



---

December 21, 2019

Director of Public Affairs  
Office of Public Affairs  
Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

**Re: Freedom of Information Act Request for Records Held by the Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR)**

Dear Director:

The American Immigration Council (Council), the American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA), and Human Rights Watch (HRW) (“Requesters”) submit the following Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for records regarding the Migrant Protection Protocols (“MPP”), otherwise known as “Remain in Mexico,” announced by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) on January 24, 2019.<sup>1</sup> In accordance with 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i), we expect a response to this request within 20 working days, unless otherwise permitted by statute.

**1. REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

For the period between December 1, 2018 to the present:

- List of immigration courts (including tent court facilities and immigration adjudication centers (“IACs”) with the MPP dockets, by city and state.
  - For each immigration court, written documentation regarding whether MPP hearings are conducted in-person or by video-teleconference (VTC).
- List of immigration judges formerly, presently, and prospectively tasked with hearing MPP cases, and the location of the courts for which the immigration judges are adjudicating MPP cases, whether for a master calendar or Individual Merits hearing.
- Guidance regarding the process for assigning judges to an MPP docket, including any special criteria or qualifications required for a judge to be assigned MPP cases.
- Any instructions, directives, or guidance to Executive Office for Immigration Review (EOIR) employees on the MPP, including but not limited to:

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Homeland Security, “Migrant Protection Protocols” (January 24, 2019), <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2019/01/24/migrant-protection-protocols>.

- Training materials, PowerPoint presentations, or other written materials directed at immigration judges conducting MPP cases.
  - Procedures immigration judges must follow regarding the issuance of hearing notices, scheduling court hearings, conducting bond proceedings, and issuing orders in MPP cases.
  - Procedures attorneys and/or *pro se* respondents must follow when filing documents in MPP cases.
  - Guidance on EOIR’s role in the process where individuals who express a fear of return during an immigration court hearing are provided a *nonrefoulement* interview subsequent to the court hearing.
- Procedures for IAC judges adjudicating MPP cases, including:
    - Guidance indicating where U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) counsel will be located.
    - Guidance indicating where witnesses and interpreters will be located.
    - Mechanisms used to ensure EOIR is complying with regulation of ensuring public access.
- Instructions regarding treatment of individuals on the MPP docket who do not appear at hearings, including instructions to order these individuals removed *in absentia*.<sup>2</sup>
- Instructions and guidance on motions practice from EOIR headquarters staff and local Assistant Chief Immigration Judges (ACIJ) assigned to courts that will hear or have heard MPP cases, regarding how to adjudicate:
    - Motions for a custody redetermination hearing (i.e. “bond hearings”) for individuals subject to the MPP.
    - Motions for a change of venue for individuals in the MPP.
    - Motions to Terminate for individuals subject to the MPP.
    - Any other guidance on motion practice for individuals subject to the MPP.
- Communications, directives or guidance relating to legal access at immigration courts conducting MPP hearings, including tent courts and IACs, as follows:
    - Attorney visitation and appearance.

---

<sup>2</sup> Gaby Del Valle, *Trump’s Remain in Mexico Policy Is Causing Asylum-Seekers to Miss Court Dates — and Get Deported*, VICE News (Sept. 24, 2019), [https://www.vice.com/en\\_us/article/gyzdp9/trumps-remain-in-mexico-policy-is-causing-asylum-seekers-to-miss-court-dates-and-get-deported](https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/gyzdp9/trumps-remain-in-mexico-policy-is-causing-asylum-seekers-to-miss-court-dates-and-get-deported) (“At the Wednesday, Sept. 18 hearing [in the Laredo tent court], Judge Margaret Burkhart suggested she and other immigration judges had been instructed to order no-shows deported in absentia, regardless of extenuating circumstances, according to Krishnaswami. The Executive Office for Immigration Review did not reply to a request for comment on this claim.”).

- Legal observers.
  - Legal group presentations (such as “know your rights” or “legal orientation programs”).
  - Policies relating to communication between lawyers, legal observers, the media, and individuals in MPP awaiting hearings (or post-hearing) at the San Diego and El Paso immigration courts.
  - Policies relating to courtroom observation of MPP cases at the San Diego and El Paso immigration courts
- Guidance regarding how EOIR coordinates with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and ICE to implement the MPP program, limited to guidance related to:
    - Attorney access to MPP courts, including tent courts.
    - Access to legal observers, reporters, and the public to MPP, including tent courts.
    - Communication between CBP and EOIR when an individual appears at the port of entry and is not brought to the immigration court for any reason.
  - Any written or visual description of immigration courts hearing MPP cases, including tent courts and immigration adjudication centers (IACs), documenting physical locations and dimensions of courtrooms, attorney visitation rooms, waiting areas, and offices designated for immigration judges and Office of Chief Counsel (OCC) attorneys.
  - Minutes, transcripts, or audio of daily interagency calls on MPP that EOIR court clerks and Public Information Officers participate in on a regular basis.
  - Emails between Lauren Alder Reid and/or Kathryn Mattingly and any regional Public Information Officers (PIOs) regarding MPP.

### **3. FEE WAIVER REQUEST**

Requesters seek a fee waiver because the information they seek is “likely to contribute significantly to public understanding of the operations or activities of the government and is not primarily in the commercial interest of the [requesters]....” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(A)(iii).

#### *A. Disclosure Will Contribute to Public Understanding of EOIR Operations*

As noted previously, DHS announced the MPP, otherwise known as “Remain in Mexico,” on January 24, 2019, imposing the requirement that asylum-seekers wait in Mexico while the U.S. government adjudicates their asylum claims. Mandating that asylum-seekers wait in Mexico while they pursue their asylum claims is an unprecedented shift in U.S. asylum policy and procedure. Though this shift implicates serious safety and due process concerns, DHS has not

made guidance or information about how the MPP operates available to the public, advocates, attorneys, and asylum-seekers directly impacted by this new program.

Further, while DHS implementation of the MPP is premised on improving the process to seek asylum in the United States, while observing the safety of asylum-seekers, public reporting about the program casts doubts on these purported governmental objectives. Media outlets and non-governmental organizations have exposed the systemic infringement on due process rights, such as the right to notice of and access to court hearings, inherent in the MPP.<sup>3</sup> Reports have also documented the physical harm—including kidnapping and death—that asylum-seekers have faced while awaiting decisions on their asylum claims in Mexico.<sup>4</sup>

As the agency that administers U.S. immigration courts, EOIR plays a crucial role in the implementation of the MPP. This request seeks the disclosure of information that will enhance the public's understanding of EOIR's operations regarding the program. As outlined below, Requesters intend to make the information received in response to this request available to the public at no charge. Further, Requesters have significant audience reach, which includes varied segments of the U.S. public.

The Council regularly provides information to the public based on its FOIA requests.<sup>5</sup> In keeping with its track record of synthesizing or otherwise publishing information on governmental operations shared in responses to FOIA requests, the Council intends to post documents received in response to this FOIA request on its publicly accessible website. For calendar year 2019 (January 1, 2019-present), the Council has received 2.6 million pageviews from 1.5 million unique visitors.

---

<sup>3</sup> Molly O'Toole, "Trump Administration Appears to Violate Law in Forcing Asylum Seekers Back to Mexico, Officials Warn," Los Angeles Times (Aug. 28, 2019), <https://lat.ms/2th7YwW>; Human Rights Watch, *U.S. Move Puts More Asylum Seekers at Risk: Expanded 'Remain in Mexico' Program Undermines Due Process* (September 25, 2019), <http://bit.ly/2Ps51T6>; Human Rights First, *Orders from Above: Massive Human Rights Abuses Under Trump Administration Return to Mexico Policy* (October 2019), <http://bit.ly/34wuyPn>; Judy Perry Martinez, *Due Process Concerns at U.S.-Mexico Border*, American Bar Association (Oct. 2019), <http://bit.ly/2swT7OC>.

<sup>4</sup> Human Rights Watch, *We Can't Help You Here* (July 2, 2019), <http://bit.ly/2Eo3OG8>; Emily Green, "Trump's Asylum Policies Sent Him Back to Mexico. He Was Kidnapped Five Hours Later By a Cartel.," Vice News (Sept. 16, 2019), <http://bit.ly/2PqPAKH>; This American Life, "The Out Crowd," National Public Radio (Nov. 15, 2019), <http://bit.ly/2PuzK1X>.

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Guillermo Cantor and Walter Ewing, American Immigration Council, *Still No Action Taken: Complaints Against Border Patrol Agents Continue to Go Unanswered* (August 2017) (examining records of alleged misconduct by Border Patrol employees), [http://bit.ly/Council\\_StillNoActionTaken](http://bit.ly/Council_StillNoActionTaken); American Immigration Council, *Enforcement Overdrive: A Comprehensive Assessment of ICE's Criminal Alien Program* (November 2015) (analyzing data obtained from ICE on the CAP program), [http://bit.ly/Council\\_ICE\\_CAP](http://bit.ly/Council_ICE_CAP).

AILA also widely disseminates information to its members and the public in the form of continuing legal education materials, information, and resources, primarily through its website <https://www.aila.org/>.<sup>6</sup> Those who visit AILA's website include immigration attorneys and their individual and employer clients, media representatives, U.S businesses, foreign nationals, law students, elected officials, government employees, and other interested members of the public. Moreover, information posted to AILA's website is often linked to the websites of other organizations and immigration law firms. AILA also disseminates the information through its newsletters, social media, and other print and electronic publications.

HRW uses its extensive contacts in the media to draw greater attention to the issues, and HRW employees often comment on issues in the media. For example, HRW was mentioned in media 347,234 times in 2018, an average of nearly 1000 a day. HRW's media mentions spanned 189 countries and at least 58 languages. HRW has 4.2 million followers on its English-language Twitter account, and 2.6 million Facebook followers. HRW intends to make the information provided in response to this request to publicly available at no charge.<sup>7</sup>

#### *B. Disclosure of the Information Is Not in the Commercial Interest of the Requesters*

The Council is a not-for-profit organization and has no commercial interest in the present request. *See e.g.* 6 C.F.R. § 5.11(k)(3)(i)-(ii). This request furthers the Council's work to increase public understanding of immigration law and policy, advocate for the fair and just administration of our immigration laws, protect the legal rights of noncitizens, and educate the public about the enduring contributions of America's immigrants. As with all other reports and information available on the Council's website, the information that the Council receives in response to this FOIA request will be available to immigration attorneys, noncitizens, and other interested members of the public free of charge.

AILA is a nonpartisan, 501(c)(6) tax-exempt not-for-profit organization with no commercial interest in the present request. AILA provides its members and the public with continuing legal education, information, and resources, primarily through its website, [www.aila.org](http://www.aila.org), that is

---

<sup>6</sup> *See AILA Receives Records Relating to EOIR Misconduct in FOIA Lawsuit*, AILA Doc. No. 13111458 (last updated November 1, 2018), available at <https://www.aila.org/infonet/eoir-records-relating-misconduct>; *CBP Releases Officer's Reference Tool Documents*, AILA Doc. No. 18112701 (last updated October 21, 2019), available at <https://www.aila.org/infonet/gr-foia-cbp-table>; *FOIA Response Highlights Importance of Independent Judges, Court Reform*, AILA Doc. No. 18040300 (Last Updated April 23, 2018), available at <https://www.aila.org/infonet/foia-response-labor-agreement-between-eoir-naij>.

<sup>7</sup> *See, e.g.*, Human Rights Watch, *"I Still Need You": The Detention and Deportation of Californian Parents* (May 2017) (examining records of parents deported and separated from their US citizen children), <https://www.hrw.org/report/2017/05/15/i-still-need-you/detention-and-deportation-californian-parents>; Human Rights Watch, *"Forced Apart (By the Numbers): Non-Citizens Deported Mostly for Nonviolent Offenses* (April 2009) (examining records related to the practice of removing non-citizens for non-violent, non-serious offenses), <https://www.hrw.org/report/2009/04/15/forced-apart-numbers/non-citizens-deported-mostly-nonviolent-offenses>

updated daily with the latest immigration news and information, including agency guidance, interpretations, and policy memoranda. As described above, AILA seeks the requested information for the purpose of disseminating it to the general public, free of charge.

HRW is a non-governmental organization with no commercial interest in the present request. HRW employs over 450 professionals, among them lawyers, journalists, and academics who work to uncover and report on human rights issues around the world. In order to reach the broadest audience possible, the organization publishes detailed reports on human rights issues of interest to a broad spectrum of people. These reports are made available in print and on Human Rights Watch's website at no charge (<https://www.hrw.org/>).

Given that FOIA's fee-waiver requirements are to "be liberally construed in favor of waivers for noncommercial requesters," a waiver of all fees is justified and warranted in this case. See *Judicial Watch v. Rossotti*, 326 F.3d 1309, 1312 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (finding a fee waiver appropriate when the requester explained, in detailed and non-conclusory terms, how and to whom it would disseminate the information it received).

### **3. REQUEST TO EXPEDITE**

Requesters also ask that EOIR expedite this request because they can demonstrate that expedited treatment is warranted under the statute and governing regulations. See 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(I); 28 C.F.R. § 16.5(e). The FOIA is intended to ensure the public has timely access to information regarding governmental operations. This objective is particularly heightened regarding MPP—a program implemented without transparency that directly impacts the lives of thousands of asylum-seekers every day.

As outlined by DOJ regulations, a request qualifies for expedited treatment where it is demonstrated that:

**"(i)** circumstances in which the lack of expedited processing could reasonably be expected to pose an imminent threat to the life or physical safety of an individual; **(ii)** An urgency to inform the public about an actual or alleged federal government activity, if made by a person who is primarily engaged in disseminating information; **(iii)** The loss of substantial due process rights; or **(iv)** A matter of widespread and exceptional media interest in which there exist possible questions about the government's integrity which affect public confidence."

28 C.F.R. § 16.5(e). The courts have interpreted the "compelling need" language in the statute to encompass three factors: "(1) whether the request concerns a matter of current exigency to the American public; (2) whether the consequences of delaying a response would compromise a significant recognized interest; and (3) whether the request concerns federal government activity." See *Protect Democracy Project, Inc. v. U.S. Department of Defense*, 263 F.Supp.3d 293, 298-99 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (citing *Al-Fayed v. C.I.A.*, 254 F.3d 300, 310 (D.C. Cir. 2001)).

A FOIA request need not meet all criteria but the present request nonetheless meets all requirements for expedited treatment. In the first instance, it has been widely documented that the MPP has resulted in threats to the life and physical safety of thousands of asylum-seekers who are forced to wait in Mexico while the U.S. government adjudicates their asylum claims—asylum-seekers have been kidnapped, physically assaulted, and killed.<sup>8</sup>

Second, as noted above, Requesters are primarily engaged in the dissemination of information and intend to make the information they receive via this request available to the public. EOIR has released little to no public information regarding this program and the lack of information has generated confusion and concern as asylum-seekers, advocates, and the media are unclear about the program’s contours and procedures. Given the dangers to asylum-seekers and lack of transparency regarding due process, there is an urgent need for the public to understand how this program operates.

Third, the manner in which the MPP has been designed (to the extent publicly known) appears to have a systemically adverse impact on the due process rights of asylum-seekers, given the lack of clarity regarding immigration court procedures, including as to how asylum-seekers are processed for deportation proceedings, how they receive notice, how they can present and challenge evidence and what the program’s access to counsel policies entail.<sup>9</sup> These are significant lines of inquiry as all these procedures reflect established due process safeguards that an asylum-seeker must receive in a court proceeding in the United States.

Finally, the MPP is a “matter of widespread and exceptional media interest,” which has generated many questions about the “government’s integrity,” thereby affecting “public confidence.” The MPP appears intended to discourage asylum-seekers from seeking protection in the United States, thus conflicting with a long-standing history of welcoming those fleeing persecution. Alarming, asylum officers—DHS employees—have publicly voiced concern about the program’s legality and morality, serving to raise legitimate questions about the government’s integrity and shaking public confidence in the immigration agencies tasked with administering asylum claims.<sup>10</sup>

#### **4. EXEMPTIONS**

If EOIR concludes that statutory exemptions apply to any of the information requested, please describe in detail the nature of the information withheld, the specific exemption or privilege upon

---

<sup>8</sup> See *supra*, n. 4.

<sup>9</sup> See *supra*, n. 3.

<sup>10</sup> Molly O’Toole, “Asylum Officers Rebel Against Trump Policies They Say are Immoral and Illegal,” Los Angeles Times (Nov. 15, 2019), <https://lat.ms/36Dx2wD>; Priscilla Alvarez, “Senate Report: Whistleblowers Blast Trump Administration’s Immigration Policies,” CNN (Nov. 22, 2019), <https://cnn.it/2EriyUk>; Tanvi Misra, “‘Remain in Mexico’ Policy Faces Internal Critiques at House Hearing,” Roll Call (Nov. 29, 2019), <http://bit.ly/2S0buWW>.

which the information is withheld, and whether the portions of withheld documents containing non-exempt or non-privileged information have been provided.

## 5. FORMAT OF PRODUCTION

Requesters seek the data in a workable format, such as Microsoft Excel. ***Please also provide a glossary or other descriptive records containing definitions of acronyms, numerical codes, or terms contained in data responsive to this request, if those terms are not in the form template and/or publicly defined.***

---

Pursuant to 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(vi), I certify the statement in support of the request for expedited treatment to be true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this request. If you have any questions regarding this request, please feel free to email or call Laura Lynch at the contact information under the first signature block below.

Sincerely,

/s/ Laura Lynch

Laura Lynch

American Immigration Lawyers Association

1331 G Street, NW, Suite 300

Washington, DC 20005

202-507-7627

[llynch@aila.org](mailto:llynch@aila.org)

Emily Creighton

American Immigration Council

1331 G Street, NW, Suite 200

Washington, DC 20005

[ecreighton@immcouncil.org](mailto:ecreighton@immcouncil.org)

Clara Long

Human Rights Watch

350 Sansome Street #1000

San Francisco, CA 94104

[longc@hrw.org](mailto:longc@hrw.org)