Preventing Unlawful Detentions: Habeas Training

UC Law SF, 11/19/2025

Panelists: (listed from left to right)

- Professor Richard Boswell, Professor of Law, UC Law SF [RB]
- Abigail Sullivan Engen, Centro Legal de la Raza [ASE]
- Suhi Koizumi, Minami Tamaki, LLP [SK] -Facilitator
- Olivia Lee, Minami Tamaki, LLP [OL] -Moderator
- Avantika Shastri, Van Der Hout, LLP [AS]
- Jordan Weiner, La Raza Centro Legal [JW]
- Hon. Elizabeth Lee Young, Emeriti Law & Former Asst. Chief Imm. Judge [ELY]

(See end of notes for sponsoring organizations)

<u>Goal: Walk the crowd through Habeas Petitions, followed by networking</u> [OL]

- Over 220 people signed up in person/online!
- Similar programming to potentially take place in East and South Bay in the new year
- Plan to send an eval survey to those who signed in for CLE credit – please complete!
- Program is brought together by the Prometheus Project- this is a somewhat new org: cutting edge in bringing back rebellious lawyering
- Materials for this CLE, templates, and recording(s) will be posted to prometheusproject.net (still in process)

<u>General</u> [SK]

- Goal of this training is to provide introductory overview of habeas, real life situations that present the need for it, and how to get involved; life cycle of habeas, what it is like to file your first; and some time to answer a few questions.

<u>Why habeas are necessary in immigration and why now?</u> [ELY]

- Current statistics: 10-14 million people in the US are without documentation, 40-60% of them entered without a visa (ex. Went to POE and claimed asylum or crossed EWI, etc.)
- 7% of that population was subject to mandatory detention for committing a crime deemed serious by the INA- Aggravated Felony or CIMT- and rest could go on somewhat normally
- When Trump entered office in January, there was a rapid series of changes to the immigration system- executive orders, policy changes, and attempting to interpret laws than any way we've seen it done previously
- Impact: doesn't enforce the legal process, but instead, the way they do it is to bypass the legal process for these individuals

    - Especially: the detention context
- One big change that created where we are now: Sept. BIA issued a decision making a massive departure from past interpretations- anyone who entered without a visa is subject to mandatory detention. Panelists will explain more but mandatory detention is more about jurisdiction of the immigration judges than them having to be detained
    - Prior to issuance of this decision- at very least, 700K were subject to mandatory; if we extrapolate with estimate we have, 4-8 million now subject to mandatory detention.
    - Number of IJs started decreasing due to forcing people out and firings. Fewer people to hear detained cases → bigger backlog; also quotas (3k/day) for DHS to arrest in a day; and to make those arrests can pull from anywhere in that 4-8 million group
- First place we saw this- aggressive enforcement at immigration courts
    - ICE would go into courthouses with intent to detain individuals going through the legal process; master hearing would take place and then individuals would get detained despite actively pursuing the legal process
    - This has waned a bit in the Bay Area
- Now, increased instances of detentions at ICE Check-Ins
    - Again, these people are appearing to comply with the rules and are getting detained
- USCIS: affirmatively applying for something, like AOS, outside of court, if they fall under this scheme
- We know something will probably come to SF after seeing it in LA and Chicago- mass arrest events where they come in with ICE and other agencies, like national guard, and invading neighborhoods, setting up ICE checkpoints around cities, showing up at events; in LA, tried to do a mass arrest action at a free medical clinic in LA
    - Huge events are coming up with World Cup, Superbowl…something could arise at one of those
- Before sept., most people in immigration court were eligible for bond via immigration court; no longer possible for these 4-8 million; instead must seek habeas in district court
- Habeas around the country is at a nearly 100% success rate- allowing people to get out on the bond they would have been eligible for in front of an IJ but they're just having to seek it elsewhere
- But majority of people aren't filing for these- many are pro se individuals without attorneys, and may not know it's an option
- Currently have 600 IJs on the bench- if you put 4-8 million in detention, IJs have to hear all of those- the math doesn't work out. Detention isn't to make their cases heard, it's to make their lives so miserable they'll give up on their case and return to a country where they're afraid for their life.

Common Fact Patterns leading to Habeas Petitions [ASE]

- Mandatory detention: sounds like "detention is mandatory" but it really means IJ doesn't have the authority to order that person released, which is why federal court is so important right now
- Nowhere near enough judges to adjudicate through minimally fair process, but nowhere near enough "beds" in detention centers. What we see instead is people are in overcrowded facilities, describing only getting one cup of water a day, waiting hours for it, detention facilities are not adequately cleaned, food is barely edible, and it's creating fear that there is more risk of going into such awful conditions
- Courthouse arrests:
    - These have decreased, likely due to success of habeas in northern California
    - In SF this has waned, but still expecting they can happen and have happened since the summer
    - We have Stephen Miller concocting a dangerous metric of 3k arrests/day and ICE has used immigration courts as an easy way to fill quotas
    - What happens at court:
        - ICE attorney (ACC) moves to dismiss the case (this is bad: being in removal proceedings offers some level of protection; if person is out of proceedings that have some safeguards, can be placed in expedited removal)-
        - IJ might grant that motion; but even when IJ doesn't grant, you can still have issues; ICE is positioned outside the door to arrest them. Often this is happening with unrepresented respondents
    - Very hard for noncitizens in removal to find high quality, affordable attorneys, many are trying over a year, all nonprofits are at capacity and many private firms are not taking cases- majority of people at master hearings don't have representation
    - When it happens at SF EOIR, they're in the northern district; if they're moved before the habeas petition is filed, habeas jurisdiction will be determined by where they are when it's filed (which may not be northern district)
    - We have great judges here- get moving quickly so you get habeas petition filed before the person is transferred out of district.
    - Note: they will still often get transferred elsewhere in CA or out of CA, but jurisdiction will remain locked in once the habeas is filed.

High level summary on habeas cases [ASE]

- Immigration is civil- not "punitive" like criminal; flip side, criminal proceedings offer more constitutional safeguards → detention has to be justified on narrow grounds- for the duration of removal proceedings (danger to community or flight risk)

- Courthouse arrests: most people seeking asylum in EOIR had some prior contact with CBP on entry or with ICE; at that contact, they were detained for hours/days, then released (different procedural ways to get release)- that release *necessarily means* an officer of CBP or ICE determined they're not a flight risk or danger to the community; sometimes even amenable to release on conditions
- Now that person is showing up at court for their case and in that sense, they're showing they're even more of not a flight risk; the only basis for detaining is *if something changed* making them danger to community or flight risk
- Habeas are successful because ICE is arresting anyone they can and not arguing/pursuing the changed circumstances analysis
- The person being at court really shows they're not a flight risk
- There is a class action suit looking to get class certified for those re-detained after being determined not to be flight risk. Re-detention is illegal because no changed circumstances have occurred.
    - Another ongoing potential class action: inhumane detention facilities
- TROs are getting granted in hours, even if the person is transferred to another district or out of state, judge orders release, and then they get back home.

<u>Arrests at ICE Check-Ins</u> [JW]

- Increasing lately for all sorts of case postures- post removal, CFI process, alleged violations of release for those still in 260 full removal proceedings released at border and confined up to point of arrest
- In this posture: arguments are the same as in the courthouse arrest setting
- ICE Check-In context pushes that people are owed a pre-deprivation process for their liberty – if you're on an order of supervision, they can't just re-arrest you without process
- Judge is effectively saying: You need to have a bond hearing before you're in custody (as opposed to "they can't take you into custody at all")

<u>ICE Check-Ins for those with final orders of removal</u> [ASE]

- These individuals already have an order that can be executed
- Many in this situation haven't been removed; may be from a country unwilling to issue a travel document (ex. Unable/unwilling to issue a passport; no functioning government to issue travel documents); or maybe there is another form of relief they're eligible for/sympathetic factors for some reason so they're allowed to be here
- Lots of people have "orders of supervision" and must check in with ICE on a regular basis. Coming in regularly
- What we've seen: ICE is making arrests at these- people showing up for over 25 years are suddenly being told they'll be removed;

    - for those who don't have travel docs, ICE may not be able to remove them anywhere and have those docs; so they just sit there while ICE is allegedly trying to get those docs. It's a real question what ICE is doing in that time.
    - So they had permission to stay here on some level; if ICE can execute the removal order, they will be removed; and if they can't execute it, leave them in custody
- **New:** in some cases, people are moved to countries they're not even citizens of. Could be those who ICE doesn't have travel docs for but also those who have it but ICE wants to make a political statement (ex. that if you have committed a prior crime, they can remove you to Libya, Sudan, Ukraine..etc).
    - So even if they're willing to go back to their country of origin, ICE can arbitrarily to decide to send them, as a non-national, to a third country.
- Those without counsel are most likely to get picked up; but those with counsel can still be detained.
- Risk is significant now- very dangerous to have any of these people go to their appts.
- Habeas is important: can file in advance of being detained, to stop them from being detained; or else, file as soon as possible after detention
- Arguments:
    - For pre-detention hearing before getting detained; whether it's actually possible they can be removed (is removal reasonably foreseeable)- if not, it's indefinite, which is against the constitution.
    - Other arguments:
        - they're on orders of supervision, there are regs that apply before those can revoked, like giving notice of the reasons for revocation, have correct person sign the notices, interview with opportunity to respond. So if ICE isn't following their own regs, then that should be mentioned
- Analyze what's going on
- *Post final orders of removal: should we be attending the check-ins with them?*
    - Yes. Have a serious consideration of what could happen at these hearings and discuss with clients.
- Variety of arguments have been successful- judges recognize the unfairness of taking way liberty interests without hearings; if ICE is violating regs, judges hate that; if removal isn't foreseeable there's a constitutional issue.
- Success rate is pretty good; ICE is getting better at trying to go through some steps so we have to be good about pointing out why the notice provided isn't sufficient, etc.
- These cases are a little different: these people have final orders of removal. Habeas prevents their detention but we still need to figure out if there's a long term solution for them staying in US that isn't just based on immigration

<u>How Facts Matter for Habeas- Reviewing a Case from the UC Law SF Clinic</u> [RB]

- None of the things immigration is doing is pursuant to any statutory changes; updates to statute like Laken Riley is a separate matter
- Facts matter in these cases
- These judges who are hearing the cases are driven by facts of the cases and are very receptive
- Clinic started at UC Law SF- suppression at immigration court, would have to do habeas → first case was someone from San Pablo, CA, had been in US for 34 years, was outside in the morning walking his dog; 2 years before had had a stroke, as a result, hard to move; immigration approached him on the street saying they were looking for someone- he turned around and they asked if he was that person, he said no, they ultimately arrested him anyways. Never actually looked for the person they said they were looking for.
    - All of these factors were what was put into the habeas petition- it was based on the decision that IJ Young was referencing- immigration had a policy position that they'd taken that IJs had no authority to make bond decisions and after that, that was too weak; had BIA make decision solidify it into an admin ruling;
    - Fed Court: outlined the facts of this arrest in eastern district of CA, client was held near Fresno; US ATTNY office had no experience doing these cases- had been doing drug cases, were citing to bad law;
        - The Judge when they walked in said to US ATTNY "are you arguing this? Expedited removal for someone in the US for 30 years; I don't want to hear that, if you have something else, I'll hear that"- the facts were strong.
        - *That needs to be in your habeas- very detailed information on what happened in the case- there may be other issues you want to preserve for later*
    - Here: the judge could have sent back to the IJ and said they did have authority to decide bond; but decided Gov couldn't point out any reason why this person would escape- he was walking his dog, doing nothing wrong, no criminal record, no flight risk: ordered immediate (within 2 days) release
- Judges are very receptive- these judges don't hear these on a regular basis. Not like appellate judges who see immigration cases a lot. They're used to drug cases with different respondents.
- These can be very fact driven- you will often see people in the US who have been here for many years, and the government can't point out a flight risk or danger

<u>Detentions at USCIS interviews</u> [ASE]

- USCIS isn't supposed to be an enforcement agency- supposed to be non-adversarial…but we're seeing nightmarish examples of arrests at USCIS interviews. New, dynamic- not sure of trends just yet
- Recent examples

    - Well know that you have to submit medical exam for AOS; doctors who can certify someone medically have to be certified by USCIS;
        - USCIS interview about 1-1.5 weeks ago, 2 people were there together for green card interviews, had submitted civil surgeon exams but the civil surgeon who had done the exams had allegedly lost their certification to be a civil surgeon from USCIS. Based on that, these people were both arrested. ICE's position is they have to detain them because they're subject to "mandatory detention"- no allegation they had criminal history/drug issue- just allegedly, the doctor who signed the required form was no longer qualified to sign the form.
    - Marriage based interview- allegation where spouse applying for green card had criminal history the person maintains they don't have. We don't know if they were mixed up with someone else
    - Have seen some arrests at AO- usually when someone has a reasonable or credible fear interview
- Interpretation of mandatory detention statute is wrong; district judges very much agree that detention statutes are being interpreted wrong; can use due process arguments on the fundamental fairness of going to an interview scheduled for your benefit application and then getting detained

<u>Prolonged Detention</u> [JW]

- People who know how to do habeas likely got their start with these; you've been subject to mandatory detention but it's unreasonably prolonged outside of what the constitution allows or what was contemplated in the statute
- A few general questions:
    - Does a bond hearing have to be denied to be eligible for habeas?
        - There will be a nationwide class action decision on this issue, may have more answers soon? Saw a lot of instances where individuals were denied bond hearings and then sought habeas.
    - Can a habeas be filed pre-detention? Not a huge fan of pre-deprivation habeas; filing it in advance of a check in, in the event they're detained. Save the federal judge's resources.
        - But there is a strategy of emailing the ICE attny ahead of time and threatening to file the habeas if they're detained if they won't tell you if your client will be detained- leverage. (But make sure client is actually ok with you filing habeas)

<u>Life Cycle of Habeas: Nuts and Bolts</u> [JW]

- How to do a habeas petition

- 1) File your petition- you can get petition from template from a database- not one on every circumstances yet- take one of those and spend some time with the case law. Lots of caselaw from last 5 months; adapt to the situation; you know how to do this
    - You're not doing all briefing upfront, like a call up deadline in EOIR- in habeas, you're just initiating the case. You just need to allege the basic facts and arguments, not the full briefing
    - Where your client is located at the time of the habeas is filed decides the jurisdiction- if you file it while they're in SF, Northern District gets it; if they're moved to somewhere else,
    - File this to lock in jurisdiction
- 2) Email Assistant US Attorney office- civil chief- tell them you're about to file TRO; the TRO is ex parte- telling judge to act immediately, person can't even wait for judge answer. But judge wants to know you tried to inform the government. Tell the gov a TRO is happening, which may also open the door for negotiation (and that you tried)
    - The TRO is what gets people released in hours- see sample filings, a one paragraph motion asking judge to grant preliminary relief, ask judge to do something in the case just started, not ultimate relief. Ask for immediate release because they were detained without pre-deprivation bond hearing, and constitution requires that hearing before you take that away.
- 3) Send US Attorney a copy of that TRO same day because it has to be believable you really can't wait.
- 4) Memorandum in support of the motion: actual brief, using the TRO factors- likelihood of success on factors, gov interest, etc.
    - Likelihood of success on merits: why detention is unlawful (most important section)
    - Don't spend too much time on harm: 9th circuit caselaw (Hernandez)- unlawful detention is harm enough; judges have been finding being detained is sufficient harm so you don't have to pin all your time into this
    - Make sure you comply with service requirements
- 5) Judge responds (have been responding within hours!)- assuming successful, orders release.
    - Read the whole order! At the end, it tells you when you have to go to court. Can schedule it for about 2 weeks later; appear before judge and give the government a chance to make the case because the TRO was made against them so this is their first shot
- 6) Client is released!!
- 7) E-file proposed summons

- 8) Get summons back from court- have an event on electronic filing system → FRCP rule of service + x days (30 days?) gov has to respond to the petition.
    - Gov responds to the original TRO petition
    - Option to reply to their briefing
- 9) Preliminary Injunction hearing- can differ- can be 10 minutes or an hour
    - You may or may not have to do much- it depends.
- 10) a few weeks later, TRO will convert to preliminary injunction- don't have to do anything, it's automatic; if judge grants preliminary injunction after the hearing order is in place DHS can't re-detain your client without a bond hearing until completion of litigation
- 11) Merits- can agree with schedule on the government, get a month between gov response and your reply, hearing on the merits of habeas petition will be had

<u>What is it Like to File Your First Habeas</u> [ASE]

- Note: don't be scared to get into habeas; federal court is generally more reasonable and long appointed (less beholden) to fears of losing their jobs and have lots of experience. They're warmly receiving these.
- Lock in the northern district jurisdiction- file the habeas ASAP; then file the TRO ideally in 24 hours. If the person is transferred, including out of state, you're looking for local counsel in a district court you're not licensed in…it gets messy fast.
- Example
    - July 3rd: client had an advocate with them; client was detained; attny contacted ACLU NorCal who provided a template- first case in northern district of CA. Client is in the process of hopefully being certified as a class action in San Jose.
    - She was compelling: young, suffered from anxiety and medical complications requiring regular medication and monitoring- not necessary for these courthouse arrest cases- these equities were put into the filings
    - Template took maybe 1.5 hour to turn it into a habeas filing; next day, a lot of time was spent on TRO, especially Table of Authority
    - When arrested, locked in jurisdiction, but then client was sent to Adelanto; her transfer was inhumane- didn't have access to her medicine and went through withdrawals, all 4 limbs shackled, not given water for 9 hours, no criminal history
- Judges so far haven't been sticklers if you're immediately filing the habeas and have little formatting issues. Litigation of the actual habeas petition will be more substantial but it's months out.
    - This individual now has an order to not be detained and as in removal proceedings

<u>How are Judges Responding to These Petitions?</u> [RB]

- Understand: judges don't like getting cases like this, they know what the case law is and are getting overwhelmed. Federal district court judges are discussing how to deal with this, including setting up pro bono panels.
- In almost every case, they point to the fact that the government hasn't been able to cite to a case in which they've won, which is extra compelling in more conservative states
- Judges are relieved to see pro bono attorneys
- You're there to help the court in a way- steer the case that otherwise would be pro se for someone who doesn't know the law and you're there to facilitate. You wouldn't bring a frivolous case.
- It is important to cite the details/facts of case because it brings the judge and their humanity into the situation.

<u>How We Can All Get Involved in Habeas</u> [JW]

- Find the breadcrumbs, take initiative: look on https://habeasdockets.org/
- Judges are nice; the clerks in the court will just fix it for you if you have filing issues, so if you're scared to file it wrong- don't be, just reach out to them for help!
- Bay Area Habeas Network- people in nonprofits who want to see community come together to mass file habeas while we're waiting for a class action to come through
- Vision: use rapid response networks that exist to have someone each day at 630 Sansome, have 5 attorneys who are taking shifts each day of the week to identify what type of case it is, file that petition to lock in jurisdiction before person is transferred
    - So onsite and offsite attorneys work together to file pro se and then help find
    - Gets flagged for JDC's federal court help desk, to flag case for judge who assigns order to locate counsel
    - JDC help desk is building up panel of qualified attorneys for pro se cases
    - **The ask:** join JDC's federal court habeas panel- maybe some mentorship, incentive/training to be on panel to help encourage practitioners.
- Here they order release in hours; but in E.D. Cal, it could be weeks; people can't file in time a lot here so we have to get these to the Nor Cal District judges

More information on the panel:

- Northern District has 2 programs: assist pro se litigants with their cases and facilitate panels of pro bono attorneys to take civil cases when there is an order to find a volunteer attorney
- They want to develop sub-panels for attorneys to take on cases after habeas is filed pro se via rapid response network → to get TRO and represent moving forward
- If interested: can join one or both of the panels

- These can be subject to equal access to justice (EAJA) fees- nonprofits don't get funding for pro se; so if you get to final judgement on the merits, can move for fees, feel free to donate those to any of the nonprofits that don't get funding otherwise for this work
    - Note: EAJA fees- need to keep track of your time from the moment you start the case and until the end; once the case is finally decided on a permanent injunction order, then you go back and ask the same judge for the fees. (Takes place at the end).
    - If motion to dismiss happens and you're looking to get fees granted- point out the government did not have a basis for their motion.
    - Bill the time spent on the EJA motion too! Fees on fees!

<u>Questions</u>

- Databases for samples/templates- where can people find these resources
    - ELY: some resources a lot of people have contributed to- those will be on the PrometheusProject.net Website (posted around the same time as the recording of this event): https://www.prometheusproject.net/
- Estimated time frame for decision on habeas?
    - AS: filed in northern, eastern, and central districts; timelines are changing because volume of habeas is increasing. Northern sounds like fastest; eastern sounded quick but looks like it's slowing down. Depends on judge of course. Central has been seen to move in about one week. Judges in Eastern are likely getting burnt out and less helpful as time goes by
    - US Assistant Attorneys who didn't do immigration work are getting drawn into this- they're maybe not as jaded or ideological, which can be nice, but they also may not know how to work with the agency to get you the info you want. But they're also overwhelmed and incentivized to try to keep habeas going
- USCIS apprehensions – if someone overstayed status, can habeas be filed right away, do you have to wait for bond hearing? Is a pre-deprivation possible in this scenario
    - ASE: Probably no reason you'd need a bond hearing just because arrest happened at USCIS
        - At least 1 district where because of a class action case, you have to request bond before IJ and be denied before you can go to habeas (Western District of Washington; Tacoma, where a lot of detained persons from CA get sent)
    - ASE: Pre-deprivation is ultimately a strategic call- would client be in a situation where they could be arrested? Maybe in Fresno CIS, where arrests have gone up a lot, would be concerned; but chances probably aren't high enough for the other USCIS offices to warrant it yet
        - When you go there- if it's a final order client- possible when they go could get arrested due to nature of conviction, or background- Vietnamese with

prior removal history and ICE is going after those individuals now because more chance of removing them.
        - Note: if you do the pre-deprivation, you're drawing attention to the case for the officer when they might have otherwise just blown past it
        - Contact ICE in advance- can you provide us assurance you won't arrest our client today? Or else, we will file a habeas today
            - BUT make sure your client is actually willing for you to file habeas
            - If ICE won't provide assurance, can file ahead of time; argument- clients are on orders of supervision or have check-ins, on some order and they are in custody even if not yet in custody.
            - Sometimes can do it but has to be a strategic decision
- For the Bay Area Habeas Project- are you looking for habeas attorneys to lock in the habeas or just those to do the TRO or case moving forward?
    - JW: Working out someone filing the habeas with the TRO and then trying to get pro bono to come in for Preliminary Injunction hearing and onward
- Looking to have a subsequent follow-up

Organizations in this space:

- Asian Law Caucus- preparing materials to help people file habeas; finalizing advisory and templates for certain kinds of habeas; will have a training in the new year
    - probono@asianlawcaucus.org
- Tahirih Justice Center- survivors of gender-based violence, FGM, trafficking; primarily focused on asylum, U-visa, VAWA. Looking for assistance to prepare upcoming habeas cases and templates
    - See website for information: www.Tahiri.org
    - Contact: Payals@tahiri.org
- AILA NorCal- looking for co-pro bono coordinator to assist with attorney members coordinating for attorney efforts. Not necessarily doing cases themselves but being interested in being part of coordinating the habeas efforts; AILA national has projects too, plus local
    - If interested: chair@ailanorcal.org
- Asian Pacific Islander Legal Outreach (APILO)- volunteer to work on habeas as co-counsel; good place to get your first habeas done.
    - rkwak@aplegaloutreach.org
- Lawyers Community for Civil Rights – SF Bay Area: traditional habeas practice is on prolonged detention, will relaunch that in 2026, but current focus would be to build up immigration attorney network for affirmative and defensive cases.

    - If interested to be in pro bono network: probonoteam@lccrsf.org
- Centro Legal de la Raza (Oakland)- need for pro bono partners for habeas cases; not looking to file pro se; looking for attorneys (whether you have significant federal court practice) start co-counseling as soon as possible after TRO is granted. Preliminary injunction hearing takes place 10 days out or so after TRO, it's pretty resource intensive- would be helpful to have a partner with more paralegal support and can research federal court rules and requirements that may differ
    - If interested in partnering: email ASE, put something in subject line about being interested in pro bono habeas cases; asullivanengen@centrolegal.org
- Pro bono sign up page on Northern District Court website (new!): can easily google it, under "Attorneys"- can use to sign up for the federal panels
- LATINAN w. partner organizations in Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito counties is launching an asylum clinic on Jan 24; still looking for pro bono volunteers to join; clinic will be in Watsonville;
    - If interested: Claudia.abasto@latinan.org for more details

This event was supported and sponsored by the following organizations (and more!):

- AILA Northern California Chapter
- AILA Santa Clara Chapter
- API Legal Outreach (APILO)
- Asian American Bar Association (AABA)
- Asian Law Alliance
- Asian Law Caucus
- Chinese for Affirmative Action
- The Prometheus Project
    - [Project of: Chinese for Affirmative Action dba Asian Americans for Civil Rights and Equality]
- Centro Legal de la Raza
- Federal Bar Association: Northern District of California
- Justice and Diversity Center, Bar Association of San Francisco
- Korean American Bar Association of Northern California
- La Raza Centro Legal
- Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area
- Mayor's Office for Victims' Rights
- Pangea Legal Services
- Tahirih Justice Center
- UC Law SF Immigrant Rights Clinic