

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

)
HAITIAN-AMERICANS UNITED, INC.,)
BRAZILIAN WORKER CENTER,)
CHELSEA COLLABORATIVE, INC.,)
CENTRO PRESENTE,)
GLADYS VEGA, NORIELIZ DEJESUS,)
ROY AVELLANEDA, DIEUFORT)
FLEURISSAINT, MARTHA FLORES,)
and JESSICA ARMIJO,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

Case No. 20-11421-DPW-BMS-PBS

)
DONALD J. TRUMP, President of the)
United States in his Official Capacity,)
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF)
COMMERCE, UNITED STATES)
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, STEVEN)
DILLINGHAM, Director of the U.S.)
Census Bureau in his Official Capacity,)
and WILBUR ROSS, Secretary of the)
Department of Commerce in his Official)
Capacity,)

Defendants.)

_____)

ORDER FOR STAY

November 3, 2020

PER CURIAM

The parties in this matter have jointly moved for a stay in light of the pendency of two similar cases now before the Supreme Court of the United States: one, *Trump v. New York*, No. 20-366, set for oral argument on November 30, 2020, and the other, *Trump v. City of San Jose*,

No. 20-561, for which the appellees' response regarding appellants' statement of jurisdiction is required to be filed by November 30, 2020.

The parties observe that “[b]oth the *New York* and the *San Jose* cases involve the same defendants and similar claims to those Plaintiffs assert here. In addition, the presiding three-judge courts have granted declaratory and injunctive relief that is essentially identical to the relief that Plaintiffs seek here.” With the recent filing of the Plaintiffs’ first amended complaint, to which the Defendants have not yet had an occasion to respond, this case by contrast stands essentially at the beginning of its travel.

Upon review of the parties’ submissions in this case and a review of similar litigation being conducted in District and Circuit courts throughout the country, this Court shares the view expressed by the parties that a stay of the proceedings in this case “is warranted in the interests of judicial economy and the Parties’ interests in the efficient use of their own resources.”

Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

That this case is hereby STAYED, and it is FURTHER ORDERED,

That this STAY shall remain in effect pending the earlier of further Order of this Court or the resolution of the appeal in *Trump v. New York*, (S. Ct. No. 20-366), following which the parties shall submit, within two weeks of the lifting of the Stay, a joint status report regarding future proceedings in this case and proposing a schedule for the pursuit of any such proceedings.

/s/ **Bruce M. Selya**
Bruce M. Selya
United States Court of Appeals Judge

/s/ **Douglas P. Woodlock**
Douglas P. Woodlock*
United States District Judge

/s/ **Patti B. Saris**
Patti B. Saris
United States District Judge

* In accordance with the customary practice reflected in the three-judge District court opinions directing final judgment in the similar *New York* and *San Jose* cases now pending on appeal in the Supreme Court of the United States, *see City of San Jose v. Trump*, 2020 WL 6253433, at *51 n.17 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 22, 2020) (citing *New York v. Trump*, 2020 WL 5422959, at *36 n.21 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 10, 2020)), Judge Woodlock, to whom this case was originally assigned, hereby certifies he has separately arrived at the conclusions this three-judge court has reached collectively by jointly issuing this Order for Stay *per curiam*.