



# City of Cambridge

## Executive Department

**YI-AN HUANG**  
City Manager

CMA 2026-153  
**IN CITY COUNCIL**  
May 18, 2026

To the Honorable, the City Council:

The City Manager will give a Federal update and the Law Department will provide an update on relevant court cases.

Very truly yours,

Yi-An Huang  
City Manager





**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
King County v. Turner	25-3664, 26-1689 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-00814 (W.D. Wash.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge is a plaintiff in this case.</b></p> <p>Plaintiffs sued Secretary of Transportation, HUD, Secretary of HHS, and HHS for imposing conditions on grants to local governments, including HUD Continuum of Care and DOT grants. The conditions include prohibitions on DEI, "gender ideology," "elective abortions," and aid to immigrants. The imposed conditions threaten over \$12 billion dollars in federal funding. Local governments argue that in imposing conditions on grants, the federal government violates the separation of powers, Spending Clause, the Tenth Amendment, the Due Process Clause (Vagueness), and the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).</p>	<p>Preliminary Injunction entered in favor of local governments on June 3, 2025. The Preliminary Injunction Order has allowed the City to enter into grant agreements with HUD for the Continuum of Care grant funds. Federal government appealed. Appeal pending.</p> <p>A Motion for Preliminary Injunction, asking the Court to order that the conditions do not apply to additional grants, such as CDBG grants, was granted on August 12, 2025. Federal government appealed the August 12 order. On November 12, 2025, the District Court allowed plaintiffs to amend the complaint a third time to add 15 new local governmental entities. A further motion for preliminary injunction was granted by the District Court, on January 21, 2026, extending relief to further local governmental entities. On February 9, 2026, oral arguments were held in the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals regarding the Federal government's appeal of the District Court's preliminary injunction. The parties are awaiting a decision from the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals. A further appeal to the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit was filed on March 18, 2026.</p>
San Francisco v. Trump	25-3889 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir.) 25-cv- 01350 (N.D. Cal.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge is a plaintiff in this case.</b></p> <p>Lawsuit to enjoin enforcement of President Trump's initial Sanctuary Jurisdiction Executive Order (EO). Plaintiffs argue the EO violates the Tenth Amendment, Separation of Powers, Spending Clause, and Due Process Clause.</p>	<p>Preliminary Injunction entered in favor of local governments, ordering that the Federal government cannot enforce the Sanctuary Jurisdiction EO. Federal government appealed. Appeal oral argument scheduled for December 5, 2025.</p> <p>Second Amended Complaint (SAC) filed that added Cambridge as a plaintiff. Federal government moved to dismiss the SAC. On January 20, 2026, the District Court denied the motion to dismiss the SAC.</p> <p>Plaintiffs filed a second Motion for Preliminary Injunction asking the Court to prevent the Federal government from enforcing Sanctuary Jurisdiction EOs against all of the Plaintiffs, including Cambridge. The Court allowed the motion.</p>
NAEH v. HUD	26-1218 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-00636 (D.R.I.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge is a plaintiff in this case. This case is similar to <u>State of Washington v. HUD</u> (see below) but extends the litigation from the state level to local nonprofits and governments.</b></p> <p>Multiple nonprofits and local governments, including Cambridge, are challenging HUD's changes to the Continuum of Care grant program, which has provided funds to local governments and organizations to fund permanent housing for vulnerable populations. The plaintiffs argue that reversing previous HUD Housing First policy and the imposition of unlawful conditions violates the APA, the Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, and the First Amendment. The plaintiffs are requesting that the Court order HUD to grant CoC funds on the same basis it did in the last fiscal year, and to strike the unlawful conditions.</p>	<p>Plaintiff nonprofits and local governments filed a motion for preliminary injunction, which was granted on December 19, 2025. An order expediting summary judgment was also granted by the Court. An amended complaint and motion for summary judgment were filed by plaintiffs on January 14, 2026. On January 23, 2026, the federal government filed a cross motion for summary judgment and opposition to NAEH's motion for summary judgment. Summary judgment briefing continues. No argument date set yet. The federal government filed a motion to dissolve the December 19, 2025 preliminary injunctions on an emergency expedited basis. The District Court denied that motion on March 6, 2026. The federal government has since appealed to the 1<sup>st</sup> Circuit for an emergency stay pending appeal. On April 1, 2026, the 1<sup>st</sup> Circuit denied the federal government's motion for a stay pending appeal. On April 27, 2026, the Appeals Court entered judgment dismissing the appeal and issued the Appeals Court's mandate. Separately, the federal government appealed to the 1<sup>st</sup> Circuit the rulings for injunctive relief in favor of the plaintiff nonprofits and local governments.</p> <p>On April 27, 2026, the District Court held a status conference concerning delays in HUD's issuance of awards. The court expressed concern about the length of time for award announcements to be</p>



**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
			<p>made, and unexplained delays preventing announced awards from becoming available to grantees. To address these concerns, the court instructed HUD to submit a status report providing details as to status of awards. After the status report is submitted, Plaintiffs will have the opportunity to amend the briefing to include unreasonable delay claims under the APA. The required status report was filed on May 4, 2026. As of May 12, 2026, plaintiffs have not amended to include unreasonable delay claims.</p>
<p>State of New York v. U.S. Department of Justice (PWORA case)</p>	<p>25-2099 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-00345 (D.R.I.)</p>	<p><b>An order in this case applies to the City of Cambridge.</b></p> <p>States challenged the revocation of various exemptions under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA). PRWORA is part of the federal welfare system and governs the eligibility of noncitizens for public benefits. Several federal agencies issued new requirements requiring recipients of federal funding to be checked for immigration status. This has meant that many undocumented immigrants who previously had access to certain federal benefits under the agency exemptions are no longer exempted. This also means that states administering federal benefit programs are now required to implement verification schemes to verify the status of benefit recipients, even if the programs previously did not require such verification.</p>	<p>On July 30, the federal defendants stipulated they would not enforce the challenged notices against the plaintiff states until September 10, 2025. The federal defendants also stipulated that they would not enforce the notices based on conduct occurring in the plaintiff States prior to September 11, 2025; funds expended in the plaintiff States prior to September 11, 2025; or any other actions taken in reliance on this Stipulation prior to September 11, 2025. Since Massachusetts is a plaintiff, this applies to Cambridge. On September 10, 2025, the Court granted plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction, which applies to Cambridge. On September 23, 2025, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint. Defendants moved to stay the case because of the Federal shutdown. The District Court denied the request. An appeal of the preliminary injunction ruling was filed on November 7, 2025. On December 11, 2025, the appeal was voluntarily dismissed pursuant to a joint stipulation.</p> <p>On December 4, 2025, the plaintiff states filed a third amended complaint. On December 8, 2025, a stipulation was filed wherein the federal defendants consented to the third amended complaint and agreed to stay enforcement and application of the HUD PRWORA Notice until judgment issues. Summary judgment briefing is scheduled to end on April 17, 2026.</p>
<p>City of Chicago v. Noem</p>	<p>25-cv-12765 (N.D. Ill.)</p>	<p><b>The City of Boston is a plaintiff in this case. Also, Cambridge, as part of “Boston-Cambridge-Newton, MA-NH Funded Urban Area,” receives UASI funds that are at issue in the case.</b></p> <p>Chicago, Boston, and other cities allege that DHS and FEMA are violating separation of powers principles, taking action not authorized by Congress, violating Congress’ power of the purse, and violating the APA because they are compelling compliance with anti-DEI requirements as part of their terms and conditions for local governments, like the City of Cambridge, to receive funding for programs supporting mitigation and prevention of natural disasters, terrorist attacks, mass shootings, and other complex emergencies.</p>	<p>Complaint filed on October 20, 2025. Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction on October 24, 2025. On November 21, 2025, the District Court entered a preliminary injunction. In doing so, the court found that the federal government likely violated the APA. On January 20, 2026, the federal government filed a notice appealing the preliminary injunction. Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint on January 21, 2026. On March 2, 2026, the District Court granted a second preliminary injunction that applies to new plaintiffs in the case.</p>



**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
State of Illinois v. HUD	26-cv-02262 (N.D. Cal.)	<p><b>The Commonwealth is a plaintiff in the case and relief is sought that would apply to the City of Cambridge.</b></p> <p>Plaintiff states allege that HUD’s ambiguous, arbitrary, and capricious changes to the Fair Housing Enforcement Policy violate the APA and threaten their substantial equivalency certification, fund reimbursement, and future processing of claims under state law. Plaintiff States also allege HUD’s actions are contrary to the Spending Clause.</p>	Complaint filed on March 16, 2026.
Newsom v. Trump	25-3727; 25-5553 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir.); 25-cv-04870 (N.D. CA)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined amicus briefs in the District Court and in the Appellate Court.</b></p> <p>California seeks order prohibiting the Department of Defense from federalizing the CA National Guard and deploying it to conduct domestic law enforcement without meeting statutory requirements.</p>	<p>U.S. District Court ruled that federal deployment of CA National Guard was illegal and violated the 10<sup>th</sup> amendment. On June 15, 2025, the City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief arguing that the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit should not stay the District Court’s ordered temporary relief. On June 19, 2025, the Ninth Circuit stayed the lower court order pending appeal. On October 7, 2025, California requested the Ninth Circuit vacate the June 19<sup>th</sup> order or grant a motion for an injunction pending appeal.</p> <p>After a three-day bench trial, on September 2, 2025, the District Court ruled that the federal government violated the Posse Comitatus Act when it unlawfully deployed National Guard troops to Los Angeles for immigration enforcement operations. The District Court’s ruling was meant to bar “deploying, ordering, instructing, training, or using the National Guard currently deployed in California, and any military troops heretofore deployed in California, to execute the laws, including but not limited to engaging in arrests, apprehensions, searches, seizures, security patrols, traffic control, crowd control, riot control, evidence collection, interrogation, or acting as informants.”</p> <p>On September 2, 2025, plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction to enjoin an August 5, 2025 order federalizing and deploying 300 members of California’s National Guard for ninety days and to return control of the California National Guard to Governor Newsom. On September 4, 2025, the 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. stayed this order pending an appeal by the federal government. Oral argument before a panel of the 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. took place on October 22, 2025. That same day, a judge of the court requested a vote to rehear the case en banc. That vote failed.</p> <p>On October 29, 2025, the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit ruled that the District Court retains jurisdiction over the plaintiffs’ challenge to the August 5 order. On November 4, 2025, the District Court lifted its stay of proceedings related to plaintiffs’ motion to enjoin the August 5 order and set an expedited briefing schedule. A hearing took place on December 5, 2025, on the plaintiffs’ renewed motion for preliminary injunction. A motion to dismiss the complaint was filed that same day by the federal government.</p> <p>On December 10, 2025, the District Court issued an order enjoining deployment of the CA Nat’l. Guard in Los Angeles and directed return of control of the CA Nat’l. Guard to Gov. Newsome. The federal government</p>



**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
			<p>appealed this order.</p> <p>After the Supreme Court issued its decision in the related Illinois case, the federal government announced the withdrawal of troops from Los Angeles, Chicago, and Portland.</p> <p>On January 12, 2026, the 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. entered an order holding in abeyance the appeal docketed as No. 25-5553 pending resolution of related appeals. On May 12, 2026, the parties filed a status report wherein they agreed No. 25-5553 should continue to be held in abeyance. On January 16, 2026, the District Court stayed further briefing related to the federal government’s motion to dismiss the lower court case until further order of the Court or until the 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. resolves appeals in related cases. On January 23, 2026, the federal government moved to dismiss the appeal docketed as No. 25-3727.</p>
Commonwealth of MA v. National Institutes of Health, et al, and other associated cases	25-1343 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir.); 25-cv-10338 (D. Mass.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>MA argues that cap of 15% reimbursement for all new grants, regardless of the indirect cost needs of the institution, violates the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	U.S. District Court issued a final judgment enjoining federal government’s 15% cap on reimbursement for all new grants. Federal government appealed. On January 5, 2026, the Appeals Court affirmed the lower court judgment, and the Appeals Court’s mandate entered on February 27, 2026. Federal government has until April 29, 2026 to appeal.
United States v. City of Rochester	25-cv-06226 (W.D.N.Y.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>Federal government sued Rochester seeking injunctive relief holding that sanctuary policies violate the Supremacy Clause.</p>	Cross motions for judgment on the pleadings filed by both parties. Amicus brief, in which Cambridge joined, filed on August 28, 2025. Case dismissed, without prejudice, as moot. Federal government filed an amended complaint on December 19, 2025. A motion to dismiss the amended complaint was filed on behalf of the City of Rochester, while the federal government has moved for summary judgment.



**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
United States v. City of Newark	25-cv-05081 (D. N.J.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>Federal government alleges local governments and officials violated the Supremacy Clause because sanctuary laws conflict with federal law, local laws unlawfully regulate the federal government, and local laws discriminate against the federal government by marking out federal immigration authorities for disfavored treatment. The federal government seeks declaratory and injunctive relief.</p>	<p>Defendant local governments moved to dismiss. No argument date yet.</p> <p>Federal government moved to stay this case due to the federal government shutdown. District Court of N.J. denied the request because the federal government’s claimed allegations of a grave national emergency at the “Southern Border” warrant “this action proceeding in its ordinary course.”</p>
Lujan v. FMCSA	25-cv-1215 (D.C. Cir.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>Suit was filed contesting an interim final rule issued by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA). FMCSA's rule bars asylum seekers, refugees, and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) recipients with work authorization from holding non-domiciled commercial driver’s licenses.</p>	<p>As of November 13, 2025, FMCSA’s rule is stayed because rule likely improperly issued, was issued without notice and comment, FMCSA acted arbitrarily and capriciously, individual drivers/businesses would be irreparably harmed, and rule would more likely act to harm the public than protect it from a public safety standpoint. The City of Cambridge has also joined other local governments in submitting comments to the FMCSA on its <a href="#">decision</a> to severely narrow the ability for non-citizens to obtain commercial driver’s licenses. The case was ordered to be held in abeyance. A further amicus brief was filed, on March 5, 2026, supporting plaintiffs’ challenge of the interim final version of the rule revoking eligibility of some non-domiciled people for commercial drivers licenses.</p>
National TPS Alliance v. Noem	25-5724 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>An appeal of a summary judgment order vacating the federal government’s vacatur and termination of TPS for Venezuela and vacatur of TPS for Haiti.</p>	<p>The amicus brief Cambridge joined was filed on November 12, 2025. On January 28, 2026, a panel of the 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. ruled that the federal government violated the Immigration and Nationality Act and “[t]he [DHS] Secretary’s actions fundamentally contradict Congress’s statutory design, and her assertion of a raw, unchecked power to vacate a country’s TPS is irreconcilable with the plain language of the statute.” On February 3, 2026, the federal government petitioned for rehearing en banc. On March 11, 2026, that petition was denied by the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit, and on March 14, 2026 the court’s mandate entered.</p> <p>In the underlying case, <a href="#">National TPS Alliance v. Noem</a>, 25-cv-01766 (N.D. CA), the District Court granted on December 10, 2025, Plaintiffs’ motion for <a href="#">declaratory relief</a>, finding the vacatur of the January 17, 2025 extension of Venezuela’s TPS designation and the termination of the 2023 TPS designation of Venezuela unlawful. This case also involves the TPS designation impacting Haiti. The federal government separately appealed this order on January 8, 2026. That appeal is docketed as 26-187 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.).</p>



**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
National TPS Alliance v. Noem	25-4901 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>An appeal of an order postponing the effective date of the federal government’s vacatur of TPS for Honduras, Nepal, and Nicaragua.</p>	<p>In the underlying district court case, <u>NTPSA v. Noem</u>, 25-cv-05687 (N.D. CA), an order was entered, on July 31, 2025, continuing TPS for 60,000 individuals from Honduras, Nicaragua, and Nepal. The federal government appealed that order and, on August 20, 2025, a three-judge panel of the 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. granted the federal government’s request to stay, pending appeal, the district court order continuing TPS for those individuals.</p> <p>Briefs addressing the overall propriety of the lower court case were later filed by the parties and amici. Argument has not been scheduled. However, during the appeal the district court case continued to proceed, and on December 31, 2025, the district court entered an order that in part granted summary judgment for NTPSA on two of the APA claims. On January 8, 2026, the federal government appealed that ruling to the 9<sup>th</sup> Cir.</p>
United States v. City of Boston	25-cv-12456 (D. Mass.)	<p><b>The City of Boston is a defendant in this case, and the City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>Federal government sued Boston seeking injunctive relief holding that sanctuary policies violate the Supremacy Clause.</p>	<p>On November 17, 2025, Boston filed a motion to dismiss, and the City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief filed in the U.S. District Court in support of Boston. Federal government filed its opposition brief on January 7, 2026. On March 18, 2026, the District Court ordered the parties brief whether the federal government has Article III standing as to each of its claims against the City of Boston. Motion to dismiss hearing scheduled for May 13, 2026,</p>
United States v. New York City	25-cv-04084 (E.D.N.Y.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>Federal government alleges local government violated the Supremacy Clause because sanctuary laws conflict with federal law. The federal government seeks declaratory and injunctive relief.</p>	<p>Defendant local government moved to dismiss. No argument date yet, but the amicus brief has been docketed.</p>



**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
Watson v. Republican Nat'l. Committee	24-1260 (Supreme Court)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>Local election officials nationwide oppose a 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals decision invalidating post-Election Day ballot receipt deadlines and counting procedures, which would make the processing of provisional ballots, absentee ballots, and Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA) ballots impossible. This is an argument regarding whether federal law preempts state laws.</p>	Argued on March 23, 2026.
State of Minnesota, et al. v. Noem, et al.	26-cv-00190 (D. Minn.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>Lawsuit to enjoin the unwanted federal law enforcement “surge” in Minnesota. Plaintiffs argue the “surge” violates the Tenth Amendment, Equal Sovereignty, and Administrative Procedures Act; is unconstitutional retaliation and viewpoint discrimination in violation of the First Amendment; and constitutes ultra vires executive action.</p> <p>The State of Illinois and City of Chicago, on January 12, 2026, filed a similar suit. 26-cv-321 (N.D. Ill.).</p>	District Court converted plaintiffs’ motion for a temporary restraining order (TRO) to a motion for preliminary injunction (PI). The District Court held that Minnesota did not meet its burden of showing that the Tenth Amendment (anticommandeering) and/or Equal Sovereignty require the grant of a preliminary injunction halting a federal law enforcement operation. On April 20, 2026, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint. A response to the Amended Complaint is due by May 20, 2026.
National Council of Nonprofits et al. v. McMahon	25-cv-13242 (D. Mass.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>This case changes a rule change to the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program. The rule would allow Secretary McMahon to disqualify employers she deems to be engaging in “substantially illegal activities,” which include: providing gender affirming care to transgender youth, supporting undocumented immigrants and their families, promoting “diversity, equity, and inclusion,” calling for an end to the war in Gaza and engaging in protests and demonstration activities.</p> <p>The City attracts employees because of the ability to participate in the PSLF program, and many of the City’s employees currently are enrolled in the PSLF program. This rule change would change the program into a political tool to coerce municipalities to adopt the views of the federal administration.</p>	The amicus brief that Cambridge joined was filed on February 24, 2026. A hearing on the dispositive motions filed in the case is scheduled for June 3, 2026.



**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
Donald J. Trump v. Barbara	25-365 (Supreme Court)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>This case challenges an executive order that ends birthright citizenship to babies born in the US after February 19, 2025 to parents without legal status. The case is a nationwide class action. The federal administration has appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. The case is led by the ACLU and argues the order violates the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment.</p>	Lower courts blocked the executive order and on December 5, 2025, the Supreme Court granted certiorari. The amicus brief was filed on February 26, 2026. Argued on April 1, 2026.
President and Fellows of Harvard College v. DHS, et al.	25-1627 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-11472 (D. Mass.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge filed an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>Harvard contests federal government’s revocation of Harvard’s ability to enroll foreign students and otherwise prevent foreign students from enrolling at Harvard.</p>	<p>U.S. District Court entered order enjoining federal government from “implementing, instituting, maintaining, or giving any force or effect” to the federal government’s revocation of Harvard’s ability to enroll foreign students. Court likewise enjoined presidential proclamation barring foreign students destined for Harvard. Federal government appealed. Appeal pending regarding injunction. Cambridge’s brief in support of Harvard filed on January 16, 2026.</p> <p>The 1<sup>st</sup> Cir. will coordinate argument of this matter with argument of President and Fellows of Harvard College v. HHS, et al., 25-2230.</p>
Miot v. Trump	25-1084 (consolidated with 25-1083) (Supreme Court) 26-5050 (D.C. Cir.) 25-cv-02471 (D. D.C.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>Case concerns TPS status for Haitians. Plaintiffs sued to postpone termination of TPS status for Haiti on grounds that termination as implemented by DHS was arbitrary and capricious and violated equal protection.</p>	The District Court stayed the termination of the TPS designation for Haiti pending judicial review. The federal government appealed for a stay of the District Court order pending appeal. The D.C. Circuit denied the federal government’s motion for a stay of the District Court’s order. As a result, Haiti TPS beneficiaries will retain protections and benefits, including employment authorization and protection from detention and deportation, pending further judicial review. The Supreme Court granted a petition for writ of certiorari before judgment and heard arguments in this case and in another consolidated case on April 29, 2026. The Supreme Court taking the case at this stage indicates the Supreme Court believes this case is of national significance and should proceed on an expedited timeline. The District Court case is stayed pending resolution of the Supreme Court’s decision.



**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
Mullin v. Dahlia Doe	25-1083 (consolidated with 25-1084) (Supreme Court) 25-2995 (2 <sup>nd</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-08686 (S.D.N.Y.)	<b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b>  Case concerns TPS status for Syrians. Plaintiffs sued to postpone termination of TPS status for Syrians on grounds that termination as implemented by DHS was arbitrary and capricious and violated equal protection.	(See <u>Miot v. Trump</u> above)
Danco Labs v. State of Louisiana	25A1207 & 25A1208 (Supreme Court)	<b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case.</b>  Whether the Supreme Court should stay or vacate the 5 <sup>th</sup> Circuit ruling preventing mifepristone from being prescribed by telemedicine and delivered by mail.	The 5 <sup>th</sup> Circuit’s May 1, 2026 order was administratively stayed until 5 p.m. (EDT) on Thursday, May 14, 2026. No date for argument set.
President and Fellows of Harvard College v. HHS, et al.	25-2230 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-11048 (D. Mass.)	<b>Harvard case.</b>  Harvard contests federal government’s withdrawal of federal funding. Harvard argues that the federal government did not take necessary steps to cancel federal funds.	On September 3, 2025, the District Court ruled that the federal government violated the Constitution, Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and the APA when it froze more than \$2.6 billion in Harvard research funding. The ruling vacated the freeze orders and termination notices Harvard received from the federal government and permanently enjoined reimposition of unconstitutional conditions on funding. Final judgment entered on October 20, 2025. Federal government appealed the judgment on December 18, 2025. Appellate briefing to conclude in late April/early May.  The 1 <sup>st</sup> Cir. will coordinate argument of this matter with argument of President and Fellows of Harvard College v. HHS, et al., 25-1627.



**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
United States v. Illinois, Cook County, & Chicago	25-2904 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-01285 (N.D. Ill.)	<p><b>Case concerns a similar Welcoming Community Ordinance.</b></p> <p>Federal government sued Illinois, Cook County, and Chicago seeking declaratory and injunctive relief holding that sanctuary policies violate the Supremacy Clause.</p>	<p>On July 25<sup>th</sup>, the District Court dismissed the case and upheld the sanctuary policies, including Chicago’s Welcoming Community Ordinance. Local government decisions not to participate in immigration enforcement are protected by the Tenth Amendment and not preempted by federal law. The federal government had until August 22, 2025, to amend its complaint. No amended complaint was filed. The case was dismissed with prejudice on August 26, 2025. On October 24, 2025, the federal government filed a notice of appeal. Appellate briefing to conclude mid-June.</p>
City of Chicago v. United States Department of Homeland Security	25-cv-05462 (N.D. Ill.)	<p><b>The City of Boston is a plaintiff in this case.</b></p> <p>Lawsuit seeks to enjoin federal government from freezing funding under the Securing Cities counterterrorism program (STC) and to require the federal government to process pending and future reimbursement requests pursuant to law. The complaint alleges that DHS is violating the separation of powers, that its actions are ultra vires, and that it is violating the APA.</p>	<p>No significant Court orders in this case. Summary judgment papers to be filed by August 2026.</p>
City of Chelsea v. Trump	25-cv-10442 (D. Mass.)	<p><b>The Cities of Chelsea and Somerville are plaintiffs in this case.</b></p> <p>Lawsuit challenges Protecting the American People from Invasion EO and other executive actions related to withholding of federal funds based on immigration policy. The plaintiffs seek to enjoin the federal government from withholding federal funds based on sanctuary policies.</p>	<p>Somerville and Chelsea filed a Motion for Preliminary Injunction. On October 2, 2025, the District Court denied the Motion for Preliminary Injunction holding that the cities failed to demonstrate they would suffer imminent and irreparable harm without injunctive relief. On December 18, 2025, Somerville and Chelsea filed a second amended complaint. Federal government has until June 10, 2026 ,to file a response.</p>



**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
Vasquez-Perdomo v. Noem	25A169 (Supreme Court) 25-4312 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir.); 25-cv-05605	<p><b>The City of Boston has filed an amicus brief in this case.</b></p> <p>Lawsuit seeks a temporary restraining order to enjoin ICE and CBP from engaging in unconstitutional and unlawful stops of Los Angeles residents during immigration sweeps. Plaintiffs allege ICE and CBP have a policy and practice of engaging in unconstitutional stops not based on reasonable, individualized suspicion of unlawful presence, but instead based on racial profiling.</p>	<p>District Court granted temporary restraining order, in favor of plaintiffs, regarding unlawful stops and access to counsel. The parties are briefing preliminary injunction and class certification in the District Court. On September 8, 2025, using its Emergency Docket, the Supreme Court entered a stay enjoining the temporary restraining order halting the federal government from “stopping individuals based solely on four factors: (1) their apparent race or ethnicity; (2) whether they spoke Spanish or English with an accent; (3) the type of location at which they were found (such as a car wash or bus stop); and (4) the type of job they appeared to work.” This means the federal government may continue to rely on these four factors alone to stop and seize individuals. Importantly, Justice Kavanaugh indicated in his concurring opinion that if the case eventually reaches the Supreme Court, then the Supreme Court will likely reverse any permanent injunctive relief similar to the temporary relief the District Court previously ordered.</p> <p>The appeal was dismissed on November 21, 2025, and the case returned to lower courts for further proceedings. Plaintiffs filed a second amended complaint, which the federal government has moved to dismiss. Discovery proceeding in case.</p>
Massachusetts v. USDA	25-cv-13165 (D. Mass.)	<p><b>Massachusetts is the lead plaintiff in this case.</b></p> <p>Multiple states argue that the federal government’s decision not to use available contingency funds to pay SNAP benefits violates the APA. The states are suing to force the USDA to use available contingency funds for the November SNAP benefits.</p>	<p>The District Court heard arguments, on October 30, 2025, on whether to issue a temporary restraining order (TRO) forcing the USDA to fund November SNAP benefits. The Court issued a ruling stating that the federal government’s “suspension of SNAP benefits is contrary to law.” The court’s TRO remains in force pending further order of the court. The parties went through extensive motion practice regarding whether full or reduced SNAP benefits will issue for November and funding therefore. This litigation was impacted by contemporaneous rulings in <u>R.I. State Council of Churches v. Rollins</u>, which case was since dismissed by the parties as moot. Case dismissed by joint stipulation for an order of dismissal without prejudice, which order was entered on May 1, 2026.</p>
State of Washington v. HUD	25-cv-00626 (D.R.I.)	<p><b>Similar case to <u>NAEH v. HUD</u> (see above). The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is a plaintiff in this case.</b></p> <p>Multiple states, including Massachusetts, are challenging HUD’s changes to the Continuum of Care grant program, which has provided funds to local governments and organizations to fund permanent housing for vulnerable populations. The plaintiffs argue that reversing previous HUD Housing First policy and the imposition of unlawful conditions violates the APA, the Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, and the Tenth Amendment. The plaintiffs are requesting that the Court order HUD to grant CoC funds on the same basis it did in the last fiscal year, and to strike the unlawful conditions.</p>	<p>Plaintiff states filed a motion for preliminary injunction. On December 11, 2025, plaintiff states filed an amended complaint adding New Mexico as a plaintiff and new allegations related to the federal government’s withdrawal of the 2025 Notice of Funding Opportunity. The motion for preliminary injunction was granted on December 19, 2025. An amended complaint and motion for summary judgment were filed by plaintiffs on January 14, 2026. Summary judgment briefing continues. On May 12, 2026, the parties jointly stipulated that the federal government withdraws grant conditions it attempted to require as part of the non-competitive renewals of expiring Continuum of Care (CoC) projects.</p> <p>As in <u>NAEH v. HUD</u>, the federal government filed a motion to dissolve the December 19, 2025 preliminary injunctions on an emergency expedited basis. The District Court denied that motion on March 6, 2026. The 1<sup>st</sup> Circuit subsequently also denied the federal government’s motion for a stay pending appeal. On April 23, 2026, the Appeals Court entered judgment dismissing the appeal and</p>



**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
			issued the Appeals Court’s mandate.
United States v. California	26-926 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-10999 (C.D. California)	<p><b>Case concerns state laws regulating permissible uniforms for federal agents.</b></p> <p>Federal government argues that under the Supremacy Clause the States have no power to regulate “the operations of” the federal government – in this case how federal agents may dress and address the public.</p>	<p>Hearing held January 14, 2026 on federal government’s motion for a preliminary injunction to enjoin enforcement of state laws. A stay was granted as to the state law prohibition against face masks and otherwise denied. The 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit entered a temporary administrative injunction pending appeal. Oral argument was scheduled for March 3, 2026. Appellate briefing is ongoing. On April 22, 2026, California was enjoined from applying or enforcing § 10 of its No Vigilantes Act.</p> <p>In the District Court, an Answer to the Complaint was filed on April 2, 2026. On May 8, 2026, an order of abeyance was entered, in the District Court case, pending resolution of the Appeals Court case.</p>
RICADV v. Kennedy	25-2229 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-00342 (D.R.I.)	<p><b>Case concerns non-profit coalition challenge to federal executive orders.</b></p> <p>Plaintiff nonprofit organizations challenge grant conditions as arbitrary, in excess of statutory authority, and unconstitutional where they seek to impose restrictions on DEI, gender ideology, and abortion.</p>	<p>A preliminary injunction blocks HHS and HUD from enforcing new grant conditions nationwide while the litigation is ongoing. The court determined that the federal government’s actions were arbitrary, exceeded statutory authority, and were likely unconstitutional. The injunction preserves previous grant terms and prevents the imposition of challenged restrictions imposed by executive orders 14168, 14169, and 14182. This PI applies to HUD grant programs where the conditions were imposed - including CDBG, HOME, ESG, Continuum of Care, and HOPWA. On December 22, 2025, the federal government appealed the preliminary injunction order. On January 6, 2026, an order entered voluntarily dismissing the federal government’s appeal. In the District Court the parties filed motions for summary judgment.</p>



**CITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR**

## Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or of Special Interest to the City – May 18, 2026 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
United States v. Connecticut	26-cv-00568 (D. Conn.)	Federal government alleges local governments and officials violated the Supremacy Clause and Immigration and Nationality Act because sanctuary laws conflict with federal law, local laws unlawfully regulate the federal government, and local laws discriminate against the federal government while attempting to enforce immigration law. The federal government seeks declaratory and injunctive relief.	Defendant local governments have until July 6, 2026, to respond to the complaint.
United States v. New Jersey	26-cv-01770 (D.N.J.)	Federal government challenges, on Supremacy Clause grounds, New Jersey governor’s executive order preventing federal immigration officers from using non-public areas of state-owned property as operation bases to enforce civil immigration law. The federal government seeks declaratory and injunctive relief.	Motion to dismiss for lack of standing and failure to state a claim is set for June 1, 2026 (to be decided on the papers).

NOTE: Resolved cases are removed from this report. To date removed resolved cases include:

- California v. United States DOT, 26-1026 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir.); 25-cv-00208 (D.R.I.)
- R.I. State Council of Churches v. Rollins, 25A539 (Supreme Court); 25-2089 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir.); 25-cv-00569 (D.R.I.)
- State of Oregon v. Trump, 25-7194, 25-6268 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.); 25-cv-01756 (D. Ore.)
- State of Illinois v. Trump, 25A443 (Supreme Court); 25-2798 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir.); 25-cv-12174 (N.D. Ill.)