

**ORAL ARGUMENT NOT YET SCHEDULED****No. 21-5028**

*In the*  
**United States Court of Appeals**  
*for the*  
**District of Columbia Circuit**

---

WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF TECHNOLOGY WORKERS,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

– v. –

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY,  
*Defendant-Appellee,*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS, et al.,  
*Intervenors-Appellees.*

---

On appeal from a final judgment of the  
United States District Court for the District of Columbia  
No. 16-cv-01170  
Hon. Reggie B. Walton

---

**BRIEF FOR INTERVENORS-APPELLEES**

---

Paul W. Hughes  
Andrew A. Lyons-Berg  
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
500 North Capitol Street NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 756-8000

*Counsel for Intervenors-Appellees*  
(additional counsel listed on signature page)

## CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS, AND RELATED CASES

### A. Parties and Amici

Except for the following, all parties, intervenors, and amici appearing before the district court and in this Court are listed in the Brief for Plaintiff-Appellant.

New amici in this Court are: Landmark Legal Foundation, Louie Gohmert, Mo Brooks, Madison Cawthorn, Joe Kent, Programmers Guild, American Engineering Association, Inc., and U.S. Tech Workers.

### B. Rulings Under Review

References to the rulings at issue appear in the Brief for Plaintiff-Appellant.

### C. Related Cases

This case was previously before the Court in *Washington Alliance of Technology Workers v. DHS*, No. 17-5110. A previous case involving material identical regulations and arguments was before the Court in *Washington Alliance of Technology Workers v. DHS*, No. 15-5239.

/s/ Paul W. Hughes

## CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Intervenor-Appellees are the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, and the Information Technology Industry Council.

None of the Intervenor-Appellees has a parent company, and no publicly held company has a 10% or greater ownership interest in any of the Intervenor-Appellees. Each Intervenor-Appellee is a trade association for purposes of Circuit Rule 26.1(b).

*/s/ Paul W. Hughes*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Certificate as to Parties, Rulings, and Related Cases .....	i
Corporate Disclosure Statement.....	ii
Table of Authorities .....	iv
Glossary .....	xi
Introduction .....	1
Statutes and Regulations .....	2
Issue Presented for Review .....	2
Statement.....	2
A. Statutory background. ....	2
B. The OPT Program.....	3
C. Procedural background.....	9
Summary of the Argument .....	12
Argument .....	14
I. The OPT program is a lawful exercise of DHS authority.....	14
A. The F-1 nonimmigrant definition does not preclude DHS from authorizing post-completion practical training. ....	15
1. Washtech’s argument fails as a textual matter. ....	15
2. The Executive has interpreted the INA to allow post-completion practical training for more than seventy years. ....	24
B. DHS has ample authority generally to authorize noncitizen employment.....	41
C. The OPT program is eminently reasonable. ....	52
Conclusion.....	59

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES<sup>†</sup>

### Cases

<i>Matter of Alberga</i> , 10 I. & N. Dec. 764 (B.I.A. 1964).....	29
* <i>Altman v. SEC</i> , 666 F.3d 1322 (D.C. Cir. 2011).....	24, 47, 48
<i>Anwo v. INS</i> , 607 F.2d 435 (D.C. Cir. 1979).....	22
<i>Ariz. DREAM Act Coal. v. Brewer</i> , 757 F.3d 1053 (9th Cir. 2014).....	51
<i>Bolden v. Blue Cross &amp; Blue Shield Assoc.</i> , 848 F.2d 201 (D.C. Cir. 1988).....	35
<i>Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.</i> , 467 U.S. 837 (1984).....	12, 14, 19
<i>Cnty. for Creative Non-Violence (CCNV) v. Kerrigan</i> , 865 F.2d 382 (D.C. Cir. 1989).....	19, 20, 57
<i>Commodity Futures Trading Comm’n v. Schor</i> , 478 U.S. 833 (1986).....	24, 35, 47, 48, 51
<i>Doe, 1 v. Fed. Election Comm’n</i> , 920 F.3d 866 (D.C. Cir. 2019).....	13, 19, 20, 52
<i>Elkins v. Moreno</i> , 435 U.S. 647 (1978).....	22, 23
<i>Fox Television Stations, Inc. v. FilmOn X LLC</i> , 150 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2015).....	35
<i>Good Fortune Shipping SA v. Commissioner</i> , 897 F.3d 256 (D.C. Cir. 2018).....	19
<i>Matter of Gutierrez</i> , 15 I. & N. Dec. 727 (B.I.A. 1976).....	30
<i>Hoffman Plastic Compounds, Inc. v. NLRB</i> , 535 U.S. 137 (2002).....	42
<i>Jenkins v. Haubert</i> , 179 F.3d 19 (2d Cir. 1999).....	44

---

<sup>†</sup> Authorities on which we chiefly rely are marked with asterisks.

# 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.