

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
MIAMI DIVISION**

CITY OF SOUTH MIAMI; FLORIDA IMMIGRANT COALITION, INC.; THE FARMWORKER ASSOCIATION OF FLORIDA INC.; FAMILY ACTION NETWORK MOVEMENT, INC.; QLATINX; WECOUNT!, INC.; WESTMINSTER PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH UNITED OF GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA, INC.; AMERICANS FOR IMMIGRANT JUSTICE, INC.; THE GUATEMALAN-MAYA CENTER, INC.; AND HOPE COMMUNITY CENTER, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RON DESANTIS, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA AND ASHLEY MOODY, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA,

Defendants.

Civil Action File No.

---

**JURY TRIAL  
DEMANDED**

**COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF  
AND DECLARATORY JUDGMENT**

Plaintiffs City of South Miami; Florida Immigrant Coalition, Inc. (“FLIC”), The Farmworker Association of Florida Inc. (“FWAF”), Family Action Network Movement, Inc. (“FANM”), QLatinx, and WeCount!, Inc. (“WeCount”), on behalf of their members and their organizations as a whole; Americans for Immigrant Justice, Inc. (“AI Justice”), The Guatemalan-Maya Center, Inc. (“GMC”), Hope Community Center, Inc., and Westminster Presbyterian Church United of Gainesville, Florida, Inc. (“Westminster”), on behalf of their organizations (collectively,

the “Plaintiffs”) sue Defendants Ron DeSantis, Governor of the State, of Florida, and Ashley Moody, Attorney General of the State of Florida.

## I. INTRODUCTION

1. On May 2, 2019, the Florida Legislature passed the anti-immigrant and unconstitutional Senate Bill 168, enacted as Chapter 908 of Florida Statutes (“SB 168”). *See* Exhibit 1 (Enacted Version of SB 168).

2. Described in the bill title as “[a]n act relating to federal immigration enforcement,” the original version of SB 168 was drafted by anti-immigrant hate groups, Floridians for Immigration Enforcement (“FLIMEN”) and The Federation for American Immigration Reform (“FAIR”).

3. Governor Ron DeSantis, who ran for office on an anti-immigrant platform, signed the bill into law on June 14, 2019.

4. Deemed by its sponsors an “anti-sanctuary cities law,” SB 168 impermissibly authorizes and requires state and local law enforcement to perform the functions of federal immigration agents. This encroaches into an area of exclusive federal authority and will interfere and conflict with the comprehensive federal immigration system enacted by Congress in violation of the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution. SB 168 targets immigrants and people of color throughout the state of Florida who will be subject to arrest for deportation by state and local police, under circumstances not permitted by the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”), even when the cities, and counties, and local law enforcement object.

5. SB 168 will lead to the erosion of trust in law enforcement, racial profiling, and the violation of the constitutional rights of hundreds of thousands of Floridians.

6. SB 168 will subject Floridians—including countless U.S. citizens and noncitizens who have permission from the federal government to remain in the United States—to racial profiling. Black and brown Floridians who may be perceived as “foreign” by state or local law enforcement will be in constant jeopardy of harassment and unlawfully prolonged detention and arrest by state and local law enforcement officers operating under SB 168.

7. Racial and national origin minorities who are victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking will be deterred from accessing services for crime, placing them at greater risk and undermining public safety.

8. As a result of SB 168, and under color of state law, Plaintiffs will be deprived of rights, privileges, or immunities guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution.

9. This action challenges SB 168 on multiple constitutional grounds to prevent imminent harm that Plaintiffs and other Floridians, including both U.S. citizens and noncitizens, will suffer if the law goes into effect.

10. Plaintiffs seek injunctive and declaratory relief to prevent such egregious unconstitutional actions from occurring in their communities.

A. KEY PROVISIONS OF SB 168

11. In addition to challenging SB 168 in its entirety, Plaintiffs specifically challenge sections 908.102(6), 908.103, 908.104(1), 908.104(4), 908.105(1), and 908.106.

12. Section 908.102(6) defines sanctuary policies.

908.102 Definitions.—As used in this chapter, the term: . . . (6) ‘Sanctuary policy’ means a law, policy, practice, procedure, or custom adopted or allowed by a state entity or local governmental entity which prohibits or impedes a law enforcement agency from complying with 8 U.S.C. s. 1373 or which prohibits or impedes a law enforcement agency from communicating or cooperating with a federal immigration agency so as to limit such law enforcement agency in, or prohibit the agency from: (a) Complying with an immigration detainer; (b) Complying with a request

from a federal immigration agency to notify the agency before the release of an inmate or detainee in the custody of the law enforcement agency; (c) Providing a federal immigration agency access to an inmate for interview; (d) Participating in any program or agreement authorized under section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. s. 1357; or (e) Providing a federal immigration agency with an inmate's incarceration status or release date.

13. Section 908.103 bans sanctuary policies.

Sanctuary policies prohibited. — A state entity, law enforcement agency, or local governmental entity may not adopt or have in effect a sanctuary policy.

14. Section 908.104(1) mandates the use of “best efforts” to support the enforcement of federal immigration law.

908.104 Cooperation with federal immigration authorities. —

(1) A law enforcement agency shall use best efforts to support the enforcement of federal immigration law. This subsection applies to an official, representative, agent, or employee of the entity or agency only when he or she is acting within the scope of his or her official duties or within the scope of his or her employment.

15. Section 908.104(4) deals with transportation across state lines.

908.104 Cooperation with federal immigration authorities.— . . . (4) When a county correctional facility or the Department of Corrections receives verification from a federal immigration agency that a person subject to an immigration detainer is in the law enforcement agency's custody, the agency may securely transport the person to a federal facility in this state or to another point of transfer to federal custody outside the jurisdiction of the law enforcement agency. The law enforcement agency may transfer a person who is subject to an immigration detainer and is confined in a secure correctional facility to the custody of a federal immigration agency not earlier than 12 days before his or her release date. A law enforcement agency shall obtain judicial authorization before securely transporting an alien to a point of transfer outside of this state.

16. Section 908.105(1) mandates arrests for civil immigration violations upon receipt of an immigration detainer request.

908.105 Duties related to immigration detainers. — (1) A law enforcement agency that has custody of a person subject to an immigration detainer issued by a federal immigration agency shall: (a) Provide to the judge



authorized to grant or deny the person's release on bail under chapter 903 notice that the person is subject to an immigration detainer. (b) Record in the person's case file that the person is subject to an immigration detainer. (c) Upon determining that the immigration detainer is in accordance with s. 908.102(2), comply with the requests made in the immigration detainer.

17. Section 908.106 requires agreements with ICE.

Reimbursement of costs. — Each county correctional facility shall enter into an agreement or agreements with a federal immigration agency for temporarily housing persons who are the subject of immigration detainees and for the payment of the costs of housing and detaining those persons. A compliant agreement may include any contract between a correctional facility and a federal immigration agency for housing or detaining persons subject to immigration detainees, such as basic ordering agreements in effect on or after July 1, 2019, agreements authorized by section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. s. 1357, or successor agreements and other similar agreements authorized by federal law.

## II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

18. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, because this action arises under the U.S. Constitution and laws of the United States, and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1343, because this action seeks to redress the deprivation, under color of state law, of Plaintiffs' civil rights and to secure equitable or other relief for the violation of those rights.

19. This Court has jurisdiction to grant declaratory relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 57.

20. Venue is proper in the Southern District of Florida under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred or will occur in this District or Division and a substantial number of Plaintiffs are located in this judicial district. Defendants are sued in their official capacity. Each Defendant resides within the State of Florida.

### III. PARTIES

21. **Plaintiff City of South Miami (“South Miami”)** is a municipal corporation organized under the laws of the State of Florida and is located in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

22. South Miami’s leadership consists of the Mayor, Vice-Mayor, and three City Commissioners who are responsible for adopting an annual budget and establishing policies and local laws and ordinances.

23. South Miami has an estimated population of 12,219. Approximately 43.1% of the City identifies as Hispanic or Latino, 17.8% identifies as Black or African-American, and 4.8% identifies as being of Asian descent. Families make up approximately 56% of the City of South Miami’s population. Immigrants make up part of South Miami’s community.

24. The South Miami Police Department (“SMPD”) is an integral arm of the City of South Miami as a full-service law enforcement agency with approximately 48 sworn positions and eight civilian staff.

25. In 2017, South Miami adopted Resolution 028-17-14829 (“Resolution”) that limits SMPD’s entanglement with federal immigration enforcement.

26. The Resolution provides that immigration detainers will not be honored as a matter of course and was passed to avoid repeating past incidents of entanglement between SMPD with federal immigration agents from U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) that resulted in South Miami residents being detained and deported. These incidents involved a request from ICE that SMPD enter a South Miami resident’s home to turn the individual over to ICE, ICE participation in SMPD checkpoints for driving under intoxication, and an investigation by SMPD into immigration matters of a legal permanent resident.

27. SMPD receives immigration detainer requests to arrest individuals for civil immigration violations, but SMPD does not carry out these arrests automatically. The Miami-Dade County Police Department, however, has a policy of arresting people on all immigration detainers. The Miami-Dade County Police Department occasionally conducts operations inside South Miami without notifying SMPD, and South Miami uses the county's police services for homicide investigations and SWAT.

28. South Miami believes SB 168 does not provide South Miami, SMPD, or its residents any actual and understandable notice of the statutory requirements that apply to their conduct.

29. South Miami is not clear as to which portions of SB 168 apply to it, making it difficult to attempt compliance.

30. South Miami believes that it may be deemed out of compliance with SB 168 by Defendant DeSantis, which will lead to (1) the suspension without pay of its leadership, including its Mayor, Vice-Mayor, and Commissioners; and (2) a lawsuit by Defendant DeSantis and Defendant Moody.

31. South Miami believes that attempts to comply with SB 168 will lead to liability in damage lawsuits by residents and visitors against South Miami or SMPD.

32. **Plaintiff Florida Immigrant Coalition ("FLIC")** is a non-profit organization and statewide coalition of more than 50 member organizations and over 100 allies. FLIC is based in Miami, Florida and has staff covering six counties throughout Florida. FLIC's member organizations are located in over twenty Florida counties.

33. Some of FLIC's members and constituents lack immigration status, are the parents of children born abroad, or U.S. Citizen children of parents born abroad.

34. FLIC works with people of different status from the undocumented to citizens, those with Temporary Protected Status (“TPS”), Legal Permanent Resident (“LPR”) status, and refugees, including many immigrants who are subject to arrest due to an immigration detainer request.

35. FLIC’s mission is to grow the connection, consciousness, and capacity of immigrant families, organizations and communities so that everyone can live, love, and labor without fear.

36. FLIC has several campaigns and programs to advocate and assist the Florida immigrant community, such as driver’s licenses, a Farmworker Caucus, immigration reform, a Florida New Americans program to help people on a path to naturalization, English classes, access to college, wage theft, public education, and voter registration.

37. FLIC also operates a toll-free hotline that provides information to immigrant communities, allies, and concerned stakeholders as it relates to citizenship, access to college, detention and deportation, and other basic social needs.

38. FLIC has diverted resources away from some of these campaigns and programs as a result of the enactment of SB 168.

39. The uncertainty surrounding the meaning of SB 168 and how it will be implemented in different parts of Florida has strained FLIC’s staff and resources as they work to try and answer the immigrant community’s questions regarding SB 168.

40. FLIC’s toll-free hotline has received more than twice the normal number of calls it normally receives. Due to the increase in questions regarding SB 168, FLIC has been forced to change the hotline script to address SB 168.

41. FLIC's services, organizing, civic engagement, and administration teams have all had a significant increase in work to respond to the passage of SB 168. Since SB 168 passed, approximately 45% of FLIC's staff time has been devoted to answering questions and responding to needs related to the implementation of SB 168. This diversion of resources has resulted in a major reduction of time spend on FLIC's core work and programs. Moreover, FLIC has had to rely more heavily on volunteers as a stopgap measure in an attempt to meet the overwhelming needs regarding detention and deportation, immigration policy, and immigration law.

42. The work caused by SB 168 has taken time away from existing priorities for FLIC's other programs and initiatives, such as family separation, child detention deaths, the census citizenship question, and DACA.

43. FLIC will be forced to continue to divert resources from the communications, fundraising, and development departments, as well as other programs, to address issues relating to SB 168, including an increase in the arrests of individual members and members of its organizational members due to racial profiling. These limitations will hinder FLIC's future ability to respond and provide support to its members and the immigrant communities.

44. **Plaintiff The Farmworker Association of Florida ("FWAF")** is a non-profit organization with headquarters in Apopka, Florida, and offices throughout the state, including Homestead, Fellsmere, Immokalee, and Pierson, Florida.

45. FWAF is a grassroots and community-based farmworker membership organization with over 10,000 Haitian, Latinx, and African American members.

46. FWAF serves seasonal workers as well as migrant workers who travel with the seasons to harvest crops. FWAF's members include immigrants who are both documented and undocumented, including some who are subject to immigration detainers.

47. FWAF's mission is to build power among farmworker and rural low-income communities, to respond to and gain control over the social, political, economic, workplace, health, and environmental justice issues that impact their lives. FWAF's programs include civic participation, advocacy, worker's rights, health and safety, and immigrant rights.

48. The passage of SB 168 has already substantially diverted scarce organizational resources away from FWAF's health and safety and civic engagement work.

49. FWAF staff has devoted additional time to train existing volunteers and new volunteers on SB 168. Since SB 168 passed, FWAF has started providing more Know Your Rights ("KYR") presentations, holding member meetings regarding SB 168, and sending out information and communications to its members and the immigrant community.

50. FWAF staff have received more calls each day since SB 168 passed, including calls with concerns regarding deportation, travel in Florida, family separation when a parent is detained, and how FWAF can help once SB 168 goes into effect.

51. Because of SB 168, FWAF is working on developing a rapid response strategy to ICE arrests and raids in anticipation of an increased ICE presence in the communities it serves. FWAF is preparing itself for a surge in deportations when SB 168 goes into effect by identifying attorneys and counselors for referrals and working with a coalition of organizations to provide a rideshare service.

52. The increase in FWAF staff's time and focus on SB 168 is driven by the needs of FWAF's membership.

53. FWAF lacks the funds to increase its staffing to educate the community on SB 168 and its consequences. FWAF must now divert resources to fundraise in an attempt to address this deficit.

54. FWAF anticipates that the community impact of SB 168, including arrests and detentions, will continue to divert FWAF's resources from its core mission of strengthening farmworker communities through its different programs and normal organizing work.

55. FWAF also expects rapid response alerts will take staff time away from other work, such as civic engagement and health and safety.

56. FWAF expects that there will be less immigrant community participation in important health clinics and other services that FWAF offers due to concerns about transportation, thereby requiring new strategies and additional outreach.

57. **Plaintiff Family Action Network Movement ("FANM")** is a social services non-profit organization located in Little Haiti in Miami-Dade County, Florida, home to one of the largest Haitian immigration communities in the United States.

58. FANM's mission is to empower low to moderate income families socially, financially, and politically through counseling, services, organizing, and advocacy.

59. FANM has approximately 300 members, who are mostly Haitian immigrants and families of mixed immigration statuses, including United States citizens, lawful permanent residents, Temporary Protected Status ("TPS") recipients, and many undocumented immigrants.

60. FANM's members reside in Miami-Dade and Broward counties.

61. FANM has six main program areas: Family Intervention and Empowerment; Health Promotion and Prevention; Youth Development and Leadership; Immigration Services and Advocacy; Community Economic Development; and Adult Education.

62. Through its various program areas, FANM provides approximately 6,000 beneficiaries throughout Florida with a wide-range of social services and programs every year,

including but not limited to counseling, health education, language instruction, financial literacy and planning, small business development, afterschool programs, and legal case referrals.

63. Additionally, FANM is involved in community organizing and advocacy on many pressing issues impacting Haitian immigrants and families, including local campaigns to combat gentrification and inequitable development in Little Haiti and a national campaign to protect TPS for Haitians and other affected immigrants.

64. Since the time SB 168 was filed and passed, FANM has been forced to respond to an increase in inquiries from members and community residents concerned about SB 168's impact on Haitian immigrants and families.

65. FANM has hosted community meetings to educate its members and community residents on immigration detainers and the impact of SB 168, translated informational materials on SB 168 into Haitian-Creole, and responded to office visits, calls, and emails requesting information on SB 168.

66. Because of SB 168, FANM has been forced to divert resources and staff time away from other programs, services, and campaigns.

67. As SB 168 is implemented, FANM expects it will be forced to devote even more resources, time, and attention to inform members about how the SB 168 is being implemented and to assist members who are stopped, arrested, and/or deported in Miami-Dade and Broward because of SB 168.

68. Given FANM's predominately Black membership, FANM anticipates that SB 168 will have an acute impact on its members and lead to increased racial profiling, police scrutiny, and criminalization of its members, documented and undocumented, who will be at risk of being subject to immigration detainers.



69. FANM's continued diversion of resources to address issues related to SB 168 and its implementation will hinder its ability to dedicate the resources, time, and attention needed to effectively implement its other programs, services, and campaigns.

70. **Plaintiff QLatinx** is an educational advocacy and support group located in Orlando, Florida.

71. QLatinx was founded as an unincorporated association in response to the 2016 mass shooting at Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida during the LGBTQ+ establishment's Latinx-themed night. QLatinx brought together members of the local community directly impacted by this tragedy to build a supportive infrastructure, address inequity, and promote inclusionary practices for local leadership and partnering agencies.

72. The QLatinx mission is to center and empower the most marginalized members of its community, establish affirming and supportive healing spaces, build a strong and united community, and work towards a society free of fear, violence, and hate.

73. QLatinx has created several initiatives and programs, including immigration advocacy; a multicultural education series that explores various traditions through music, language, and cuisine; a Social Justice Institute; a series of workshops and trainings on diversity, inclusion, and social equity for corporations, nonprofits, and government agencies to bolster diversity and inclusion efforts; and an HIV prevention and education initiative.

74. The passage of SB 168 has already substantially diverted scarce organizational resources away from QLatinx's work on its non-immigration programs and services as well as its own organizational development to grow into a self-sustaining non-profit organization. QLatinx had to hire an additional staff member to focus on the immigration issues that arose after SB 168 passed.

75. QLatinx anticipates additional immigration work and a reallocation of staff time to work on immigration issues after it becomes clear how SB 168 is implemented by law enforcement in Orlando, Florida and surrounding areas.

76. QLatinx anticipates it will need to address the isolation of its documented and undocumented immigrant members due to the fear of being racially profiled and arrested, thereby making them unable to access the greater community in Orlando, healthcare, social spaces, and learning spaces that are LGBTQ competent.

77. QLatinx was instrumental in getting the City of Orlando to adopt a Trust Act resolution on July 23, 2018. QLatinx has been working to expand these efforts across the region. Because of SB168's restriction on sanctuary policies, a regional Trust Act for central Florida will likely be stalled and prevent QLatinx from advancing efforts to create a more welcoming and affirming central Florida.

78. **Plaintiff WeCount! (“WeCount”)** is a community-based, non-profit organization located in Homestead, Florida. WeCount serves the areas of Homestead and Florida City.

79. WeCount has approximately 200 members, including immigrant adults and youth of mixed immigration statuses. Many of its members, documented and undocumented, could be subject to immigration detainers. The majority of WeCount's members are Mexican and Central American immigrants who work in farm work, plant nursery work, and construction.

80. WeCount's mission is to build the power of Latin American immigrants in Homestead, Florida through education, support, and collective action.

81. WeCount has three main projects: education, support, and collective action.

82. WeCount provides members and community residents with language instruction, computer literacy classes, and workshops on wage theft, workplace health and safety, and

immigration. WeCount also hosts a community radio station, “Radio Poder,” that broadcasts music and educational information to Homestead residents in Spanish and indigenous languages.

83. WeCount supports members affected by workplace and immigration issues by assisting members and their families with filling out necessary paperwork, accompanying members through complaint processes, hosting screening clinics with legal service organizations, offering case referrals, and providing social, emotional, and psychological support.

84. WeCount is also involved in collective action and organizing campaigns, including a Planting Justice (“Sembrando Justicia”) campaign to improve the wages and working conditions of plant nursery workers in South Florida and a campaign to close the Homestead Detention Center, where thousands of immigrant children are being detained. These campaigns have included publishing a research report, organizing marches and events, coordinating community coalitions, and meeting with elected officials.

85. Because of SB 168, WeCount has been forced to divert its limited staff’s time, attention, and resources away from its education, support, and collective action projects.

86. Since SB 168 was filed and passed, WeCount has been forced to divert time, attention, and resources to educate its members and community residents on SB 168 and to respond to an increase in inquiries from members and community residents concerned about SB 168’s impact on immigrant families in Homestead.

87. SB 168 has caused a growing fear and concern in WeCount’s membership and in the immigrant community of Homestead. Because of the confusion around SB 168 and its implementation, many of WeCount’s members are fearful of interacting with local law enforcement agencies and being subject to racial profiling and police harassment.

88. Due to SB 168, WeCount anticipates that many of its members will be less willing to report crimes, pursue medical assistance at hospitals, and interact with government agencies.

89. WeCount expects to expend even more time and resources responding to SB 168, including updating members on the implementation of SB 168 and supporting members who are arrested, placed on immigration detainers, or have issues with the police due to SB 168. These activities related to SB 168 will force WeCount to further divert its scarce organizational resources and will harm the organization and its members.

90. **Plaintiff Westminster Presbyterian Church United of Gainesville, Florida, Inc. (“Westminster”)** is a non-profit corporation and house of worship with approximately 105 members located in Gainesville, Florida.

91. Westminster’s mission is to nurture, equip, and send out disciples to be Christ’s ministers of compassion, healing and peace in their daily lives.

92. Westminster hosts worship services, bible study, and community classes each week. Westminster also partners with several other organizations to participate in a variety of programming and work on issues relating to homelessness, housing, medical care, education, food scarcity, and economic diversity.

93. Westminster declared itself a sanctuary church approximately two years ago and converted a building behind the church into a sanctuary house for those who are facing deportation and are in the process of either appealing or filing for asylum to care for and serve those in need of shelter and protection.

94. Since SB 168 passed, Westminster has received an increase in requests for referrals to immigration attorneys, and inquiries about the requirements to stay in the sanctuary house, whether Westminster’s ability to provide the sanctuary house will be affected by SB 168, and how

local law enforcement will respond to SB 168 in Alachua County. The increase in these requests, along with attempting to understand how SB 168 will be interpreted by Alachua County law enforcement has created additional work for Westminster since SB 168 passed.

95. Before SB 168 was enacted, the Alachua County Sheriff's Office maintained a policy of not arresting people with an immigration detainer, except in very limited circumstances.<sup>1</sup>

96. Westminster anticipates a sharp increase in requests for personalized assistance, housing in Westminster's sanctuary house, access to resources, and support in managing the emotional harm to families affected by SB 168. Because of SB 168, the Alachua County Sheriff will begin arresting people when immigration authorities lodge detainer requests.<sup>2</sup> Meeting community needs as a result of this increase in arrests will divert time and resources away from the other services and events that Westminster provides to the local and immigrant community.

97. **Plaintiff Americans for Immigrant Justice, Inc. ("AI Justice")** is a non-profit law and advocacy organization that protects and promotes the basic human rights of immigrants. AI Justice is located in Miami-Dade County, Florida and has served over 130,000 immigrants from all over the world since it was founded in 1996.

98. AI Justice's mission is to protect and promote the basic human rights of immigrants through a unique combination of free direct services, impact litigation, policy reform, and public education at local, state, and national levels.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cindy Swirko, *Alachua Sheriff Won't Join ICE Pilot Program*, The Gainesville Sun, Jan. 18, 2018, available at <https://www.gainesville.com/news/20180118/alachua-sheriff-wont-join-ice-pilot-program>.

<sup>2</sup> Cindy Swirko, *Sheriff Will Hold Inmates 48 Hours for ICE*, The Gainesville Sun, June 18, 2019, available at <https://www.gainesville.com/news/20190618/sheriff-will-hold-inmates-48-hours-for-ice>.

99. AI Justice represents numerous undocumented individuals, including some who are subject to immigration detainers, through its various programs.

100. AI Justice's programs include family defense, advocacy, litigation, children's legal, domestic violence and human trafficking ("Lucha Program"), and detention. These programs served over 9,000 individual clients in 2018 alone.

101. Since SB 168 passed, AI Justice has seen an increase in attendees at its in-office intakes, clients concerned about their possible detention and removal due to SB 168, and questions about the law's significance during screenings and KYR presentations.

102. AI Justice has experienced a dramatic increase in calls and emails from social service and community-based organizations seeking guidance on whether immigrant victims should continue to report domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking to local law enforcement. AI Justice has noticed that more trafficking and domestic abuse victims are hesitant to report crimes because they are confused about the implications of SB 168.

103. SB 168 threatens twenty years of AI Justice's work with local law enforcement to ensure that victims are unafraid of the police and will force AI Justice to shift its resources to assessing whether it is safe for a victim to report a crime post-SB 168 and training social service providers that interact with immigrant victims.

104. Because SB 168's ultimate implementation is unclear, AI Justice has had to put additional work into evaluating the law to respond to inquiries from clients and the community. AI Justice has also incorporated information about SB 168 into its KYR and general immigration presentations.

105. As SB 168 is implemented throughout Florida, AI Justice anticipates an increase in work across all its projects.

106. AI Justice expects an increase in immigrants who are arrested and detained due to SB 168, along with a corresponding increase in the detained population. AI Justice is concerned that it will be unable to stretch its limited resources to meet the needs of the detained population.

107. AI Justice also expects an increase in requests for presentations, advice, and counsel regarding SB 168.

108. Depending on how school systems throughout Florida interpret and implement SB 168, AI Justice expects a significant amount of resources will be diverted to advocating for the rights of undocumented children in public schools.

109. AI Justice also expects to divert resources from representing immigrant victims in their immigration matters in several of its programs, to educating and advising other social and legal service providers on how to proceed in light of SB 168.

110. **Plaintiff The Guatemalan-Maya Center, Inc. (“GMC”)** is a non-profit organization located in Lake Worth, Florida.

111. GMC was founded in 1992 to address the dire need for prenatal care for indigenous women in Palm Beach County and provide cultural interpretation for the medical community.

112. GMC’s mission is to foster a nurturing, stable and culturally diverse environment to empower those victimized by violence to seek justice and to build community.

113. GMC provides several programs for immigrant and refugee families in Palm Beach County, including early childhood education programs and case management services relating to health care, education, public safety, emergency management, housing, and legal needs.

114. In addition to its regular programs, GMC also seeks to respond to the community’s concerns regarding immigration issues and address fears of ever-changing immigration policies.

115. The majority of the clients served by GMC are undocumented or come from families of mixed legal status.

116. Since SB 168 passed, GMC has participated in calls and virtual meetings with local organizations in response to SB 168 and responded to community members requests for clarification regarding SB 168 due to inconsistent messages from Palm Beach Sheriff's Office regarding how they will handle immigration detainer requests.

117. GMC has also seen incidents of miscommunication between local law enforcement and individuals who speak indigenous languages.

118. GMC has noticed a recent increase in the number of immigrants being arrested by local law enforcement for minor infractions such as fishing after hours or driving without a license.

119. Many of GMC's immigrant clients fear contacting local enforcement and being stopped by local law enforcement officials due to their race or color. Many also fear that local law enforcement will act as ICE agents to raid their homes and arrest them for ICE.

120. GMC anticipates an increase in its need to respond to misinformation and its clients' requests for assistance as SB 168 is implemented.

121. As the implementation of SB 168 unfolds, the increase in demand for assistance will require GMC to divert case managers from existing caseloads in order to provide Know Your Rights presentations and legal screenings and to respond to requests for referrals to attorneys, and other types of assistance that GMC does not currently provide.

122. The additional work brought about by SB 168 will be a significant drain on GMC's resources.

123. **Plaintiff Hope Community Center, Inc. ("Hope Community Center")** is a non-profit faith-based organization located in Apopka, Florida. Hope Community Center is a service-



learning community dedicated to the empowerment of Central Florida's immigrant and working poor communities through education, advocacy and spiritual growth.

124. Hope Community Center's mission is to cultivate self-determined communities through personal, social, and communal transformation and its vision is to be the premier center of hope and empowerment for central Florida's immigrant and working poor communities.

125. Hope Community Center serves approximately 6,600 people each year in Lake, Orange, Seminole, Volusia, and Osceola counties. Many of the families with whom Hope Community Center works with are of mixed immigration status, having at least one family member who is undocumented, including some who are subject to immigration detainers.

126. Hope Community Center's programs and services include immigration, education, service learning, community organizing, and youth and families.

127. Since SB 168 passed, Hope Community Center has diverted resources from its non-immigration programs due to additional work relating to SB 168. For example, Hope Community Center organized forums on SB 168 and legal clinics to aid in the preparation of power of attorneys for the immigrant community in anticipation of increased deportations and separated families.

128. Hope Community Center has been researching how local police will proceed with detaining community members for minor traffic infractions once SB 168 is implemented.

129. Hope Community Center has been working on responding to an increase in members' needs arising from the fear of being racially profiled due to SB 168. Hope Community Center has been organizing transportation for people who need to attend court, preparing educational materials on SB 168, and researching other arrest scenarios that may come up due to SB 168.

130. Hope Community Center expects that its resources, staff time, and funds will continue to be diverted from its other programs and services such as child education, family educational services, service learning, community organizing, and family work. Specifically, Hope Community Center anticipates diverting more staff time to creating circles of protection for the immigrant community in Apopka by providing information and education regarding their rights.

131. Hope Community Center also plans to work on a rapid response project to assist the anticipated increase in detained members.

A. Defendants

132. **Defendant Ron DeSantis** is the Governor of Florida. Pursuant to Article IV Section 1(a) of the Florida Constitution, Defendant DeSantis is vested with the “supreme executive” power in Florida and is constitutionally required to “take care that the laws be faithfully executed.” Fla. Const. Art. IV, § 1(a).

133. SB 168 provides that “[a]ny executive or administrative state, county, or municipal officer who violates his or her duties under this chapter may be subject to action by the Governor in the exercise of his or her authority under the State Constitution and state law.” Fla. Stat. § 908.107(1).

134. SB 168 further provides that pursuant to Article IV Section 1(b) of the Florida Constitution, “the Governor may initiate judicial proceedings in the name of the state against such officers to enforce compliance with any duty under this chapter or restrain any unauthorized act contrary to this chapter” Fla. Stat. § 908.107(1).

135. Article IV Section 1(b) of the Florida Constitution states that “[t]he governor may initiate judicial proceedings in the name of the state against any executive or administrative state,

county or municipal officer to enforce compliance with any duty or restrain any unauthorized act.” Fla. Const. Art. IV, § 1(b).

136. Article IV Section 7(a) of the Florida Constitution provides that “[b]y executive order stating the grounds and filed with the custodian of state records, the governor may suspend from office any state officer not subject to impeachment, any officer of the militia not in the active service of the United States, or any county officer, for malfeasance, misfeasance, neglect of duty, drunkenness, incompetence, permanent inability to perform official duties, or commission of a felony, and may fill the office by appointment for the period of suspension. The suspended officer may at any time before removal be reinstated by the governor.” Fla. Const. Art. IV, § 7(a).

137. Therefore, Defendant DeSantis is responsible for the enforcement of SB 168 in the State of Florida and is an appropriate defendant in this case.

138. Defendant DeSantis is sued in his official capacity.

139. **Defendant Ashley Moody** is the Attorney General of Florida, the chief legal officer of the state. Fla. Const. Art. IV, § 4(b).

140. The Attorney General is required to appear in the courts on behalf of the State of Florida. Fla. Stat. § 16.01(4).

141. SB 168 provides that the “Attorney General may file suit against a local governmental entity or local law enforcement agency in a court of competent jurisdiction for declaratory or injunctive relief for a violation of this chapter.” Fla. Stat. § 908.107(2).

142. Therefore, Defendant Moody is responsible for the enforcement of SB 168 in the State of Florida and is an appropriate defendant in this case.

143. Defendant Moody is sued in her official capacity.

#### IV. FACTS

A. SB 168 Intentionally Incorporates Racial and National Origin Animus into Florida Law

144. SB 168 is an overly broad law that is rooted in anti-immigrant animus and makes state and local agencies enforcers of immigration law.

145. The original version of SB 168 was drafted by anti-immigrant hate groups, the Federation for American Immigration Reform (“FAIR”) and their Florida-state affiliate, Floridians for Immigration Enforcement (“FLIMEN”), who recruited Florida state representatives to turn their anti-immigrant agenda into state law. Additionally, sponsors of SB 168 used biased data provided by FAIR and its sister organization, the Center for Immigration Studies (“CIS”), in their staff analysis of the bill.

146. FAIR and its sister organization, CIS, have both designated as hate groups by the Southern Poverty Law Center (“SPLC”).<sup>3</sup>

147. FAIR and CIS were both founded by John Tanton, an avowed white supremacist whose history of racism, xenophobia, and current influence in anti-immigrant legislation and politics is well documented.<sup>4</sup>

148. FLIMEN is an anti-immigrant group closely associated with FAIR.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See “*Center for Immigration Studies*,” Southern Poverty Law Center, available at <https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/group/center-immigration-studies>.

<sup>4</sup> See “*Ties Between Anti-Immigrant Movement and Eugenics*,” Anti-Defamation League, February 22, 2013, available at <https://www.adl.org/news/article/ties-between-anti-immigrant-movement-and-eugenics> ; see also Jessica Cobian, “*The Anti-Immigrant Extremists in Charge of the U.S. Immigration System*,” Center for American Progress, June 24, 2019, available at <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/news/2019/06/24/471398/anti-immigrant-extremists-charge-u-s-immigration-system/>.

<sup>5</sup> In 2010, FLIMEN’s site indicated then-president, Janet Renner, and vice president and founder, David Caulkett, serve as “Florida state advisors” for FAIR. That same year, FAIR listed FLIMEN on its page under “Join a Local Immigration Reform Group.” In November 2018, FAIR President Dan Stein hosted Caulkett on FAIR’s podcast to discuss FLIMEN’s influence over legislation in Florida. As of June 2019, Caulkett is listed as a “Florida State Advisor for FAIR” on FLIMEN’s site.

149. On December 13, 2016, FILMEN's former legislative director Jack Oliver emailed Senator Aaron Bean (District 4)'s office seeking a sponsor for a mandatory E-Verify and anti-sanctuary city bill the organization had drafted.<sup>6</sup>

150. One month later, David Caulkett, FLIMEN's founder and Florida state advisor for FAIR, left a voicemail for Sen. Bean asking him to be the Senate sponsor for an E-verify bill his organization had already written.<sup>7</sup>

151. In December 2018, Florida Senators Bean and Joe Gruters (District 23) filed anti-sanctuary bills—SB 168 and SB 170 respectively—in the state Senate that closely resembled the model legislation sent by FLIMEN in the December 2016 email.<sup>8</sup> In fact, the final bill as passed retains many remnants of FAIR's model legislation, including four near-identical sentences. *See* Exhibit 5 (Enacted Version of SB 168 with Language in Common from Model Legislation Highlighted).

---

<sup>6</sup> Mr. Oliver emailed Senator Bean stating: "Floridians for Immigration Enforcement is seeking sponsorship for our mandatory E-Verify bill and our anti-sanctuary city bill ... I know you have taken a stand for the citizens of Florida on immigration issues in the past and hope that you will take a stand this legislative session by being a sponsor for these important bills." *See* Exhibit 2 (FOIA-produced Electronic Correspondence dated December 13, 2016). Mr. Oliver attached model legislation for both bills to the email.

<sup>7</sup> Senator Bean's aide detailed the content of the voicemail in an email. The aide said the message was "asking the Senator to sponsor their e-verify bill which they have already written. They currently have a House sponsor but need a Senate sponsor." *See* FOIA-produced Electronic Correspondence, *available at* <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/5730601-Jan-23-2017-FLIMEN-Sen-Bean-Email.html>.

<sup>8</sup> *See* Exhibit 3(FAIR Anti-Sanctuary Model Legislation). *See also* Exhibit 4 (Version of SB 168 Bill Filed on December 18, 2018 with Language in Common from Model Legislation Highlighted) and Exhibit 5 (Enacted Version of SB 168 with Language in Common from Model Legislation Highlighted).

152. The staff analysis used by sponsors of SB 168, relied on biased information from FAIR and CIS to accuse multiple cities of still operating as “sanctuary” jurisdictions in Florida.<sup>9</sup> See Exhibit 6, (Excerpt from Florida Senate’s Staff Analysis of SB 168).

153. On March 12, 2019 during a Florida Senate committee meeting, Senator Janet Cruz (District 18) questioned Senator Gruters about the staff analysis in support of the bill: “I researched that both of the institutions whose estimates were mentioned [CIS and FAIR] have been deemed anti-immigrant hate groups ... with foundational principles in white nationalism and connections to white supremacists. So, my question is how was this used? Why did we use them? How did this happen in our analysis?”<sup>10</sup>

154. In April 2019, Representatives of FLIMEN once again emailed and coordinated with Florida legislators, including Florida Senator Gruters and Florida Representative Cord Byrd, during the Florida Legislative Session to push SB 168 and HB 527 forward.<sup>11</sup>

155. On April 17, 2019 Florida Senator Gruters and Representative Byrd sponsored and participated in a press conference planned by FLIMEN, who hosted and invited speakers Amapola Hansberger and Yvonne Larsen. Hansberger and Larsen are well-known for their fear-mongering

---

<sup>9</sup> See Jerry Iannelli, “Florida GOP Chair Is Consulting With Groups Linked to White Nationalists,” March 27, 2019 available at <https://www.miaminewtimes.com/news/florida-gop-chair-joe-gruters-consulted-with-fair-group-linked-to-white-nationalists-11130302>.

<sup>10</sup> See Senate Committee Meeting at 1:27:48, March 12, 2019, available at [http://www.flSenate.gov/media/VideoPlayer?EventID=2443575804\\_2019031164&Redirect=true](http://www.flSenate.gov/media/VideoPlayer?EventID=2443575804_2019031164&Redirect=true)

<sup>11</sup> See Exhibit 7 (FOIA-produced Electronic Correspondence dated April 15, 2019 and April 19, 2019).

and hateful rhetoric toward immigrants.<sup>12</sup> During the press conference, Hansberger warned that “[undocumented people] will kill you.”<sup>13</sup>

156. SB 168 was drafted by these anti-immigrant hate groups to spread fear in the state. As a result of their successful attempt to rope Florida representatives into promoting their hateful ideals, Floridians must now bear the consequences of an unconstitutional law.

#### *Pre-emption of Federal Law*

157. In enacting SB 168, the Florida legislature legislated in an area committed exclusively to the federal government under the U.S. Constitution and the Immigration and Nationality Act.

158. The legislative record and public comments from proponents and sponsors of SB 168 make it clear that a primary motivating factor in passing this law was the Florida Legislature’s

---

<sup>12</sup> Hansberger is the founder and president of Legal Immigrants for America (LIFA). LIFA is a group that advocates for “ending citizenship to anchor babies” and restricting immigration to English speakers only. See “LIFA GOALS!” (listing “requiring proficiency in English”) at <https://www.golifa.com/lifa-goals/>; see also “LIFA Sends Letters to Congress in Support of Ending U.S. Citizenship to Anchor Babies,” (Aug. 17, 2017), <https://www.golifa.com/lifa-sends-letters-to-congress-in-support-of-ending-us-citizenship-to-anchor-babies/>. LIFA also falsely blames undocumented immigrants for “increased crime rates, lower standards of education, and the declining home values where they live.” See LIFA Facebook page, “*Our Story*,” (Dec. 26, 2019), [https://www.facebook.com/pg/4golifa/about/?ref=page\\_internal](https://www.facebook.com/pg/4golifa/about/?ref=page_internal). Yvonne Larsen is a member of the Remembrance Project, whose founder Maria Espinoza, propagates hate speech against undocumented immigrants. For example, a March 2014 Facebook post by Espinoza read, “Child molestation and rape are very numerous in this illegal alien demographic!” See Anti-Defamation League, “*Anti-Immigrant Activist Maria Espinoza Increases Her Profile*,” (June 2, 2014), <https://www.adl.org/news/article/anti-immigrant-activist-maria-espinoza-increases-her-profile>. Just two days prior to the FLIMEN-coordinated press conference, Larsen testified before the Senate during a Florida Senate Rules Committee Meeting, intimating that undocumented immigrants were responsible for sexual assault and domestic assault in Miami Dade. See *Hearing on SB 168 Before the Senate Rules Committee Meeting at 1:02:05*, April 17, 2019, at [http://www.flsenate.gov/media/VideoPlayer?EventID=2443575804\\_2019041212&Redirect=true](http://www.flsenate.gov/media/VideoPlayer?EventID=2443575804_2019041212&Redirect=true)

<sup>13</sup> See “*4/17/19 Press Conference on HB 527 Sanctuary Cities*,” Florida Channel, April 17, 2019, available at <https://thefloridachannel.org/videos/4-17-19-press-conference-on-hb-527-sanctuary-cities/>.

desire to correct the perceived failings of the federal government with respect to immigration enforcement.

159. Speaking at a bill signing ceremony in Sarasota on May 17, 2019, Governor Ron DeSantis told reporters, “We cannot accommodate in Florida the dumping of unlawful migrants in our state. ... The state legislature, at my urging, just passed a bill outlawing sanctuary cities and so we basically as a state said ... we are going to work with them to help remove criminal aliens. ... To just be put on the hook for things that are a result of the Congress’ failure and failed policy at the federal level, that is not acceptable.”<sup>14</sup>

160. In April 2019, speaking to reporters about SB 168 and HB 527, Sen. Gruters said, “[o]verall, we have a complete failure of Washington to take care of the [immigration] situation...”<sup>15</sup>

161. Florida Representative Mike Beltran (District 57), co-sponsor of HB 527, made several statements showing the legislature’s intent to supplant federal immigration authority. For example, on March 20, 2019, during a Civil Justice Subcommittee meeting on HB 527, Rep. Beltran explained that it would be easier – if not better – for local law enforcement to identify and detain undocumented persons: “[s]tate and local law enforcement vastly outnumber ICE agents or

---

<sup>14</sup> See Carey Codd, “Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis, ‘We Cannot Accommodate The Dumping Of Unlawful Migrants In Our State’” CBS Miami, May 17, 2019, at <https://miami.cbslocal.com/2019/05/17/gov-desantis-blindsided-by-feds-plan-to-send-migrants-to-broward-palm-beach/>.

<sup>15</sup> See Samantha J. Gross, “Amid Trump’s Threats, Florida lawmakers push ban on ‘sanctuary cities’” Tampa Bay Times, April 16, 2019, at <https://www.adl.org/news/article/ties-between-anti-immigrant-movement-and-eugenics>.



FBI agents or anyone else at the federal level and this is really an alternative to having ICE go to work sites, go to communities and try to find undocumented folks.”<sup>16</sup>

162. On the afternoon of April 17, 2019, during a Senate Rules Committee meeting, Sen. David Simmons (District 9) expressed support of SB 168, stating “We need a solution to our federal immigration policies.”<sup>17</sup>

163. On the afternoon of May 2, 2019, during the 59<sup>th</sup> Regular House Session, Rep. Elizabeth Fetterhoff (District 26) said of SB 168, “I am voting yes on this bill today knowing full well that our immigration system is broken and knowing full well that we are in desperate need of overhaul of that system.”<sup>18</sup>

164. On March 12, 2019 during a Senate Infrastructure and Security Committee Meeting, Sen. Gruters avoided answering why he included data provided by designated hate groups FAIR and CIS in SB-168’s staff analysis by stating, “[w]e have an opportunity where we have 29 counties right now with Basic Operating Agreements. We can get that all the way up to 67.”<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> See *Hearing on SB 168 Before the House Civil Justice Subcommittee at 1:35:15*, March 20, 2019, available at <https://thefloridachannel.org/videos/3-20-19-house-civil-justice-subcommittee/>.

<sup>17</sup> See *Hearing on SB 168 Before the Senate Rules Committee Meeting at 1:51:25*, available at [http://www.flsenate.gov/media/VideoPlayer?EventID=2443575804\\_2019041212&Redirect=true](http://www.flsenate.gov/media/VideoPlayer?EventID=2443575804_2019041212&Redirect=true)

<sup>18</sup> See *Hearing on SB 168 Before the House – 59<sup>th</sup> Day of Regular Session at 3:46:55*, available at [http://www.flsenate.gov/media/VideoPlayer?EventID=2443575804\\_2019051001&Redirect=true](http://www.flsenate.gov/media/VideoPlayer?EventID=2443575804_2019051001&Redirect=true)

<sup>19</sup> See *Hearing on SB 168 Before the Senate Infrastructure and Security Committee Meeting at 1:29:00*, available at [http://www.flsenate.gov/media/VideoPlayer?EventID=2443575804\\_2019031164&Redirect=true](http://www.flsenate.gov/media/VideoPlayer?EventID=2443575804_2019031164&Redirect=true)

165. In short, as expressed by Florida Senator Wengay Newton (District 70) during the April 24, 2019 House Session on HB 527, “[W]e are creating Federal Immigration Enforcement.”<sup>20</sup>

B. SB 168 Will Lead to Racial Profiling and Discriminatory Enforcement, and Heightened Risk to Victims of Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault, and Human Trafficking

166. Section 908.104(1) mandates the use of “best efforts” to support the enforcement of federal immigration law. This “best efforts” clause will lead to state and local law enforcement using race and color as a proxy for immigration status. Cases and data across the country show that racial minorities “are vulnerable to arrest for minor traffic violations, such as driving without a license or driving with an expired license.” See Hagan, Jacqueline, et al., *The Effects of U.S. Deportation Policies on Immigrant Families and Communities: Cross-Border Perspectives*, 88 N. C. L. REV. 1799, 1815 (2010) (discussing the fear of deportation in a North Carolina immigrant community stemming from a police stop for driving without a license).

167. Black and Latino drivers are more likely to be stopped for discretionary investigatory stops, searched, and arrested than white drivers.<sup>21</sup> For example, in Alamance County, North Carolina, the U.S. Department of Justice found that local law enforcement targeted Latino

---

<sup>20</sup> See *Hearing on SB 168 Before the House – 51<sup>st</sup> Day of Regular Session at 02:05:00*, available at [http://www.flsenate.gov/media/VideoPlayer?EventID=2443575804\\_2019041282&Redirect=true](http://www.flsenate.gov/media/VideoPlayer?EventID=2443575804_2019041282&Redirect=true)

<sup>21</sup> *Report of The Sentencing Project to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Contemporary Forms of Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance Regarding Racial Disparities in the U.S. Criminal Justice System*, March 2018, available at <https://www.sentencingproject.org/publications/un-report-on-racial-disparities/> (citing Langton, L. & Durose, M., U.S. Dept. of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Police Behavior during Traffic and Street Stops, 2011* (Sept. 2013) available at <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/pbtss11.pdf>; Eith, C. & Durose, M. R., U.S. Dept. of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Contacts Between Police and the Public, 2008* (Oct. 11, 2011) available at <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cpp08.pdf>).

drivers for traffic stops and were between four and ten times more likely to stop Latino drivers than non-Latino drivers.<sup>22</sup>

168. Latinos are especially susceptible to racial profiling when local law enforcement officers assume the role of federal immigration agents.<sup>23</sup> Cities have seen an increase in the number of Latinos stopped, questioned, and detained by local law enforcement following the implementation of formal collaborations with ICE.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> *U.S. v. Johnson, Terry S.*, No. 12-CV-01349 (M.D.N.C. Dec. 20, 2012).

<sup>23</sup> See Johnson, Kevin R., *The Case Against Racial Profiling in Immigration Enforcement*, 78 WASH U. L.Q. 675, 677 (2000) (explaining that U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents of Latin American descent “bear the brunt of race-based immigration enforcement.”).

<sup>24</sup> In 2017, local police and state troopers stopped Latino drivers, “questioned them and their passengers about their immigration status, and then detained them without warrants for up to four hours until ICE arrived.” See Pro Publica, *For Cops Who Want to Help ICE Crack Down on Illegal Immigration, Pennsylvania Is a Free-for-All*, available at <https://www.propublica.org/article/pennsylvania-immigration-ice-crackdown-cops-free-for-all>. When Davidson County, Tennessee entered into a 287(g) agreement, the arrest rate for Latinos driving without a license increased 136 percent. Lindsey Kee, *The Consequences and Costs of a 287(g) Jail Agreement: One Tennessee County’s Story*, American Civil Liberties Union of Tennessee, (2013), available at <https://www.aclu.org/blog/immigrants-rights/immigrants-rights-and-detention/consequences-and-costs-287g-jail-agreement> (last visited July 13, 2019). After Irving, Texas entered into a 287(g) agreement, there was an “immediate” and “dramatic” increase in the discretionary arrests of Latinos for “petty offenses—particularly minor traffic offenses” consistent with racial profiling of Latinos “in order to filter them through the [federal immigration enforcement program’s] screening system.” Trevor Gardner II and Aarti Kohli, *The C.A.P. Effect: Racial Profiling in the ICE Criminal Alien Program* (Sept. 2009), available at [https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/policybrief\\_irving\\_0909\\_v9.pdf](https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/policybrief_irving_0909_v9.pdf). In Arizona, a sheriff’s policy of using race as a factor in determining reasonable suspicion and in investigating or detaining Latino occupants of motor vehicles suspected of being undocumented without any basis for state charges was held to be in violation of the Fourth Amendment and Fourteenth Amendment grounds. *Melendres v. Arpaio*, 989 F. Supp. 2d 822, 826 (D. Ariz. 2013) (detailing constitutional violations committed by Maricopa County police officers against individuals of Latino descent who the officers suspected were undocumented noncitizens), *aff’d in part vacated in part, Melendres v. Arpaio*, 784 F.3d 1254 (9th Cir. 2015), *cert. denied, Maricopa County, Az. v. Melendres*, 136 S.Ct. 799, U.S. (Jan. 11, 2016). In East Haven, Connecticut, the U.S. Department of Justice filed an action against the town in 2012 alleging that the local police targeted Latinos for routine traffic stops and detained Latino drivers and passengers to determine immigration status without any lawful basis due to race, color, or national origin. *U.S. v. East Haven*, No. 12-1652 (D. Conn. filed

169. U.S. citizens have been wrongfully arrested pursuant to immigration detainers because of law enforcement officers' assumptions based on the individual's appearance and language. *See e.g., Galarza v. Szalcyk*, 745 F.3d 634, 636, 638 (finding that a Latino U.S. citizen was wrongfully held in custody under an immigration detainer for several days after he posted bail). Wrongful arrests will only increase as a result of SB 168.

170. As Plaintiff AI Justice has directly experienced, and as numerous experts, advocates and journalists have documented, human traffickers, perpetrators of sexual assault (including sexual abuse in the workplace), and domestic abusers prey on vulnerable immigrants, threatening to turn victims over to immigration officials and filing frivolous complaints that may result in serious consequences for victims.<sup>25</sup>

171. As documented in a recent national survey, immigrant victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and trafficking are increasingly afraid to contact police, pursue civil or criminal cases, or go to court for any reason.<sup>26</sup> This traps victims in a Catch-22 situation: Ask for

---

Nov. 20, 2012). According to the Complaint, an "analysis of traffic stop data over a two-year period revealed that almost 20% of all traffic stops conducted by [local] officers were of Latinos, while only approximately 8.3% of drivers in East Haven are Latino. *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> *See* Cora Engelbrecht, N.Y. TIMES, *Fewer Immigrants Are Reporting Domestic Abuse. Police Blame Fear of Deportation*, available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/03/us/immigrants-houston-domestic-violence.html>; Hannah Rappleye, *Immigration crackdown makes women afraid to testify against abusers, experts warn*, NBC News, (Sept. 2018), available at <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/immigration/immigration-crackdown-makes-women-afraid-testify-against-abusers-experts-warn-n908271>; Olivares, Mariela, *Battered by Law: The Political Subordination of Immigrant Women*, 64 AM. U. L. REV. 231, 231-283 (2014); Gonzalez, B., Collingwood, L., & El-Khatib, S. O. (2017), *The politics of refuge: Sanctuary cities, crime, and undocumented immigration*, Urban Affairs Review, available at <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078087417704974>; Wong, T., *The effects of sanctuary policies on crime and the economy*. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress (2017); Melissa Jeltsen, *Domestic Abusers Have An Ally In The Trump Era. It's ICE*, Huffpost, (July 2018), available at [https://www.huffpost.com/entry/ice-domestic-violence-abuse\\_n\\_5b561740e4b0b15aba914404](https://www.huffpost.com/entry/ice-domestic-violence-abuse_n_5b561740e4b0b15aba914404).

<sup>26</sup> *See* Tahirih Justice Center et al., *May 2019 Findings: Immigrant Survivors Fear Reporting Violence* (June 2019), available at [32](https://www.tahirih.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/2019-</a></p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

help and risk deportation, retaliation by an abuser, and separation from one's children; or stay with a violent partner and risk one's life.

172. SB 168 reinforces and legitimates these fears for victims of domestic abuse, sexual assault, and human trafficking in Florida. This law will place victims at greater risk and undermine public safety.

C. SB 168 Intentionally Regulates Areas of Law Reserved for Federal Immigration Enforcement

173. The federal government has exclusive power over immigration matters. Congress has legislated when and by whom an individual can be arrested and detained for a civil immigration violation. It also legislates how state and local law enforcement may be authorized to carry out functions of federal immigration agents, such as the arrest and transportation of people.

174. The U.S. Constitution grants the federal government the power to “establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization,” U.S. Const. Art. I, § 8, cl. 4, and to “regulate Commerce with foreign Nations,” U.S. Const. Art. I, § 8, cl. 3. In addition, the Supreme Court has held that the federal government's power to control immigration is inherent in the nation's sovereignty.

175. Because immigration policies can implicate foreign relations, the United States has a core, constitutionally-protected interest in setting a uniform federal immigration scheme. *Arizona v. United States*, 567 U.S. 387, 395 (2012).

---

Advocate-Survey-Final.pdf (national survey finding that three out of four advocates and attorneys reported that immigrant survivors have concerns about going to court for a matter related to the abuser/offender, and over 76% reported that immigrant survivors have concerns about contacting the police).

176. The U.S. Congress has created a comprehensive system of federal laws, agencies, and procedures regulating immigration. *See id.*; *see generally*, Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq.*

177. The INA carefully calibrates the nature—criminal or civil—and the degree of penalties applicable to each possible violation of its terms.

178. Mere presence inside the United States without federal immigration status is not a criminal offense. Rather, it is a civil violation under federal immigration law.

179. Through the INA, Congress granted the power to enforce civil immigration law, including the power to make warrantless arrests under limited circumstances, to federal immigration agents. *Arizona*, 567 U.S. at 407-10; *Creedle v. Miami-Dade County*, 349 F. Supp. 3d 1276, 1293 (S.D. Fla. 2018).

180. Congress also created three narrow exceptions under which state and local law enforcement may make a civil arrest. *Arizona*, 567 U.S. at 408-09.

181. The first exception, 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g), is that state and local governments can apply for specified officers to be trained and deputized as immigration agents authorized to make civil immigration arrests, detain, and to transport “aliens across state lines to detention centers.” 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g)(1).

182. Through § 1357(g) agreements, Congress created an exclusive pathway to delegate civil arrest authority to specified state and local law enforcement officers, who must undergo training before they can make an arrest, detain, or transport noncitizens across state lines to detention centers. 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g)(2). The agreement specifies the authorities delegated, requires direction and supervision by federal immigration officials, and limits the direction of authority. 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g)(3) & (g)(5).

183. Prior to the passage of SB 168, fourteen Florida counties had entered into 1357(g) agreements—commonly known as “287(g) Agreements”—to deputize specific local officers as immigration agents.

184. The second exception, 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(10), permits the U.S. Attorney General to delegate enforcement authority to local law enforcement in the case of a mass immigration influx, but only “with the consent of the head of the department, agency, or establishment under whose jurisdiction the individual is serving.” *See* 28 C.F.R. § 65.81 *et. seq.* (implementing regulations requiring a written agreement that specifies training, specific delegation of authority, and the limited duration). As of the filing of this action, no such authorization has been issued to state or local law enforcement in Florida.

185. The third exception, 8 U.S.C. § 1252c(a), grants authority to state and local law enforcement to make civil immigration arrests of (1) any convicted felon, (2) who was deported after the felony conviction, and (3) who illegally reentered the United States. But arrests under this exception can occur only “after confirmation from [Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)] of the status of such individual” and “only for such period of time as may be required for [ICE] to take the individual into Federal custody.”

186. Absent these three narrow exceptions, state and local law enforcement lack authority to perform the functions of federal immigration agents.

D. “Immigration Detainer Request” System

187. Typically, persons who are arrested for a criminal offense are taken to a state or local jail, where jail officials take their fingerprints.

188. These fingerprints are sent to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the FBI automatically shares them with ICE for possible issuance of an immigration detainer.

189. The fingerprint background check reveals any outstanding judicial warrants. It may also trigger an immigration detainer request.

190. A detainer asks a state or local law enforcement agency to hold an individual for up to 48 hours after there is no longer any basis to hold the person under state law—whether because the person posts bond, completes his sentence, or otherwise resolves his state charges.

191. Continuing to detain a person after the authority for the criminal arrest expires constitutes a new arrest and requires arrest authority. *See e.g., Morales v. Chadbourne*, 793 F.3d 208 (1st Cir. 2015) (affirming the District Court’s finding that detaining someone beyond their release date is an arrest under the Fourth Amendment).

192. The detainer request is conveyed through a form that ICE fills out remotely and sends to the local law enforcement agency.

193. A detainer request is not a judicial warrant.

194. Detainers are a check-box form, with check boxes for a generic list of potential sources of information that do not form the basis for a particularized probable cause determination that the detainer subject is removable on a civil immigration violation.

195. The detainer request form contains no determination that there is a reason to believe that the subject individual is “likely to escape before a warrant can be obtained,” as is required for federal authorities to make a warrantless civil immigration arrest under federal law. 8 U.S.C. § 1357(a)(2); *Arizona*, 367 U.S. at 408; *Moreno v. Napolitano*, 213 F. Supp. 3d 999, 1005-09 (N.D. Ill. 2016) (conceding that ICE never makes flight risk determinations when issuing detainers).

196. ICE issues detainer requests based solely on database information. These databases are unreliable and can lead to the wrongful detention of individuals. *Roy v. Cty. of Los Angeles*, No. CV1209012ABFFMX, 2018 WL 914773, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 7, 2018), *reconsideration*



*denied*, No. CV1209012ABFFMX, 2018 WL 3439168 (C.D. Cal. July 11, 2018). For example, a recent National Public Radio study showed that, from 2007 to 2015, local law enforcement authorities improperly detained 693 U.S. citizens in local jails on federal immigration detainers.

197. Miami-Dade County's internal database of immigration detainers lists 420 individuals jailed or to be jailed on immigration detainers as U.S. Citizens.<sup>27</sup>

198. Local and state law enforcement is vulnerable to litigation challenging detentions of U.S. citizens pursuant to immigration detainers in violation of the Fourth Amendment, as demonstrated by pending lawsuits against Miami-Dade and Monroe Counties. *See Creedle v. Miami-Dade Cty.*, 349 F. Supp. 3d 1276 (S.D. Fla. 2018); *Brown v. Ramsay*, Case No. 4:18-cv-10279, S.D. Fla. (2018).

E. Impossibility of Local Law Enforcement to Accurately Determine Immigration Status

199. Under the INA, a noncitizen's immigration status may be fluid and subject to change over time. *See Plyler v. Doe*, 457 U.S. 202, 241 (1982). An inquiry into ICE's database yields, at best, a possibly outdated snapshot of an individual's immigration status which may not correspond to the ultimate finding of whether she is subject to removal.<sup>28</sup>

200. A noncitizen who enters the United States with authorization, such as a visa, may overstay his visa and either lose his status or, if he is eligible to change into a different visa

---

<sup>27</sup> Jerry Iannelli, *ICE Issued False Deportation Requests for 420 U.S. Citizens*, in *Miami-Dade, ACLU Reports*, Miami New Times, Mar. 20, 2019, available at <https://www.miaminewtimes.com/news/ice-issued-420-detainer-requests-to-deport-us-citizens-in-miami-aclu-says-11122765> (last visited July 14, 2019).

<sup>28</sup> *See* Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General, Follow-up Review of the Status of IDENT/IAFIS Integration at 41 (2004), available at <http://www.justice.gov/oig/reports/plus/e0501/final.pdf> (noting that, according to DHS officials, DHS's immigration "databases cannot be relied upon to accurately determine immigration status [at any given time] because immigration status is dynamic[.]" and database entries may be outdated).

classification, remain in status. Conversely, a noncitizen who enters the United States without authorization may file a successful asylum application and subsequently gain lawful status.

201. Even when a noncitizen is in removal proceedings, there is no assurance the person will be removed because the federal government has prosecutorial discretion to decide how to prioritize and pursue each case based upon a wide range of equitable factors.

202. This fluidity of immigration status is a fundamental feature of the Immigration and Nationality Act that accommodates important national interests, including the nation's humanitarian and international law obligations regarding asylum seekers and refugees fleeing torture.

#### **V. SB 168'S REGULATION OF FEDERAL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT**

203. SB 168 purports to authorize state and local law enforcement to exercise power delegable only by Congress via the Attorney General,<sup>29</sup> where no such delegation exists under the INA.

204. As a state law, SB 168 cannot unilaterally confer authority to carry out the functions of federal immigration agents.

205. SB 168 Section 908.105 requires that local and state law enforcement agencies make warrantless civil immigration arrests based on immigration detainees.

206. SB 168 does not track the INA. It does not require that law enforcement officers qualify under any of the three exceptions in the INA that authorize local and state officers to make a civil immigration arrest. *Arizona*, 567 U.S. at 408-09, *supra* ¶¶180-186.

---

<sup>29</sup> Following the passage of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, many of the references to the "Attorney General" in the INA are now read to mean the DHS Secretary. *See Clark v. Suarez Martinez*, 543 U.S. 371, 374 n.1 (2005).

207. Nor does SB 168 track the INA's requirement of a "flight risk" determination before a warrantless arrest can be made lawfully under the INA. 8 U.S.C. § 1357(a)(2); *Arizona*, 367 U.S. at 408-09 (holding that state law enforcement cannot have broader immigration warrantless arrest authority than federal immigration officials); *Moreno v. Napolitano*, 213 F. Supp. 3d 999, 1005-09 (N.D. Ill. 2016) (conceding that ICE never makes a "likelihood to escape" determination before issuing a detainer).<sup>30</sup>

208. SB 168 requires law enforcement to comply with immigration detainers based on civil immigration violations even when they possess evidence negating probable cause of removability.

209. SB 168 leaves no room for state and local law enforcement to conduct an individualized assessment of probable cause, as required by the Fourth Amendment.

210. SB 168 presumes that immigration status is definite, not subject to nuance, and readily and quickly ascertained. But those presumptions are not accurate.

*SB 168 Authorizes Agreements Other Than Under 287(g)*

211. SB 168 does not require state or local law enforcement agencies to enter into 287(g) Agreements. Section 908.106 requires county correctional facilities to enter into "an agreement or agreements with a federal immigration agency for temporarily housing persons who are the subject of immigration detainers and for the payment of the costs of housing and detaining those persons." This provision can be satisfied by "... *any contract* between a correctional facility and a federal immigration agency." (emphasis added).

---

<sup>30</sup> Undeputized state and local law enforcement officers cannot make an arrest pursuant to the I-200 or I-205 administrative warrant that sometimes accompanies a detainer. *See Arizona*, 367 U.S. at 407-08 (only trained immigration officers are authorized to make arrests pursuant to administrative warrants).

212. At the time of SB 168's passage, only a small number of Florida County Sheriff's Offices had 287(g) Agreements in place authorizing some, but not all of their officers to perform specific federal immigration duties, including the power to arrest and transport. With passage of SB 168, however, all local and state law enforcement entities are now required to perform specific federal immigration duties.

213. Even in jurisdictions that currently have 287(g) Agreements in place, SB 168 will now require that all law enforcement officers - even those who have not received training and certification pursuant to a 287(g) Agreement and as required by 8 USC § 1357(g) – carry out immigration functions.

214. 287(g) Agreements, by definition, are voluntary service agreements and require delegated functions be carried out at the expense of the state or local agency. 8 USC § 1357(g)(1). Federal law expressly disallows what Section 908.106 purports to require, namely “Reimbursement of costs” “. . . for temporarily housing persons who are the subject of immigration detainees.”

215. As of January 2019, twenty-eight (28) Florida counties have entered into Basic Ordering Agreements (“BOA”), provide for some payment to local law enforcement.

216. BOAs, however, do not delegate any powers of federal immigration agents to state and local officers.

#### *SB 168's Impact on Foreign Relations*

217. Florida's attempt to regulate immigration through SB 168 adversely impacts the United States' ability to conduct foreign relations with other countries. SB 168 undermines the ability of the U.S. government to speak with a single voice about immigration, including communicating to foreign nations what their nationals can expect when they come to visit or reside

in the United States. State attempts to interfere with these inherently federal issues can have severe impacts on foreign relations.

218. SB 168 interferes with U.S. foreign relations by calling into question the federal government's ability to ensure compliance with our country's treaty obligations. In particular, the United States has signed and ratified two international treaties that prohibit racial profiling: the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination ("ICERD"), art. 2(2), 660 U.N.T.S. 195, 218; and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights ("ICCPR"), art. 2(2), 999 U.N.T.S. 171, 173. Those treaties, ratified by the United States, require the U.S. government to combat racial profiling. By encouraging and authorizing racial profiling, and in light of formal statements of concern by foreign governments, SB 168 interferes with the United States' compliance with its treaty obligations and subjects the United States to international censure.

219. In response to similar state anti-immigrant laws, such as Arizona SB 1070 and Georgia's HB 87, numerous foreign governments expressed concern that such laws will cause widespread violations of the United States' treaty obligations, which would harm their nationals living in or visiting the United States. *See, e.g.*, Brief of the United Mexican States as Amicus Curiae in Support of Plaintiffs, *Friendly House et al. v. Whiting et al.* at 1, Case No. 10-01061, Doc. No. 299 (D. Ariz. filed July 8, 2010); Motion of the Governments of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Peru for Leave to Join Brief of the United Mexican States as Amicus Curiae in Support of Plaintiffs at 3, *Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights, et al. v. Deal, et al.*, Case No. 11-1804, Doc. No. 54 (N.D. Ga. filed June 15, 2011).

220. These governments have also explained that state immigration laws, if implemented, would negatively impact foreign relations by undermining public opinion in their home countries and by making it impossible for their countries to engage on a sovereign-to-sovereign basis with the United States on important issues such as immigration and trade.

## VI. SB 168'S VAGUE PROVISIONS

221. Under SB 168, law enforcement agencies are required to “use best efforts to support the enforcement of federal immigration law.” *See* § 908.104(1).

222. State and local government entities cannot “prohibit[] or impede[] a law enforcement agency from complying with 8 U.S.C. § 1373.” nor may they prohibit or impede a wide range of communication or cooperation with a federal immigration agency. *See* § 908.102(6).

223. Prohibited “sanctuary policies” as defined in SB 168, include not only a “law” or “policy,” but also a “practice,” “procedure,” or “custom” that are adopted or even simply “allowed” by state or local government entities. *See* §§ 908.102(6); 908.103.

224. These provisions contain vague language that cannot be understood by people of “ordinary intelligence.” *United States v. Williams*, 553 U.S. 285, 304 (2008).

225. Due to the vague language “best efforts” and “impede” in Sections 908.104(1) and 908.102(6), it is unclear is whether local government officials may adopt policies to ensure that federal immigration enforcement does not undermine community cooperation with their own law enforcement officers. For example, a police chief might tell officers to not perform the functions of federal immigration agents at hurricane shelters, colleges, court houses, or homeless shelters, so as to ensure that they do not deter access to necessary and, at times, life-saving civic resources.

226. Local government entities and law enforcement agencies struggle to interpret what these broad provisions require or prohibit. And given the severe penalties that SB 168 sets out,

local officials are likely to overcompensate, in violation of federal law and the Constitution. *See Melendres v. Arpaio*, 989 F. Supp. 2d 822, 826 (D. Ariz. 2013); *U.S. v. East Haven*, No. 12-1652 (D. Conn. filed Nov. 20, 2012); *U.S. v. Johnson, Terry S.*, No. 12-CV-01349 (M.D.N.C. filed Dec. 20, 2012).

## VII. DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

227. An actual and substantial controversy exists between Plaintiffs and Defendants as to their respective legal rights and duties. Plaintiffs face an imminent threat of harm if SB 168 is enforced. They dispute Defendants' power to carry out the enforcement of federal immigration agents and contend that this law violates the U.S. Constitution and federal law.

228. Defendants are obligated to enforce SB 168 unless it is found to be illegal, and their enforcement of SB 168 will constitute an official policy of the State of Florida.

229. In violating Plaintiffs' rights under the U.S. Constitution and federal law, Defendants have acted and will be acting under color of state law.

230. If allowed to go into effect, SB 168 will cause irreparable injury to Plaintiffs.

231. Plaintiffs have no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law against SB 168 other than the relief requested in this Complaint.

232. If SB 168 takes effect, the Plaintiffs' members and staff, and other individuals in Florida, will be subject to unlawful detention, arrest, and harassment on the basis of race, ethnicity, and national origin.

233. If allowed to take effect, SB 168 would violate the Supremacy Clause because Florida law enforcement agencies and officials will be carrying out the functions of federal immigration authorities without authorization under the INA.

234. If allowed to take effect, SB 168 would violate the right to equal protection of all organizational Plaintiffs, their staff, and members, as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment.

235. SB 168 will thwart the organizational Plaintiffs' missions by forcing them to divert their resources in order to respond to their members' and community partners' questions regarding the new law, and to assist members who are arrested as a result of the law's implementation. This undermines Plaintiffs' ability to advance pre-existing organizational priorities, programs, and services.

236. SB 168 will further thwart the organizational Plaintiffs' missions by deterring their members from participating in membership activities.

237. In taking the actions alleged in this Complaint, Defendants will deny Plaintiffs' rights secured by the U.S. Constitution and federal law.

238. Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that SB 168 is unconstitutional on its face and to an order preliminarily and permanently enjoining its enforcement.

## **VIII. CAUSES OF ACTION**

### **COUNT I**

#### **SB 168 Section 908.105 Violates the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution**

**(42 U.S.C. § 1983)**

#### **Declaratory and Injunctive Relief**

239. Plaintiff City of South Miami repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 16, 18-31, 132-143, 173-220, 227-231, 233, and 237-238 as if fully set forth herein.



240. Plaintiff FLIC, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 16, 18-31, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

241. Plaintiff FWAF, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 16, 18-20, 44-56, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

242. Plaintiff FANM, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 16, 18-20, 57-69, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

243. Plaintiff GMC, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 16, 18-20, 110-122, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

244. Plaintiff QLatinx, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 16, 18-20, 70-77, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

245. Plaintiff WeCount, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 16, 18-20, 78-89, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

246. Plaintiff Westminster, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 16, 18-20, 90-96, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

247. Plaintiff AI Justice, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 16, 18-20, 97-109, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

248. Plaintiff Hope Community Center, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 16, 18-20, 123-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

249. Under the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution, the “Constitution, and the laws of the United States ... shall be the supreme law of the land.”

250. The federal government has exclusive power over immigration law and policy. Congress has created a comprehensive system of federal laws regulating immigration law enforcement. *See generally* Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”), 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq*; *Arizona v. United States*, 567 U.S. 387, 395 (2012).

251. The INA creates an exhaustive framework that dictates who can perform which immigration enforcement functions and under which circumstances. Through the INA, Congress has occupied the fields of when and by whom an individual can be arrested and detained for a civil immigration violation and how state and local law enforcement may be authorized to carry out the functions of immigration agents.

252. Congress has authorized only three narrow circumstances in which state and local law enforcement has authority to carry out the functions of federal immigration agents to make an arrest on the basis of civil immigration violations. *See Arizona*, 567 U.S. at 408-09.

253. SB 168 Section 908.105 unlawfully legislates in an area occupied by federal law and is preempted under the Supremacy Clause.

254. Section 908.105 requires that state and local law enforcement officials comply with immigration detainers. Under this provision, state and local officers must arrest and detain individuals for a suspected civil immigration violation after the basis for their detention under state law has expired. This custody constitutes a new arrest.

255. State and local officers, however, lack federal authority to arrest and detain a person for a civil immigration violation outside the narrow exceptions in the INA. Section 908.105 requires them to act, nonetheless.

256. Even for agencies operating under a 287(g) Agreement, Section 908.105 requires individual officers who have not been trained or certified to comply with immigration detainers to do so.

257. Section 908.105 is preempted for the additional reason that it conflicts with federal law's requirement that a person must be found likely to escape before a warrantless immigration arrest can occur.

258. Congress has only authorized warrantless arrests (whether pursuant to a detainer or otherwise) in the limited circumstance when there has been an individualized determination that the individual is "likely to escape before a warrant can be obtained for [the] arrest." 8 U.S.C. § 1357(a)(2).

259. Section 908.105's mandate that state and local law enforcement detain people upon request by the federal government leaves no room for law enforcement to make a flight assessment, and requires warrantless arrests and detention where no risk of escape exists.

260. Section 908.105 does not limit the immigration detainer mandate in instances where other federal or constitutional protections, such as when evidence of U.S. Citizenship or legal permanent residency is presented, are triggered.

261. Plaintiffs move for relief on this claim directly under the Constitution and also under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 as an action seeking redress of the deprivation of statutory rights under the color of state law.

**COUNT II**  
**SB 168 Section 908.104(4) Violates the Supremacy Clause**  
**of the U.S. Constitution**  
**(42 U.S.C. § 1983)**  
**Declaratory and Injunctive Relief**

262. Plaintiff FLIC, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 15, 18-20, 32-43, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

263. Plaintiff FWAF, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 15, 18-20, 44-56, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

264. Plaintiff FANM, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 15, 18-20, 57-69, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

265. Plaintiff GMC, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 15, 18-20, 110-122, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

266. Plaintiff QLatinx, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 15, 18-20, 70-77, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

267. Plaintiff WeCount, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 15, 18-20, 78-89, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

268. Plaintiff Westminster, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 15, 18-20, 90-96, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

269. Plaintiff AI Justice, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 15, 18-20, 97-109, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

270. Plaintiff Hope Community Center, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 15, 18-20, 123-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

271. Under the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution, the “Constitution, and the laws of the United States ... shall be the supreme law of the land.”

272. The federal government has exclusive power over immigration law and policy. Congress has created a comprehensive system of federal laws regulating immigration law enforcement. *See generally*, Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq*; *Arizona*.

273. Congress has created an exhaustive framework that dictates who can perform which immigration enforcement functions and under which circumstances. Through the INA, they have occupied the fields of when and by whom an individual can be arrested and detained for a civil immigration violation and how state and local law enforcement may be authorized to carry out the functions of federal immigration agents.

274. 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g)(1) allows for the delegation of federal immigration agents' function to transport "aliens across state lines to detention centers" only through 287(g) Agreements.

275. SB 168 Section 908.104(4) authorizes, by other means, correctional agents to transport people suspected of violating civil immigration law within and across state lines.

276. State and local officers, including correctional agents, lack federal authority to take custody of and transport people across suspected civil immigration violations outside of 287(g) Agreements.

277. Because Section 908.104(4) creates additional authority under which correctional agents may transport people for civil immigration purposes, it is unconstitutional under the Supremacy Clause.

278. Plaintiffs move for relief on this claim directly under the Constitution and under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 as an action seeking redress of the deprivation of statutory rights under the color of state law.

**COUNT III**  
**SB 168 Section 908.106 Violates the Supremacy Clause**  
**of the U.S. Constitution**  
**(42 U.S.C. § 1983)**  
**Declaratory and Injunctive Relief**

279. Plaintiff FLIC, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 17-20, 32-43, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

280. Plaintiff FWAF, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 17-20, 44-56, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

281. Plaintiff FANM, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 17-20, 57-69, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

282. Plaintiff GMC, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 17-20, 110-122, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

283. Plaintiff QLatinx, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 17-20, 70-77, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

284. Plaintiff WeCount, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 17-20, 78-89, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

285. Plaintiff Westminster, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 17-20, 90-96, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

286. Plaintiff AI Justice, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 17-20, 97-109, 132-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

287. Plaintiff Hope Community Center, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 17-20, 123-143, 173-220, 227-233, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

288. Under the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution, the “Constitution, and the laws of the United States ... shall be the supreme law of the land.”

289. The federal government has exclusive power over immigration law policy. Congress has created a comprehensive system of federal laws regulating immigration law enforcement. *See generally* Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1101 *et seq.*; *Arizona*, 567 U.S. at 395 (2012).

290. Section 908.106 mandates: “Each county correctional facility shall enter into an agreement ... with a federal immigration agency for temporarily housing persons who are the subject of immigration detainees and for the payment of the costs of housing and detaining those persons.” The title of the section is “Reimbursement of Costs.”

291. 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(11) grants the federal government discretion to decide when to enter into detention contracts with localities.

292. Federal law does not allow localities to be paid for such functions carried out under 287(g) Agreements. Although 31 U.S.C. § 1342 generally bans volunteer service to the federal government, 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g)(1) creates an exception for service under a 287(g) Agreement. See 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g)(1) (specifying that services rendered to the federal government are “at the expense of the State or political subdivision”).

293. Section 908.106 is preempted because it conflicts with 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a)(11) and 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g)(1).



294. Plaintiffs move for relief on this claim directly under the Constitution and under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 as an action seeking redress of the deprivation of statutory rights under the color of state law.

**COUNT IV**  
**SB 168 Sections 908.102(6) and 908.103 Violate the**  
**Due Process Clause of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the U.S. Constitution**  
**(42 U.S.C. § 1983)**  
**Declaratory and Injunctive Relief**

295. Plaintiff FLIC, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 32-43, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

296. Plaintiff FWAF, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 44-56, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

297. Plaintiff FANM, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 57-69, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

298. Plaintiff GMC, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 110-122, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

299. Plaintiff QLatinx, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 70-77, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

300. Plaintiff WeCount, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 78-89, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

301. Plaintiff Westminster, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 90-96, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

302. Plaintiff AI Justice, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 97-109, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

303. Plaintiff Hope Community Center, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 123-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

304. The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides, in pertinent part, “nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”

305. Section 908.102(6) is unconstitutionally vague because it fails to provide a person of ordinary intelligence fair notice of what is prohibited, and its lack of standards authorizes, and encourages, arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement.

306. Section 908.103 is unconstitutionally vague because the definition of “sanctuary policy” found in Section 908.102(6) is itself unconstitutionally vague due to its unclear language and undefined terms, including, but not limited to its use of the term “impede.”

307. Government entities and law enforcement agencies that are found to have violated SB 168 are subject to enforcement actions brought by the Attorney General. Executive or

administrative state, county, and municipal officers who are said to have violated this section are subject to enforcement actions brought by the Governor of Florida and are subject to suspension from office. The due process clause does not allow these officers livelihoods to be subject to such indeterminate, internally incoherent, and amorphous, standards.

308. Such vague language authorizes and encourages discriminatory enforcement of SB 168 by Defendants against law enforcement agencies and government entities. It also authorizes and encourages discriminatory enforcement of federal immigration law by state and local law enforcement and against individuals, including members of the Plaintiff organizations.

309. These vague mandates threaten individual Floridians and members of Plaintiff organizations, who have no way of determining what conduct is prohibited, nor what state and local law enforcement will choose to enforce under SB 168's purported authorization.

310. Plaintiffs move for relief on this claim directly under the Constitution and under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 as an action seeking redress of the deprivation of statutory rights under the color of state law.

**COUNT V**  
**SB 168 Sections 908.102(6) and 908.103 Violate the**  
**Due Process Clause of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the U.S. Constitution**  
**(42 U.S.C. § 1983)**  
**Declaratory and Injunctive Relief**

311. Plaintiff City of South Miami repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-31, 132-143, 221-231, and 237-238 as if fully set forth herein.

312. The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides, in pertinent part, “nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”

313. Section 908.102(6) is unconstitutionally vague because it fails to provide a person of ordinary intelligence fair notice of what is prohibited, and its lack of standards authorizes, and encourages, arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement.

314. Section 908.102(6) is vague and violates due process because the term “impede” when applied to the actions, or lack of action, from a state or local government entity is undefined and fails to provide any meaningful standard of conduct. This vague language will result in arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement.

315. Section 908.103 is unconstitutionally vague because the definition of “sanctuary policy” found in Section 908.102(6) is itself unconstitutionally vague, including, but not limited to its use of the term “impede.”

316. Due to these vague terms, the City of South Miami is unable to determine whether any of actions, resolutions, policies, or statements by its leadership place it in violation of SB 168.

317. Government entities and law enforcement agencies that are found to have violated SB 168 are subject to enforcement actions brought by the Attorney General. Executive or administrative state, county, and municipal officers who are said to have violated this section are subject to enforcement actions brought by the Governor of Florida and are subject to suspension from office. The due process clause does not allow these officers livelihoods to be subject to such indeterminate, internally incoherent, and amorphous, standards.

318. Such vague language authorizes and encourages discriminatory enforcement of SB 168 by Defendants against law enforcement agencies and government entities such as the City of

South Miami. It also authorizes and encourages discriminatory enforcement of federal immigration law by state and local law enforcement and against individuals, including residents of the City of South Miami.

319. SB 168's vague mandates also threaten individual Floridians and residents of the City of South Miami who have no way of determining what conduct is prohibited, nor what state and local law enforcement agencies will choose to enforce under SB 168's purported authorization.

320. Even if City of South Miami attempts to comply with SB 168, City of South Miami's leadership, including the Mayor, Vice-Mayor, and Commissioners, may still be subjected to suspension and an enforcement lawsuit by the Governor of Florida and Attorney General, respectively, if the City of South Miami is deemed to be out of compliance based on unknown and unspecified standards.

321. Plaintiffs move for relief on this claim directly under the Constitution and under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 as an action seeking redress of the deprivation of statutory rights under the color of state law.

**COUNT VI**  
**SB 168 Section 908.104(1) Violates the Due Process Clause**  
**of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the U.S. Constitution**  
**(42 U.S.C. § 1983)**  
**Declaratory and Injunctive Relief**

322. Plaintiff FLIC, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 32-43, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

323. Plaintiff FWAF, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 44-56, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

324. Plaintiff FANM, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 57-69, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

325. Plaintiff GMC, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 110-122, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

326. Plaintiff QLatinx, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 70-77, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

327. Plaintiff WeCount, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 78-89, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

328. Plaintiff Westminster, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 90-96, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

329. Plaintiff AI Justice, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 97-109, 132-143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

330. Plaintiff Hope Community Center, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 123--143, 221-232, and 235-238 as if fully set forth herein.

331. The Bill Title of SB 168 includes the following:

An act relating to federal immigration enforcement ... requiring state entities, local governmental entities, and law enforcement agencies to use best efforts to support the enforcement of federal immigration law.

332. The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides, in pertinent part, “nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”

333. Section 908.104(1) is unconstitutionally vague because it fails to provide a person of ordinary intelligence fair notice of what is prohibited, and its lack of standards authorizes, and encourages, arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement.

334. Section 908.104(1) is vague and violates due process because the clause “best efforts to support the enforcement of federal immigration law” is unclear and fails to provide any meaningful standard of conduct.

335. Such vague language authorizes and encourages discriminatory enforcement of SB 168 by Defendants against law enforcement agencies and government entities. It also authorizes and encourages discriminatory enforcement of federal immigration law by state and local law enforcement and against individuals, including members of the Plaintiff organizations.

336. Such vague language will inevitably result in arbitrary or discriminatory enforcement.

337. Government entities and law enforcement agencies that are found to have violated these provisions are subject to enforcement actions brought by the Attorney General. Executive or administrative state, county, and municipal officers who are said to have violated these sections are subject to enforcement actions brought by the Governor of Florida and are subject to suspension from office. The due process clause does not allow these officers livelihoods to be subject to such indeterminate, internally incoherent, and amorphous, standards.

338. These vague mandates threaten individual Floridians and members of Plaintiff organizations, who have no way of determining what conduct is prohibited, nor what state and local law enforcement will choose to enforce under SB 168's purported authorization.

339. Plaintiffs move for relief on this claim directly under the Constitution and as an action seeking redress of the deprivation of statutory rights under the color of state law, also under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

**COUNT VII**  
**SB 168 Section 908.104(1) Violates the Due Process Clause**  
**of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the U.S. Constitution**  
**(42 U.S.C. § 1983)**  
**Declaratory and Injunctive Relief**

340. Plaintiff City of South Miami repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-31, 132-143, 221-231, and 237-238 as if fully set forth herein.

341. The Bill Title of SB 168 includes the following:

An act relating to federal immigration enforcement ... requiring state entities, local governmental entities, and law enforcement agencies to use best efforts to support the enforcement of federal immigration law.

342. The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution provides, in pertinent part, "nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

343. Section 908.104(1) is unconstitutionally vague because it fails to provide a person of ordinary intelligence fair notice of what is prohibited, and its lack of standards authorizes, and encourages, arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement.



344. Section 908.104(1) is vague and violates due process because the clause “best efforts to support the enforcement of federal immigration law” is unclear and fails to provide any meaningful standard of conduct.

345. Such vague language authorizes and encourages discriminatory enforcement of SB 168 by Defendants against law enforcement agencies and government entities. It also authorizes and encourages discriminatory enforcement of federal immigration law by state and local law enforcement and against individuals, including members of the Plaintiff organizations.

346. Such vague language will inevitably result in arbitrary or discriminatory enforcement.

347. Government entities and law enforcement agencies that are found to have violated these provisions are subject to enforcement actions brought by the Attorney General. Executive or administrative state, county, and municipal officers who are said to have violated these sections are subject to enforcement actions brought by the Governor of Florida and are subject to suspension from office. The due process clause does not allow these officers livelihoods to be subject to such indeterminate, internally incoherent, and amorphous standards.

348. SB 168’s inconsistent references to local entities makes it difficult for local entities to determine whether certain portions of SB 168, including the “best efforts” requirement applies to them, thereby making it impossible for the City of South Miami to attempt to fully comply with SB 168.

349. These vague mandates threaten individual Floridians and residents of the City of South Miami, who have no way of determining what conduct is prohibited, nor what state and local law enforcement will choose to enforce under SB 168’s purported authorization.

350. These vague SB 168 mandates place the City of South Miami's leadership at risk of lawsuits by its residents and visitors for civil rights violations if City of South Miami attempts to interpret SB 168's without the necessary statutory guidance and use its "best efforts" to support the enforcement of federal immigration law. This also undermines the City of South Miami's ability to control its own budget and provide its residents with necessary services.

351. Even if City of South Miami attempts to comply with SB 168, City of South Miami's leadership, including the Mayor, Vice-Mayor, and Commissioners, may still be subjected to suspension and an enforcement lawsuit by the Governor of Florida and Attorney General, respectively, if the City of South Miami is deemed to be out of compliance based on unknown and unspecified standards.

352. Plaintiffs move for relief on this claim directly under the Constitution and as an action seeking redress of the deprivation of statutory rights under the color of state law, also under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

**COUNT VIII**  
**SB 168 Section 908.104(1) Violates Equal Protection of**  
**the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the U.S. Constitution**  
**(42 U.S.C. § 1983)**  
**Declaratory and Injunctive Relief**

353. Plaintiff FLIC, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 32-43, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

354. Plaintiff FWAF, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 44-56, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

355. Plaintiff FANM, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 57-69, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

356. Plaintiff GMC, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 110-122, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

357. Plaintiff QLatinx, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 70-77, 132-72, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

358. Plaintiff WeCount, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 78-89, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

359. Plaintiff Westminster, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 90-96, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

360. Plaintiff AI Justice, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 97-109, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

361. Plaintiff Hope Community Center, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-11, 14, 18-20, 123-131, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

362. SB 168 requires law enforcement agencies to use their “best efforts to support the enforcement of federal immigration law.” Fla. Stat. § 908.104(1).

363. The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides that “No State shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

364. SB 168 was enacted with the intent and purpose to harm and discriminate against racial and national origin minorities, including Florida residents and visitors, on the basis of race, color, and national origin.

365. The term “best efforts” is not defined by SB 168 and does not provide any guidance or limitations on how much discretion law enforcement officers can use to support the enforcement of federal immigration law during the course of daily duties operations.

366. Without any parameters on the extent to which law enforcement officers may use their “best efforts” to support the enforcement of federal immigration law, SB 168 authorizes impermissible discrimination by Florida state, local, and municipal officers and officials on the basis of race, color, and national origin.

367. SB 168 impermissibly allows discrimination against U.S. citizens and noncitizens alike on the basis of race, color, and national origin and deprives them of the equal protection of the laws within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Such discrimination deters racial and national origin minorities from accessing public services, healthcare, public education, and services for crime, domestic violence, and trafficking victims.

368. SB 168 subjects Plaintiffs and their members who on the basis of race, color, and national origin to discrimination by law enforcement officials in violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

369. Plaintiffs move for relief on this claim directly under the Constitution and under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 as an action seeking redress of the deprivation of statutory rights under the color of state law.

**COUNT IX**  
**SB 168 Section 908.103 Violates Equal Protection of**  
**the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the U.S. Constitution**  
**(42 U.S.C. § 1983)**  
**Declaratory and Injunctive Relief**

370. Plaintiff FLIC, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 32-43, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

371. Plaintiff FWAF, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 44-56, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

372. Plaintiff FANM, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 11-13, 18-20, 57-69, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

373. Plaintiff GMC, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 110-122, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

374. Plaintiff QLatinx, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 70-77, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

375. Plaintiff WeCount, on behalf of itself as an organization and its members, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 78-89, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

376. Plaintiff Westminster, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 90-96, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

377. Plaintiff AI Justice, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 11-13, 18-20, 97-109, 132-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

378. Plaintiff Hope Community Center, on behalf of itself as an organization, repeats and incorporates by reference each allegation of the prior paragraphs numbered 1-13, 18-20, 123-172, 227-232, and 234-238 as if fully set forth herein.

379. The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides that “No State shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

380. SB 168 was enacted with the intent and purpose to harm and discriminate against racial and national origin minorities, including Florida residents and visitors, on the basis of race, color, and national origin.

381. SB 168 authorizes impermissible discrimination by Florida state, local, and municipal officers and officials on the basis of race, color, and national origin.

382. SB 168 impermissibly allows discrimination against U.S. citizens and noncitizens alike on the basis of race color, and national origin and deprives them of the equal protection of the laws within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

383. SB 168’s bar on sanctuary policies seeks to deter racial and national origin minorities from accessing public services, healthcare, and public education. Moreover, SB 168 will deter victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and human trafficking from racial and national origin minority groups from accessing services for crime, thus undermining public safety.

384. Therefore, SB 168 impermissibly deprives Plaintiffs and their members who are racial and national origin minorities of equal protection pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

385. Plaintiffs move for relief on this claim directly under the Constitution and 42 U.S.C. § 1983 as an action seeking redress of the deprivation of statutory rights under the color of state law.

### **IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, in light of the foregoing facts and arguments, Plaintiffs request that the Court:

- a. Assume jurisdiction over this matter;
- b. Declare that sections 908.102(6), 908.103, 908.104(1), 908.104(4), 908.105(1), and 908.106 are unconstitutional;
- c. Declare that SB 168 is unconstitutional in its entirety;
- d. Preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants sections 908.102(6), 908.103, 908.104(1), 908.104(4), 908.105(1), and 908.106;
- e. Preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants from enforcing SB 168 in its entirety;
- f. Grant Plaintiffs' costs of suit, and reasonable attorneys' fees and other expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988; and
- g. Grant any other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: July 16, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Anne Janet Hernandez Anderson  
*On behalf of Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

Anne Janet Hernandez Anderson (Fla. Bar No. 0018092)

E-mail: [aj.hernandez@splcenter.org](mailto:aj.hernandez@splcenter.org)

Paul R. Chavez\*

E-mail: [paul.chavez@splcenter.org](mailto:paul.chavez@splcenter.org)

Mich Gonzalez\*

E-mail: [mich.gonzalez@splcenter.org](mailto:mich.gonzalez@splcenter.org)

SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER

P.O. Box 370037

Miami, FL 33137-0037

Telephone: (786) 810-5673

Fax: (786) 237-2949

Rebecca Sharpless (Fla. Bar No. 0131024)

E-mail: [rsharpless@law.miami.edu](mailto:rsharpless@law.miami.edu)

IMMIGRATION CLINIC

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI SCHOOL OF LAW

1311 Miller Drive, E273

Coral Gables, FL 33146

Tel.: (305) 284-6092

Fax: (305) 284-6093

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

Alana Greer (Fla. Bar No. 92423)

Email: [alana@communityjusticeproject.com](mailto:alana@communityjusticeproject.com)

Oscar Londoño (Fla. Bar No. 1003044)

E-mail: [oscar@communityjusticeproject.com](mailto:oscar@communityjusticeproject.com)

COMMUNITY JUSTICE PROJECT, INC.

3000 Biscayne Blvd. Suite 106

Miami, Florida 33137

Tel.: (305) 907-7697 ext. 1

\* Application for admission *pro hac vice* forthcoming



# **Exhibit 1**

## CHAPTER 2019-102

### Committee Substitute for Committee Substitute for Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 168

An act relating to federal immigration enforcement; creating chapter 908, F.S., relating to federal immigration enforcement; providing legislative findings and intent; providing definitions; prohibiting sanctuary policies; requiring state entities, local governmental entities, and law enforcement agencies to use best efforts to support the enforcement of federal immigration law; prohibiting restrictions by the entities and agencies on taking certain actions with respect to information regarding a person's immigration status; providing requirements concerning certain criminal defendants subject to immigration detainers or otherwise subject to transfer to federal custody; authorizing a law enforcement agency to transport an alien unlawfully present in the United States under certain circumstances; providing an exception to reporting requirements for crime victims or witnesses; requiring recordkeeping relating to crime victim and witness cooperation in certain investigations; providing applicability; specifying duties concerning immigration detainers; requiring county correctional facilities to enter agreements for payments for complying with immigration detainers; providing for enforcement; providing for declaratory or injunctive relief; requiring a court to enjoin unlawful sanctuary policies; requiring written findings of fact under certain circumstances; providing for applicability to certain education records; prohibiting discrimination on specified grounds; providing for implementation; requiring repeal of existing sanctuary policies within a specified period; providing effective dates.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

Section 1. Chapter 908, Florida Statutes, consisting of sections 908.101-908.109, is created to read:

#### CHAPTER 908

#### FEDERAL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

908.101 Legislative findings and intent.—The Legislature finds that it is an important state interest to cooperate and assist the federal government in the enforcement of federal immigration laws within this state.

908.102 Definitions.—As used in this chapter, the term:

(1) “Federal immigration agency” means the United States Department of Justice and the United States Department of Homeland Security, a division within such an agency, including United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement and United States Customs and Border Protection,

any successor agency, and any other federal agency charged with the enforcement of immigration law.

(2) “Immigration detainer” means a facially sufficient written or electronic request issued by a federal immigration agency using that agency’s official form to request that another law enforcement agency detain a person based on probable cause to believe that the person to be detained is a removable alien under federal immigration law, including detainers issued pursuant to 8 U.S.C. ss. 1226 and 1357 along with a warrant described in paragraph (c). For purposes of this subsection, an immigration detainer is deemed facially sufficient if:

(a) The federal immigration agency’s official form is complete and indicates on its face that the federal immigration official has probable cause to believe that the person to be detained is a removable alien under federal immigration law; or

(b) The federal immigration agency’s official form is incomplete and fails to indicate on its face that the federal immigration official has probable cause to believe that the person to be detained is a removable alien under federal immigration law, but is supported by an affidavit, order, or other official documentation that indicates that the federal immigration agency has probable cause to believe that the person to be detained is a removable alien under federal immigration law; and

(c) The federal immigration agency supplies with its detention request a Form I-200 Warrant for Arrest of Alien or a Form I-205 Warrant of Removal/Deportation or a successor warrant or other warrant authorized by federal law.

(3) “Inmate” means a person in the custody of a law enforcement agency.

(4) “Law enforcement agency” means an agency in this state charged with enforcement of state, county, municipal, or federal laws or with managing custody of detained persons in this state and includes municipal police departments, sheriff’s offices, state police departments, state university and college police departments, county correctional agencies, and the Department of Corrections.

(5) “Local governmental entity” means any county, municipality, or other political subdivision of this state.

(6) “Sanctuary policy” means a law, policy, practice, procedure, or custom adopted or allowed by a state entity or local governmental entity which prohibits or impedes a law enforcement agency from complying with 8 U.S.C. s. 1373 or which prohibits or impedes a law enforcement agency from communicating or cooperating with a federal immigration agency so as to limit such law enforcement agency in, or prohibit the agency from:

(a) Complying with an immigration detainer;

(b) Complying with a request from a federal immigration agency to notify the agency before the release of an inmate or detainee in the custody of the law enforcement agency;

(c) Providing a federal immigration agency access to an inmate for interview;

(d) Participating in any program or agreement authorized under section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. s. 1357; or

(e) Providing a federal immigration agency with an inmate's incarceration status or release date.

(7) "State entity" means the state or any office, board, bureau, commission, department, branch, division, or institution thereof, including institutions within the State University System and the Florida College System.

908.103 Sanctuary policies prohibited.—A state entity, law enforcement agency, or local governmental entity may not adopt or have in effect a sanctuary policy.

908.104 Cooperation with federal immigration authorities.—

(1) A law enforcement agency shall use best efforts to support the enforcement of federal immigration law. This subsection applies to an official, representative, agent, or employee of the entity or agency only when he or she is acting within the scope of his or her official duties or within the scope of his or her employment.

(2) Except as otherwise expressly prohibited by federal law, a state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency, or an employee, an agent, or a representative of the entity or agency, may not prohibit or in any way restrict a law enforcement agency from taking any of the following actions with respect to information regarding a person's immigration status:

(a) Sending the information to or requesting, receiving, or reviewing the information from a federal immigration agency for purposes of this chapter.

(b) Recording and maintaining the information for purposes of this chapter.

(c) Exchanging the information with a federal immigration agency or another state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency for purposes of this chapter.

(d) Using the information to comply with an immigration detainer.

(e) Using the information to confirm the identity of a person who is detained by a law enforcement agency.

(3)(a) For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable criminal case” means a criminal case in which:

1. The judgment requires the defendant to be confined in a secure correctional facility; and

2. The judge:

a. Indicates in the record under s. 908.105 that the defendant is subject to an immigration detainer; or

b. Otherwise indicates in the record that the defendant is subject to a transfer into federal custody.

(b) In an applicable criminal case, when the judge sentences a defendant who is the subject of an immigration detainer to confinement, the judge shall issue an order requiring the secure correctional facility in which the defendant is to be confined to reduce the defendant’s sentence by a period of not more than 12 days on the facility’s determination that the reduction in sentence will facilitate the seamless transfer of the defendant into federal custody. For purposes of this paragraph, the term “secure correctional facility” means a state correctional institution as defined in s. 944.02 or a county detention facility or a municipal detention facility as defined in s. 951.23.

(c) If the information specified in sub-subparagraph (a)2.a. or sub-subparagraph (a)2.b. is not available at the time the sentence is pronounced in the case, but is received by a law enforcement agency afterwards, the law enforcement agency shall notify the judge who shall issue the order described by paragraph (b) as soon as the information becomes available.

(4) When a county correctional facility or the Department of Corrections receives verification from a federal immigration agency that a person subject to an immigration detainer is in the law enforcement agency’s custody, the agency may securely transport the person to a federal facility in this state or to another point of transfer to federal custody outside the jurisdiction of the law enforcement agency. The law enforcement agency may transfer a person who is subject to an immigration detainer and is confined in a secure correctional facility to the custody of a federal immigration agency not earlier than 12 days before his or her release date. A law enforcement agency shall obtain judicial authorization before securely transporting an alien to a point of transfer outside of this state.

(5) This section does not require a state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency to provide a federal immigration agency with information related to a victim of or a witness to a criminal offense if the victim or witness timely and in good faith responds to the entity’s or agency’s request for information and cooperation in the investigation or prosecution of the offense.

(6) A state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency that, pursuant to subsection (5), withholds information regarding the immigration information of a victim of or witness to a criminal offense shall document the victim's or witness's cooperation in the entity's or agency's investigative records related to the offense and shall retain the records for at least 10 years for the purpose of audit, verification, or inspection by the Auditor General.

(7) This section does not authorize a law enforcement agency to detain an alien unlawfully present in the United States pursuant to an immigration detainer solely because the alien witnessed or reported a crime or was a victim of a criminal offense.

(8) This section does not apply to any alien unlawfully present in the United States if he or she is or has been a necessary witness or victim of a crime of domestic violence, rape, sexual exploitation, sexual assault, murder, manslaughter, assault, battery, human trafficking, kidnapping, false imprisonment, involuntary servitude, fraud in foreign labor contracting, blackmail, extortion, or witness tampering.

#### 908.105 Duties related to immigration detainees.—

(1) A law enforcement agency that has custody of a person subject to an immigration detainer issued by a federal immigration agency shall:

(a) Provide to the judge authorized to grant or deny the person's release on bail under chapter 903 notice that the person is subject to an immigration detainer.

(b) Record in the person's case file that the person is subject to an immigration detainer.

(c) Upon determining that the immigration detainer is in accordance with s. 908.102(2), comply with the requests made in the immigration detainer.

(2) A law enforcement agency is not required to perform a duty imposed by paragraph (1)(a) or paragraph (1)(b) with respect to a person who is transferred to the custody of the agency by another law enforcement agency if the transferring agency performed that duty before the transfer.

(3) A judge who receives notice that a person is subject to an immigration detainer shall cause the fact to be recorded in the court record, regardless of whether the notice is received before or after a judgment in the case.

908.106 Reimbursement of costs.—Each county correctional facility shall enter into an agreement or agreements with a federal immigration agency for temporarily housing persons who are the subject of immigration detainees and for the payment of the costs of housing and detaining those persons. A compliant agreement may include any contract between a correctional facility and a federal immigration agency for housing or

detaining persons subject to immigration detainers, such as basic ordering agreements in effect on or after July 1, 2019, agreements authorized by section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. s. 1357, or successor agreements and other similar agreements authorized by federal law.

908.107 Enforcement.—

(1) Any executive or administrative state, county, or municipal officer who violates his or her duties under this chapter may be subject to action by the Governor in the exercise of his or her authority under the State Constitution and state law. Pursuant to s. 1(b), Art. IV of the State Constitution, the Governor may initiate judicial proceedings in the name of the state against such officers to enforce compliance with any duty under this chapter or restrain any unauthorized act contrary to this chapter.

(2) In addition, the Attorney General may file suit against a local governmental entity or local law enforcement agency in a court of competent jurisdiction for declaratory or injunctive relief for a violation of this chapter.

(3) If a local governmental entity or local law enforcement agency violates this chapter, the court must enjoin the unlawful sanctuary policy. The court has continuing jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter and may enforce its orders with the initiation of contempt proceedings as provided by law.

(4) An order approving a consent decree or granting an injunction must include written findings of fact that describe with specificity the existence and nature of the sanctuary policy that violates this chapter.

908.108 Education records.—This chapter does not apply to the release of information contained in education records of an educational agency or institution, except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, 20 U.S.C. s. 1232g.

908.109 Discrimination prohibited.—A state entity, a local governmental entity, or a law enforcement agency, or a person employed by or otherwise under the direction or control of the entity or agency, may not base its actions under this chapter on the gender, race, religion, national origin, or physical disability of a person except to the extent authorized by the United States Constitution or the State Constitution.

Section 2. A sanctuary policy, as defined in s. 908.102, Florida Statutes, that is in effect on the effective date of this act violates the public policy of this state and must be repealed within 90 days after that date.

Section 3. Section 908.107, Florida Statutes, as created by this act, shall take effect October 1, 2019, and, except as otherwise expressly provided in this act, this act shall take effect July 1, 2019.

Approved by the Governor June 14, 2019.

Filed in Office Secretary of State June 14, 2019.



# **Exhibit 2**

**Subject:** Fw: Request to sponsor bills  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 13, 2016 at 5:51:45 PM Eastern Standard Time  
**From:** Nicklas, Austin  
**To:** Endicott, Joseph  
**Attachments:** image001.jpg, image002.jpg, florida e-verify legislation (SR).docx, Flimen FL Anti-Sanctuary Legislation.docx

Request to sponsor bills from Floridians for Immigration Enforcement.

Austin

----- Original message-----

**From:** Jack Oliver  
**Date:** Tue, Dec 13, 2016 10:46 AM  
**To:** Nicklas, Austin;  
**Cc:**  
**Subject:** Request to sponsor bills



## Floridians for Immigration Enforcement

[www.flimen.org](http://www.flimen.org)

*When immigration is viewed only racially and culturally, limits and legality will never be imposed. The debate must focus on limitations and lawfulness, otherwise open borders will make the United States a marketplace instead of a country.*

Senator Bean  
December 13, 2016  
RE. Request to Sponsor Bills

Dear Senator Bean

Floridians for Immigration Enforcement ([www.flimen.org](http://www.flimen.org)) is seeking sponsorship for our mandatory E-Verify bill and our anti-sanctuary city bill. We have house sponsorship for the E-Verify bill and are reaching out to several house members to sponsor the anti-sanctuary city bill. I know you have taken a stand for the citizens of Florida on Immigration issues in the past and hope that you will take a stand this legislative session by being the sponsor for these important bills. Thank You

Best Regards

Jack Oliver  
Legislative Director for Floridians for Immigration Enforcement  
772-215-8424  
[jack@flimen.org](mailto:jack@flimen.org)

[jackoiver1950@gmail.com](mailto:jackoiver1950@gmail.com)  
[jackoiver1950@gmail.com](mailto:jackoiver1950@gmail.com)



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)

# **Exhibit 3**

**SECTION 1. TITLE.**

This Act shall be known as the “Secure our Streets” or “SOS” Act.

**SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS.**

For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions shall apply:

- (a) “Department of Homeland Security” means the United States Department of Homeland Security and any of its agencies, including the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the United States Border Patrol, and any successor department or agency. The term includes officials, representatives, agents, and employees.
- (b) “Immigration detainer” means a written request issued on behalf of the United States Department of Homeland Security to another federal, state, or local law enforcement agency to provide notice of release and to detain an individual based on an inquiry into immigration status or an alleged violation of a civil immigration law, including detainers issued pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 287.7, 8 C.F.R. 236.1, or on the Department of Homeland Security Form I-247N “Request for Voluntary Notification of Release of Suspected Priority Alien”, Form I-247D “Immigration Detainer – Request for Voluntary Action”, or pursuant to any successor form or regulation.
- (c) “Inmate” means any individual in the custody of a law enforcement agency.
- (d) “Law enforcement agency” means an agency in the state or a political subdivision thereof charged with enforcement of state, county, municipal, or federal laws, or with managing custody of detained persons in the state, and includes but is not limited to county and other municipal police departments, sheriffs’ departments, state police, campus police, and the Florida Department of Law Enforcement. The term includes officials, representatives, agents, and employees.
- (e) “Local entity” means any city, county, municipality, town or other political subdivision of this state, including law enforcement agencies. The term includes officials, representatives, agents, and employees.
- (f) “State entity” means any agency, bureau, commission, council, department, or other office established under the laws of the state, including law enforcement agencies. The term includes officials, representatives, agents, and employees.

**SECTION 3. PROHIBITION OF SANCTUARY POLICIES.**

- (a) No state or local entity may prohibit, or in any way restrict, any state or local entity from sending to, or receiving from, the Department of Homeland Security, information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual.
- (b) No state or local entity may prohibit, or in any way restrict, any state or local entity taking any of the following actions with respect to information regarding immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual:
  - (1) Sending such information to, or requesting or receiving such information from, the Department of Homeland Security;
  - (2) Maintaining such information;
  - (3) Exchanging such information with any other federal, state, or local entity;
  - (4) Determining eligibility for any public benefit, service, or license provided by federal law or a law of this state or its political subdivisions;
  - (5) Verifying a claim of residence or domicile if a determination of residence or domicile is required under federal law or a law of this state or its political subdivisions or under a judicial order issued pursuant to a civil or criminal proceeding in this state; or
  - (6) Confirming the identity of a person who is detained by a law enforcement agency.
- (c) All state and local entities shall fully comply with and, to the full extent permitted by law, support the enforcement of federal immigration law.
- (d) No state or local entity may limit or restrict the enforcement of federal immigration law, including, but not limited to, limiting or restricting a state or local entity from complying with an immigration detainer, limiting or restricting a state or local entity from providing a federal immigration official access to an inmate for an interview, limiting or restricting a state or local entity from initiating an immigration status investigation, or limiting or restricting a state or local entity from providing a federal immigration official with the incarceration status or release date of an inmate in custody of a state or local entity.
- (e) Notwithstanding any other law or policy, a law enforcement agency may securely transport an alien whom the agency has received verification from the Department of Homeland Security is unlawfully present in the United States and who is in the law enforcement agency's custody to a federal facility in this state or to any other point of transfer into federal custody that is outside the jurisdiction of the law enforcement

agency. A law enforcement agency shall obtain judicial authorization before securely transporting an alien who is unlawfully present in the United States to a point of transfer that is outside of this state.

**SECTION 4. COMPLAINT PROCESS; PENALTIES.**

- (a) The attorney general shall receive complaints regarding any violation of Section 3. Such complaints may be submitted by any resident of this state, and shall be submitted in writing in such form and manner as prescribed by the attorney general. In lieu of submitting a complaint, any member of the state legislature may request, at any time, that the attorney general investigate and issue an opinion as to whether a state or local entity has violated Section 3.
- (b) Upon receiving a complaint or request, the attorney general shall investigate and determine whether a violation of Section 3 has occurred. The attorney general shall issue and make public an opinion stating whether the state or local entity, which is the subject of the complaint or request, has enacted or adopted a policy, law, regulation, or other written or unwritten directive in violation of Section 3. Upon the issuance of such an opinion by the attorney general that a state or local entity has violated Section 3, the entity shall become ineligible to receive any moneys that would otherwise be remitted to it by a state agency. Such ineligibility shall commence on the date such opinion is issued, and shall continue until such time that as the attorney general certifies that such policy, law, regulation or other written or unwritten directive is repealed or is no longer in effect.
- (c) The attorney general shall send to the state or local entity that was the subject of the investigation and to the state treasurer a copy of any opinion issued pursuant to this section and any certification by the attorney general that a violation of Section 3 is no longer in effect.

**SECTION 5. CAUSE OF ACTION TO ENJOIN SANCTUARY POLICY.**

- (a) In the event the attorney general fails to investigate a complaint pursuant to section 4, any resident of the state may bring an action in a county court to challenge a suspected violation of Section 3. The court shall expedite any action under this section, including assigning the hearing at the earliest practicable date.
- (b) If there is a judicial finding that a state or local entity has violated Section 3, the court shall enjoin such policy or practice.
- (c) The court may award court costs and reasonable attorney fees to the prevailing party in a proceeding brought pursuant to this section.

**SECTION 6. CAUSE OF ACTION FOR PERSONAL INJURY OR WRONGFUL DEATH ATTRIBUTED TO A SANCTUARY POLICY.**

A person injured by the tortious acts or omissions of an alien unlawfully present in the United States, or the personal representative of a person killed by the tortious acts or omissions of an alien unlawfully present in the United States, has a cause of action for damages against a state or local entity if the entity was in violation of Section 3 at the time such tortious act or omission occurred.

**SECTION 7. DUTY TO REPORT.**

Every person holding public office or having official duties as a representative, agent, or employee of the state or a local entity shall have a duty to report a violation of Section 3 of this act. Persons reporting under this Section shall be protected under Florida's "Whistle-blower's Act."

**SECTION 8. IMPLEMENTATION; SEVERABILITY.**

- (a) This Act shall be effective upon enactment and implemented in a manner consistent with federal laws regulating immigration, protecting the civil rights of all persons, and respecting the privileges and immunities of United States citizens.
- (b) In complying with the requirements of this Act, a law enforcement officer may not consider an individual's race, color, or national origin, except to the extent permitted by the United States or Florida constitutions.
- (c) If any part or provision of this Act is in conflict or inconsistent with applicable provisions of federal law, or otherwise held to be invalid or unenforceable by any court of competent jurisdiction, such part or provision shall be suspended and superseded by such applicable laws or regulations, and the remainder of this Act shall not be affected thereby.



# **Exhibit 4**

CHAPTER 2019-102

Committee Substitute for Committee Substitute for  
Committee Substitute for Senate Bill No. 168

An act relating to federal immigration enforcement; creating chapter 908, F.S., relating to federal immigration enforcement; providing legislative findings and intent; providing definitions; prohibiting sanctuary policies; requiring state entities, local governmental entities, and law enforcement agencies to use best efforts to support the enforcement of federal immigration law; prohibiting restrictions by the entities and agencies on taking certain actions with respect to information regarding a person's immigration status; providing requirements concerning certain criminal defendants subject to immigration detainers or otherwise subject to transfer to federal custody; authorizing a law enforcement agency to transport an alien unlawfully present in the United States under certain circumstances; providing an exception to reporting requirements for crime victims or witnesses; requiring recordkeeping relating to crime victim and witness cooperation in certain investigations; providing applicability; specifying duties concerning immigration detainers; requiring county correctional facilities to enter agreements for payments for complying with immigration detainers; providing for enforcement; providing for declaratory or injunctive relief; requiring a court to enjoin unlawful sanctuary policies; requiring written findings of fact under certain circumstances; providing for applicability to certain education records; prohibiting discrimination on specified grounds; providing for implementation; requiring repeal of existing sanctuary policies within a specified period; providing effective dates.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

Section 1. Chapter 908, Florida Statutes, consisting of sections 908.101-908.109, is created to read:

CHAPTER 908

FEDERAL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT

908.101 Legislative findings and intent.—The Legislature finds that it is an important state interest to cooperate and assist the federal government in the enforcement of federal immigration laws within this state.

908.102 Definitions.—As used in this chapter, the term:

(1) "Federal immigration agency" means the United States Department of Justice and the United States Department of Homeland Security, a division within such an agency, including United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement and United States Customs and Border Protection,

Ch. 2019-102

LAWS OF FLORIDA

Ch. 2019-102

any successor agency, and any other federal agency charged with the enforcement of immigration law.

(2) “Immigration detainer” means a facially sufficient written or electronic request issued by a federal immigration agency using that agency’s official form to request that another law enforcement agency detain a person based on probable cause to believe that the person to be detained is a removable alien under federal immigration law, including detainers issued pursuant to 8 U.S.C. ss. 1226 and 1357 along with a warrant described in paragraph (c). For purposes of this subsection, an immigration detainer is deemed facially sufficient if:

(a) The federal immigration agency’s official form is complete and indicates on its face that the federal immigration official has probable cause to believe that the person to be detained is a removable alien under federal immigration law; or

(b) The federal immigration agency’s official form is incomplete and fails to indicate on its face that the federal immigration official has probable cause to believe that the person to be detained is a removable alien under federal immigration law, but is supported by an affidavit, order, or other official documentation that indicates that the federal immigration agency has probable cause to believe that the person to be detained is a removable alien under federal immigration law; and

(c) The federal immigration agency supplies with its detention request a Form I-200 Warrant for Arrest of Alien or a Form I-205 Warrant of Removal/ Deportation or a successor warrant or other warrant authorized by federal law.

(3) “Inmate” means a person in the custody of a law enforcement agency.

(4) “Law enforcement agency” means an agency in this state charged with enforcement of state, county, municipal, or federal laws or with managing custody of detained persons in this state and includes municipal police departments, sheriff’s offices, state police departments, state university and college police departments, county correctional agencies, and the Department of Corrections.

(5) “Local governmental entity” means any county, municipality, or other political subdivision of this state.

(6) “Sanctuary policy” means a law, policy, practice, procedure, or custom adopted or allowed by a state entity or local governmental entity which prohibits or impedes a law enforcement agency from complying with 8 U.S.C. s. 1373 or which prohibits or impedes a law enforcement agency from communicating or cooperating with a federal immigration agency so as to limit such law enforcement agency in, or prohibit the agency from:

(a) Complying with an immigration detainer;



Ch. 2019-102

LAWS OF FLORIDA

Ch. 2019-102

(b) Complying with a request from a federal immigration agency to notify the agency before the release of an inmate or detainee in the custody of the law enforcement agency;

(c) Providing a federal immigration agency access to an inmate for interview;

(d) Participating in any program or agreement authorized under section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. s. 1357; or

(e) Providing a federal immigration agency with an inmate's incarceration status or release date.

(7) "State entity" means the state or any office, board, bureau, commission, department, branch, division, or institution thereof, including institutions within the State University System and the Florida College System.

908.103 Sanctuary policies prohibited.—A state entity, law enforcement agency, or local governmental entity may not adopt or have in effect a sanctuary policy.

908.104 Cooperation with federal immigration authorities.—

(1) A law enforcement agency shall use best efforts to support the enforcement of federal immigration law. This subsection applies to an official, representative, agent, or employee of the entity or agency only when he or she is acting within the scope of his or her official duties or within the scope of his or her employment.

(2) Except as otherwise expressly prohibited by federal law, a state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency, or an employee, an agent, or a representative of the entity or agency, may not prohibit or in any way restrict a law enforcement agency from taking any of the following actions with respect to information regarding a person's immigration status:

(a) Sending the information to or requesting, receiving, or reviewing the information from a federal immigration agency for purposes of this chapter.

(b) Recording and maintaining the information for purposes of this chapter.

(c) Exchanging the information with a federal immigration agency or another state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency for purposes of this chapter.

(d) Using the information to comply with an immigration detainer.

(e) Using the information to confirm the identity of a person who is detained by a law enforcement agency.

Ch. 2019-102

LAWS OF FLORIDA

Ch. 2019-102

(3)(a) For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable criminal case” means a criminal case in which:

1. The judgment requires the defendant to be confined in a secure correctional facility; and

2. The judge:

a. Indicates in the record under s. 908.105 that the defendant is subject to an immigration detainer; or

b. Otherwise indicates in the record that the defendant is subject to a transfer into federal custody.

(b) In an applicable criminal case, when the judge sentences a defendant who is the subject of an immigration detainer to confinement, the judge shall issue an order requiring the secure correctional facility in which the defendant is to be confined to reduce the defendant’s sentence by a period of not more than 12 days on the facility’s determination that the reduction in sentence will facilitate the seamless transfer of the defendant into federal custody. For purposes of this paragraph, the term “secure correctional facility” means a state correctional institution as defined in s. 944.02 or a county detention facility or a municipal detention facility as defined in s. 951.23.

(c) If the information specified in sub-subparagraph (a)2.a. or sub-subparagraph (a)2.b. is not available at the time the sentence is pronounced in the case, but is received by a law enforcement agency afterwards, the law enforcement agency shall notify the judge who shall issue the order described by paragraph (b) as soon as the information becomes available.

(4) When a county correctional facility or the Department of Corrections receives verification from a federal immigration agency that a person subject to an immigration detainer is in the law enforcement agency’s custody, the agency may securely transport the person to a federal facility in this state or to another point of transfer to federal custody outside the jurisdiction of the law enforcement agency. The law enforcement agency may transfer a person who is subject to an immigration detainer and is confined in a secure correctional facility to the custody of a federal immigration agency not earlier than 12 days before his or her release date. A law enforcement agency shall obtain judicial authorization before securely transporting an alien to a point of transfer outside of this state.

(5) This section does not require a state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency to provide a federal immigration agency with information related to a victim of or a witness to a criminal offense if the victim or witness timely and in good faith responds to the entity’s or agency’s request for information and cooperation in the investigation or prosecution of the offense.



Ch. 2019-102

LAWS OF FLORIDA

Ch. 2019-102

(6) A state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency that, pursuant to subsection (5), withholds information regarding the immigration information of a victim of or witness to a criminal offense shall document the victim's or witness's cooperation in the entity's or agency's investigative records related to the offense and shall retain the records for at least 10 years for the purpose of audit, verification, or inspection by the Auditor General.

(7) This section does not authorize a law enforcement agency to detain an alien unlawfully present in the United States pursuant to an immigration detainer solely because the alien witnessed or reported a crime or was a victim of a criminal offense.

(8) This section does not apply to any alien unlawfully present in the United States if he or she is or has been a necessary witness or victim of a crime of domestic violence, rape, sexual exploitation, sexual assault, murder, manslaughter, assault, battery, human trafficking, kidnapping, false imprisonment, involuntary servitude, fraud in foreign labor contracting, blackmail, extortion, or witness tampering.

908.105 Duties related to immigration detainees.—

(1) A law enforcement agency that has custody of a person subject to an immigration detainer issued by a federal immigration agency shall:

(a) Provide to the judge authorized to grant or deny the person's release on bail under chapter 903 notice that the person is subject to an immigration detainer.

(b) Record in the person's case file that the person is subject to an immigration detainer.

(c) Upon determining that the immigration detainer is in accordance with s. 908.102(2), comply with the requests made in the immigration detainer.

(2) A law enforcement agency is not required to perform a duty imposed by paragraph (1)(a) or paragraph (1)(b) with respect to a person who is transferred to the custody of the agency by another law enforcement agency if the transferring agency performed that duty before the transfer.

(3) A judge who receives notice that a person is subject to an immigration detainer shall cause the fact to be recorded in the court record, regardless of whether the notice is received before or after a judgment in the case.

908.106 Reimbursement of costs.—Each county correctional facility shall enter into an agreement or agreements with a federal immigration agency for temporarily housing persons who are the subject of immigration detainees and for the payment of the costs of housing and detaining those persons. A compliant agreement may include any contract between a correctional facility and a federal immigration agency for housing or

Ch. 2019-102

LAWS OF FLORIDA

Ch. 2019-102

detaining persons subject to immigration detainers, such as basic ordering agreements in effect on or after July 1, 2019, agreements authorized by section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. s. 1357, or successor agreements and other similar agreements authorized by federal law.

908.107 Enforcement.—

(1) Any executive or administrative state, county, or municipal officer who violates his or her duties under this chapter may be subject to action by the Governor in the exercise of his or her authority under the State Constitution and state law. Pursuant to s. 1(b), Art. IV of the State Constitution, the Governor may initiate judicial proceedings in the name of the state against such officers to enforce compliance with any duty under this chapter or restrain any unauthorized act contrary to this chapter.

(2) In addition, the Attorney General may file suit against a local governmental entity or local law enforcement agency in a court of competent jurisdiction for declaratory or injunctive relief for a violation of this chapter.

(3) If a local governmental entity or local law enforcement agency violates this chapter, the court must enjoin the unlawful sanctuary policy. The court has continuing jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter and may enforce its orders with the initiation of contempt proceedings as provided by law.

(4) An order approving a consent decree or granting an injunction must include written findings of fact that describe with specificity the existence and nature of the sanctuary policy that violates this chapter.

908.108 Education records.—This chapter does not apply to the release of information contained in education records of an educational agency or institution, except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, 20 U.S.C. s. 1232g.

908.109 Discrimination prohibited.—A state entity, a local governmental entity, or a law enforcement agency, or a person employed by or otherwise under the direction or control of the entity or agency, may not base its actions under this chapter on the gender, race, religion, national origin, or physical disability of a person except to the extent authorized by the United States Constitution or the State Constitution.

Section 2. A sanctuary policy, as defined in s. 908.102, Florida Statutes, that is in effect on the effective date of this act violates the public policy of this state and must be repealed within 90 days after that date.

Section 3. Section 908.107, Florida Statutes, as created by this act, shall take effect October 1, 2019, and, except as otherwise expressly provided in this act, this act shall take effect July 1, 2019.

Approved by the Governor June 14, 2019.

**Ch. 2019-102**

**LAWS OF FLORIDA**

**Ch. 2019-102**

Filed in Office Secretary of State June 14, 2019.



# **Exhibit 5**

By Senator Gruters

23-00406A-19

2019168

1 A bill to be entitled  
2 An act relating to federal immigration enforcement;  
3 providing a short title; creating chapter 908, F.S.,  
4 relating to federal immigration enforcement; providing  
5 legislative findings and intent; providing  
6 definitions; prohibiting sanctuary policies; requiring  
7 state entities, local governmental entities, and law  
8 enforcement agencies to comply with and support the  
9 enforcement of federal immigration law; prohibiting  
10 restrictions by such entities and agencies on taking  
11 certain actions with respect to information regarding  
12 a person's immigration status; providing requirements  
13 concerning certain criminal defendants subject to  
14 immigration detainers or otherwise subject to transfer  
15 to federal custody; authorizing a law enforcement  
16 agency to transport an alien unlawfully present in the  
17 United States under certain circumstances; providing  
18 an exception to reporting requirements for crime  
19 victims or witnesses; requiring recordkeeping relating  
20 to crime victim and witness cooperation in certain  
21 investigations; specifying duties concerning certain  
22 arrested persons; specifying duties concerning  
23 immigration detainers; authorizing a board of county  
24 commissioners to adopt an ordinance to recover costs  
25 for complying with an immigration detainer;  
26 authorizing local governmental entities and law  
27 enforcement agencies to petition the Federal  
28 Government for reimbursement of certain costs;  
29 requiring reports of violations; providing penalties

23-00406A-19

2019168

30 for failure to report violations; providing whistle-  
31 blower protections for persons who report violations;  
32 requiring the Attorney General to prescribe and  
33 provide the format for submitting complaints;  
34 providing requirements for entities to comply with  
35 document requests from state attorneys concerning  
36 violations; providing for investigation of possible  
37 violations; providing for injunctive relief and civil  
38 penalties; providing for venue; requiring written  
39 findings; prohibiting the expenditure of public funds  
40 for specified purposes; providing a civil cause of  
41 action for personal injury or wrongful death  
42 attributed to a sanctuary policy; providing that a  
43 trial by jury is a matter of right; requiring written  
44 findings; providing for ineligibility to receive  
45 certain funding for a specified period of time;  
46 providing for applicability to certain education  
47 records; prohibiting discrimination on specified  
48 grounds; providing for implementation; requiring  
49 repeal of existing sanctuary policies within a  
50 specified period; providing effective dates.

51  
52 Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

53  
54 Section 1. Short title.—This act may be cited as the “Rule  
55 of Law Adherence Act.”

56 Section 2. Chapter 908, Florida Statutes, consisting of  
57 sections 908.101-908.402, is created to read:

58 CHAPTER 908

23-00406A-19

2019168

FEDERAL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENTPART IFINDINGS AND INTENT AND DEFINITIONS

908.101 Legislative findings and intent.—The Legislature finds that it is an important state interest that state and local governmental entities and their officials have an affirmative duty to all citizens and other persons lawfully present in the United States to assist the Federal Government in the enforcement of federal immigration laws within this state, including their compliance with federal immigration detainers. The Legislature further finds that it is an important state interest that, in the interest of public safety and adherence to federal law, this state support federal immigration enforcement efforts and ensure that such efforts are not impeded or thwarted by state or local laws, policies, practices, procedures, or customs. State and local governmental entities and their officials who encourage persons unlawfully present in the United States to locate within this state or who shield such persons from personal responsibility for their unlawful actions breach this duty and should be held accountable.

908.102 Definitions.—As used in this chapter, the term:

(1) "Federal immigration agency" means the United States Department of Justice and the United States Department of Homeland Security, a division within such an agency, including United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement and United States Customs and Border Protection, any successor agency, and any other federal agency charged with the enforcement of immigration law. The term includes an official or employee of such an agency.

23-00406A-19

2019168

88 (2) "Immigration detainer" means a facially sufficient  
89 written or electronic request issued by a federal immigration  
90 agency using that agency's official form to request that another  
91 law enforcement agency detain a person based on probable cause  
92 to believe that the person to be detained is a removable alien  
93 under federal immigration law, including detainers issued  
94 pursuant to 8 U.S.C. ss. 1226 and 1357. For purposes of this  
95 subsection, an immigration detainer is deemed facially  
96 sufficient if:

97 (a) The federal immigration agency's official form is  
98 complete and indicates on its face that the federal immigration  
99 official has probable cause to believe that the person to be  
100 detained is a removable alien under federal immigration law; or

101 (b) The federal immigration agency's official form is  
102 incomplete and fails to indicate on its face that the federal  
103 immigration official has probable cause to believe that the  
104 person to be detained is a removable alien under federal  
105 immigration law, but is supported by an affidavit, order, or  
106 other official documentation that indicates that the federal  
107 immigration agency has probable cause to believe that the person  
108 to be detained is a removable alien under federal immigration  
109 law.

110 (3) "Inmate" means a person in the custody of a law  
111 enforcement agency.

112 (4) "Law enforcement agency" means an agency in this state  
113 charged with enforcement of state, county, municipal, or federal  
114 laws or with managing custody of detained persons in the state  
115 and includes municipal police departments, sheriff's offices,  
116 state police departments, state university and college police



23-00406A-19

2019168

117 departments, and the Department of Corrections. The term  
 118 includes an official or employee of such an agency.

119 (5) "Local governmental entity" means any county,  
 120 municipality, or other political subdivision of this state. The  
 121 term includes a person holding public office or having official  
 122 duties as a representative, agent, or employee of such entity.

123 (6) "Sanctuary policy" means a law, policy, practice,  
 124 procedure, or custom adopted or permitted by a state entity,  
 125 local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency which  
 126 contravenes 8 U.S.C. s. 1373(a) or (b) or which knowingly  
 127 prohibits or impedes a law enforcement agency from communicating  
 128 or cooperating with a federal immigration agency with respect to  
 129 federal immigration enforcement, including, but not limited to,  
 130 limiting a state entity, local governmental entity, or law  
 131 enforcement agency in, or prohibiting such an entity or agency  
 132 from:

133 (a) Complying with an immigration detainer;

134 (b) Complying with a request from a federal immigration  
 135 agency to notify the agency before the release of an inmate or  
 136 detainee in the custody of the state entity, local governmental  
 137 entity, or law enforcement agency;

138 (c) Providing a federal immigration agency access to an  
 139 inmate for interview;

140 (d) Initiating an immigration status investigation; or

141 (e) Providing a federal immigration agency with an inmate's  
 142 incarceration status or release date.

143 (7) "Sanctuary policymaker" means a state or local elected  
 144 official, or an appointed official of the governing body of a  
 145 local governmental entity, who has voted for, allowed to be

23-00406A-19

2019168

146 implemented, or voted against repeal or prohibition of a  
 147 sanctuary policy.

148 (8) "State entity" means the state or any office, board,  
 149 bureau, commission, department, branch, division, or institution  
 150 thereof, including institutions within the State University  
 151 System and the Florida College System. The term includes a  
 152 person holding public office or having official duties as a  
 153 representative, agent, or employee of such entity.

154 PART II

155 DUTIES

156 908.201 Sanctuary policies prohibited.—A state entity, law  
 157 enforcement agency, or local governmental entity may not adopt  
 158 or have in effect a sanctuary policy.

159 908.202 Cooperation with federal immigration authorities.—

160 (1) A state entity, local governmental entity, or law  
 161 enforcement agency shall fully comply with and, to the full  
 162 extent permitted by law, support the enforcement of federal  
 163 immigration law. This subsection applies to an official,  
 164 representative, agent, or employee of such entity or agency only  
 165 when he or she is acting within the scope of his or her official  
 166 duties or within the scope of his or her employment.

167 (2) Except as otherwise expressly prohibited by federal  
 168 law, a state entity, local governmental entity, or law  
 169 enforcement agency may not prohibit or in any way restrict  
 170 another state entity, local governmental entity, or law  
 171 enforcement agency from taking any of the following actions with  
 172 respect to information regarding a person's immigration status:

173 (a) Sending such information to or requesting, receiving,  
 174 or reviewing such information from a federal immigration agency



23-00406A-19

2019168\_\_

175 for purposes of this chapter.

176 (b) Recording and maintaining such information for purposes  
 177 of this chapter.

178 (c) Exchanging such information with a federal immigration  
 179 agency or another state entity, local governmental entity, or  
 180 law enforcement agency for purposes of this chapter.

181 (d) Using such information to determine eligibility for a  
 182 public benefit, service, or license pursuant to federal or state  
 183 law or an ordinance or regulation of a local governmental  
 184 entity.

185 (e) Using such information to verify a claim of residence  
 186 or domicile if a determination of residence or domicile is  
 187 required under federal or state law, an ordinance or regulation  
 188 of a local governmental entity, or a judicial order issued  
 189 pursuant to a civil or criminal proceeding in this state.

190 (f) Using such information to comply with an immigration  
 191 detainer.

192 (g) Using such information to confirm the identity of a  
 193 person who is detained by a law enforcement agency.

194 (3) (a) For purposes of this subsection the term "applicable  
 195 criminal case" means a criminal case in which:

196 1. The judgment requires the defendant to be confined in a  
 197 secure correctional facility; and

198 2. The judge:

199 a. Indicates in the record under s. 908.204 that the  
 200 defendant is subject to an immigration detainer; or

201 b. Otherwise indicates in the record that the defendant is  
 202 subject to a transfer into federal custody.

203 (b) In an applicable criminal case, at the time of



23-00406A-19

2019168\_\_

204 pronouncement of a sentence of confinement, the judge shall  
205 issue an order requiring the secure correctional facility in  
206 which the defendant is to be confined to reduce the defendant's  
207 sentence by a period of not more than 7 days on the facility's  
208 determination that the reduction in sentence will facilitate the  
209 seamless transfer of the defendant into federal custody. For  
210 purposes of this paragraph, the term "secure correctional  
211 facility" means a state correctional institution as defined in  
212 s. 944.02 or a county detention facility or a municipal  
213 detention facility as defined in s. 951.23.

214 (c) If the information specified in sub-subparagraph  
215 (a)2.a. or sub-subparagraph (a)2.b. is not available at the time  
216 the sentence is pronounced in the case, the judge shall issue  
217 the order described by paragraph (b) as soon as the information  
218 becomes available.

219 (4) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a law  
220 enforcement agency has received verification from a federal  
221 immigration agency that an alien in the law enforcement agency's  
222 custody is unlawfully present in the United States, the law  
223 enforcement agency may securely transport such alien to a  
224 federal facility in this state or to another point of transfer  
225 to federal custody outside the jurisdiction of the law  
226 enforcement agency. A law enforcement agency shall obtain  
227 judicial authorization before securely transporting such alien  
228 to a point of transfer outside of this state.

229 (5) This section does not require a state entity, local  
230 governmental entity, or law enforcement agency to provide a  
231 federal immigration agency with information related to a victim  
232 of or a witness to a criminal offense if such victim or witness

23-00406A-19

2019168\_\_

233 timely and in good faith responds to the entity's or agency's  
234 request for information and cooperation in the investigation or  
235 prosecution of such offense.

236 (6) A state entity, local governmental entity, or law  
237 enforcement agency that, pursuant to subsection (5), withholds  
238 information regarding the immigration information of a victim of  
239 or witness to a criminal offense shall document such victim's or  
240 witness's cooperation in the entity's or agency's investigative  
241 records related to the offense and shall retain such records for  
242 at least 10 years for the purpose of audit, verification, or  
243 inspection by the Auditor General.

244 908.203 Duties related to certain arrested persons.—

245 (1) If a person is arrested and is unable to provide proof  
246 of his or her lawful presence in the United States, not later  
247 than 48 hours after the person is arrested, and before the  
248 person is released on bond, a law enforcement agency performing  
249 the booking process:

250 (a) Shall review any information available from a federal  
251 immigration agency.

252 (b) If information obtained under paragraph (a) reveals  
253 that the person is not a citizen of the United States and is  
254 unlawfully present in the United States according to the terms  
255 of the federal Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. ss.  
256 1101 et seq., must:

257 1. Provide immediate notice of the person's arrest and  
258 charges to a federal immigration agency.

259 2. Provide notice of that fact to the judge authorized to  
260 grant or deny the person's release on bail under chapter 903.

261 3. Record the person's arrest and charges in the person's

23-00406A-19

2019168\_\_

262 case file.

263 (2) A law enforcement agency is not required to perform the  
264 duty imposed by subsection (1) with respect to a person who is  
265 transferred to the custody of the agency by another law  
266 enforcement agency if the transferring agency performed that  
267 duty before the transfer.

268 (3) A judge who receives notice of a person's immigration  
269 status under this section shall ensure that such status is  
270 recorded in the court record.

271 908.204 Duties related to immigration detainers.-

272 (1) A law enforcement agency that has custody of a person  
273 subject to an immigration detainer issued by a federal  
274 immigration agency shall:

275 (a) Provide to the judge authorized to grant or deny the  
276 person's release on bail under chapter 903 notice that the  
277 person is subject to an immigration detainer.

278 (b) Record in the person's case file that the person is  
279 subject to an immigration detainer.

280 (c) Comply with, honor, and fulfill the requests made in  
281 the immigration detainer.

282 (2) A law enforcement agency is not required to perform a  
283 duty imposed by paragraph (1)(a) or paragraph (1)(b) with  
284 respect to a person who is transferred to the custody of the  
285 agency by another law enforcement agency if the transferring  
286 agency performed that duty before the transfer.

287 (3) A judge who receives notice that a person is subject to  
288 an immigration detainer shall ensure that such fact is recorded  
289 in the court record, regardless of whether the notice is  
290 received before or after a judgment in the case.



23-00406A-19

2019168

291 908.205 Reimbursement of costs.-

292 (1) A board of county commissioners may adopt an ordinance  
 293 requiring a person detained pursuant to an immigration detainer  
 294 to reimburse the county for any expenses incurred in detaining  
 295 the person pursuant to the immigration detainer. A person  
 296 detained pursuant to an immigration detainer is not liable under  
 297 this section if a federal immigration agency determines that the  
 298 immigration detainer was improperly issued.

299 (2) A local governmental entity or law enforcement agency  
 300 may petition the Federal Government for reimbursement of the  
 301 entity's or agency's detention costs and the costs of compliance  
 302 with federal requests when such costs are incurred in support of  
 303 the enforcement of federal immigration law.

304 908.206 Duty to report.-

305 (1) An official, representative, agent, or employee of a  
 306 state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement  
 307 agency shall promptly report a known or probable violation of  
 308 this chapter to the Attorney General or the state attorney  
 309 having jurisdiction over the entity or agency.

310 (2) An official, representative, agent, or employee of a  
 311 state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement  
 312 agency who willfully and knowingly fails to report a known or  
 313 probable violation of this chapter may be suspended or removed  
 314 from office pursuant to general law and s. 7, Art. IV of the  
 315 State Constitution.

316 (3) A state entity, local governmental entity, or law  
 317 enforcement agency may not dismiss, discipline, take any adverse  
 318 personnel action as defined in s. 112.3187(3) against, or take  
 319 any adverse action described in s. 112.3187(4) (b) against, an

23-00406A-19

2019168\_\_

320 official, representative, agent, or employee for complying with  
321 subsection (1).

322 (4) Section 112.3187 of the Whistle-blower's Act applies to  
323 an official, representative, agent, or employee of a state  
324 entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency who  
325 is dismissed, disciplined, subject to any adverse personnel  
326 action as defined in s. 112.3187(3) or any adverse action  
327 described in s. 112.3187(4) (b), or denied employment because he  
328 or she complied with subsection (1).

329 908.207 Implementation.—This chapter shall be implemented  
330 to the fullest extent permitted by federal law regulating  
331 immigration and the legislative findings and intent declared in  
332 s. 908.101.

### 333 PART III

#### 334 ENFORCEMENT

335 908.301 Complaints.—The Attorney General shall prescribe  
336 and provide through the Department of Legal Affairs' website the  
337 format for a person to submit a complaint alleging a violation  
338 of this chapter. This section does not prohibit the filing of an  
339 anonymous complaint or a complaint not submitted in the  
340 prescribed format. Any person has standing to submit a complaint  
341 under this chapter.

342 908.302 Enforcement; penalties.—

343 (1) The state attorney for the county in which a state  
344 entity is headquartered or in which a local governmental entity  
345 or law enforcement agency is located has primary responsibility  
346 and authority for investigating credible complaints of a  
347 violation of this chapter. The results of an investigation by a  
348 state attorney shall be provided to the Attorney General in a

23-00406A-19

2019168\_\_

349 timely manner.

350 (2) (a) A state entity, local governmental entity, or law  
351 enforcement agency about which the state attorney has received a  
352 complaint shall comply with a document request from the state  
353 attorney related to the complaint.

354 (b) If the state attorney determines that a complaint filed  
355 against a state entity, local governmental entity, or law  
356 enforcement agency is valid, the state attorney shall, not later  
357 than the 10th day after the date of the determination, provide  
358 written notification to the entity or agency that:

359 1. The complaint has been filed.

360 2. The state attorney has determined that the complaint is  
361 valid.

362 3. The state attorney is authorized to file an action to  
363 enjoin the violation if the entity or agency does not come into  
364 compliance with the requirements of this chapter on or before  
365 the 60th day after the notification is provided.

366 (c) No later than the 30th day after the day a state  
367 entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency  
368 receives written notification under paragraph (b), the entity or  
369 agency shall provide the state attorney with a copy of:

370 1. The entity's or agency's written policies and procedures  
371 with respect to federal immigration agency enforcement actions,  
372 including the entity's or agency's policies and procedures with  
373 respect to immigration detainers.

374 2. Each immigration detainer received by the entity or  
375 agency from a federal immigration agency in the current calendar  
376 year-to-date and the 2 prior calendar years.

377 3. Each response sent by the entity or agency for an

23-00406A-19

2019168\_\_

378 immigration detainer described by subparagraph 2.

379 (3) The Attorney General, the state attorney who conducted  
380 the investigation, or a state attorney so ordered by the  
381 Governor pursuant to s. 27.14 may institute proceedings in  
382 circuit court to enjoin a state entity, local governmental  
383 entity, or law enforcement agency found to be in violation of  
384 this chapter. Venue of an action brought by the Attorney General  
385 may be in Leon County. The court shall expedite an action under  
386 this section, including setting a hearing at the earliest  
387 practicable date.

388 (4) Upon adjudication by the court or as provided in a  
389 consent decree declaring that a state entity, local governmental  
390 entity, or law enforcement agency has violated this chapter, the  
391 court shall enjoin the unlawful sanctuary policy and order that  
392 such entity or agency pay a civil penalty to the state of at  
393 least \$1,000 but not more than \$5,000 for each day that the  
394 sanctuary policy was in effect commencing on October 1, 2019, or  
395 the date the sanctuary policy was first enacted, whichever is  
396 later, until the date the injunction was granted. The court has  
397 continuing jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter and  
398 may enforce its orders with the imposition of additional civil  
399 penalties as provided for in this section and the initiation of  
400 contempt proceedings as provided by law.

401 (5) An order approving a consent decree or granting an  
402 injunction or imposing civil penalties pursuant to subsection  
403 (4) must include written findings of fact that describe with  
404 specificity the existence and nature of the sanctuary policy  
405 that is in violation of s. 908.201 and identify each sanctuary  
406 policymaker who voted for, allowed to be implemented, or voted



23-00406A-19

2019168

407 against repeal or prohibition of the sanctuary policy. The court  
 408 shall provide to the Governor a copy of the consent decree or  
 409 order granting an injunction or imposing civil penalties which  
 410 contains the written findings required by this subsection within  
 411 30 days after the date of rendition. A sanctuary policymaker  
 412 identified in an order approving a consent decree or granting an  
 413 injunction or imposing civil penalties may be suspended or  
 414 removed from office pursuant to general law and s. 7, Art. IV of  
 415 the State Constitution.

416 (6) A state entity, local governmental entity, or law  
 417 enforcement agency ordered to pay a civil penalty pursuant to  
 418 subsection (4) shall remit such payment to the Chief Financial  
 419 Officer, who shall deposit it into the General Revenue Fund.

420 (7) Except as required by law, public funds may not be used  
 421 to defend or reimburse a sanctuary policymaker or an official,  
 422 representative, agent, or employee of a state entity, local  
 423 governmental entity, or law enforcement agency who knowingly and  
 424 willfully violates this chapter.

425 908.303 Civil cause of action for personal injury or  
 426 wrongful death attributed to a sanctuary policy; trial by jury;  
 427 required written findings.-

428 (1) A person injured in this state by the tortious acts or  
 429 omissions of an alien unlawfully present in the United States,  
 430 or the personal representative of a person killed in this state  
 431 by the tortious acts or omissions of an alien unlawfully present  
 432 in the United States, has a cause of action for damages against  
 433 a state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement  
 434 agency in violation of ss. 908.201 and 908.202 upon proof by the  
 435 greater weight of the evidence of:



23-00406A-19

2019168

436 (a) The existence of a sanctuary policy in violation of s.  
437 908.201; and

438 (b)1. A failure to comply with s. 908.202 which results in  
439 such alien's having access to the person injured or killed when  
440 the tortious acts or omissions occurred; or

441 2. A failure to comply with s. 908.204(1)(c) which results  
442 in such alien's having access to the person injured or killed  
443 when the tortious acts or omissions occurred.

444 (2) A cause of action brought pursuant to subsection (1)  
445 may not be brought against a person who holds public office or  
446 who has official duties as a representative, agent, or employee  
447 of a state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement  
448 agency, including a sanctuary policymaker.

449 (3) Trial by jury is a matter of right in an action brought  
450 under this section.

451 (4) A final judgment entered in favor of a plaintiff in a  
452 cause of action brought pursuant to this section must include  
453 written findings of fact that describe with specificity the  
454 existence and nature of the sanctuary policy that is in  
455 violation of s. 908.201 and that identify each sanctuary  
456 policymaker who voted for, allowed to be implemented, or voted  
457 against repeal or prohibition of the sanctuary policy. The court  
458 shall provide a copy of the final judgment containing the  
459 written findings required by this subsection to the Governor  
460 within 30 days after the date of rendition. A sanctuary  
461 policymaker identified in a final judgment may be suspended or  
462 removed from office pursuant to general law and s. 7, Art. IV of  
463 the State Constitution.

464 (5) Except as provided in this section, this chapter does

23-00406A-19

2019168\_\_

465 not create a private cause of action against a state entity,  
466 local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency that  
467 complies with this chapter.

468 908.304 Ineligibility for state grant funding.-

469 (1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a state  
470 entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement agency is  
471 ineligible to receive funding from nonfederal grant programs  
472 administered by state agencies that receive funding from the  
473 General Appropriations Act for a period of 5 years after the  
474 date of adjudication that such state entity, local governmental  
475 entity, or law enforcement agency had in effect a sanctuary  
476 policy in violation of this chapter.

477 (2) The applicable state attorney shall notify the Chief  
478 Financial Officer of an adjudicated violation of this chapter by  
479 a state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement  
480 agency and shall provide him or her a copy of the final court  
481 injunction, order, or judgment. Upon receiving such notice, the  
482 Chief Financial Officer shall timely inform all state agencies  
483 that administer nonfederal grant funding of the adjudicated  
484 violation by the state entity, local governmental entity, or law  
485 enforcement agency and direct such agencies to cancel all  
486 pending grant applications and enforce the ineligibility of such  
487 entity for the prescribed period.

488 (3) This subsection does not apply to:

489 (a) Funding that is received as a result of an  
490 appropriation to a specifically named state entity, local  
491 governmental entity, or law enforcement agency in the General  
492 Appropriations Act or other law.

493 (b) Grants awarded prior to the date of adjudication that

23-00406A-19

2019168\_\_

494 such state entity, local governmental entity, or law enforcement  
495 agency had in effect a sanctuary policy in violation of this  
496 chapter.

497 PART IV

498 MISCELLANEOUS

499 908.401 Education records.—This chapter does not apply to  
500 the release of information contained in education records of an  
501 educational agency or institution, except in conformity with the  
502 Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, 20 U.S.C. s.  
503 1232g.

504 908.402 Discrimination prohibited.—A state entity, a local  
505 governmental entity, or a law enforcement agency, or a person  
506 employed by or otherwise under the direction or control of such  
507 an entity or agency, may not base its actions under this chapter  
508 on the gender, race, religion, national origin, or physical  
509 disability of a person except to the extent authorized by the  
510 United States Constitution or the State Constitution.

511 Section 3. A sanctuary policy, as defined in s. 908.102,  
512 Florida Statutes, as created by this act, that is in effect on  
513 the effective date of this act must be repealed within 90 days  
514 after that date.

515 Section 4. Sections 908.302 and 908.303, Florida Statutes,  
516 as created by this act, shall take effect October 1, 2019, and,  
517 except as otherwise expressly provided in this act, this act  
518 shall take effect July 1, 2019.

# **Exhibit 6**

### **Sanctuary Jurisdictions in Florida**

It is difficult to determine how many sanctuary jurisdictions, if any, exist in Florida because organizations use different criteria for making their determinations. For example, the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR) released a list of sanctuary jurisdictions in May 2018 which stated that, as of April 2018, 12 counties and 3 cities qualified as Florida sanctuary jurisdictions.<sup>14</sup> The Center for Immigration Studies provided a list of sanctuary jurisdictions, updated October 2018, which stated that Alachua and Clay Counties were sanctuary jurisdictions.<sup>15</sup>

Perhaps one of the most objective ways to measure whether an entity is a sanctuary jurisdiction is to determine whether it is disqualified from receiving federal criminal justice grant funds due to perceived violations of federal immigration law. Those violations generally involve limiting or restricting communication and information between a state or local entity and the DHS about an immigrant's status or release. The Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE) serves as the state administering agency for the federal Byrne Justice Assistance Grant Program.<sup>16</sup> According to FDLE and the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs, applicants that seek grant funding<sup>17</sup> from the Department of Justice must submit specific certifications from the attorney general and the chief executive officer, which is either the governor or mayor, stating that the applicant complies with 8 U.S.C. s. 1373<sup>18</sup> and does not restrict communications

---

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*

<sup>14</sup> Federation for American Immigration Reform. *Sanctuary Jurisdictions Nearly Double Since President Trump Promised to Enforce Our Immigration Laws*, 52-55 (May 2018), <http://www.fairus.org/sites/default/files/2018-05/Sanctuary-Report-FINAL-2018.pdf>. FAIR stated that it drew its information from resolutions, ordinances, and policy directives as well as secondary sources. At that time, and not necessarily currently, the counties listed were Alachua, Bradford, Broward, Flagler, Gulf, Highlands, Leon, Palm Beach, Seminole, St. Lucie, Volusia, and Washington. The cities were Key West, St. Petersburg, and West Palm Beach.

<sup>15</sup> Center for Immigration Studies. *Fact Sheet, Sanctuary Cities, Counties, and States* (Oct. 2018), <https://cis.org/Fact-Sheet/Sanctuary-Cities>.

# **Exhibit 7**



**From:** [kdmlady](#)  
**To:** [Woodby, Katherine](#)  
**Cc:** [Byrd, Cord](#)  
**Subject:** RE: FLIMEN Victims Day Press Conference  
**Date:** Monday, April 15, 2019 11:24:28 AM

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside of the Legislature. USE CAUTION when clicking links or opening attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Katherine,

That's perfect, thanks so much! We'll see you tomorrow at the Judiciary Committee.

Karyn

Karyn Morton  
Communications Director  
Floridians for Immigration Enforcement (FLIMEN)  
904-652-7640

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

----- Original message -----

**From:** "Woodby, Katherine"  
**Date:** 4/15/19 9:50 AM (GMT-05:00)  
**To:** kdmlady  
**Cc:** "Byrd, Cord"  
**Subject:** RE: FLIMEN Victims Day Press Conference

Karyn,

Per our conversation, the press conference will be on Wednesday, April 17<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 p.m. on the 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Rotunda. Senator Gruters office and I are coordinating to have Governor Desantis and AG Ashley Moody at the press conference also.

I will ensure that that the Michaels have an opportunity to speak as well.

Regards,

Katherine

*Katherine Woodby – Legislative Assistant*

**State Representative Cord Byrd**

Florida House of Representatives – District

DISTRICT OFFICES

308 House Office Building

402 South Monroe Street

Tallahassee, FL 32399

(850) 717-5011

Robert M. Foster Justice Center  
6347 Veterans Way

Yulee, FL 32097

(904) 548-9333

421 Third Street North

Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

(904) 242-3495

**From:** kdmlady

**Sent:** Saturday, April 13, 2019 6:42 PM

**To:** Woodby, Katherine

**Cc:** ken@flimen.org; david@flimen.org

**Subject:** FLIMEN Victims Day Press Conference

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** This email originated from outside of the Legislature. USE CAUTION when clicking links or opening attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Katherine

This is to follow up with our earlier communication.

Floridians for Immigration Enforcement (FLIMEN) is sponsoring a 'Victims of Illegal Immigration Day' this week.

Wednesday, April 17

9am-5pm

3rd Floor Rotunda

We will be joined by Legal Immigrants for America (LIFA), The Remembrance Project & Angel Parents, Kiyana & Bobby Michael.



We will also be attending the House Judiciary Committee on Tuesday (4/16) 1:30 pm to support HB 527, and the Senate Rules Committee on Wednesday (4/17) 2:00 pm to support SB 168.

We'd like to have a press conference on Wednesday to coordinate with our all-day display and the final Committee votes, but it needs to be sponsored and set up by a legislator. Also, timing is an issue with the Senate hearing on the same day.

We'd love to have Representative Byrd sponsor or co-sponsor with Senator Joe Gruters and possibly Senator Aaron Bean. We'd also like to have a member of each of the three 'Victims Day' organizations speak briefly (1-2 minutes each) and possibly invite Governor Desantis and Attorney General Moody to speak as well.

Can we get it done? What do you need from me? Just let me know.

Thank you so much!

Karyn

Karyn Morton

Board Member, Communications Director

Floridians for Immigration Enforcement (FLIMEN)

904-652-7640

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

**From:** [Byrd, Cord](#)  
**To:** [Woodby, Katherine](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Sanctuary cities & Counties in Florida  
**Date:** Friday, April 19, 2019 10:44:25 PM

---

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** ROBERT WINDHAM <[wardeagle46rw@cox.net](mailto:wardeagle46rw@cox.net)>  
**Date:** April 18, 2019 at 7:42:52 PM EDT  
**To:** <[cord.byrd@myfloridahouse.gov](mailto:cord.byrd@myfloridahouse.gov)>  
**Cc:** <[katherine.woodby@myfloridahouse.gov](mailto:katherine.woodby@myfloridahouse.gov)>  
**Subject:** Sanctuary cities & Counties in Florida  
**Reply-To:** ROBERT WINDHAM <[wardeagle46rw@cox.net](mailto:wardeagle46rw@cox.net)>

<b>EXTERNAL EMAIL:</b> This email originated from outside of the Legislature. USE CAUTION when clicking links or opening attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.
--

Hi. Congratulations on the passing of HB 527 last Tuesday. I was there and I testified. Here in the message below are sanctuary counties in Florida as identified by FAIR (Federation of American Immigration Reform). My brother lives in Washington County so I replied back to this email asking David jaroslav what was Washington County doing that made them a sanctuary county and he said they were not honoring ICE detainees unless it came with a judicial warrant. You can go to the May 2018 report he mentions in his email to find out what these counties and cities are doing that qualifies them as sanctuary entities or just contact David directly. He has been a great help to us (Floridians for Immigration Enforcement).

----- Original Message -----

**From:** David Jaroslav <[djaroslav@fairus.org](mailto:djaroslav@fairus.org)>  
**To:** "'[ken@flimen.org](mailto:ken@flimen.org)'" <[ken@flimen.org](mailto:ken@flimen.org)>, 'Kenneth Morrow' <[emenon9@gmail.com](mailto:emenon9@gmail.com)>, "'[david@flimen.org](mailto:david@flimen.org)'" <[david@flimen.org](mailto:david@flimen.org)>, 'ROBERT WINDHAM' <[wardeagle46rw@cox.net](mailto:wardeagle46rw@cox.net)>  
**Cc:** Shari Rendall <[srendall@fairus.org](mailto:srendall@fairus.org)>, Jonathan Hanen <[jhanen@fairus.org](mailto:jhanen@fairus.org)>, Susan Tully <[tullys@fairus.org](mailto:tullys@fairus.org)>  
**Date:** March 22, 2019 at 11:05 AM  
**Subject:** Follow-up to FLIMEN conference call

Good morning, gentlemen:

We identified the following 15 Florida jurisdictions in our [May 2018](#)

[sanctuary report](#) as having sanctuary policies (pgs. 52-55 of the report, each with links to the actual policies):

- Alachua County
- Bradford County
- Broward County
- Flagler County
- Gulf County
- Highlands County
- City of Key West
- Leon County
- Palm Beach County
- Seminole County
- St. Lucie County
- City of St. Petersburg
- Volusia County
- Washington County
- City of West Palm Beach

Additionally, since the report was published, the City of Orlando adopted a sanctuary resolution in July, which we covered in a [legislative update here](#), for a total of 16.

Five Florida sheriffs are in 287(g): Clay County, Collier County, Hernando County, Pasco County and Jacksonville-Duval County.

17 Florida sheriffs signed on in January 2018 to Basic Ordering Agreements (“BOA’s”) with ICE, which aren’t as extensive as 287(g) but which do result in them honoring detainees: Bay, Brevard, Charlotte, Columbia, Hillsborough, Indian River, Lee, Manatee, Monroe, Pinellas, Polk, Suwannee, Santa Rosa, Sarasota and Walton counties. This indicates that the number has since increased to 29 counties, which might include some of the ones we’d previously listed as sanctuaries, which should result in them no longer being designated as such:

<https://www.orlandoweekly.com/Blogs/archives/2019/03/12/florida-sheriffs-look-at-options-as-gov-ron-desantis-urges-them-to-cooperate-with-ice> My guess would be Sheriff Gualtieri in Pinellas would probably have up-to-date numbers, etc., as he's been spearheading that.

Miami-Dade County does not have a formal agreement with ICE, but in early 2017 reversed its previous sanctuary policy and has honored detainers since. We do not currently regard it as a sanctuary county, and indeed it has turned over hundreds if not thousands of illegal aliens to ICE since reversing course.

Regarding E-Verify, I will see about possibly doing an alert to the presiding officers backing up DeSantis's recent comments. If you can reach out to anyone in Speaker Oliva's [House district](#) (Hialeah and Miami Lakes) or President Galvano's [Senate district](#) (Manatee County around Bradenton and up into southeast Hillsborough) to get them to push for it as constituents, that would of course also be helpful. I will see if Nayib can reach out for any constituents who can push on Oliva as well.

Thanks again for all your great work. Please let me know whatever else you might need. Also, please let me know if I should include Karen or Yvonne or anyone else from the call on future emails.

Have a great weekend,

Dave J.

**David L. Jaroslav**

***State & Local Legislative Manager***



***Your Voice, Your Vision, Your Values***

Federation for American Immigration Reform

25 Massachusetts Ave., NW Suite 330

Washington, D.C. 20001

202-328-7004

[www.FAIRus.org](http://www.FAIRus.org)