



# City of Cambridge

## Executive Department

**YI-AN HUANG**  
City Manager

CMA 2025 #273  
**IN CITY COUNCIL**  
November 17, 2025

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.

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 – November 17, 2025 Update

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
King County v. Turner	25-3664 (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>Plaintiffs most recent 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.</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. Federal government’s motion to dismiss hearing scheduled for November 5, 2025. The District Court opted to proceed without oral argument on the motion to dismiss.</p> <p>Cambridge added as a plaintiff. Plaintiffs 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. The Court allowed the motion.</p>
California v. United States DOT	25-cv-00208 (D.R.I.)	<p><b>An order in this case applies to the City of Cambridge.</b></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>On November 4, 2025, District Court entered summary judgment for the plaintiff states holding that immigration enforcement conditions (IEC) imposed by the Department of Transportation in exchange for federal funding are unlawful. The Court wrote, “The IEC is declared unlawful and ordered vacated from all grant agreements administered by [USDOT]. [USDOT is] permanently enjoined from implementing or enforcing the IEC against the States, or otherwise attempting to condition federal transportation funding on State cooperation with federal civil immigration enforcement.”</p>
State of New York v. U.S. Department of Justice (PWORA case)	25-2099 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-00345 (D.R.I.)	<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.</p>

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
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 will go into effect on September 12, 2025, and 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. 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.</p> <p>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>
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>	<p>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. Oral argument heard on November 5, 2025.</p>
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 intends to file 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.</p> <p>On August 6, 2025, the federal government stipulated that “the May 22 letter will not be used to revoke Harvard’s SEVP certification or Exchange Visitor Program designation. Defendants are currently following the procedures under 8 C.F.R. §§ 214.3, 214.4 and 22 C.F.R. Part 62.” Harvard did not accept the stipulation. The federal government has moved to dismiss the District Court case. Appellate proceedings stayed pending end of federal government shutdown.</p>
President and Fellows of Harvard College v. HHS, et al.	25-cv-11048 (D. Mass.)	<p><b>Harvard case.</b></p> <p>Harvard contests federal government’s withdrawal of federal funding. Harvard argues that the federal government did not take necessary steps to cancel federal funds.</p>	<p>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.</p>
United States v. Illinois, Cook County, & Chicago	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.</p>

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
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>	No significant Court orders in this case. Summary judgment papers to be filed between December 1, 2025 and February 17, 2026.
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>	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.
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>Case returned to lower courts for further proceedings. On October 21, 2025, the 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. remanded the appeal, in part, to allow the district court to dissolve the Fourth Amendment TRO.</p>
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. Arguments not scheduled yet.
United States v. City of Boston	25-cv-12456 (D. Mass.)	<p><b>The City of Boston is a defendant in this case.</b></p> <p>Federal government sued Boston seeking injunctive relief holding that sanctuary policies violate the Supremacy Clause.</p>	Boston has until November 17, 2025, to file a response to the Complaint.
State of Oregon v. Trump	25-6268 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-01756 (D. Ore.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined an amicus brief in this case in the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</b></p> <p>Oregon seeks an order prohibiting the federal government from federalizing National Guard troops and deploying them to conduct domestic law enforcement without meeting statutory requirements and in violation of the U.S. Constitution.</p>	<p>District Court granted two temporary restraining orders (TRO), expiring on October 18 and 19, 2025, enjoining federal government from deploying federalized National Guard troops in or to Oregon. A panel of the 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. stayed the first TRO, allowing the President to continue federalizing national guard troops. The en banc 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. then stayed the panel decision through October 28, 2025. The 9<sup>th</sup> Cir. will rehear the matter en banc. On November 3, 2025, the federal government moved to dismiss the appeal.</p> <p>After a bench trial on the preliminary injunction and merits of the case, the District Court held and ordered that President Trump’s order to deploy the National Guard to Portland was unlawful and unconstitutional and the federal government is permanently enjoined from deploying members of any state’s National Guard to Oregon based on the facts for which deployment was ordered in this case.</p>

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
State of Illinois v. Trump	25A443 (Supreme Court) 25-2798 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-12174 (N.D. Ill.)	<p><b>The City of Cambridge joined amicus filings in this case in the 7<sup>th</sup> Circuit and the Supreme Court.</b></p> <p>Illinois seeks an order halting the illegal and unconstitutional federalization and deployment of members of the National Guard of the United States, including both the Illinois and Texas National Guard.</p>	<p>District Court granted temporary restraining order (TRO), expiring on October 23, 2025, enjoining federal government from federalizing and deploying National Guard troops within Illinois. Federal government appealed. Appeal pending. The Appeals Court, pending further argument, entered an order allowing federalized National Guard troops deployed to Illinois to remain in the state, but those troops may not be deployed for purposes of law enforcement. On October 23, 2025, upon agreement by the parties, the District Court entered an order extending the TRO until final judgment on the merits is entered in the case.</p> <p>The Supreme Court has directed the parties to brief the following question: “Whether the term ‘regular forces’ refers to the regular forces of the United States military, and, if so, how that interpretation affects the operation of 10 U. S. C. §12406(3).” All briefing due by November 17, 2025.</p>
City of Chicago v. Noem	25-cv-12765 (N.D. Ill.)	<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>	Complaint filed on October 20, 2025. Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction on October 24, 2025.
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>
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 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits violates the APA. The states are suing to force the USDA to use available contingency funds for the November SNAP benefits.</p>	The District Court heard arguments, on October 30, 2025, on whether to issue a temporary restraining order 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 parties went through extensive motion practice regarding whether full or reduced SNAP benefits will issue for November and funding therefore. This litigation is impacted by contemporaneous rulings in R.I. State Council of Churches v. Rollins.
R.I. State Council of Churches v. Rollins	25A539 (Supreme Court) 25-2089 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir.) 25-cv-00569 (D.R.I.)	<p><b>Similar case to MA v. USDA but extends the litigation beyond individual states to the whole nation.</b></p> <p>A coalition of local governments, charitable, legal, and faith-based nonprofit organizations, small businesses, and workers’ rights organizations argue the federal government violated the APA and federal appropriations law when it ignored congressional mandate to fund SNAP benefits and revoked work requirement waivers in localities with persistent unemployment.</p>	On October 31, 2025, the District Court granted a TRO and ordered the federal government to pay full SNAP benefits by November 3, 2025, or partial payments by November 5, 2025. On November 3, USDA stated it “will fulfill its obligation to expend the full amount of SNAP contingency funds,” but it will not use other funds to provide full SNAP payments for November 2025. On November 6, the District Court held the federal government did not comply with its October 31 order and ordered full November SNAP payments by November 7. On November 9, the 1 <sup>st</sup> Cir. upheld the District Court order enforcing the October 31 TRO. The Supreme Court extended an administrative stay of the TRO through November 13, 2025, and the federal government indicated its intent to continue to pursue a stay of the District Court’s orders from the Supreme Court.
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>	As of November 10, 2025, FMCSA’s rule is administratively stayed pending further order of the D.C. Cir.

Lawsuit Name	Case No. / Case Citation	Summary of Lawsuit	Status
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>	Briefing schedule closes on November 19, 2025.
Noem v. National TPS Alliance	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>	Briefing schedule closes on January 9, 2026.