii) that the requested information will be used solely for  
11 humanitarian purposes  
12

13 15. The FOIA Request also advised, “[i]f you find it impossible to produce all  
14 documents called for by this request within the statutorily prescribed time limits, please  
15 produce all documents that are located by you within such time and advise us when  
16 you believe the remainder of the documents requested will be produced.”  
17

18 16. More than 30 days have passed since the request was submitted, and  
19 Defendant has not notified Plaintiffs as to whether it will comply with their request.  
20 Thus, under 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i) and 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(C), Plaintiffs has  
21 exhausted the applicable administrative remedies with respect to their FOIA request.  
22

23 17. In light of Defendant's non-response to Plaintiffs' Request, an administrative  
24 appeal is not required. Nevertheless, on September 14, 2018 Plaintiffs brought  
25 Defendant's non-response to Plaintiffs' Request to the attention of the agency by way  
26 of administrative appeal.  
27  
28

1 18. Plaintiffs have private rights of action against Defendant USCIA, as pleaded  
2 herein, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552 and the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §  
3 706.  
4

5 V

6 FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

7 [Failure to Make Timely Determination of FOIA Request]

8  
9 19. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference ¶¶ 1 through 18 of this  
10 Complaint as though fully set forth here.  
11

12 20. Plaintiffs have received no communication from USCIS that contains the  
13 notification required by 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i). Defendant USCIS's failure to  
14 respond within the statutory time limit violates 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A) and prejudices  
15 Plaintiffs by preventing them from undertaking any collateral action on Defendant's  
16 likely attempts to avoid producing the requested documents. Defendant's failure to  
17 make a timely determination on Plaintiffs' FOIA Request is arbitrary and capricious.  
18 Thus, this determination renders Defendant USCIS in violation of 5 U.S.C. § 552, 6  
19 C.F.R. § 5.5, the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 706, *et seq.*, and the Due  
20 Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

VI

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

[Unlawful refusal to waive or reduce fees]

21. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference ¶¶ 1 through 18 of this Complaint as though fully set forth here.

22. Plaintiffs' FOIA Request seeks disclosure of documents without commercial value and solely to further governmental transparency by allowing a study and assessment of the federal Government's costs, budget allocations for, policies and practices relating to the adjudication of and delays in processing of N-400 naturalization applications. Defendant USCIS's refusal to waive or reduce fees for processing Plaintiffs' FOIA Request amounts to a violation of 5 U.S.C. § 552, 6 C.F.R. § 5.11(k)(1), the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 706, *et seq.*, and the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE Plaintiffs pray this Court —

1. Enjoin Defendants from demanding fees, or refusing to reduce fees, as a condition of producing the records Plaintiffs' FOIA Request seeks;

2. Enjoin Defendants from withholding the agency records Plaintiffs' FOIA Request seeks and require Defendants to produce such records forthwith, or in the alternative, to make a determination forthwith regarding Plaintiffs' FOIA Request that meets the requirements of 5 U.S.C. §552(a)(4)(G)(6) and 6 C.F.R. § 5.5;

1 3. Make a written finding pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(F) that the  
2 circumstances surrounding Defendants’ withholding of the requested records raise  
3 questions whether agency personnel acted arbitrarily or capriciously with respect to  
4 such withholding; and  
5

6 4. Award Plaintiffs reasonable attorney’s fees and costs pursuant to 5 U.S.C. §  
7 552(a)(4)(E) or the Equal Access to Justice Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2412(d);  
8

9 5. Grant such other and further relief as Plaintiffs may seek or the Court may  
10 deem just and proper.  
11

12 Dated: September 17, 2018.

PETER A. SCHEY  
CARLOS R. HOLGUIN  
CENTER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND  
CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

15 AMY KAIZUKA  
16 JULIA R. WILSON  
17 ONEJUSTICE

18 LUIS A. PEREZ JIMENEZ  
19 CINTHIA NATALY FLORES  
20 COALITION FOR HUMANE IMMIGRANT  
RIGHTS

21 ERIN C. GANGITANO  
22 ASIAN PACIFIC ISLANDER LEGAL  
23 OUTREACH

24 Signed: /s/ Peter A. Schey  
25 *Attorneys for plaintiffs*

26 ///  
27  
28