

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	3
I. USDA’S FARM SERVICE AGENCY AND FARM LOAN PROGRAMS	3
II. THE HISTORY OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS IN USDA PROGRAMS.....	4
III. CONGRESSIONAL RECOGNITION OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS IN USDA PROGRAMS AND PAST FAILURES TO REMEDY ITS LINGERING EFFECTS	6
A. Congress Concludes that Its Previous Efforts Failed To Address—and Indeed Perpetuated—the Disparities Caused By the Longstanding Discrimination Against Socially Disadvantaged Farmers.	8
B. Congress Enacts Section 1005 To Remedy Discrimination in USDA Programs and Avoid Perpetuating Its Effects.	11
IV. PROCEDURAL HISTORY.....	13
ARGUMENT	13
I. Plaintiffs Have Not Satisfied Any Of The Requirements For the Extraordinary Relief They Seek.....	13
A. Plaintiffs’ Legally Incorrect Conclusory Assertions Fail to Show Any Substantial Likelihood of Irreparable Harm.	14
B. Plaintiffs Are Not Likely To Succeed On The Merits Of Their Claim.	17
1. The Government’s Provision of Debt payments to SDFRs Serves Compelling Government Interests.	19
2. The Government Had Strong Evidence that Remedial Action Was Necessary To Further Its Compelling Interests.	20
3. The Provision of Debt Relief to Minority Farmers Is Narrowly Tailored To Serve the Government’s Compelling Interests.	29
C. The Balance Of Equities And Public Interest Favor Defendant	33
II. If The Court Concludes An Injunction Is Warranted—and It Is Not—Any Such Injunction Should Be Limited To Plaintiffs With Article III Standing.	36
CONCLUSION.....	38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena,
515 U.S. 200 (1995)..... 17

Am. Civil Liberties Union of Ky. V. McCreary Cty., Ky.,
354 F.3d 438 (6th Cir. 2003)..... 16, 17

Ayotte v. Planned Parenthood of Northern New Eng.,
546 U.S. 320 (2006)..... 35

Canal Auth. Of State of Fla. V. Callaway,
489 F.2d 567 (5th Cir. 1974)..... 14

Cantu v. United States,
565 F. App'x 7 (D.C. Cir. May 27, 2014)..... 23

Cherokee Pump & Equip. Inc. v. Aurora Pump,
38 F.3d 246 (5th Cir. 1994)..... 13, 14

City of Chicago v. Barr,
961 F.3d 882 (7th Cir. 2020)..... 37

City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.,
488 U.S. 469 (1989)..... 19, 20, 29, 33

Connection Distrib. Co. v. Reno,
154 F.3d 281 (6th Cir. 2003)..... 17

Contractors Ass'n of E. Pa., Inc. v. City of Phila.,
6 F.3d 990 (3d Cir. 1993)..... 21

Dean v. City of Shreveport,
438 F.3d 448 (5th Cir. 2006)..... 19, 20, 21

Elrod v. Burns,
427 U.S. 347 (1976)..... 16

Enter. Int'l, Inc. v. Corporacion Estatal Petrolera Ecuatoriana,
762 F.2d 464 (5th Cir. 1985)..... 14

Fisher v. U. of Tex.,
136 S. Ct. 2198 (2016) 31

Fullilove v. Klutznick,
448 U.S. 448 (1980) 31

Garcia v. Johanns,
444 F.3d 625 (D.C. Cir. 2006) 4

Gill v. Whitford,
138 S. Ct. 1916 (2018) 36

Grutter v. Bollinger,
539 U.S. 306 (2003) 18, 29

Humana Ins. Co. v. Tenet Health Sys.,
No. 3:16-CV-2919-B, 2016 WL 6893629 (N.D. Tex. Nov. 21, 2016)..... 14

In re Black Farmer, Discrimination Litig., (Pigford II),
856 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 2011) 5, 22, 23

Loc. 28 of Sheet Metal Workers' Int'l Ass'n v. EEOC,
478 U.S. 421 (1986) 32

Madsen v. Women's Health Ctr., Inc.,
512 U.S. 753 (1994) 36

Maryland v. King,
567 U.S. 1301 (2012) 33, 34

Morgan v. Fletcher,
518 F.2d 236 (5th Cir. 1975)..... 17

Nken v. Holder,
556 U.S. 418 (2009) 14, 33

Pigford v. Glickman, (Pigford I),
185 F.R.D. 82 (D.D.C. 1999) 23

Rothe Dev. Corp. v. Dep't of Def.,
545 F.3d 1023 (Fed. Cir. 2008)..... 21

<i>Sessions v. Morales-Santana</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1678 (2017)	35
<i>Tate v. Am. Tugs, Inc.</i> , 634 F.2d 869 (5th Cir. 1981).....	15
<i>Trump v. Hawaii</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2392 (2018)	37
<i>United States v. Paradise</i> , 480 U.S. 149 (1987)	19, 29, 31, 32
<i>Washington v. Trump</i> , 2017 WL 4857088 (W.D. Wash Oct. 27, 2017)	15
<i>W. H. Scott Const. Co. v. City of Jackson, Miss.</i> , 199 F.3d 206, 217 (5th Cir. 1999)	19
<i>White v. Carlucci</i> , 862 F.2d 1209 (5th Cir. 1989).....	14, 17
<i>Wygant v. Jackson Bd. of Educ.</i> , 476 U.S. 267 (1986)	18
Statutes	
7 USC §§ 1921 <i>et seq.</i>	3
7 USC § 1923	4
7 USC § 1942.....	4
7 USC § 1963	4
7 USC § 2279.....	12, 13
7 USC § 6932.....	3
16 USC § 590h.....	4
American Rescue Plan, § 1005	12, 15, 36
Claims Resolution Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-291 (2010)	23

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.