

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HUMANITARIAN LAW PROJECT,)	CASE NO.: CV 05-8047 ABC (RMCx)
et al.)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	FINAL JUDGMENT RE: PLAINTIFFS'
)	MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT,
v.)	DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS AND
)	CROSS-MOTION FOR SUMMARY
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF)	JUDGMENT, AND DEFENDANTS' MOTION
TREASURY, et al.)	FOR RECONSIDERATION
)	
Defendants.))	

This action came before the Court, the Honorable Audrey B. Collins presiding, on Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56, and on Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' claims in part under Fed. R. Civ. P 12(b)(1) for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and on Defendants' Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment. The issues presented by these Motions were heard on July 26, 2006. Upon the Court's request, the parties thereafter filed supplemental briefing on whether Plaintiffs had standing to bring one of their challenges. Upon submission of these briefs, an Order was issued by the Court on November 21, 2006. A Judgment was entered on January 24, 2007.

On January 30, 2007, Defendants filed a Motion for

1 Reconsideration in Part of the Court's Order and Judgment. Upon
2 consideration of the parties' briefs, the Court found the matter
3 appropriate for determination without oral argument and took it under
4 submission. On April 20, 2007, the Court issued an Order deciding
5 Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration.

6 In view of the two Court Orders on the parties' respective
7 motions, it is hereby ORDERED and ADJUDGED that:

8 This Judgment supercedes the Judgment entered on January 24,
9 2007. Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED. Defendants'
10 Motion to Dismiss and Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED in
11 part and DENIED in part, and Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration is
12 GRANTED, as follows:

13 1. The Court finds that Plaintiffs have standing to bring their
14 First Amendment challenge to Executive Order 13224, §
15 1(d)(ii), the "otherwise associated with" provision. The
16 Court therefore DENIES Defendants' Motion to Dismiss on this
17 ground.

18 2. The Court finds that Executive Order 13224, § 1(d)(ii), the
19 "otherwise associated with" provision, as it existed prior
20 to the January 26, 2007, issuance of 31 C.F.R. § 594.316,
21 was unconstitutionally vague on its face and overbroad.
22 However, the Court finds, upon reconsideration, that 31
23 C.F.R. § 594.316 cures the constitutional defects of
24 Executive Order 13224, § 1(d)(ii). Accordingly, the
25 injunction against enforcing Executive Order 13224, §
26 1(d)(ii) against Plaintiffs is hereby LIFTED.

27 //

28 //

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

3. In all other respects, Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED.

DATED: _____

AUDREY B. COLLINS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

