

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PERKINS COIE LLP,

Plaintiff,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

NO. 1:25-cv-00716-BAH

**UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF OF
AMICI CURIAE 334 SOLO AND SMALL FIRM LAWYERS IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND FOR
DECLARATORY AND PERMANENT INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

Amici Curiae—334 solo and small firm lawyers from across the United States—respectfully move for leave to file the attached *amicus curiae*, pursuant to Local Civ. Rule 7(o). On March 6, 2025, President Donald J. Trump signed Executive Order 14230 into law which targeted Plaintiff Perkins Coie LLP (“Plaintiff”) – a large law firm comprised of over two thousand employees – due to its representation of politically unfavored clients. The sweeping order seeks to eliminate Plaintiff’s access to federal courthouses, government agencies, security clearances, and critical information by and through the authority vested in the Defendants.¹ Plaintiff sued Defendants and moved for Summary Judgment and Permanent Injunctive Relief.

¹ Defendants U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Communications Commission, Office of Management and Budget, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Office of Personnel Management, General Services Administration, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, The United States Of America, and in their official capacities, Pamela J. Bondi, Brendan Carr, Russell T. Vought, Andrea R. Lucas, Charles Ezell, Stephen Ehekian, And Tulsi Gabbard

This executive overreach threatens the rule of law and the entirety of the legal practice through the United States of America. *Amici* seek leave to file the attached *amici* brief in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and Permanent Injunctive Relief. A copy of the *amicus* brief is attached. Counsel for Plaintiff and the Government were informed last week that *amici* intended to submit a brief on April 9, 2025 and they have consented to the filing of *amici*'s brief.

LEGAL STANDARD

When deciding whether to grant a third party leave to file an *amicus curiae* brief, this Court has broad discretion and has allowed *amicus* participation by *amici* with "relevant expertise and a stated concern for the issues at stake" where the Court found that "it may benefit from their input" in deciding the case. *District of Columbia v. Potomac Elec. Power Co.*, 826 F. Supp. 2d 227, 237 (D.D.C. 2011); *see also, Nat'l Ass'n of Home Builders*, 519 F. Supp. 2d at 93 (granting leave to file because "the court may benefit from [*amicus*] input"). *Amicus* participation "should be permitted if it will assist the judge 'by presenting ideas, arguments, theories, insights, facts or data that are not to be found in the parties' briefs.'" *Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe*, 2020 WL 2615523 at *1 (D.D.C. May 22, 2020) (quoting *Voices for Choices v. Ill. Bell Tel. Co.*, 339 F.3d 542, 545 (7th Cir. 2003)); *see also In re Search of Info.*, 13 F. Supp.3d at 167 (D.D.C. 2014) (same).

Local Civ. Rule 7(o)(2) requires potential *amici* to set forth the reasons why an *amicus* brief "is desirable, why the movant's position is not adequately represented by a party, and why the matters asserted are relevant to the disposition of the case." D.D.C. LR 7(o)(2). It directs that motions for leave to file must be filed "in a timely manner such that it does not unduly delay the Court's ability to rule on any pending matter." D.D.C. LR 7(o)(2). The proposed *amicus* brief satisfies these standards and the requirements.

INTEREST OF AMICI

Amici are solo practitioners and small firm attorneys who serve as the primary point of access to justice for millions of Americans—individuals, small businesses, nonprofit organizations, and marginalized communities. Together, these lawyers make up approximately 75% of law firms nationwide and are responsible for the vast majority of federal criminal defense, immigration, disability benefits, and other civil litigation work for clients who lack institutional power or influence.

Amici write not only in solidarity with Plaintiff but to also underscore the unprecedented danger posed by Executive Order 14230 to the independence of the legal profession and the ethical obligation of attorneys to advocate without fear of government reprisal. Unlike large firms, solo and small firm lawyers do not have the institutional resources to shield themselves from executive overreach, making the Executive Order’s chilling effect particularly acute.

GROUND FOR LEAVE

I. *Amici’s* Brief is Relevant to the Disposition of this Case.

Amici’s brief highlights how Executive Order 14230, if allowed to stand, would empower the executive branch to retaliate against any attorney who represents politically disfavored clients. The brief explains how this dynamic threatens the First and Sixth Amendment rights not only of attorneys, but of clients—especially those in rural or underserved communities—who depend on solo and small firm lawyers to assert their legal rights.

II. *Amici’s* Brief Offers a Unique and Practical Perspective.

While Plaintiff’s motion appropriately focuses on constitutional theory and institutional harm, *amici* offer the perspective of the “foot soldiers of the legal profession”—attorneys who are far more vulnerable to the Order’s access restrictions, loss of security clearances, and potential

blacklisting from agency practice. The brief articulates how the Executive Order would force these lawyers to choose between ethical representation and economic survival, particularly in areas like immigration, bankruptcy, veterans' benefits, and civil rights.

Amici also detail how the Order creates a toxic environment of fear and retaliation corroding the professional norms that sustain collegiality and ethical practice.

III. *Amici's* Brief is Timely.

This brief is submitted one week after Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment and will not delay the Court's ruling or prejudice any party. Counsel for all parties have consented.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, *Amici* respectfully request that this Court grant leave to file the proposed amicus curiae brief in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and Permanent Injunctive Relief.

Dated: April 9, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Carolyn Elefant
Carolyn Elefant (D.C. Bar No. 425433)
LAW OFFICES OF CAROLYN ELEFANT
7315 Wisconsin Avenue
Bethesda, MD 20814
(202) 297-6100
carolyn@carolynelefant.com

*Counsel for Amici Curiae 334 Solo and Small
Firm Lawyers*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on April 9, 2025, I electronically filed the original of this Motion, its accompanying appendix, and its attached proposed brief with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system. Notice of this filing will be sent to all attorneys of record by operation of the Court's electronic filing system.

DATED this 9th day of April 2025.

/s/ Carolyn Elefant
Carolyn Elefant

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

PERKINS COIE LLP,

Plaintiff,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION, OFFICE OF
MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET,
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
COMMISSION, OFFICE OF PERSONNEL
MANAGEMENT, GENERAL SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION, OFFICE OF THE
DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL
INTELLIGENCE, THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA, and in their official
capacities, PAMELA J. BONDI, BRENDAN
CARR, RUSSELL T. VOUGHT, ANDREA
R. LUCAS, CHARLES EZELL, STEPHEN
EHEKIAN, and TULSI GABBARD,

Defendants.

NO. 1:25-cv-00716-BAH

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE* 334 SOLO AND SMALL FIRM LAWYERS IN SUPPORT
OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND FOR
DECLARATORY AND PERMANENT INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

Carolyn Elefant
LAW OFFICES OF CAROLYN ELEFANT
7315 Wisconsin Ave. #400W
Bethesda, MD 20814
Telephone: (202) 297-6100
carolyn@carolynelefant.com
Counsel for Amici Curiae

April 9, 2025

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Amici curiae are individual attorneys and solo and small law firms. They have no parent corporations and do not issue stock.

Table of Contents

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
IDENTITY AND STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE	1
BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	3
ARGUMENT	5
I. The Executive Order Endangers Access to Justice for Solo and Small Firm Clients by Eviscerating Constitutional Guarantees and Ethics Imperatives that Protect Free Advocacy and the Right to Counsel	5
II. The Executive Order Enables Gamesmanship and Weaponizes Disqualification to Silence Adverse Representation	7
III. President Trump Exceeded His Authority by Issuing an Executive Order that Enacts New Regulations Interfering with Lawyers’ Ability to Practice their Trade	8
CONCLUSION	10
APPENDIX A	I

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

US SUPREME COURT CASES

NAACP v. Button,
371 U.S. 415 (1981) 5

United States v. Gonzalez-Lopez,
548 U.S. 140 (2006) 5

Myers v. United States,
272 U.S. 52 (1926) 9

Sawyer,
343 U.S. 579 (1952) 9

FEDERAL RULES

Fed. R. App. P.
Rule 29(a)(4) 12

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Exec. Order No. 14,230, 90 Fed. Reg. 11,781 (Mar. 6, 2025) 1

Embroker Team, 50 Surprising Solo Law Firm Statistics for 2025, Embroker (Mar. 13, 2025), <https://www.embroker.com/blog/solo-law-firm-statistics/> 1

<https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/defender-services> 2

<https://clp.law.harvard.edu/knowledge-hub/magazine/issues/immigration-lawyering/building-dreams/> 2

Executive Order No. 14237, 90 Fed. Reg. 13,039 (March 14, 2025) 3

Executive Order No. 14246, 90 Fed. Reg. 13,997 (March 25, 2025) 3

Another Big Law Firm Reaches Agreement with Trump, The New York Times (Apr. 2, 2025), <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/04/02/business/trump-law-firms-milbank-deal.html> 4

American Bar Association, Professionalism Codes, https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/resources/professionalism/professionalism_codes/ 7

Massachusetts Bar Association, Civility and Professionalism Guidelines (2016),
<https://www.massbar.org/docs/default-source/publications-document-library/ejournal/2016-17/civilityandprofessionalismguidelines.pdf> 7

Executive Order No. 14237, competitors sought to exploit the situation by attempting to poach the firm's clients. See Tatyana Monnay, Paul Weiss Chairman Accuses Rival Firms of Pursuing Its Clients, Bloomberg Law (Mar. 23, 2025) 8

<https://www.aclu.org/news/privacy-technology/what-is-an-executive-order-and-how-does-it-work>..... 9

IDENTITY AND STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*

Amici Curiae are 334 independent solo practitioners and small firm lawyers from across the United States who represent individuals, small businesses, nonprofits, and community organizations across diverse practice areas.¹ We join this brief not only to support Plaintiff Perkins Coie LLP (“Perkins Coie”) but to warn that the challenged Executive Order 14230² (“Executive Order” or “Order”) has repercussions extending far beyond one large law firm. Of particular concern, the Order empowers the President with authority to target any attorney or law firm who represent politically disfavored clients. This includes denying access to federal buildings, agency personnel, and security clearances. These actions threaten the livelihood of solo and small firm practitioners as well as the rights of the millions of clients. These clients depend on *amici* for access to justice.

Amici are all attorneys actively practicing or retired from solo ventures and small law firms. These attorneys account for 75% of law firms in the United States.³ *Amici*’s practices span a wide variety of specializations, including family law and estate planning, criminal defense, personal injury, bankruptcy, immigration, intellectual property, construction, energy and

¹ *Amici* are listed in Appendix A at the back of this brief. *Amici* Andrea Goldman co-authored this brief and *Amici* Kimberly Russell edited this brief and drafted the Motion for Leave to File.

² Exec. Order No. 14,230, 90 Fed. Reg. 11,781 (Mar. 6, 2025) titled “Addressing Risks from Perkins Coie LLP,” as well as the accompanying Fact Sheet titled “Fact Sheet: President Donald J. Trump Addresses Risks from Perkins Coie LLP” of the same date.

³ Embroker Team, *50 Surprising Solo Law Firm Statistics for 2025*, EMBROKER (Mar. 13, 2025), <https://www.embroker.com/blog/solo-law-firm-statistics/> (last visited April 3, 2025)(noting that solos account for 40 percent of law firms while firms of six attorneys or fewer comprise 75 percent of all law firms).

environmental justice, regulatory and compliance, corporate start-ups, ERISA, social security disability and civil rights and constitutional law. More than half of *amici* represent clients in some federal matters and roughly 20% of *amici* represent clients in exclusively in federal courts or federal agencies.

In the spirit of Atticus Finch in *To Kill a Mockingbird*, many lawyers in solo practices and small firms uphold a proud tradition of representing marginalized, controversial, or unpopular clients against the government – not merely as occasional *pro bono* matters but as the bread and butter of their practices.⁴ Solo and small firm lawyers accept court-appointed criminal defense assignments in federal court and comprise the vast majority of the more than 12,000 panel appointments.⁵ Solo practitioners also account for 42% of immigration lawyers who practice exclusively in federal court.⁶ With the looming specter of the Executive Order, these lawyers would have to “toe the line” for fear that they are “next.”

Perkins Coie and numerous other *Amici Curiae* have extensively briefed the legal deficiencies of the Executive Order. Solo practice and small law firm *amici* endorse but do not duplicate those arguments here. Instead, *amici*’s brief focuses on the very real and disruptive consequences these foot soldiers of the legal profession face if the Executive Order stands.

⁴ Andre Wharton, *Representing the Unpopular Client of Cause*, 31 GPSolo 62 (2014)(“The job of solo and small firm practitioners is difficult but invaluable to our system of justice; nowhere is this clearer than in the representation of "sensitive" or "high-profile" (read: unpopular) cases or clients.”)

⁵ Admin. Office of the U.S. Courts, *Defender Services*, U.S. Courts, <https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/defender-services> (last visited Apr. 4, 2025).

⁶ *Building Dreams*, The Practice (Harvard Law Sch. Ctr. on the Legal Profession), Mar./Apr. 2024, <https://clp.law.harvard.edu/knowledge-hub/magazine/issues/immigration-lawyering/building-dreams/>.

BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The legal profession was shaken in early 2025 when the President Donald J. Trump and his Administration (“Trump Administration”) launched an unprecedented campaign against law firms deemed adversarial to the President. The opening salvo came on March 6, 2025, with the issuance of the Executive Order which targeted Perkins Coie by imposing sweeping penalties on the firm. The Order seeks retaliation against Perkins Coie for its representation of political opponents (namely former presidential candidate Hillary Clinton) and participation in challenges to certain election laws. Among other things, the Executive Order directs agencies to suspend security clearances held by Perkins Coie staff and to limit the firm’s employees from accessing government buildings or engaging federal employees.⁷ The Order also threatens government contractors who maintain relationships with the firm.⁸

The Executive Order quickly progressed into a broader attack on more law firms. Within weeks, a series of orders followed and took aim at Paul Weiss,⁹ Jenner & Block,¹⁰ and WilmerHale.¹¹ Similar to Perkins Coie, these firms represent clients or causes at odds with the Trump Administration’s priorities. So far, three large firms have entered into agreements with the

⁷ Executive Order, Section 2a and 5.

⁸ Executive Order, Section 3.

⁹ Executive Order No. 14237, 90 Fed. Reg. 13,039 (March 14, 2025).

¹⁰ Executive Order No. 14246, 90 Fed. Reg. 13,997 (March 25, 2025).

¹¹ Executive Order. *Addressing Risks from Wilmer Hale* (March 27, 2025).

Trump Administration to avoid retribution. These agreements include more than \$100 million in *pro bono* services aligned with the President’s priorities.¹²

For now, the Trump Administration’s assault on lawyers is largely confined to large law firms but could easily expand to any lawyer—including lawyers who frequently serve as adversaries to the government in their solo practices or as employees of small firms. Solo and small firm lawyers face even greater vulnerability because they lack the financial buffers, institutional protections, and diversified client bases needed to withstand such governmental pressure.

To shield solo and small firm lawyers and the clients we serve from the disastrous, real-world consequences of the Executive Order, *Amici* file this brief urging the court to grant Perkins Coie’s Motion for Summary Judgment and Permanent Injunctive Relief for the following reasons: **First**, the Order undermines constitutional protections—particularly the First and Sixth Amendments—and forces lawyers to choose between ethical advocacy and professional survival. **Second**, it invites political manipulation by enabling opposing parties to exploit disqualification tools, undermining the professional norms that sustain legal practice. **Third**, the Order exceeds executive authority by imposing new legal constraints without legislative approval. For these reasons, the Court must grant Plaintiff Perkins Coie’s Motion for Summary Judgment and for Declaratory and Permanent Injunctive Relief.

¹² Matthew Goldstein, “*Another Big Law Firm Reaches Agreement with Trump*,” The New York Times (Apr. 2, 2025) <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/04/02/business/trump-law-firms-milbank-deal.html>.

ARGUMENT

I. **The Executive Order Endangers Access to Justice for Solo and Small Firm Clients by Eviscerating Constitutional Guarantees and Ethics Imperatives that Protect Free Advocacy and the Right to Counsel.**

The Executive Order leverages government power to intimidate or punish attorneys for advocating on behalf of clients whose positions are adverse to the Trump Administration. This contravenes established precedent in *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415, 431 (1981) holding that the First Amendment protects litigation as “the most effective form of political association” for many groups. It also undermines the Sixth Amendment right to counsel of choice articulated in *United States v. Gonzalez-Lopez*, 548 U.S. 140, 146 (2006) which “commands, not that a trial be fair, but that the accused be defended by the counsel he believes to be best.” Although the President attempted to justify the Order as necessary to protect national interests, the government may not “under the guise of prohibiting professional misconduct ignore constitutional rights.” *Button*, 371 U.S. at 439.

Not only does the Executive Order eviscerate longstanding constitutional imperatives, but, in doing so, it disproportionately impacts solo and small firm lawyers—not to mention the millions of ordinary Americans who comprise the majority of the clients *amici* serve. The Order would devastate the legal ecosystem by imposing crippling practical barriers through security clearance revocations and denial of access to government buildings and officials. Unlike large firms with diversified practices, solo practitioners often specialize in one practice area like bankruptcy, employment law, immigration or white-collar criminal defense that relies on access to federal agencies and courts. When a solo immigration attorney is banned from USCIS offices or a small-firm bankruptcy lawyer cannot enter the federal courthouse, these lawyers cannot serve their clients and may be forced to shutter their businesses. The same holds true for the small law firm handling Veteran Affairs benefits and social security disabilities claims appeals, a solo

specializing in challenging Internal Revenue Service collection actions on behalf of small businesses, or court-appointed federal criminal defense panel attorneys representing accused individuals. Loss of clearance to protected government data or access to federal officials and agency buildings would end these firms' ability to represent clients entirely. Even a seemingly benign matter like challenging an award of a trademark to a competing business could erupt into a political melee if one of the parties is a political donor who taps connections to bar the opposing attorney from access to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

The Order also contravenes ethical mandates by violating the principle that "representation of a client does not constitute endorsement of the client's views" and manufacturing conflicts of interest between attorneys and clients. MODEL RULES OF PRO. CONDUCT r. 1.2(b) and r. 1.7 (AM. BAR ASS'N 2025). A small-firm attorney who takes on a politically controversial case could suddenly find their entire client base at risk as the Order forces lawyers to choose between zealous advocacy and professional survival. This ethical bind particularly impacts attorneys in smaller communities and legal deserts where a solo practitioner might be the only lawyer willing to challenge government overreach. For example, a rural attorney who brings civil rights claims against local federal officials could be branded untrustworthy or a threat to national security and lose access to the very courthouse where they must file claims.

The Order disproportionately harms vulnerable clients who rely on solo and small firm lawyers to access justice. Solo and small firm practitioners often uphold the proud tradition of representing marginalized, controversial, or unpopular clients against the government. These attorneys are uniquely susceptible to targeted retaliation as they lack the institutional buffers of large firms. A solo practitioner who loses a security clearance has no colleague who can step in;

a small partnership blacklisted from federal courthouses may lose a substantial income stream with no alternative practice area to fall back on. Consider the three-lawyer firm specializing in challenging denials of disability benefits, or the solo practitioner representing military whistleblowers—both serve clients who would find no representation elsewhere if these attorneys were intimidated into silence or forced to withdraw after being stripped of their ability to effectively represent clients.

II. The Executive Order Enables Gamesmanship and Weaponizes Disqualification to Silence Adverse Representation.

One of the tenets of working in litigation is the importance of collegiality within the Bar. The Massachusetts Bar Association, among others,¹³ has established formal guidelines to promote civility and professionalism among attorneys.¹⁴ Even in larger cities, solo and small firm lawyers in specific practice areas develop supportive networks amongst their peers. Today’s attorneys build professional connections nationwide through legal organizations and social media groups.¹⁵ An Executive Order such as this encourages exactly the opposite kind of legal environment.

The Executive Order is the first step toward a return to the McCarthy era pressure to “name names” that will result in attorneys being blacklisted from numerous practice areas. The potential for disqualification or agency retaliation creates a chilling effect on advocacy and encourages

¹³ American Bar Association, Professionalism Codes, https://www.americanbar.org/groups/professional_responsibility/resources/professionalism/professionalism_codes/ (last visited Apr. 5, 2025).

¹⁴ Massachusetts Bar Association, Civility and Professionalism Guidelines (2016), <https://www.massbar.org/docs/default-source/publications-document-library/ejournal/2016-17/civilityandprofessionalismguidelines.pdf>.

¹⁵ The authors of this *amicus* brief met through their involvement with the American Bar Association.

gamesmanship. The Order invites abuse by creating a pathway for opposing parties to weaponize politics against counsel—especially solo and small firm attorneys who frequently take on controversial cases. Lawyers will be motivated to snitch on their colleagues for failure to comply with the Order or taking action adverse to the Trump Administration to steal clients¹⁶ or curry favor with the President. They will feel the need to be more guarded and less candid with opposing counsel for fear of being “found out” or accused of noncompliance.

The Executive Order also directly affects *amici*'s clients by placing attorneys in a position where their interests are in conflict with those of their clients. Lawyers may not be able to communicate with agency officials or access information necessary for effective representation. Lawyers may be forced to choose between their livelihood and service to their clients. Clients involved in cases impacted by the Trump Administration's restrictions may have difficulty finding representation altogether if their lawyers are forced to withdraw. If allowed to stand, the Executive Order marks the start of a slippery slope that threatens the traditional collegiality of the legal profession and solo and small firms' ability to zealously represent clients.

III. President Trump Exceeded His Authority by Issuing an Executive Order that Enacts New Regulations Interfering with Lawyers' Ability to Practice their Trade.

One of the basic tenets of our democracy is that we have three branches of government; the Executive, the Congress and the Judiciary. A system of checks and balances was created by our forefathers in order to prevent any given branch from exceeding its authority.

The doctrine of the separation of powers was adopted by the convention of 1787 not to promote efficiency but to preclude the

¹⁶ Reportedly, after Paul Weiss was targeted by Executive Order No. 14237, competitors sought to exploit the situation by attempting to poach the firm's clients. See Tatyana Monnay, Paul Weiss Chairman Accuses Rival Firms of Pursuing Its Clients, Bloomberg Law (Mar. 23, 2025), <https://news.bloomberglaw.com/business-and-practice/paul-weiss-chairman-accuses-rival-firms-of-pursuing-its-clients>.

exercise of arbitrary power. The purpose was not to avoid friction, but, by means of the inevitable friction incident to the distribution of the governmental powers among three departments, to save the people from autocracy.

Myers v. United States, 272 U.S. 52, 293 (1926) Article II of the Constitution vests the President with executive power over the government, including the obligation to “take care that the laws be faithfully executed.” An executive order is a written directive, signed by the President, that orders the government to take specific actions to ensure “the laws be faithfully executed.”¹⁷

Executive Orders are typically issued to ratify given laws, or during a time of national emergency. *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. et al. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (1952). In *Youngstown*, the President issued an order directing the Secretary of Commerce to seize control of the nation’s steel mills in order avert a strike and assure the continued availability of steel. The Court granted a preliminary injunction at the District Court level preventing the seizure. The United States Supreme Court affirmed the judgment of the District Court, stating that the President did not have the right to create new law.

As stated in *Youngstown*, ‘It is clear that if the President had authority to issue the order he did, it must be found in some provisions of the Constitution.’ *Id.* at 587. The Court explains:

Nor can the seizure order be sustained because of the several constitutional provisions that grant executive power to the President. In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker. The Constitution limits his functions in the lawmaking process to the recommending of laws he thinks wise and the vetoing of laws he thinks bad.

Id. at 579.

¹⁷ Christopher Anders, What Is an Executive Order and How Does it Work?, ACLU (Feb. 4, 2025), <https://www.aclu.org/news/privacy-technology/what-is-an-executive-order-and-how-does-it-work>.

The Court reminds us, “In the framework of our Constitution, the President's power to see that the laws are faithfully executed refutes the idea that he is to be a lawmaker.” *Id.* at 587, see also *Pflag, Inc., et al, v. Donald J. Trump et al.*, Civil No. 25-337-BAH, United States District Court, D. Maryland.

Through the Executive Order, President Trump has effectively created new law that restrains trade for lawyers—particularly solo and small firm practitioners who are disproportionately impacted when access to federal buildings or security clearances is denied. When the President circumvents Congress by enacting new law contrary to the separation of powers doctrine, solo and small firm lawyers bear the brunt of this unprecedented overreach.

CONCLUSION

The Executive Order represents an unconstitutional assault on the legal profession's independence and the right to counsel. The Order paves a path for the President to threaten solo and small firm practitioners with professional ruin for zealously advocating for clients and causes adverse to the Trump Administration's policies.

Amici, solo and small law firm practitioners who serve as frontline defenders of the rights of millions of Americans, cannot be forced to “toe the line” to avoid governmental retaliation. Unlike large firms, we lack the institutional resources to defend against these attacks. When our access is denied, our clients—often society's most vulnerable—are silenced.

The President has no authority to redefine attorneys' ethical obligations or erect barriers to federal buildings and courtrooms through bureaucratic fiat. Allowing this Order to stand would establish a dangerous precedent enabling future administrations to disqualify opposing counsel at will. To preserve our legal system's integrity and protect our clients' access to justice, the Court should grant Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and Permanent Injunctive Relief.

Dated: April 9, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Carolyn Elefant

Carolyn Elefant D.C. Bar No. 425433

LAW OFFICES OF CAROLYN ELEFANT

7315 Wisconsin Avenue

Bethesda, Maryland 20814

(202) 297-6100

carolyn@carolynelefant.com

Counsel for *Amici Curiae*

334 Solo and Small Firm Lawyers

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to LCvR 7(o), I hereby certify that this brief conforms to the requirements of LCvR 5.4, complies with the requirements set forth in Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(4), and does not exceed 25 pages in length.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Carolyn Elefant

Appendix A

LIST OF AMICI

334 Solo & Small Firm Lawyers

AMICI CURIAE 334 SOLO AND SMALL FIRM LAWYERS

Andrea Goldman

Goldman Law Group
Newton, MA

Charlie Germano

Washington DC

Bill Singer

Singer & Fedun, LLC
Belle Mead, NJ

Marc Meyer

Law Office of Marc Meyer PLLC
Montgomery, TX

Cynthia Replogle

Cynthia Replogle IP Law
San Luis Obispo, CA

Lainey Feingold

Law Office of Lainey Feingold
Berkeley, CA

Meagan McElroy Nardone

McElroy Nardone Law LLC
Livingston, NJ

Ryan Semerad

Fuller & Semerad, LLC
Casper, WY

Morgan Leigh

MEL Legal PLLC
Washington, DC

Kimberly Bennett

K Bennett Law
Philadelphia, PA

Mytili Bala

Sitara Human Rights Law
San Diego, CA

Brandi M. Bennett, Esq., CIPP/US

Bennett IP Law
Minneapolis, MN

Steven Brown

S Brown Law LLC
Denver, CO

Angelik Holloway

Edmonds Law Office
Atlanta, GA

Moloy K. Good

The Good Law Clinic, PLLC
Vancouver, WA

Renee Sophia Coulter

Omnus Law
Detroit, MI

Julia A. Clayton

Law Office of Julia A. Clayton, P.C.
Emeryville, CA

Victoria Santoro & Jessica Gray

Santoro & Gray LLC
Boston, MA

Taylor Tieman
Legalmiga Law PC
Palos Verdes Estates, CA

Kimberly Russell
The Russell Law Firm PLLC
Washington, DC

Michele Magar
Oakland, CA

Tracey Ingle
Ingle Law, P.C.
Southborough, MA

Renee Glover Chantler
ChantlerLaw LLP
San Mateo, CA

Robin E. Miller
Law Office of Robin Miller
Berkeley, CA

Christine Tetreault
Law Office Of Christine M. Tetreault
West Springfield MA

Virginia McMichael
Appellate Law Group LLC
Radnor, PA

Jordan Howlette
Justly Prudent
Washington, DC

Barbara Quinn Smith
Law Offices of Barbara Quinn Smith
Mentor, OH

Michael Neff
Neff Injury Law
Atlanta, GA

Russell W. Dombrow
Dombrow Law Firm
Syracuse, NY

Jo Anne Simon
Jo Anne Simon, PC
Brooklyn, NY

Rukayatu Tijani
Firm for the Culture
Sacramento, CA

Michelle K. Camp
Kay Camp Law

Danielle Bess
South Atlanta Injury Lawyers, LLC
Atlanta, GA

Crystal G. Lovett
Crystal Sapphire Legal
Des Moines, IA

Nancy Baum Delain
Delain Law Office, PLLC
Schenectady, NY

Anjana Turner
Anjana Turner & Associates, PLLC
Dan Anjana Turner Law
Washington, DC

Debby Winters
Cascade Law Group
Fayetteville AR

Cynthia Swanson
Swanson Law Center, P.A.
Gainesville, FL

Erika Bryant
The Bryant Firm
Indianapolis, IN

Mark Silver
Law Office of Mark Silver, PLLC
Brooklyn, NY

Wendi Lawson See
Southeastern Law LLC
Summerville, SC

Lenore C. Garon
Law Office of Lenore C. Garon,
PLLC
Falls Church, VA

Roseanne Eckert
The Eckert Law Firm, PLLC
Orlando, FL

Mandi Clay
Three Thirteen Law PLLC
Plant City, FL

Erica McKinley
Erica McKinley, PLLC
Washington, DC
Jackson, MS

Eric Toscano
Tenant Law Group, PC
San Francisco, CA

Sara Ovando
Ovando Bowen LLP
CA

Charity Anderson, Esq.
Charity Anderson Law
La Jolla, CA

Kimberly DeCarrera
Springboard Legal
Atlanta GA

Rhonda Cates
Law Office of Rhonda Cates PLLC
Garland, TX

Shannon McNulty
The Village Law Firm
New York, NY

Julie Hancock
Your Virtual Advocate
De Pere, WI

Mirriam Seddiq
Seddiq Law
Rockville, MD

Keisha Garner
Garner Law PLLC
Washington, DC

Amber D. McClain
Jones Law Firm, PC
Centennial, CO 80112

Elisabeth R. Myers
Strategix Legal
Marrakech, Morocco

**Valentine Austriaco & Bueschel,
P.C.**
Chicago, IL

Renee M. Fairbanks
Law Office of Renee M. Fairbanks
Santa Barbara, CA

Grace E Wein
Wein& Associates
Northbrook, IL

Christopher J Chan
Christopher J Chan IP Law LLC
Atlanta GA

Brian Tannebaum
Brian L Tannebaum PA
Miami FL

Philip A. Feigin
PFeiginLaw LLC
Morrison CO

Stacy Bauer
BauerGriffith, LLC
Beachwood, Ohio

Antonio Glenn
AMG Counsel, PLLC
Dallas, TX

Mary Ellen Hulce
Attorney At Law
Geneva, IL

Natasha Nazareth
Nazareth Bonifacino Law Benefit
LLC
Rockville, MD

Sue Saign
Saign Law, PC
Morgan Hill, CA

Andrea Vacca
Vacca Family Law Group
New York, NY

Michelle Cohen Levy
The Law Office Of Michelle Cohen
Levy
Lighthouse Point, FL

Shayla N Waldon
The Waldon Law Firm, PLLC
Delray Beach, FL

Lara Pearson
Law Office of Lara Pearson Ltd, PBC
d/b/a Brand Geek
Incline Village, NV

David Boundy
Cambridge, MA

Edmond Ford
Ford, McDonald & Borden, P.A.
Manchester, NH

Katya Sverdlov
Sverdlov Law PLLC
New York NY

Adam Cohen
Cohen & Siegel, PLLC
White Plains, NY

Perry Chappano
Chappano Wood PLL
Columbus, Ohio

Joi G. Kush
Johnson Kush, P.C.
Colorado Springs, CO

Barney Brannen
Brannen & Loftus, PLLC
Hanover, NH

Jason Meyer
Princeton Business Law
Princeton NJ

Elizabeth Baker
Seattle WA

Sean T. Carter
The Carter Law Group, PC
Oakland, CA

Gregory K Wells
Shadoan, Michael & Wells, LLP
Rockville, MD

James Hein
Hein Business Law LLC
Portland, OR

Dana Cisneros
Cisneros Firm
Anaheim Hills, CA

Jessica R. Friedman
Attorney at Law
New York City

David Hricik
Macon, GA

Madalyn McElwain
McElwain Law
Denver, CO

R. Griffith Thomas
Griffith Thomas Law
St Petersburg, FL

Gerry J. Elman
Elman IP
Denton, TX

Randolph Gaw
Gaw | Poe LLP
San Francisco, CA

Katrina Zafiro
ZafiroLaw, PLLC
Seattle, WA

Eric Greenwald
Law Offices of Eric A. Greenwald
Austin, TX

David Saperstone
Lawyers for Therapists PLLC
Remote in CO and MA

Evan Goodman
Goodman Corporate Law PLLC
Washington, DC

Paul Rosenzweig
Paul Rosenzweig, Esq.
Washington DC

Michael Peacock
Hotchkiss Hoffecker Peacock llc
Atlanta, GA

Gregory L. Poe

Joshua Noffke

Noffke Law
Birmingham, MI

Lara DeCaro

Bond Legal & Dispute Resolution
Services PC
San Francisco, CA

Marc Jacobson

Law Offices of Marc Jacobson, PLLC
New York, New York

Jill Switzer

Jill Switzer Attorney Mediator
Pasadena, CA

Julian Sarafian

For Creators by Creators PC
Folsom, CA

Abigail Molina

Molina Immigration
Springfield, OR

Suzann Beckett

Beckett Law LLC
Hartford, CT

Elise Buie

Elise Buie Family Law Group, PLLC
Seattle, WA

John A. Gleason

Gleason Law Office LLC
Columbus, OH

Julie Reczek

Reczek Chase Law
Louisville, KY

M David Johnson

Modern Family Law
Denver, CO

Nick Coulson

Coulson P.C.
Detroit, MI

TM Law & Associates

St Louis MO

Denise Kirby

The Law Office of Denise Kirby, LLC
Kansas City, MO

Alexander Hartley

The Hartley Law Firm
Kansas City, MO

Elana Goodmann

Horowitz Law
Fort Lauderdale, FL

Stephen Chahn Lee

Law Office of Stephen Chahn Lee,
LLC
Chicago, IL

Inti Martínez-Alemán

Ceiba Fôrte Law Firm
St. Paul, MN

Steve Zemanick

Four Reasons Legal
Denver, CO

Reena Sikdar
Valentine Austriaco & Bueschel, P.C.
Chicago, IL

Kathleen E. Brennan
The Brennan Law Group LLC
Chicago, IL

Emily Sexton
Sexton Law PLLC
Washington, DC

Catharine Blake
Resolve Family Law
Concord, MA

Ethan Chase
Reczek Chase Law, PLLC
Louisville, Kentucky

Melissa Bobrow
Law Office of Melissa Bobrow
San Diego, CA

Amanda R. Conley
Conley Law, P.C.
Alameda, CA

Shaun Watchie Perry
Law Office of Shaun Watchie Perry
Grapeview, WA

Jennifer Hill
Rosehill Law, PLLC
Tacoma, WA

Starleigh Smith
SKS Legal, PLLC
Wenatchee, WA

Timothy Zerillo
Zerillo Law Firm, LLC
Portland, ME

David Heller
The Law Office of David Heller,
PLLC
Plant City, FL

Carol L Johnson
C L Johnson Law Office, PLLC
Redmond, WA

Carla N. McKain
McKain Law, PLLC
Ithaca, NY

Spears Manning & Martini
Southport, CT

Jennifer Bucher
JB Law LLC
Seattle, WA

David Shaw
Shaw Law Group
Portland OR

Nicholas Yanchar
Yanchar Law Office
Portland, OR

Rebecca Cambreleng
Cambreleng & Marton LLC
Portland, OR

Peter Crocker
Law Office of Peter Crocker, PLLC
Seattle, WA

Ashley Marton
Cambreleng & Marton LLC
Portland, OR

Eric D. Morton
Clear Sky Law Group, P.C.
Oakland, CA

Rachel Roberts
Roberts Law PLLC
Shoreline, WA

Oliver Platz
Platz Law P.C.
New York, NY

David Bouchard, Esq.
Atlanta, GA

T.R. Hoefle
Hoefle Law, LLC
Belton, MO

Jo Ritcey
JRD Law PLLC
Washington, DC

Elena Sullivan
Endereza Law, PLLC
San Antonio, Texas

Nita Kundanmal
Law Office of Nita Kundanmal
Hackensack, NJ

Peter Holland
Holland Law Firm, PC
Annapolis, MD

Jay Alexander
Alexander Arbitration LLC
Dillon, CO

Subodh Chandra
The Chandra Law Firm LLC
Cleveland, OH

Sheila M Lake
Lake Law Firm, P.A.
St Petersburg, FL

Tahmina Watson
Watson Immigration Law
Seattle, WA

Elizabeth McMahon
Law Office of Elizabeth L McMahon
Branford

Stacy Grossman
SGIP
Harrison, NY

Ramon de la Cabada
Law Office of Ramon de la Cabada,
P.A.
Miami, Florida

Lindsey Phoenix
State of Missouri
DESE - Jefferson City MO

Stephen Dane
Dane Law LLC
Perrysburg, OH

Demian Jackson
Jackson IPG PLLC
Shipman, VA

Danielle Van Lier
Van Lier Law
Los Angeles, CA

Candice O'Neil
Hudkins and O'Neil PLLC
Hampton, NH

Katrin Lewertoff
Lewertoff IP Law Group, LLC
New York, NY

Christopher Reid
Reid Legal Consulting LLC
Princeton, NJ

Jill G Weiss
Jill G Weiss PA
Palm Beach Gardens, FL

Rona L. Platt

Eric F. Pierson
Pierson Law
Oakland, CA

Roger Sagal
Sagal Law, LLC
Ridgway, CO

Sejal Mistry
Law Offices of Sejal Mistry
Oakland, CA

Aubrie Hicks
Dobson Hicks PLLC
Seattle, WA

Suzann Moskowitz
The Moskowitz Firm
Cleveland, OH

Jennifer Arnett
Arnett Litigation, LLC
Lafayette, CO

Teveia R. Barnes
Pro Bono Law Office
Sausalito, California

Alan R. Sankin
Pro Bono Law Office
Sausalito, CA

Rosanne Felicello
Felicello Law P.C.
New York, NY

Juliana Saxberg
LexArtia Professional Corporation
Ottawa Ontario

Charles Barquist
Eric Maschoff
Los Angeles, CA
Park City, UT

Elizabeth Marx
Pennsylvania Utility Law Project
Harrisburg, PA

Lilah Rosenblum
Rosenblum Immigration Law, PLLC
Washington, DC

Annette M. Lamoreaux
Law Offices of Annette Lamoreaux
Huntsville, TX

Ciara Faber
Monarch Legal Movement LLC
Denver, CO

Julie King
King Business and Patent Law, PLLC
Champaign, IL

Kelly K Sondrini
Sondrini Law Office
Hinsdale, MA

Cheryl Morrison
Law Office of Cheryl A Morrison
Mokena, IL

Rebecca M. Young
Rebecca M. Young, Attorney at Law
Marblehead, MA

Emily Klick
Klick Law
Boise, ID

Michael D. Steger
Law Offices of Michael D. Steger, PC
Orangeburg, NY

Pamela Parker
Parker Counsel Legal Services
Austin, TX

David Boundy
Boston, MA

Marc Borbely
D.C. Tenants' Rights Center
Washington, DC

Kenneth John Laska
Segal & Laska, LLC
Plainville, CT

Amy Robinson
Giskan Solotaroff & Anderson
New York, NY

Lucretia Dillard
Lue Dillard, Attorney at Law PLLC
Houston, TX

David Baum
Baum Law Corp.
Los Angeles, CA

Daniel Dykes
Oakdale, CT

Nicole Gardner
Gardner Skelton PLLC
Charlotte, NC

Betsy Brazy
Law Office of Betsy Brazy
Alameda, CA

John L Burnett
Lavey and Burnett
Little Rock, AR

David G. Sacks
Judge David G. Sacks (Ret.)
Holyoke, MA

Robert Kaufman
Law Offices of Robert C. Kaufman
Bellevue, WA

Breanna Geiger
Geiger Family Law
Portland, OR

Gavin Lentz, Esquire
Gavin Lentz, Esquire
Philadelphia, PA

Kristi Rothschild
Santa Barbara, CA

Devereux Chatillon and Lisa Weiss
Chatillon Weiss PLLC
Mt. Kisco, NY

Gregory M. O'Boyle
Alpern Myers Stuart LLC
Colorado Springs, CO

Casey D. Mayell
The Mayell Legal Group, LLC
North Royalton, OH

Abigail Schmitz
Abigail Schmitz Law
Chicago, IL

Susan M. Jenkins
Washington, DC

David Benowitz
Price Benowitz LLP
Washington, DC

David P. Heim, Esquire

Kean Maynard
Philadelphia, PA

Dineen Wasylik
DPW Legal
Tampa, FL

Esther Dominguez
Esther Dominguez, Esq
Cambridge, MA

Charles Sipio
Sipio Law P.C.
Princeton, NJ

John Mack Green
John M. Green, Esq.
Solo, Murfreesboro, TN

Marcus Pearson
Pearson Law Group, PLLC
Bozeman, MT

David Hoffman
Boston Law Collaborative, LLC
Newton, MA

Carmen Casado
Casado Law
Berkeley, CA

Joseph Scrofano
Scrofano Law PC
Washington, DC

James A Penney
Seattle, WA

Robert S. Fleishman
Energy Resolve LLC
Columbia, MD

Joseph T Monahan
Monahan Law Group,LLC
Chicago, IL

Maria T. Vullo
Vullo Advisory Services, PLLC
New York, NY

Deborah K. Marcuse
Marcuse Law
Baltimore, MD and New York, NY

Evan Raynes
Symbus Law Group PLLC
Washington, DC

Dana Cisneros
The Cisneros Firm
Anaheim, CA

A Antonio Pedrero
Beauceant Foundation
Reston VA

Jeffrey I. Gordon
Javanti Law
Raleigh, NC

Tonya Baña
Tonya Baña LLC
Baltimore, MD

Cody Salfen, Esq.
The Salfen Law Firm, APLC
Los Gatos, CA

Leah Gillis
Leah Gillis Law
San Jose , CA

Zachary Margulis-Ohnuma
ZMO Law PLLC
New York, NY

David Bosland
Bosland Law, PLLC
Seattle, WA

Perry M Chappano
Chappano Wood PLL
Columbus, OH

Mehdi Essmidi
The Law Offices of Mehdi Essmidi
P.L.L.C.
New York, NY

Jennifer LaBaire
Law Office of Jennifer L. LaBaire
Leominster, MA

Stephanie J. Vardavas
Law Office of Stephanie J. Vardavas
Portland, OR

Stephen Adams
Law Office of Stephen Adams
Santa Cruz, CA

Ronald R. Ward
Law Office of Ronald R. Ward PLLC
Seattle, WA

Jeff Bauer
BLG PLLC
Minneapolis, MN

Hirsch Roberts Weinstein LLP
Boston, MA

Asia Wright
The Wright Choice
Dallas, TX

Dean N. Alterman
Alterman Law Group PC
Portland OR

Owen McGrann
McGrannLAW LLC
Pittsburgh, PA

Erdal Turnacioglu
Erdal Employment Law, LLC
Verona, NJ

Carl Fink
Blue Planet Energy Law, LLC
Portland, OR

Thomas G. Martin
Foresight Legal Group, P.C.
Long Beach, CA

Doris W. Gelbman
Gelbman Law PLLC
Charlottesville, VA

Mitch Jackson, Esq.
Jackson & Wilson, Inc.
Laguna Niguel, CA

Sarah Nichols
Nichols Law, P.C.
San Francisco, CA

Neil Forester
Forester Family Law PC
El Dorado Hills, CA

Tom Spiggle
The Spiggle Law Firm
Alexandria, VA

Jessica Adler
The Law Office of Jessica E. Adler
Washington, DC

Mona Reza
Stellar 5 Legal, LLC
Greenbelt MD

Mindy Yocum
Yocum Law
Shelby OH

Haley Morrison
Portland, OR

Brandy Mai
Brandy Mai, PC
Savannah, GA

Ben Golden
Ben Golden Consulting PC
Seattle, WA

William Mansfield
Law Office of William M. Mansfield
Indianapolis, IN

Margaret A O'Reilly
Fairfax, VA

Elizabeth L.A. Garvish
Garvish Immigration Law Group,
LLC
Atlanta, GA

Ryan McCarl and John Rushing
Rushing McCarl LLP
Los Angeles, CA

Christopher J. Huber
The Huber Law Firm LLC
Atlanta, GA

Anne Brafford

Merrill Baumann
Merrill Baumann LLC
Lake Oswego OR

Stacey Eunnae
Eunnae at Law PLLC
Washington DC

Karl Mill
Mill Law Center
Los Angeles, CA

Nancy J Mertz
Mertz Law PLLC
New York, NY

John Ratnaswamy
The Law Office of John Ratnaswamy,
LLC
Chicago, IL

Nihit Desai
Wright Squared, PLLC
Kansas City, MO

Todd N. Hallock
Hallock & Hallock, a professional
corporation
Logan, UT

Linda Priebe
Washington, DC

Farrin Solero

Julia Sullivan
Law Office of Julia E Sullivan LLC
Annapolis MD

Jana FitzGerald

Cat Moon
C Moon Law
Franklin, TN

Alexandra Golden
Golden Law Center
Newton, MA

Diana L. Bartolotta
B-Law LLC
Glastonbury, CT

David S. Secrest
Law Offices of David S. Secrest. PC
Santa Barbara CA

Suzelle Smith
Howarth & Smith
Malibu, CA

Mikaela McDermott
Mikaela McDermott Law
New Bedford, MA

J. Paul Vance, Jr., Esq.
Logan, Vance, Sullivan & Kores, LLP
Torrington, CT

Danielle M. Wood
Law Office of Danielle M. Wood
Boston, MA

Daniel Berner
Austin, Texas

Kathleen Megill Streck
KMS Juvenile Law, PC
Eugene and Corvallis, OR

Trudi Foutts Loh
Trudi Foutts Loh , Attorney at Law
Westlake Village, CA

Dana E. Heitz
Heitz Legal, P.C.
New York, NY and Berlin, Germany

Kai Jacob
Kanzlei Jacob
Baden-Wuerttemberg, Germany

Melissa Hall
MRH Enterprises, LLC
Arlington, VA

Jennifer Wazenski
Watershed Legal Counsel
Annapolis, MD

Michael E. McCabe, Jr.
McCabe & Ali LLP
Potomac, MD

The Basile Law Firm

Adria Notari
Notari Law
Fort Lauderdale, FL

Edward J. Ungvarsky
Ungvarsky Law, PLLC

Daniel N. Arshack
Arshack, Hajek & Lehrman
New York, NY

Christina A. Jump
Const'l Law Center for Muslims in
America
(division of Muslim Legal Fund of
America)
Richardson, TX

Steven Chizen
Chizen Law, PC
Oakland, CA

Kathleen McDermott
McDermott Law LLC
Annapolis, MD

Anuar Ramirez-Medina, Esq.
Seven Hills Law Firm
Oakland, CA

Autumn Witt Boyd
Law Office of Autumn Witt Boyd
PLLC d/b/a AWB Firm
Chattanooga, TN

Michael W. Bartnik
Law For Baby Boomers, PLLC
Bloomfield Hills, MI

Rahil K. Swigart
Swigart Law Group, APC
San Diego, CA

Annette P. Heller
Trademark & Copyright Attorney
Chesterfield, MO

Andi Mazingo
Lumen Law Center
Los Angeles, CA

Paul D. Murphy
David E. Rosen
Murphy Rosen LLP
Santa Monica, CA

Jodi Green
Antithesis Law PC
Los Angeles, CA

John G. Balestriere
Vittoria M. Fariello
Michael J. Weiner
Balestriere
New York, NY

Nathalie Ferro, Esq.
Law Office of Nathalie Ferro
Oakley, CA

Klavens Law Group, P.C.
Boston, MA

Nathan A. Holcomb Esq., PC
New York, NY

Sarah Desormiers
Integrated Tax Consultants, LLC
Falmouth, ME

Bridget Elizabeth Butler, Esq.
New York, NY

Lissett Costa Ferreira, Esq.
Meenan & Associates, LLC
New York, NY

Joe Scropo, Ph.D., J.D.
Licensed Psychologist/Attorney &
Counselor at Law
Forensic Psychology Consulting
PLLC
Woodmere, NY

Alan Rosenthal
Law Office of Alan Rosenthal
Syracuse, NY

Scott B. Tulman
Law Offices of Scott B. Tulman &
Associates, PLLC
New York, NY

Law Office of David Louis Cohen
Kew Gardens, New York

Theodore Bruce Godfrey
Silver Spring, MD

John M. Thompson
Linda J. Thompson
Thompson & Thompson P.C.
Springfield, MA

**Maurice H. Sercarz and Roland G.
Riopelle**
Sercarz & Riopelle, LLP

Cathy Iles
Attorney at Law
Long Beach, CA

Joel Leonard
Portland, OR

Joseph R. DeMatteo, Esq.
Bernfield, DeMatteo & Bernfield,
LLP
Tarrytown, NY

Greg D. Lubow, Esq
6026 Main Street
Tannersville, NY

Tracy Green
Green & Associates
Los Angeles, CA

Virginia G. Alvarez, Esq.
New York, NY

James E. Neuman, Esq.
James E. Neuman, PC
New York, NY

Michele Hauser
Attorney at Law
Brooklyn, NY

Mary R. Robberson
Maggie E. Schroedter
Rachel M. Garrard
Lane C. Hilton
Robberson Schroedter LLP
San Diego, CA

Amber Fayerberg
Law Office of Amber Fayerberg
Santa Fe, NM

Daniel A. Hochheiser
Attorney At Law
Scarsdale, NY

Elizabeth Kelley
Law Office of Elizabeth Kelley

Krantz & Berman LLP
New York, New York

Terrence Buehler
The Law Office of Terrence Buehler
Oak Park, Il

David J. Fryman
Fryman PC
Valley Stream, NY

EJ Hurst II
Lexington, KY

Daniel P. Donahue
Donahue Law Firm, PLLC
Nags Head, NC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

PERKINS COIE LLP,

Plaintiff,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

NO. 1:25-cv-00716-BAH

PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS BRIEF

COMES NOW, *Amici Curiae*, by and through the undersigned counsel, pursuant to Rule 29 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and D.C. Circuit Rule 29, and hereby respectfully moves this Court to enter the following Proposed Order granting leave to file an amicus brief in support of Plaintiff Perkins Coie LLP's Motion for Summary Judgment and Permanent Injunctive Relief, pursuant to Local Civ. Rule 7(o).

Upon consideration of *Amici*'s Motion and for good cause shown, it is hereby:

ORDERED that *Amici*'s Motion for Leave is GRANTED; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk shall file the Amicus Brief submitted with the Motion for Leave to File.

SO ORDERED this ___ day of April, 2025.

HON. BERYL A. HOWELL
United District Senior Judge

WHEREFORE, *Amici Curiae* respectfully requests that this Court enter the above Proposed Order granting leave to file an *amicus* brief in support of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and Permanent Injunctive Relief.

Dated: April 9, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Carolyn Elefant
Carolyn Elefant (D.C. Bar No. 425433)
LAW OFFICES OF CAROLYN ELEFANT
7315 Wisconsin Avenue
Bethesda, MD 20814
(202) 297-6100
carolyn@carolynelefant.com

*Counsel for Amici Curiae Solo and Small
Firm Lawyers*