

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROY GARRETT, MARY GARRETT,
ESCONDIDO HUMAN RIGHTS
COMMITTEE, JANE DOE 1 and DOE
JANE DOE 2,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF ESCONDIDO,

Defendant.

Civil No. 06CV2434 JAH (NLS)

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'
APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER**

[Doc. No. 3]

INTRODUCTION

Now before this Court is Plaintiffs Roy Garrett, Mary Garrett and Escondido Human Rights Committee's (collectively "Plaintiffs") application for a temporary restraining order ("TRO") to restrain Defendant City of Escondido ("Defendant") from implementing and/or enforcing Ordinance No. 2006-38 R, Chapter 16E of the Escondido Municipal Code. Doc. No. 3. Oral argument was heard on November 16, 2006, with appearances by Phillip Tencer, Alan Mansfield, and David Blair-Loy for Plaintiffs, and Donald Lincoln and Christopher Garrett for Defendant. This Court, after hearing the oral argument of counsel, and after a careful consideration of the pleadings, relevant exhibits, and for the reasons set forth below, GRANTED Plaintiffs' application for temporary restraining order. The Court's oral ruling of November 16, 2006, is hereby incorporated by reference into this Order.

///

BACKGROUND

1
2 On October 18, 2006, Defendant adopted Ordinance No. 2006-38R titled “Establishing
3 Penalties for the Harboring of Illegal Aliens in the City of Escondido” (the “Ordinance”). The
4 Ordinance seeks to penalize “any person or business that owns a dwelling unit”¹ in the city of
5 Escondido (“City”) who “harbor[s] an illegal alien in the dwelling unit, knowing or in reckless
6 disregard of the fact that an alien has come to, entered, or remains in the United States in
7 violation of law, unless such harboring is otherwise expressly permitted by federal law.” Decl.
8 of V. Calderon, Exh. 1, Minutes from October 4, 2006 Escondido City Council Meeting at 1;
9 Exh. 3 at 1 and 3. The enforcement provisions allow for the suspension of an owner’s business
10 license if, upon receipt of a complaint and subsequent verification “with the federal government
11 [regarding] the lawful immigration status of a person seeking to use, occupy, lease, or rent a
12 dwelling unit in the City” of a violation of the Ordinance, an owner: 1) “let[s], lease[s] or
13 rent[s] a dwelling unit to an illegal alien, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that an
14 alien has come to, entered, or remains in the United States in violation of law”; 2) fails to
15 correct a violation of the Ordinance upon “receipt of written notice from the City that a
16 violation has occurred and that the immigration status of any alleged illegal alien has been
17 verified”; or 3) fails to respond to the City within five business days of notification of the
18 complaint. *See* Exh. 3. The suspension of an owner’s license precludes the collection of rent
19 or payment “from any tenant or occupant in the dwelling unit.” Where more than one
20 violation has occurred,² an owner would be subject to “a monetary penalty of up to \$1000.00
21 per violation per day or a jail term of six months, or both.” TRO Appl. at 4, citing to §16E-2(h);
22 EMC §16-249. An illegal alien is defined in the Ordinance as:

23
24 _____
25 ¹ The Ordinance at the present time specifically targets individuals who own more than three
26 rental units. Epp Ltr., Exh. 2 at 3 (“Presently, Escondido Municipal Code Section 16-17 requires a
27 business license for all persons engaged in certain types of business ... The general practice of the City
28 has been to require a business license for those who rent units in excess of three units; due to staffing
constraints and availability of resources, enforcement of a business license is not requested for
individual dwellings on a lot or for individual rooms in a homeowner’s home.”).

² Plaintiffs assert that the Ordinance defines each day “beginning ten business days after
receipt of a notice of violation from the City” as a separate violation. *See* Exh. 3 at 3.

1 An alien who is not lawfully present in the United States, according to the terms
2 of United States Code Title 8, section 1101 et seq. The City shall not conclude
3 that a person is an illegal alien unless and until an authorized representative of the
4 City has verified with the federal government, pursuant to United States Code
5 Title 8, subsection 1373(c), that the person is an alien who is not lawfully present
6 in the United States.

7 *See* Exh. 3 at 3.

8 On November 3, 2006, Plaintiffs filed the instant complaint, asserting various
9 constitutional rights violations against Defendant. Plaintiff filed a TRO application on
10 November 7, 2006. Doc. No. 3. This Court, after reviewing Plaintiffs' TRO application,
11 scheduled a hearing for November 16, 2006, with responses due by November 13, 2006. Doc.
12 No. 4. On November 9, 2006, Plaintiffs filed an additional declaration by Estela de los Rios
13 in support of their TRO application. Doc. No. 7. Defendant filed its opposition on November
14 13, 2006. Doc. No. 8. On November 14, 2006, the San Diego Apartment Association,
15 California Apartment Association and the National Apartment Association (collectively
16 "Apartment Associations") requested leave to file an amicus brief with this Court in support of
17 Plaintiff's TRO application. Doc. No. 9. This Court granted the amicus parties' application.
18 Doc. No. 11. Plaintiffs filed a request for judicial notice in support of their TRO application
19 on November 15, 2006. Doc. No. 13.

20 DISCUSSION

21 I. Legal Standard

22 The purpose of a temporary restraining order ("TRO") is to preserve the *status quo* before
23 a preliminary injunction hearing may be held; its provisional remedial nature is designed merely
24 to prevent irreparable loss of rights prior to judgment. *See* Granny Goose Foods, Inc. v. Bhd.
25 of Teamsters & Auto Truck Drivers, 415 U.S. 423, 439 (1974) (noting that a TRO is restricted
26 to its "underlying purpose of preserving the *status quo* and preventing irreparable harm just so
27 long as is necessary to hold a hearing, and no longer"). As such, an applicant for a TRO is
28 required to demonstrate "immediate and irreparable injury, loss or damage." Fed. R. Civ. P.
65(b); *see also* Caribbean Marine Serv. Co., Inc. v. Baldrige, 844 F.2d 668, 674 (9th Cir. 1988).

The standard for issuing a TRO is similar to the standard for issuing a preliminary
injunction. Lockheed Missile & Space Co., Inc. v. Hughes Aircraft Co., 887 F. Supp. 1320,

1 1323 (N.D. Cal. 1995). The Ninth Circuit recognizes two tests for demonstrating preliminary
2 injunctive relief: the traditional test or an alternative sliding scale test. Cassim v. Bowen, 824
3 F.2d 791, 795 (9th Cir. 1987). Under the traditional test, a party must show: “1) a strong
4 likelihood of success on the merits, 2) the possibility of irreparable injury to plaintiff if
5 preliminary relief is not granted, 3) a balance of hardships favoring the plaintiff, and 4)
6 advancement of the public interest (in certain cases).” Save Our Sonoran, Inc. v. Flowers, 408
7 F.3d 1113, 1120 (9th Cir. 2005). Where a party demonstrates that a public interest is
8 involved, a “district court must also examine whether the public interest favors the plaintiff.”
9 Fund for Animals, Inc. v. Lujan, 962 F.2d 1391, 1400 (9th Cir. 1992).

10 Alternatively, a party seeking injunctive relief under Fed. R. Civ. P. 65 must show either
11 (1) a combination of likelihood of success on the merits and the possibility of irreparable harm,
12 or (2) that serious questions going to the merits are raised and the balance of hardships tips
13 sharply in favor of the moving party. Immigrant Assistance Project of the L.A. County of Fed’n
14 of Labor v. INS, 306 F.3d 842, 873 (9th Cir. 2002); Sun Microsystems, Inc. v. Microsoft
15 Corp., 188 F.3d 1115, 1119 (9th Cir. 1999); Roe v. Anderson, 134 F.3d 1400, 1402 (9th Cir.
16 1998). “These two formulations represent two points on a sliding scale in which the required
17 degree of irreparable harm increases as the probability of success decreases.” Roe, 134 F.3d at
18 1402 (quoting United States v. Nutri-cology, Inc., 982 F.2d 394, 397 (9th Cir. 1992)); accord
19 Sun Microsystems, 188 F.3d at 1119. “Thus, ‘the greater the relative hardship to the moving
20 party, the less probability of success must be shown.” Sun Microsystems, 188 F.3d at 1119
21 (quoting Nat’l Ctr. for Immigrants Rights v. INS, 743 F.2d 1365, 1369 (9th Cir. 1984)).

22 The Ninth Circuit makes clear that a showing of immediate irreparable harm is essential
23 for prevailing on a TRO. See Caribbean Marine, 844 F.2d at 674. “Speculative injury does not
24 constitute irreparable injury sufficient to warrant granting a preliminary injunction.” Id.
25 Moreover, “a plaintiff seeking an injunction against a local or state government must present
26 facts showing a threat of immediate, irreparable harm before a federal court will intervene.”
27 Midgett v. Tri-County Met. Transp. Dist., 254 F.3d 846, 851 (9th Cir. 2001). Thus, a plaintiff
28 must show the presence of an “immediate threatened injury as a prerequisite to preliminary

1 injunctive relief.” *Id.*, citing Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum Commission v. National Football
2 League, 634 F.2d 1197, 1201 (9th Cir. 1980).

3 **II. Analysis**

4 **A. Judicial Notice**

5 Prior to the TRO hearing, Plaintiffs requested that this Court take judicial notice of a
6 Federal Register publication, 65 Fed. Reg. 58,301 (September 28, 2000), entitled
7 “Responsibility of certain entities to notify the Immigration and Naturalization Service of any
8 alien who the entity ‘knows’ is not lawfully present in the United States.” Doc. No. 13 at 1.
9 Pursuant to the Federal Register Act, a federal court shall take judicial notice of regulations
10 appearing in the Federal Register. *See* 44 U.S.C. § 1507 (“The contents of the Federal Register
11 shall be judicially noticed”); Biodiversity Legal Foundation v. Badgley, 309 F.3d 1166, 1179
12 (9th Cir. 2002). Accordingly, this Court GRANTED Plaintiffs’ request for judicial notice.

13 **B. Interpretation Memorandum**

14 Defendant submits an “Interpretation Memorandum” (the “Memorandum”) as support
15 for its opposition to the TRO application, which Defendant asserts “is the City’s Manager [sic]
16 formal statement of how the Ordinance will be implemented.” Resp. at 4. In his declaration,
17 the City Manager states that he is “charged with managing the affairs of the City on a day to
18 day basis” and “charged with implementing City policy.” *See* Phillips Decl. at ¶ 3. The City
19 Manager also declares that he is “the final authority on the City staff’s interpretation of any
20 ordinance.” *Id.* Plaintiffs at oral argument contested the validity of the Memorandum, stating
21 that the City’s code gives no authority to the City Manager to interpret or amend the subject
22 matter of the Ordinance.

23 From the record before this Court, it is unclear what binding effect, if any, the City
24 Manager’s Memorandum has on the construction of the Ordinance. Although administrative
25 instructions or memoranda may be used by a court in construing a state statute or ordinance,
26 the limiting construction may affect its analysis only if the construction is “made explicit by
27 textual incorporation, binding judicial or administrative construction, or well-established
28 practice.” Santa Monica Food Not Bombs v. City of Santa Monica, 450 F.3d 1022, 1035 (9th

1 Cir. 2006), citing to City of Lakewood v. Plain Dealer Publishing Corp., 486 U.S. 750, 770
2 (1988). For example, in Santa Monica Food, the Ninth Circuit noted that the text of the
3 ordinance in question “specifically provides that “[t]he City Manager, or his/her designee, shall
4 adopt administrative regulations that are consistent with and that further the terms and
5 requirements set forth within this chapter.” 450 F.3d at 1026. Here, unlike in Santa Monica
6 Food, the Ordinance does not explicitly allow for the textual incorporation of a later-drafted
7 administrative policy memorandum. Moreover, the Ordinance contains no language that
8 delegates any regulatory authority on the City Manager, nor does Defendant present any
9 evidence indicating that the City Council or a legislative body, through judicial or
10 administrative construction, delegated to the City Manager the power or authority to
11 “interpret” and set forth regulations for implementing the Ordinance. Although the City
12 Manager has declared that he is “the final authority on the City staff’s interpretation of any
13 ordinance,” the lack of evidence of a well-established practice as required by the Ninth Circuit
14 does not convince this Court at this time that the City Manager possesses the authority to draft
15 an implementation memorandum that construes the subject matter of the Ordinance. The City
16 Manager, with the record present before the Court, therefore, cannot step into the role of
17 council member and interpret the scope of the Ordinance.

18 This Court also questions the propriety of a City policy memorandum to effectively
19 amend a city ordinance where the plain language of the Ordinance does not limit its effects to
20 prospective tenancy arrangements. In Richardson, the Ninth Circuit noted that “[w]hile a
21 municipality cannot delegate any part of its governmental power it may, of course, delegate
22 ministerial or administrative functions to its officials or employees.” 242 F.2d at 285. In the
23 instant matter, the duties that have been allegedly delegated to the City Manager do not appear
24 to be of an administrative or ministerial nature, but instead is of a legislative nature since it
25 appears to amend the plain language of the Ordinance. For example, the phrases “to let, lease,
26 rent” and “to suffer or permit” in the Ordinance indicate present, as well as future, lease or
27 applicable agreements. Moreover, the Ordinance itself does not specifically address tenancy
28 agreements that may be affected by enforcement, and in fact explicitly states that illegal aliens

1 reside in units “*without* typical leasing, payment and other tenancy arrangements.” Exh. 3 at
2 1 (emphasis added). The Memorandum, therefore, attempts to amend the Ordinance by
3 significantly limiting the subject matter outside the plain language of the Ordinance.

4 In response, Defendant argues that the Memorandum construing the Ordinance as being
5 “applied only to leases and rental agreements entered into *after* the effective date” only reflects
6 the “fundamental tenet of statute interpretation” that “[s]tatutes do not operate retroactively
7 unless there is a clear indication of intent that they do so.” Resp. at 23 (emphasis in original),
8 citing to Hermosa Beach Stop Oil Coalition v. City of Hermosa Beach, 86 Cal.App.4th 550
9 (2001). Although Defendant is correct in its assertion that “a statute shall not be given
10 retroactive effect unless such construction is required by explicit language or by necessary
11 implication,” *see* Fernandez-Vargas v. Gonzales, 126 S.Ct. 2422, 2428 (2006) (citations
12 omitted), it is unclear to this Court how the termination of a pre-existing tenancy agreement
13 is a “retroactive” application of the Ordinance. As discussed, the Ordinance here does not
14 contemplate the need of an owner to break a formal lease or agreement of a tenant once a
15 tenant has been found to be an “illegal alien,” as the Memorandum addresses. In fact, the
16 Ordinance specifically contemplates that illegal aliens are more likely to “reside in dwelling units
17 *without typical leasing, payment and other tenancy arrangements ... such as written leases.*” *See*
18 Ordinance, Exh. 3 at 1-2 (emphasis added). Because the Ordinance does not address the
19 breaking of any lease or rental agreement as the Memorandum contemplates, the breaking of
20 a prior lease or rental agreement should not be a retroactive application of the Ordinance.
21 Instead, a prospective application of the Ordinance would include newly entered leasing
22 arrangements, existing leasing arrangements, as well as housing situations that do not have a
23 typical leasing arrangement.

24 Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, this Court has serious concerns regarding the
25 binding authority and validity of the Memorandum. As such, the Memorandum does not
26 provide a limiting construction of the Ordinance, and will not be considered by this Court at
27 this time.

28 ///

1 C. Irreparable Harm

2 Plaintiffs allege that irreparable injury will occur if the Ordinance is not enjoined because
3 landlords in Escondido will be subject to fines and penalties if they do not violate their tenants
4 “privacy rights or federal and state privacy laws by sharing confidential information with the
5 City,” including compelling landlords to “speak to the City” within five days of receipt of a
6 complaint. TRO Appl. at 6. In addition, Plaintiffs further contend that the Ordinance forces
7 landlords to: 1) “face uncertainty” regarding which acts constitute the harboring of illegal aliens
8 given the complexity of federal immigration laws; and 2) choose between violation of the
9 Ordinance or breaching valid contracts such that it requires them to “engage in policing actions
10 or impairing their existing contractual obligations.” *Id.* at 6-7. Plaintiffs also assert that the
11 Jane Doe Plaintiffs “risk being evicted from their homes at any time, even though they have
12 U.S. citizen children living with them who attend school in Escondido, and even though they
13 are employed in Escondido.” *Id.* at 7. Finally, Plaintiff EHRC alleges that it will suffer
14 irreparable harm because it is forced to divert its limited resources in order to “provide outreach
15 opportunities to immigrants” in Escondido who are “confused and fearful” regarding the effects
16 of the Ordinance. *Id.* Defendant asserts that Plaintiffs have misinterpreted how the Ordinance
17 will be implemented, and that the Ordinance will not apply to the leasing arrangements
18 outlined in Plaintiffs’ declarations. Resp. at 6.

19 Plaintiffs have alleged irreparable harm to Jane Doe Plaintiffs 1 and 2. Jane Doe 1
20 specifically asserts that she lives in an apartment under a “month to month lease,” and that she
21 is afraid she will be “evicted from our home because of this ordinance.” Decl. Jane Doe 1 at 2.
22 Jane Doe 2 states that she has rented an apartment in Escondido since 1996, and is afraid of
23 becoming homeless because if asked to leave her apartment, it would be difficult with her three
24 children to find a place to live. Decl. Jane Doe 2 at 2. As discussed, this Court will not
25 construe the Ordinance in light of the Memorandum, and therefore finds irreparable harm to
26 Jane Does 1 and 2 real and immediate harm due to the threat of eviction if the Ordinance is
27 enacted, especially where as here, Plaintiffs would have a difficult, if not impossible, time
28 finding alternative housing where their kids attend school. *See Plyler v. Doe*, 457 U.S. 202,

1 221-222 (1982) (illegal immigrant children irreparably harmed when deprived of access to
2 education); Mitchell v. U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, 569 F.Supp. 701, 704
3 (N.D. Cal. 1983) (irreparable harm with threat of eviction and limited housing availability in
4 geographic area).

5 This Court also finds that Plaintiffs Roy and Mary Garrett will likely suffer irreparable
6 harm because as landlords, they would be exposed to an imminent threat of litigation arising
7 from the enforcement of the Ordinance as it presently reads. As discussed below, the Ordinance
8 provides no guidance regarding the process of verification of a tenant's alienage status, nor does
9 it provide for a meaningful hearing at a meaningful time. Finally, the Ordinance effectively
10 requires that the landlord evict the tenant, even if a tenant disputes the City's violation
11 determination or even if the landlord could not obtain the necessary information as mandated
12 by the Ordinance. The threat of litigation for wrongful eviction by a tenant as a result of the
13 Ordinance is therefore real, establishing irreparable harm to Plaintiffs Garrett. Accordingly, this
14 Court finds that Plaintiffs have established a threatened and imminent irreparable harm, that
15 cannot be adequately compensated at a later time. *See Sampson v. Murray*, 415 U.S. 61, 89-90
16 (1974).

17 **D. Public Purpose/Balance of Hardships**

18 Plaintiffs argue that the balance of hardships weighs in favor of Plaintiffs since no harm
19 will come to the City if the Ordinance is enacted. TRO Appl. at 4-6. In response, Defendants
20 argue that because the Ordinance should be presumed constitutional, and that the City has
21 deemed the Ordinance "beneficial for its residents," the balance of hardship tips in favor of the
22 City. Resp. at 9. To determine which direction the balance of hardship tips, "a court must
23 identify the possible harm caused by the [TRO] against the possibility of the harm caused by
24 not issuing it." University of Hawaii Professional Assembly v. Cayetano, 183 F.3d 1096, 1108
25 (9th Cir. 1999).

26 Plaintiffs first contend that the enactment of the Ordinance prohibiting illegal aliens
27 from obtaining housing in Escondido will not relieve the perceived problems of urban blight put
28 forth by Defendant, pointing out that the study used by Defendant to justify the Ordinance

1 did not cite illegal immigrants as the source of housing problems, but that the blight conditions
2 in the Mission Park area were due to the “high costs of housing and the unavailability of
3 affordable subsidized housing in Escondido.” *Id.* at 4. Plaintiffs also point out that while the
4 Ordinance’s findings make reference to crime caused by the illegal immigrant population, the
5 public record supports that crime significantly declined in the most recent crime statistics
6 available. *Id.*

7 Defendant responds that the referred to study identified an “increasing trend of urban
8 blight in at least one section of Escondido,” and that during City Council meetings, testimony
9 was given suggesting that “the landlords’ rental of housing to illegal aliens likely compounded
10 the identified blighted conditions due to the fact that illegal aliens do not wish to draw
11 attention to themselves, and therefore, would not bring substandard property maintenance
12 conditions and related problems to the attention of City enforcement officials.” *Resp.* at 2.
13 Defendant also adds since a city ordinance should be presumed valid, “the balance of hardship
14 tips in favor of the City and the TRO should be denied.” *Resp.* at 9.

15 The Ordinance cites several reasons for enactment of a ban against housing rental or
16 other arrangements with illegal aliens, including: 1) the harboring of illegal aliens endangers the
17 health, safety and welfare of its citizens; 2) criminal activities of illegal aliens; 3) illegal aliens
18 are less likely to enter into legal tenancy arrangements; and 4) illegal aliens are less likely to
19 report housing and property maintenance violations, which remain unreported. *See Ordinance,*
20 *Exh. 3 at 1-2.* Plaintiffs argue that the Ordinance will not affect overall levels of criminal
21 activity, and provide evidence in support of their argument that the crime rate actually declined
22 in the City in 2005. *See Calderon Decl., Exh. 6.* Plaintiffs also assert that the City in passing
23 the Ordinance, impermissibly tied any alleged criminal activity to illegal aliens without any
24 supporting evidence that illegal aliens actually caused the crime. This Court finds that the
25 evidence supports Plaintiff’s argument in regards to criminal activity. The statistics provided
26 by Plaintiffs, which are not refuted by Defendant, supports that no increase in criminal activity
27 has occurred, nor that illegal aliens are or should be tied to any alleged criminal activity in the
28 City. Plaintiffs’ arguments regarding a lack of support for criminal activity caused by illegal

1 aliens, therefore, is persuasive.

2 In regards to endangering the health, safety and welfare of its citizens, the City again fails
3 to provide support for its statements. The City points to a report done by California State
4 University San Marcos (CSUSM) entitled “Mission Park Community Survey” that addresses
5 urban blight in the City of Escondido. *See* Calderon Decl., Exh. 4. Although the report does
6 outline a problem with overcrowding and disrepair of rental housing in this area, the report
7 attributes these problems specifically to the high cost of housing in the area and the lack of
8 affordable housing, where housing costs on average exceed 75% of a renter’s income in this
9 geographic area. *Id.* at 17, 53 et seq. In addition, although the report does generally state that
10 “[r]enters who are new immigrants and/or are exceeding the unit capacity are also less likely to
11 complain or identify maintenance problems that could lead to unhealthy housing,” the report
12 specifically recognizes that it “did not collect information about citizenship status.” *Id.* at 15,
13 18. Accordingly, it is unclear to this Court how the urban blight spoken of by Defendant as the
14 purpose behind the Ordinance can be directly or indirectly attributed to illegal immigrants since
15 illegal immigration or any blight that might be caused thereby was not the focus of the study.

16 Without such proof, there appears to be no public benefit to its citizens, or other legitimate
17 public purpose for enacting the Ordinance, and the balance of hardships tips sharply in favor
18 of Plaintiffs.

19 Finally, Defendant conceded during oral argument that the issuance of a TRO staying
20 enactment of the Ordinance would result in no actual prejudice to the City. Defendant
21 recognized that while the City would like to begin enforcement of the Ordinance, the City
22 would not lose benefits, or funds that it would be otherwise entitled, should the Court issue the
23 TRO. Accordingly, this Court finds that this factor weighs in favor of granting Plaintiffs’ TRO
24 application.

25 E. Serious Questions Going to the Merits

26 Plaintiffs assert that there are serious questions regarding the constitutionality of the
27 Ordinance, and that they will likely succeed on the merits of their claims. Plaintiffs allege
28 several constitutional violations, including under the: 1) supremacy clause; 2) California

1 Constitution; 3) contracts clause; 4) First Amendment and Art. I., §2(a) of the California
2 Constitution and 5) Fourteenth Amendment due process.³

3 The Court initially notes that there is a “strong presumption of constitutionality that
4 applies to legislative enactments,” such that a plaintiff must “allege some sort of improper
5 purpose or insufficient justification in order to state a colorable federal claim for relief.” First
6 English Evangelical Lutheran Church of Glendale v. County of Los Angeles, California, 482
7 U.S. 304, 327 (1987). The burden lies with the party challenging the ordinance to
8 demonstrate any alleged constitutional violations. *See* New Orleans Public Service v. City of
9 New Orleans, 261 U.S. 682, 686 (1930) (“The ordinance is presumed to be valid and the
10 burden is upon the appellant to show that ... [the ordinance] deprive[s] appellant of its property
11 without due process of law.” (citations omitted)). In City of Anchorage v. Richardson Vista
12 Corp., 242 F.2d 276 (9th Cir. 1957) (Richardson), the Ninth Circuit commented on the duties
13 of a district court to uphold an ordinance “unless the ordinance is unnecessarily oppressive or
14 unreasonable.” *Id.* at 285. “It must be kept in mind that the courts cannot set aside city
15 ordinances unless they are unconstitutional or ultra vires, or in some special connection or
16 effect, unreasonable.” *Id.* Accordingly, this Court must exercise a presumption of
17 constitutionality of the Ordinance, absent a showing by Plaintiffs to the contrary.

18 a. Supremacy Clause

19 Plaintiffs first argue that the Ordinance violates the supremacy clause because the
20 Ordinance impermissibly attempts to regulate immigration. TRO Appl. at 10. Defendants
21 argue that the Ordinance is not preempted by federal law because it does not regulate
22 immigration. Resp. at 9.

23 The parties agree that DeCanas v. Bica, 424 U.S. 351 (1976), provides the relevant
24 factors for determining whether a city ordinance impermissibly preempts federal law. *See* TRO
25 Appl. at 9; Resp. at 9. In DeCanas, the Supreme Court reviewed the constitutionality of a
26

27
28 ³ The TRO application does not address the equal protection, 42 U.S.C. § 1981, Federal Fair
Housing Act, Fair Employment and Housing Act, Unruh Act, legitimate police powers violation and
state law preemption claims that are asserted in the complaint.

1 California state law prohibiting employers from hiring illegal aliens.⁴ The Supreme Court, while
2 recognizing that the “[p]ower to regulate immigration is unquestionably exclusively a federal
3 power,” found that there is no per se preemption against state statutes where aliens are a subject
4 matter of the legislation. “[S]tanding alone, the fact that aliens are the subject of a state statute
5 does not render it a regulation of immigration, which is essentially a determination of who
6 should or should not be admitted into the country, and the conditions under which a legal
7 entrant may remain.” 424 U.S. at 355. Instead, the Supreme Court established three ways in
8 which a state ordinance may be preempted by federal law: 1) where the local law attempts to
9 regulate immigration; 2) where the local law attempts to operate in an area occupied by federal
10 law; and 3) where implementation of the local law is an obstacle or “burdens or conflicts in any
11 manner with any federal laws or treaties.” *See id.* at 354, 362-363.

12 *I. Regulation of Immigration*

13 Plaintiffs assert that the Ordinance is an impermissible attempt to regulate immigration
14 because it seeks to decide “who may stay and who must depart,” which “is the very core of
15 immigration regulation.” TRO Appl. at 10-11. Plaintiffs also assert that any regulation that
16 seeks to deny abode to undocumented immigrants “impermissibly interferes with the exclusive
17 federal power over immigration.” *Id.* at 11, citing to Graham v. U.S., 403 U.S. 365, 380
18 (1971).

19 Defendant replies that the Ordinance does not violate the supremacy clause because it
20 does not “determine who can enter or remain in this country.” Resp. at 9. Defendant
21 emphasizes that “it is the creation of standards for determining who is and is not in this
22 country legally that constitutes a regulation of immigration in these circumstances, not whether
23 a state’s determination in this regard results in the actual removal or inadmissibility of any
24 particular alien.” *Id.* at 9-10, quoting Equal Access Educ. v. Merten, 305 F.Supp.2d 585, 603-
25 04 (E.D. Va. 2004). Defendant concludes that since the Ordinance “defers entirely to *federal*

27
28 ⁴ The California law at issue stated “[n]o employer shall knowingly employ an alien who is not
entitled to lawful residence in the United States if such employment would have an adverse effect on
lawful resident workers.” 424 U.S. at 352, quoting Cal. Labor Code Ann § 2895(a).

1 law concerning the immigration status of a rental applicant” it does not in and of itself regulate
2 immigration. Id. (emphasis in original).

3 Whether a state law impermissibly regulates immigration is dependent upon whether the
4 regulation is “essentially a determination of who should or should not be admitted into the
5 country, and the conditions under which a legal entrant may remain.” DeCanas, 424 U.S. at
6 355. A review of the language appears to support that the Ordinance does not attempt to
7 impermissibly regulate immigration. The Ordinance does not determine the condition under
8 which an individual may remain in the country, relying solely on federal agencies and
9 authorities to make that determination for the City. Accordingly, the Court finds Defendant’s
10 argument persuasive that the Ordinance is not likely preempted under the first prong of
11 DeCanas.

12 2. Field Preemption

13 Plaintiffs next argue that the Ordinance is also invalid because “the federal government
14 has comprehensively legislated generally in the field of immigration and specifically with respect
15 to the harboring of undocumented immigrants.” TRO Appl. at 12. Plaintiffs specifically point
16 to 8 U.S.C. § 1324 as support that the federal government has already addressed the legality
17 of “‘harboring’ individuals who have violated immigration laws,” and accordingly well occupies
18 this field. Id. at 13. In response, Defendant states that the “Ordinance regulates only the
19 landlord-tenant relationship, an area of law not completely occupied by the INA.” Resp. at 11.

20 In DeCanas, the Supreme Court found preemption of a state employment regulation did
21 not occur where “‘in the absence of persuasive reasons either that the nature of the regulated
22 subject matter permits no other conclusion, or that the Congress has unmistakably so
23 ordained.’” 424 U.S. at 356. The Court found that Congress, through the Immigration and
24 Naturalization Act, did not intend to affect “state regulation[s] touching on aliens in general,
25 or the employment of illegal aliens in particular,” noting especially that respondents could not
26 point to any specific wording or legislative intention. Id. at 358.

27 The Court finds that the facts in DeCanas are inapposite to the instant action. Unlike
28 the field of employment, where federal law did not legislate nor did Congress contemplate

1 legislation in this area at the time the Supreme Court ruled in DeCanas, federal statutes
2 specifically provide for fines and criminal penalties for the harboring of illegal aliens. In
3 particular, 8 U.S.C. § 1324 provides for criminal penalties where a person “(iii) knowing or in
4 reckless disregard of the fact that an alien has come to, entered, or remains in the United States
5 in violation of law, conceals, harbors, or shields from detection, or attempts to conceal, harbor,
6 or shield from detection, such alien in any place, including any building or any means of
7 transportation”, in addition to where a person “(iv) encourages or induces an alien to come to,
8 enter, or reside in the United States, knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that such
9 coming to, entry, or residence is or will be in violation of law.” See 8 U.S.C. §
10 1324(a)(1)(A)(iii) - (iv). It appears that Federal law, therefore, may occupy the same field in
11 which the Ordinance attempts to legislate. Further support for this finding appears in the
12 language of the Ordinance itself, which states that the act of housing that the Ordinance seeks
13 to regulate is within the definition of “harboring”. See Ordinance, Exh. 3 at 2 (“United States
14 Code Title 8, subsection 1324(a)(1)(A) prohibits the harboring of illegal aliens. The provision
15 of housing to illegal aliens is a fundamental component of harboring.”). Accordingly, this Court
16 finds serious concerns in regards to the field preemption of the Ordinance by existing federal
17 statutes.

18 3. Burdens or Conflicts With Federal Law

19 Plaintiffs also argue that the Ordinance conflicts with individual provisions of Federal
20 law, pointing out that there are “numerous categories of persons who may technically not be
21 lawfully present in the United States [but who] are nonetheless permitted to live and work in
22 the United States with the full knowledge of the federal government.” TRO Appl. at 14.
23 Plaintiffs also point to 8 U.S.C. § 1254a and 8 C.F.R. § 212.5(f) for support that federal
24 officials have considerable discretion “not to deport persons who are otherwise removable,” and
25 presumably listed on a federal list as an illegal alien.

26 In response, Defendant states the Ordinance does not stand as an obstacle to federal
27 immigration laws, but instead “is harmonious with its purposes and objectives.” Resp. at 13.
28 Stating that the INA’s intent is to “remove incentives for illegal immigration,” and recognizing

1 that “harboring’ illegal aliens is unlawful and punishable for up to ten years imprisonment”
2 according to federal law, Defendant argues that the Ordinance and Memorandum “make clear
3 that the City has no intent to frustrate the federal immigration scheme with respect to aliens
4 permitted by the federal government to live and work in the United States or those aliens that
5 are in the process of obtaining legal status.” Id. at 14.

6 A review of the Ordinance language appears to support that it could stand as a burden
7 or obstacle to federal law as it currently stands. The Ordinance states that “[t]he City shall not
8 conclude that a person is an illegal alien unless and until an authorized representative of the
9 City has verified with the federal government, pursuant to United States Code Title 8,
10 subsection 1373(c), that the person is an alien who is not lawfully present in the United
11 States.” Ordinance, Exh. 3 at 3. The Ordinance further looks to federal immigration officials
12 to determine the lawful status of the tenant in question, and only if a federal immigration
13 official can answer that the tenant is an “illegal alien” will the Ordinance be applicable.
14 Defendant states in oral argument and through its Memorandum that it could make use of the
15 federal government’s Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) program to carry
16 out this task. It is unclear to this Court, however, whether Defendant would be entitled to use
17 the SAVE program where the Ordinance seeks to regulate landlord-tenant relationships outside
18 of the scope of a public benefit. *See* Def. Exh. B-1 at 1. In addition, federal regulations make
19 clear that federal or state entities charged with reporting to the federal government the alienage
20 status of an individual must first themselves make a “formal determination that is subject to
21 administrative review” on an individual’s alienage status. 65 Fed. Reg. 58,301 (September 28,
22 2000). Because of the purpose of the SAVE program as a query for public benefit uses, as well
23 as the federal regulations’ clear mandate placing the responsibility of determining an
24 individual’s alienage status on the local or state entities themselves, this Court has serious
25 concerns regarding Defendant’s use of federal resources and procedures for a private benefit,
26 and the burden that it would cause to the federal government for the latter to conduct a formal
27 hearing to make the requisite finding of fact and conclusions of law for the Defendant. That
28 the Ordinance uses the Immigration and Nationality Act to define “illegal alien” implies that

1 it will likely place burdens on the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security that will
2 impede the functions of those federal agencies. *See* Exh. 3 at 2. The Court, therefore, has
3 serious concerns regarding the burden this Ordinance will place on federal regulations and
4 resources.

5 Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, this Court finds that Plaintiffs have raised serious
6 concerns regarding the constitutionality of the Ordinance and its preemption by federal law.

7 b. Due Process

8 Plaintiffs argue that the Ordinance “facially deprives Plaintiffs of due process” because
9 it “fails to provide either landlords or tenants with any notice or opportunity to be heard before
10 depriving them of fundamental liberty and property rights.” TRO Appl. at 21-22. Plaintiffs
11 cite to legitimate property interests, and the Ordinance’s provisions which lack any “right to
12 notice and opportunity to be heard *before* deprivation of liberty or property.” *Id.* at 22
13 (emphasis in original). Plaintiffs also contend that the “Ordinance provides tenants with *no*
14 opportunity to challenge their designation as ‘illegal aliens.’” *Id.* at 23 (emphasis in original).

15 Defendant responds that there is no violation of Plaintiffs’ due process rights because
16 there is “substantial process that must be completed prior to the enforcement of any penalty”
17 and there are substantial appellate opportunities “permitting a property owner to contest such
18 a suspension,” as well as the right of both landowners and tenants to avail themselves of
19 California’s eviction procedures. Resp. at 16. Defendant also points to the Memorandum,
20 which outlines that a property owner has several alternatives, including, (1) seeking “additional
21 information from the tenant in an attempt to establish the tenant’s legal status”; and (2)
22 commencing “steps under state or federal law to end the tenancy.” *Id.* at 17, citing to Phillips
23 Decl., Exh. B at 2-3.

24 The right to be heard prior to the deprivation of a property interest is a fundamental
25 protection of the Due Process clause. “[T]here can be no doubt that at a minimum [the Due
26 Process Clause] require[s] that deprivation of life, liberty or property by adjudication be
27 preceded by notice and opportunity for hearing appropriate to the nature of the case.” Mullane
28 v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 313 (1950). “A constitutionally

1 protected property interest results ‘from a legitimate claim of entitlement ... defined by existing
2 rules or understandings that stem from an independent source.’ Groten v. California, 251 F.3d
3 844, 850 (9th Cir. 2001), quoting Bd. of Regents v. Roth, 408 U.S. 564, 577 (1972). Here,
4 Plaintiffs have a legitimate property interest in collecting rent under its leases, as well as the
5 incursion of costs associated with any eviction procedures that the Ordinance requires a
6 landlord to undertake if a tenant is found to be an illegal alien. See Cook v. City of Buena Park,
7 126 Cal.App.4th 1, 6 (2005). Accordingly, Plaintiffs have legitimate property interests that
8 require Defendant to provide adequate process before the landlords are deprived of that
9 property interest.

10 Defendant argues that the procedures subscribed to by the Ordinance to determine a
11 tenant’s alienage status are sufficient to meet the due process rights of Plaintiffs. First, as
12 discussed, the provisions relied upon by Defendant to determine a tenant’s status require a
13 “formal determination that is subject to administrative review” prior to submission of the
14 information to the Department of Justice. The Ordinance provides no such undertaking by the
15 City, nor does it provide any type of administrative review available to either the landlord or
16 tenant to contest the findings of the City or the federal government prior to the requirement
17 to initiate eviction proceedings by the landlord. The Ordinance, therefore, provides no recourse
18 to Plaintiffs prior to the deprivation of a life, liberty or property interest, including the
19 withholding of rents as well as the possible administration of fines and a jail term of up to six
20 months.

21 Second, Defendant presents no support for its contention that the procedures for
22 determining a tenant’s status satisfies a tenant’s due process rights. The Supreme Court makes
23 clear that illegal aliens are also afforded rights under the Due Process clause:

24 The Fourteenth Amendment provides that “[n]o State shall ... deprive any person
25 of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to *any person*
26 *within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.*” ... Whatever his status under the
27 immigration laws, an alien is surely a ‘person’ in any ordinary sense of that term.
Aliens, even aliens whose presence in this country is unlawful, have long been
recognized as “persons” guaranteed due process of law by the Fifth and
Fourteenth Amendments.

28 Plyler, 457 U.S. at 210 (emphasis in original). Because the Ordinance fails to provide for notice

1 or hearing of any kind prior to the deprivation of an illegal alien's tenancy interest, this Court
2 has serious concerns regarding the constitutionality of the Ordinance under the Due Process
3 clause.

4 Defendant further argues that sufficient appellate procedures are available to Plaintiff
5 landlords that satisfy the due process requirement. However, "[t]he right to prior notice and
6 a hearing" under the Due Process clause can only be abridged "in extraordinary situations
7 where some valid governmental interest is at stake that justifies postponing the hearing until
8 after the event." United States v. James Daniel Good Real Property, 510 U.S. 43, 53 (1993),
9 quoting Fuentes v. Shevin, 407 U.S. 67, 82 (1972). Defendant presents no evidence of an
10 extraordinary circumstance that would justify the lack of notice and hearing prior to the
11 deprivation of Plaintiff landlords' property interest. Moreover, from the record before the
12 Court, it is not apparent that the appellate proceedings referred to by Defendant provide a
13 hearing within a meaningful time in a meaningful manner sufficient to satisfy Plaintiffs' Due
14 Process rights.

15 Finally, Defendant again fails to address any legally sufficient type of procedural due
16 process available to tenants who are deemed illegal aliens. As discussed, the Fourteenth
17 Amendment guarantees illegal aliens due process prior to the deprivation of a property interest.
18 Accordingly, it appears that there are serious concerns regarding due process considerations of
19 the Ordinance, weighing heavily in favor of granting Plaintiff's TRO application.

20 c. Conclusion

21 For the foregoing reasons, this Court finds serious questions exist going to the merits of
22 this matter. Together with the Court's previous findings of irreparable harm and a balance of
23 hardships tipping sharply in Plaintiffs' favor, this Court accordingly GRANTS Plaintiffs'
24 application for temporary restraining order.

25 **E. Bond Requirement**

26 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 65(c) require the posting of security by plaintiff "in such
27 sum as the court deems proper, for the payment of such costs and damages as may be incurred
28 or suffered by any party who is found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained." The

1 Ninth Circuit has no steadfast rule as to the amount of a bond as a result of the issuance of a
2 preliminary injunction. Generally, the bond amount should be sufficient “to protect his
3 adversary from loss in the event that future proceedings prove that the injunction issued
4 wrongfully.” Edgar v. MITE Corp., 457 U.S. 624, 649 (1982), citing to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(c).
5 The Ninth Circuit gives wide discretion to the issuance of preliminary injunction bonds, holding
6 that “[s]o long as a district court does not set such a high bond that it serves to thwart citizen
7 actions, it does not abuse its discretion.” Save Our Sonoran, Inc. v. Flowers, 408 F.3d 1113,
8 1126 (9th Cir. 2005).

9 Plaintiffs argue that “[t]here should be no or only a nominal bond, since there is no cost
10 to Escondido if enforcement of the Ordinance is deferred.” TRO Appl. at 24. Defendant does
11 not address this point in its brief. Because Defendant has already conceded that no actual harm
12 would come as the result of the issuance of a TRO, this Court finds that a minimal bond would
13 be sufficient here. Accordingly, Plaintiffs shall post a bond of \$100.00 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ.
14 P. 65(c).

15 CONCLUSION AND ORDER

16 For the foregoing reasons, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

- 17 1. Plaintiffs’ request for judicial notice [Doc. No. 13] is **GRANTED**.
- 18 2. The Court’s oral ruling of November 16, 2006, is incorporated by reference into
19 this Order.
- 20 3. Plaintiffs’ Application for a Temporary Restraining Order [Doc. No. 3] is
21 **GRANTED**. Defendant City of Escondido is prohibited from enforcing
22 Ordinance No. 2006-38R titled “Establishing Penalties for the Harboring of
23 Illegal Aliens in the City of Escondido” until a hearing on the preliminary
24 injunction and determination on its merits of the same.
- 25 4. This Order shall be effective upon the posting of a bond of **\$100.00** by Plaintiffs
26 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(c) **on or before 4:00 p.m. on November 22,**
27 **2006.**
- 28 5. Plaintiffs shall file and serve their preliminary injunction brief with this Court **on**


1 or before January 12, 2007.

2 6. Defendant shall file and serve their opposition brief on or before February 2,
3 2007. Plaintiff may file and serve their reply brief on or before February 16,
4 2007.

5 7. The preliminary injunction hearing shall be heard on March 8, 2007, at 2:00
6 p.m.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8
9 DATED: November 20, 2006

10 

11 HON. JOHN A. HOUSTON
12 United States District Judge

13 cc: Magistrate Judge Stormes
14 All Counsel of Record

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28