

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

United States of America,)	Civil Action No. 2:11-cv-02958-RMG
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
State of South Carolina, and)	
Nikki R. Haley, in her official)	
capacity as the Governor of)	
South Carolina,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	
Lowcountry Immigration Coalition, et al,)	Civil Action No. 2:11-cv-02779
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	
Nikki Haley, et al,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

JOINT REPORT REGARDING CASE STATUS AND DISPOSITION

Plaintiffs in both cases and defendants State of South Carolina, Governor Nikki R. Haley and Attorney General Alan Wilson (Defendants) have conferred regarding the proper disposition of this matter in light of decisions by the United States Supreme Court and, in the instant case, the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit and the District Court of the District of South Carolina. In the interest of assisting the Court in the proper and efficient resolution of this case in accordance with those decisions, the parties make the following representations and requests regarding the various statutory provisions at issue:

1. Each reference to a provision of Act 69, 2011 S.C. Acts, herein shall be construed as a reference to any amendments to those provisions as of this date.

2. The parties acknowledged that the Fourth Circuit panels decision in *United States v. South Carolina*, 720 F.3d 518 (4th Cir. 2013), holds that Sections 54, and 6(B)(2) of Act 69 (S.C. Code §§ 16-460, 16-17-750, 17-13-170(B)(2)), are preempted by federal law. Further, the parties agree that consistent with this Court's previous determination of the Plaintiff's likelihood of success in challenging Section 15, *United States v. South Carolina*, 720 F.3d 518 (4th Cir. 2013), and together with the Supreme Court's decision in *Arizona v. United States*, 132 S.Ct. 2492 (2012), this Court would conclude that Section 15 of Act 69 (S.C. Code § 17-170) is preempted by federal law. The parties also agree that the Plaintiffs satisfy for this Court, the other requirements for obtaining final injunctions against these provisions.

3. The Defendants submit that in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Arizona v. United States*, 132 S. Ct. 2492 (2012), and the ruling of this Court on November 15, 2012, 906 F. Supp.2d 463 (D.S.C., 2012), the remainder of Section 6 of Act 69 (S.C. Code § 17-170), is subject to an interpretation that does not authorize an officer to prohibit a stop based upon the officer's inquiry into or based on a determination, suspicion, or admission concerning a person's immigration status. The view of Defendants is expressed in the Opinion of the Office of the Attorney General of March 3, 2014 (see Attachment 1). In light of this interpretation, Plaintiffs will dismiss their remaining claims as to the remainder of Section 6 without prejudice.

4. Although this Court found that the Lowcountry Plaintiffs lacked standing to challenge Section 7 of Act 69 (§ 23-3-1100) at the preliminary injunction stage, Plaintiffs believe that they would be able to show standing to seek permanent injunctive relief. The Defendants are willing for this Court to address this issue because of the similarity of issues concerning both Sections 6 and 7 and the opportunity to resolve all issues at the same time. Defendants submit that in light of the Supreme Court's *Arizona* decision and the ruling of this Court on November 15, 2012, Section 7 is subject to an interpretation that does not authorize

prolonging the detention of a person in jail or prison simply to determine the person's immigration status and it does not authorize transferring an individual on the basis that he or she is believed or determined to be unlawfully present to federal custody. The view of Defendants is expressed in the Opinion of the Office of the Attorney General March 3, 2014 (see Attachment 1). In light of this interpretation, the Lowcountry Plaintiffs will dismiss their remaining claims against Section 7 without prejudice.

5. The Defendants respectfully disagree with the rulings of this Court and the Court of Appeals enjoining the above referenced provisions and defer to those rulings rather than consent to the injunction. They have vigorously defended the challenged parts of Act 69, and join in this Report only in recognition that the Courts have ruled regarding these sections of the Act and that further litigation of this matter would be inconsistent with those rulings and would be contrary to judicial economy. Should governing statutory or decisional law or other circumstances change in the future, they reserve their right, and that of any other appropriate State official, to seek modification of the injunctions in the Final Judgment via a subsequent motion under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or through any other means permitted by law.

6. Plaintiffs will voluntarily dismiss all claims not specifically referenced above without prejudice. Defendants consent to the voluntary dismissal of these claims.

7. Accordingly, all parties consent to the form of Final Judgment submitted as Attachment 2 hereto.

[Signature blocks on next pages]

Respectfully submitted,

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General

Susan K. Dunn (Federal Bar No. 647)
American Civil Liberties Union of
South Carolina
P. O. Box 20998
Charleston, South Carolina 2940998
T: (843) 7201425
sdunn@aclusouthcarolina.org

Steven Suggs (Federal Bar No. 7525)

Reginald Lloyd (Federal Bar No. 6052)
LLOYD LAW FIRM
One Law Place 223 East Main Street Suite
500
Rock Hill, South Carolina 29730
T: (803) 9098707
reggie@lloydlawfirm.net

Katherine Desormeau
(Appearing pro hac vice)
Cecillia D. Wang
(Appearing pro hac vice)
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION FOUNDATION IMMIGRANTS'
RIGHTS PROJECT
39 Drumm Street
San Francisco, California 94111
T: (415) 3430775
kdesormeau@aclu.org
cwang@aclu.org

Amy Pedersen (Appearing pro hac vice)
MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGAL
DEFENSE AND EDUCATIONAL FUND

Samuel Brooke (Appearing pro hac vice)
SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER
400 Washington Ave.
Montgomery, Alabama 36104
T: (334) 9568200
samuel.brooke@splcenter.org

Foster S. Maer (Appearing pro hac vice)
Ghita Schwarz (Appearing pro hac vice)
LATINOJUSTICE PRLDEF
99 Hudson St., 14th Floor
New York, New York 10013
T: (212) 2193360
fmaer@latinojustice.org
gschwarz@latinojustice.org

ARTHUR R. GOLDBERG
Assistant Director

W. SCOTT SIMPSON
Senior Trial Counsel

Attorneys, Department of Justice
Civil Division, Room 7210
Post Office Box 883
Washington, D.C. 20044
Telephone: (202) 5143495
Facsimile: (202) 6168470
E-mail: scott.simpson@usdoj.gov

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:11-cv-02958RMG

March 3, 2014