

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

RURAL & MIGRANT MINISTRY, INC.,
ALIANZA NACIONAL DE CAMPESINAS, EL
COMITE DE APOYO A LOS
TRABAJADORES AGRÍCOLAS,
FARMWORKER ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA,
MIGRANT CLINICIANS NETWORK,
PINEROS Y CAMPESINOS UNIDOS DEL
NOROESTE, RURAL COALITION, UNITED
FARM WORKERS, UNITED FARM WORKERS
FOUNDATION,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL
PROTECTION AGENCY, and Andrew Wheeler,
in his official capacity as Administrator of the
United States Environmental Protection Agency,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:20-cv-10645-LJL

[Related to No. 1:20-cv-10642-LJL]

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 65 AND 5 U.S.C. § 705**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....ii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIESiii

INTRODUCTION1

STANDARD FOR ISSUANCE OF A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND/OR A
STAY OF THE EFFECTIVE DATE2

ARGUMENT.....3

 I. THE FINAL RULE WILL IRREPARABLY HARM FARMWORKERS, THEIR
 FAMILIES, AND OTHER BYSTANDERS4

 A. The AEZ Provides Essential Protection Against Pesticide Poisoning from
 Drift Exposure; Limiting this Protection Threatens Irreparable Harm4

 B. The Final Rule Significantly Weakens the Protections Afforded by the
 AEZ.....6

 C. The Provisions of the 2015 WPS Rule that Remain in Place Are Not
 Sufficient, on Their Own, to Protect Against Drift Exposure.....7

 D. By Weakening AEZ Protections, the Final Rule Will Result in Irreparable
 Harm to Farmworkers, Their Families and Other Bystanders11

 II. PLAINTIFFS ARE LIKELY TO SUCCEED ON THE MERITS13

 A. The Weakened AEZ Violates FIFRA, and EPA’s Contrary Interpretation
 is Not Permissible14

 B. The Final Rule Is Arbitrary and Capricious Under the APA.....16

 C. Congress Did Not Sanction the Final Rule Through PRIEA.....21

 III. THE BALANCE OF EQUITIES AND PUBLIC INTEREST FAVOR A STAY
 AND/OR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION23

 IV. A FURTHER STAY AND/OR INJUNCTION PREVENTING
 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FINAL RULE MUST APPLY NATIONWIDE
 AND TO THE FINAL RULE IN ITS ENTIRETY25

 A. A Further Stay Must Apply Nationwide.....25

 B. A Preliminary Injunction Must Apply Nationwide26

 C. A Stay and/or Preliminary Injunction Must Apply to the Entire Final
 Rule.....27

CONCLUSION.....29

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

Page number(s)

| | |
|--|--------|
| <i>Beal v. Stern</i> , 184 F.3d 117 (2d Cir. 1999)..... | 3 n.1 |
| <i>Bostock v. Clayton County</i> , 140 S. Ct. 1731 (2020)..... | 23 |
| <i>Burlington Truck Lines v. United States</i> , 317 U.S. 156 (1962)..... | 19 |
| <i>Califano v. Yamasaki</i> , 442 U.S. 682 (1979)..... | 26 |
| <i>Carlson v. Postal Regulatory Comm’n</i> , 938 F.3d 337 (D.C. Cir. 2019)..... | 27 |
| <i>Casa de Maryland, Inc. v. Trump</i> , 971 F.3d 220 (4th Cir. 2020) | 26 |
| <i>Casa de Maryland, Inc. v. Wolf</i> , No. 8:20-cv-02118-PX, 2020 WL 5500165 (D. Md. Sept. 11, 2020) | 26 |
| <i>Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.</i> , 467 U.S. 837, 845 (1984)..... | 14, 15 |
| <i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Nat’l Highway Traffic Safety Admin.</i> , 538 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2008) | 21 |
| <i>Davis Cnty. Solid Waste Mgmt. v. EPA</i> , 108 F.3d 1454 (D.C. Cir. 1997)..... | 27–28 |
| <i>District of Columbia v. U.S. Dep’t of Agric.</i> , 444 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2020)..... | 25 |
| <i>District Hosp. Partners, L.P. v. Burwell</i> , 786 F.3d 46 (D.C. Cir. 2015)..... | 19 |
| <i>Faively Transp. Malmo AB v. Wabtec Corp.</i> , 559 F.3d 110 (2d Cir. 2009)..... | 2–3 |
| <i>FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.</i> , | |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| 556 U.S. 502 (2009)..... | 16, 18, 20 |
| <i>Harmon v. Thornburgh</i> , 878 F.2d 484 (D.C. Cir. 1989)..... | 25 |
| <i>HarperCollins Publishers L.L.C. v. Gawker Media LLC</i> , 721 F. Supp. 2d 303 (S.D.N.Y. 2010)..... | 2 |
| <i>Kiakombua v. Wolf</i> , No. 19-cv-1872 (KBJ), 2020 WL 6392824 (D.D.C. Oct. 31, 2020) | 27 |
| <i>League of Women Voters of U.S. v. Newby</i> , 838 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2016) | 23 |
| <i>Libertarian Party of Conn. v. Lamont</i> , 977 F.3d 173 (2d Cir. 2020)..... | 3 n.1 |
| <i>MD/DC/DE Broadcasters Ass’n v. FCC</i> , 236 F.3d 13 (D.C. Cir. 2001) | 28 |
| <i>Merrell v. Thomas</i> , 608 F. Supp. 644 (D. Or. 1985) | 14 |
| <i>Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n of the U.S., Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> , 463 U.S. 29 (1983)..... | 19 |
| <i>New York v. U.S. Dep’t of Educ.</i> , No. 20-CV-4260 (JGK), 2020 WL 4581595 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 9, 2020)..... | 2–3, 21 |
| <i>New York v. U.S. Dep’t of Health & Human Servs.</i> , 414 F. Supp. 3d 475 (S.D.N.Y. 2019)..... | 28 |
| <i>New York v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.</i> , 969 F.3d 42 (2d Cir. 2020)..... | <i>passim</i> |
| <i>North Carolina v. F.E.R.C.</i> , 730 F.2d 790 (D.C. Cir. 1984) | 27 |
| <i>O.A. v. Trump</i> , 404 F. Supp. 3d 109 (D.D.C. 2019) | 25 |
| <i>Organized Migrants in Cmty. Action, Inc. v. Brennan</i> , 520 F.2d 1161 (D.C. Cir. 1975) | 22, 23 |
| <i>Pangea Legal Servs. v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.</i> , | |

No. 20-cv-07721-SI, 2020 WL 6802474 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2020)27

Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.,
467 U.S. 986 (1984).....14

Saint Francis Med. Ctr. v. Azar,
894 F.3d 290 (D.C. Cir. 2018)28

Sussman v. Crawford,
488 F.3d 136 (2d Cir. 2007).....3 n.1

Tex. Off. of Pub. Util. Couns. v. FCC,
265 F.3d 313 (5th Cir. 2001)19

United States v. Shimer,
367 U.S. 374 (1961).....15

West Harlem Env’t. Action v. EPA,
380 F. Supp. 2d 289 (S.D.N.Y. 2005).....19

Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.,
555 U.S. 7 (2008).....2

Wright v. Giuliani,
230 F.3d 543 (2d Cir. 2000).....3 n.1

STATUTES & LEGISLATIVE MATERIALS

5 U.S.C. § 705.....2, 3, 29

7 U.S.C. § 136a(c)(5).....22

Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018,
Pub. L. No. 116-8, 133 Stat. 484 (2019).....21

S. Rep. No. 92-838. 92d Cong., 2d Sess. 1 (1972), U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News
1972, p. 399314, 22

REGULATIONS & EXECUTIVE MATERIALS

40 C.F.R. § 170.4018

40 C.F.R. § 170.401(c)(3)(iv)9

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.