

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ARAB AMERICAN CIVIL
RIGHTS LEAGUE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 17-10310
Honorable Victoria A. Roberts

v.

DONALD TRUMP, et al.,

Defendants.

**ORDER DEEMING MOOT DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISSOLVE INJUNCTION
[Doc. 15] AND RENEWED MOTION TO VACATE INJUNCTION [Doc. 57]**

On January 27, 2017, President Donald Trump issued Executive Order 13769, 82 Fed. Reg. 8977 (Feb. 1, 2017) (the "Original EO"), which, among other things, affected travel to and from the United States of lawful permanent residents from seven designated countries. Plaintiffs filed this suit and an *ex parte* motion for temporary restraining order to enjoin the Original EO. The Court held a telephone conference on the motion on February 2, 2017.

During the call, counsel for Defendants stated that the White House issued a memorandum on February 1, 2017, clarifying that the Original EO did not apply to lawful permanent residents of the United States. Despite the clarification, Plaintiffs' counsel voiced concern that without a federal court order, the Government could change its mind again and decide to curtail the rights of lawful permanent residents. With no dissent from the Government, the Court stated it would enter an order to address Plaintiffs' concerns.

Accordingly, the Court entered an order on February 2 permanently enjoining the United States from applying Sections 3(c) and 3(e) of the Original EO against lawful permanent residents of the United States.

On March 6, 2017, the President issued Executive Order 13780, 82 Fed. Reg. 13209 (March 9, 2017) (the "New EO"). The New EO revokes and replaces the Original EO and explicitly states that it does not apply to lawful permanent residents of the United States.

Now, Defendants have filed two motions: (1) motion to dissolve injunction and amend order [Doc. 15]; and (2) renewed motion to vacate permanent injunction [Doc. 57]. Plaintiffs initially opposed Defendants' motion to dissolve. [Doc. 20]. However, following the issuance of the New EO, Plaintiffs revised their stance; they now ask the Court to deny Defendants' motion as moot. [Doc. 45].

Because the New EO revokes and replaces the Original EO, the Original EO no longer has force or effect; as a natural result of this revocation, the Court's order enjoining the United States from applying the Original EO against lawful permanent residents no longer has effect. An order vacating or dissolving the injunction is unnecessary and would be inappropriate.

Defendants' motions [Docs. 15, 57] are **MOOT**.

IT IS ORDERED.

S/Victoria A. Roberts
Victoria A. Roberts
United States District Judge

Dated: March 21, 2017

The undersigned certifies that a copy of this document was served on the attorneys of record by electronic means or U.S. Mail on March 21, 2017.

s/Linda Vertriest
Deputy Clerk