

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.



# Litigation Tracker for the Charitable Sector

Updated as of August 26, 2025

This document tracks litigation on the federal and state levels that affects nonprofits and philanthropies.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b>CHALLENGES TO EXECUTIVE ORDERS</b>			
<i>Am. Federation of Teachers v. Dep't of Educ., No. 1:25-cv-00628 (D. Md.)</i>  (Filed 2/25/25)	8/14/25: Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment granted in part and denied in part. Defendants motion to dismiss granted in part and denied in part. 7/18/25: Second amended complaint filed by plaintiffs.  7/1/25: Motion to dismiss filed by defendants.  6/5/25: Motion for summary judgment filed by plaintiffs.  4/24/25: Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction granted in part and denied in part.	Plaintiffs allege that the Defendant's February 14, 2025 "Dear Colleague" letter on "nondiscrimination obligations of schools and other entities that receive federal financial assistance" and subsequent April 3, 2025 notice to state education agencies requiring that they certify compliance with the Department's views outlined in the "Dear Colleague" letter violated the Administrative Procedure Act, the First Amendment and Fifth Amendment, and exceeded agency authority.	The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the administration's stance on "unlawful discrimination" and diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>4/9/25: Motion for expedited preliminary injunction filed by plaintiffs.</p> <p>3/28/25: Motion for preliminary injunction filed by plaintiffs.</p> <p>3/5/25: Amended complaint filed.</p> <p>2/25/25: Complaint filed.</p>		
<p><b><i>State of N. J. et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Justice et al., No. 1:25-cv-00404 (D.R.I.)</i></b></p> <p><b>(Filed 8/18/25)</b></p>	8/18/25: Complaint filed.	Plaintiff alleges that the U.S. DOJ and its associated offices have imposed new conditions on the Victims of Crime Act funds, requiring states to assist in federal immigration enforcement to access these funds. Plaintiffs argue that these restrictions are due to EO <a href="#">14159</a> , which directed the AG and Secretary of Homeland Security to “ensure that so-called ‘sanctuary’ jurisdictions []do not receive access to Federal funds” and to take “any other lawful actions, criminal or civil, that they deem warranted.” Plaintiffs claim these new conditions violate the Administrative Procedure Act, the Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, and are Ultra Vires.	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that serve immigrant communities and/or are involved in immigration advocacy.
<p><b><i>D.C. v. Trump et al., No. 1:25-cv-02678 (D.D.C.)</i></b></p> <p><b>(Filed 8/15/25)</b></p>	8/15/25: Complaint filed.	The District of Columbia alleges that President Trump unlawfully attempted to seize control of the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) by issuing EO <a href="#">14333</a> to invoke his authority under Section 740 of the	The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions targeting the police power of municipalities.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		Home Rule Act, which allows the President to request MPD services for federal purposes in emergency situations. Subsequently, Plaintiff claims AG Bondi issued an order purported to install federal officials in MPD leadership roles, rescind MPD policies, and enforce local laws, exceeding the authority granted by Section 740. Plaintiff claims that these actions violate the Administrative Procedure Act, the Separation of Powers, the Take Care Clause, the District Clause, and are Ultra Vires acts.	
<b><i>Nat'l Ass'n of Agric. Employees v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-02657 (D.D.C.)</b>  <b>(Filed 8/13/25)</b>	8/13/25: Complaint filed.	Plaintiff alleges that the U.S. Dept. Agriculture, along with other federal officials, unilaterally altered collective bargaining agreements, imposed workforce reductions, and interfered with union activities in response to EO <a href="#">14251</a> aimed at “streamlining” federal agriculture programs, in violation of First Amendment, the Equal Protection Clause, and is Ultra Vires.	The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions targeting employee rights without Congressional authorizations, and may impact charitable organizations’ access to federal funding.
<b><i>Env't'l Defense Fund, Inc. et al. v. Wright et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-12249 (D. Mass.)</b>  <b>(Filed 8/12/25)</b>	8/14/25: Plaintiff filed a motion for a preliminary injunction arguing that the establishment of the Climate Working Group violates the Federal Advisory Committee Act.	Plaintiffs allege that the U.S. Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency have violated the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) by establishing a secretive Climate Working Group to challenge the scientific consensus on climate change due to EO <a href="#">14154</a> . Plaintiffs allege that the Climate Working Group’s formation and operations were not disclosed to the public, and its meetings and records have not been made public, violating FACA’s transparency requirements. Plaintiffs allege these actions violate FACA and the Administrative Procedure Act.	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations’ access to federal funding, particularly those that perform environmental and climate work.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>State of Wash. v. U.S. Dep't of Com. et al.</i>, No. 2:25-cv-01507 (W.D. Wash.)</b>  (Filed 8/8/25)	8/8/25: Complaint filed.	Plaintiff alleges that Defendants unlawfully terminated two of Plaintiff's federal funding awards intended to support climate resilience after President Donald Trump directed agencies to advance his policies, including EO <a href="#">14153</a> , in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Appointment Clause, the Spending Clause, and the Separation of Powers Doctrine.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities, particularly those that perform environmental and climate work.
<b><i>Commonwealth of Mass. et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-12162</b>  (Filed 8/1/25)	8/1/25: Complaint filed.	Plaintiffs challenge EO <a href="#">14187</a> and related directives, alleging that they harm transgender individuals by targeting gender-affirming healthcare for those under age 19, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act and the Tenth Amendment.	The outcome of this case may impact the application of <a href="#">EO 14187</a> which will in turn impact the work of any charitable organizations that engage in gender affirming healthcare.
<b><i>Bldg. Materials Re-Use Ass'n v. U.S. Env't Prot. Agency et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-02493</b>  (Filed 7/31/25)	7/31/25: Complaint filed.	Plaintiff alleges that Defendants wrongfully terminated the Reducing Embodied GHG Emissions for Construction Materials and Products Program in their implementation of EO <a href="#">14154</a> in violation of Separation of Powers, the Presentment Clauses, and the Administrative Procedure Act.	The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions terminating federal programs without Congressional authorizations, and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.
<b><i>City of Seattle v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 2:25-cv-1435 (W.D. Wash)</b>  (Filed 7/31/25)	7/31/25: Complaint filed.	Plaintiff challenges EO <a href="#">14173</a> and EO <a href="#">14168</a> for allegedly imposing unconstitutional and unlawful requirements on Plaintiff as a recipient of federal contracts and grants in violation of Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, the Due Process Clause, the Tenth Amendment, and the Administrative Procedure Act.	The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions terminating federal programs without Congressional authorizations, and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Planned Parenthood of Greater New York et al. v. Dep't of Health and Human Services et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-2453 (D.D.C)</b>  (Filed Jul 29, 2025)	7/29/25: Complaint filed.	Plaintiffs challenge Defendants' imposition of new requirements on grantees under the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program, which conditions federal funding on alignment with EOs 14151 and 14173, and introduces additional content-based restrictions that are vague and fundamentally incompatible with the statutory mandate Congress established for the TPP program, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act and Fifth Amendment.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<b><i>State of N.Y. et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Just. et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00345 (D.R.I.)</b>  (Filed 7/21/25)	8/15/25: Amended Complaint filed.  7/24/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction arguing that the certification causes irreparable harm by forcing states to shut down programs.	Plaintiffs challenge the implementation of EO 14218, which directed the revocation of exemptions under the Personal Responsibility of Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. These exemptions previously allowed individuals to access community-based programs, such as soup kitchens and domestic violence shelters, without providing proof of citizenship or immigration status. Plaintiffs claim that that Defendants' actions violates the Administrative Procedure Act and the Spending Clause.	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that serve immigrant communities and/or are involved in immigration advocacy.
<b><i>State of Wash. et al. v. Fed. Emergency Mgmt. Agency et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-12006 (D. Mass.)</b>  (Filed 7/16/25)	8/6/25: Motion for preliminary injunction granted. Government is preliminarily enjoined from spending funds allocated to BRIC until final judgment on the merits is entered.  7/16/25: Motion for preliminary injunction filed by Plaintiffs arguing that	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants unlawfully terminated the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) program. The BRIC was a pre-disaster mitigation initiative designed to fortify communities against natural disasters. Plaintiffs claim that the shutdown of the BRIC program has reportedly forced communities to delay, scale back, or cancel hundreds of mitigation projects, increasing the risk of harm from natural disasters. Plaintiffs allege	The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions terminating federal programs without Congressional authorizations, and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding, particularly those that perform environmental and climate work.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	the termination of the BRIC is causing irreparable harm by increasing risk from natural disasters.	the termination of BRIC violates the Administrative Procedure Act, Separation of Powers, Appropriations Clause, Spending Clause, and Appointments Clause, and is ultra vires.	
<b><i>Nat'l TPS All. et al. v. Noem et al.</i>, No. 3:25-cv-05687 (N.D. Cal.)</b>  <b>(Filed 7/7/25)</b>	8/25/25: Plaintiffs filed motion for partial summary judgment.  8/15/25: Plaintiffs filed motion to certify class.  8/1/25: Defendants filed Notice of Appeal to Ninth Circuit.  7/31/25: Court granted Plaintiffs' motion to postpone effective date of agency action and ordered that TPS terminations shall be postponed until 11/18 hearing on the merits.  7/8/25: Plaintiffs filed motion to postpone effective date of agency action.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' attempt to terminate Temporary Protected Status designations for Honduras, Nepal, and Nicaragua violates the Administrative Procedure Act and the Fifth Amendment.	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that serve immigrant communities and/or are involved in immigration advocacy.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Right To Be et al. v. Bondi et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-03676 (E.D.N.Y.)</b>  (Filed 7/2/25)	7/2/25: Complaint filed	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' termination of the Anti-Hate Crimes Grant Program was part of a broader effort by the Department of Justice to comply with "recent Executive Orders" in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Fifth Amendment, the Separation of Powers, the Due Process Clause and are ultra vires.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<b><i>Launch Alaska v. Dep't of the Navy, Off. of Naval Rsch.</i>, No. 3:25-cv-00141 (D. Alaska)</b>  (Filed 7/1/25)	8/19/25: Answer filed.  8/5/25: Court denied Defendant's motion to dismiss and granted Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction.,  7/21/25: Defendant filed a motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.  7/3/25: Plaintiff filed motion for preliminary injunction against ONR to rescind its termination of the grant award.	Launch Alaska alleges that the Office of Naval Research terminated a grant under the Alaska Regional Collaboration Technology Innovation and Commercialization program in response to various EOs, including <a href="#">EO 14153</a> , in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act and the terms of the grant agreement.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<b><i>State of Cal. et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Services et al.</i>, No. 3:25-cv-05536 (N.D. Cal.)</b>  (Filed 7/1/25)	8/12/25: Court granted in part and denied in part motion for preliminary injunction. DHS is enjoined from using Medicaid data for immigration enforcement purposes.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants transferred protected health data from state Medicaid agencies to the Department of Homeland Security without consent, notice, or public input, as permitted under by <a href="#">EO 14218 (Borders)</a> and <a href="#">EO 14243 (Information Silos)</a> , but in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act and the Spending Clause.	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations' access to federal resources, particularly those involved in public health, community services, and immigration advocacy.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.



**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	7/11/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction arguing that this data could be used for immigration enforcement, which could deter eligible individuals from seeking necessary medical care.		
<b><i>Goodman et al. v. Lutnick et al.</i>, No. 8:25-cv-02097 (D. Md.)</b> <b>(Filed 6/30/25)</b>	6/30/25: Complaint filed.	Plaintiffs allege that the purging of federal employees, particularly probationary employees, in an attempt to enforce EO <a href="#">14210</a> and <a href="#">14284</a> , violated the Privacy Act and the Declaratory Judgment Act.	The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions that target specific federal jobs.
<b><i>State of Washington et al. v. United States Dep't of Education et al.</i>, No. 2:25-cv-01228 (W.D. Wash.)</b> <b>(Filed 6/30/25)</b>	6/30/25: Complaint filed.	Plaintiffs allege that the U.S. Department of Education's termination of mental health funding to elementary and secondary schools, in an attempt to comply with "executive policies" and "executive acts", violates the Administrative Procedure Act, the Spending Clause, and Separation of Powers principles.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities and may impact access to federal funding for charitable organizations that perform work relating to mental health.
<b><i>Barbara et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00244 (D.N.H.)</b> <b>(Filed 6/27/25)</b>	7/10/25: Court granted Plaintiffs' provisional class certification motion and motion for preliminary injunction, staying the case until this issue can be	Plaintiffs allege that EO <a href="#">14160</a> , which denies citizenship to children born in the United States if their mother is "unlawfully" or temporarily present and their father is not a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident, violates the 14th Amendment and the Administrative Procedure Act. Plaintiffs claim	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that serve immigrant communities and/or are involved in immigration advocacy.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.



**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>decided by the Supreme Court.</p> <p>6/27/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction arguing that the EO renders children stateless, ineligible for U.S. passports, and unable to access essential services like SNAP and medical care.</p> <p>6/27/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion to certify the class.</p>	that the Executive Order will unlawfully deny citizenship to over two hundred thousand newborns each year, creating a subclass of children without fundamental legal recognition.	
<p><b><i>Appalachian Voices et al. v. U.S. Env't'l. Prot. Agency et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-01982 (D.D.C.)</b></p> <p><b>(Filed 6/25/25)</b></p>	<p>7/14/25: Defendants filed Motion to Dismiss.</p> <p>6/27/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction and a motion to certify the class. Plaintiffs claim that a preliminary injunction is warranted because they are being harmed by the halting of projects aimed at addressing environmental harms, leading to layoffs, program cuts, and reputational damage.</p>	Plaintiffs allege that the Environmental Protection Agency and its Administrator violated the Separation of Powers, the Presentment Clauses, and the Administrative Procedure Act by unlawfully terminating the Environmental and Climate Justice Block Grant program when implementing various EOs, including EO <a href="#">14154</a> and EO <a href="#">14151</a> .	The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions that target specific organizations, and impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding, particularly those that perform environmental and climate work.
<p><b><i>State of New Jersey et al. v. U.S. Office of Management and Budget</i></b></p>	6/24/25: Complaint filed	Plaintiffs, consisting of multiple states and the District of Columbia, allege that Defendants unlawfully terminated federal funding t	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-11816 (D. Mass.)</b>  (Filed 6/24/25)		previously awarded to Plaintiffs to comply with EOs <a href="#">14158</a> , <a href="#">14222</a> , <a href="#">14151</a> , <a href="#">14168</a> , <a href="#">14242</a> , <a href="#">14287</a> in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act.	charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<b><i>Bd. of Educ. for the Silver Consol. Schools v. McMahon et al.</i>, No. 2:25-cv-00586 (D.N.M.)</b>  (Filed 6/20/25)	6/23/25: Plaintiff filed a motion for a TRO arguing that the termination of the grants will cause irreparable harm by depriving Plaintiff of essential funding for mental health programs.	Plaintiff alleges that the U.S. Department of Education violated the First Amendment, Fifth Amendment, the Spending Clause, and the Administrative Procedure Act by terminating Plaintiff's \$6 million Bipartisan Safer Communities Act grant in response to various EOs, including EO <a href="#">14190</a> , and the Department of Education's Dear Colleague Letter.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities, and may impact access to federal funding for charitable organizations that perform work relating to education.
<b><i>Am. Ass'n of Physics Teachers Inc. et al. v. Nat'l Science Found. et al.</i>, No 1:25-cv-1923 (D.D.C.)</b>  (Filed 6/18/25)	7/11/25: Defendants filed Motion to Dismiss.  6/23/25: Motion for preliminary injunction filed by Plaintiffs.  6/18/25: Complaint filed.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants unlawfully engaged in mass termination of grants aimed at expanding participation of women and underrepresented groups in STEM, through the implementation of EO <a href="#">14151</a> , in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Fifth Amendment, and is ultra vires. Plaintiffs seek an injunction against the termination of grants.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities, and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.
<b><i>Rhode Island Coal. Against Domestic Violence et al. v. Bondi et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00279 (D.R.I.)</b>  (Filed 6/16/25)	8/8/25: Court granted motion for preliminary injunction with respect to request for preliminary stay of challenged conditions on all FY 2025 grants, but denied request for Section	Plaintiffs allege that the Office on Violence Against Women has imposed new grant conditions in response to various EOs, including EO <a href="#">14173</a> and EO <a href="#">14168</a> , that conflict with the Violence Against Women Act and violate the Administrative Procedure Act, Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause,	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities, and may

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	705 preliminary stay and injunctive relief.  6/26/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction arguing that new conditions for funding are causing irreparable harm.	the First Amendment, and the Fifth Amendment.	impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.
<b><i>Am. Bar Ass'n v. Exec. Off. of the President</i>, No. 1:25-cv-01888 (D.D.C.)</b>  <b>(Filed 6/16/25)</b>	8/8/25: Defendants filed motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction.	Plaintiff alleges that recent executive action unlawfully retaliates against law firms and legal organizations, including the ABA, for engaging in protected speech and association in violation of the First Amendment, and also encroaches on the judiciary's authority by attempting to influence or penalize legal representation and litigation in violation of Separation of Powers.	The outcome of this case may impact how courts interpret executive actions that target specific organizations, and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding and/or legal services.
<b><i>Thakur et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 3:25-cv-4737 (N.D. Cal.); 25-04249 (9th Cir.)</b>  <b>(Filed 6/4/25)</b>	7/18/25: Plaintiffs filed Amended Complaint.  7/10/25: Defendants filed a notice of appeal of the preliminary injunction/class certification order.  6/23/25: Court granted motion for preliminary injunction and for provisional class certification.  6/5/25: Plaintiffs filed motion for TRO and motion for class certification.	Plaintiffs allege that EOs <a href="#">14151</a> , <a href="#">14154</a> , <a href="#">14158</a> , <a href="#">14168</a> , <a href="#">14173</a> , <a href="#">14217</a> , <a href="#">14238</a> , and/or <a href="#">14222</a> interfere with congressionally appropriated funds for research grants in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, Impoundment Control Act of 1974, Fifth Amendment, First Amendment, and Separation of Powers.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities, and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Shapiro et al. v. Dep't of Agric.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-998 (M.D. Pa.)</b>  <b>(Filed 6/4/25)</b>	7/28/25: Motion to dismiss filed by Defendants.  6/26/25: Plaintiffs filed motion for preliminary injunction. (Brief ISO filed 7/3/25.)	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants wrongfully terminated Pennsylvania's Local Food Purchasing Assistance Program in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act and Due Process Clause.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with administration priorities, and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding, particularly those involved in food security, agricultural support, or rural community development.
<b><i>Nat'l Job Corps et al. v. Dep't of Labor</i>, No. 1:25-cv-4641 (S.D.N.Y)</b>  <b>(Filed 6/3/25)</b>	8/13/25: Intervenor Complaint filed by Jacob Valine.  7/24/25: Court entered amended order granting preliminary injunction, limiting scope to specific Job Corps centers, and ordering that the injunction will not supersede contrary rulings by other courts.  6/25/25: Court granted Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction. Court order enjoined Defendants from enforcing, implementing, maintaining or giving effect to the closure of the private Job Corps centers, including the	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' elimination of Job Corps was unlawful under the Administrative Procedure Act and Separation of Powers doctrine, and an ultra vires action.	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that perform work with Job Corps and impact access to federal funding and courts' interpretation of such executive actions without Congressional approval under the APA.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>stop work orders and termination and non-renewal notices delivered to Job Corps center operators, and from issuing, enforcing, implementing, maintaining or giving effect to any shutdown tasks, job terminations, or student removals.</p> <p>6/4/25: TRO granted, enjoining Defendants from enforcing, implementing, maintaining or giving effect to the elimination of the Job Corps program.</p>		
<p><b><i>Nat'l Public Radio, Inc. et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-01674 (D.D.C.)</b></p> <p><b>(Filed 5/27/25)</b></p>	<p>7/31/25: Answer to Complaint filed by Corporation for Public Broadcasting.</p> <p>7/12/25: Cross motion for summary judgment filed.</p> <p>6/13/25: Plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment.</p> <p>5/30/25: Complaint filed in <i>PBS et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-1722 (D.D.C) (bringing substantially the same claims)</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that EO <a href="#">14290</a>, which withholds all federal funding from NPR and PBS and prohibits local stations receiving federal grants from using those funds to acquire NPR or PBS programming or otherwise support them, constitutes “view-point based discrimination” and “textbook retaliation” in violation of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, the Administrative Procedure Act, the First Amendment, the Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, and the Due Process Clause.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with administration priorities, and may impact charitable organizations that operate in public media or partner with NPR, PBS, or local affiliates, including non-profits that depend on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting pass-through grants or collaborative programming.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Am. Ass’n of Physicians for Human Rights, Inc. et al. v. Nat’l Instes. of Health et al.</i>, No. 8:25-cv-01620 (D. Md.)</b>  (Filed 5/20/25)	8/1/25: Motion for preliminary injunction granted in part and denied in part. Court enjoins Defendants from implementing and enforcing agency action based on agency priorities or because research relates to DEI/gender identity, etc, and orders Defendants to review properly submitted application related to LGBTQI+ health research.  5/28/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants cancelled research grants dedicated to the health of LGBTQI+ Americans, “decreeing that the government will not fund research addressing their health needs[.]” in violation of the Equal Protection Clause, the Affordable Care Act, the Due Process Clause, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Separation of Powers.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with administration priorities, and may may impact charitable organizations’ access to federal funding, particularly those involved in public health and community services.
<b><i>Wash. State Med. Ass’n et al. v. Kennedy et al.</i>, No. 2:25-cv-00955 (W.D. Wash.)</b>  (Filed 5/20/25)	8/15/25: Per the parties’ stipulated motion, Court ordered stay pending settlement.  7/25/25: Plaintiffs filed Amended complaint.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants removed a broad range of health-related data from publicly available websites, which was taxpayer-funded and crucial for doctors, nurses, researchers, and the public, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act and the Separation of Powers.	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations’ access to federal resources, particularly those involved in public health and community services.
<b><i>State of Illinois et al. v. Fed. Emergency Mgmt. Agency et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00206 (D.R.I.)</b>  (Filed 5/13/25)	7/23/25: Defendants filed motion for summary judgment and opposition to Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment.	Plaintiffs allege that the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and its sub-agencies, particularly the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) by conditioning grants on state cooperation in immigration enforcement measures, in part by implementing EOs <a href="#">14159</a> and <a href="#">14287</a> , violates	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that serve immigrant communities and/or are involved in immigration advocacy, legal aid, education, and community services, especially those organizations located in states and local jurisdictions identified as

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>7/2/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment.</p> <p>7/2/25: First Amended Complaint filed.</p> <p>6/6/25: Defendants filed an opposition to the motion for preliminary injunction.</p> <p>5/19/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction.</p>	the Administrative Procedure Act, the Spending Clause, and are ultra vires actions.	Sanctuary Jurisdictions as defined in EO 14159.
<p><b><i>Iverson v. Trump et al., No. 1:25-1353 (D.D.C.)</i></b></p> <p><b>(Filed 5/5/2025)</b></p>	<p>Settled.</p> <p>5/5/25: Plaintiff filed motions for TRO and preliminary injunction.</p>	Plaintiff, serving as a lead prosecutor for the International Criminal Court (ICC), alleges that EO <a href="#">14203</a> (“Imposing Sanctions on the International Criminal Court”), which sanctions ICC personnel, violates his constitutional and statutory rights to engage in protected speech and the practice of law.	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that work with and/or fund international NGOs and/or that perform work relating to human rights, international law, or war crimes.
<p><b><i>King Cnty., et al. v. Turner, et al., No. 2:25-cv-814 (W.D. Wash); 25-3664 (9th Cir. Jun 10, 2025)</i></b></p> <p><b>(Filed 5/2/2025)</b></p>	<p>8/15/25: Appellees’ answering brief filed.</p> <p>8/12/25: Court granted Plaintiffs’ third motion for TRO.</p> <p>7/10/25: Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Complaint.</p> <p>7/8/25: Appellants’ opening brief filed.</p>	Plaintiffs, which include several counties and cities, challenge grant conditions imposed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Transportation, and Federal Transit Administration, alleging that the conditions, tied to various EOs that impose federal funding restrictions, “coerce grant recipients” to comply with President Trump’s “policy agenda” which includes “opposition to all forms of DEI policies and initiatives, participation in aggressive and lawless immigration enforcement, exclusion of transgender people,	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.



**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>6/9/25: Defendants filed a notice of appeal to the Ninth Circuit of the order granting preliminary injunction.</p> <p>5/23/25: Court granted Plaintiffs' second motion for a TRO because the second motion raises the same questions of law and fact as the first motion.</p> <p>5/21/25: Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Complaint adding several additional Plaintiffs, a second motion for a TRO on the same grounds as the first motion, and a motion for a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>5/7/25: Court entered a TRO enjoining Defendants from pausing, freezing, terminating, or withholding funds.</p>	and cutting off access to lawful abortions,” in violation of the Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, the Tenth Amendment, the Fifth Amendment, and the Administrative Procedure Act.	
<p><b><i>Am. Council of Learned Societies, et al. v. McDonald, et al., No. 1:25-cv-3657 (S.D.N.Y.)</i></b></p> <p><b>(Filed 5/1/2025)</b></p>	<p>8/1/25: Plaintiffs filed notice of interlocutory appeal to 2d Circuit.</p> <p>7/25/25: Court granted motion for preliminary</p>	Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants are “wholesale dismantling” the National Endowment for the Humanities by eliminating entire programs, conducting mass firings of staff, and terminating funding for grants in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act,	The outcome of this case will impact charitable organizations that receive funding from and/or work with the National Endowment for the Humanities.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>injunction as to the mass cancellation of Authors Guild grants but otherwise denied motion for preliminary injunction, and accordingly granted the Motion to Dismiss as to the Administrative Procedure Act and the Separation of Powers counts.</p> <p>5/30/25: Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss.</p> <p>5/27/25: Amended Complaint filed as class action.</p> <p>5/23/25: Motion for preliminary injunction filed.</p>	the Separation of Powers, the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the Appropriations Act, and the First Amendment.	
<b><i>Jewell v. Jagadesan</i>, No. 1:25-cv-01322 (D.D.C.)</b>  <b>(Filed 5/1/2025)</b>	4/30/5: Complaint filed.	Plaintiff alleges that her employment as a Chief Diversity and Inclusion Officer and Equal Employment Opportunity Director for the U.S. International Development Finance Corporation was terminated because of EOs targeting DEI programs, including EO <a href="#">14151</a> and <a href="#">14148</a> , in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the First Amendment, the Due Process Clause, and the Equal Protection Clause.	This case will help inform what the courts are considering when determining the legality of executive actions to implement EOs.
<b><i>Corp. for Pub. Broad., et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-1305 (D.D.C.)</b>	7/25/25: Plaintiffs filed motion for summary judgment.	Plaintiffs allege wrongful termination of three Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) board members, arguing that the action, as	This case may impact nonprofit organizations that operate in public media or partner with NPR, PBS, or

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b>(Filed 4/28/2025)</b>	6/8/25: Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction denied for failure to demonstrate likelihood of success on the merits, and failure to show likelihood of irreparable harm.	well as EO <a href="#">14294</a> , which directs the CPB to cease funding to NPR and PBS, is part of a broader effort by the administration to target public media, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Separation of Powers, and the Presentment, Appropriations, and Take Care Clauses.	local affiliates, including nonprofits that depend on CPB pass-through grants or collaborative programming support.
<b><i>Wash. State Ass'n of Head Start and Early Childhood Educ. and Assistance Program et al. v. Kennedy et al.</i>, No. 2:25-cv-00781 (W.D. Wash.)</b>  <b>(Filed 04/28/25)</b>	8/19/25: Plaintiffs filed Second Amended Complaint.  8/8/25: Court denied TRO motion filed 7/21 as moot.  8/5/25: Oral argument for motion for preliminary injunction held.  7/21/25: Motion for TRO filed by Plaintiffs to postpone effective date of agency action.  5/16/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction. Oral argument on motion set for 8/5/25.  5/13/24: Plaintiffs filed an Amended Complaint adding an additional plaintiff.	Plaintiffs allege that the administration's cancellation of federal public health funding (including for Head Start providers) and other actions, including the closure of five regional Head Start offices, violates the Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, the Fifth Amendment, the First Amendment, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Rehabilitation Act, and are ultra vires actions.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>State of N.Y. et al. v. US Dep't of Educ. et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-11116 (D. Mass.)</b>  (Filed 4/25/25)	6/30/25: Answer to Complaint filed.	Plaintiffs challenge the DOE's April 3, 2025 action that imposes new certification requirements on states that receive federal education funds. Plaintiffs argue that the directive is part of a broader directive from the Trump Administration to eliminate diversity, equity, and inclusion programs, which the Plaintiffs argue is based on an unsupported interpretation of Title VI. Plaintiffs allege that the agency action violates the Administrative Procedure Act, Separation of Powers, Appropriations Clause, and Spending Clause, and constitutes an ultra vires action.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<b><i>Harris Cnty. et al., v. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-1275 (D.D.C.)</b>  (Filed 4/24/2025)	7/15/25: Defendants filed partial motion for reconsideration on order granting preliminary injunction.  6/17/25: Court entered order granting preliminary injunction in part due to likelihood of success on the merits as to separation-of-powers and ultra vires claims regarding grants issued. The court denied the request for nationwide relief.  4/30/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants unlawfully terminated over \$11 billion in Centers for Disease Control and Prevention grants intended for COVID-19 recovery and public health preparedness, in violation of the Separation of Powers doctrine, Spending Clause, and Administrative Procedure Act.	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding, particularly those involved in public health and community services.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Oregon et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00077 (Ct. Int'l Trade), No. 25-1812 (Fed. Cir.)</b>  <b>(Filed 04/23/25)</b>	<p>7/8/25: Response brief filed by appellees.</p> <p>6/24/25: Opening brief filed by appellants.</p> <p>6/11/25: The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit granted appellants' emergency motion for a stay pending appeal.</p> <p>5/28/25: Defendants filed a Notice of Appeal with the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.</p> <p>5/27/25: Court ruled in accordance with Motion for Summary Judgment granted in <i>V.O.S. Selections, Inc. v. Trump</i> (No. 1:25-cv-00066), that EO 14193 and 14194 are invalid as contrary to law.</p> <p>5/7/25: Motion for preliminary injunction filed.</p>	Plaintiffs challenge the administration's imposition of tariffs on imports from Canada and Mexico announced via EOs <a href="#">14193</a> and <a href="#">14194</a> , alleging that the tariffs violate the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, the Separation of Powers, and the Administrative Procedure Act and that they constitute an ultra vires action.	This case will help inform how courts assess the administration's authority to issue certain EOs.
<b><i>State of Minnesota v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 0:25-cv-01608 (D. Minn.)</b>	6/26/25: Defendants filed Motion to Dismiss for lack	Plaintiffs challenge several EOs and associated government actions, arguing that their reversal of civil rights protections for	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
(Filed 4/22/25)	of jurisdiction and failure to state a claim.	transgender people and conditioning of federal funding on compliance, violates the Separation of Powers, Title IX, the Tenth Amendment, and Administrative Procedure Act.	charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<i>President and Fellows of Harvard Coll. v. US Dep't. of Health and Hum. Servs et al.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-11048 (D. Mass.)  (Filed 4/21/25)	6/16/25: Cross Motion for Summary Judgment filed by Defendants, alleging lack of jurisdiction and insufficient pleadings.  6/2/25: Motion for Summary Judgment filed by Plaintiffs alleging necessity for injunction.	The lawsuit challenges the administration's freeze of \$2.2 billion in federal research grants and threats to cut additional funding, alleging the funding freezes are "an attempt to coerce and control Harvard" after it refused to comply with government "demands" relating to hiring and admission practices, in violation of the First Amendment, the Administrative Procedure Act, and Title VI, and further alleging the Defendants' actions are an ultra vires action.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<i>Rona et al. v. Trump et al.</i> , No 1:25-cv-03114 (S.D.N.Y.)  (Filed 4/15/2025)	8/18/25: Court ordered that Defendants are enjoined from enforcing penalties under EO 14203.  7/30/25: Court granted preliminary injunction against all Defendants except for President Trump. All other Defendants are enjoined from enforcing IEEPA's civil or criminal penalty provisions against Plaintiff.  4/15/25: Plaintiffs filed motion for preliminary injunction.	Plaintiffs allege that the effect of EO <a href="#">14203</a> ("Imposing Sanctions on the International Criminal Court") violates the First and Fifth Amendments and the Administrative Procedure Act.	This outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that work with and/or fund international NGOs and/or that perform work relating to human rights, international law, or war crimes.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Smith et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00158 (D. Me.)</b>  <b>(Filed 4/11/2025)</b>	<p>7/22/25: Plaintiffs filed amended complaint seeking declaratory judgment.</p> <p>7/18/25: Court granted motion for preliminary injunction. Government is enjoined from imposing civil or criminal penalties on Plaintiffs under EO <a href="#">14203</a> and the IEEPA based on Plaintiffs' provision of speech-based services to the ICC.</p> <p>4/25/25: Plaintiffs filed motion for preliminary injunction.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege the administration's restrictions on providing services to the International Criminal Court's Office of the Prosecutor inhibit their constitutionally protected speech and their ability to pursue accountability for human rights violations in violation of the First Amendment.</p>	<p>This outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that work with and/or fund international NGOs and/or that perform work relating to human rights, international law, or war crimes.</p>
<b><i>Am. Ass'n of Univ. Professors-Harvard Fac. Chapter et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Just. et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-10910 (D. Mass.)</b>  <b>(Filed 4/11/25)</b>	<p>6/16/25: Defendants filed Cross Motion for Summary Judgment alleging lack of standing and ripeness, compliance with APA, and Plaintiffs' failure to establish claims under the First Amendment, Separation of Powers, Spending Clause, and Due Process Clause.</p> <p>6/2/25: Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Summary Judgment alleging</p>	<p>Defendants challenge the administration's conditioning of nearly \$9 billion in federal funding to Harvard on the university adopting broad programmatic and structural changes, including governance reforms, admissions policies, and the elimination of DEI programs, alleging that the demands violate the Administrative Procedure Act, First Amendment, and Fifth Amendment.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.



**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>violations of the APA and First Amendment.</p> <p>5/16/25: Motion for leave to file Second Amended Complaint filed.</p> <p>5/5/25: Amended Complaint filed.</p>		
<p><b><i>State of Maine v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00131 (D. Me.)</b></p> <p><b>(Filed 4/7/2025)</b></p>	<p>Settled.</p> <p>5/2/25: State of Maine filed notice of voluntary dismissal with prejudice.</p> <p>4/18/25: TRO extended until 05/09/25.</p> <p>4/11/25: District Court granted Plaintiff's motion for TRO.</p>	<p>The State of Maine alleges that the United States Secretary of Agriculture unlawfully froze federal funds allocated to Maine for feeding schoolchildren without following statutory and regulatory requirements. The Secretary's action was based on the claim that Maine violated Title IX by allowing transgender girls and women to participate in girls' and women's school sports.</p> <p>State of Maine claims the Secretary's action violates the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.</p>
<p><b><i>State of R.I., et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00128 (D.R.I.)</b></p> <p><b>(Filed 4/4/2025)</b></p>	<p>8/22/25: Plaintiffs filed Motion for Summary Judgment.</p> <p>6/12/25: Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Complaint.</p> <p>5/16/25: Defendants filed Notice of Appeal as to Court's Order granting preliminary injunction.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that <a href="#">EO 14238</a> (the "Closure Order"), which directs several agencies, including the Institute of Museum and Library Services, the Minority Business Development Agency, and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, to eliminate non-statutory programs and reduce statutory functions to the minimum required by law, is an unlawful attempt to dismantle federal agencies in defiance of Congress's directives.</p>	<p>This case may impact charitable organizations that work with, provide support to, or receive support from the agencies impacted by EO 14238.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>5/6/25: District Court granted Plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>4/23/25: Plaintiffs submitted supplemental briefing in support of their motion for a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>4/18/25: District Court held a hearing on the motion for a preliminary injunction. Motion is taken under advisement.</p>	Plaintiffs claim the EO violates the Administrative Procedure Act, the Appropriations Clause, the Separation of Powers, and is an ultra vires action.	
<p><b><i>Commonwealth of Mass. et al. v. Kennedy, Jr. et al., No. 1:25-cv-10814 (D. Mass.); 25-01612 (1st Cir.)</i></b></p> <p><b>(Filed 4/4/2025)</b></p>	<p>7/2/25: Court entered an official order granting final judgement on Plaintiffs’ claim that the challenged directives and resulting grant terminations are arbitrary and capricious in violation of the APA.</p> <p>6/24/25: Defendants filed notice of appeal as to Court’s jurisdiction.</p> <p>6/20/25: Defendants filed motion to dismiss.</p>	Plaintiffs, various state governments, allege that the National Institute of Health (NIH) has unlawfully cut previously issued grants and delayed the review and approval of applications that “no longer effectuate[] agency priorities,” and/or are connected to “DEI” or other “disfavored” topics. Plaintiffs allege that the NIH’s actions violate the Administrative Procedure Act, the Separation of Powers, and the Spending Clause.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>5/12/25: Court ordered that it has subject-matter jurisdiction over this case.</p> <p>5/2/25: Preliminary Injunction hearing set for 5/8/25.</p> <p>4/14/25: Plaintiffs filed an Amended Complaint and a motion for preliminary injunction.</p> <p>4/4/25: Plaintiffs filed an emergency motion for a TRO.</p>		
<p><b><i>American Public Health Association et al. v. Nat’l Institutes of Health et al., No. 1:25-cv-10787 (D. Mass.); 25-1611 (1st Cir.)</i></b></p> <p><b>(Filed 4/2/2025)</b></p>	<p>7/2/25: Court entered an order granting final judgement on Plaintiffs’ claim that the challenged directives and resulting grant terminations are arbitrary and capricious in violation of the APA.</p> <p>6/23/25: Defendants filed notice of appeal of the partial final judgment.</p> <p>6/23/25: Court entered the Plaintiffs’ proposed Rule 54(b) partial final judgment on their claim that the challenged Directives and</p>	<p>Plaintiffs, various professors and health organizations, allege that the NIH cutting already-issued grants, delaying review and approval of applications, and removing available funding opportunities off the NIH’s website violates the Administrative Procedure Act, Fifth Amendment, and Separation of Powers. Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants are trying to justify these actions by saying the grants have some connection to “gender identity,” “DEI,” or other “now-forbidden language.”</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>Resulting Grant Terminations are arbitrary and capricious in violation of the APA.</p> <p>5/30/25: Court granted the motion to dismiss as to Counts IV and VI, void for vagueness claims, holding that the standard for vagueness is relaxed in the context of government funding, and, as to Count VII, a separation of powers claim, holding that Plaintiffs' concerns were better addressed by their APA claims. The motion to dismiss was denied as to the remaining counts.</p> <p>5/22/25: Hearing on preliminary injunction held and court denied the motion with no explanation. Court also heard argument on Defendant's opposition to preliminary injunction being treated as a motion to dismiss and took that under advisement.</p>		
<b><i>Am Ass'n of People with Disabilities v. Dudek, No. 1:25-cv-00977 (D.D.C.)</i></b>	8/13/25: Motion to dismiss filed by Social Security Administration.	Plaintiffs allege that DOGE has engaged in actions that undermine the Social Security Administration's (SSA) ability to serve	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that work with individuals with disabilities or

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
(Filed 4/2/2025)	<p>7/7/25: First Amended Complaint filed. Motion to dismiss denied as moot.</p> <p>6/20/25: Defendants filed motion to dismiss for lack of standing and subject matter jurisdiction, as well as failure to state a claim.</p> <p>5/6/25: Court denied Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction, finding that Plaintiffs failed to establish irreparable harm.</p> <p>4/2/25: Plaintiff filed a motion for a preliminary injunction.</p>	<p>individuals with disabilities, including older adults who rely on Social Security benefits. Plaintiffs allege that DOGE has dismantled key SSA offices, such as the Office of Civil Rights and Equal Opportunity and the Office of Transformation, which are essential for meeting the needs of beneficiaries with disabilities.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that these actions violate the Rehabilitation Act, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Fifth Amendment, as they strip vital protections from individuals with disabilities.</p>	who otherwise receive Social Security benefits.
<p><b><i>League of United Latin Am. Citizens v. Exec. Off. of the President</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00946 (D.D.C.)</b></p> <p>(Filed 3/31/2025)</p>	<p>8/20/25: Defendants filed motion for partial summary judgment as to Plaintiffs' remaining claims</p> <p>8/8/25: Other Defendants filed cross motions for summary judgment.</p> <p>7/11/25: Groups of Plaintiffs and Defendants filed motions for partial summary judgment.</p>	<p>Plaintiff alleges that EO <a href="#">14248</a> oversteps presidential authority by dictating election rules, a power reserved for states and Congress under the Constitution.</p> <p>Plaintiff alleges the EO is an ultra vires presidential action and violates the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	This outcome of this case may impact the application of EO <a href="#">14248</a> , which will in turn impact the work of any charitable organizations that engage in voter registration or advocacy work.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>6/12/25: Court granted in part and denied in part the motion to intervene. The Republican National Committee may intervene as a Defendant against all Plaintiffs' claims for relief from the implementation of Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(d), 3(a), and 7(a) of Executive Order 14248. Motion is otherwise denied.</p> <p>6/3/25: The Republican National Committee filed a motion to intervene.</p> <p>5/31/25: Answer to Complaint filed.</p> <p>4/24/25: District Court granted the preliminary injunction as to Sections 2(a) and 2(d) of the Executive Order. But denied the preliminary injunction as to Sections 2(b), 7(a), and 7(b).</p> <p>4/17/25: District Court held a hearing on the motion for a preliminary injunction.</p>		

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	Motion is taken under advisement.		
<b><i>Nat'l Educ. Ass'n et al. v. US Dep't of Educ. et al., No. 1:25-cv-00091 (D. N.H)</i></b>  <b>(Filed 3/25/2025)</b>	<p>7/17/25: Defendants filed Cross Motion for Summary Judgement.</p> <p>6/10/25: Plaintiffs filed Motion for Summary Judgment alleging no genuine dispute as to material fact and clear violations of Due Process Clause, First Amendment, and Administrative Procedure Act.</p> <p>5/12/25: Plaintiffs filed an Amended Complaint adding an additional plaintiff and an additional cause of action under the Spending Clause.</p> <p>4/24/25: Court granted Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction.</p> <p>4/15/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for leave to file a Second Amended Complaint.</p> <p>4/10/25: After Plaintiffs filed an emergency motion</p>	<p>Plaintiff, a nonprofit organization, alleges that the Department of Education's <a href="#">"Dear Colleague" letter</a>, which is directed at schools and other entities that receive federal financial assistance, and the Department of Education's actions implementing the letter (namely, selective investigation of Title VI complaints and the narrow focus of the "End DEI" complaint portal) violate the Due Process Clause, the First Amendment, and the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.



**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>for a TRO, which Defendants opposed, the parties reached an agreement. Court denied the TRO as moot.</p> <p>3/21/25: Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint and a motion for preliminary injunction.</p>		
<p><b><i>Am. Ass’n of Univ. Professors et al. v. Rubio et al., No. 1:25-cv-10685 (D. Mass.)</i></b></p> <p><b>(Filed 3/25/2025)</b></p>	<p>7/10/25: Bench trial held.</p> <p>6/16/25: Defendants filed Cross Motion for Summary Judgment and Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment.</p> <p>6/2/25: Plaintiffs filed Motion for Summary Judgment.</p> <p>4/29/25: Court granted motion to dismiss with respect to Fifth Amendment claim, but denied the motion to dismiss the First Amendment and APA claims.</p> <p>4/1/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction to enjoin implementation or</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that EO <a href="#">14161</a> threatens deportation for non-citizens expressing views critical of the United States, while EO <a href="#">14188</a> targets individuals labeled as anti-Semitic, conflating criticism of Israel with anti-Semitism, with both orders unconstitutionally restricting speech based on viewpoint.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that policies adopted by Defendants to implement EO <a href="#">14161</a> and EO <a href="#">14188</a>, including “large-scale arrests, detentions, deportations or noncitizen students and faculty who participate in pro-Palestinian protests and other related expression and association” (1) violate the First Amendment because they target individuals on the basis of lawful political speech, (2) violate the Fifth Amendment because they are impermissibly vague, (3) violate the Administrative Procedure Act because they are contrary to constitutional right and arbitrary and capricious, and (4) that Defendants’ threats to target non-citizens based on ideology violate</p>	<p>This case will help inform what the courts are considering when determining the legality of executive actions to implement EOs.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	enforcement of the “ideological-deportation policy.”	the First Amendment because such threats are coercive and retaliatory.	
<b><i>Somerville Pub. Schs. et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-10677 (D. Mass); 25-1500 (1st Cir.)</b>  <b>(Filed 3/24/2025)</b>	<p>6/4/25: In the appellate case, Court denied the motion for a stay.</p> <p>5/23/25: In the appellate case, Defendant-appellants filed an emergency motion for a stay of the preliminary injunction pending appeal and an administrative stay.</p> <p>5/22/25: Defendants filed a notice of appeal of the order granting the preliminary injunction.</p> <p>5/22/25: Court granted the motion for a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>5/22/25: Court ordered this case to be consolidated with 25-cv-10601 (now the lead case).</p> <p>4/25/25: Hearing held regarding motion for a preliminary injunction and arguments taken under advisement.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants are unlawfully dismantling the Department of Education, which (1) violates the separation of powers; (2) violates the Take Care Clause; (3) is outside the Defendants’ constitutional and/or statutory authority, constituting an ultra vires action; (4) violates the Administrative Procedure Act; and (5) violates the Spending and Appropriations Clauses.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the work of charitable organizations that provide or receive funding for, or otherwise perform work relating to educational institutions.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	4/1/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction.		
<b><i>Nat'l Assoc. for the Advancement of Colored People et al. v. US et al., No. 8:25-cv-00965 (D. Md.)</i></b> <b>(Filed 3/24/2025)</b>	8/19/25: Court denied motion for preliminary injunction and motion to dismiss.  7/25/25: Defendants filed a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim and lack of jurisdiction.  7/1/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for a preliminary injunction.  7/1/25: First Amended Complaint filed.	Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants are unlawfully dismantling the Department of Education, which (1) violates the separation of powers; (2) violates the Take Care Clause; (3) is outside the Defendants' constitutional and/or statutory authority, constituting an ultra vires action; (4) violates the Administrative Procedure Act; and (5) violates the Spending and Appropriations Clauses.	The outcome of this case may impact the work of charitable organizations that provide or receive funding for, or otherwise perform work relating to educational institutions.
<b><i>Erie Cnty N.Y. v. Corp. for Nat'l and Cmty. Serv. et al., No. 1:25-cv-00783 (D.D.C.)</i></b> <b>(Filed 3/17/2025)</b>	Settled.  4/14/25: Plaintiff filed a notice of voluntary dismissal without prejudice because the Defendant changed its certification requirements after the filing of the lawsuit.  3/21/25: Motion for preliminary injunction filed by Plaintiffs.	Plaintiff, an AmeriCorps grantee, alleges that AmeriCorps regulations require applicants for that grant to establish an advisory council reflecting the demographics of the service area. Plaintiff alleges that, in response to EOs <a href="#">14151</a> and <a href="#">14173</a> , AmeriCorps required Plaintiff to (1) certify that its grant program does not include any activities that promote DEI, (2) remove or update any language related to DEI activities, or (3) relinquish the award.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with EOs <a href="#">14151</a> and <a href="#">14173</a> .

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		Plaintiffs allege that AmeriCorps has (1) violated the Administrative Procedure Act by imposing unauthorized restrictions on federal funding; and (2) violated the Spending Clause by conditioning federal funding on a requirement regarding DEI.	
<b><i>Taal et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 3:25-cv-00335 (N.D.N.Y.)  (Filed 3/15/2025)</b>	4/2/25: Court ordered the closure of the case pursuant to Plaintiffs' notice for voluntary dismissal without prejudice.  3/27/25: Court denied Plaintiffs' motions for a TRO, finding Plaintiffs had not established the Court had subject-matter jurisdiction nor that the Plaintiffs had standing, although the Court invited briefings on whether a hearing on the motion for preliminary injunction related to the original Complaint should be held considering the filing of an Amended Complaint.	Plaintiffs allege that EO <a href="#">14161</a> threatens deportation for non-citizens expressing views critical of the United States, while EO <a href="#">14188</a> targets individuals labeled as anti-Semitic, conflating criticism of Israel with anti-Semitism, with both orders unconstitutionally restricting speech based on viewpoint.  Plaintiffs allege that the EOs (1) violate the First Amendment rights to free speech, to listen, and to associate, and is vague and overbroad; (2) violate due process rights under the Fifth Amendment, as well as because of vagueness and lack of notice; and (3) violate the Immigration and Nationality Act, Administrative Procedure Act, and <i>Accardi</i> doctrine.	The outcome of this case may impact the application of EOs <a href="#">14161</a> and <a href="#">14188</a> , and impact charitable organizations that support immigrants or perform other work relating to immigration.
<b><i>State of Cal. et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Educ. et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-10548 (D. Mass.); 25-1244 (1st Cir.)  (Filed 3/6/2025)</b>	6/30/25: Defendants filed motion to dismiss Amended Complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, or, in the alternative, to transfer the case to the Court of Federal Claims.	Plaintiffs, eight states, allege that the Department of Education unlawfully terminated certain federal funding based on an assertion that the grants were inconsistent with Department priorities. Plaintiffs allege that the grants were terminated because they "appear to encompass [the administration's]	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>6/2/25: Plaintiffs filed an Amended Complaint</p> <p>5/12/25: Defendant filed a motion to dismiss for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction and, in the alternative, a motion to transfer the case to the Court of Federal Claims.</p> <p>4/23/25: First Circuit granted Appellants' unopposed motion to voluntarily dismiss the appeal.</p> <p>4/4/25: The United States Supreme Court stayed the TRO, finding that it was an appealable preliminary injunction. It found that the Government is likely to succeed in showing that District Court lacked jurisdiction under the particular circumstances of this case.</p> <p>3/28/25: District Court held a hearing on the motion for preliminary injunction.</p>	<p>'policy objectives' of ending disfavored but lawful efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion." Plaintiffs allege the termination of the grants violates the Administrative Procedure Act. They also allege that the terms and conditions of the grants do not allow for termination based on failure to effectuate agency priorities.</p>	<p>executive orders and/or other administration priorities.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>3/21/25: First Circuit denied Defendant's motion for a stay of the TRO.</p> <p>3/11/25: Defendant filed notice of appeal of TRO.</p> <p>3/10/25: District Court entered an order granting a TRO, finding the termination of the grants was arbitrary and capricious, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act. The Court ordered the Department to restore the Plaintiff States to the pre-existing status quo prior to termination of the grants and cease further termination of the grants.</p>		
<p><b><i>Am. Ass'n of Colls. for Teacher Educ. et al. v. McMahon et al., No. 1:25-cv-00702 (D. Md.); 25-1281 (4th Cir.)</i></b></p> <p><b>(Filed 3/3/2025)</b></p>	<p>5/6/25: District Court denied Plaintiff's motion to dissolve the preliminary injunction because court struggled to see a substantive or procedural advantage by dissolving the preliminary injunction.</p> <p>4/27/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion to dissolve the preliminary injunction and</p>	<p>Plaintiffs American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and National Center for Teacher Residencies allege that the Department of Education unlawfully terminated certain federal funding based on an assertion that the grants were inconsistent with Department priorities. Plaintiffs allege the termination of the grants violates the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>request for indicative ruling under <a href="#">Rule 62.1</a>.</p> <p>4/10/25: Court granted the motion to stay the preliminary injunction in light of Supreme Court's ruling in <i>State of California et al. v. U.S. Department of Education et al.</i></p> <p>3/25/25: Defendants filed a motion in the Fourth Circuit requesting a stay of the preliminary injunction pending appeal.</p> <p>3/24/25: Defendants appealed the preliminary injunction decision to the Fourth Circuit.</p> <p>3/17/25: District Court entered an order granting in part Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction and ordering (1) Defendants to reinstate Plaintiffs' grant awards; and (2) prohibiting Defendants from terminating any of the identified grant programs.</p>		
<b><i>Chi. Women in Trades v. Trump</i>, No. 1:25-cv-</b>	8/18/25: Appellant's brief filed.	Plaintiff is a non-profit organization that alleges it is a recipient of multiple federal	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b>02005 (N.D. Ill.); 1:25-cv-02144 (7th Cir.)</b>  <b>(Filed 2/26/2025)</b>	<p>7/3/25: Defendants filed a notice of appeal of the order granting preliminary injunction.</p> <p>5/7/25: Court denied Plaintiff's motion to modify the preliminary injunction to expand its scope.</p> <p>4/14/25: District Court granted a preliminary injunction in part and denied it in part. DOL is enjoined from requiring any grantee or contractor to make a certification pursuant to EO <a href="#">14173</a>. DOL is also enjoined from applying EO <a href="#">14151</a> against Plaintiff to prevent termination of its Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations grant. The preliminary injunction is otherwise denied.</p> <p>4/1/25: District Court issued a temporary restraining order, holding that (1) the Department of Labor shall not pause,</p>	<p>grants, some of which were initially frozen after the executive orders were issued. The Plaintiffs claim that EOs <a href="#">14151</a> and <a href="#">14173</a> (1) violate the First Amendment because they are unconstitutionally vague and overbroad, are a form of viewpoint discrimination, and place unconstitutional conditions on federal funds; (2) violate the Plaintiffs' Fifth Amendment due process rights due to vagueness; (3) violate the Spending Clause by attempting to unilaterally terminate grants or contracts without congressional authority; and (4) violate the separation of powers doctrine by imposing conditions on federal funding that are within the purview of Congress, not the executive branch.</p>	<p>administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with EOs <a href="#">14151</a> and <a href="#">14173</a>.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.



**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	freeze, impede, block, cancel, or terminate any awards, contracts or obligations with the Plaintiffs on the basis of EO <a href="#">14151</a> 's termination provision, and (2) the Department of Labor shall not require any grantee or contractor to make any certification pursuant to EO <a href="#">14173</a> .  3/5/25: Plaintiff moved for nationwide preliminary injunction.		
<b><i>San Francisco Aids Foundation v. Trump</i>, No. 4:25-cv-01824 (N.D. Cal.) (Filed 2/20/2025)</b>	8/25/25: Parties filed stipulation to stay case pending appeal of preliminary injunction.  8/7/25: Defendants entered Notice of Appeal of order granting preliminary injunction to the 9th Circuit.  6/9/25: Court granted in part and denied in part the motion for a preliminary injunction because Plaintiffs demonstrated likelihood of success on the merits as to viewpoint	Plaintiffs allege that EOs <a href="#">14151</a> , <a href="#">14168</a> and <a href="#">14173</a> (1) violate the First Amendment by imposing viewpoint and content discrimination; (2) violate the Plaintiffs' Fifth Amendment due process rights due to vagueness; and (3) violate the separation of powers doctrine by imposing conditions on federal funding that are within the purview of Congress, not the executive branch. Plaintiffs also allege that EO <a href="#">14168</a> violates the Equal Protection Clause by discriminating against transgender people. Plaintiffs also allege that the EOs conflict with existing statutes that support the HIV Health Care Services Program (also known as the "Ryan White Program"), the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS program, and funding for	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with EOs <a href="#">14151</a> , <a href="#">14168</a> , and <a href="#">14173</a> .

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	discrimination in suppressing ideas such as equity and gender ideology, discrimination on transgender status, and violation of separation of powers.  3/3/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction.	Federally Qualified Health Centers under Section 330 of the Public Health Services Act.	
<b><i>Nat'l Urban League et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00471 (D.D.C.)  (Filed 2/19/2025)</b>	8/8/25: Defendants filed motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and for failure to state a claim.  6/30/25: Plaintiffs filed Amended Complaint.  5/20/25: Parties filed a joint motion for leave to file an amended complaint (likely aimed to address new agency actions and refine claims after injunction denial).  5/2/25: Court denied Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction, holding that Plaintiffs failed to establish standing with respect to some claims, and	Plaintiffs allege that EOs <a href="#">14151</a> , <a href="#">14168</a> and <a href="#">14173</a> falsely assert that DEI programs and activities are illegal and put them at significant risk of losing federal funds that they use to help people in need.  Plaintiffs allege the EOs (1) violate the First Amendment by imposing viewpoint and content discrimination; (2) violate Plaintiffs' Fifth Amendment due process rights due to vagueness; (3) violate the Separation of Powers doctrine by imposing conditions on federal funding that are within the purview of Congress, not the executive branch; (4) violate the Equal Protection Clause by discriminating based on protected characteristics; and (5) are ultra vires Presidential Actions.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with EOs <a href="#">14151</a> , <a href="#">14168</a> , and <a href="#">14173</a> .

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>others faltered on the underlying First and Fifth Amendment claims.</p> <p>3/17/25: Hearing held on the preliminary injunction.</p> <p>2/28/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction.</p>		
<p><b><i>Personal Servs. Contractor Ass’n v. Trump</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00469 (D.D.C.); 25-05291 (D.C. Cir.)</b></p> <p><b>(Filed 2/18/2025)</b></p>	<p>8/13/25: Plaintiff filed Notice of Appeal to D.C. Circuit.</p> <p>7/25/25: Court denied motion for preliminary injunction.</p> <p>4/23/25: Plaintiff filed a motion for preliminary injunction.</p> <p>3/14/25: District Court denied temporary restraining order.</p>	<p>Plaintiff Personal Services Contractor Association (PSCA), an organization that represents personal services contractors employed at USAID, alleges that EO <a href="#">14169</a> violates the separation of powers doctrine, the Take Care Clause, and the Administrative Procedure Act by being arbitrary, capricious, and not in accordance with law</p>	<p>This case will help inform what the courts are considering when determining the legality of executive actions to implement EOs.</p>
<p><b><i>Doctors for Am. et al. v. Off. of Personnel Mgmt. et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00322 (D.D.C.)</b></p> <p><b>(Filed 2/4/2025)</b></p>	<p>7/2/25: Court granted Plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment as to Counts I and III, denied the motion as to Count II, and denied as moot the motion for a preliminary injunction. Court granted Defendants’ motion for</p>	<p>On January 29, 2025, in response to EO <a href="#">14168</a>, the Office of Personnel Management (“OPM”) issued a memorandum requiring agencies to take down webpages that “inculcate[d] or promote[d] gender ideology.” Plaintiffs allege that HHS removed from both its website and the websites of its agency components a broad range of health-related webpages and datasets, that Plaintiffs allege</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations’ access to government data and information.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>summary judgment as to Count II and denied the motion in all other respects.</p> <p>3/24/25: Defendants filed a cross-motion for summary judgment.</p> <p>3/11/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for preliminary injunction and motion for summary judgment.</p> <p>2/4/25: District Court entered a temporary restraining order requiring the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Center for Disease Control (CDC), and Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to restore certain webpages and data sets.</p>	<p>are essential to patient care. Plaintiffs allege that (1) OPM exceeded its statutory authority by removing the information; (2) CDC and HHS violated the Paperwork Reduction Act by failing to provide adequate notice before removing the information; and (3) the FDA and HHS violated the Administrative Procedure Act by removing the webpages arbitrarily and capriciously.</p>	
<p><b><i>PFLAG, INC., et al. v. Donald Trump, et al.</i>, No. 8:25-cv-00337 (D. Md.); 25-01279 (4th Cir.)</b></p> <p><b>(Filed 2/4/2025)</b></p>	<p>7/25/25: Opening brief filed by Appellants.</p> <p>5/12/25: Court granted appellants' unopposed motion to hold case in abeyance pending Supreme Court decision in <i>United States v. Skrmetti</i>.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that EOs <a href="#">14187</a> and <a href="#">14168</a>, which prohibit federal funding for institutions that provide certain medical care for transgender patients under the age of nineteen, (1) violate the First Amendment by imposing viewpoint discrimination; (2) violate the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of the Fifth Amendment by discrimination based on sex and transgender status and infringing on parental rights; (3) violate the separation of powers doctrine by imposing conditions on</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition any non-profit healthcare organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with EOs <a href="#">14187</a> and <a href="#">14168</a>.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>4/9/25: Court granted a joint motion for a limited partial stay pending the Fourth Circuit panel's consideration of the Defendants' appeal.</p> <p>4/8/25: Fourth Circuit set a scheduling order: opening brief due 05/19/25; and response brief due 06/17/25.</p> <p>3/21/25: Defendants appealed the preliminary injunction order to the Fourth Circuit.</p> <p>3/4/25: District Court granted a motion for nationwide preliminary injunction, holding that Plaintiffs were likely to succeed on the merits of their claims that the EOs exceed presidential authority, violate the separation of powers doctrine, violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fifth Amendment, and violate Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act and</p>	<p>federal funding that are within the purview of Congress, not the executive branch; and (4) conflict with the Affordable Care Act and Public Health Service Act, which prohibit discrimination based on sex and disability.</p>	

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	Section 1908 of the Public Health Service Act.		
<b><i>Nat'l Ass'n of Diversity Officers in Higher Educ. et al. v. Donald Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00333 (D. Md.); No. 25-01189 (4th Cir.)</b>  <b>(Filed 2/3/2025)</b>	7/10/25: Oral argument set for 9/11/25.  3/14/25: Fourth Circuit temporarily stayed the preliminary injunction that District Court entered, pending a decision on the merits.  2/21/25: District Court held the Plaintiffs established entitlement to preliminary injunction on their First Amendment and Fifth Amendment claims, temporarily halting enforcement of (1) the provision in EO <a href="#">14151</a> directing all agencies to terminate all DEI-related grants or contracts; and (2) the "certification provision" in EO <a href="#">14173</a> requiring federal contractors and grant recipients to certify they do not engage in illegal DEI.	Plaintiffs allege that EOs <a href="#">14151</a> and <a href="#">14173</a> (1) violate the First Amendment because they are a form of viewpoint discrimination and chill free speech; (2) violate Plaintiffs' Fifth Amendment due process rights due to vagueness; (3) violate the Spending Clause by attempting to unilaterally terminate grants or contracts without congressional authority; and (4) violate the separation of powers doctrine by imposing conditions on federal funding that are within the purview of Congress, not the executive branch.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with EOs <a href="#">14151</a> and <a href="#">14173</a> .
<b><i>State of New York et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00039 (D.R.I.); 25-01236 (1st Cir.)</b>	8/22/25: Appellants' brief filed.	Plaintiffs--22 States--allege that the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB") unlawfully paused all federal financial assistance. The States allege that the funding	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
(Filed 1/28/2025)	<p>5/27/25: Appellants' brief filed.</p> <p>3/27/25: First Circuit denied the administration's motion for a stay pending appeal of the preliminary injunction decision.</p> <p>3/10/25: The administration filed a notice of appeal to the First Circuit.</p> <p>3/6/25: The Court granted Plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction, finding that the States were likely to succeed on the merits of their claims, and enjoining OMB from imposing the funding freeze.</p>	<p>pause violated (1) the Administrative Procedure Act; (2) the Separation of Powers doctrine; and (3) the Spending, Presentment, Appropriations, and Take Care Clauses of the U.S. Constitution.</p>	
<p><i>National Council of Nonprofits v. OMB</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00239 (D.D.C.); No. 25-05148 (D.C. Cir.)</p> <p>(Filed 1/28/2025)</p>	<p>5/12/25: Case stayed in District Court pending appeal.</p> <p>4/24/25: Defendant appealed order granting preliminary injunction to D.C. Circuit.</p> <p>4/14/25: Defendant filed Answer to Complaint.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that OMB unlawfully paused all federal financial assistance. Plaintiffs allege that the funding pause violated the Administrative Procedure Act and Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights by conditioning the receipt of federal funding on the recipients' political and moral viewpoints.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>3/14/25: Court denied Plaintiffs' motion to clarify the order granting preliminary injunction.</p> <p>2/25/25: District Court entered a preliminary injunction prohibiting OMB from refusing to disperse funds.</p>		

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b>CHALLENGES TO GRANT PROGRAMS</b>			
<p><i>American Alliance for Equal Rights v. Founders First Community Development Corporation</i>, No. 4:24-cv-00327 (N.D. Tex.)</p> <p>(Filed 4/16/2024)</p>	<p>Settled.</p> <p>8/12/24: District Court entered judgment pursuant to an offer of judgment Founders First accepted, which prohibits Founders First from considering race in awarding grants.</p> <p>7/31/24: District Court granted Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction.</p> <p>6/3/24: District Court granted Plaintiff's request for expedited discovery and ordered Founders First to</p>	<p>Plaintiff alleged that Founders First's Job Creators grant program, which provided \$25,000 - \$50,000 grants, was limited to businesses founded by persons of color, Indigenous, LGBTQIA+, military veterans, women, and founders located in low-to-moderate income areas. Plaintiffs alleged the grant program violated Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act.</p>	<p>The District Court's decisions compelling the production of demographic data and granting Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction may inform (1) how some courts will assess when litigants have standing to challenge charitable grant programs under anti-discrimination laws; (2) the factors that some courts may consider when determining when Section 1981 applies to a grant program; and (3) the type of evidence some courts may consider when determining whether a grant program likely violates Section 1981.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.



**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case		Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		produce information regarding how many individuals in certain demographic categories applied for and were accepted for the program		

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

<p><b><i>Am. Alliance for Equal Rights v. Sw. Airlines Co., No. 3:24-cv-01209 (N.D. Tex.)</i></b></p> <p><b>(Filed 5/20/2024)</b></p>	<p>5/22/25: Court entered final judgment against Southwest for nominal damages in the sum of \$0.01.</p> <p>5/14/25: Court entered an order raising <i>sua sponte</i> its intent to enter final judgment, because Defendants unconditionally surrendered to a judgment in AAER's favor, eliminating the need for further litigation on the merits.</p> <p>4/10/25: The United States filed a statement of interest.</p> <p>4/9/25: Defendant filed a motion for entry of judgment arguing that the only claim left is for nominal damages and Court should enter judgment against the Defendant for \$0.01 nominal damages and end the case.</p> <p>3/3/25: Plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment</p> <p>12/6/24: District Court denied in part, and granted in part, Defendant's motion to dismiss, finding that</p>	<p>Plaintiff filed suit on behalf of two individuals who allege that they were ineligible for Defendant's travel award program for Hispanic students. Plaintiff alleges the program violates Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, because it is racially discriminatory.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may provide guidance regarding when litigants have standing to challenge charitable programs, as well as the factors courts consider when determining when a charitable program creates a contract under Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act.</p>
---	---	--	--

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	Southwest's decision to eliminate the race-based provisions of the program mooted Plaintiff's claim for injunctive relief but also finding that Plaintiff had associational standing to assert claims for nominal damages.		
<b><i>American Alliance for Equal Rights v. Fearless Fund Management, LLC et al.</i>, 1:23-cv-03424 (N.D. Ga.), 23-13138 (11th Cir.)  (Filed 9/27/2023)</b>	Settled.  9/11/24: Stipulation of Dismissal filed.  6/3/2024: Eleventh Circuit enjoined the grant program, holding that (1) Plaintiff likely had standing to challenge the program on behalf of its anonymous members; (2) Section 1981 likely applied to the program because the terms and conditions of the program likely created contracts; and (3) the First Amendment did not protect the program.	Plaintiff alleged that the Fearless Fund's Fearless Strivers Grant Program, through which it provided \$20,000 grants as well as other business tools and mentorship to Black female entrepreneurs, violated Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act because it discriminated based on race.	The Eleventh Circuit's decision enjoining the program impacts (1) how certain courts will assess when litigants have standing to challenge charitable grant programs under anti-discrimination laws; (2) the factors that certain courts may consider when determining when Section 1981 applies to a grant program; (3) the type of evidence some courts may consider when determining whether a grant program likely violates Section 1981; and (4) how certain courts will assess when the First Amendment protects charitable activity

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Roberts v. Progressive Preferred Insurance Co., No. 1:23-cv-01597 (N.D. Ohio), No. 24-3454 (6th Cir.)</i></b>  <b>(Filed 8/16/2023)</b>	<p>7/24/25: Oral argument occurred, case under advisement.</p> <p>5/15/25: Oral argument in front of the Sixth Circuit is set for 7/24/25.</p> <p>5/29/24: Plaintiffs filed an appeal of the dismissal to the Sixth Circuit.</p> <p>5/21/24: Court entered a judgment granting Defendants' motions to dismiss on the grounds that Plaintiffs lacked standing because they could not show they would have received the grant had the criteria for the grant program been race-neutral, and by the time they filed the complaint, the program had been closed, so they could not show that they would suffer future harm.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs, a trucking business and its white male owner, sought to enjoin a program that offered \$25,000 grants to Black-owned trucking businesses, alleging that the grant program violated Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may provide guidance regarding when litigants have standing to challenge an organization's grant program, especially when that grant program has already ended.</p>
<b>CHALLENGES TO IMPACT INVESTMENT PROGRAMS</b>			
<b><i>Am. Alliance for Equal Rights et al. v. Chicago City et al., No. 1:25-cv-01017 (N.D. Ill.)</i></b>  <b>(Filed 1/29/2025)</b>	<p>Settled.</p> <p>6/2/25: Parties have nearly finalized the settlement agreement.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants have instituted an investment offering for investors in Bally's Chicago Casino based on race, in violation of Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act. Plaintiffs claim that the offering, which requires that certain Class A Interests only be</p>	<p>The case may further inform when a litigant has standing to challenge impact investments and other investments</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	5/6/25: District Court stayed the motion to dismiss briefing schedule pending potential settlement.  4/4/25: Defendant Chicago City and State Defendants filed separate motions to dismiss.	transferred to qualified minorities and women, impairs their ability to make and enforce contracts due to the racial qualification criteria.	
<b><i>Desai et al. v. PayPal Holdings, Inc. et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00033 (S.D.N.Y.)  (Filed 1/2/2025)</b>	8/1/25: Second motion to dismiss is fully briefed.  5/29/25: Court denied as moot Defendants' first motion to dismiss.  5/28/25: Defendants filed a second motion to dismiss.  5/7/25: Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Complaint adding facts, arguments, damages, and a new claim under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act.  4/16/25: Defendants filed a motion to dismiss.	Plaintiff, an Asian-American woman, alleges that PayPal Holdings, Inc. discriminated against her based on her race and ethnicity because it allegedly did not consider investing in her company out of its \$500 million investment fund for minority businesses. She alleges violation of Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, the New York State Human Rights Law, and the NYC Human Rights Law.	The case may further develop when a litigant has standing to challenge impact investments.  If the case survives a standing challenge, it may also provide insight into the discovery a court may permit and/or the evidence that a court may consider when determining when an investment program for minority-led businesses is discriminatory.
<b>CHALLENGES TO SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS</b>			
<b><i>Do No Harm v. American Chemical Society</i>, 1:25-cv-00638 (D.D.C.)  (Filed 3/5/2025)</b>	Settled.  5/7/25: Parties filed a joint stipulation of dismissal.	Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's ACS Scholars Program violates Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act because it is allegedly open to only Black, Hispanic, and Indigenous Americans, excluding white and Asian applicants.	The outcome of this case may provide guidance regarding (1) when litigants have standing to challenge scholarship programs under anti-discrimination laws, and (2) how courts may analyze whether

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		Plaintiff is seeking an injunction to bar the consideration of race.	scholarship programs for underrepresented groups violate anti-discrimination laws.
<b><i>American Alliance for Equal Rights v. McDonald's Corporation et al., No. 3:25-cv-00050 (M.D. Tenn. Jan. 12, 2025)</i></b>  <b>(Filed 1/12/2025)</b>	Settled.  2/3/25: Case dismissed pursuant to a stipulation of dismissal, under which Defendants agreed to revise the challenged scholarship program to remove any eligibility requirement or preference based on applicants' race or ethnicity.	Plaintiff alleged that Defendants' scholarship program is a contract-based contest that discriminates against non-Hispanic applicants in the making and enforcement of contracts in violation of Section 1981.	This case provides insight into the types of scholarship programs that may be challenged under anti-discrimination laws.
<b><i>American Alliance for Equal Rights v. Pritzker et al., No. 3:24-cv-03299 (C.D. Ill.)</i></b>  <b>(Filed 10/22/2024)</b>	8/5/25: Court <a href="#">denied</a> Defendants' motion to dismiss holding that the American Alliance has satisfied its burden of pleading associational standing, and that jurisdictional discovery is not warranted at this stage.  1/17/25: Plaintiff filed an opposition to Defendant's motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction, arguing that disclosure of its member's legal name was irrelevant to jurisdiction and asserting Article III standing through associational standing. The State did not file a reply,	Plaintiff alleges that the Minority Teachers of Illinois Scholarship Program violates the Equal Protection Clause because it discriminates and excludes certain students based on race.	The outcome of this case may provide guidance regarding (1) when litigants have standing to challenge scholarship programs under anti-discrimination laws, and (2) how courts may analyze whether scholarship programs for underrepresented groups violate anti-discrimination laws.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	and the motion is now fully briefed.		
<b><i>Do No Harm v. Nat'l Ass'n of Emergency Med. Techs.</i>, 3:24-cv-00011 (S.D. Miss.)</b>  <b>(Filed 1/10/2024)</b>	Settled.  4/17/25: Parties filed a stipulation of dismissal.  3/31/25: District court denied Defendant's motion to dismiss the amended complaint, finding Plaintiff had standing, as it sufficiently alleged harm to a specific member and further finding Section 1981 protects all persons from racial discrimination in contracts, regardless of race.  2/29/24: Plaintiff withdrew motion for preliminary injunction based on Defendant's counsel representation that the application window or selection of winners for the scholarship in dispute would not occur until Court enters final judgment.	Plaintiff alleges that the National Association of Emergency Medical Technicians' diversity scholarship program violates Section 1981, because white students are allegedly excluded from forming contractual relationships through the scholarship program.	The outcome of this case may provide guidance regarding (1) when litigants have standing to challenge scholarship programs under anti-discrimination laws and (2) how courts may analyze whether scholarship programs for underrepresented groups violate anti-discrimination laws.
<b>CHALLENGES TO HOUSING PROGRAMS</b>			

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>National Fair Housing Alliance et al. v. Dep't of Housing and Urban Development, et al., No. 1:25-cv-01965 (D.D.C.)</i></b> <b>(Filed 6/24/25)</b>	<p>8/11/25: Court converted the TRO into a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>7/28/25: Court granted in part and denied in part Plaintiffs motion for a TRO. Court ordered Defendants to comply with their statutory obligations and make funds available under the FHIP before the appropriations lapse on 9/30/25.</p> <p>7/7/25: Plaintiffs filed a motion for a temporary restraining order arguing that HUD denying grants is causing irreparable harm.</p> <p>7/4/25: Defendants filed a motion to dismiss arguing that the court does not have jurisdiction and Plaintiffs have failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is refusing to administer the Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP) grants in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Appropriations Clause, the Separation of Powers, and the Due Process Clause.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.



**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Massachusetts Fair Housing Center, et al. v. Dep't of Housing and Urban Development, et al.</i>, No. 3:25-cv-30041 (D. Mass.); No. 25-01368 (1st Cir.)</b>  <b>(Filed 3/13/25)</b>	<p>7/30/35: Oral argument took place, and motion is taken under advisement.</p> <p>6/17/25: Oral argument scheduled for 7/30/25.</p> <p>4/16/25: Plaintiffs appealed the order granting the dissolution of the TRO to the 1st Circuit.</p> <p>4/14/25: District Court granted Defendants motion to dissolve the TRO.</p>	<p>On February 27, 2025, HUD terminated 78 Fair Housing Initiatives Program grants, citing a directive from the Department of Government Efficiency and claiming the grants no longer effectuated program goals or agency priorities. This termination was communicated through a form letter and was effective immediately. The grants are used by fair housing organizations to combat housing discrimination. These grants support activities such as enforcement, education, outreach, and litigation to ensure compliance with the Fair Housing Act. Plaintiffs allege the termination of the grants violate the Administrative Procedure Act and the actions are ultra vires.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.</p>
<b><i>Cappelletti et al. v. Georgia Dep't of Cmty. Affairs (DCA) et al.</i>, No. 5:25-cv-00009 (S.D. Ga.)</b>  <b>(Filed 1/30/25)</b>	<p>6/24/25: Defendants filed a motion to dismiss for a failure to state a claim.</p> <p>6/24/25: Defendants filed a motion to transfer venue from S.D. Ga. to N.D. Ga. arguing forum non conveniens.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that the Georgia Department of Community Affairs prioritizes granting applications and distributing funds to homeowners in preferred racial and ethnic groups over white homeowners in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.</p>	<p>This case provides insight into the types of housing programs that may be challenged under anti-discrimination laws. This case may further inform when courts allow for the use of race in determining program eligibility.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Anderson et al. v. Florida Dep't of Commerce et al., No. 4:25-cv-00016 (N.D. Fla.)</i></b>  <b>(Filed 1/13/2025)</b>	<p>8/22/25: Defendants filed a motion to dismiss the First Amended Complaint.</p> <p>7/28/25: Court denied Defendants' motion to dismiss as moot.</p> <p>7/25/25: Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Complaint.</p> <p>6/27/25: Defendants filed a motion to dismiss for a failure to state a claim.</p>	<p>Plaintiff alleges that Defendant developed, marketed, and administered its Florida Homeowner Assistance Fund program based on a race-based definition of socially disadvantaged individuals, leading to a disproportionate allocation of COVID-19 relief funds favoring certain racial groups over others in violation of Title VI and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Plaintiff claims that the demographic outcomes of the program's approved applications do not reflect the state's racial composition and cannot be justified by income disparities or other race-independent reasons, highlighting a significant discrepancy between the racial distribution of the program's beneficiaries and the state's population.</p>	<p>This case may further inform to what extent outcomes consistent or inconsistent with the demographic makeup of a community are relevant to a finding of discrimination.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Found. Against Intolerance and Racism Inc v. Walker, No. 2:24-cv-01770 (W.D. Wash.)</i></b>  <b>(Filed 10/29/2024)</b>	<p>7/25/25: Plaintiff filed a motion for a preliminary injunction arguing that its members' constitutional rights are being violated.</p> <p>7/22/25: Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint.</p> <p>6/30/25: Plaintiff has until 7/22/25 to file an amended complaint.</p> <p>6/24/25: The Court granted Defendant's motion to dismiss and dismissed the claim for nominal damages with prejudice and the remaining claims without prejudice.</p> <p>12/20/24: Motion to dismiss filed by Defendant. The motion was fully briefed as of 2/7/25.</p>	<p>Plaintiff alleges violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment based on the Covenant Homeownership Program's alleged racial eligibility preferences and provision of housing benefits. Plaintiff argued those preferences constitute state-sponsored racial discrimination. Plaintiff claims that the program's requirements, including documentation of residency and race/ethnicity for homebuyers or their ancestors prior to April 1968, unlawfully categorize individuals based on race. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants lack a strong basis in evidence to justify the race-based remedial actions of the program and that such actions are not constitutionally permissible.</p>	<p>This case may inform in what circumstances courts may find that development programs for underrepresented groups violate anti-discrimination laws.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Robbins et al. v. Tenn. Hous. Dev. Agency (THDA) et al.</i>, No. 1:24-cv-01229 (W.D. Tenn.)</b>  <b>(Filed 10/25/2024)</b>	<p>5/19/25: Motion to dismiss is fully briefed as of 5/19/25.</p> <p>4/24/25: Defendants filed a motion to stay discovery pending motion to dismiss.</p> <p>4/7/25: Defendants filed a motion to dismiss.</p> <p>3/14/25: Plaintiffs filed an Amended Complaint.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs sued Defendants, a state housing finance agency and its officials, for alleged racial discrimination and violations of Title VI and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Plaintiffs claim that Defendants designed and administered the Tennessee Homeowner Assistance Fund program in a way that explicitly considered race as a factor for social disadvantage, prioritizing certain minority groups. Plaintiffs further allege that Defendants' actions resulted in an application process that is not race-neutral, contravening constitutional and statutory requirements for government assistance programs.</p>	<p>This case could further inform the circumstances in which litigants have standing to challenge board appointments.</p>
<b><i>Flinn et al. v. City of Evanston</i>, Docket No. 1:24-cv-04269 (N.D. Ill.)</b>  <b>(Filed 5/23/24)</b>	<p>5/7/25: Oral argument took place, and motion is taken under advisement.</p> <p>04/11/25: Oral argument on Motion to Dismiss filed by Defendant scheduled for 5/7/25.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs sued the City of Evanston for violating the Equal Protection Clause, alleging the city used race as an eligibility requirement for a program distributing \$25,000 payments to residents or their direct descendants from specific time periods. Plaintiffs claim this requirement is unconstitutional, as it does not require evidence of direct harm from housing discrimination between 1919 and 1969, effectively using race as a proxy for discrimination.</p>	<p>This case provides insight into the types of charitable housing programs that may be challenged under anti-discrimination laws. This case may further inform when courts allow for the use of race in determining program eligibility.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Californians for Equal Rights Foundation v. City of San Diego et al.</i>, 3:24-cv-00484 (S.D. Cal.)</b>  <b>(Filed 3/12/24)</b>	Settled.  2/7/25: Court granted the parties' Joint Motion to Dismiss.	This case was a challenge to San Diego's "BIPOC First-Time Homebuyer Program," which provides grants and loans to first-time homebuyers but allegedly restricts eligibility to Black, Indigenous, or other people of color. Plaintiff alleged the City of San Diego's First-Time Homebuyer (FTHB) Program discriminates based on race, violating the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. In February 2025, the parties reached a settlement after the San Diego Housing Commission agreed to remove race-based eligibility restrictions from the program.	This case provides insight into the types of charitable housing programs that may be challenged under anti-discrimination laws.
CHALLENGES TO INTERNSHIP AND FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS			

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b><i>Do No Harm v. American Association of University Women, 1:24-cv-01782 (D.D.C.)</i></b>  (Filed 6/20/24)	Settled.  8/9/24: Dismissed pursuant to Joint Stipulation of Dismissal.	Plaintiff challenged Defendant’s “Focus Professions Group Fellowship,” a \$20,000 award for women who pursue professional degrees in concentrations where women’s participation traditionally has been low. Plaintiffs argued the fellowship was only open to women from underrepresented racially and ethnically marginalized groups in violation of Section 1981.  The parties jointly agreed to dismiss the case, because Defendant agreed to no longer consider applicants’ race or ethnicity in selecting fellows.	This case provides insight into the types of internship or fellowship programs that may be challenged under anti-discrimination laws.
<b><i>American Alliance for Equal Rights v. Zamanillo et al., 1:24-cv-00509 (D.D.C.)</i></b>  (Filed 2/22/24)	Settled.  3/26/24: Stipulation of dismissal entered.	Plaintiff challenged a museum internship program for being racially discriminatory. Plaintiff alleged that the Latino Museum Studies Program Undergraduate Internship (offered by the National Museum of the American Latino) violated the Equal Protection Clause because it was only open to Latina, Latino, and Latinx-identifying students.  Defendants agreed to clarify on the program website and in the scoring rubric that the internship is open to all and that no preference should be given to any candidate based on race or ethnicity.	This case provides insight into the types of internship or fellowship programs that may be challenged under anti-discrimination laws.
CHALLENGES TO OTHER PROGRAMS			
<b><i>Faculty, Alumni, and Students Opposed to Racial Preferences (FASORP) v. Northwestern Univ. et al.,</i></b>	5/28/25: Court entered an order granting in part and denying in part Defendants’ motion for fees and costs and a stay.	Plaintiff, a nonprofit organization, claims that Northwestern University violates Title VI, Title IX, Section 1981, and Title VII by discriminating in favor of individuals that identify as female, homosexual, or	This case may further inform when consideration of race in faculty hiring is protected.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b>No. 1:25-cv-01129 (N.D. Ill.)</b>  <b>(Filed 2/1/2025)</b>	4/4/25: Defendant moved to dismiss Complaint.  3/25/25: Defendant moved to stay case, pending resolution of Rule 41(d) motion.	transgender during faculty hiring. Plaintiff alleges that Northwestern discriminates by hiring women and racial minorities with mediocre and undistinguished records over white men who have better credentials, better scholarship, and better teaching ability.	
<b><i>Am. Alliance for Equal Rights v. Bennett et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00669 (N.D. Ill.); No. 25-02461 (7th Cir.)</b>  <b>(Filed 1/21/2025)</b>	8/22/25: Plaintiff appealed the denial of the preliminary injunction to the 7 <sup>th</sup> Circuit.  8/20/25: The Court (1) granted in part and denied in part Defendants' motion to dismiss Am. Alliance's Amended Complaint; (2) granted Intervenor-Defendants' motion to dismiss the United States' Amended Complaint in Intervention; (3) denied Defendants' motion to strike; (4) denied Am. Alliance's motion for preliminary injunction; and (5) denied the United States' motion for preliminary injunction as moot.  5/23/25: Oral arguments held as to Defendants' Motion to Strike Plaintiff's unsworn anonymous declarations, Plaintiff's	Plaintiff challenges the constitutionality of <a href="#">Illinois Senate Bill 2930</a> which requires nonprofits to publicly disclose their demographic data, arguing that the law violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments and requires nonprofits to engage in racial discrimination. Plaintiff argues that by requiring organizations to publish their demographics, the law “pushes them to hire candidates based on race.” Plaintiff also argues that the law “forces” organizations to “speak about a host of controversial demographic issues that they don’t want to discuss, advertise, or endorse.”	The outcome of this case will impact any charitable organization that operates in Illinois and is presently required to comply with the law that the Plaintiff challenges.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	<p>Motion for Preliminary Injunction, and intervenor US's Motion for Preliminary Injunction. The Court took the motions under advisement.</p> <p>5/19/25: District Court set to have a hearing on 5/23/25 regarding the motion for a preliminary injunction and the motion to strike.</p> <p>5/6/25: Defendants moved to strike Plaintiffs' unsworn anonymous declarations and memorandum in support of their motion for a preliminary injunction.</p> <p>5/6/25: Defendants moved to dismiss First Amended Complaint.</p> <p>4/22/25: Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint.</p> <p>4/15/25: Defendants moved to dismiss the Complaint.</p> <p>4/1/25: Plaintiff moved for a preliminary injunction enjoining Defendant from implementing SB 2390. (Response due 4/29/25,</p>		

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.



**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	reply due 5/13/25, oral argument 5/23/25)		
	3/13/25: The United States filed an Intervenor complaint in this case.		
<b><i>Young Ams. for Freedom et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Educ. et al.</i>, No. 3:24-cv-00163 (D.N.D.); 25-02307 (8th Cir.)</b> <b>(Filed 8/27/2024)</b>	<p>7/1/25: Plaintiffs appealed the denial of the preliminary injunction to the 8<sup>th</sup> Circuit.</p> <p>5/6/25: Court denied Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration.</p> <p>3/17/25: Plaintiffs filed a reply to the Defendants' Response in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration of Court's denial of its Motion for Preliminary Injunction.</p> <p>12/31/24: Court denied Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction and dismissed without prejudice for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction, finding the Plaintiffs lacked Article III standing because the injuries were not redressable where the appropriate higher education institutions that also administer and develop</p>	Plaintiff alleges the Department of Education has (1) violated the Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution because of the imposition of mandatory race-based eligibility requirements on the McNair Program, which is designed to prepare disadvantaged students for doctoral study, and (2) violated the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) because of unconstitutional racial classifications.	The outcome of this case may provide guidance regarding (1) when litigants have standing to challenge charitable programs under anti-discrimination laws, and (2) how courts may analyze whether charitable programs for underrepresented groups violate anti-discrimination laws.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a light blue background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
	the challenged program were missing from this case		
<b><i>Samuels v. Cornell Tech et al.</i>, No. 1:24-cv-01946 (S.D.N.Y.)</b>  <b>(Filed 3/14/2024)</b>	Resolved on the merits.  3/10/25: Court granted Defendants' motion to dismiss.  12/20/24: Defendant filed a reply in support of its motion to dismiss arguing failure to state a claim and that the Plaintiff lacks standing. The motion is now fully briefed.	Plaintiff, a Black man, filed a motion to initiate a lawsuit in S.D.N.Y., alleging that the Break Through Tech program violates Title IX, Title VI, Title VII, and the New York Human Rights Law. The Break Through Tech program provides AI training as a pathway to careers in tech for women and non-binary undergraduate students from diverse backgrounds.	The outcome of this case may provide guidance regarding (1) when litigants have standing to challenge the charitable programs under anti-discrimination laws, and (2) how courts may analyze when development programs for underrepresented groups violate anti-discrimination laws.
<b><i>American Alliance for Equal Rights v. Ivey</i>, No. 2:24-cv-00104 (M.D. Ala.)</b>  <b>(Filed 2/13/2024)</b>	6/5/25: Parties filed a stipulation of dismissal after court denied motion to substitute individual for AAER as Plaintiff because AAER did not want to sit for deposition.  7/17/24: Plaintiffs' motion for judgment on the pleadings, which argued that the Board requirements failed strict scrutiny, was denied.	Plaintiffs allege that a state law that requires the Alabama governor to ensure there are no fewer than two individuals "of a minority race" on the Alabama Real Estate Appraisers Board violates the Equal Protection Clause.	This case may further inform when the consideration of race when selecting members of government boards may be permissible. The outcome of this case may provide guidance regarding (1) when litigants have standing to challenge state programs under anti-discrimination laws, and (2) how courts may analyze whether state programs for underrepresented groups violate anti-discrimination laws.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.