

No. 25-2808

**IN THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICES IN EAST PALO ALTO, et al.,

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

v.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES, et al.,**

Defendants-Appellants.

APPEAL FROM UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
DISTRICT COURT CASE NO. 3:25-CV-02847

**AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF OF FORMER IMMIGRATION JUDGES &
FORMER MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF IMMIGRATION APPEALS
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS-APPELLEES' OPPOSITION TO THE
PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC AND AFFIRMANCE OF
DISTRICT COURT'S PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

**AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
ASHLEY VINSON CRAWFORD (257246)
100 PINE STREET, SUITE 3200
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-5218
TELEPHONE: +1 415.765.9500**

COUNSEL TO AMICI FORMER IMMIGRATION JUDGES
& FORMER MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF
IMMIGRATION APPEALS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	2
II.	BACKGROUND	3
	A. Commencement of Proceedings via Notice to Appear	7
	B. The Master Calendar Hearing	8
	C. The Merits Hearing	11
	D. Example: Navigating the Path Through Immigration Court via SIJS	13
III.	ARGUMENT	15
	A. Representation of Unaccompanied Children Helps Immigration Judges Fulfill their Statutory Duties	16
	B. Representation of Unaccompanied Children is Efficient	17
	C. The legal representation and friend of court services Promotes Due Process	18
IV.	CONCLUSION	19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Agyeman v. INS</i> , 296 F.3d 871 (9th Cir. 2002)	11
<i>Matter of Amaya</i> , 21 I & N Dec. 583 (BIA 1996)	4
<i>Barragan-Ojeda v. Sessions</i> , 853 F.3d 374 (7th Cir. 2017)	11
<i>C.J.L.G. v. Barr</i> , 923 F.3d 622 (9th Cir. 2019) (en banc)	11
<i>Castro-O’Ryan v. U.S. Dep’t of Immigr. & Naturalization</i> , 847 F.2d 1307 (9th Cir. 1988)	3
<i>Diop v. Lynch</i> , 807 F.3d 70 (4th Cir. 2015)	3, 11
<i>Jacinto v. INS</i> , 207 F.3d 725 (9th Cir. 2000)	11
<i>Quintero v. Garland</i> , 998 F.3d 612 (4th Cir. 2021)	3, 11, 13
<i>Matter of S-M-J-</i> , 21 I. & N. Dec. 722 (B.I.A. 1997)	3
<i>Yang v. McElroy</i> , 277 F.3d 158 (2d Cir. 2002)	3
Statutes	
8 U.S.C. § 1229a(b)(1)	3
§ 1362.....	4
Immigration & Nationality Act.....	5
William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008.....	7
Other Authorities	
8 C.F.R. § 1240.10(a).....	6
8 C.F.R. § 1240.10(c).....	4, 7
8 C.F.R. § 1240.11(a)(2).....	6, 11

CONG. RSCH. SERV., IN12463, IMMIGRATION COURTS: DECLINE IN NEW CASES AT THE END OF FY2024 2 (2024)	12
EOIR, <i>Master Calendar Checklist for the Immigration Judge/The Pro Se Respondent</i>	6
<i>Federal Judicial Caseload Statistics 2024</i> , U.S. COURTS	12
<i>Immigration Court Legal Representation Dashboard</i> , VERA INST. OF JUST.	1
Procedures Memorandum 17-03: <i>Guidelines for Immigration Court Cases Involving Juveniles, Including Unaccompanied Alien Children</i> (Dec. 20, 2017)	5

IDENTITY AND INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE¹

Amici curiae are former immigration judges (“IJs”) and former members of the Board of Immigration Appeals (“BIA” or the “Board”), listed in Appendix A, with substantial, combined years of service and intimate knowledge of the U.S. immigration system. *Amici* submit this brief to illuminate for this Court how the immigration court system operates and the role that legal representation of unaccompanied children plays in operation. In particular, the funding for legal representation and friend of court services by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (“ORR”) is essential to the fair and efficient adjudication of children’s claims. Terminating the legal representation and friend of court services – which will result in fewer lawyers for children – will inevitably make the immigration courts less fair and efficient and less able provide adequate protections to unaccompanied minors.

Amici are invested in the issues presented by Plaintiffs-Appellees because *amici* have dedicated their careers to improving the fairness and efficiency of the U.S. immigration system, even after departing from the bench. Given *amici*’s familiarity with the procedures and realities of the immigration adjudication system, *amici* respectfully submit that this Court should not disturb the district court’s

¹ No party’s counsel authored this brief in whole or in part. No party, or party’s counsel, made a monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief. No person other than *amici curiae* or their counsel made such a monetary contribution. All parties have consented to the filing of this brief.

injunction, which protects vital representation services that promote fairness and efficiency in immigration proceedings involving unaccompanied children.

I. INTRODUCTION

As former IJs and former members of the Board of Immigration Appeals, *amici* have centuries of collective experience impartially administering justice in removal hearings and on appeal. One of our primary responsibilities was to ensure that unrepresented respondents—who comprise about two-thirds of all respondents in immigration court²—are treated fairly in the immigration court system. Through the funding of legal representation and friend of court services, ORR “strives for 100 percent legal representation of unaccompanied children” and funds non-profit legal aid organizations across the nation (including Plaintiffs-Appellees).

We write in support of Plaintiffs-Appellees’ opposition to the petition for rehearing en banc. This Court should not disturb the district court’s preliminary injunction, which preserves critical access to legal representation and friend of court services for unaccompanied children. These services are essential to both due process and the efficient functioning of the immigration courts. As explained below, when a child has assistance in preparing for and attending immigration court, they

² See *Immigration Court Legal Representation Dashboard*, VERA INST. OF JUST., <https://www.vera.org/ending-mass-incarceration/reducing-incarceration/detention-of-immigrants/advancing-universal-representation-initiative/immigration-court-legal-representation-dashboard> (data through December 2024).

gain a basic understanding of the functioning of the immigration court system and of their role and rights within that system. Lawyers also help children understand what options, if any, they may have to contest removal and help them articulate their claims.

On the other hand, children who appear in immigration court without lawyers require far more guidance from IJs, are less likely to proceed without continuances, and have difficulty appropriately articulating their claims for relief from removal (or understanding that they have none). Even a brief interruption in the funding will disrupt the efficient and fair functioning of the immigration courts.

This *amicus* brief explains how these services help courts function fairly and efficiently in a system where respondents must defend themselves in an unfamiliar setting against a sophisticated opponent, counsel representing the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”). Judges are tasked with ensuring that this unlevel playing field does not violate due process by educating unrepresented respondents and allowing valid claims for relief to be adequately presented to the court. Representation is vital to achieving those goals.

II. BACKGROUND

The immigration court system is the due process provided to individuals who are charged with removability from the United States (*i.e.*, deportation) by DHS. The IJ, presides over removal proceedings, and is responsible for ensuring their

fairness and efficiency. As of the end of 2024, there were approximately 700 IJs³ located in 71 immigration courts and three remote-only courts across the United States and its territories. IJs play a unique role that is different from Article III judges; as the Second Circuit has observed, an IJ “is not merely the fact finder and adjudicator but also has an obligation to establish the record.” *Yang v. McElroy*, 277 F.3d 158, 162 (2d Cir. 2002) (citing 8 U.S.C. § 1229a(b)(1)). Accordingly, IJs have a duty to interact deliberately with noncitizens who appear before them to ensure a full and fair hearing. *Quintero v. Garland*, 998 F.3d 612, 624–25 (4th Cir. 2021) (explaining at length the duty of IJs to develop the record). Indeed, a fair hearing requires “adequate assistance from the immigration judge.” *Id.* at 628 (citing *Diop v. Lynch*, 807 F.3d 70, 76 (4th Cir. 2015)). This is particularly true for those who are seeking asylum or other protections; as the BIA has held, IJs and Board members “bear the responsibility of ensuring that refugee protection is provided where such protection is warranted by the circumstances of an asylum applicant’s claim.” *Matter of S-M-J-*, 21 I. & N. Dec. 722, 723 (B.I.A. 1997). Thus, “a cooperative approach in Immigration Court is particularly appropriate[,]” giving IJs “a role in introducing [relevant] evidence into the record.” *Id.* at 724, 726. In summary, IJs “have an affirmative duty to assist and work with” those who appear before them seeking relief. *Quintero*, 998 F.3d at 626.

³ Since January 20, 2025, at least 20 IJs have been terminated.

These duties extend to all cases, including where the respondent is represented by counsel, *Id.* at 627, but require far more intervention by the IJ where the respondent is unrepresented – and even more so when that respondent is a child. As the federal courts have long recognized, immigration law is complicated and often unintelligible to those without specialized legal training. *Castro-O’Ryan v. U.S. Dep’t of Immigr. & Naturalization* (“INS”), 847 F.2d 1307, 1312 (9th Cir. 1988) (“With only a small degree of hyperbole, the immigration laws have been termed ‘second only to the Internal Revenue Code in complexity.’ A lawyer is often the only person who could thread the labyrinth.” (citation omitted)). Despite this complexity, most respondents have no lawyer to thread the labyrinth. U.S. law does provide that a respondent has a right to representation, but typically not at government expense.⁴ The funding of legal representation and friend of court services have been an important exception to this general rule. Not surprisingly, unrepresented respondents require a greater degree of assistance from IJs. Among them, unrepresented children require by far the most time, attention, and assistance from the bench.

⁴ 8 U.S.C. § 1362: Right to Counsel (“In any removal proceedings before an immigration judge and in any appeal proceedings before the Attorney General from any such removal proceedings, the person concerned shall have the privilege of being represented (at no expense to the Government) by such counsel, authorized to practice in such proceedings, as he shall choose.”).

Legal representation for unaccompanied children is not a luxury; it is essential to the efficient operation of the immigration courts. For example, federal regulations prohibit an IJ from accepting “an admission of removability from an unrepresented respondent who is incompetent or under the age of 18 and is not accompanied by an attorney or legal representative, a near relative, legal guardian, or friend.”⁵ If the child has no lawyer, the IJ is required to “direct a hearing on the issues.”⁶ And in light of a minor’s inability to admit removability, binding BIA precedent requires IJs to “exercise particular care in determining such a person’s deportability. The minor’s age and pro se, and unaccompanied status must be taken into consideration. The IJ must consider the reliability of the testimony given by such a minor in response to the factual allegations made against him in determining, after a comprehensive and independent inquiry, whether there is clear, unequivocal, and convincing evidence of the minor’s deportability as charged...”⁷ The burden on IJs is exponentially higher when a child has no lawyer to assist in court.

EOIR has long had detailed guidelines for the adjudication of removal proceedings involving unaccompanied children (the “Guidelines”).⁸ The Guidelines

⁵ 8 C.F.R. § 1240.10(c).

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *Matter of Amaya*, 21 I & N Dec. 583, 587 (BIA 1996).

⁸ See Operating Policies of Procedures Memorandum 17-03: *Guidelines for Immigration Court Cases Involving Juveniles, Including Unaccompanied Alien Children* (Dec. 20, 2017) (updating guidelines from 2007), available at <https://www.justice.gov/eoir/file/oppm17-03/dl>.

cover a wide range of issues relating to cases involving children, including interpretation, the judge’s demeanor and dress, the proper instructions and questioning, and how to determine a child’s credibility.⁹ When the child has assistance of counsel, the Guidelines are far more effective.

The following sections explain how proceedings unfold for unrepresented children and highlight the essential support ORR-funded legal representation provides.

A. Commencement of Proceedings via Notice to Appear

Immigration court removal proceedings are commenced by DHS with the service and filing of a Notice to Appear (“NTA”), a legal document that contains factual allegations and charges under the Immigration & Nationality Act (“INA”). The NTA, like a civil or criminal complaint, is not proof of removability; its allegations and charges must be proven by DHS and may be contested by the respondent.

Respondents—including asylum seekers who recently entered the United States, permanent residents with families in the country, and undocumented individuals who have lived here for decades—must then prepare to answer the allegations and charges leveled against them in the NTA and assert any claims for relief, *i.e.*, their defenses from removal. This task is daunting for adults and

⁹ *Id.* at 1-2.

essentially impossible for younger children who are not represented. The services provided by the legal representation program are invaluable to preparing a minor to understand and appear in a foreign and intimidating environment. A child simply cannot fully understand the NTA without a lawyer, and is otherwise unprepared to participate meaningfully in immigration court.

B. The Master Calendar Hearing

After the NTA is served and lodged with the immigration court, the first hearing for any respondent is the master calendar hearing, where the respondent is asked to plead to the charges in the NTA and state any claims for relief. The court then sets a date for trial (also known as an individual hearing or merits hearing). Any single master calendar hearing session is scheduled to address the cases of many dozens of respondents, one by one. As a practical matter, no more than a few minutes can be allotted to each case in order to complete the assigned docket. Nevertheless, the IJ must ensure that each respondent fully understands the proceedings—*i.e.*, why they are there and what the process will entail. The IJ must also ensure that each respondent understands the contents of the NTA, and all potentially available claims for relief.¹⁰ The IJ does this by directly questioning the respondent, often through an interpreter, and gauging whether they understand the proceedings and the NTA. This

¹⁰ See 8 C.F.R. § 1240.10(a) (listing requirements of immigration judge to advise respondent); 8 C.F.R. § 1240.11(a)(2) (“The immigration judge shall inform the alien of his or her apparent eligibility to apply for any of the benefits enumerated in this chapter.”).

can be a lengthy colloquy with the respondent; EOIR master calendar hearing guidance for questioning *pro se* respondents runs seven pages.¹¹ One of our *amici*, a former IJ, presided over thousands of hearings involving children—some old enough to speak for themselves, others barely verbal. This former judge reports that one of the most surreal and heartbreaking aspects of that role was having to “swear in” children who could not yet speak in full sentences, let alone understand the legal implications of asylum, persecution, or statutory bars. One morning, a two-year-old was brought into her courtroom for a master calendar hearing, clinging to a stuffed animal and a juice box. The child could barely walk down the aisle to the respondent’s table. A “friend of the court” – the child had no lawyer – gently lifted the girl into the chair, her feet dangling well above the floor. The judge asked, as she always did, whether this girl understood why she was in court that day. The girl blinked and reached for the microphone, giggling at the feedback noise. She had no idea where she was or why.

In cases where the respondent has no relief and is seeking voluntary return to their home country, counsel is essential to helping the IJ be satisfied that the child understands the consequences of pleading and that proper steps have been followed to ensure the child’s safe return. In such a case, the proceedings can end quickly,

¹¹ See EOIR, *Master Calendar Checklist for the Immigration Judge/The Pro Se Respondent*, available at https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/eoir/legacy/2014/08/15/Script_MC_Checklist.pdf (last accessed Mar. 10, 2025).

sometimes at the first master calendar hearing. (As discussed above, when the child has no lawyer or guardian, the court cannot accept such a pleading but must hold a hearing on the matter.)¹²

Often, though, the first master calendar hearing will not resolve the proceedings for an unaccompanied minor in ORR custody. Additional time is required to identify an appropriate adult for the release of the child from custody. Once an adult is identified the child can be released into their custody and matter will typically be transferred to a non-detained docket to allow the adult to secure paid or pro bono counsel for the minor. Conversely, if no viable adult is available, the child will formally be transferred to a foster care facility and would need counsel to represent them in the state and immigration court proceedings required to secure special immigrant juvenile visa status (“SIJS”). In other instances where the child is about to turn 18, counsel is required to ensure that an asylum application, if appropriate, is filed with USCIS to preserve their rights.

After a number of continuances, if the child remains in ORR custody, the respondent will be required to plead to the NTA. Again, the IJ must ensure that the respondent understands their pleadings and available relief. Without the assistance of counsel provided by the legal representation and friend of court services funded by ORR, the amount of time and effort that is required of an IJ to ensure proper

¹² See 8 C.F.R. § 1240.10(c).

understanding of the proceeding by a child is substantial. This is particularly so because two of the most likely applications for relief, SIJS and asylum under the protections offered by the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (“TVPRA”), require that the child prepare and file documents with other courts or agencies. For example, to seek SIJS requires the child first to secure a state court order recognizing the neglect, abuse, or abandonment of the child by at least one parent. This process is so complex that even an adult without counsel would struggle to navigate it. It is hard to overstate the role and value of counsel for unaccompanied minors in ORR custody. By virtue of their age and custody status, it is nearly impossible for unaccompanied minors, some of whom are toddlers, to not only represent themselves but to complete the necessary out-of-court steps that are required to present their claims.

When the preliminary process of the master calendar hearing has been completed, the immigration court will schedule the merits hearing to adjudicate any remaining issues, typically the claims for relief. In the case of an unaccompanied child with an asylum claim, immigration court hearings will be paused to allow the USCIS asylum office to interview the child and make a determination on the asylum application in the first instance.

C. The Merits Hearing

The merits hearing is a multi-hour adversarial hearing in which DHS is represented by an Assistant Chief Counsel (“ACC”) working for the Office of Principal Legal Advisor in Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”). An interpreter is provided for respondents who do not speak English fluently. The judge, as discussed above, is duty-bound to help develop the record and ensure that the respondent is able to articulate their claims for relief.

Even before the hearing commences, it is the respondent’s burden to present evidence to substantiate their claims. If they have no attorney, they must collect relevant documents without legal guidance and file them with the court. Even for adults, it is difficult to document a case when due to lack of representation, the respondent does not know what they need to prove. For unrepresented children, this task is virtually impossible for them to comprehend, much less accomplish.

Here again, counsel funded by ORR’s legal representation and friend of court services is invaluable. If the child is transferred to foster care or remains in custody, these programs, until recently terminated, provided critical representation to prepare and present their case. Without such representation, the child can almost certainly not file a brief, call witnesses or articulate his or her eligibility for relief from removal. Instead, it falls on the IJ to help the child build the record and explain a basis for relief, but the IJ cannot, of course, find witnesses and produce relevant documents.

D. Example: Navigating the Path Through Immigration Court via SIJS

To elucidate this process with more specificity, consider the example of “Mariana,” a composite drawn from hundreds of unaccompanied children who have appeared before *amici*.

Mariana was 15 when she arrived at the U.S.-Mexico border after a dangerous journey from Honduras. Her father had abandoned the family, and her mother, overwhelmed and impoverished, could no longer care for her. With threats mounting at home, Mariana left in search of safety.

After crossing the U.S.-Mexico border, Mariana was taken into custody by U.S. Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”). After a brief stay in a CBP holding facility, she was transferred to ORR, where she was placed in a licensed shelter for unaccompanied children.

Because she had no parent or legal guardian in the United States, and her entry was without inspection, Mariana was promptly placed in removal proceedings before an IJ. She received her NTA while still in ORR custody, with a first hearing scheduled even before she had a confirmed sponsor (*i.e.*, an adult to take custody of her) or any opportunity to understand her rights.

Without representation, Mariana would have faced an IJ alone. She lacked legal knowledge, supporting documents, or understanding of her options. A removal order or voluntary departure would have been likely.

Instead, Mariana was connected with an attorney through ORR-funded legal representation services. The attorney quickly identified that Mariana might qualify for SIJS and took immediate steps to preserve her eligibility. The attorney helped locate and clear a sponsor—Mariana’s cousin in California—and ORR released her into the cousin’s care. The attorney then filed for guardianship in probate court. The state court issued a guardianship order with SIJS predicate findings specifying that Mariana could not reunify with either parent and it was not in her best interest to return to Honduras, where she had no support network.

With the state court order in hand, and Mariana still under juvenile court jurisdiction, her attorney filed Form I-360 with USCIS, along with evidence of her age, custody, and the predicate state court order. While the petition was pending, Mariana continued attending school and ICE check-ins, with her attorney’s support. Eventually, USCIS approved the petition, classifying her SIJS.

With this USCIS SIJS approval, Mariana was now eligible to come back to immigration court to adjust status, but only once a visa number became available in the EB-4 category. Her attorney coordinated the scheduling and filing of the I-485 permanent resident petition with the IJ and scheduled a merits hearing on that petition.

At her merits hearing, Mariana, through counsel, proved her eligibility for permanent residency. Her lawyer presented her approved I-360, proof of visa

availability, and positive equities, including school attendance, community involvement, letters of support from her cousin and school counselor, and a declaration describing her past trauma and her desire to remain in a safe, stable home. Although DHS did not oppose the adjustment, Mariana's ORR-funded attorney was essential to organizing, filing and presenting this evidence to the court. The IJ granted the application from the bench,

Today, Mariana lives with her cousin, volunteers at a youth center, and is attending college. Her life is stable, and her future is full of possibilities. Had she not been connected to an attorney through the ORR-funded legal representation program, she likely would have been returned to a dangerous environment—or lost her eligibility for SIJS altogether. This composite example is a vivid reminder that legal representation for unaccompanied children is not a luxury—it is essential to ensure access to justice and protect children from harm.

III. ARGUMENT

We are concerned that the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, in terminating funding for legal representation and friend of court services, failed to consider the value it provides, both in protecting vulnerable child respondents and aiding the efficient operation of the overburdened immigration courts. Even a

temporary suspension of these services would disrupt proceedings and worsen the existing backlog.

Unaccompanied children may be eligible for relief from removal through the Special Immigration Juvenile Status (“SIJS”), but the process requires first obtaining a state court order, then filing a Form I-360 with USCIS, and finally seeking adjustment of status before an IJ.¹³ Even adults struggle to navigate this multi-step process; for an unrepresented child, it is virtually impossible. ORR-funded counsel is essential. Without it, removal is almost inevitable.

A. Representation of Unaccompanied Children Helps IJs Fulfill their Statutory Duties

As discussed above, federal courts of appeals have repeatedly held that IJs must help unrepresented respondents understand the proceedings, establish the record and present information “necessary for a reasoned decision” *Barragan-Ojeda v. Sessions*, 853 F.3d 374, 381 (7th Cir. 2017). Reading a rote script is not enough; the IJ’s duty is to “scrupulously and conscientiously” uncover all relevant facts. *Agyeman v. INS*, 296 F.3d 871, 877 (9th Cir. 2002). As the Fourth Circuit explained, *pro se* respondents must not be “thrown into removal proceedings and left

¹³ See *C.J.L.G. v. Barr*, 923 F.3d 622, 626 (9th Cir. 2019) (en banc) (remanding where the immigration judge had not informed the minor petitioner of his possible eligibility for SIJ status, in violation of the obligation under 8 C.F.R. § 1240.11(a)(2) to inform respondents subject to removal of apparent eligibility for immigration benefits).

to sink or swim without adequate assistance from the immigration judge.” *Quintero*, 998 F.3d at 628 (citing *Diop*, 807 F.3d at 76).

Nearly every unrepresented respondent struggles mightily to “swim” in immigration court, and often they “sink”: the process is unfamiliar (even to most lawyers), the law is complex, and the government is represented by a capable lawyer in these adversarial proceedings. For children, the services provided by the ORR-funded legal representation and friend of court programs are the difference between sinking and swimming. Those services enable the child respondent to navigate the deep waters that are immigration court proceedings, helping to protect their rights and present their claims.

With nearly 3.6 million pending cases¹⁴—IJs have limited time to engage in the intensive assistance required for *pro se* unaccompanied child respondents. In SIJS cases, IJs lack the ability to assist unaccompanied children through the preliminary steps before the state court and USCIS. Without funding for legal representation and friend of court services, IJs cannot discharge their statutory duties in cases involving unaccompanied children.

B. Representation of Unaccompanied Children is Efficient

¹⁴ See Holly Straut-Eppsteiner, CONG. RSCH. SERV., IN12463, IMMIGRATION COURTS: DECLINE IN NEW CASES AT THE END OF FY2024 2 (2024), <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IN/IN12463>.

In our view, the ORR-funded programs enhances efficiency. Having a lawyer assisting a child speeds up immigration court proceedings, reduces ORR housing expenditures, limits *in absentia* orders, and decreases appeals to the BIA and the federal courts. Without counsel, IJs must manage dockets of unrepresented minors alone—slowing progress and increasing judicial strain. These services benefit not only immigration courts but also BIA and federal courts already burdened with appeals.¹⁵

C. The legal representation and friend of court services Promotes Due Process

Legal representation is essential to due process. Immigration courts are required to provide a “full and fair hearing” to those who appear before them. *Quintero*, 998 F.3d at 623–24 (collecting cases). When unrepresented minors are brought into court, the assistance of trained advocates is often the only way that standard can be met. The legal representation and friend of court services are not a luxury—they are fundamental to ensuring fairness in removal proceedings involving children.

We understand that termination of these services coincides with plans to implement expedited dockets for unaccompanied children. Removing legal

¹⁵ BIA appeals accounted for 80% of administrative agency appeals and constituted the largest category of administrative agency appeals filed in each federal court of appeal except the DC Circuit. *Federal Judicial Caseload Statistics 2024*, U.S. COURTS, <https://www.uscourts.gov/data-news/reports/statistical-reports/federal-judicial-caseload-statistics/federal-judicial-caseload-statistics-2024> (last visited Mar. 10, 2025).

representation while speeding up proceedings will erode due process, leading to unjust outcomes and increased burdens on immigration judges. Attorneys are indispensable in helping judges administer justice in cases involving vulnerable youth.

One of the *amici*, a former IJ, recalls a case involving a 14-year-old boy who appeared alone in court while still in ORR custody. He had no legal representative and no adult to care for him. When asked to state his name, he whispered it to the interpreter. He then said he wanted to return to his home country immediately, a request that raised concerns for the judge. The hearing was paused to allow the child to consult with an attorney.

At the next hearing, with counsel present, the boy revealed that he had been trafficked to the United States and was being pressured by his traffickers to return. Only in the safety of an attorney-client relationship did he feel secure enough to speak. With legal assistance, he was able to pursue protection under U.S. law. That brief pause—and access to counsel—may have saved his life.

IV. CONCLUSION

As former IJs and Board members, we are deeply concerned that the immigration courts are being deprived of the structure they need to function—especially for their most vulnerable respondents. *Amici* respectfully urge this Court

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I certify that this brief complies with the length limits permitted by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 29(a)(5) and Ninth Circuit Rule 32-1. The brief is 3,026 words, excluding the portions exempted by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(f) and Ninth Circuit Rule 32-1(c). The brief's type size and type face comply with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32(a)(5) and (6) and Ninth Circuit Rule 32-1(d).

Dated: June 20, 2025

/s/ Ashley Vinson Crawford

Ashley Vinson Crawford

APPENDIX A

Former Immigration Judges and Members of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Hon. Steven Abrams, Immigration Judge, New York, Varick St., and Queens Wackenhut, 1997-2013

Hon. Terry A. Bain, Immigration Judge, New York, 1994-2019

Hon. Sarah M. Burr, Assistant Chief Immigration Judge and Immigration Judge, New York, 1994-2012

Hon. Jeffrey S. Chase, Immigration Judge, New York, 1995-2007

Hon. George T. Chew, Immigration Judge, New York, 1995 - 2017

Hon. Joan V. Churchill, Immigration Judge, Washington, D.C./ Arlington, VA - 1980 - 2005

Hon. Lisa Dornell, Immigration Judge, Baltimore, 1995-2019

Hon. Bruce J. Einhorn, Immigration Judge, Los Angeles, 1990-2007

Hon. Cecelia M. Espenosa, Appellate Immigration Judge, Board of Immigration Appeals, 2000-2003

Hon. Noel A. Ferris, Immigration Judge, New York, 1994-2013

Hon. James R. Fujimoto, Immigration Judge, Chicago, 1990-2019

Hon. Annie S. Garcy, Immigration Judge, Newark, NJ, and Philadelphia, 1990-2023

Hon. Gilbert Gembacz, Immigration Judge, Los Angeles, 1996-2008

Hon. Jennie Giambastiani, Immigration Judge, Chicago, 2002-2019

Hon. Alberto E. Gonzalez, Immigration Judge, San Francisco, 1995 - 2005

Hon. John F. Gossart, Jr., Immigration Judge, Baltimore, 1982-2013

Hon. Paul Grussendorf, Immigration Judge, Philadelphia and San Francisco, 1997-2004

Hon. Miriam Hayward, Immigration Judge, San Francisco, 1997-2018

Hon. Sandy Hom, Immigration Judge, New York, 1993-2018

Hon. Charles M. Honeyman, Immigration Judge, New York and Philadelphia, 1995-2020

Hon. Rebecca Jamil, Immigration Judge, San Francisco, 2016-2018

Hon. William P. Joyce, Immigration Judge, Boston, 1996-2002

Hon. Edward F. Kelly, Appellate Immigration Judge, Board of Immigration Appeals, 2017-2021; Deputy Chief Immigration Judge, 2013-2017; Assistant Chief Immigration Judge, EOIR Headquarters, 2011-2013

Hon. Carol King, Immigration Judge, San Francisco, 1995-2017

Hon. Eliza C. Klein, Immigration Judge, Miami, Boston, Chicago, 1994-2015; Senior Immigration Judge, Chicago, 2019-2023

Hon. Christopher M. Kozoll, Immigration Judge, Memphis, 2022-2023

Hon. Elizabeth A. Lamb, Immigration Judge, New York, 1995 - 2018

Hon. Donn L. Livingston, Immigration Judge, Denver, New York, 1995 - 2018

Hon. Dana Leigh Marks, Immigration Judge, San Francisco, 1987-2021

Hon. Margaret McManus, Immigration Judge, New York, 1991-2018

Hon. Steven Morley, Immigration Judge, Philadelphia, 2010-2022

Hon. Robin Paulino, Immigration Judge, San Francisco, 2016-2020

Hon. Charles Pazar, Immigration Judge, Memphis, 1998-2017

Hon. George Proctor, Immigration Judge, Los Angeles, San Francisco, 2003-2008

Hon. Laura L. Ramirez, Immigration Judge, San Francisco, 1997-2018

Hon. Patricia A. Rohan, Immigration Judge, New York, 1982 - 2017

Hon. Lory D. Rosenberg, Appellate Immigration Judge, Board of Immigration Appeals, 1995-2002

Hon. Susan G. Roy, Immigration Judge, Newark, 2008-2010

Hon. Andrea Saenz, Appellate Immigration Judge, Board of Immigration Appeals, 2021-2025

Hon. Paul W. Schmidt, Chairperson and Appellate Immigration Judge, Board of Immigration Appeals, 1995-2003; Immigration Judge, Arlington, VA, 2003-2016

Hon. Douglas B. Schoppert, Immigration Judge, New York, 1997-2024

Hon. Noelle Sharp, Assistant Chief Immigration Judge, Houston, 2021-2025

Hon. Patricia M. B. Sheppard, Immigration Judge, Boston, 1993-2006

Hon. Helen Sichel, Immigration Judge, New York, 1997-2020

Hon. Denise Slavin, Immigration Judge, Miami, Krome, Baltimore, 1995-2019;
Senior Immigration Judge, Orlando, 2023-2024

Hon. Andrea Hawkins Sloan, Immigration Judge, Portland, 2010-2017

Hon. A. Ashley Tabaddor, Immigration Judge, Los Angeles, 2005-2021

Rebecca Walters, Assistant Chief Immigration Judge, Alexandria/Annandale VA,
2021-2025

Hon. Polly A. Webber, Immigration Judge, San Francisco, 1995-2016

Hon. Robert D. Weisel, Assistant Chief Immigration Judge, Immigration Judge,
New York, 1989-2016