CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Senate Bill X1-1 Annual Report

AUGUST 1, 2026

I. Introduction

Section 1 of Senate Bill X1-1 (SBX1-1, Chapter 3, Statutes of 2025) authorizes the Department of Finance to augment any item of appropriation up to a total of $25 million for the purpose of "defending the State against enforcement and legal actions taken by the federal government, filing affirmative litigation challenging actions taken by the federal government, and taking administrative action authorized under state law to mitigate the impacts of actions taken by the federal government." This report uses the phrase "federal accountability litigation" to refer to such matters. To date, the Department of Justice (Department) has received $19.2 million in allocations from DOF pursuant to SBX1-1.

SBX1-1 requires the Department to provide DOF and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee with annual reports on the use of any funds allocated pursuant to SBX1-1 on or before August 1 each year through August 1, 2028. SBX1-1 requires the Department to report generally "on the use of funds allocated pursuant" to the bill's funding augmentation provisions, including: (1) "[w]hether the state is contracting with outside counsel, and the costs, if any;" and (2) "[e]ach instance in which the Department of Justice is taking administrative action authorized under state law to mitigate the impacts of actions taken by the federal government."

In compliance with that requirement, this Mandated Report (Report) provides an overview of the Department's federal accountability litigation and includes responsive information for each statutorily required reporting category as of July 30, 2026. In addition, regular updates of the Department's federal accountability work can be found at https://oag.ca.gov/federal-accountability/.

II. Federal Accountability Litigation

A. Results of Department Actions

Through July 30, 2026, the Department filed 79 lawsuits challenging federal government actions, each described below in Section III. As of July 30, 2026, the Department has also filed 122 amicus briefs in support of lawsuits brought by other parties challenging the federal government. The Department has also issued 112 comment letters, in addition to public guidance, in response to actions taken by the federal government. The $19.2 million in SBX1-1 funds that the Department has received to date has contributed to — but in no way has been sufficient to cover — the costs of the litigation summarized below.

The Department's efforts have generated a tremendous return for California. The federal government continues to attempt to impose broad restrictions on federal funding nationwide, and the Department has protected an estimated $207.1 billion for California. This includes funding protected through the second lawsuit that California filed against the Trump administration challenged its directive freezing up to $3 trillion in federal funding nationwide, including $168 billion for California, or one-third of the state budget. The Department secured a preliminary injunction against that action last year, and on March 17, 2026, the First Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed that injunction. It also includes specific funding for public safety, public health, clean energy, education, and other programs and services that Californians rely on that has been terminated, withheld, conditioned or frozen by this administration.

More than once, the federal government has specifically targeted California's funding to punish it for adopting policies it disagrees with. On January 5, 2026, the Trump administration illegally froze over $10 billion in federal funding for childcare and family assistance programs in five states: California, New York, Minnesota, Illinois, and Colorado. In response, the Department filed a lawsuit on January 8, 2026, secured a temporary restraining order the next day, and had an injunction in place the next month, which continues to protect that funding. Similarly, in February 2026, the administration withheld $1.3 billion of disaster relief funding and cut more $600 million in public health funding and $900 million in transportation funding exclusively to four Democratic-led states: California, Colorado, Illinois, and Minnesota. In response, the Department again filed a lawsuit, obtained a temporary restraining order immediately, and on March 12, 2026, secured a preliminary injunction that remains in place.

When President Trump imposed tariffs under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, the Department filed a lawsuit challenging those tariffs, because the impact to California's economy would be severe. Consistent with the Department's arguments, the Supreme Court held that the tariffs were unlawful. When the President again attempted to impose tariffs through Section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974, the Department sued again and the Court again held that the tariffs were unlawful.

The Department successfully stopped the federalization and deployment of the California National Guard, both in Los Angeles and then in Portland, Oregon. When the President federalized the Guard under a statute, 10 U.S.C 12406, that had never previously been used in this way, the Department immediately went to court to oppose the Los Angeles deployment and obtained a temporary restraining order. After numerous court proceedings, on December 10, 2025, the Department obtained a preliminary injunction barring the deployment of the Guard. On December 23, 2025, the Supreme Court held that the statute the President relied on did not support the federalization, and on December 31, 2025, the Trump administration returned command of the troops to Governor Newsom.

The Department has also defended against the federal government's repeated and unlawful attempts to interfere with the States' constitutional rights to administer elections. Twice the president issued executive orders attempting to direct States' election processes — first on March 25, 2025, with an order reworking mail-in balloting and requiring documentary proof of citizenship, and next on March 31, 2026, with an order attempting to restrict voter eligibility and mail voting to lists of voters pre-authorized by the federal government — and twice the Department has successfully led nationwide efforts against those actions. Both lawsuits resulted in orders enjoining the unlawful provisions of those orders, so that the States can continue to administer their own elections as provided by the Constitution.

The Department has successfully protected the programs that protect and care for Californians. When the federal government baselessly attempted to stop funding for counterterrorism efforts, exclude undocumented people from public benefits, strip eligibility for loan forgiveness from public service workers, impede access to gender-affirming care, reopen potentially dangerous offshore oil pipelines, and undermine housing and homeless support services, the Department successfully opposed each of these efforts.

In sum, the Department continues to use SBX1-1's appropriation to protect California's finances and its people's interests. Of the litigation the Department has initiated since inauguration, 63 lawsuits remain active, and many more are likely, as the Department continues to monitor federal action that could require a response to protect California's interests. A more detailed review of the Department's lawsuits filed through July 30, 2026, follows.

B. Affirmative Litigation

1. New Jersey v. Trump, No. 24-cv-10139, D. Mass. (Birthright Citizenship)

This case, the first multistate federal accountability matter of the second Trump Administration, challenges the President's unconstitutional executive order seeking to end birthright citizenship. Under the Administration's proposed order, an estimated 24,500 children born in California annually would be denied the citizenship they are entitled to under the U.S. Constitution.

The district court granted the coalition's motion for a preliminary injunction on February 13, 2025, and the federal government appealed to the First Circuit. The government sought a stay of the district court order pending appeal and the Supreme Court ruled on that request on June 27, 2025. In its decision, the Supreme Court clarified the standard for nationwide injunctions, sending consideration of the scope of the injunction back to the district court. The District Court issued another nationwide injunction on July 25, 2025. Ultimately, the Supreme Court resolved the substantive constitutional question in the States' favor in the related case *Trump v. Barbara*, 609 U.S. ___ (June 30, 2026). The case is currently held in abeyance at the First Circuit.

2. New York v. Trump, No. 25-cv-00039, D.R.I. (OMB Funding Freeze)

A multistate coalition, co-led by California, challenged the Trump Administration's directive freezing up to $3 trillion in federal funding. In the 2025 fiscal year, California expected to receive $168 billion in federal funds — 34% of the State's budget — not including funding for the State's public college and university system. This includes $107.5 billion in funding for California's Medicaid programs, which serve approximately 14.5 million Californians, including 5 million children and 2.3 million seniors and people with disabilities. Additionally, over 9,000 full-time equivalent State employee positions are federally funded.

The district court granted the motion for a preliminary injunction on March 6, 2025, and granted a motion to enforce compliance with the preliminary injunction on April 4, 2025. The federal government filed a notice of appeal of the preliminary injunction on March 10, 2025, and on March 16, 2026, the First Circuit affirmed the core aspects of the preliminary injunction on the merits. The deadline for the federal defendants to file a petition for certiorari with the U.S. Supreme Court has expired. The case remains pending in district court.

3. New York v. Trump, No. 25-cv-01144, S.D.N.Y. (DOGE Treasury Access)

Nineteen states including California challenged the Trump Administration's expanded access to data maintained by the Treasury Department's Bureau of the Fiscal Service, which allowed unqualified Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE) employees to unlawfully access Americans' personal information.

The district court initially granted a temporary restraining order and subsequently entered a preliminary injunction on February 21, 2025. That order precluded political appointees, including members of DOGE, from accessing Treasury Department records and limited access exclusively to Bureau of Fiscal Services' employees who had passed all background checks and security clearances. The district court has since partially dissolved the preliminary injunction as to five employees who have met the training and security requirements set forth in the order.

The federal defendants appealed the district court's preliminary injunction order and that appeal was fully briefed in April 2026; the Second Circuit Court of Appeals has not yet set a date for oral argument.

Meanwhile, the Southern District of New York issued an order on July 13, 2026, directing the parties to address potential mootness of the underlying case given recent Administration statements about the status of DOGE. The parties completed that briefing on July 21, 2026, and await a hearing date or order from the district court.

4. <u>Massachusetts v. National Institutes of Health</u>, No. 25-cv-10338, D. Mass. (NIH Indirect Cost Cap)

This litigation challenged the Trump Administration's unlawful revocation of funds that support cutting-edge medical and public health research at universities and research institutions across the country by capping the amount of "indirect costs" National Institute of Health (NIH) grantees may recover from the federal government at 15%. The impact on California is significant; in Fiscal Year 2023, the University of California received a total of over $2 billion in NIH funds and the California State University received approximately $158 million.

The district court granted the motion for a preliminary injunction on March 5, 2025, and, on April 4, 2025, the federal government agreed to convert the preliminary injunction into a permanent injunction. The federal defendants appealed and on January 5, 2026, the First Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the district court's injunction on the merits. The deadline for filing a petition for certiorari has expired, so this case is now fully and finally resolved in the coalition's favor.

5. <u>New Mexico v. Musk</u>, No. 25-cv-00429, D.D.C. (DOGE Appointments Clause)

This case challenged the President's unlawful appointment of Elon Musk as the head of DOGE without the advice and consent of the Senate, and the unlawful creation of DOGE as an entity without Congressional approval. DOGE took action to dismantle federal agencies and has disrupted billions of dollars in federal funding essential for law enforcement, healthcare, education, and other critical services.

The multistate coalition filed the complaint on February 13, 2025. The court granted the States' motion for expedited discovery. The government appealed and, in the meantime, moved to dismiss the case. On May 27, 2025, the district court denied the motion to dismiss as to all defendants except President Trump, but the D.C. Circuit subsequently stayed the district court's order granting expedited discovery. On December 15, 2025, the coalition voluntarily dismissed its complaint without prejudice, resolving this matter.

6. <u>California v. Dep't of Education</u>, No. 25-cv-10548, D. Mass. (Teacher Preparation Grants)

This case challenges the Department of Education's unlawful termination of significant grant funding for K-12 teacher preparation programs, valued at roughly $148 million for California programs that address the State's teacher shortage.

The district court entered a temporary restraining order, which the government appealed. The Supreme Court issued a stay of that order on April 4, 2025, concluding that the government was likely to prevail on a jurisdictional argument. The multistate coalition subsequently filed an amended complaint that the federal defendants moved to dismiss. On November 13, 2025, the District of Massachusetts largely denied the federal government's motion. The parties have now completed briefing on cross-motions for summary judgment.

7. <u>Maryland v. Dep't of Agriculture</u>, No. 25-cv-00748, D. Md. (Probationary Employee Terminations)

This case challenged widespread firings of federal probationary employees across a number of agencies. These employees, at the beginning of their careers in federal service, work in important roles within agencies that provide critical partnership to California, including the Departments of Veterans' Affairs and Agriculture, the National Park Service, and the U.S. Forest Service.

The district court issued a preliminary injunction, and the federal government appealed that order. On September 25, 2025, the Fourth Circuit reversed the district court's order and remanded with instructions to dismiss the case. In accordance with that order, the District of Maryland dismissed the coalition's case on October 31, 2025, fully resolving this matter.

8. <u>New York v McMahon</u>, No. 25-cv-10601, D. Mass. (Dep't of Education Dismantling)

This litigation challenges the federal government's mass terminations of Department of Education employees and the transfer of core statutory functions to other departments. The U.S. Department of Education provides $4.9 billion annually in federal funding to more than 9,000 public schools across California, serving 5.8 million students. This includes funding for Title I to support low-income families, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act funds and support for students with disabilities, school lunch programs, services to families living on military bases and Indian reservations, and post-secondary financial aid. The mass firings led to the closure of seven regional offices of the Office for Civil Rights, including the one in San Francisco, leaving 1,500 pending cases, including open investigations, cases in mediation, resolved cases under monitoring, and complaints under research by staff, in limbo.

The district court issued a preliminary injunction that was subsequently stayed by the Supreme Court in July 2025. The parties are currently engaged in merits discovery through the summer of 2026.

9. <u>Colorado v. Dep't of Health and Human Services</u>, No. 25-cv-00121, D.R.I. (Public Health Grants)

In this case, a multistate coalition challenges the federal government's unlawful termination of approximately $11 billion in critical public health funding. California's portion of these cancelled grants amounts to roughly $972 million, including over $800 million that the California Department of Public Health intended to use, in part, to vaccinate 4.5 million children statewide and assist hospitals in directing injured and ill patients to available emergency facilities, as well as over $119 million that the California Department of Health Care Services uses to support key programs, including substance use disorder prevention and early intervention services for youth in at least eighteen counties. It also includes over $45 million that the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health was planning to use, in part, to strengthen its efforts to prevent the spread of measles, and seasonal and avian influenza.

On May 16, 2025, the district court granted the multistate coalition's motion for a preliminary injunction. The federal defendants produced the administrative record on May 1, 2026. The parties dispute the need for additional discovery and await a district court ruling on that issue.

10. California v. Trump, No. 25-cv-10810, D. Mass.
(Elections Executive Order 1.0)

California is leading a challenge in this case to President Trump's unlawful executive order that purports to dramatically rework the manner of conducting federal elections without any input from Congress. The executive order sought to impose a narrow, draconian, and legally unsupported interpretation of federal election day statutes that would have upended mail balloting procedures in many States, including California. It likewise sought to impose a documentary proof of citizenship requirement for voters who chose to register to vote in federal elections using the federal mail-in registration form.

On June 12, 2025, the district court granted the multistate coalition's motion for a preliminary injunction, enjoining all challenged aspects of the executive order. The district court subsequently issued an order granting summary judgment in favor of the coalition on June 24, 2026.

11. Rhode Island v. Trump, No. 25-cv-00128, D.R.I.
(Smaller Federal Agency Dismantling)

This litigation challenges President Trump's executive order that sought to completely eliminate essentially all components of seven smaller federal agencies, including (among others) the Institute of Museum and Library Services, the Minority Business Development Agency, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and the US Interagency Council on Homelessness. California's state library budget for this fiscal year included $15.7 million in funding from the Institute of Museum and Library Services, allocated for staffing and continued operations.

The district court entered a preliminary injunction on May 13, 2025. The federal government unsuccessfully sought stays of that order pending appeal in the district court and with the First Circuit. On November 21, 2026, the District of Rhode Island entered summary judgment in favor of the coalition. The federal defendants subsequently noticed an appeal to the First Circuit on January 19, 2026. Briefing completed on May 26, 2026.

12. Massachusetts v. Kennedy, No. 25-cv-10814, D. Mass.
(NIH Grant Terminations)

In this case, the multistate coalition challenges the federal government's failure to disperse National Institutes of Health grant funding and the unlawful termination of existing grants for medical and public health research institutions nationwide. In 2024, NIH awarded $5.15 billion in grants and contracts that directly supported 55,324 jobs and $13.81 billion in economic activity in California.

The district court held a bench trial on the multistate coalition's Administrative Procedure Act claims against the challenged grant terminations. On June 23, 2025, the court entered a partial final judgment in the States' favor, concluding that the challenged grant terminations are arbitrary and capricious under the Administrative Procedure Act. The federal government appealed that judgment to the First Circuit and sought stays in the district court and the Court of Appeals, both of which were denied. The U.S. Supreme Court subsequently issued a partial stay of the district court's judgment pending the outcome of the First Circuit appeal. That appeal was argued on January 6, 2026.

13. New York v. Dep't of Education, No. 25-cv-02990, S.D.N.Y. (Education Stabilization Funding)

This case challenges the Department of Education's unlawful rescission of prior agency actions that preserved States' access to hundreds of millions of dollars in funding currently being used by school districts to support the academic recovery of students following the COVID-19 pandemic. In California alone, over $200 million in previously awarded and obligated funding is at stake — funding that school districts use for afterschool and summer learning programs, the purchase of educational technology, and the provision of mental health services and support.

On May 6, 2025, the district court granted the multistate coalition's motion for a preliminary injunction. The federal government then issued a new recission letter modifying the liquidation period for education stabilization funds, and the multistate coalition filed a second motion for a preliminary injunction on May 14, 2025. The district court issued another preliminary injunction order blocking the new rescission letter on June 3, 2025. The federal government appealed to the Second Circuit and unsuccessfully sought a stay of the district court's order. On August 6, 2025, the federal defendants dismissed their appeal of the preliminary injunctions and on November 13, 2025, they stipulated to stay the grant recissions until the grants' natural expiration dates, fully resolving this matter on favorable terms for the coalition.

14. California v. Trump, No. 25-cv-03372, N.D. Cal. (IEEPA Tariffs)

This litigation challenged President Trump's illegal effort to impose tariffs under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act of 1977. The tariffs challenged under the lawsuit would have reduced U.S. economic output by more than $178 billion, reduced labor supply by 546,000 full-time equivalent jobs, and lowered after-tax incomes on average by nearly a full percentage point. The loss to California's economy, as the nation's largest importer and second-largest exporter, would be $25 billion, with job losses of more than 64,000.

California filed its case in the Northern District of California. The government argued that the case belonged before the Court of International Trade. The district court agreed with the federal government's jurisdictional argument and, at California's request, dismissed the action to permit a rapid appeal. The Ninth Circuit subsequently affirmed the district court's dismissal order, resolving this matter. On February 20, 2026, in a separate lawsuit, the Supreme Court held that the tariffs were unlawful.

15. New York v. Dep't of Education, No. 25-cv-11116, D. Mass. (Title VI Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Certifications)

In this action, a multistate coalition co-led by California challenged the Department of Education's efforts to withhold federal funding from State and local agencies that refuse to abandon lawful programs and policies that promote equal access to education. California receives approximately $4.9 billion each year from the Department of Education to support a wide variety of needs and services related to children and education.

The multistate coalition filed its lawsuit on April 25, 2025. In the face of the lawsuit, the federal government did not withhold the funds and the district court approved a stipulation fully resolving this matter on favorable terms for the coalition on February 18, 2026.

16. **Maryland v. Corp. for National & Community Services, No. 25-cv-01363, D. Md. (AmeriCorps Funding Disruptions and Dismantling)**

This litigation challenges the DOGE-led effort to dismantle AmeriCorps, both by terminating approximately 85% of its employees and volunteers and by canceling approximately $400 million in grants, accounting for more than 40% of the agency's budget. AmeriCorps funding supports at least 6,150 California volunteers serving at more than 1,200 locations throughout the State. The district court largely granted the plaintiff states' motion for a preliminary injunction on June 5, 2025. On September 30, 2025 — the last day of the 2025 federal fiscal year — the federal defendants confirmed to the district court that they had disbursed all awarded FY 2025 AmeriCorps funds. The parties have continued to engage in discussions regarding a possible final resolution of the matter and court deadlines are stayed through August 2026.

17. **Washington v. Dep't of Transportation, No. 25-cv-00848, W.D. Wash. (National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program)**

This action challenged the Federal Highway Administration's unlawful directive to withhold billions of dollars in funding approved by bipartisan majorities in Congress for electric vehicle charging infrastructure. California's State Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Deployment Plan anticipated that California would need several hundred more EV charging ports to support all electric vehicles to meet climate goals. The plan, approved by the federal government, would leverage public funding and private investment to build out a statewide charging infrastructure, including $379 million from the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure program.

The district court granted the multistate coalition's motion for a preliminary injunction on June 24, 2025, and issued a summary judgment order on January 23, 2026. The time for filing an appeal of that order has expired, so this case is fully resolved on favorable terms.

18. **New York v. Kennedy, No. 25-cv-00196, D.R.I. (HHS Dismantling)**

This action challenged the President's attempts to dismantle the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) in the wake of Secretary Kennedy's "Make America Healthy Again" Directive. The litigation challenges the unlawful mass termination of roughly 10,000 full-time HHS employees, the consolidation of 28 HHS divisions into 15 divisions, and the closing of half of HHS's ten regional offices, including one in San Francisco.

On July 1, 2025, the district court granted the multistate coalition's motion for a preliminary injunction. On December 5, 2025, HHS brought a motion to dismiss, which the court denied.

19. **New York v. Trump, No. 25-cv-11221, D. Mass. (Offshore Wind Energy)**

A coalition of states with particular interest in the development of offshore wind energy, including California, filed this litigation in May 2025 challenging the federal government's efforts to freeze development of this homegrown source of reliable, affordable energy. Offshore wind projects support hundreds of thousands of jobs, create billions of dollars in economic activity and tax payments, and already supply more than 10% of the country's electricity. California has five federal offshore wind leases; two are located offshore by Humboldt, while the remaining three are offshore from Morro Bay. These new developments are designed to bring substantial amounts of clean energy to the grid, including enough to power 1.6 million homes.

After a June hearing, the district court denied the bulk of the government's motion to dismiss the case. On December 8, 2025, the district court granted summary judgment in favor of the coalition. The federal defendants took an appeal of that order in February 2026 but subsequently dismissed the appeal on June 15, 2026. Accordingly, this case is fully resolved in the States' favor.

20. Washington v. Trump, No. 25-cv-00869, W.D. Wash. (National Energy Emergency/Clean Water Act Permits)

This litigation challenges President Trump's "energy emergency" executive order, together with the Army Corps of Engineers' and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's actions pursuant to that order. These orders and actions are a misuse of emergency procedures meant for disaster response, bypassing important health and environmental protections for the benefit of the fossil fuel industry. A multistate coalition including California filed the initial complaint on May 9, 2025. The federal defendants subsequently filed a motion to dismiss in March 2026 that was fully briefed as of June 4, 2026.

21. Illinois v. Federal Emergency Management Agency, No. 25-cv-00206, D.R.I. (DHS Funding Conditions)

This case challenges unlawful immigration assistance conditions that the Department of Homeland Security imposed on vital sources of funding, including for disaster relief. California receives billions in funding from DHS to prepare for, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks and other catastrophes. This includes grants that allow States to prepare for terrorism in high-concentration urban areas, emergency preparedness grants, cybersecurity grants, and many others that are similarly not connected to civil immigration enforcement.

A multistate coalition co-led by California filed the complaint on May 13, 2025. The district court granted summary judgment to the coalition on September 24, 2025, and the federal defendants noticed an appeal on November 21, 2025. The U.S. Department of Justice has subsequently filed multiple requests for an extension of its deadline to file an opening brief while the Solicitor General of the United States determines whether to pursue the appeal. DOJ's most recent request for an extension remains pending with the First Circuit.

22. California v. Dep't of Transportation, No. 25-cv-00208, D.R.I. (DOT Funding Conditions)

This is another lawsuit challenging unlawful funding conditions, here immigration assistance conditions imposed by the Department of Transportation (DOT). California receives over $7.7 billion in DOT grant funding to support and maintain the roads, highways, railways, airways, and bridges that connect California's communities and carry residents to their workplaces and their homes. Neither the purpose of these grants, nor their grant criteria, are in any way connected to immigration enforcement.

The district court granted the plaintiff states' motion for a preliminary injunction on June 19, 2025, and issued a summary judgment order in the coalition's favor on November 4, 2025. Although the federal defendants noticed an appeal of that order, they dismissed it on January 13, 2026, finally resolving this matter on favorable terms.

23. <u>New York v. National Science Foundation</u>, No. 25-cv-04452, S.D.N.Y. (NSF Research Funding)

In this lawsuit, a multistate coalition including California seeks to prevent the National Science Foundation from terminating grants for scientific research that seek to promote and research issues related to diversity in higher education and the workforce, as well as from imposing a 15% cap on indirect cost reimbursements for research projects.

The district court denied the coalition's motion for a preliminary injunction on August 1, 2026. The coalition voluntarily dismissed its claims on August 25, 2026, resolving this matter.

24. <u>California v. Dep't of Justice</u>, No. 25-cv-04863, N.D. Cal. (Title IX/AB 1955)

In this case, the Department filed a lawsuit against the federal Department of Justice in anticipation of imminent legal retaliation against California's school systems related to their compliance with longstanding state anti-discrimination laws that provide for K-12 student participation in sports consistent with gender identity. The case asks the district court to uphold California's anti-discrimination law and prevent the federal government from taking retaliatory action, such as withholding or conditioning federal funding, over the State's refusal to comply with the federal government's unlawful demand that school districts certify they will not comply with California law.

The Department filed this lawsuit on June 9, 2025, and the federal defendants moved to dismiss on August 22, 2025. That motion is fully briefed and awaiting resolution in the district court.

25. <u>Newsom v. Trump</u>, No. 25-cv-04870, N.D. Cal. (Federalization of National Guard)

In this emergency litigation, the Department represented both Governor Newsom and the State of California in an action challenging orders federalizing the California National Guard for 60 days under 10 U.S.C. § 12406 and deploying the U.S. Marines to the greater Los Angeles area. The federal government's orders came without authorization from the governor and against the wishes of local law enforcement.

The Department filed this case on June 9, 2025, and on June 12, 2025, the district court granted the Department's request for a temporary restraining order on the claims of unlawful federalization. The federal government immediately appealed and obtained a stay of the district court's order from the Ninth Circuit. Separately, the district court held a bench trial on the Posse Comitatus Act claims and, on September 2, 2025, granted final judgment in California's favor. The federal defendants immediately appealed that order to the Ninth Circuit, which issued an administrative stay on September 9, 2025. On December 10, 2025, the Department obtained yet another preliminary injunction, this time enjoining the federalization of an additional 300 members of the California National Guard. Again, the federal defendants immediately appealed. After the Supreme Court held the use of 10 U.S.C. § 12406 was unlawful in *Trump v. Illinois*, the federal administration agreed to return control of the National Guard to the Governor. Defendants' appeals related to the lawfulness of the 10 U.S.C. § 12406 orders remain pending at the Ninth Circuit, and their appeal related to the Posse Comitatus Act is held in abeyance until the other appeals are resolved.

26. California v. United States of America, No. 25-cv-04966, N.D. Cal. (Congressional Review Act/Clean Air Act Waivers)

This case challenges the unprecedented and unlawful use of the Congressional Review Act to upend California's clean vehicles program, specifically the Advanced Clean Cars II, Omnibus, and Advanced Clean Trucks standards. California applies these standards pursuant to congressionally authorized preemption waivers under the Clean Air Act. If California is prevented from enforcing these vehicle emission standards, it will result in the loss of significant economic and public health benefits, costing California taxpayers an estimated $45 billion in preventable health care costs. Losing these standards would also undermine market certainty for vehicle manufacturers, stifling innovation and job creation, including in the electric vehicle sector, which has been a growing source of high-paying green jobs and investment.

A multistate coalition led by California filed this case on June 12, 2025. On December 2, 2025, following significant motions practice, the district court denied intervention requests from a number of industry trade groups. The court held a consolidated hearing on a number of pending motions on February 19, 2026, including a motion to dismiss the operative complaint. It has not yet issued a ruling.

27. New Jersey v. Office of Management and Budget, No. 25-cv-11816, D. Mass. (OMB Agency Priorities Grant Terminations)

In this multistate case, the coalition challenges the federal government's ongoing, repeated, and improper use of a single subclause buried in federal regulations promulgated by the Office of Management of Budget, 2 C.F.R. § 200.340(a)(4), to terminate tens of billions of dollars in grant funding to the States. Federal agencies ranging from the Department of Justice to the Environmental Protection Agency to the Department of Labor have terminated essential funding upon which California and its partner states rely to combat violent crime, prevent terrorist attacks, educate students with special needs, respond to natural disasters, protect clean drinking water, conduct life-saving medical and scientific research, upgrade crumbling transportation infrastructure, and much more.

The multistate coalition filed this litigation on June 24, 2025. On July 17, 2026, the district court granted the States' motion for summary judgment.

28. Washington v. Dep't of Education, No. 25-cv-01228, W.D. Wash. (Mental Health Grants 1.0)

This case challenges the Department of Education's termination of grants awarded through congressionally established school mental health funding programs, including roughly $200 million awarded to 44 local education agencies, county offices of education, and universities in California. The grants have helped schools hire hundreds of psychologists, counselors, and social workers who have served thousands of students, including in the State's most economically disadvantaged and rural communities. The Department of Education awarded this funding to the nation's high-need, low-income, and rural schools pursuant to its Mental Health Service Professional Demonstration Grant Program and its School-Based Mental Health Services Grant Program.

The complaint in this case was filed on June 30, 2025. On October 27, 2025, the district court issued a preliminary injunction. The district court issued an order granting a motion for partial summary judgment on December 19, 2025, requiring the Department of Education to make new continuation decisions. The federal defendants noticed an appeal of that decision on January 23, 2026, and on February 24, 2026, the Ninth Circuit remanded the case to the district court for the limited purpose of setting new deadlines for the Department to make continuation decisions. The district court did so on the same day. Ninth Circuit briefing continues on the appeal of the district court's summary judgment order, with the coalition's brief due on August 17, 2026.

29. California v. Dep't of Health and Human Services, No. 3:25-cv-05536, N.D. Cal. (Medicaid Data Disclosure)

This litigation, advanced by a multistate coalition led by California, challenges the Department of Health and Human Services's unsupported decision to provide the Department of Homeland Security unfettered access to individual personal health data. California's Medi-Cal program provides healthcare coverage for one out of three Californians, including more than two million noncitizens. Noncitizens include green card holders, refugees, individuals who hold temporary protected status, and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrival recipients. Not all noncitizens are eligible for federally funded Medi-Cal services, and so California uses state-only funds to provide a version of the Medi-Cal program to all eligible State residents, regardless of their immigration status. The transfer of data to the Department of Homeland Security is creating fear and confusion that will lead noncitizens and their family members to disenroll, or refuse to enroll, in emergency Medicaid for which they are otherwise eligible, leaving states and their safety net hospitals to foot the bill for federally mandated emergency healthcare services. The lawsuit, filed on July 1, 2025, asks the court to enjoin the Department of Health and Human Services from transferring personally identifiable Medicaid data to the Department of Homeland Security or any other federal agency, and to enjoin the Department of Homeland Security from using this data to conduct immigration enforcement.

The coalition has obtained two preliminary injunction orders in this case, the second issued on December 29, 2025. The federal defendants filed a motion to modify or clarify the operative preliminary injunction on June 5, 2026, and a hearing is scheduled for August 13, 2026.

30. New Jersey v. Bondi, No. 25-cv-01807, D. Md. (Firearm Forced Reset Triggers)

This case involved the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms' (ATF) plans to return thousands of forced reset triggers (FRTs) into communities across the United States. A semi-automatic firearm with an FRT allows a shooter to engage in sustained rapid fire, similar to a fully automatic machine gun, when the trigger is held down. Although ATF previously classified FRTs as illegal machine guns, it has since signed a settlement agreement reverting that classification and agreed to return thousands of seized FRTs into communities across the United States. An influx of FRTs into California would harm public safety and increase costs to the State. This lawsuit sought to prevent the return of FRTs under the settlement, asserting that they are prohibited by federal law, which prohibits anyone from owning machine guns, including devices that convert semi-automatic firearms into machine guns.

California joined this litigation on July 7, 2025. After the federal defendants represented that they did not intend to return FRTs into States in which they are unlawful (including California) and that they would take certain other steps to ensure FRTs do not end up in states where it is illegal to possess them, the multistate coalition withdrew its request for a preliminary injunction. On April 23, 2026, the coalition voluntarily dismissed its complaint, resolving this litigation on favorable terms.

31. California v. McMahon, No. 1:25-cv-000329, D.R.I. (DOE Funding Cuts)

On behalf of 23 states and two governors, California co-led this action challenging the Department of Education's funding freeze to six longstanding education programs. Impacted programs included education for migrant children and English learners; programs that promote effective classroom instruction, improve school conditions and the use of technology in the classroom; community learning centers that offer students a broad range of opportunities for academic and extracurricular enrichment; and adult education and workforce development efforts. In California, hundreds of millions of dollars in federal education funding was frozen.

The multistate complaint and motion for preliminary injunction were both filed on July 14, 2025. In the face of this litigation, the federal defendants began disbursing a portion of the withheld funding during the week of July 28, 2025, and committed to disbursing the remaining funds on October 1, 2025 (the start of new federal fiscal year). The coalition accordingly withdrew its request for a preliminary injunction on August 5, 2025, and voluntarily dismissed its claims on August 25, 2025. This matter is accordingly fully resolved on favorable terms.

32. Washington v. Federal Emergency Management Agency, No. 1:25-cv-12006, D. Mass (FEMA Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities Funding Termination)

This action challenged the unlawful termination of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) grant program. The BRIC program funds disaster preparedness projects. With that funding, communities across the nation can invest in projects that reduce harm from natural disasters. This is particularly important in California — which faces the risks of wildfires, earthquakes, landslides, and flooding — and California is the largest beneficiary of this program.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on July 16, 2025. It obtained a preliminary injunction on August 5, 2025, and an order granting summary judgment on December 11, 2025. The deadline to file a notice of appeal has expired, so this case is fully resolved on favorable terms.

33. California v. Kennedy, No. 1:25-cv-12019, D. Mass. (Affordable Care Act Rulemaking)

California is co-leading this multistate action challenging an unlawful final rule promulgated by HHS and Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services that would create significant barriers to obtaining healthcare under the Affordable Care Act (ACA). The final rule would substantially change the operation of the ACA marketplaces, including adding new bureaucratic barriers, imposing a monthly charge on all automatically reenrolled consumers who qualify for $0 premiums, and shortening the open enrollment period for signing up for health coverage. The administration estimates that it will cause up to 1.8 million people to lose their health insurance, while causing millions more to pay increased insurance premiums and out-of-pocket costs like co-pays and deductibles. The final rule also excludes coverage of gender-affirming care as an essential health benefit under the ACA. It will significantly drive up the costs incurred by states in providing healthcare, including increasing state expenditures on Medicaid, uncompensated emergency care, and funding other services provided to newly uninsured residents. California has approximately two million ACA plan enrollees, the third highest of any state.

The multistate coalition filed the complaint and motion for a preliminary injunction on July 17, 2025, which the district court denied on October 2, 2025. The coalition's motion for summary judgment will be heard July 29, 2026.

34. New York v. Dep't of Justice, No. 1:25-cv-00345, D.R.I. (Public Benefit Programs)

This multistate action challenges the federal government's decision to restrict access to more than a dozen public benefit programs — such as Head Start, food pantries, mental health and substance use disorder programs, and shelters for at-risk youth and domestic violence survivors — based on immigration status. The decision is contrary to law as well as nearly three decades of federal practice. Since 1997, the federal government has interpreted the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act to permit States' use of federal funds for certain programs that serve communities based on need regardless of immigration status. The action fails to provide notice and an opportunity to comment, is arbitrary and capricious, is contrary to law in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, and fails to give the states "fair notice" as required under the Spending Clause.

The multistate coalition filed this action on July 21, 2025, and the district court granted a motion for a preliminary injunction on September 10, 2025. The government noticed an appeal of that order but dismissed it on December 10, 2025. The parties' cross-motions for summary judgment were fully briefed on April 17, 2026, and no district court decision has yet been released.

35. California v. Dep't of Agriculture, No. 3:25-cv-06310, N.D. Cal. (SNAP Data Sharing)

California is leading this multistate lawsuit challenging the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) demand that states turn over personal and sensitive information about millions of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) recipients. SNAP is a federally funded, state-administered program that provides billions of dollars in food assistance to tens of millions of low-income families across the country. SNAP applicants provide their private information on the understanding, backed by long-standing state and federal laws, that their information will not be used for unrelated purposes. USDA has suggested that it could withhold administrative funding for the program if states fail to comply, effectively forcing states to choose between protecting their residents' privacy and providing critical nutrition assistance to those in need. California receives roughly $1 billion a year to administer the program.

The lawsuit was filed on July 28, 2025. The coalition obtained a temporary restraining order and then a preliminary injunction on October 15, 2025. On February 26, 2026, the district court issued a second preliminary injunction. On May 28, 2026, the parties stipulated to the dismissal without prejudice of claims against USDA's Office of the Inspector General, and on May 29, 2026, the court entered an order dismissing those claims pursuant to the parties' stipulations.

36. California v. Dep't of Health and Human Services, No. 1:25-cv-12118, D. Mass. (Defunding Planned Parenthood)

This case challenged the "Defund Provision" targeting Planned Parenthood in H.R. 1, the federal budget reconciliation law ("One Big Beautiful Bill"). The Defund Provision is a direct attack on the healthcare access of millions of low-income Americans, disproportionally affecting women, LGBTQ+ individuals, and communities of color. This provision specifically blocks Medicaid reimbursements for essential healthcare services provided at Planned Parenthood health centers, such as cancer screenings, birth control, and sexually transmitted infections testing.

The lawsuit was filed on July 29, 2025 and the court issued a preliminary injunction on December 2, 2025. The federal defendants immediately appealed. The First Circuit stayed the district court's order pending appeal on December 31, 2025, and on March 17, 2026, the coalition voluntarily dismissed its claims, fully resolving this matter.

37. Massachusetts v. Trump, No. 1:25-cv-12162, D. Mass. (Gender Affirming Care)

This case, led by California, challenges the Trump Administration's efforts to restrict access to healthcare for transgender, intersex, and nonbinary youth. Specifically, the lawsuit focuses on federal actions targeting the provision of medically necessary gender-affirming care for individuals under the age of 19, even in states like California where such care is legal and protected. The lawsuit, filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts, argues that the Trump Administration's actions violate the Constitution, exceed federal authority, and undermine state laws that require equal access to medical treatment.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on August 1, 2025. On June 3, 2026, the District Court denied the federal government's motion to dismiss the complaint.

38. <u>New York v. Dep't of Energy</u>, No. 25-cv-01458, D. Or.
(DOE Indirect Cost Cap)

In this case, California and the California Energy Commission (CEC) joined a multistate coalition in suing to block the Department of Energy from imposing a new funding cap that slashes support for vital state-run energy programs. The DOE policy would unlawfully deny states critical funds by limiting reimbursement for key administrative and staffing costs that have long been covered by federal energy programs. The coalition argues that by capping certain funding for these programs, DOE is jeopardizing States' ability to keep them running.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on August 15, 2025. The coalition filed a motion for summary judgment on August 27, 2025. On September 30, 2025, the District Court granted the coalition's motion for summary judgment, concluding that the Trump Administration violated the Administrative Procedure Act. The parties stipulated to dismiss the case on April 2, 2026.

39. <u>New Jersey v. Dep't of Justice</u>, No. 25-cv-00404, D.R.I.
(Victims of Crime Funding)

In this case, the multistate coalition challenged the Administration's efforts to unlawfully impose immigration enforcement requirements on over $1 billion in annual U.S. Department of Justice Victim of Crime Act grants (VOCA). These grants are unrelated to federal civil immigration enforcement and are used by states to protect public safety and provide critical resources and services to victims and survivors of crime. For fiscal year 2025, California received over $165 million in grant funds. In the lawsuit, the coalition argued that imposing this new set of conditions across VOCA grant programs is arbitrary and capricious, exceeds U.S. DOJ's legal authority, and violates the Spending Clause.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on August 18, 2025. On October 3, 2025, the Administration announced that it was abandoning its plan to impose the conditions on VOCA grants. The case is currently held in abeyance.

40. <u>Illinois v. Noem</u>, No. 25-cv-00495, D.R.I.
(FEMA Emergency Grants Reallocation)

In this case, California joined a multistate coalition seeking emergency relief to stop the unlawful reallocation of hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Homeland Security Grant Program funding away from states like California. California relies on this funding to prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorism and other catastrophes. But California and other states received award notifications that were significantly lower than anticipated, without justification and seemingly based on those states' decision to use their law enforcement resources to protect public safety rather than assist in federal immigration enforcement.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on September 29, 2025, and moved for a TRO on the same day. The District Court entered a TRO on September 30, 2025. The coalition then moved for summary judgment on October 30, 2025. The District Court granted the coalition's motion for summary judgment on December 22, 2025. The federal government initially appealed the ruling then dismissed its appeal on May 7, 2026, fully resolving this action.

41. Oregon v. Trump, No. 25-cv-1756, D. Or.
(Federalization of National Guard in Oregon)

In this case, California and Oregon filed suit in the U.S, District Court for the District of Oregon requesting that the Court block the Trump Administration's deployment of 300 federalized California National Guard troops to Portland, Oregon. This action came shortly after the District Court enjoined the Trump Administration from federalizing the Oregon National Guard, finding the federalization to be unlawful. In the filing, California joined Oregon's lawsuit and requested emergency relief to prevent federalized California National Guard troops from being unlawfully redeployed.

On October 5, 2025, California joined this lawsuit as a party, moved for a TRO, and was granted that TRO. After a bench trial in late October, the District Court entered a permanent injunction enjoining federalization and deployment of any state's National Guard troops to Oregon on November 7, 2025. The federal government appealed to the Ninth Circuit, but later moved to voluntarily dismiss their appeal on January 27, 2026. On March 2, 2026, the District Court dismissed the remaining claims without prejudice and retained the Court's jurisdiction to, *inter alia*, enforce the permanent injunction.

42. Maryland Clean Energy Ctr. v. United States, No. 25-cv-01738, Fed. Cl.
(Solar For All Funding, Court of Federal Claims)

In this case, California, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), and a multistate coalition sued in the Court of Federal Claims to block the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)'s unlawful termination of the $7 billion Solar for All Program. EPA's termination of the program denies states critical funding for solar energy in low-income and disadvantaged communities. In this lawsuit, the coalition argues that the EPA's abrupt termination of the Solar for All Program breached its contractual obligations to the states, and that it unlawfully revoked funds that Congress had already obligated, and it asks the Court of Federal Claims to restore the funding.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on October 15, 2025. After the case was stayed for several months, the coalition filed a motion for partial summary judgment on damages on May 7, 2026.

43. Arizona v. Envir. Protection Agency, No. 25-cv-2015, W.D. Wash.
(Solar For All Funding, District Court)

This case is a parallel case to *Maryland Clean Energy Ctr. v. United States*, filed in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington. In this case, the multistate coalition challenges the EPA's termination of the Solar for All Program, raising claims under the Administrative Procedure Act and the U.S. Constitution, and seeking vacatur of the termination of the program and reinstatement of that program.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on October 16, 2025. The coalition filed a motion for a preliminary injunction (seeking to ensure that EPA preserved funding for the Solar for All program) on November 14, 2025. The District Court denied that motion on January 13, 2026. On February 24, 2026, the coalition filed a motion for summary judgment. The federal government filed a cross-MSJ on March 17, 2026. That Court denied the coalition's MSJ and granted the government's MSJ (and dismissed the coalition's claims) on June 1, 2026.

44. New York v. Dep't of Justice, No. 25-cv-499, D.R.I.
(DOJ Public Safety Funds)

This case involved a challenge to the U.S. Department of Justice's new condition prohibiting recipients of various public safety and victim services grants from using funding to provide legal service to undocumented immigrants. Many of the organizations that receive these funds provide critical wraparound services to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse, human trafficking, and elder abuse — services that could be described as "legal" under U.S. DOJ's vague definition — irrespective of an individual's immigration status. This new condition, which also requires state agencies to certify to their subgrantees compliance, puts at risk at least $160 million in current funding to California and potentially hundreds of millions of dollars in future funding.

The coalition filed this lawsuit on October 1, 2025, and moved for a preliminary injunction the same day. On November 24, 2025, U.S. DOJ agreed that it would not impose the grant conditions at issue on the plaintiff states' current open grant awards, and the Court dismissed the case pursuant to a joint motion. This case is accordingly fully resolved on favorable terms.

45. Massachusetts v. Dep't of Agric., 1:25-cv-13165, D. Mass.
(SNAP Benefits Disruptions)

In this case, California co-led a multistate lawsuit against the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and its Secretary for indefinitely suspending Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits during the federal government shutdown in October and November 2025. Filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts, the lawsuit points out that USDA has funds available to it that are sufficient to cover all or a large portion of November SNAP benefits, and that suspending benefits — when USDA is sitting on billions of dollars in contingency funds — is both contrary to law and arbitrary and capricious under the Administrative Procedure Act.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on October 28, 2025, and moved for a TRO the same day. The District Court granted the TRO on November 10, 2025. After various proceedings in the First Circuit Court of Appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court (and further proceedings in the District Court), USDA announced it would issue full SNAP benefits on November 13, 2025. The Court eventually dismissed the case on May 1, 2026. This case is accordingly fully resolved.

46. Massachusetts v. Dep't of Educ., No. 25-cv-13244, D. Mass.
(Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program)

California is co-leading a multistate coalition in challenging the U.S Department of Education's regulations purporting to exclude people with federal student loans from Public Service Loan Forgiveness (PSLF) based on whether their employers engage in actions that the Administration deems to have a "substantial illegal purpose." The rule threatens PSLF eligibility for organizations that are engaged in important and legal activities, such as providing legal services to immigrants, providing gender-affirming care to minors, participating in diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives, or engaging in civil protest and the right to assembly.

The multistate coalition filed this case on November 3, 2025. The coalition moved for summary judgment on February 13, 2026. On June 30, 2026, the Court issued an order vacating the rule.

47. Washington v. Dep't of Housing & Urban Dev., No. 1:25-cv-00626, D.R.I.
(Federal Housing Grants)

In this case, California and a multistate coalition are challenging the Trump Administration's funding restrictions on the Continuum of Care (CoC) grant program. Seeking to implement President Trump's "Ending Crime and Disorder on America's Streets" Executive Order, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) announced on November 13 that it would impose new restrictions on CoC funding, including placing limits on funding for permanent housing projects, restricting the services available for people with mental disabilities and substance use disorders, and discriminating against localities whose approach to homelessness differs from the Administration.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on November 25, 2025, and subsequently was granted a preliminary injunction. After proceedings in the District Court and the First Circuit, the District Court granted the coalition's motion for summary judgment on June 30, 2026, finding both the November and December 2025 Notices of Funding Opportunity to be arbitrary and capricious for failing to consider the impact of eliminating the Housing First approach on the existing system created by Congress and HUD, and setting them aside.

48. New York v. Rollins, No. 6:25-cv-02186, D. Ore.
(SNAP Eligibility Guidance)

This case challenges the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) guidance illegally restricting eligibility for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). In California, SNAP, known as the CalFresh Program, is administered by the California Department of Social Services and is an essential hunger safety net to 5.5 million Californians each month. This lawsuit, filed by the multistate coalition in the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon, argues that USDA's guidance for implementing the "One Big Beautiful Bill" Act wrongly excludes certain lawfully residing noncitizens from SNAP eligibility, a decision that could deprive thousands of legal permanent residents of food assistance.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on November 26, 2025, and moved for a preliminary injunction on the same day. The Court granted a preliminary injunction on December 15, 2025. Though defendants initially appealed that ruling, they later dismissed the appeal. Cross motions for summary judgment are pending before the district court.

49. California v. Noem, No. 25-cv-13829, D. Mass.
(H-1B Visa Tax)

In this case, co-led by California, the multistate coalition is challenging the Trump Administration's unlawful policy imposing a $100,000 tax on new H-1B visa petitions. The lawsuit, filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts, alleges that the policy, which has been implemented by the Department of Homeland Security, is a clear violation of the law because it imposes a massive tax outside of the bounds of what is authorized by Congress, is contrary to Congress's intent in establishing the H-1B program, and exceeds the authority granted to the executive branch.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on December 12, 2025. The coalition moved for summary judgment on February 6, 2026, and that motion was granted on June 8, 2026. On June 11, 2026, the federal government filed an appeal. The district court's order is currently administratively stayed as the federal government's request for stay is pending at the First Circuit.

**50. <u>California v. Dep't of Transp.</u>, No. 2:25-cv-02574, W.D. Wash.
(Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Funds)**

This litigation, co-led by California, challenges the Trump Administration's suspension of two bipartisan grant programs for electric vehicle charging infrastructure that would reduce pollution, expand access to clean vehicles, and create thousands of green jobs. Without any explanation or notice, the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) refused to approve any new funding under two electric vehicle charging infrastructure programs created in the Infrastructure Investment & Jobs Act (IIJA): Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Program (CFI) and the Electric Vehicle Charger Reliability and Accessibility Accelerator (Accelerator) Program (together, the EV Charging Infrastructure Programs). In this lawsuit, California and the coalition allege that these unexplained and secretive actions violate the constitutional separation of powers, as the funding was approved by bipartisan majorities in Congress.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on December 16, 2025.

**51. <u>New York v. Vought</u>, No. 25-cv-02384, D. Or.
(CFPB Funding)**

This case challenges the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's (CFPB) Acting Director's unlawful decision not to fund the agency's operations, preventing it from performing legally mandated functions. The lawsuit challenges the decision by CFPB Acting Director Russell Vought to refuse to request the necessary funding for the agency from the Federal Reserve, in violation of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Dodd-Frank Act). The coalition alleges that CFPB's refusal to seek funding to continue its operations, including operating its consumer complaint database, is contrary to law, as the Dodd-Frank Act clearly provides a mechanism for funding the CFPB to perform its statutorily mandatory functions.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on December 22, 2025. On January 9, 2026, CFPB gave notice that it has requested $146 million in funding for FY 2026 Q2, in compliance with an injunction entered in a private party case in D.D.C. brought by the Treasury Employees Union.

**52. <u>Oregon v. Kennedy</u>, No. 6:25-cv-02409, D. Or.
(Secretarial Declaration re Gender Affirming Care)**

In this case, California joins a multistate coalition challenging U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Secretary Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.'s recent declaration that claims gender-affirming care fails to meet professionally recognized standards of care and, as such, HHS may disqualify any doctors or hospitals that provide such care from Medicare and Medicaid. In the lawsuit, the coalition argues that the Kennedy Declaration violates the Administrative Procedure Act, oversteps the Secretary's legal authority to regulate medicine, and would cause immediate harm to States' abilities to administer Medicaid programs in accordance with state laws.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on December 22, 2025, and moved for summary judgment on January 6, 2026. On March 19, 2026, the Court granted the coalition's motion for summary judgment. The federal government moved to amend the judgment on May 18, 2026.

**53. <u>New York v. Admin. for Children & Families</u>, No. 1:26-cv-00172, S.D.N.Y.
(Child Welfare Funds)**

This litigation, brought by California, New York, Minnesota, Illinois, and Colorado, challenges the Trump Administration's decision to illegally freeze over $10 billion in federal funding for childcare and family assistance programs to those five states. In the lawsuit, filed in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, the attorneys general allege that the funding freeze violates the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), the Separation of Powers, and the U.S. Constitution's Appropriations Clause and Spending Clause. They ask the court to block the funding freeze and the extraordinarily overbroad demands for documents and data.

The five states filed this lawsuit on January 8, 2026, and moved for a temporary restraining order the same day. The Court granted that TRO on January 9, 2026. The five states moved for a preliminary injunction on January 16, 2026, and the Court granted that injunction on February 6, 2026.

54. <u>New York v. U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Servs.</u>, No. 1:26-cv-00022, D.R.I (HHS General Grant Conditions)

In this case, California is co-leading litigation challenging new conditions in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' (HHS) Grants Policy Statement and other grant documents that attempt to require HHS grant recipients to comply with President Trump's executive order targeting transgender, nonbinary, intersex, and gender nonconforming individuals.

The multistate coalition filed this lawsuit on January 13, 2026. The parties filed a joint motion to stay the litigation on March 3, 2026, pending resolution of the summary judgment motion in a private party case that challenges the certification funding condition. During the stay, defendants agree to stay enforcement of the challenged certification. The Court granted the stay on March 12, 2026.

55. <u>California v. Pipeline & Hazardous Materials Safety Admin.</u>, No. 26-508, 9th Cir. (Federal Oil Pipeline Permitting)

This case is the first of two petitions that challenge the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's (PHMSA) orders that illegally assert exclusive jurisdiction over two California onshore oil pipelines, known as the Las Flores Pipelines or lines CA-324 and CA-325, and allow them to restart operations. Filed as an original petition in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, the case asserts that PHMSA's orders violate the Administrative Procedure Act and asks the Court to overturn them.

The petition was filed on January 23, 2026. Ninth Circuit heard oral argument on the petitions on July 7, 2026, and subsequently issued an order for additional briefing on July 13, 2026.

56. <u>California v. Dep't of Educ.</u>, No. 3:26-cv-01259, N.D. Cal. (Trans Youth Educational & Privacy Rights)

This lawsuit challenges the Department of Education's findings that the California Department of Education (CDE) "facilitated and promoted the adoption of policies and practices that violate" the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). The Trump administration demanded that CDE take "corrective actions" not required by FERPA, including permitting California local educational agencies to adopt parental notification policies that may forcibly "out" transgender students. In the lawsuit, California argues that it is in substantial compliance with FERPA, and that U.S. ED's findings are an unconstitutional attempt to impose new conditions on $4.9 billion in federal education funding.

California filed this action on February 11, 2026, and obtained a temporary restraining order the same day. On February 17, 2026, the federal defendants stipulated that they had not made any final decision to withhold education funding based on the alleged FERPA violations and agreed not to withhold any funding before 21 days after the district court makes a final determination of the legality of any actual withholding the Department eventually may impose.

57. Illinois v. Vought, No. 1:26-cv-01566, N.D. Ill.
(CDC and DOT Funding Disruptions Targeted at Four States)

This litigation involves a challenge to the Administration's decision to cut more $600 million in CDC funding and $900 million in DOT funding, as well as withholding of $1.3 billion in disaster relief funding from DHS grants, exclusively in four Democratic-led states: California, Colorado, Illinois, and Minnesota. Among the four states, California faces the largest share of the proposed funding cuts. The lawsuit alleges that the funding cuts would irreparably harm the States and are based on political animus.

The States filed the lawsuit on February 11, 2026, and obtained a temporary restraining order on February 12, 2026, and a preliminary injunction on March 13, 2026. The government filed a motion to transfer the case to the Court of Federal Claims pursuant to the Tucker Act.

58. California v. Wright, No. 3:26-cv-01417, N.D. Cal.
(DOE Funding Disruptions)

California co-leads a multistate coalition challenging the Administration's unlawful decision to terminate funding for congressionally mandated energy and infrastructure programs created by laws such as the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) and the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA, also known as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law). The lawsuit challenges the decisions by the Department of Energy, DOE Secretary Chris Wright, the Office of Management and Budget, and OMB Director Russell Vought to terminate billions of dollars in energy and infrastructure awards nationwide. Specifically in California, $1.2 billion in federal funding for ARCHES (Alliance for Renewable Clean Hydrogen Energy Systems) and $4 million under the Resilient and Efficient Codes Implementation (RECI) program was terminated.

The lawsuit was filed on February 18, 2026. On April 27, 2026, the federal defendants filed a motion seeking to transfer the litigation to the Court of Federal Claims under the Tucker Act. On July 2, 2026, the District Court largely denied that motion and retained jurisdiction over the core of the case.

59. Arizona v. Kennedy, No. 3:26-cv-01609, N.D. Cal.
(Federal Vaccine Schedule)

California co-leads a lawsuit challenging unprecedented changes to the childhood immunization schedule which will make people sicker and strain state resources. The complaint challenges a January 5, 2026 "Decision Memo" by the CDC that stripped seven childhood vaccines — those protecting against rotavirus, meningococcal disease, hepatitis A, hepatitis B, influenza, COVID-19, and respiratory syncytial virus (RSV) — of their universally recommended status. The lawsuit also challenges Secretary Kennedy's unlawful replacement of the members of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP), the expert federal panel that has guided U.S. vaccine policy for decades.

The coalition filed its complaint on February 24, 2026 and the federal defendants filed a motion to dismiss the case for lack of standing on June 25, 2026. Arguments will be heard on August 13, 2026.

60. Oregon v. Trump, No. 1:26-cv-01472, Ct. Int'l Trade
(Section 122 Tariffs)

This litigation challenged President Trump's imposition of global tariffs using Section 122 of the Trade Act of 1974. The lawsuit, filed in the Court of International Trade, argued that the President's use of Section 122 to impose tariffs is illegal because the President's justifications for its use do not fall within the limited circumstances required by the statute.

The multistate coalition's lawsuit was filed on March 5, 2026. On May 7, 2026, a three-judge panel of the Trade Court held that the tariffs were unlawful. It granted summary judgment in favor of direct importers only, which in the multistate coalition was only Washington, and it dismissed the other states from the litigation. The federal defendants appealed the Trade Court's order finding the tariffs unlawful and the States who were dismissed for lack of direct importation cross-appealed. On June 12, 2026, the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals stayed the Trade Court's summary judgment order pending the resolution of those appeals.

61. <u>Massachusetts v. Dep't of Educ.</u>, No. 1:26-cv-11229, D. Mass. (Educational Data Reporting)

In this case, California co-leads a multistate coalition challenging the Administration's burdensome new requirements that colleges and universities submit data linking race to admissions, financial aid, and student performance. While the Administration claims to be seeking this data to assist it in enforcing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination based on race, its unprecedented new demands make it all but impossible for colleges and universities to submit usable data for review.

The lawsuit was filed on March 11, 2026. The coalition obtained a temporary restraining order on March 13, 2026 and a preliminary injunction on April 3, 2026. On May 19, 2026, the Department of Education asked the District of Massachusetts to remand to the agency for further explanation of its justification for imposing the new requirements. The coalition opposed that request, explaining that no amount of additional justification could cure the legal deficiencies in the demand.

62. <u>Illinois v. Dep't of Housing & Urban Dev.</u>, No. 3:26-cv-02262, N.D. Cal. (Fair Housing Act Guidance)

California co-leads a multistate coalition against the Department of Housing and Urban Development over guidance it issued that significantly weakens fair housing protections and makes it harder to hold landlords accountable for discrimination. The FHA establishes a floor — not a ceiling — for protection against housing discrimination, meaning that states can expand the scope of protections beyond what the FHA mandates and many states have chosen to do so. HUD issued guidance in September 2025 threatening to decertify state housing agencies — thereby cutting off complaint referrals and funding — if they consider protections other than those required by the FHA, while simultaneously imposing new unlawful funding conditions.

The lawsuit was filed on March 16, 2026. The coalition filed an amended complaint on June 24, 2026, and the federal defendants filed a motion to dismiss on July 22, 2026.

63. <u>Massachusetts v. Envir. Prot. Agency</u>, No. 26-1061, D.C. Cir. (EPA Recission of Endangerment Finding)

In this case, a multistate coalition co-led by California challenges the EPA's rescission of its Endangerment Finding, EPA's formal acknowledgement that greenhouse gas emissions from motor vehicles contribute to air pollution that drives climate change and endangers public health and welfare. The Endangerment Finding has served as the legal basis under the Clean Air Act for limiting climate pollution from vehicles. The coalition alleges that EPA's rescission violates the Clean Air Act, resting on the flawed assertion that it lacks legal authority to regulate greenhouse gas emissions and ignoring overwhelming and longstanding scientific evidence that greenhouse gases endanger public health and welfare. The coalition also argues that the rule's elimination of all existing and future federal greenhouse gas emission standards for vehicles violates the agency's legal obligations and its fundamental responsibility to protect public health and welfare from environmental harm.

Pursuant to the requirements of the Clean Air Act, this petition for review was filed in the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals on March 19, 2026.

64. <u>Massachusetts v. Dep't of Agric.</u>, No. 1:26-cv-11396, D. Mass. (USDA General Grant Terms and Conditions)

California co-leads a multistate lawsuit challenging the Trump Administration's attempt to impose new discriminatory conditions on USDA grants that provide school lunches, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) funding, and other essential programs. The conditions would require federal funding recipients to comply with vague and unrelated policies on immigration, gender ideology, transgender athletes, and diversity, equity, and inclusion. The conditions violate both the U.S. Constitution by exceeding USDA's statutory authority, attaching vague conditions to funding, failing to provide a reasoned explanation or follow procedural requirements, and threatening billions of dollars in critical funding.

The States filed the complaint on March 23, 2026. On June 5, 2026, the Court issued a preliminary injunction against the federal defendants, who moved to dismiss the complaint on July 10, 2026.

65. <u>California v. Wright</u>, No. 2:26-cv-3396, C.D. Cal. (Sable Pipeline – Defense Production Act)

In this case, California is challenging the Department of Energy (DOE) Secretary Chris Wright's "Pipeline Capacity Prioritization and Allocation Order," seeking to halt its use as the basis for Sable Offshore Corp.'s unlawful restart of two California onshore oil pipelines that are subject to State regulation and oversight. The Order, issued under the Defense Production Act (DPA), unlawfully purports to supersede state law, state court orders, and a federal court-approved Consent Decree to allow Sable to restart oil transport through lines CA-324 and CA-325, also known as the Las Flores Pipelines. In addition to infringing on California's sovereign power under the Tenth Amendment and violating the Separation of Powers by purporting to override state law, the action also violates a preliminary injunction issued by the Santa Barbara Superior Court, and a judicial Consent Decree approved by the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California that expressly acknowledged and approved the State's role in reviewing and approving any planned restart of the onshore pipelines.

The Department filed the case on March 30, 2026, and filed a motion for a preliminary injunction on May 1, 2026. Several parties intervened in the action throughout May 2026 (including Sable). The federal defendants have also filed a motion to dismiss.

66. <u>California v. Trump</u>, No. 1:26-cv-11581, D. Mass. (Mail Balloting Executive Order)

California is leading a multistate lawsuit challenging President Trump's executive order that unlawfully attempts to interfere with States' constitutional authority to administer elections by restricting voter eligibility and mail voting to lists of voters pre-authorized by the federal government. The executive order threatens both criminal prosecution and federal funding loss for noncompliance.

The coalition filed its complaint on April 3, 2026. The court ordered summary judgment order on June 25, 2026. On July 1, 2026, the federal defendants asked the district court to stay its permanent injunction, which the court declined to do. The federal defendants thereafter sought a stay from the First Circuit court of appeals.

67. California v. Zeldin, No. 3:26-cv-3500, N.D. Cal. (National Air Quality Standards)

California and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) are leading a multistate lawsuit against the EPA over its failure to implement a lifesaving 2024 Clean Air Act rule strengthening National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for fine particulate matter, commonly known as soot. The lawsuit alleges that EPA violated the Clean Air Act by failing to designate areas in the United States as in or out of attainment with the 2024 standard. EPA's failure undermines the ability of states and local governments to reduce levels of fine particulate pollution in the air — especially in low-income communities and communities of color, which are disproportionately impacted — and to achieve significant public health benefits including reduced premature deaths, mortality, and healthcare and administrative costs. The benefits of maintaining and implementing the 2024 standard are particularly important in California, due to the severity of its air pollution, especially in populous areas.

The coalition filed its complaint on April 26, 2026. On July 17, 2026, the court entered summary judgment in favor of the coalition.

68. Maryland v. Dep't of Educ., No. 1:26-cv-01957, D. Md. (Professional Degree Loan Limits)

This case challenges the Department of Education's final rule that narrows the federal definition of a "professional degree" and would dramatically reduce the availability of federal student loans for students seeking graduate degrees in nursing, physician assistant studies, physical therapy, and other professions. This change would make it harder for these vital healthcare workers to pursue advanced degrees, threatening the availability of a critical workforce as well as the operations of healthcare systems in California and across the country. The lawsuit challenges the restrictive definition of "professional degree," which the coalition argues is contrary to law, and also challenges the arbitrary and capricious implementation of the One Big Beautiful Bill Act's grandfathering provision, which would disadvantage students who transfer schools or withdraw and then re-enroll.

The coalition filed its complaint on May 19, 2026.

69. California v. Dep't of Educ., No. 3:26-cv-05549, N.D. Cal. (Special Education Funds)

In this case, California is leading a multistate lawsuit challenging the Department of Education's discontinuation of awarded grants under the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) program. These competitive grants provide critical funding for the professional development of special education staff and support services for children with disabilities. In California, more than 880,000 students are eligible for special education services. Although the California Department of Education had been awarded a five-year SPDG grant in 2022, the Department of Education discontinued the grant in September 2025 because of conclusory, baseless concerns about equity-related initiatives.

The coalition filed its complaint on June 6, 2026.

70. Maryland v. Hegseth, No. 1:26-cv-02322, D. Md. (Federal Contractors Executive Order)

California is co-leading a lawsuit against the federal administration over the implementation of an Executive Order that requires the addition of new terms to federal contracts that — in the name of purging "diversity, equity, and inclusion" — impose unclear and confusing requirements on federal contractors and subcontractors. These terms depart from antidiscrimination policies that contractors have followed for many decades. The federal Administration is also threatening severe penalties on federal contractors that do not comply yet fails to provide adequate notice of what is prohibited.

The coalition filed its complaint on June 10, 2026. On July 21, 2026, the coalition filed a motion for summary judgment.

71. <u>Santa Clara v. U.S. Imm. & Customs Enfmt.</u>, No. 5:26-cv-05604, N.D. Cal. (ICE Detention Facility in Gilroy, CA)

In this case, California and Santa Clara County seek to block the illegal development of an ICE facility in unincorporated Santa Clara County near Gilroy, California. In January 2025, a private developer leased the property to the federal government for use by ICE, likely as an Enforcement and Removal Operations (ERO) office. ERO offices, which are only designed for administrative use and short-term detainment, have been the subject of numerous lawsuits during the Trump Administration, and investigative reports have revealed frequent overcrowding, long term confinement, and inhumane conditions. The lawsuit asks the district court to permanently enjoin construction of this facility because the project violates the National Environmental Policy Act, the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, the Administrative Procedure Act, and California's Williamson Act.

The Department filed a complaint on June 10, 2026, and a motion for a preliminary injunction on June 24, 2026. On July 13, 2026, the federal government stipulated to pausing construction on the facility until September 9, 2026, when the motion for a preliminary injunction will be heard.

72. <u>California v. Envir. Prot. Agency</u>, No. 1:26-cv-02185, D.D.C. (Clean Air Act Waivers)

The Department filed this suit on behalf of the State of California, the Governor, and CARB, challenging the EPA's attempt to reclassify four of California's Clean Air Act preemption waivers as "rules" subject to Congressional disapproval under the Congressional Review Act. The four waivers allow California to implement important vehicle emissions standards that help address severe air pollution. In over 50 years since the Clean Air Act was enacted, waivers have never been considered rules subject to Congressional disapproval. Nor have any other agency orders that adjudicate requests for permission, such as oil and gas leases or mining permits. EPA purported to reclassify these waivers as rules and submitted them to Congress in an unlawful attempt to end-run administrative procedure and tee up a Congressional attack on California's vehicle emissions rules.

The Department filed the complaint on June 22, 2026, and a motion for a preliminary injunction on June 25, 2026.

73. <u>Massachusetts v. Oz</u>, No. 1:26-cv-12962, D. Mass. (Medicaid Work Requirements)

California co-leads this multistate lawsuit concerning the Trump Administration's unlawful implementation of new Medicaid work requirements included in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. Specifically, the lawsuit challenges provisions of an interim final rule published by HHS and CMS that adopts a new interpretation of key terms like "medically frail," making it harder for medically vulnerable individuals to be excused from the work requirements.

The coalition filed its complaint and a motion for a preliminary injunction on June 29, 2026.

74. Washington v. Dep't of Housing & Urban Dev., No. 1:26-cv-00439, D.R.I.
(HUD Public Housing Funding)

This is another multistate action challenging disruptions to HUD's Continuum of Care (CoC) Program. As noted above, CoC is the federal government's flagship program for funding affordable housing and other services for individuals at risk of and experiencing homelessness. In this action, the coalition alleges that HUD's 2026 CoC Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) seeks to steer funding away from permanent supportive housing projects, despite the federal court order blocking HUD's 2025 CoC NOFO, which sought to divert more than $3 billion in federal funding from those projects. The complaint also alleges that new scoring criteria in the 2026 NOFO unlawfully penalizes applicants by steering funding away from proven low-barrier housing toward programs that impose conditions before individuals can access housing.

The coalition filed its complaint on July 7, 2026.

75. Washington v. Dep't of Education, No. 2:26-cv-02409, W.D. Wash.
(Mental Health Grants 2.0)

This is a multistate case challenging the Department of Education's further termination of grants awarded through congressionally established school mental health funding programs, including roughly $200 million awarded to 44 local education agencies, county offices of education, and universities in California. The grants have helped schools hire hundreds of psychologists, counselors, and social workers who have served thousands of students, including in the State's most economically disadvantaged and rural communities. The Department previously filed a lawsuit (#28 above) challenging earlier attempts to discontinue the grants, and successfully secured summary judgment. In response, the federal government announced a plan to end the funding under a different regulation, which this action challenges.

The lawsuit and a motion for a temporary restraining order were filed on July 10, 2026. On July 27, 2026, the court granted the motion for a temporary restraining order.

76. Renewable Northwest v. Hegseth, No. 3:26-cv-01092, D. Or.
(Onshore Wind Energy)

The Department joined a multistate coalition moving to intervene in a lawsuit brought by several wind industry associations and businesses against the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) and Secretary Pete Hegseth for unlawfully freezing routine reviews of land-based wind energy projects across the country. Federal law requires DoD to review proposed wind projects for potential national security concerns and work with developers to address any issues. In August 2025, DoD stopped moving projects through this process, blocking onshore wind energy development nationwide. The complaint in intervention asks the court to set aside DoD's unlawful freeze and order the agency to resume the review process required by federal law.

The motion to intervene and complaint in intervention was filed on July 16, 2026.

77. California v. Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, No. ____, 9th Cir.
(Federal Oil Pipeline Permitting)

This is the second Ninth Circuit petition challenging the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's (PHMSA) recent issuance of a new "non-emergency special permit" for Sable Offshore Corp. to transport oil through two California onshore oil pipelines in Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, and Kern counties. In December 2025, at the request of Sable, PHMSA issued Sable an emergency permit waiving compliance with its own safety regulation requiring evaluation and remediation of pipeline corrosion. The Department already filed one action challenging that emergency permit, alongside PHMSA's reclassification of the pipelines as interstate, and its approval of Sable's restart plan (#55 above).

The petition was filed on July 20, 2026.

78. Massachusetts v. Envir. Prot. Agency, No. __, D.C.Cir.
(HFC Regulations)

This multistate action challenges the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) rule that would weaken regulations designed to phase out the use of hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs) in commercial equipment. HFCs are chemicals used for refrigeration and cooling that are up to 10,000 times more potent than the equivalent amount of carbon dioxide; they are among the fastest-growing sources of greenhouse gas emissions both in the United States and around the world. The rule rolls back some of the existing deadlines for industry to move from using HFCs as refrigerant gases to refrigerants with less greenhouse effect, known as Global Warming Potential.

The petition was filed in the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals, in accordance with Clean Air Act procedure, on July 21, 2026.

79. Illinois v. Fed. Emerg. Mgmt. Agency, No. 26-cv-00485, D.R.I.
(Emergency Preparedness Grant Conditions)

This is a multistate case challenging the Trump Administration's imposition of unlawful conditions on billions of dollars in U.S. Department of Homeland Security and Federal Emergency Management Agency grants that help States and local governments prepare for, protect against, respond to, and recover from catastrophic disasters. Specifically, the Administration is requiring States to adopt its preferred policies to receive these grants, including complying with new immigration enforcement mandates, accepting new election administration requirements, and allowing funding to be terminated based on vague and subjective criteria. The multistate has previously challenged and blocked two similar attempts to impose conditions on these same grant programs.

The complaint was filed on July 23, 2026.

C. Defensive Litigation

In addition to its affirmative actions challenging the federal administration's overreach, the Department also defends actions brught by the federal government that challenge California's policies and seek to enforce unlawful policies.

1. United States v. California, No. 25-cv-06230, C.D. Cal.
(Prop. 12)

In this case, the federal government challenges Health and Safety Code section 25990(b)(3)-(4) (enacted through AB 1437 and Prop. 12) and related regulations, which govern the conditions of egg-laying hens and the sale of eggs in California. In its complaint, the United States argues that the federal government alone has the power to regulate the quality, inspection, and packaging of eggs under the Egg Products Inspection Act (EPIA) and that the Supremacy Clause does not permit California to promulgate additional standards.

The United States filed its initial complaint on July 9, 2025. On March 18, 2026, the Court granted California's motion to dismiss for lack of standing and granted the federal government leave to amend its complaint. After the United States filed its amended complaint on April 1, 2026, California filed another motion to dismiss on May 11, 2026.

2. Doe v. Regents, No. 25-cv-01485, C.D. Cal. (Transgender Student Athletes)

In this case, the United States is challenging policies by the California Department of Education (CDE) and the California Interscholastic Federation (CIF) that allow transgender athletes to compete on school sports teams that are consistent with their gender identity, irrespective of the gender listed on their records. Specifically, the United States alleges that this policy violates Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and CDE's Title IX contractual assurances, and the federal government asks the court for both declaratory and injunctive relief.

The United States filed its complaint on July 9, 2025, and in response, CIF and CDE moved to dismiss on September 9, 2025.

3. United States v. Baass, No. 25-mc-83, C.D. Cal. (Petition to Enforce DHS Administrative Subpoena)

The United States petitioned the court to enforce a Department of Homeland Security (DHS) administrative subpoena issued to Michelle Baass, the Director of the California Department of Health Care Services. The subpoena seeks any application for Medi-Cal benefits submitted between June 5, 2021, and the present, where the applicant did not affirm that they have satisfactory immigration status. This information purportedly supports a DHS investigation into (1) the presence of undocumented immigrants residing within the Central District of California, and (2) California's facilitation of violations of immigration laws by providing services to individuals without satisfactory immigration status.

The United States filed a petition to enforce the administrative subpoena on August 19, 2025. On March 31, 2026, the Court denied the federal government's petition to enforce. The United States filed a notice of appeal to the Ninth Circuit on May 29, 2026.

4. United States v. Weber, No. 25-cv-09149, C.D. Cal. (Access to Unredacted Voter Roll Information)

In this case, the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) is challenging the California Secretary of State's refusal to provide sensitive voter roll data to the federal government. DOJ requested from the Secretary: an electronic, unredacted copy of California's statewide voter registration list; a list of election officials responsible for maintaining California's voter registration list; and a list of follow-up questions to the information provided by California in its response to the U.S. Election Assistance Commission's 2024 Election Administration and Voting Survey. DOJ alleges that, in refusing to provide this information, California Secretary of State Shirley Weber violated Title III of the Civil Rights Act of 1960, the National Voter Registration Act, and the Help America Vote Act.

The United States filed this complaint on September 25, 2025, and the court granted California's motion to dismiss on January 15, 2026. On February 25, 2026, the United States filed a notice of appeal.

5. **NLRB v. Cal. Pub. Emp. Rels. Bd., No. 25-at-01400, E.D. Cal. (AB 288)**

In this case, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) challenges the constitutionality of AB 288, which allows private sector workers the right to petition the Public Employee Relations Board for resolution of various labor law violations if the NLRB does not fulfill its duties. In the complaint, the NLRB claims that the law is preempted by the National Labor Relations Act and seeks to enjoin its enforcement.

The NLRB filed its complaint on October 15, 2025, and moved for a preliminary injunction on November 19, 2025. The Court granted that motion in part and denied it in part on December 26, 2025. California filed an answer on January 9, 2026.

6. **Tangipa v. Newsom, No. 25-cv-10616, C.D. Cal. (Prop. 50)**

This action involves a challenge brought by residents of California, a state elected official, and the California Republican Party to the constitutionality of Proposition 50, the amendment which granted the California Legislature the power to redraw the state's congressional districts. Specifically, the complaint alleges that the California Legislature violated the Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments when it allegedly drew new congressional district lines based on race to favor Hispanic voters.

This lawsuit was filed on November 5, 2025, and two days later, on November 7, the plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction. After a three-day hearing in December 2025, a three-judge panel of the C.D. Cal. District Court denied the plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction on January 14, 2026. On January 20, 2026, plaintiffs filed an emergency motion for stay in the Supreme Court of the United States, which was denied on February 4, 2026. On February 11, 2026, California filed a motion to dismiss.

7. **United States v. California, No. 25-cv-10999, C. D. Cal. (SB 627 & SB 805)**

In this case, the United States is challenging the constitutionality of SB 627, which prohibits law enforcement from wearing masks in performance of their duties, and SB 805, which requires federal law enforcement to visibly display identification when performing their duties. The United States alleges that both laws violate the Supremacy Clause because they constitute an unlawful regulation of the federal government and unlawful discrimination against the federal government in violation of the intergovernmental immunity doctrine. They seek declaratory judgment that the laws are invalid as applied to federal agencies and officers, a preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining enforcement, and costs and fees.

The United States filed this complaint on November 17, 2025, and filed a motion for preliminary injunction on November 25, 2025. On February 9, 2026, the court granted the United States' motion regarding SB 627's "conduct provision" and denied it with respect to all other challenged provisions. The United States filed a notice of appeal of the preliminary injunction order and applied ex parte for an injunction pending appeal on February 17, 2026. On April 22, 2026, the Ninth Circuit granted an injunction pending appeal on SB 805.

8. United States v. Newsom, No. 25-cv-03375, E.D. Cal. (CA Dream Act/Non-Resident Tuition Waiver)

In this case, the United States is challenging AB 540 and the California Dream Act, known together as California's "Education Access Laws." In the lawsuit, the federal government claims that California Education Code § 68130.5 and the California Dream Act extend eligibility for in-state tuition benefits to undocumented immigrants over U.S. citizens from other states, in violation of 8 U.S.C. § 1623(a) and the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution.

The United States filed this complaint on November 20, 2025, and California filed a motion to dismiss on December 30, 2025, which is fully briefed and awaiting a ruling.

9. United States v. California, No. 26-cv-00107, E.D. Cal. (SB 1137)

In this case, the United States is challenging SB 1137, which restricts fossil fuel development activities within 3,200 feet of "sensitive receptors." In the complaint, the United States argues that SB 1137 is preempted by federal law, violates the Supremacy Clause, infringes on the constitutional authority of the United States to manage federal land and mineral resources under the Property clause and other provisions of federal law, including the Mineral Leasing Act and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, and violates the intergovernmental immunity doctrine.

The United States filed this lawsuit on January 14, 2026, and filed a motion for preliminary injunction two days later. On March 31, 2026, the court denied the United States' preliminary injunction motion. California filed an answer to the complaint on April 21, 2026.

10. United States v. Cal. Air. Res. Bd., No. 2:26-cv-00847, E.D. Cal. (Advanced Clean Cars I)

The United States Department of Transportation filed a suit seeking declaratory and injunctive relief against the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for adopting and enforcing the state's Advanced Clean Cars (ACC) program, which established regulations related to fuel economy standards for light-duty vehicles. The complaint alleges that the ACC program's restrictions are in violation of the Energy Policy Conservation Act, 49 U.S.C. § 32919(a), and the Supremacy Clause.

The United States filed this complaint on March 12, 2026, and on May 26, 2026, California filed a motion to dismiss. In response, the United States filed an amended complaint on June 16, 2026. California filed a new motion to dismiss on July 7, 2026.

11. United States v. California, No. 26-cv-1697, C.D. Cal. (Handgun Roster)

In this case, the United States is challenging California Penal Code § 27595(a), which prohibits firearms dealers from selling certain semiautomatic pistols and requires handguns sold at retail to be listed on the State's official roster of handguns. The lawsuit argues that the restrictions are presumptively unconstitutional under the Supreme Court's *Bruen* framework, as the regulation lacks a sufficient historical basis. The United States asks for declaratory relief and for the court to enjoin enforcement of the law.

The United States filed this lawsuit on July 1, 2026, and on the same day, filed an application for TRO and preliminary injunction. On July 9, 2026, the court denied the government's request for a TRO.

D. Amicus Briefs

The Department has filed 122 amicus briefs supporting plaintiffs in other litigation that challenges federal overreach. These briefs express California's interests and explain the impacts to California of improper federal action. Like the affirmative litigation, the Department often files these briefs in the context of multistate action, thus maximizing Department resources and leveraging interoffice collaboration.

The Department filed briefs supporting the integrity of independent federal boards and commissions, such as the Consumer Financial Protection Board and the Federal Trade Commission. The amicus briefs have emphasized the need for independence of those commissioners to ensure that the boards' work is done without partisan impact and consistent with their mission, including protecting consumers and ensuring labor rights.

The Department has filed many briefs supporting immigrants' rights. This has included supporting student visas, lawful immigrant admissions, temporary protected status for Syrians, Somalians, and Haitians, and unaccompanied children. The briefs explain that immigrants are key contributors to State economies and communities, and the federal actions will separate families, damage communities, and endanger immigrants.

The Department filed an amicus brief opposing the Immigration and Customs Enforcement raids in Los Angeles and across the country, explaining that those actions have intimidated communities, scarred civil society, harmed local economies, and sown confusion and distrust that impedes local law enforcement. Likewise, California provided amicus support to the Los Angeles Press Club supporting media access to immigration enforcement protests without unnecessary assaults.

In addition to its affirmative litigation, the Department filed amicus briefs opposing unlawful National Guard deployment in the District of Columbia. It also filed an amicus brief in the US Supreme Court supporting the Illinois National Guard challenge that resulted in the Court's decision that the statute the President relied upon did not support the federalization and deployment.

The federal government has attempted to unlawfully obtain sensitive personal data on individuals across the country and the Department has filed amicus briefs opposing those efforts. This includes multiple amicus briefs supporting states that refuse to provide unredacted voter rolls to the federal government. Those briefs explain that there is no basis to obtain that information and states are responsible for election administration. In addition, the Department has filed numerous amicus briefs opposing the federal attempt to obtain personal health information about adolescents who have received gender-affirming care. Those briefs emphasize the States' right to regulate the practice of medicine and the need to support access to medical treatment.

The Department's amicus briefs have supported the enforcement of environmental laws, emphasizing the broad public interest in supporting reliable clean energy and protecting public health. For example, the Department's briefs discuss the importance of supporting wind and solar power and safe drinking water, and oppose federal action that destabilizes environmental protection by rescinding the Endangerment Finding that is the predicate for reducing greenhouse gasses.

In addition, the Department has filed amicus briefs in a broad variety of other topics, including worker protection, USAID funding, public support, academic freedom, and gender anti-discrimination rights.

E. Administrative and Public Action

Finally, the Department has submitted 112 written comment letters on proposed federal regulatory action in order to ensure California's interests are considered in regulatory process. These comment letters have addressed proposed broad restrictions on federal funding, including the requirement of attesting to federal policy positions in order to receive any funding, and a wholesale restructuring of federal funding that would allow unlawful federal review and termination. The comments have also addressed environmental protection, including proposed regulations narrowing pollutant standards and chemical accident protection, broadly allowing offshore fracking and drilling, and rescinding clean energy regulations. The Department commented on proposed rules that would limit protection for workers, such as a proposal to require a non-disclosure agreement for federal employees and a Department of Labor rule weakening employee protection. The Department also commented on federal actions that would reduce predatory lending and ERISA account protection as well as weaken the Consumer Financial Protection Board's authority. It opposed a proposed rule that would weaken rules prohibiting housing discrimination and the rescission of regulations addressing disparate impact discrimination. The Department commented on a USDA notice that would allow federal access to personal data of Americans that use the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. It opposed the development of an ICE facility at California City. It commented on proposed federal rules that would limit California's ability to protect against gun violence. The Department commented on matters that affect Californians' healthcare, including access to the Affordable Care Act, protection of Medicaid, protection of mifepristone and reproductive healthcare services for veterans and their families, access to gender-affirming care, and opposing weakening restrictions on e-cigarettes and use of AI tools in healthcare. The Department also commented on many other matters, such as the unlawful imposition of tariffs and proposed election mail rules.

In the face of hostile immigration enforcement action, the Department has also published guidance and model policies for state and local agencies to inform their interaction with immigration authorities, in compliance with state and federal law, and to enable protection of residents' personal data. Additionally, the Department published guidance for schools, childcare centers, and healthcare facilities to help them limit immigration enforcement presence in order to allow safe access by students and patients.

III. Other Required Reporting

A. Outside Counsel

The Department has not used any SBX1-1 allocated funds to contract with outside counsel for the purposes of legal representation in connection with any federal accountability matter.

B. Administrative Actions Under State Law

The Department understands "administrative action authorized under state law" to mean non-judicial acts specifically authorized under a California state statutory or regulatory provision that may "mitigate the impacts of actions taken by the federal government." Although many State executive agencies have likely considered or taken such administrative action, the Department is not aware of any administrative actions within the meaning of SBX1-1 that the Department itself has undertaken in specific response to executive overreach by this federal administration.