



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

Lawsuits Challenging Federal Actions that Involve the City, or are of Special Interest to the City - August 4, 2025 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
King County v. Turner	25-cv-00814 (W.D. Wash.)	<p>The City of Cambridge is a plaintiff in this case.</p> <p>Plaintiffs sued Secretary of Transportation and HUD 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 \$4 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>Additionally, the Plaintiffs have filed a second Motion for Preliminary Injunction asking the Court to order that the conditions do not apply to additional grants, such as CDBG grants. The Court has not issued a decision yet.</p>
San Francisco v. Trump	25-cv- 01350 (N.D. Cal.)	<p>The City of Cambridge is seeking to be added as a plaintiff in this case.</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 pending.</p> <p>Plaintiffs asked the Court to amend the Complaint to add new parties, including Cambridge, and to challenge the second Sanctuary Jurisdiction EO. Plaintiffs also filed a second Motion for Preliminary Injunction asking the Court to prevent the Federal Government from enforcing both Sanctuary Jurisdiction EOs against all of the Plaintiffs and prospective Plaintiffs, including Cambridge.</p>
California v. United States DOT	25-cv-00208 (D.R.I.)	<p>An order in this case applies to the City of Cambridge.</p> <p>States challenge an April 24, 2025, letter issued by Secretary Duffy, requiring recipients of DOT grants to cooperate with federal immigration enforcement. The letter does not define what constitutes “cooperation.” States allege that the conditions are beyond DOT’s authority.</p>	<p>Preliminary Injunction entered on June 19, 2025, which protects funding for the 20 states that brought the suit, including Massachusetts, and the local governments in those states, including Cambridge.</p>
State of New York v. U.S. Department of Justice	25-cv-00345 (D.R.I.)	<p>An order in this case applies to the City of Cambridge.</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 Federal, State, and local 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>Federal government has agreed to pause enforcing these new rules against the Plaintiff states and the subdivisions. Since Massachusetts is a plaintiff, this applies to Cambridge. The Plaintiffs have filed a Motion for Preliminary Injunction.</p>

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
Newsom v. Trump	25-3727 (9 th Circuit); 25-CV-04870 (N.D. CA)	The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case. 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.	U.S. District Court ruled that federal deployment of CA National Guard was illegal and violated the 10 th amendment. On June 19, 2025, the Ninth Circuit stayed the lower court order pending appeal.
Commonwealth of MA v. National Institutes of Health, et al, and other associated cases	25-1343 (1 st Cir.); 25-cv-10338 (D. Mass.)	The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case. 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.	U.S. District Court issued a final judgment enjoining federal government's 15% cap on reimbursement for all new grants. Federal government appealed. Appeal pending.
President and Fellows of Harvard College v. DHS, et al.	25-cv-11472 (D. Mass.)	The City of Cambridge intends to file an amicus brief in this case. Harvard contests federal government's revocation of Harvard's ability to enroll foreign students and otherwise prevent foreign students from enrolling at Harvard.	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.
President and Fellows of Harvard College v. HHS, et al.	25-cv-11048 (D. Mass.)	Harvard case. Harvard contests federal government's withdrawal of federal funding. Harvard argues that the federal government did not take necessary steps to cancel federal funds.	After oral argument matter currently under advisement.
United States v. Illinois, Cook County, & Chicago	25-cv-01285 (N.D. Ill.)	Case concerns a similar Welcoming Community Ordinance. Federal government sued Illinois, Cook County, and Chicago seeking declaratory and injunctive relief holding that sanctuary policies violate the Supremacy Clause.	On July 25 th , 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 may amend its complaint by August 22, 2025.
City of Chicago v. United States Department of Homeland Security	25-cv-05462 (N.D. Ill.)	The City of Boston is a plaintiff in this case. 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.	No significant Court orders in this case.
City of Chelsea v. Trump	25-cv-10442 (D. Mass.)	The Cities of Chelsea and Somerville are plaintiffs in this case. 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.	Somerville and Chelsea filed a Motion for Preliminary Injunction and a hearing was held on July 18, 2025.
Vasquez-Perdomo v. Noem	25-4312 (9 th Cir.); 2:25-cv-05605-MEMF-SP	The City of Boston has filed an amicus brief in this case. 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.	Lower Court granted temporary restraining order on unlawful stops and access to counsel.in favor of plaintiffs. Appeal pending.