LITIGATION TRACKER
LEGAL CHALLENGES TO TRUMP ADMINISTRATION ACTIONS
through March 19, 2025[1]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STRUCTURE OF GOVERNMENT / PERSONNEL

Executive Action: Reinstatement of Schedule F for Policy/Career Employees (Executive Order 14171) 2
Executive Action: Establishment of "Department of Government Efficiency" (DOGE) (Executive Order 14158)..... 3
Executive Action: Solicitation of information from career employees..... 8
Executive Action: Disclosure of personal and financial records to DOGE..... 9
Executive Action: "Fork Directive" deferred resignation offer to federal employees (OPM Directive)..... 17
Executive Action: Removal of independent agency leaders..... 18
Executive Action: Dismantling of USAID (**Executive Order 14169**)..... **23**
Executive Action: Denial of State Department Funds..... **29**
Executive Action: Dismantling the U.S. African Development Foundation (Executive Order 14127)..... 30
Executive Action: Large-scale reductions in force (Executive Order 14210)..... 31
Executive Action: Termination of probationary employees..... **32**

GOVERNMENT GRANTS, LOANS AND ASSISTANCE

Executive Action: "Temporary Pause" of grants, loans, and assistance programs..... 34
Executive Action: Reduction of indirect cost reimbursement rate for research institutions (**NIH Guidance**)..... 38

DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION, AND ACCESSIBILITY

Executive Action: Ban on DEIA initiatives in the executive branch and by **contractors** (**Executive Order 14151**; **Executive Order 14173**)..... 39

[1] **SOURCE**: Just Security Litigation Tracker, found at https://www.justsecurity.org/107087/tracker-litigation-legal-challenges-trump-administration/ (last visited **March 19, 2025**).

Case name	Complaint	Date filed	Case Summary	Last update
STRUCTURE OF GOVERNMENT / PERSONNEL				
Executive Action: Reinstatement of Schedule F for Policy/Career Employees (Executive Order 14171)				
National Treasury Employees Union v. Donald J. Trump et al (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00170	Complaint	Jan. 20, 2025	**Overview:** *National Treasury Employees Union ("NTEU"), a labor union that represents federal government employees in 37 agencies and departments, sued the Trump administration to block the implementation of President Donald Trump's Executive Order ("EO") that would authorize the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to reclassify members of the civil service and enable the Trump administration to terminate them at will. NTEU argues the EO violates civil servant protection laws.* **Case Summary**: Trump's executive order authorizes the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to reclassify thousands of members of the civil service and strip them of their civil-service protections, enabling the president or heads of agencies to fire them at will. The National Treasury Employees Union sued to block implementation of the order on behalf of the union's members. The lawsuit argues that the executive order violates laws Congress passed to provide civil-service protections to the vast majority of civil servants, with only limited exceptions for Senate-confirmed political appointees.	2025-01-31
Government Accountability Project v. Office of Personnel Management (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00347	Complaint	Feb. 6, 2025	**Overview:** *A group of non-profit organizations who represent the interests of federal employees sued President Donald Trump and the U.S. Office of Personnel Management ("OPM") alleging Trump's Executive Order and OPM's related guidance that took away protections for thousands of career government workers. The non-profits argue that the EO and OPM guidance violate the Administrative Procedure Act and the Civil Service Reform Act.* **Case Summary**: On Jan. 27, Director of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Charles Ezell issued Guidance implementing the president's executive order, which aims to reclassify thousands of members of the civil service and strip them of their civil-service protections, enabling the president or heads of agencies to fire them at will. Plaintiffs—independent nonprofits representing whistleblowers, federal employees, retirees and their survivors—allege that the OPM Guidance did not go through proper procedure under the Administrative Procedure Act, violates the Civil Service Reform Act's protections for career employees, and violates civil servants' Fifth Amendment Due Process rights. They seek a declaratory judgment that the executive order and the OPM Guidance are unlawful and an injunction enjoining the administration from implementing the executive order and the OPM Guidance.	2025-02-06

Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility v. Donald Trump et al (D. Md.) Case No. 8:25-cv-00260-PX	Complaint	Jan. 28, 2025	**Overview:** *Non-profit organization Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility ("PEER") challenged President Donald Trump's Executive ("EO") that would authorize the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to reclassify members of the civil service and enable the Trump administration to terminate them at will. The lawsuit seeks to block the EO's implementation and argues that the EO violates the Administrative Procedure Act and deprives civil servants of their rights under the Constitution and the Civil Service Reform Act.* **Case Summary**: Trump's executive order authorizes the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to reclassify thousands of members of the civil service and strip them of their civil-service protections, enabling the president or heads of agencies to fire them at will. PEER, represented by Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington and Democracy Forward, sued to enjoin implementation of the executive order. The lawsuit argues that the executive order violates the Administrative Procedure Act and deprives civil servants of due process by stripping them of protections guaranteed under the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978.	2025-01-31
American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO and American Federation of State, County And Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO v. Donald Trump et al (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00264	Complaint	Jan. 29, 2025	**Overview:** *Two major labor unions, representing over two million federal employees, sued President Donald Trump to block an Executive Order ("EO") that changes workers' job category, removing protections against being fired. The unions argue that the EO violates the Administrative Procedure Act (APA).* **Case Summary**: On Jan. 27, Director of the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Charles Ezell issued guidance implementing the president's executive order, which aims to reclassify thousands of members of the civil service and strip them of their civil-service protections, enabling the president or heads of agencies to fire them at will. The AFGE and AFSCME – labor organizations representing federal, state and local employees – assert that the Trump administration failed to follow proper notice-and-comment procedures under the Administrative Procedural Act in issuing the order, which renders "inoperative or without effect" existing regulations, 5 C.F.R. 210.102(b)(3), 5 C.F.R. 210.102(b)(4), and 5 C.F.R. § 302.601-603. The plaintiffs sued, seeking a declaratory judgment to that effect, as well as an injunction enjoining the Defendants from enforcing the order without first complying with the APA's notice-and-comment requirements.	2025-01-31
Executive Action: Establishment of "Department of Government Efficiency" (DOGE) (Executive Order 14158)				
Public Citizen Inc et al v. Donald J. Trump and Office of Management and Budget (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00164	Complaint	Jan. 20, 2025	**Overview:** *Two advocacy organizations sued President Donald Trump and the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, arguing that Trump's Executive Order ("EO") creating the Department of Government Efficiency violates the Federal Advisory Committee Act by delegating regulatory and monetary power to unelected citizens without public oversight. Two other cases, Lentini v. Department of Government Efficiency and American Public Health Association v. Office of Budget and Management, have now been consolidated under this case.*	2025-03-03

CASE CLOSED			**Case Summary**: Trump's executive order renames the U.S. Digital Service as the U.S. DOGE Service (Department of Government Efficiency) and reestablishes the office under the Executive Office of the President. Two advocacy organizations and the American Federation of Government Employees sued, arguing that the order violates the Federal Advisory Committee Act, which bars the delegation of decision-making authority to private citizens without public access. The suit asks the court to enjoin the operation of DOGE unless and until it complies with the FACA's requirements. **Update 1:** On Feb. 18, 2025, Judge Jia M. Cobb (D.D.C.) granted defendants' motion to consolidate two cases with this case. Parties in *Lentini v. Department of Government Efficiency* (complaint), and *American Public Health Association v. Office of Budget and Management* (complaint) must make all future filings in this case. **Update 2:** On Mar. 3, 2025, Public Citizen Plaintiffs dismissed their action without prejudice. The Lentini Plaintiffs in Lentini v. Department of Government Efficiency and American Public Health Association Plaintiffs remain in American Public Health Association v. Office of Budget and Management.	
Jerald Lentini, Joshua Erlich, and National Security Counselors v. Department of Government Efficiency, Office of Management and Budget, Office of Personnel Management, Executive Office of the President, Elon Musk, Vivek Ramaswamy, Russell Vought, Scott Kupor, and Donald Trump (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00166	Complaint	Jan. 20, 2025	***Overview**: National Security Counselors (a public advocacy organization) and two individuals challenged President Donald Trump's Executive Order ("EO") establishing the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE), arguing that DOGE violates the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) by delegating regulatory and monetary power to unelected citizens without public oversight. This case was consolidated under Public Citizen, Inc v. Trump.* **Case Summary**: Trump's executive order renames the U.S. Digital Service as the U.S. DOGE Service (Department of Government Efficiency) and reestablishes the office under the Executive Office of the President. The advocacy organization National Security Counselors, Inc., sued, arguing that the order violates the Federal Advisory Committee Act, which bars the delegation of decision-making authority to private citizens without public access. The suit asks the court to enjoin the operation of DOGE unless and until it complies with the FACA's requirements. **Update 1:** On Feb. 18, 2025, Judge Jia M. Cobb (D.D.C) granted defendants' motion in *Public Citizen, Inc. v. Trump* to consolidate three cases. Parties in *Lentini v. Department of Government Efficiency* and *American Public Health Association v. Office of Budget and Management* must make all future filings in *Public Citizen*.	2025-02-18
American Public Health Association et al v. Office of Management	Complaint	Jan. 20, 2025	**Overview:** *Several public interest advocacy organizations challenged President Donald Trump's Executive Order (EO) that established the Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE). The lawsuit argues that DOGE violates the Federal Advisory Committee Act by delegating regulatory*	2025-02-18

and Budget, Acting Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Department of Government Efficiency (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00167			*and monetary power to unelected citizens without public oversight. This case was consolidated under Public Citizen, Inc v. Trump.* **Case Summary**: Trump's executive order renames the U.S. Digital Service as the U.S. DOGE Service (Department of Government Efficiency) and reestablishes the office under the Executive Office of the President. Several advocacy organizations sued, arguing that the order violates the Federal Advisory Committee Act, which bars the delegation of decision-making authority to private citizens without public access. The suit asks the court to enjoin the operation of DOGE unless and until it complies with the FACA's requirements. **Update 1:** On Feb. 18, 2025, Judge Jia M. Cobb (D.D.C) granted defendants' motion in Public Citizen, Inc. v. Trump to consolidate three cases. Parties in Lentini v. Department of Government Efficiency and American Public Health Association v. Office of Budget and Management must make all future filings in Public Citizen.	
Center for Biological Diversity v. Office of Management and Budget (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00165	Complaint Amended Complaint	Jan. 20, 2025 Feb. 27, 2025	**Overview:** *The Center for Biological Diversity sued the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Freedom of Information Act demanding records related to communications between OMB and the Department of Government Efficiency ("DOGE"), alleging the requested information is important to the public interest.* **Case Summary:** Trump's executive order renames the U.S. Digital Service as the U.S. DOGE Service (Department of Government Efficiency) and reestablishes the office under the Executive Office of the President. The Center for Biological Diversity sued the Office of Management and Budget under the Freedom of Information Act, demanding records related to communications between OMB and DOGE's leadership or those acting on its behalf. **Update 1**: On Feb. 27, 2025, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint. The new complaint added defendants, including DOGE, Elon Musk, and Amy Gleason. It also included a new second claim, with plaintiffs arguing DOGE's alleged failures to comply with FOIA's affirmative disclosure obligations violate the Administrative Procedure Act.	**2025-02-27**
J. Doe 1-26 v. Musk (D. Md) Case 8:25-cv-00462-TDC	Complaint	Feb. 13, 2025	***Overview**: Twenty-six current and former employees of the U.S. Agency for International Development ("USAID") sued Elon Musk and the Department of Government Efficiency ("DOGE") alleging that Musk's appointment to his role as head of DOGE violates the Constitution's Appointments Clause and requesting that the court prevent Musk and DOGE from taking further action until this legal question is resolved.* Trump's executive order renames the U.S. Digital Service as the U.S. DOGE Service (Department of Government Efficiency) and reestablishes the office under the Executive Office of the President. Twenty-six current and former USAID employees or contractors filed a lawsuit	**2025-03-18**

			claiming that Elon Musk's constitutional authority to exercise significant government powers as the head of DOGE without Senate confirmation violates the Appointments Clause. The complaint alleges that Musk and the DOGE staff are exercising "significant authority" by controlling agency operations, making personnel decisions, and directing federal spending, all powers the plaintiffs claim can be wielded only by properly appointed officers of the United States. The lawsuit argues that Musk is functioning as a principal officer while evading the constitutional requirement for Senate confirmation. The plaintiffs also claim that Musk's actions would be unconstitutional even if he were considered merely an inferior officer, as Congress has not authorized the President to directly appoint anyone to his position. The plaintiffs also argue that DOGE's structure violates separation of powers by creating a "shadow chain of command" that undermines Congress's power to create agencies and their authorities through statute, confirm appointed officers, and conduct oversight. The suit asks the court to declare Musk and DOGE to be acting unlawfully, enjoin Musk and DOGE from exercising government authority unless appointed by proper process, and set aside their actions taken to date. **Update 1:** On Feb. 18, Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction. **Update 2:** On Feb. 24, Defendants filed a motion in response to the request for a preliminary injunction; to which the Plaintiffs replied on Feb. 26. **Update 3**: On March 18, the District Court issued a Memorandum Opinion. Details to come.	
New Mexico et al. v. Musk (D.D.C.) Case No. 1.25-cv-00429	Complaint	Feb. 13, 2025	**Overview:** *Fourteen states sued Elon Musk and the Department of Government Efficiency ("DOGE") alleging that Musk's appointment to his role as head of DOGE violates the Constitution's Appointments Clause and requesting that the court prevent Musk and DOGE from taking further action until this legal question is resolved. A federal court denied the request to temporarily block further actions by Musk and DOGE but acknowledged potential constitutional issues with Musk's appointment and ordered Musk and DOGE to provide documents and information requested by the states.* Trump's executive order renames the U.S. Digital Service as the U.S. DOGE Service (Department of Government Efficiency) and reestablishes the office under the Executive Office of the President. Fourteen states filed a lawsuit claiming that Elon Musk's constitutional authority to exercise significant government powers as the head of DOGE without Senate confirmation violates the Appointments Clause. The complaint alleges that Musk and the DOGE staff are exercising "significant authority" by controlling agency operations, making personnel decisions, and directing federal spending, all powers they claim can only be wielded by properly appointed officers of the United States. The suit asks the court to declare Musk and DOGE to be acting unlawfully, impose a temporary restraining order barring Musk and DOGE from exercising government authority (including a specific list of official actions) while awaiting preliminary and permanent injunctions to the same effect, and set aside their actions taken to date.	**2025-03-12**

			Update 1: On Feb. 17, the government submitted a declaration by Joshua Fisher, Director of the Office of Administration, stating that Musk is not the head of DOGE nor an employee of DOGE. **Update 2:** On Feb 18, Judge Tanya Chutkan denied the Plaintiffs' request for a temporary restraining order but also indicated a potentially favorable view of the Plaintiffs' argument on the merits (pp. 8-9). **Update 3:** On Feb. 24, plaintiff states filed a motion for expedited discovery relating to an upcoming motion for a preliminary injunction. Defendants filed a memorandum in opposition on Feb 28. Plaintiffs filed a reply on Mar. 3. Plaintiffs' expedited discovery motion seeks "to confirm public reporting about Defendants' conduct, show Defendants' future plans, and illustrate the nature and scope of the unconstitutional and unlawful authority that Defendants are exercising and will continue to imminently exercise." The document requests and interrogatories generally concern DOGE's and Musk's conduct in four areas: (1) eliminating or reducing the size of federal agencies; (2) terminating or placing federal employees on leave; (3) cancelling, freezing, or pausing federal contracts, grants, or other federal funding; and (4) obtaining access, using, or making changes to federal databases or data management systems. **Update 4**: On Mar 7, defendants filed a motion to dismiss arguing plaintiffs lack Article III standing and have failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. **Update 5**: On Mar. 12, Judge Tanya Chutkan granted Plaintiffs' motion for expedited discovery and ordered Elon Musk and DOGE to produce the requested documents and respond to the interrogatories and requests for admissions in Plaintiffs' discovery requests.	
Japanese American Citizens League v. Musk (D.D.C) Case No. 1:25-cv-00643	Complaint	Mar. 5, 2025	**Overview:** *Plaintiffs are four nonprofit organizations – the Japanese American Citizens League, Organization of Chinese Americans–Asian Pacific American Advocates, Sierra Club, and Union of Concerned Scientists – bringing suit against Elon Musk, DOGE, Amy Gleason, and several executive agencies and their heads.* **Case Summary:** Plaintiffs are four nonprofit organizations – the Japanese American Citizens League, Organization of Chinese Americans–Asian Pacific American Advocates, Sierra Club, and Union of Concerned Scientists – bringing suit against Elon Musk, DOGE, Amy Gleason, and several executive agencies and their heads. Plaintiffs allege that they are harmed by DOGE's cutting of federal funding and firing of federal employees, including in the work of the National Park Service and historic sites. Plaintiffs allege that Musk and DOGE are acting in an ultra vires manner "to dramatically alter the federal budget, slash federal spending, reduce the federal workforce, and dismantle disfavored	03-05-2025

			agencies." Plaintiffs also allege that Defendants have acted in violation of the separation of powers "by directing and causing the termination of grants and contracts under previously appropriated federal funds; terminating federal workers funded by congressional appropriations; reducing the size of the federal workforce; working to abolish federal departments and agencies including the U.S. Department of Education, an executive department created by federal statute; and refusing to spend money appropriated by Congress." Finally, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants have violated the Appointments Clause and the Administrative Procedure Act. They seek declaratory and injunctive relief holding that Musk, DOGE, and Gleason have no legal authority to take a wide array of actions and that those actions have no legal effect.	
Center for Biological Diversity v. U.S. Department of Interior (D.D.C) Case No. 1:25-cv-00612	Complaint	Mar. 3, 2025	**Overview:** *On Jan. 20, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Orders 14158, renaming the U.S. Digital Service as the U.S. DOGE Service (Department of Government Efficiency). On Feb. 19, Trump signed Executive Order 14219 directing the rescission of regulations in which "agency heads shall, in coordination with their DOGE Team Leads and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, initiate a process to review all regulations."* **Case Summary:** On Jan. 20, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Orders 14158, renaming the U.S. Digital Service as the U.S. DOGE Service (Department of Government Efficiency). On Feb. 19, Trump signed Executive Order 14219 directing the rescission of regulations in which "agency heads shall, in coordination with their DOGE Team Leads and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, initiate a process to review all regulations." Plaintiffs, a nonprofit organization focused on habitat preservation for endangered species, alleges that DOGE and the Department of Interior have violated the Administrative Procedures Act by failing to follow Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) requirements for disclosure and public access to advisory committee meetings. They seek declaratory judgment that DOGE and its sub-teams are subject to the FACA and have violated the APA and FACA, an injunction stopping Department of Interior employees from meeting with or relying on work by DOGE employees, and an order of mandamus requiring compliance with the FACA.	03-03-2025
Executive Action: Solicitation of information from career employees				
Jane Does 1-2 v. Office of Personnel Management (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00234	Complaint	Jan. 27, 2025	**Overview:** *Two federal employees brought a class action lawsuit against the Office of Personnel Management ("OPM") alleging that OPM used an unauthorized email system to collect data on all civilian federal workers without conducting a required privacy assessment. A federal court denied the request to halt OPM's actions and OPM has since moved to dismiss the case.* **Case Summary**: The Office of Personnel Management announced it was testing a new system to email all civilian federal employees from a single email address, HR@opm.gov. Individuals	**2025-03-07**

			claiming to be OPM employees subsequently posted online that the emails were being stored on an unsecure server at OPM. Plaintiffs, employees of executive-branch agencies who received "test" emails from HR@opm.gov requesting information, sued. The lawsuit alleges that the new procedure violates the E-Government Act of 2002 and asks the court to require the Office of Personnel Management to conduct a Privacy Impact Assessment before collecting any data from employees, as required under the law. **Update 1 and 2:** On Feb. 4, 2025, the plaintiffs requested a temporary restraining order. On Feb. 6, Judge Randolph D. Moss denied the TRO request and said an opinion will follow. **Update-3:** On Feb. 11, OPM moved to dismiss the Complaint on the grounds that Plaintiffs lack Article III standing and failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. **Update 4**: On Feb. 17, 2025, in a Memorandum Opinion and Order, Judge Moss denied plaintiffs' most recent motion for a TRO on the ground that they had not shown they were likely to have standing or face irreparable injury without emergency relief. **Update 5**: On Mar. 5, plaintiffs filed a memorandum in opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss. Defendants filed a reply on Mar. 7.	
Executive Action: Disclosure of personal and financial records to DOGE				
Alliance for Retired Americans v. Scott Bessent et al (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00313	Complaint	Feb. 3, 2025	***Overview:*** *A group of labor unions representing federal employees sued Secretary of the Treasury Scott Bessent and others alleging that individuals affiliated with the Department of Government Efficiency ("DOGE") were granted unauthorized access to sensitive Treasury Department records in violation of the Privacy Act and the IRS Code. Both parties agreed to an order limiting access to Treasury payment records to specific individuals with "read-only" access.* **Case Summary**: The complaint alleges that the Treasury Department granted DOGE-affiliated individuals access to sensitive personal and financial information maintained by the Treasury Department. The plaintiffs sued on behalf of members whose records may have been transmitted from the Treasury Department to DOGE employees, thus allegedly depriving the members of privacy. The lawsuit seeks an injunction and declaratory relief, as well as a temporary restraining order, for alleged violations of the Administrative Procedure Act and actions in excess of legal authority under the Privacy Act. **Update 1:** On Feb. 6, 2025, the parties in the suit mutually proposed an order that Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly adopted. It limits access to Treasury Department payment records and systems to two (Musk-affiliated) Special Government Employees in the Department ("read-only" access),	**2025-03-07**

			other employees who need to access the record to perform their duties, or individuals who are already entitled to access the records under statute. **Update 2:** On Feb. 20, the court issued an order accepting an unopposed motion to modify the Feb. 6 order. **Update 3:** On Feb. 25, following a hearing the previous day, the court ordered "that Defendants shall file the administrative record underlying the decisions challenged in this case on or before March 10, 2025." **Update 4:** On Mar. 7, Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly denied plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction on the grounds that plaintiffs have not cleared the "high standard" of showing a likelihood of an irreparable injury that is "beyond remediation." She noted, "If Plaintiffs could show that Defendants imminently planned to make their private information public or to share that information with individuals outside the federal government with no obligation to maintain its confidentiality, the Court would not hesitate to find a likelihood of irreparable harm."	
New York et al v. Donald J. Trump (S.D.N.Y.) Case No. 1:25-cv-01144-JAV	Complaint	Feb. 7, 2025	**Overview:** *Nineteen state attorneys general sued President Donald Trump and Secretary of the Treasury Scott Bessent alleging that individuals affiliated with the Department of Government Efficiency ("DOGE") were granted unauthorized access to sensitive Treasury Department records in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Privacy Act, and other ethics statutes. A federal court temporarily blocked DOGE's access to certain payment records maintained by the Treasury Department containing sensitive data while the case proceeds, citing potential violations of federal law.* **Case Summary**: The complaint alleges that the Treasury Department granted DOGE-affiliated individuals access to sensitive personal and financial information maintained by the Treasury Department. The plaintiffs, attorneys general of 19 states, sued on the ground that the policy of giving expanded access to political appointees and "special government employees" to Treasury's Bureau of Fiscal Services violated the Administrative Procedure Act (APA). The plaintiffs claim the policy violates the APA by exceeding authority conferred by statute for the unauthorized purpose of impeding payments and accessing private information; for failure to conduct a privacy impact statement; for violation of the Privacy Act; and for violating ethics statutes on conflicts of interest. The plaintiffs also assert the policy usurps congressional authority and is ultra vires. The plaintiffs requested an emergency temporary restraining order, as well as preliminary and permanent injunction to bar access to political appointees, special government employees, and government employees detailed from other agencies as well as to any person who has not received a background check, security clearance, and information security training.	**2025-03-07**

			Update 1: The case is before Judge Jeannette A. Vargas. On Feb. 8, 2025, after midnight, Judge Paul A. Engelmayer issued an emergency temporary restraining order until Judge Vargas holds a hearing on Feb. 14. Judge Engelmayer's order prohibits access to the Treasury Department's systems and also requires prohibited persons to immediately destroy any material already downloaded from the Treasury Department's systems. **Update 2:** On Feb. 21, Judge Vargas granted a limited preliminary injunction, enjoining the Treasury Department from granting access to DOGE-affiliated individuals to any payment record, payment systems, or any other data systems maintained by the Treasury Department containing personally identifiable information and/or confidential financial information of payees. The court noted that "a real possibility exists that sensitive information has already been shared outside of the Treasury Department, in potential violation of federal law." The court ordered the Treasury Department to submit a report by March 24 including several forms of information and certifications including "the vetting and security clearances processes that members of the Treasury DOGE Team have undergone;" "setting forth the legal authority pursuant to which each DOGE Team member was employed by or detailed to the Treasury Department;" and "explaining the reporting chains that govern the relationship between the DOGE Team members, USDS/DOGE, and Treasury leadership." **Update 3:** On Mar. 7, plaintiffs filed a motion for reconsideration to the court's Feb. 21 ruling that states' interests do not fall within personal identifying information (PII) protections of the Privacy Act of 1973 and E-Government Act of 2002	
AFL-CIO v. Dep't of Labor (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00339	Complaint	Feb. 5, 2025	**Overview:** *A coalition of labor unions sued the Department of Labor ("DOL"), the Department of Government Efficiency ("DOGE"), and others seeking to block DOGE's access to internal DOL information systems on the basis that such access violates the Administrative Procedure Act, the Privacy Act, the Economy Act, and other federal laws. A federal court denied requests to temporarily block DOGE's access while the case proceeds, but indicated further analysis was needed in particular on the Economy Act claims.* **Case Summary**: On Feb. 5, 2025, DOGE sought access to internal information systems at the Department of Labor. Plaintiffs sued, arguing DOGE's attempt to direct the agency and access internal information systems are an unlawful exercise of power beyond its authority; and unlawful under the Administrative Procedure Act as a prohibited personnel practice, violation of the Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act, violation of the Privacy Act, rulemaking without proper procedure, and arbitrary and capricious abuse of discretion. They seek temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief to prevent the Department of Labor from granting access to DOGE, from taking adverse action against employees who refuse to cooperate with DOGE, and from providing any person with non-public Department of Labor information regarding that person's business interests or direct competitors.	2025-02-27

			On the same day as the complaint was filed, judge John Bates issued an Order which stated, "Defendants represented to the Court that DOL [Department of Labor] will not allow DOGE access to any DOL data until after this Court rules on the TRO motion on Friday." **Update 1:** On Feb. 7, Judge Bates denied the petition for a temporary restraining order on the ground that the plaintiffs lacked standing. **Update-2**: On Feb. 12, Plaintiffs submitted a renewed request for a TRO enjoining agency defendants from granting members of DOGE access to their systems of records, except as consistent with applicable federal law. **Update 3:** On Feb. 14, Judge Bates denied the renewed request for a TRO, but added, "On the Economy Act question, which is the most important for this denial of a TRO, the Court will benefit from further briefing and analysis on a motion for preliminary injunction." **Update 4:** On Feb. 27, Judge Bates ordered limited expedited discovery in the case in the form of answers to written interrogatories, production of documents, and the deposition of four individuals (one each from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and DOGE), to last no more than eight hours in aggregate.	
University of California Student Ass'n v. Carter et al Case No. 1:25-cv-00354	Complaint	Feb. 7, 2025	**Overview:** *The University of California Student Association sued the Department of Education seeking to block the Department of Government Efficiency's ("DOGE's") access to sensitive information systems containing student data on the basis that such access violates the Administrative Procedure Act, the Privacy Act, and the Internal Revenue Code. A federal court denied the request to temporarily block DOGE's access while the case proceeds.* **Case Summary**: On Feb. 3, 2025, reportedly 20 people affiliated with DOGE were working with the Department of Education, some of whom obtained access to sensitive internal information systems, including systems related to federal student aid. Plaintiffs sued, arguing DOGE's access is unlawful under the Administrative Procedure Act in that it is contrary to law in violation of the Privacy Act and Internal Revenue Code; arbitrary and capricious; and in excess of statutory authority. They seek a declaratory judgment that DOGE officials are not authorized to access Department of Education records that contain personal information, and temporary, preliminary, or permanent injunctive relief preventing the Department of Education from continuing to provide access to DOGE, ensuring there is no further dissemination of data, and requiring recovery of unlawfully transferred information. **Update 1**: On Feb. 10, Plaintiff moved for a TRO, requesting Defendants be enjoined from disclosing information about individuals to individuals affiliated with DOGE, and required to retrieve and safeguard any such information that has already been obtained by and shared or transferred by DOGE or individuals associated with it.	2025-02-17

			Update 2: On Feb. 17, Judge Randolph Moss denied the TRO on the grounds that mere "access" to data by government employees who are not formally authorized to view it, without more, does not create an irreparable injury. He wrote that courts find dissemination of information to be an irreparable injury where highly sensitive information will be made public or is given to someone with no obligation to keep it confidential. He also wrote that irreparable harm was not present because plaintiffs would have a private right of action and money damages for certain unauthorized disclosures.	
National Treasury Employees Union v. Russell Vought (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00380	Complaint	Feb. 9, 2025	**Overview:** *The National Treasury Employees Union sued Acting Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau ("CFPB") Russell Vought seeking to block the Department of Government Efficiency's ("DOGE's") access to sensitive information systems with CFPB employee records on the basis that the CFPB's decision to grant DOGE-affiliated individuals access to employee information and non-classified systems violated the Privacy Act and CFPB regulations.* **Case Summary**: DOGE "special government employee" entered CFPB. On February 7, 2025, Chris Young, Nikhil Rajpul, and Gavin Kliger—none of whom is or has been a CFPB employee—were added to CFPB's staff and email directories as "senior advisers." Russell Vought, as Acting Director of CFPB, instructed CFPB staffers to grant this DOGE team access to all non-classified systems. Plaintiffs maintain that CFPB has a statutory obligation to protect its employee information under both the Privacy Act and CFPB regulations (5 C.F.R. Part 1070). Plaintiffs claim that CFPB violated that obligation by granting DOGE access to employee information without satisfying an exception in the Privacy Act. Plaintiffs seek a judgment declaring that CFPB violated the law by granting DOGE access to CFPB systems, that CFPB's disclosure of employee information to DOGE is unlawful, and request an injunction to prevent CFPB from disclosing employee records to DOGE.	2025-02-09
American Federation of Teachers et al v. Bessent et al (D. Md.) Case No. 8:25-cv-00430	Complaint	Feb. 10, 2025	**Overview:** *The American Federation of Teachers and other plaintiffs sued the Treasury, Office of Personnel Management ("OPM"), and the Department of Education ("DOE"), challenging the agencies' disclosure of sensitive personal information to Department of Government Efficiency ("DOGE") employees. The plaintiffs argue that the disclosure violates federal law and goes beyond the agencies' scope of authority. They have asked the court to declare the disclosure unlawful, to temporarily and permanently stop the agencies from further sharing information, and to require the agencies retrieve the information disclosed. The court has stopped DOE and OPM from disclosing information with DOGE, while Treasury has also been stopped from disclosure by a separate but related case.* **Case Summary**: The complaint alleges that the Treasury Department, Office of Personnel Management, and Department of Education have provided DOGE "special government employees" with access to information systems that contain records of private citizens' sensitive personal information (including Social Security numbers, financial records, and more).	2025-02-24

			Plaintiffs sued, arguing DOGE access is unlawful under the Administrative Procedure Act as (1) not in accordance with the Privacy Act; (2) an arbitrary and capricious abuse of discretion; and (3) in excess of statutory authority. They seek a declaratory judgment that disclosing records to DOGE is unlawful and temporary, preliminary, or permanent injunctive relief to bar defendants from allowing DOGE to access sensitive information; ensure there is no further unauthorized disclosure; ensure records improperly disseminated are retrieved or destroyed; and ensure future disclosures will only occur in accordance with the Privacy Act. **Update 1:** On Feb. 12, Plaintiffs moved for a TRO enjoining Defendants from providing DOGE access to their records systems and ordering any records housed outside government information systems be retrieved or destroyed. **Update 2:** On Feb. 24, the court granted a TRO enjoining the Department of Education and Office of Personnel Management from disclosing sensitive information to any DOGE affiliates. The court denied the motion for a TRO against Treasury officials on the basis that a preliminary injunction against Treasury has already been granted in a related case.	
Electronic Privacy Information Center v. U.S. Office of Personnel Management (E.D.V.A.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00255	Complaint	Feb. 10, 2025	**Overview:** *The Electronic Privacy Information Center ("EPIC") and a federal employee sued the Office of Personnel Management ("OPM") and the Treasury Department, challenging the agencies' disclosure of sensitive personal information to Department of Government Efficiency ("DOGE") employees. The plaintiffs argue that the disclosure violates federal law, violates their constitutional rights, puts them at risk of identity theft, and goes beyond the agencies' scope of authority. They have asked the court to declare the disclosures unlawful and stop the agencies from sharing and accessing the information. The court denied their request to block DOGE's access because the possible scenarios for harm were too speculative.* **Case Summary**: The complaint alleges that the Treasury Department granted DOGE-affiliated individuals access to sensitive personal and financial information maintained by the Treasury Department. The plaintiffs, Electronic Privacy Information Center (EPIC) and Doe 1 (a federal employee), sued, claiming that the transmission of these records violated the plaintiffs' right to privacy and puts plaintiffs at risk of identity theft and financial crimes. Plaintiffs also argue that the transmission of these records was not compliant with the Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) and other privacy and security requirements. The lawsuit seeks injunctive and declaratory relief curing the release of information and halting further sharing by OPM and Treasury, alleging violations of the Administrative Procedure Act, Privacy Act, the Fifth Amendment, 26 U.S.C. § 6103, and actions beyond the scope of authority—primarily by the DOGE defendants. Doe 1 also seeks an award of statutory and punitive damages. **Update 1:** On Feb. 12, Plaintiffs moved for a TRO to enjoin Treasury and OPM defendants from providing DOGE access to information systems, to enjoin DOGE defendants from accessing information systems, and to require status reports.	2025-02-21

			Update 2: On Feb. 21, Judge Rossie D. Alston, Jr. issued a Memorandum Opinion and Order converting the motion for a TRO to a motion for a preliminary injunction, and denying the motion. Judge Alston wrote, "Plaintiffs' fears of future harm are much too speculative and would require the Court to make several leaps in reasoning in order to warrant injunctive relief" based on the record before the court. The judge stated: "Although the Court is denying injunctive relief based on the current record, Plaintiffs are permitted to take necessary action to protect their rights if, in the future, they experience harm that is more concrete and immediate, including if Plaintiffs are able to provide evidence that unauthorized personnel accessed the BFS and/or EHRI systems."	
American Federation of Government Employees, et al. v. Office of Personnel Management et al (S.D.N.Y) Case No. 1:25-cv-01237	Complaint	Feb. 11, 2025	**Overview:** *The American Federation of Government Employees and other plaintiffs sued the Office of Personnel Management ("OPM"), challenging the agencies' alleging unlawful disclosure of sensitive personal information to Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) employees. The plaintiffs argue that the disclosure violates federal laws and goes beyond the agencies' scope of authority. They have asked the court to declare the disclosure unlawful, stop the agencies from further sharing information, and require the agencies retrieve and destroy the information disclosed.* **Case Summary**: Plaintiffs allege the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) has given DOGE access to OPM information systems that contain sensitive personal and employment records of government employees (including Social Security numbers, demographic information, job performance information, health records, and more). Plaintiffs, current and former federal employees and unions representing them, sued, arguing OPM's disclosure of this information to DOGE violates the Privacy Act and the Administrative Procedure Act; and that DOGE's actions are ultra vires. They seek a declaratory judgment that the government's actions are unlawful; temporary, preliminary, or permanent injunctive relief; and an order for the impoundment and destruction of copies of improperly disclosed personal information. **Update 1:** On Feb. 14, plaintiffs filed a motion for a temporary restraining order. On Feb. 19, defendants filed a memorandum in opposition. On Feb. 23, in light of a TRO issued by the District of Maryland in Am. Fed. of Teachers v. Bessent, plaintiffs joined defendants in requesting that their motion for a TRO be converted to a motion for a preliminary injunction. **Update 2**: On Feb. 27, plaintiffs filed a motion for expedited discovery. Defendants filed a memorandum in opposition on Mar. 4. Plaintiffs filed a reply on Mar. 6. Judge Cote granted the motion in part on Mar. 7.	**2025-03-07**
Nemeth-Greenleaf, et al. v. Office of Personnel Management, et	Complaint	Feb. 11, 2025	**Overview:** *Federal employees have sued the Office of Personnel Management ("OPM") and the Treasury, challenging the agencies' disclosure of personal, health, and financial information to the Department of Government Efficiency's ("DOGE") employees. The plaintiffs argue the disclosure*	2025-02-11

al. (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00407			*violates federal laws. They have asked the court to stop further disclosure and compensation for harm.* **Case Summary**: Plaintiffs are federal employees from various government departments who filed suit as a proposed class action. They allege that DOGE workers unlawfully accessed their private information from OPM and the Treasury Department. They argue that Defendants are engaged in an "unlawful ongoing, systemic, and continuous disclosure of personal, health, and financial information" to Elon Musk and DOGE in violation of the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552a. They seek injunctive relief and damages.	
Gribbon et al. v. Musk (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00422	Complaint	Feb. 12, 2025	**Overview:** *Six individuals sued Elon Musk, the Office of Personnel Management ("OPM"), and the Treasury for sharing personal information. The plaintiffs argue that by sharing their private information, Musk and the agencies violated federal laws. The plaintiffs have asked the court to declare Musk and the agencies' actions unlawful, stop them from further sharing the plaintiffs' information, and require them to provide lifetime identity theft and fraud protection services.* **Case Summary**: Plaintiffs filed a proposed class action lawsuit. They are recipients of federal benefits, student loans, or have filed tax return information with the federal government. The complaint alleges that "Defendants [are] liable for their willful failure to ensure the security of Plaintiffs' and Class members'" private information. Plaintiffs allege Defendant Elon Musk violated the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act and that Defendants OPM and Treasury violated the Privacy Act of 1974. Plaintiffs are suing for injunctive relief and monetary damages "resulting from Defendants' unlawful ongoing, systematic, and continuous disclosure of personal and financial information."	2025-02-12
Center for Taxpayer Rights v. IRS (D.D.C) Case 1:25-cv-00457	Complaint	Feb. 17, 2025	**Overview:** *Several organizations, on behalf of taxpayers, sued the Internal Revenue Service ("IRS") and the Treasury, challenging the access to private tax information the agencies gave to the Department of Government Efficiency's ("DOGE"). The plaintiffs argue that by allowing DOGE's access, the agencies violated multiple federal laws and exceeded their scope of authority. The plaintiffs have asked the court to declare the access unlawful, stop DOGE's access, and require the return or deletion of the shared information.* **Case Summary:** Plaintiffs filed a lawsuit challenging the U.S. Department of Government Efficiency's access to information from the Internal Revenue Service. Plaintiffs are organizations that represent low-income taxpayers, immigrants, domestic abuse survivors, small businesses, and public and private sector employees. They allege that by allowing DOGE to access private citizens' tax information, the IRS has violated the Federal Information Security Act, the Privacy Act, and the Administrative Procedure Act. Plaintiffs also allege that DOGE has engaged in "ultra vires" actions by "directing and controlling the use and administration of Defendant IRS' systems." They seek declaratory and injunctive relief to stop allegedly "wrongful provision of	2025-02-17

			access, inspection, and disclosure of return information and other personal information in the IRS system to members of DOGE." They also seek other forms of relief such as ordering Defendants to disgorge all unlawfully obtained information.	
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO v. Social Security Administration (D. Md.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00596	Complaint Amended Complaint	Feb. 21, 2025 Mar. 7, 2025	**Overview:** *Three labor unions sued the Social Security Administration ("SSA") and the Department of Government Efficiency ("DOGE"), challenging the access to sensitive personal data of millions of Americans which SSA gave to DOGE. The unions argue that the access violates multiple federal laws and the Constitution. The unions have asked the court to declare DOGE's access to SSA data unlawful, require DOGE return to delete the data, and stop any further sharing of information and access* **Case Summary:** Plaintiffs filed a lawsuit challenging the U.S. Department of Government Efficiency's access to Social Security Administration data and systems. They allege that allowing DOGE to access private citizens' sensitive data violates several laws, including the Internal Revenue Code, the Privacy Act, the Federal Information Systems Modernization Act, the E-Government Act, and the Administrative Procedure Act. They further allege that Acting SSA Commissioner Leland Dudek's exercise of significant authority without nomination or confirmation violates the Appointments Clause of the U.S. Constitution. Plaintiffs ask the court to declare DOGE's access to SSA data and systems unlawful, order DOGE to disgorge or delete any unlawfully obtained data, and prohibit any further efforts by either DOGE or SSA to enable DOGE to access SSA data or systems. **Update 1:** On Mar. 7, the plaintiffs filed an amended complaint. **Update 2:** On Mar. 7, the plaintiffs filed a motion for a temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction, and/or stay.	**2025-03-07**
Executive Action: "Fork Directive" deferred resignation offer to federal employees (OPM Directive)				
American Federation of Gov't Employees, AFL-CIO v. Ezell (D. Mass) Case No. 1:25-cv-10276	Complaint	Feb. 4, 2025	**Overview:** *Multiple labor unions sued the Office of Personnel Management ("OPM"), challenging the legality of the "deferred resignation" offer program. The offer, sent to nearly all federal employees, gives them the option to receive compensation until September 30, 2025 if they resign by February 6, 2025, where the unions say the implied alternative is earlier termination. The unions argue that the program violates the Constitution and federal laws. The unions have asked the court to declare the program unlawful, void the program, and immediately and permanently suspend the February 6 deadline. The court initially suspended the deadline until the court heard arguments from both sides; however, shortly after, the court removed the suspension and denied the unions' requests on the basis that they had not followed correct procedures in filing the suit.*	2025-02-12

			Case Summary: On January 28, 2025, the Office of Personnel Management sent an email to career federal employees presenting what it described as a deferred resignation program, an offer to receive compensation until September 30, 2025 if they resign now ("Fork Directive" email). A deadline for the offer was set for February 6, 2025. Plaintiffs filed suit, arguing the directive violates the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) because it is "arbitrary and capricious" and not in accordance with the Antideficiency Act. They seek a declaratory judgment that the directive violates the APA and that the directive be vacated; they also seek an preliminary and permanent injunction of the February 6, 2025 deadline and an order that OPM submit for court approval a corrected communication for all employees who received the directive. **Update 1:** On Feb. 5, 2025, the plaintiffs requested a temporary restraining order and that within 24 hours of the TRO, the Government provide written notice of the TRO to all federal employees who have received the directive. **Update 2:** On Feb. 6, 2025, Judge George O'Toole issued an order to pause the program and extend the deadline until Monday when a hearing is scheduled. **Update 3:** On Feb. 10, 2025, Judge O'Toole ordered that the stay of the Feb. 6 deadline will remain in effect "pending the completion of briefing and oral argument on the issues." Defendants notified the Court of their compliance with the order. **Update-4:** On Feb. 12, 2025, Judge O'Toole dissolved the TRO and denied further preliminary injunctive relief, finding that the plaintiffs lacked Article III standing and that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over the claims asserted.	
Executive Action: Removal of independent agency leaders				
Gwynne A. Wilcox v. Donald J. Trump et al (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00334	Complaint	Feb. 5, 2025	**Overview:** *Gwynne Wilcox (a member of the National Labor Relations Board) sued President Donald Trump challenging her removal from the National Labor Relations Board as a violation of the National Labor Relations Act, claiming that Trump did not meet the standard required for Wilcox's removal under federal law and that Wilcox was not given notice and a hearing to contest her removal.* **Case Summary**: This case challenges President Trump's removal of Gwynne A. Wilcox from her position on the National Labor Relations Board. The suit alleges the removal is in violation of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. § 151 et seq.), which allows the president to remove Board members only in cases of neglect of duty or malfeasance and only after notice and hearing. The Plaintiff is seeking relief under the Declaratory Judgement Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, to establish that she remains a rightful member of the Board and that the President lacks authority to remove her. She also seeks an injunction against the Chairman of the National Labor	**2025-03-08**

			Relations Board, who oversaw the termination. **Update 1:** On Feb. 10, Plaintiff moved for expedited summary judgment. **Update 2:** On Feb. 21, the government filed a cross-motion for summary judgment, arguing statutory restrictions protecting NLRB members unconstitutionally conflict with the President's Article II powers. **Update 3:** On Mar. 6, Judge Beryl Howell granted the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, and denied the defendant's cross motion for summary judgment. The court issued a declaratory judgment that Wilcox's firing was unlawful and that she remains a member of the NRLB; the court further ordered that Wilcox be allowed to continue to serve in office unless removed for cause under the NLRA, and enjoined defendants from removing Wilcox or impeding her from executing her duties. **Update 4:** On Mar. 7, defendants appealed (Case No. 25-5057) and requested the district court issue a stay pending appeal. On Mar. 8, Judge Howell denied the motion to stay.	
Grundmann v. Trump et al. (D.D.C) Case No. 1:25-cv-00425	Complaint	Feb. 13, 2025	**Overview:** *Susan Grundmann (former Chair of the Federal Labor Relations Authority) sued President Donald Trump challenging her removal from the National Labor Relations Authority as a violation of the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute, claiming that Trump did not meet the standard required for Grundmann's removal under federal law and that Grundmann was not given notice and a hearing to contest her removal. A federal judge has ruled that her removal was unlawful and ordered her to be reinstated.* **Case Summary**: On Feb, 10, 2025, White House official Trent Morse sent a two-sentence email to Susan Grundmann stating that her position on the Federal Labor Relations Authority (FLRA), an independent agency, "is terminated, effective immediately." Plaintiff Susan Grundmann challenges her removal from the FLRA. Plaintiff was Chair of the FLRA when she received the email from Morse, Deputy Director of the White House Office of Presidential Personnel. Plaintiff alleges she was improperly removed in violation of the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute (5 U.S.C. § 7104), which states that "Members of the Authority…may be removed by the President only upon notice and hearing and only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office." Plaintiff seeks declaratory relief and an injunction ordering her reinstatement. **Update 1:** On Feb. 14, Plaintiff filed a motion for preliminary injunction and summary judgment. **Update 2:** On Feb. 25, defendants filed a cross motion for summary judgment and memorandum in opposition to the motion for a preliminary injunction.	**2025-03-12**

			Update 3: On Mar. 12, Judge Sparkle Sooknanan granted Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, holding that her termination was unlawful and granting a permanent injunction reinstating her authority.	
Dellinger v. Bessent (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00385-ABJ CASE CLOSED	Complaint	Feb. 10, 2025	**Overview:** *Hampton Dellinger, Special Counsel of the U.S. Office of Special Counsel, sued President Donald Trump for firing him without cause in violation of a statute saying he may only be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. A federal judge allowed him to resume his position while the case proceeded through the courts. The Supreme Court rejected the government's appeal of this decision on February 21. On March 5, 2025, the DC Circuit Court issued a 3-0 decision that effectively removed Dellinger from his position as Special Counsel of the U.S. Office of Special Counsel, and the following day Dellinger dropped his case.* **Case Summary**: Plaintiff Hampton Dellinger has been the Special Counsel in the Office of the Special Counsel (OSC) since Mar. 6, 2024, when he was nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a five-year term. The OSC is an independent federal agency founded by Congress as part of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978. Its primary function is to protect federal employees and others who come forward as whistleblowers. Once confirmed, the Special Counsel serves a five-year term and "may be removed by the President only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office." On Feb. 7, 2025, Dellinger received a two-sentence email from Sergio Gor, informing Dellinger that he was terminated, effective immediately, and stating no cause for such termination. Dellinger is suing under six different counts and seeks a declaratory judgment that President Trump's decision to fire him was unlawful, that the Special Counsel may only be removed for cause; and seeks an order that Dellinger may not be removed and is entitled to backpay. As precedent for the constitutionality of the statutory for-cause protection, Dellinger cites to Humphrey's Executor. **Update 1:** On Feb. 10, 2025, Judge Amy Berman Jackson issued an administrative stay on Dellinger's termination through midnight on February 13, 2025, while the parties submit their briefs. **Update 2:** On Feb. 11, 2025, defendants appealed to the D.C. Circuit (case no. 25-5025), making an emergency motion to stay the district court's administrative stay. **Update 3:** On Feb. 12, 2025, the D.C. Circuit dismissed the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. **Update 4:** On Feb. 12, 2025, Judge Amy Berman Jackson of the D.C. District Court granted a temporary restraining order, ordering that Dellinger shall continue to serve as Special Counsel and prohibiting defendants from denying him the resources and materials of his office. **Update 5:** On Feb. 13, Defendants filed an appeal to the D.C. Circuit (case no. 25-5028). In the District Court, their motion for a stay pending appeal was denied.	2025-03-05

			Update 6: On Feb. 15, the D.C. Circuit rejected the Defendant's appeal in a 2-1 opinion. **Update 7:** The Government petitioned the U.S. Supreme Court asking the Justices to freeze and vacate the district court order that had temporarily reinstated Dellinger. **Update 8:** On Feb. 21, the Supreme Court rejected (7-2) the Government's petition on the ground that a TRO was not properly subject to appeal at this stage. **Update 9:** On Feb. 26, Judge Jackson extended the TRO ordering that Dellinger remain as Special Counsel for an additional three days until she "complete[s] the written opinion on the consolidated motion for preliminary injunction and cross motions for summary judgment" (indicating she will rule on that day, Mar. 1). **Update 10:** On Mar. 1, Judge Jackson issued an Opinion and Order in favor of the Plaintiff. The Defendants immediately appealed to the DC Circuit. **Update 11:** On Mar. 5, the DC Circuit in a 3-0 decision put a halt to the district court order pending the appeal. "This order gives effect to the removal of [Dellinger] from his position as Special Counsel of the U.S. Office of Special Counsel," the DC Circuit wrote. **Update 12:** On Mar. 6, Dellinger announced that he was dropping his case. Final Update: **CASE CLOSED**	
Cathy A. Harris v. Bessent et al (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00412	Complaint	Feb. 11, 2025	**Overview:** *Cathy A. Harris, a member of the Merit Systems Protection Board ("MSPB"), sued President Donald Trump for firing her from the MSPB without cause in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act. Harris asked the court to allow her to continue in her position while the lawsuit proceeds and to declare her removal unlawful. A federal court agreed Harris could remain in her role while the case is pending, ruling that Trump likely did not meet the standard required for her removal under applicable law. Trump appealed this ruling.* **Case Summary**: Plaintiff Cathy A. Harris challenges her removal from the Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB), an independent federal agency. Plaintiff alleges that she received a one-sentence email from Trent Morse, Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy Director of the White House Presidential Personnel Office, stating that Plaintiff had been terminated, effective immediately. Plaintiff, whose term on the MSPB was set to expire in 2028, alleges that she was unlawfully removed from her position without justification, despite the statutory requirement that MSPB members may only be removed for "inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office." She alleges the action was ultra vires and violated the Administrative Procedure Act. She seeks a declaratory judgment and injunction as well as an emergency temporary restraining order to reinstate her position on the MSPB.	2025-03-05

			Update 1: On Feb. 11, Plaintiff moved for a TRO declaring that her removal is unlawful and that she is a member of the MSPB, and enjoining obstructing her access to the office. **Update 2:** On Feb. 18, Judge Rudolph Contreras granted the temporary restraining order and ordered that Harris continue to serve as Chair of the MSPB until the court rules on a preliminary injunction. **Update 3:** On Mar. 4, Judge Contreras granted the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment. The court issued a declaratory judgment that Harris remains a member of the MSPB and that she may be removed by the President prior to the expiration of her term only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. The court also enjoined defendants from removing Harris from office without cause. **Update 4:** On Mar. 4, the government appealed to the D.C. Circuit and moved that the district court stay its order pending appeal. **Update 5:** On Mar. 5, the district court denied the government's motion to stay its order pending appeal.	
LeBlanc & Felten v. United States Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00542	Complaint	Feb. 24, 2025	**Overview:** *After all three Democratic members of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board ("PCLOB") were removed by the PCLOB, two of them sued to challenge their removal. By law, the PCLOB is required to have members from both Democrat and Republican parties. The plaintiffs argue that they were dismissed unlawfully on the basis of their political affiliation and not for good cause. They have asked the court to declare that the Board does not have the authority to remove them purely for political reasons, and to void the removals as unlawful. They have also asked the court to require the PCLOB (aside from the President) to reinstate and stop the PCLOB (aside from the President) from future removals not based on good cause.* **Case Summary**: On Jan, 27, 2025, the U.S. Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board (PCLOB) purported to remove Plaintiffs, two Senate-confirmed members of the Board. Plaintiffs represent two out of three Democratic members of the Board, which is required by statute to have Democratic and Republican members. Plaintiffs allege that the text, structure, and function of the 9/11 Commission Act bars removal of PCLOB members without good cause. They also assert that by removing Board members solely on the basis of their political affiliation, defendants have acted "not in accordance with law." They seek a declaration that the Defendants "have no authority" to remove Plaintiffs from the Board based on their political affiliation and for the court to "hold unlawful and set aside the purported removals." They also seek an injunction prohibiting defendants (other than the President) from removing them from their positions without good cause and enjoin defendants (other than the President) to restore them to those positions.	2025-02-24

Executive Action: Dismantling of USAID (Executive Order 14169) **(State Dept stop-work order)**				
American Foreign Service Association v. Trump (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00352	Complaint	Feb. 6, 2025	**Overview:** *Two unions sued the Trump administration, challenging its efforts to dismantle the United States Agency for International Development ("USAID"). The unions argue that the efforts are unconstitutional, violate federal law, and exceed the scope of agency authority. The unions have asked the court to declare the administration's actions unlawful and unconstitutional, and immediately stop the administration's efforts by appointing an independent administrator, restoring funding, and voiding the suspension of employees. The court initially stopped the administration from suspending employees but did not restore funding; however, on February 21, 2025, the court reversed its earlier temporary restrictions on the administration, on the basis that the dispute could be resolved outside of the court. On March 10, 2025, the unions filed a new motion arguing that the court should have jurisdiction to decide this dispute.* **Case Summary**: On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration issued an executive order including a 90-day pause in "foreign development assistance," and the Secretary of State then issued stop-work orders for United States Agency for International Development (USAID) foreign assistance grants. Later, Secretary of State Rubio was named as acting USAID Administrator and USAID contractors were laid off or furloughed. On Feb. 3, Elon Musk posted that he had spent the previous weekend "feeding USAID to the woodchipper," and USAID headquarters in Washington, D.C. was closed. On Feb. 4, a message was posted on the USAID website that all directly-hired USAID staff would be placed on administrative leave as of 11:59pm EST on Friday, Feb. 7, 2025. Plaintiffs sued, arguing executive actions either to dissolve USAID or merge it with the State Department are unconstitutional violations of the separation of powers and the Take Care Clause; and unlawful under of the Administrative Procedure Act by exceeding statutory authority, violating the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, and involving arbitrary and capricious abuses of discretion. Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment that the administration's actions are unlawful and unconstitutional; a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction directing the administration to halt efforts to shut down the agency, including by appointing an independent administrator, restoring grant funding, recalling furloughs, and halting efforts to place more employees on administrative leave, among other actions. Plaintiffs also seek court supervision, and a permanent injunction barring the administration from taking action to dissolve USAID absent congressional authorization. **Update 1:** On Feb. 7, 2025, Judge Carl J. Nichols issued a temporary restraining order preventing USAID from placing employees on administrative leave or evacuating them. He rejected the plaintiffs' request for a restraining order on the funding freeze on the ground that the plaintiffs (USAID employees) could not show sufficient harm to themselves. **Update 2:** On Feb. 13, the court extended the TRO until Friday, Feb. 21, at 11:59 PM. Judge Nichols	**2025-03-14**

			also amended the TRO's statement to clarify that no USAID employees can be involuntarily evacuated from their host countries while the TRO remains in place. **Update 3:** On Feb. 14, the Government submitted a declaration by Pete Marocco, who performs the duties and functions of both Deputy Administrators of USAID; the declaration responds to the court's questions about government actions to protect USAID employees abroad subject to administrative leave or in the event of employees staying voluntarily beyond the time of an evacuation. **Update 4:** On Feb. 21, Judge Nichols issued an Order and Memorandum Opinion rejecting the preliminary injunction and dissolving the TRO. His reasoning included that plaintiffs do not face irreparable harm after a series of concessions from Deputy Administrator Marocco, and that they could pursue remedies with administrative bodies governing disputes. **Update 5:** On Mar. 10, Plaintiffs moved for summary judgment, arguing that the court (not administrative bodies) has jurisdiction over the claim, and that Defendants' actions violate both the Constitution and the Administrative Procedure Act. **Update 6**: On Mar. 11, Plaintiffs moved for a temporary restraining order alleging potential destruction of documents, including a copy of an internal email from Acting Executive Secretary of USAID Erica Carr to staff. **Update 7**: On Mar. 12, the Defendants responded to the Mar. 11 motion for a temporary restraining order and included an affidavit by Carr. The defendants stated that the instruction to destroy documents "had nothing to do with this litigation," was done to clear space formerly occupied by USAID, and were copies "where the originally classified document is retained by another government agency and for which there is no need for USAID to retain a copy." Update 8: On Mar. 14, the Plaintiffs dropped their Mar. 11 motion on destruction of documents based on the Defendants' assurances.	
AIDS Vaccine Advocacy Coalition v. United States Department of State(D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00400	Complaint	Feb. 10, 2025	**Overview:** *Two nonprofit organizations sued the Trump administration over the suspension of United States Agency for International Development ("USAID") funding. The organizations argue that the suspensions have harmed their work and employees, exceed the President's scope of authority, and violate the Constitution. The organizations have asked the court to declare the suspension unlawful, immediately reinstate funding, and stop enforcement of the suspension. The court stopped the enforcement of a blanket suspension of funding but did not stop the underlying Executive Order (EO 14169) which affects employment and contracts. The organizations subsequently argued that the administration failed to comply with the order, to which the court ordered enforcement on the administration but did not expressly acknowledge any noncompliance.*	2025-03-10

			The Trump administration appealed this case up to the US Supreme Court. On March 5, 2025, the Supreme Court decided that the administration must continue to pay already appropriated foreign assistance funds. **Case Summary**: On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration issued an executive order including a 90-day pause in "foreign development assistance," and the Secretary of State then issued stop-work orders for United States Agency for International Development (USAID) foreign assistance grants. Plaintiffs, AIDS Vaccine Advocacy Coalition (AVAC) and Journalism Development Network (JDN), sued for declaratory and injunctive relief to stop the implementation of the Executive Order and the stop-work order. Plaintiffs are two nonprofit organizations that receive federal grants from USAID to support their work. Both AVAC's and JDN's funding was appropriated by Congress through the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act. Plaintiffs allege the Executive Order and stop-work order have been detrimental to their work, forcing them to lay off staff, slashing their budgets, and impacting their ability to carry out their missions. They allege the President acted ultra vires and usurped legislative authority. They also allege the President has violated the Take Care Clause. Plaintiffs' claims against the State Department, USAID, Secretary of State Marc Rubio, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and OMB Director Vought are that the stop-work orders are arbitrary and capricious in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Anti-Deficiency Act (as an "unlawful reserve"), and the Impoundment Control Act. Plaintiffs seek a declaration from the court that the suspension of foreign aid is unlawful, an injunction stopping defendants from enforcing the Executive Order, and an order to immediately reinstate foreign assistance funding. **Update 1:** On Feb. 12, Plaintiffs moved for a TRO enjoining Defendants from enforcing the Executive Order and State Department policy, enjoining stop-work orders, and reinstating foreign assistance funding and administration. **Update 2:** On Feb. 13, the court granted a TRO in this case and *Global Health Council v. Trump* on narrower terms than originally requested. The order enjoins implementation on the blanket suspension of foreign aid funding, but does not enjoin enforcement or implementation of Executive Order 14169, individual personnel decisions, or termination of individual contracts. **Update 3:** On Feb. 19, Plaintiffs filed an emergency motion for contempt seeking to enforce the Feb. 13 TRO against Defendants and hold them in civil contempt. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' purported compliance with the TRO "strains credulity" and that Defendants have continued to suspend funding and enforce stop-work orders in violation of the court's orders. **Update 4:** On Feb. 20, the court granted in part plaintiffs' motion for enforcement of the court's TRO "to the extent Defendants have not complied with the terms of the TRO," but did not make	

			a finding of contempt, citing "Defendants' explicit recognition that 'prompt compliance with the order' is required." The granted motion applies to this case and Global Health Council v. Trump. **Update 5:** On Feb. 24, plaintiffs in Global Health Council v. Trump filed an emergency renewed motion to enforce the TRO. The court held a hearing the following day and, on Feb. 25, granted the motion for a proposed order requiring the Administration pay all invoices and letter of credit drawdown requests for work completed prior to the TRO, as well as reimbursements on grants and assistance agreements by 11:59 pm on Wednesday, Feb. 26. The court further mandated that the Administration take no actions to impede and must ensure the prompt payment of appropriated foreign assistance funds going forward. The court also reportedly ordered the government to provide the court, by Feb. 26 at noon, with all internal directives to agency employees concerning compliance with the TRO. **Update 6:** On Feb. 25, the Government submitted a notice of its decision to appeal the court's decision to the DC Circuit, and a motion to stay the court's order pending appeal. **Update 7:** On Feb. 26, the district court rejected and the D.C. Circuit dismissed the Government's motion for a stay. **Update 8:** On Feb. 26, the Government filed an application with the U.S. Supreme Court (while the decision before the D.C. Circuit was still pending) to vacate the district court's TRO and grant an immediate administrative stay. That evening, Chief Justice Roberts granted an administrative stay and ordered a response by the plaintiffs by Feb. 28 at 12:p.m. EST. **Update 9:** On Feb. 28, the Plaintiffs filed its opposition to the application. **Update 10:** On Mar. 5, the Supreme Court rejected the Defendants' petition in a 5-4 decision. **Update 11:** On Mar. 6, Judge Amir H. Ali ruled from the bench that the government must make outstanding balances to the Plaintiffs by Mar. 10; but did not resolve the payments for foreign aid recipients other than the Plaintiffs, which total near $2 billion. **Update 12:** On Mar. 10, Judge Ali granted in part and denied in part the motion for a preliminary injunction. The judge ordered the government to pay nearly $2 billion in foreign assistance for work performed before Feb. 13, but he did not reject the State Department's review and termination of thousands of foreign aid contracts for work after that date. He ruled that the plaintiffs were not likely to succeed on the claim that the latter actions flowed from the original government directives in violation of the law.	
Global Health Council v. Trump (D.D.C.)	Complaint	Feb. 11, 2025	**Overview:** *A group of organizations sued the Trump administration for defunding the United States Agency for International Development ("USAID"), laying off employees, and attempting to*	2025-03-10

Case No. 1:25-cv-00402			*dismantle the agency. The group argues that these actions violated the Constitution and federal laws, and exceeded the authority of the agencies and the President. The group has asked the court to void all actions taken by the administration, and stop the administration from implementing the underlying Executive Order (EO 14169). The Trump administration appealed this case up to the US Supreme Court. On March 5, 2025, the Supreme Court decided that the administration must continue to pay already appropriated foreign assistance funds.* **Case Summary**: A group of for-profit and nonprofit organizations that contract with USAID sued the Trump administration over its recent actions to defund USAID, lay off or furlough employees, and transfer the Agency to be under the State Department. Plaintiffs provide a detailed chronology of the actions, memoranda, and statements that the Administration has issued. In addition to imperiling future projects by freezing future funds, plaintiffs also allege that there is money unpaid for services already performed. ($3,376,832 for Democracy International, approximately $120 million for DAI, $103.6 million for Chemonics, and tens of millions for SBAIC's members.) Plaintiffs allege that neither the President, nor the Secretary of State, nor the USAID Administrator have the authority to unilaterally withhold already-appropriated funds, citing the Constitution and statutory law prohibiting the unilateral withholding: the Impoundment Control Act and the Anti-Deficiency Act. Plaintiffs also claim violations of the Administrative Procedure Act; that the Executive's actions were arbitrary and capricious, and contrary to statutory and constitutional law. Plaintiffs ask the court to vacate and set aside all of the defendants' actions to implement Executive Order 14169 and seek injunctions to prevent defendants from continuing to implement EO 14169 and from "dismantling USAID." **Update 1:** On Feb. 11, Plaintiffs moved for a TRO enjoining implementation of the Executive Order and State Department Memorandum. **Update 2:** On Feb. 13, the court granted a TRO in this case and *AIDS Vaccine Advocacy Coalition v. United States Department of State* on narrower terms than originally requested. The order enjoins implementation on the blanket suspension of foreign aid funding, but does not enjoin enforcement or implementation of Executive Order 14169, individual personnel decisions, or termination of individual contracts. **Update 3:** On Feb. 20, the court granted in part plaintiffs' motion for enforcement of the court's TRO "to the extent Defendants have not complied with the terms of the TRO," but did not make a finding of contempt, citing "Defendants' explicit recognition that 'prompt compliance with the order' is required." The granted motion applies to this case and *AIDS Vaccine Advocacy Coalition v. United States Department of State*. **Update 4**: On Feb. 24, plaintiffs filed an emergency renewed motion to enforce the TRO. The court held a hearing the following day and, on Feb. 25, granted the motion for a proposed	

			order requiring the Administration pay all invoices and letter of credit drawdown requests for work completed prior to the TRO, as well as reimbursements on grants and assistance agreements by 11:59 pm on Wednesday, Feb. 26. The court further mandated that the Administration take no actions to impede and must ensure the prompt payment of appropriated foreign assistance funds going forward. The court also reportedly ordered the government to provide the court, by Feb. 26 at noon, with all internal directives to agency employees concerning compliance with the TRO. **Update 5:** On Feb. 25, the Government submitted a notice of its decision to appeal the court's decision to the DC Circuit, and a motion to stay the court's order pending appeal. **Update 6:** On Feb. 26, the district court rejected and the D.C. Circuit dismissed the Government's motion for a stay. **Update 7:** On Feb. 26, the Government filed an application with the U.S. Supreme Court (while the decision before the D.C. Circuit was still pending) to vacate the district court's TRO and grant an immediate administrative stay. That evening, Chief Justice Roberts granted an administrative stay and ordered a response by the plaintiffs by Feb. 28 at 12:p.m. EST. **Update 8:** On Feb. 28, the Plaintiffs filed its opposition to the application. **Update 9:** On Mar. 5, the Supreme Court rejected the Defendants' petition in a 5-4 decision. **Update 10:** On Mar. 6, Judge Amir H. Ali ruled from the bench that the government must make outstanding balances to the Plaintiffs by Mar. 10; but did not resolve the payments for foreign aid recipients other than the Plaintiffs, which total near $2 billion. **Update 11:** On Mar. 10, Judge Ali granted in part and denied in part the motion for a preliminary injunction. The judge ordered the government to pay nearly $2 billion in foreign assistance for work performed before Feb. 13, but he did not reject the State Department's review and termination of thousands of foreign aid contracts for work after that date. He ruled that the plaintiffs were not likely to succeed on the claim that the latter actions flowed from the original government directives in violation of the law.	
Personal Services Contractor Association v. Trump et al (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00469	Complaint	Feb. 18, 2025	**Overview:** *The Personal Services Contractor Association, representing contractors from the US Agency for International Development ("USAID"), challenged President Donald Trump's Executive Order that suspended U.S. foreign aid and began dismantling USAID. They seek both an immediate temporary restraining order and a permanent injunction to prevent USAID's dismantling and the freezing of congressionally appropriated foreign assistance funds. On Mar. 6, a federal judge denied the contractors' request for the temporary restraining order.*	2025-03-06

			On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration issued an executive order including a 90-day pause in "foreign development assistance," and the Secretary of State then issued stop-work orders for United States Agency for International Development (USAID) foreign assistance grants. The Personal Services Contractor Association filed suit on Feb. 18, 2025, challenging Executive Order 14169 and subsequent actions that effectively suspended U.S. foreign aid and began dismantling USAID. The plaintiffs, representing USAID contractors, allege these actions have caused severe disruption, including contractors being locked out of facilities and email, facing eviction overseas, losing access to healthcare, and being unable to carry out humanitarian aid work. The plaintiffs bring four causes of action: (1) violation of separation of powers against Trump, (2) violation of the Take Care Clause against Trump, (3) violation of the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) for arbitrary and capricious actions against all defendants except Trump, and (4) violation of the APA for actions not in accordance with law (including under the Impoundment Act and Anti-Deficiency Act) against all defendants except Trump. The plaintiffs seek both immediate temporary relief (to restore USAID contractors to their pre-January 20 employment status and work conditions) and permanent injunctive relief to prevent USAID's dismantling, its absorption into the State Department, and the freezing of congressionally-appropriated foreign assistance funds without congressional approval. They also request ongoing compliance monitoring through regular status reports. **Update 1:** On Feb. 19, Plaintiffs submitted a motion for a temporary restraining order, including 13 Declarations as Exhibits. **Update 2:** On Mar. 6, Judge Carl Nichols ruled from the bench denying the contractors' request for the temporary restraining order. Judge Nichols said the complaints should be adjudicated by the board of contract appeals or the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. The judge also said the plaintiffs had not established that they would suffer irreparable harm or that a TRO was in the public interest.	
Executive Action: Denial of State Department Funds				
National Endowment for Democracy v. United States (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00648	Complaint	Mar. 5, 2025	***Case Summary:*** *The National Endowment for Democracy (NED) filed suit challenging the Executive Branch's withholding of funds appropriated to the Endowment by Congress. The NED was established by the National Endowment for Democracy Act of 1983. In the Act, Congress specified that the NED would be funded by annual congressional appropriations, which would then be disbursed to the Endowment via grants from the Department of State. The statute also prescribes that the Endowment must withdraw funds from an account held by the Department of Treasury on an as-needed basis.* The complaint alleges that for the past month, "the Executive Branch has denied the	2025-03-06

			Endowment access to its congressionally appropriated funds—something that has never occurred before in the Endowment's forty-two-year existence." As a result, the Endowment claims it is "experiencing a devastating cash flow crisis that jeopardizes its ability to fulfill its mission and its very existence, as well as that of its core institutes and grantees." The complaint alleges that the Executive Branch is obligated by the NED Act to grant the funds appropriated by Congress, and by not doing so, it is acting "contrary to law and in excess of statutory authority because the statutory scheme creates a mandatory, non-discretionary duty for Defendants to make available, obligate, and disburse the Endowment's congressionally appropriated funds." The complaint argues that the administration's actions constitute an "unlawful impoundment" in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the All Writs Act, the Presentment Clause, the Appropriations Clause, the Take Care Clause, and the Separation of Powers. Plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief, a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction barring Defendants from impounding the Endowment's funds. **Update 1:** On Mar. 6, plaintiffs filed a motion for a temporary restraining order.	
Dismantling the U.S. African Development Foundation (Executive Order 14127)				
Brehm v. Marocco (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00660	Complaint	Mar. 6, 2025	**Overview:** *President Donald Trump issued an Executive Order to eliminate parts of four government offices, including the U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF). Ward Brehm, a USADF Board member, received a notice of termination after USADF refused to provide DOGE with access to USADF information systems, and Pete Marocco was appointed as acting Chair. Brehm filed a lawsuit against Marocco, DOGE, and Trump, seeking to stop his removal and Marocco's appointment and requesting a temporary block. A federal judge has denied Brehm's request to temporarily block his removal and Marocco's appointment while the case proceeds.* **Case Summary**: On Feb. 19, President Trump issued Executive Order 14127, which directed that "non-statutory components and functions" of four government entities, including the U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF), "be eliminated," among other actions. On Feb. 21, DOGE allegedly demanded access to USADF information systems, and USADF staff informed them of legal requirements that DOGE employees would have to satisfy before access was provided. On Feb. 24, Ward Brehm, a member of the USADF Board, allegedly received notice from the White House Presidential Personnel Office (PPO) that he had been terminated. On Feb. 28, USADF management allegedly received a letter from PPO appointing Pete Marocco as acting Chair of the Board of USADF. On Mar. 3, previously appointed members of the Board allegedly held an emergency meeting and determined that Marocco's appointment was unlawful. On Mar. 5, Brehm allegedly informed DOGE that Marocco did not hold a position with USADF and instructed USADF staff to deny him access to its offices.	**2025-03-11**

			On Mar. 6, Brehm in his personal and official capacity, filed suit against Marocco, DOGE, and President Trump, arguing the defendants actions are (1) an ultra vires violation of the African Development Foundation Act as Marocco was neither nominated to the Board nor confirmed by the Senate; (2) an ultra vires violation of the separation of powers; (3) a violation of the APA as not in accordance with the law and in excess of statutory authority. Brehm seeks a declaratory judgment that he is the President of USADF and Marocco's appointment was unlawful; preliminary and permanent injunctive relief; and, in the alternative, a writ of mandamus prohibiting his removal by any entity other than the Board. The same day, plaintiff filed a motion for a temporary restraining order. **Update 1**: On Mar. 6, Judge Richard J. Leon issued an administrative stay prohibiting Brehm from being removed from office and Marocco from being appointed to the Board. **Update 2**: On Mar. 11, Judge Leon issued a Memorandum Order denying the TRO request. "The heart of the problem is that Brehm has not identified any cognizable irreparable harm to himself as opposed to potential harm to the agency and its partners," Judge Leon wrote (emphasis in original). As an aside, Judge Leon wrote that "Brehm raise[sic] a colorable Appointment Clause claim," that the Vacancy Act does not permit the appointment of Marocco and "[t]he Court has not found–nor has the Government identified–any other statute that provides President Trump with the authority to appoint Marocco as the Acting Chairman of the Board."	
Executive Action: Large-scale reductions in force (Executive Order 14210)				
National Treasury Employees Union v. Donald Trump (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00420	Complaint	Feb. 12, 2025	**Overview:** *Multiple unions have challenged President Donald Trump's executive order (EO) to reduce the federal workforce by stripping thousands of civil service members of their employment protections, allowing them to be fired without cause. The unions argue that mass firings, the "deferred resignation" program, and preparations for large-scale reductions in force ("RIFs") violate the Constitution and federal law. The unions have asked the court to declare these actions unlawful and stop agencies from implementing the RIFs and deferred resignation program.* **Case Summary:** On Feb. 11, 2025, President Trump issued an executive order instructing agency heads to "undertake preparations to initiate large-scale reductions in force (RIFs)." Plaintiffs allege that the executive order, along with the Office of Personnel Management's "deferred resignation program," violates separation of powers principles by undermining Congress's authority, and the Administrative Procedure Act by imposing RIFs contrary to regulations. They seek a declaration that mass firings and the deferred resignation program are unlawful, along with injunctions to prevent agency heads from implementing RIFs and OPM from extending, expanding, or replicating its deferred resignation program.	**2025-02-20**

			Update 1: On Feb. 14, plaintiffs filed a motion for a temporary restraining order. **Update 2**: On Feb. 17, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint. **Update 3**: On Feb. 20, Judge Christopher R. Cooper denied the motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction, ruling that the court lacked subject matter jurisdiction and claims must first be brought before the Federal Labor Relations Authority.	
Maryland et al. v. U.S. Department of Agriculture et al. (D. Md.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00748-ABA	Complaint	Mar. 06, 2025	Case Summary: On Feb. 11, 2025, President Trump issued an executive order instructing agency heads to "undertake preparations to initiate large-scale reductions in force (RIFs)." Plaintiff States allege that Defendant agencies violated the Administrative Procedure Act by not abiding by the necessary statutory and regulatory requirements for RIF procedures including a required 60-day notice to states and employees; and on ground that the procedures adopted were arbitrary and capricious. They seek declaratory and injunctive relief requiring the Defendant agencies to 1) cease the RIFs of probationary employees; 2) reinstate any employees who were fired as part of the mass terminations that followed President Trump's second inauguration; 3) refrain from separating any employees pursuant to a RIF prior to reinstatement of the unlawfully terminated employees; and 4) conduct any future RIFs in accordance with applicable law, including providing advance notice to States. **Update 1:** On Mar. 7, plaintiffs filed a motion for a temporary restraining order. Update 2: On Mar. 13, the District Court granted plaintiffs' motion for a temporary restraining order. Judge * wrote that the government said "it dismissed each one of these thousands of probationary employees for "performance" or other individualized reasons. On the record before the Court, this isn't true. There were no individualized assessments of employees. They were all just fired. Collectively."	**2025-03-13**
Executive Action: Termination of probationary employees				
American Federation Of Government Employees, AFL-CIO v. Office of Personnel Management and Ezell (N.D. Cal.) Case No. 3:25-cv-01780	Complaint Amended Complaint	Feb. 19, 2025 Feb. 23, 2025	***Overview:** A group of labor and nonprofit organizations are challenging the Office of Personnel Management's ("OPM") order to terminate federal employees en masse. The organizations argue that the terminations have falsely cited performance reasons and violate the Constitution and federal law. The organizations also argue that the OPM has violated federal law by sending emails to employees requesting weekly updates on their work; Elon Musk further stated that failure to comply would be considered a resignation. The organizations have asked the court to declare the mass termination unlawful, void the mass termination order, and rescind unlawful terminations made so far. A federal judge has temporarily blocked the mass termination order and ordered the firings to be stopped and rescinded.*	**2025-03-17**

			Case Summary: On Feb. 13, 2025, the Office of Personnel Management and Acting Director Charles Ezell ordered federal agencies to terminate tens of thousands of probationary employees en masse. Probationary employees are members of the competitive service in their first year of employment or of the excepted service in their first two years of employment, and may also include long-time federal workers who have recently been employed in a new position or a new agency. Among the factual claims, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants sent agencies "standardized notices of termination, drafted by OPM, that falsely state that the terminations are for performance reasons." Plaintiffs allege that the mass termination violates multiple requirements under the Administrative Procedure Act and separation of powers principles by overriding Congressional statutes authorizing and regulating agency hiring and firing. They seek a declaration that the mass termination is unlawful and a preliminary or permanent injunction setting aside OPM's order, ceasing terminations pursuant to the order, and rescinding any prior unlawful terminations. **Update 1**: On Feb. 23, Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint alleging that OPM further violated the APA by sending emails to government employees requesting updates on their week-to-week accomplishments and Musk's stating that "[f]ailure to respond will be taken as a resignation." **Update 2**: On Feb. 27, Judge William Alsup reportedly ruled from the bench that OPM had no legal authority to issue directives for other agencies to fire probationary employees. Alsup noted that, due to jurisdictional issues, his order applies only to employees at six agencies (the National Park Service, National Science Foundation, Small Business Administration, Bureau of Land Management, and Department of Veterans Affairs, and Department of Defense), and that he could not directly order agencies to cease the firings. As for other agencies not covered, Alsup said, "I am going to count on the government to do the right thing, and to go a little bit further than I have ordered, and to let some of these agencies know what I have ruled." **Update 3:** On Feb. 28, Judge Alsup issued an Opinion and a written Order for a TRO. The Order states that OPM's memos directing the termination of probationary workers were "unlawful, invalid, and must be stopped and rescinded," and that OPM must provide written notice of the order to the six agencies. **Update 4**: On Mar. 13, Judge Alsup held a preliminary injunction hearing and, in ruling from the bench, granted and extended the TRO. Alsup directed counsel to file briefs by Mar. 21. **Update 5**: On Mar. 13, the Defendants submitted a **notice of appeal** to the Ninth Circuit.	

			Update 6: On Mar. 17, the Ninth Circuit denied the government's request for an administrative stay.	
GOVERNMENT GRANTS, LOANS AND ASSISTANCE				
Executive Action: "Temporary Pause" of grants, loans, and assistance programs				
National Council of Nonprofits v. Office of Management and Budget (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00239-LLA	Complaint	Jan. 28, 2025	**Overview:** *Small business and nonprofit recipients of federal funds sued the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB"), challenging their memo requiring every federal agency to pause any activities related to President Donald Trump's executive orders ("EOs"). The plaintiffs argue that OMB's memo violates the Constitution and federal law, and exceeds the scope of its authority. The plaintiffs have asked the court to declare the memo unlawful and unconstitutional, and stop the OMB from implementing or enforcing its memo. After the court temporarily stopped OMB from implementing the memo, OMB rescinded its memo but issued a statement that the underlying EOs on freezing federal funding was still in effect and would be implemented. The court subsequently issued a temporary block on OMB from implementing the funding freeze. On February 11, the plaintiffs requested the block be extended for the duration of the lawsuit and on February 25, the court granted the plaintiffs' request.* **Case Summary**: The Acting Director of the Office of Management and Budget issued a memorandum purported to "require every federal agency to temporarily pause" any agency activities "that may be implicated by [President Trump's] executive orders." The plaintiff organizations, represented by Democracy Forward, are small businesses and nonprofits that receive federal funds. The suit sought a temporary restraining order to allow the Court "an opportunity to more fully consider the illegality of OMB's actions," alleging violations of the Administrative Procedure Act and the First Amendment. **Update 1:** On Jan. 28, 2025, Judge Loren AliKhan of the District Court for the District of Columbia issued a temporary restraining order against the OMB policy to allow arguments from the plaintiffs and the government. **Update 2:** On Jan. 29, 2025, the Government submitted a Notice that the OMB had rescinded the challenged memo. On the same day, the White House Press Secretary stated, "This is not a rescission of the federal funding freeze. It is simply a rescission of the OMB memo. Why? To end any confusion created by the court's injunction. The President's EO's on federal funding remain in full force and effect, and will be rigorously implemented." **Update 3:** On Feb. 3, 2025, Judge Alikhan issued a temporary restraining order blocking the OMB from implementing its funding freeze, finding that the Plaintiffs are likely to succeed in their	2025-02-25

			claim that the directive was arbitrary and capricious under the APA, and that the post-complaint rescission of the memorandum was "disingenuous" and still causing irreparable injury. The order directed the OMB to release the frozen funds, notify agencies of this TRO, and file a status report on compliance by Feb. 7, 2025. **Update 4:** On Feb. 11, Plaintiffs moved for a preliminary injunction to enjoin the Trump Administration from reinstating the funding freeze. The Government filed a memorandum in opposition to the motion, and plaintiffs replied. The hearing was held on Feb. 20. **Update 5:** On Feb. 25, the court issued a memorandum opinion and granted the plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction, enjoining the Trump administration from implementing, giving effect to, or reinstating under a different name the blanket freeze on disbursement of Federal funds.	
New York et al v. Donald J. Trump et al (D.R.I.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00039	Complaint	Jan. 28, 2025	**Overview:** *The attorneys general of 22 states and the District of Columbia sued the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB), challenging its directive to pause federal funding as a violation of the Administrative Procedure Act and the First Amendment. While the OMB later rescinded the memo referred to in the states' complaint, the federal courts since then have ruled that the Trump Administration should release the funding freeze and the First Circuit of Appeals issued a voluntary dismissal of the Trump Administration's appeal of the Rhode Island District Court's ruling.* **Case Summary**: The Acting Director of the Office of Management and Budget issued a memorandum purported to "require every federal agency to temporarily pause" any agency activities "that may be implicated by [President Trump's] executive orders." The attorneys general of 22 states and the District of Columbia filed a lawsuit seeking preliminary and permanent injunctions against enforcement of the policy. The suit alleges that the policy violates the Administrative Procedure Act and the First Amendment. **Update 1:** On Jan. 28, responding to National Council of Nonprofits v. Office of Management and Budget, Judge Loren AliKhan of the District Court for the District of Columbia issued a temporary restraining order against the OMB policy to allow arguments from the plaintiffs and the government. **Update 2:** On Jan. 29, the Government submitted a Notice that the OMB had rescinded the challenged memo. On the same day, the White House Press Secretary stated, "This is not a rescission of the federal funding freeze. It is simply a rescission of the OMB memo. Why? To end any confusion created by the court's injunction. The President's EO's on federal funding remain in full force and effect, and will be rigorously implemented." **Update 3:** On January 31, Judge McConnell issued a temporary restraining order against the OMB policy to allow the states to file their motion for a preliminary injunction. Judge	2025-03-06

			McConnell's order notes that the case is not moot because "the alleged rescission of the OMB Directive was in name only and may have been issued simply to defeat the jurisdiction of the courts." The judge also wrote, "the States are likely to succeed on the merits of some, if not all, their claims." **Update 4:** On Feb. 10, Judge McConnell granted Plaintiffs' motion to enforce the temporary restraining order. Judge McConnell noted the Plaintiff States presented evidence suggesting that Defendants "have continued to improperly freeze federal funds and refused to resume disbursement of appropriated federal funds" (citing three exhibits). Judge McConnell emphasized that this is a violation of the TRO and ordered Defendants to immediately restore frozen funding. **Update 5**: On Feb. 14, the First Circuit issued a voluntary dismissal of defendants' motion to appeal the decision. **Update 6**: On Mar. 6, Judge McConnell granted the plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. Defendants were enjoined from in any way impeding the disbursement of appropriated federal funds to the states.	
Shapiro et al. v. Department of Interior et al. (E.D. Pa.) Case No. 2:25-cv-00763	Complaint	Feb. 13, 2025	**Overview:** *Pennsylvania Governor Josh Shapiro and several Pennsylvania state departments sued the Trump Administration over a funding freeze implicating billions in already committed federal funds. The lawsuit alleges violations of the Administrative Procedure Act and the Constitution, seeking to restore the suspended funding.* **Case Summary**: The Plaintiffs—Governor Josh Shapiro of Pennsylvania and four Pennsylvania governmental departments—allege that five Executive Orders and a subsequent OMB Directive froze funds already appropriated to various departments and projects in Pennsylvania. The complaint describes five different communications from EPA, HHS, and DOE after the Jan. 27 OMB Directive. None of these communications identified specific programs or funds that would be terminated, and none cited any legal authority. Much of this funding was appropriated under either the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) or the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA). The plaintiffs allege that, in total, the funding freeze jeopardizes at least $5.5 billion that had been committed to Pennsylvania, and over $1 billion of which had already been obligated. The plaintiffs note the ongoing litigation on the funding freeze, but they claim that, despite the court action – Jan. 31 TRO (D.R.I.), the Feb. 3 TRO (D.D.C.), the Feb. 7 motion to enforce the TRO (D.R.I.), and the Feb. 11 denial of the defendants' motion for an administrative stay (1st Cir.) – as of Feb. 13, over $1.2 billion in grant funding is suspended and more than $900 million is marked as requiring further federal review before being approved. Plaintiffs claim that defendants' actions violate the Administrative Procedure Act because they are contrary to law (contrary to the IRA and the IIJA) and are arbitrary and capricious. Plaintiffs also claim that defendants' actions are unconstitutional, violating both the Take Care Clause and the Spending Clause.	2025-02-13

			Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment that defendants' actions are illegal and seek an injunction to prevent defendants from freezing or interfering with congressionally appropriated funds.	
Catholic Charities Diocese of Fort Worth, Inc. v. DHHS (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00605	Complaint	Mar. 3, 2025	**Case Summary**: On Jan. 27, 2025, the Acting Director of the Office of Management and Budget issued a memorandum purported to "require every federal agency to temporarily pause all activities related to obligation or disbursement of all Federal financial assistance." Despite the purported rescission of the memo days later, and temporary restraining orders requiring agencies to disburse funding, as of Mar. 3, 2025, federal funding apparently remained frozen. Plaintiffs, who receive federal funding through the Department of Health and Human Services' Office of Refugee Resettlement, allege that the funding freeze violates the Constitution's Spending Clause, the Administrative Procedure Act, the Impoundment Control Act, and the Refugee Act of 1980. They seek declaratory judgment that the spending freeze violates statutory law and the Constitution and temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctions against enforcement of any funding freeze against the plaintiffs.	2025-03-03
Corporation for Public Broadcasting v. Federal Emergency Management Agency (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00740	Complaint	Mar. 13, 2025	**Overview:** *The Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB), a DC-based nonprofit that manages the federal government's investment in public broadcasting, brought a suit against the FEMA for placing a hold on congressionally appropriated funds intended for the national emergency weather alert system. The nonprofit is seeking to block the hold and to prevent FEMA from interfering with any grant payments. On Mar. 17, a federal judge denied the nonprofit's request for a temporary block while the case proceeds.* **Case Summary:** On Feb. 19, 2025, FEMA placed a hold on grant funds that are due and owed under a grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and FEMA to the Plaintiff relating to the Next Generation Warning System (NGWS) for the nation's emergency alert system. FEMA has not identified any reason for this hold. Plaintiff claims that FEMA's failure to allow CPB to submit reimbursements and receive payments owed to 42 sub-awardee public media stations, which have committed funds to purchase critical equipment for NGWS program upgrades and enhancements, is arbitrary and unlawful. Plaintiffs bring the suit under the Administrative Procedure Act arguing the government conduct is arbitrary and capricious, and they seek a TRO and preliminary injunction. **Update 1:** Plaintiff filed a motion for a TRO on Mar. 13, 2025. Defendants filed a memorandum in opposition to the TRO on Mar. 15, and Plaintiff filed a reply on Mar. 16. **Update 2:** On Mar. 17, 2025, Judge Timothy Kelly denied Plaintiff's motion for a TRO.	2025-03-13

Executive Action: Reduction of indirect cost reimbursement rate for research institutions (NIH Guidance)				
Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. National Institutes of Health (D. Mass.) Case No. 1:25-cv-10338	Complaint	Feb. 10, 2025	The National Institutes of Health's guidance imposes an across-the-board 15 percent reimbursement rate for "indirect costs" of medical research, which research institutions have historically negotiated on an individual basis. Plaintiffs, 22 state governments whose public research institutions will face hardship under the policy, allege that the policy violates the Administrative Procedure Act – including as an "arbitrary and capricious" change that failed to weigh reliance interests and that involves a reversal of fact-finding and as an action in excess the NIH's statutory authority and in violation of Congress's express directives in appropriating NIH funding. They seek declaratory judgment and a temporary restraining order and preliminary and permanent injunctions against implementing the policy in the plaintiff states. On Feb. 10, 2025, Judge Angel Kelley granted the plaintiffs emergency motion for a temporary restraining order and imposed a regular reporting requirement on the part of the administration to confirm compliance. **Update 1:** On Mar. 5, 2025: Judge Kelley issued a nationwide preliminary injunction prohibiting implementation of the NIH Guidance "in any form with respect to institutions nationwide."	2025-03-05
Association of American Universities, et al. v. Department of Health and Human Services, et al. (D. Mass.) Case No. 1:25-cv-10346	Complaint	Feb. 10, 2025	***Overview**: Multiple academic institutions sued the Department of Health and Human Services ("DHHS") and the National Institute of Health ("NIH"), challenging a new NIH policy that caps the amount of reimbursements available in medical research grants. The institutions argue that the policy violates the constitution and federal law, and exceeds NIH's authority. The institutions have asked the courts to declare the policy unlawful and to stop implementation of the policy. The court has their request and has blocked the policy from implementation nationwide.* **Case Summary**: National Institutes of Health (NIH) guidance imposes an across-the-board 15 percent reimbursement rate for "indirect costs" of medical research, which research institutions have historically negotiated on an individual basis. Plaintiffs, including associations representing universities and college and individual universities, allege the reduction in indirect cost rate to 15% will have immediate destructive effects on NIH-funded research. They sued, arguing the policy is unlawful under of the Administrative Procedure Act in that it (1) is contrary to law in that it departs from the Continuing Appropriations Act of 2024; (2) is contrary to law as it violates the Constitution's Appropriation Clause; (3) is contrary to law as it departs from negotiated cost rates provided by 45 C.F.R. 75.414 and NIH Grants Policy Statement; (4) is an arbitrary and capricious abuse of discretion; (5) is contrary to law as it departs from HHS cost recovery regulations and policy guidance; (6) fails to observe required notice-and-comment procedures; (7) is contrary to law violates the Public Health Service Act; and (8) is in excess of statutory authority as a retroactive action. Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment that the policy is unlawful and preliminary and permanent injunctive relief. Later on Feb. 10, Plaintiffs filed	2025-03-05

			a motion for a Temporary Restraining Order to prohibit Defendants from implementing the policy. **Update 1:** On Mar. 5, 2025: Judge Kelley issued a nationwide preliminary injunction prohibiting implementation of the NIH Guidance "in any form with respect to institutions nationwide."	
Association of American Medical Colleges v. National Institutes of Health (D. Mass.) Case No. 1:25-cv-10340	Complaint	Feb. 10, 2025	**Overview:** *Multiple nonprofit organizations sued the Department of Health and Human Services ("DHHS") and the National Institute of Health ("NIH"), challenging a new NIH policy that caps the amount of reimbursements available in medical research grants. The organizations argue that the policy violates federal law, and exceeds NIH's authority. The organizations have asked the courts to stop implementation of the policy; the court has their request and has blocked the policy from implementation nationwide.* **Case Summary**: The National Institutes of Health's guidance imposes an across-the-board 15 percent reimbursement rate for "indirect costs" of medical research, which research institutions have historically negotiated on an individual basis. Plaintiffs, including associations representing universities, hospitals, and health systems across the country, allege that the Rate Change Notice is invalid under the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA") and seek to enjoin any actions taken to implement its directives. They argue that the Rate Change Notice is contrary to Health and Human Services' (HHS) existing regulations and the 2024 Further Consolidated Appropriations Act. Moreover, they contend that it is arbitrary and capricious and failed to undergo required notice and comment rulemaking. **Update 1:** On Mar. 5, 2025: Judge Kelley issued a nationwide preliminary injunction prohibiting implementation of the NIH Guidance "in any form with respect to institutions nationwide."	2025-03-05
DIVERSITY, EQUITY, INCLUSION, AND ACCESSIBILITY				
Executive Action: Ban on DEIA initiatives in the executive branch and by contractors (**Executive Order 14168**; **Executive Order 14151**; **Executive Order 14173**)				
Nat'l Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Ed. v. Trump (D. Md.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00333-ABA	Complaint	Feb. 3, 2025	**Overview:** *Several organizations, including the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education, sued President Donald Trump alleging his Executive Orders 14151 and 14173 ("EOs") that target diversity, equity, and inclusion ("DEI") programs violate their constitutional rights, including the right to free speech. The organizations are asking the judge to declare both EOs unconstitutional and unlawful, and to stop enforcement of the EOs immediately and at least for the duration of the lawsuit. The judge has partially granted the organization's request by stopping enforcement of the EOs while the lawsuit is pending. The Trump administration has appealed the judge's decision to a higher court.*	**2025-03-07**

			Case Summary: On January 20, 2025, the Trump administration issued an executive order directing the OMB Director, assisted by the Attorney General and OPM, to terminate DEI programs, offices and positions, and "equity-related" grants and contracts. On January 21, 2025, the administration issued another executive order revoking an Equal Employment Opportunity executive order in place since 1965; requiring federal grant recipients and contractors to certify that they do not operate DEI programs that violate anti-discrimination laws; and requiring each executive agency to identify up to nine corporations or nonprofit entities or associations to target with civil investigations to deter DEI programs. Plaintiffs argue the first order is an unconstitutional violation of the Spending Clause and the 5th Amendment's due process guarantee for vagueness. They argue the second order unconstitutionally violates 5th Amendment due process for vagueness; the 1st Amendment's free speech clause; and the separation of powers. They seek declaratory judgments that both orders are unlawful and unconstitutional, and preliminary and permanent injunctions against both. **Update 1**: On Feb. 13, Plaintiffs moved for a TRO and preliminary injunction against enforcement of the Executive Orders. **Update 2:** On Feb. 18, Defendants filed a response against Plaintiffs' motion for a TRO and preliminary injunction, arguing, inter alia, that two of four Plaintiffs lack standing and that Plaintiffs' claims fail on merits. On Feb. 19, Plaintiffs filed a supplemental brief in support for a TRO and preliminary injunction. **Update 3:** On Feb. 21, Judge Adam B. Abelson issued a memorandum opinion and granted the preliminary injunction in large part, enjoining implementation of the Termination Provision of Executive Order 14151 and of the Certification and Enforcement Threat Provisions of Executive Order 14173. The court stated that "Plaintiffs' irreparable harms include widespread chilling of unquestionably protected speech." The court also denied the preliminary injunction in part, allowing the Attorney General to prepare the report pursuant to Executive Order 14173 and to engage in an investigation. **Update 4:** On Feb. 24, the Defendant submitted a notice of appeal to the Fourth Circuit. **Update 5**: On Mar. 3, Judge Abelson denied the Defendants' motion to stay the injunction pending an appeal. **Update 6**: On Mar. 10, Judge Abelson granted Plaintiff's motion to clarify the scope of the injunction, such that it applies not only to "persons in active concert or participation with defendants," but to all federal executive branch agencies. **Update 7**: On Mar. 14, the Fourth Circuit granted the government's petition for a stay of the preliminary injunction pending appeal.	

Doe 1 v. Office of the Director of National Intelligence (E.D.Va.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00300-AJT-LRV	Complaint	Feb. 17, 2025	**Overview:** *A group of career U.S. intelligence officers sued the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) for placing them on administrative leave following President Donald Trump's Executive Order ("EO") terminating Diversity Equity & Inclusion ("DEI") programs. The officers argued that the ODNI terminated them without sufficient cause, in violation of the agency's legal obligations and their constitutional rights, and asked the court to immediately block ODNI's actions. A federal court has permitted ODNI to proceed but has extended the officers' deadline to resign voluntarily in return for additional time on paid leave.* **Case Summary**: On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration issued an executive order directing the OMB Director, assisted by the Attorney General and OPM, to terminate DEI programs, offices and positions, and "equity-related" grants and contracts. Plaintiffs are U.S. intelligence officers who were assigned to diversity, equity, inclusion and accessibility (DEIA) initiatives at ODNI and CIA. The complaint alleges that Defendants placed Plaintiffs on administrative leave "apparently only because of [Plaintiffs'] temporary assignments to personnel functions involving DEIA." Plaintiffs bring several causes of action. First, they claim that Defendants violated the Administrative Leave Act by placing Plaintiffs on leave for more than ten work days, despite the fact that no worker misconduct had been alleged. Second, Plaintiffs maintain that Defendants violated the Administrative Procedure Act, because Plaintiffs' "imminent termination" is "arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, not in accordance with [Intelligence Community] regulations, and unsupported by any evidentiary record whatsoever." Third, Plaintiffs allege that Defendants violated the First and Fifth Amendments by firing Plaintiffs on the basis of "their assumed beliefs about a domestic political issue [DEIA]" and causing them to lose "their property interest in their employment without due process of law." The plaintiffs seek injunctive relief. The plaintiffs also submitted a request for a temporary restraining order. **Update 1:** On Feb 18, the court issued an administrative stay blocking the termination of plaintiffs' employment or placing plaintiffs on leave without pay. **Update 2:** On Feb. 20, Defendants filed a motion in opposition to the plaintiffs' request for a TRO. **Update 3:** On Feb. 27, the court vacated its prior administrative stay and denied plaintiffs' motion for a temporary restraining order. Judge Anthony Trenga extended the employees' deadline to accept the administration's deferred resignation program to Monday, March 3.	2025-02-27

National Urban League v. Trump (D.D.C.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00471	Complaint	Feb. 19, 2025	**Overview:** *A group of civil rights organizations sued President Donald Trump over three Executive Orders ("EOs") that target diversity, equity, and inclusion ("DEI") programs and trangender rights. The organizations argue that the EOs violate constitutional rights, including free speech and due process. The organizations are asking the court to declare the EOs unlawful and to permanently block the EOs from being enforced.* **Case Summary**: On Jan. 20, the Trump administration issued an executive order directing the OMB Director, assisted by the Attorney General and OPM, to terminate DEI programs, offices and positions, and "equity-related" grants and contracts. On Jan. 21, the administration issued another executive order revoking an Equal Employment Opportunity executive order applying to contractors, in place since 1965; requiring federal grant recipients and contractors to certify that they do not operate DEI programs that violate anti-discrimination laws; and requiring each executive agency to identify up to nine corporations or nonprofit entities or associations to target with civil investigations to deter DEI programs. Plaintiffs, non-profits that receive federal funding for programs designed to serve vulnerable populations, allege that the executive orders violate the First Amendment's protections for freedom of speech, the Fifth Amendment's Equal Protection and Due Process guarantees, and the Administrative Procedure Act. Plaintiffs allege the same regarding Executive Order 14168, which takes similar action against programs involving trans rights, violates the same laws. Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment that the executive orders are unlawful, rescission of the executive orders, and permanent injunctions against any actions taken to enforce the executive orders.	2025-02-19
San Francisco AIDS Foundation et al v. Trump (D.D.C.) Case No. 3:25-cv-1824	Complaint	Feb. 20, 2025	**Overview:** *A group of nonprofit organizations representing LGBTQ interests sued President Donald Trump over three Executive Orders ("EOs") that target diversity, equity, and inclusion ("DEI") programs and trangender rights. The organizations argue that the EOs violate constitutional rights, including the freedom of expression and due process, and exceed the scope of the President's authority under the constitution. The organizations have asked the court to declare the EOs unlawful and unconstitutional, and to immediately and permanently block the implementation and enforcement of the EOs.* **Case Summary**: On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration issued an executive order to "[defend] women from gender ideology extremism and [restore] biological truth to the federal government." That same day, the President issued an executive order directing the OMB Director, assisted by the Attorney General and OPM, to terminate DEI programs, offices and positions, and "equity-related" grants and contracts. On Jan. 21, the administration issued a third executive order revoking an Equal Employment Opportunity executive order in place since 1965; requiring federal grant recipients and contractors to certify that they do not operate DEI programs that violate anti-discrimination laws; and requiring each executive agency to identify up to nine corporations or nonprofit entities or associations to target with civil investigations to deter DEI programs.	2025-02-20

			Plaintiffs allege that these three executive orders "pose an existential threat to transgender people and the organizations that respect their existence, shield them from harm, provide them with life-saving services and community, and engage in core protected speech advocating for their liberation." Specifically, Plaintiffs claim that the EOs: 1) have been used by Defendants to engage in viewpoint and content discrimination in violation of the First Amendment, (2) violate the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment and are void for vagueness, (3) exceed the President's powers under Article II of the Constitution by usurping congressional authority, and (4) violate the Fifth Amendment's guarantee of equal protection. Plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief to prevent implementation and enforcement of the EOs.	
Chicago Women in Trades v. Trump (N.D. Ill.) Case No. 1:25-cv-02005	Complaint	Feb. 26, 2025	**Case Summary**: On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration issued an executive order to "[defend] women from gender ideology extremism and [restore] biological truth to the federal government." That same day, the President issued an executive order directing the OMB Director, assisted by the Attorney General and OPM, to terminate DEI programs, offices and positions, and "equity-related" grants and contracts. On Jan. 21, the administration issued a third executive order revoking an Equal Employment Opportunity executive order in place since 1965; requiring federal grant recipients and contractors to certify that they do not operate DEI programs that violate anti-discrimination laws; and requiring each executive agency to identify up to nine corporations or nonprofit entities or associations to target with civil investigations to deter DEI programs. Plaintiff, a non-profit organization that works to train women to enter and remain in high-skilled trades, filed suit, arguing the executives orders (1) violate the First Amendment due to (a) overbreadth and vagueness; (b) viewpoint discrimination; and (c) setting unconstitutional conditions on speech; (2) violate the Fifth Amendment's Due Process clause for vagueness; (3) are ultra vires violations of Article I, Sec. 8 (the Spending Clause); and (4) violate the separation of powers. The Plaintiff seeks declaratory judgments that the orders are unconstitutional and preliminary and permanent injunctions enjoining their enforcement.	2025-02-26
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education v. Carter (D. Md.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00702-JRR	Complaint	Mar. 3, 2025	**Case Summary**: On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration issued an executive order to "[defend] women from gender ideology extremism and [restore] biological truth to the federal government." That same day, the President issued an executive order directing the OMB Director, assisted by the Attorney General and OPM, to terminate DEI programs, offices and positions, and "equity-related" grants and contracts. On Jan. 21, the administration issued a third executive order revoking an Equal Employment Opportunity executive order in place since 1965; requiring federal grant recipients and contractors to certify that they do not operate DEI programs that violate anti-discrimination laws; and requiring each executive agency to identify up to nine corporations or nonprofit entities or associations to target with civil investigations to deter DEI programs.	2025-03-03

			Plaintiffs are organizations whose members include hundreds of teacher preparation programs. Those programs receive grants through the U.S. Department of Education's Teacher Quality Partnership Program (TQP), Supporting Effective Educator Development Program (SEED), and Teacher and School Leader Incentive Program (TSL). Plaintiffs assert that, pursuant to the President's Executive Order 14151 which halted DEI initiatives, the Department of Education summarily terminated many of the TQP, SEED, and TSL grants without proper procedure. Specifically, the lawsuit alleges that EO 14151 is unconstitutionally vague and that the termination of the grants constitutes an arbitrary and capricious decision in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act. Plaintiffs seek declaratory relief and an injunction ordering reinstatement of grant funds. They also submitted a motion for a temporary restraining order.	
Rhode Island Latino Arts v. National Endowment for the Arts (D.R.I.) Case No. 1:25-cv-00079 Complaint (Mar. 6, 2025)	Complaint	Mar. 6, 2025	**Case Summary**: On Jan. 20, 2025, the Trump administration issued an executive order to "[defend] women from gender ideology extremism and [restore] biological truth to the federal government." That same day, the President issued an executive order directing the OMB Director, assisted by the Attorney General and OPM, to terminate DEI programs, offices and positions, and "equity-related" grants and contracts. On Jan. 21, the administration issued a third executive order revoking an Equal Employment Opportunity executive order in place since 1965; requiring federal grant recipients and contractors to certify that they do not operate DEI programs that violate anti-discrimination laws; and requiring each executive agency to identify up to nine corporations or nonprofit entities or associations to target with civil investigations to deter DEI programs. Plaintiffs are arts nonprofit corporations that have received funding from the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). Pursuant to the Jan. 20 "gender ideology" EO, the NEA now requires all grant applicants to certify their understanding that "federal funds shall not be used to promote gender ideology." Plaintiffs, who seek to "affirm transgender and nonbinary identities and experiences in the projects for which they seek funding," allege that such projects now appear to be ineligible for NEA funding, and the vagueness of the new NEA policy "requires [Plaintiffs] to guess as to what if anything they can create, produce, or promote that addresses themes of gender." The Plaintiffs claim that the NEA's "gender ideology" prohibition exceeds statutory authority under the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 and is arbitrary and capricious in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, and that the prohibition violates the First and Fifth Amendments by imposing vague and viewpoint-based restrictions on artistic speech. They seek declaratory and injunctive relief stopping the government from implementing the EO.	2025-03-06
State of California v. U.S Department of Education (D. Mass.)	Complaint	Mar. 6, 2025	**Overview:** *Eight states, including California, challenge the Department of Education's ("DOE") decision to terminate approximately $250 million in federal grants under the Teacher Quality Partnership ("TQP") and Supporting Effective Educator Development ("SEED") programs. The*	**2025-03-12**

Case No. 1:25-cv-10548			*lawsuit argues that the DOE's actions violate the Administrative Procedure Act. On March 10, a federal judge issued an order temporarily blocking the DOE from terminating the grants.* **Case Summary**: On Jan. 20, the Trump administration issued an executive order directing the government to terminate DEI programs, offices and positions, and "equity-related" grants and contracts. On Jan. 21, the administration issued another executive requiring federal grant recipients and contractors to certify that they do not operate DEI programs that violate anti-discrimination laws. On Jan. 29, the administration issued a third executive order instructing the Secretary of Education to develop a plan to eliminate federal funding for "illegal and discriminatory treatment and indoctrination in K-12 schools." On Feb. 5, the Acting Secretary of Education issued a department directive instructing DOE employees to review ongoing grants to ensure they "do not fund discriminatory practices–including in the form of DEI." Allegedly, within two days recipients of Congressionally authorized Teacher Quality Partnership (TQP) and Supporting Effective Educator Development (SEED) grants totaling more than $250M received termination letters from the Department, stating that the grants conflict with the administration's policies opposing DEI efforts. Eight states filed suit, arguing that the Department's termination of TQP and SEED grants unlawfully violates the Administrative Procedure Act as (1) arbitrary and capricious; and (2) an agency action not in accordance with law, in this case the Department's own procedures. The Plaintiff states seek an order vacating and setting aside the Department's termination of previously-awarded grants; a declaratory judgment that terminating the grants violated the APA; and preliminary and permanent injunctions preventing the government from unlawfully terminating the grants. **Update 1:** On Mar. 10, a federal judge issued a temporary restraining order blocking the DOE from terminating the grants. **Update 2:** On Mar. 12, the Defendant submitted a notice of appeal to the First Circuit.	