SUPREME COURT COPY

SUPREME COURT
FILED

Bar Misc. 4186 S202512

DEC 03 2013

Frank A. McGuire Clerk

Deputy

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE SERGIO C. GARCIA ON ADMISSION

APPLICANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF

Robert Cooper (SBN: 209641)
WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER LLP

555 S. Flower Street, 29th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 Tel: (213) 443-5100 Fax: (213) 443-5101

robert.cooper@wilsonelser.com

Attorney for Applicant SERGIO C. GARCIA

Bar Misc. 4186 S202512

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE SERGIO C. GARCIA ON ADMISSION

APPLICANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF

Robert Cooper (SBN: 209641)
WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER LLP

555 S. Flower Street, 29th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071 Tel: (213) 443-5100 Fax: (213) 443-5101

robert.cooper@wilsonelser.com

Attorney for Applicant **SERGIO C. GARCIA**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTROI	DUCTION	1
DISCUS	SION	1
I.	The Immigration Laws Adopted by Congress Preclude the Arguments Advanced by Kierniesky.	1
II.	The Argument Raised by DeSha Should Be Summarily Rejected As Well	3
CONCL	USION	3
CERTIF	TICATE OF WORD COUNT	5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases Arizona v. United States (2012) 132 S. Ct. 2492......1 Connerly v. State Personnel Bd. Elk Grove Unified Sch. Dist. v. Newdow (2004) 542 U.S. 1......3 Elkins v. Moreno In Re Rainford Tibke v. INS **Statutes** 8 U.S.C. Other Authorities Act of Aug. 26, 1994, Pub.L. No. 103-317,

INTRODUCTION

This Court's recent order requested supplemental briefing regarding the impact of recent legislation. The amicus letter filed by Kierniesky completely disregards the adjustment-of-status procedure allowed under federal immigration laws. The amicus brief by DeSha erroneously mixes the licensing issue – the dispositive issue presented here – with the distinct issue of employment eligibility. Given that these issues involve apples and oranges, the Court should reject the arguments raised by both of these individuals.

DISCUSSION

I. The Immigration Laws Adopted by Congress Preclude the Arguments Advanced by Kierniesky.

The first amicus letter brief, seeking to use buzz words to create the false impression of criminal conduct, repeatedly refers to Garcia's presence here as a form of "lawlessness." (Kierniesky Letter, p. 1.) In reality, however, "it is not a crime for a removable alien to remain in the United States." (*Arizona v. United States* (2012) 132 S. Ct. 2492, 2505 [internal citation omitted].)

Instead, an alien who is merely present in the country without federal authorization may be subject to civil removal proceedings (after administrative and judicial review). (See 8 U.S.C. §§ 1182(a)(6)(A)(i), 1227(a)(1)(A)-(B).) At the same time, Congress has given the Executive Branch discretion to grant various forms of relief from removal, up to and including permanent cancellation of removal and adjustment to lawful-permanent-resident status. (See, e.g., 8 U.S.C. §§ 1229b(b), 1255(i).) Given

that immigration proceedings are inherently time-consuming (as evidenced by the long waiting period faced by Garcia in connection with his visa petition), the mere act of waiting for a visa to become available does not contribute to "lawlessness."

Although Congress is fully aware of the visa backlog faced by Garcia and other immigrants, Congress for the most part has not acted to eliminate the backlog or the resulting waiting periods. (See H.R. Rep. No. 104-469, 2d Sess., p. 134 (1996) ["there is a backlog of 1.1 million spouses and minor children of lawful permanent residents waiting for admission or for legal status"].) Congress, however, has rejected proposals to eliminate or reduce the backlog. (See *id.* at p. 84; H.R. Rep. No. 104-879, 2d Sess., p. 112 (1997).) To the extent that Kierniesky argues that an immigrant defies the law by merely waiting in this country for a visa to become available, Kierniesky's fight is with Congress, not with Garcia (or with this Court for that matter).

Furthermore, Kierniesky's argument completely disregards the operation of the current immigration system. Under the current system, "adjustment of status is merely a procedural mechanism by which an alien [already in the United States] is assimilated to the position of one seeking to enter the United States." (*In re Rainford* (BIA 1992) 20 I.&N. Dec. 598, 601.) Before Congress created the mechanism of adjustment of status, however, "aliens in the United States who were not immigrants had to leave the country and apply for an immigrant visa at a consulate abroad." (*Elkins v. Moreno* (1978) 435 U.S. 647, 667.) Under the adjustment-of-status procedure, an alien already in the United States is treated as if he were seeking admission from abroad but is generally permitted to remain here while the application is pending. (*Tibke v. INS* (2d Cir. 1964) 335 F.2d 42, 44-45.) As a result, the notion that an immigrant's reliance on the

adjustment-of-status process for citizenship contributes to lawlessness is totally false. ¹

Accordingly, the arguments raised by Kierniesky should be rejected.

II. The Arguments Raised by DeSha Should Be Summarily Rejected As Well.

DeSha's arguments are flawed because the issue of license eligibility is completely distinct from the issue of employment eligibility. The United States agrees with Garcia regarding this point. (See Supplemental Letter Brief of U.S., dated November 12, 2013, p. 2 ["employment authorization is distinct from possession of a law license"].) Accordingly, this Court need not address the issue of employment eligibility.

CONCLUSION

Although the Court's order requesting supplemental briefing contemplated amicus briefing to "facilitate informed judicial consideration" of the issues presented here (Connerly v. State Personnel Bd. (2006) 37 Cal.4th 1169, 1177), the supplemental opposition briefs filed by the two individual amici appear to represent a "heckler's veto" in response to the recent statutory amendment. (Elk Grove Unified Sch. Dist. v. Newdow (2004) 542 U.S. 1, 33 (conc. opn. of Rehnquist, C.J.).)

¹ There is no question that Congress has made adjustment of status available to undocumented immigrants. (See 8 U.S.C. § 1255(i) (enacted by Act of Aug. 26, 1994, Pub.L. No. 103-317, § 506(b), 108 Stat. 1765).) Under the current law, this statutory relief encompasses aliens as to whom a family-based visa petition was filed by April 30, 2001. (See 8 U.S.C. § 1255(i)(1)(B)(i).) Garcia's visa petition was filed by his father in 1994 and approved in 1995. (CBX Op. Br. 1.)

In conclusion, Garcia respectfully requests an order admitting him to the bar.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: December 2, 2013

WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER LLP

Robert Cooper

Attorney for Applicant SERGIO C. GARCIA

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT

This brief was generated by Microsoft Office, Word 2003. According to the word-counting feature in this program, the text of this brief contains 816 words.

DATED: December 2, 2013

WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER LLP

 $By_{\underline{}}$

Robert Cooper Attorney for Applicant SERGIO C. GARCIA

PROOF OF SERVICE 1013a(3) CCP Revised 5/1/88

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18. I am not a party to this action. My business address is 555 S. Flower Street, Suite 2900, Los Angeles, CA 90071.

On **December 2, 2013**, the foregoing document described as **APPLICANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF** is being served on the interested parties in this action by placing true copies thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as follows:

SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

- [X] (BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY) The attached document is being filed by delivery to a common carrier promising overnight delivery as shown on the carrier's receipt, consistent with CRC 8.25.
- [X] BY MAIL As follows: I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. The envelope was sealed and placed for collection and mailing on this date following our ordinary practices. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

Executed on **December 2, 2013** at Los Angeles, California.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Cheryl A. White

Sent by Fed Ex:

Office of the Clerk CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT 350 McAllister Street San Francisco, CA 94102-4797 Telephone: (415) 865-7000 Eight copies and an original	
Daniel Tenny Department of Justice Civil Division, Room 7226 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20530-0001 Telephone: (202) 514-2000	United States of America: Amicus curiae

Served by US Mail:

Starr Babcock	Committee of Bar Examiners of the
Lawrence C. Yee	State Bar of California
Richard J. Zanassi	·
Rachel S. Grunberg	
Office of General Counsel	
State Bar of California	
180 Howard Street	
San Francisco, CA 94105	
Rachel S. Grunberg	
Office of General Counsel	
State Bar of California	
1149 South Hill Street	
Los Angeles, CA 90015	
Robert E. Palmer	
Gibson Dunn and Crutcher LLP	
3161 Michelson Drive	
Irvine, CA 92612-4412	
Mark A. Perry	
Gibson Dunn and Crutcher LLP	
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.	
Washington, DC 20036-5306	

Kevin R. Johnson UC Davis School of Law 400 Mrak Hall Drive Davis, CA 95616 Donald K. Tamaki Minette A. Kwok Phillip M. Zackler Minami Tamaki LLP 360 Post Street, 8th Floor San Francisco, CA 94108-4903 Bill Ong Hing University of San Francisco School of Law 2199 Fulton Street San Francisco, CA 94117 Bryan Springmeyer 275 Battery Street, Suite 1170 San Francisco, CA 94111 James Wagstaffe Kerr & Wagstaffe LLP 100 Spear Street, Suite 1800 San Francisco, CA 94105-1576 Ross Moody Attorneys for Amicus Curiae California Department of Justice Kamala Harris 455 Golden Gate Ave., Suite # 11000 Attorney General of California San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 Ross.Moody@doj.ca.gov Carlos R. Moreno Los Angeles County Bar Association: Irell and Manella LLP Amicus curiae; 1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 960 Alameda County Bar Association: Los Angeles, CA 90067 Amicus curiae: Asian American Bar Association of the Greater Bay Area: Amicus curiae; Asian Pacific American Bar Association of Silicon Valley: Amicus curiae; Bar Association of San Francisco: Amicus curiae: Beverly Hills Bar Association: Amicus curiae; Kern County Bar Association: Amicus

Anthony Philip Marquez Lorenzo Patino School of Law	curiae; Marin County Bar Association: Amicus curiae; Mexican American Bar Association: Amicus curiae; Multicultural Bar Alliance of Southern California: Amicus curiae; Riverside County Bar Association: Amicus curiae; Sacramento County Bar Association: Amicus curiae; San Bernardino County Bar Association: Amicus curiae; San Diego County Bar Association: Amicus curiae; Santa Clara County Bar Association: Amicus curiae; Santa Clara County Bar Association: Amicus curiae; South Asian Bar Association of Northern California: Amicus curiae La Raza Lawyers Association of Sacramento: Amicus curiae;
1115 H Street Sacramento, CA 95814 Joshua Kaizuka Law Office of Denis White 901 H Street, Suite 101 Sacramento, CA 95814	Asian/Pacific Bar Association of Sacramento: Amicus curiae
Francisco Ugarte Dolores Street Community Services 938 Valencia Street San Francisco, CA 94110	Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto: Amicus curiae; Dolores Street Community Services: Amicus curiae; Educators for Fair Consideration: Amicus curiae; Bickel and Brewer Latino Institute for Human Rights at New York University School of Law: Amicus curiae

Juan Arturo Ramos Mexican American Bar Association of Los Angeles County 714 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 450 Los Angeles, CA 90015	Mexican American Bar Association of Los Angeles County : Amicus curiae
Arturo J. Gonzalez Morrison and Foerster LLP 425 Market Street San Francisco, CA 94105	California Latino Legislative Caucus : Amicus curiae
Angela Katherine Perone National Center for Lesbian Rights 870 Market Street, Suite 370 San Francisco, CA 94102	National Center for Lesbian Rights: Amicus curiae; Lambda Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc.: Amicus curiae
Raymond A. Cardozo Reed Smith LLP 101 Second Street, Suite 1800 San Francisco, CA 94105-3659	Michael A. Olivas: Amicus curiae; Holly S. Cooper: Amicus curiae; Karen Musalo: Amicus curiae; Hiroshi Motomura: Amicus curiae; Cruz Reynoso: Amicus curiae; Wendi Adelson: Amicus curiae; Deborah Anker: Amicus curiae; SabrinehArdalan: Amicus curiae; Kristina M. Campbell: Amicus curiae; Violeta R. Chapin: Amicus curiae; Michael J. Churgin: Amicus curiae; Alina Das: Amicus curiae; Nora V. Demleitner: Amicus curiae; Lauren Gilbert: Amicus curiae; Roberto Gonzales: Amicus curiae; PratheepanGulasekaram: Amicus curiae; Anjum Gupta: Amicus curiae; Laura A. Hernandez: Amicus curiae; Barbara Hines: Amicus curiae; Geoffrey Hoffman: Amicus curiae; Geoffrey Hoffman: Amicus curiae; Jennifer Lee Koh: Amicus curiae; Jennifer Lee Koh: Amicus curiae; Beth Lyon: Amicus curiae; FatmaMarouf: Amicus curiae; M. Isabel Medina: Amicus curiae; Nancy Morawetz: Amicus curiae;

Mark Noferi: Amicus curiae; Blake Nordahl: Amicus curiae Mariela Olivares: Amicus curiae Amagda Perez: Amicus curiae: Ediberto Roman: Amicus curiae Victor C. Romero: Amicus curiae: Ruben G. Rumbaut: Amicus curiae; Leticia Saucedo: Amicus curiae; Andrew Silverman: Amicus curiae: Deborah S. Smith: Amicus curiae: Devin T. Theriot-Orr: Amicus curiae; Diane K. Uchimiya: Amicus curiae; Michael S. Vastine: Amicus curiae: LetiVolpp: Amicus curiae; Jonathan Weinberg: Amicus curiae; Michael J. Wishnie: Amicus curiae; Stephen Yale-Loehr: Amicus curiae Jerome B. Falk Sandra L. Brooks: Amicus curiae: Arnold and Porter LLP Erwin Chemerinsky: Amicus curiae; Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor Christopher Edley, Jr.: Amicus curiae; San Francisco, CA 94111 Victor Gold: Amicus curiae: Rachel Moran: Amicus curiae: William A. Norris Drucilla S. Ramey: Amicus curiae; L. Rachel Lerman Frank H. Wu: Amicus curiae Akin Gump Strauss et al., LLP 2029 Century Park East, Suite 2400 Los Angeles, CA 90067 Jennifer C. Newell American Civil Liberties Union: Michael Tan Amicus curiae: **ACLU** Foundation American Immigration Lawyers Immigrants' Rights Project Association: Amicus curiae: 39 Drumm Street American Civil Liberties Union of San Francisco, CA 94111 Northern California: Amicus curiae: American Civil Liberties Union of San Bernard Pavel Wolfsdorf Diego and Imperial Counties: Amicus American Immigration Lawyers curiae: 1416 2nd Street American Civil Liberties Union of San Santa Monica, CA 90401 Diego and Imperial Counties: Amicus curiae: American Civil Liberties Union of Lee Gelernt American Civil Liberties Union Southern California: Amicus curiae; Immigrants' Rights Project Asian Law Caucus: Amicus curiae;

125 Broad Street, 18th Floor	Legal Aid Society - Employment Law
New York, NY 10004	Center : Amicus curiae;
	National Asian Pacific American Bar
	Association : Amicus curiae;
	National Immigration Law Center:
Alexis Yee-Garcia	Amicus curiae; Cesar Vargas : Amicus curiae
Orrick Herrington and Sutcliffe LLP	Cesai Vargas : Affileus curiae
405 Howard Street	
San Francisco, CA 94105-0001	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Cynthia J. Larsen	
Orrick Herrington and Sutcliffe LLP	
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 3000	[
Sacramento, CA 95814-4497	
Index Vivia	
Judy Kwan Orrick Herrington and Sutcliffe LLP	
777 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 3200	
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5855	
Bos inigolos, eri 90017 9099	
Jose Perez	
Latino Justice PRLDEF	
99 Hudson Street, 14th Floor	
New York, NY 10013	
Nicholás Espíritu	Amicus National Immigration Law
National Immigration Law Center	Center
3435 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2850	Center
Los Angeles, CA 90010	
Telephone: (213) 639-3900	
Brigit G. Alvarez	Joseph A. Vail Center for Immigrant
Joseph A. Vail Center For Immigrant	Rights : Amicus curiae
Rights	
448 S. Hill Street, Suite 615	
Los Angeles, CA 90013	
Nicholas Kierniesky	Amicus curiae
2 West Harrison Avenue	1 mineus curiac
Millville, NJ 08332	
Larry DeSha	Amicus curiae
5077 Via Cupertino	
Camarillo, CA 93012	

Tia Koonse UCLA Downtown Labor Center 675 South Park View Street Los Angeles, CA 90057	Dream Team Los Angeles : Amicus curiae; Orange County Dream Team : Amicus curiae; California Dream Network : Amicus curiae; San Fernando Valley Dream Team : Amicus curiae; United We Dream Network : Amicus curiae;
Howard B. Miller GIRARDI KEESE 1126 Wilshire Boulevard Los Angeles, California 90017	Attorney for Amicus Curiae California Latino Legislative Caucus
Nina A. Rabin Bacon Immigration Law & Policy Program UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA JAMES E. ROGERS COLLEGE OF LAW 1145 North Mountain Avenue Tucson, Arizona 85719	
Joshua Kaizuka Law Offices of Kaizuka & Valcarenghi 2530 J Street, Suite 320 Sacramento, CA 95816	Attorney for Amicus Curiae Asian/Pacific Bar Association of Sacramento
Tanya Broder National Immigration Law Center 405 14 th Street, Suite 401 Oakland, CA 94612	Attorneys for Amicus Curiae National Immigration Law Center
Ilyce Shugall Community Legal Services East Palo Alto 2117-B University Avenue East Palo Alto, CA 94303	Attorney for Amicus Curiae Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto