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<slide 1>

Today we're examining a critical Supreme Court immigration case decided just days ago on September 8, 2025. Noem v. Vasquez Perdomo represents a significant moment in constitutional law where the Court intervened through its emergency docket to address immigration enforcement practices in Los Angeles. This case sits at the intersection of Fourth Amendment protections against unreasonable searches and seizures, Equal Protection concerns about racial profiling, and Article III standing doctrine. The Court's decision to grant a stay has immediate consequences for millions of residents in Southern California and broader implications for how law enforcement can conduct immigration stops nationwide. What makes this case particularly noteworthy is that we have no majority opinion—only Justice Kavanaugh's concurrence and Justice Sotomayor's dissent, joined by Justices Kagan and Jackson, providing us with competing constitutional interpretations.

<slide 2>

The central question before the Court involves the constitutionality of immigration stops based on four specific factors: apparent race or ethnicity, speaking Spanish or accented English, location such as car washes or bus stops, and type of work performed. The procedural posture is crucial to understanding this decision. A federal district court in the Central District of California had enjoined the government from conducting stops based solely on these four factors, finding they violated the Fourth Amendment's reasonable suspicion standard. When the government sought an emergency stay from the Supreme Court, they encountered the high bar established in Nken v. Holder, requiring extraordinary circumstances to interrupt the normal appellate process. The Court's unsigned order granting the stay, with only a concurrence and dissent to guide us, leaves many questions unanswered about the majority's reasoning.

<slide 3>

Operation At Large began in June 2025 as part of the Trump administration's immigration enforcement priorities. The scale was unprecedented: nearly 2,800 immigration-related arrests in just one month across Los Angeles and surrounding counties. The operation involved teams of armed, masked federal agents conducting what can only be described as dragnet-style enforcement at car washes, tow yards, farms, and public spaces. The evidence suggests this wasn't random enforcement but a systematic targeting approach. Deputy Chief of Staff Stephen Miller's reported instructions to 'turn the creativity knob up to 11' and arrest quotas of 3,000 per day nationwide reveal the policy-driven nature of these operations. This context matters for our constitutional analysis because it suggests coordinated government action rather than isolated incidents of officer misconduct.

<slide 4>

The documented incidents reveal the human impact of these enforcement practices. Jason Gavidia, a U.S. citizen working at a tow yard, faced an escalating interrogation despite repeatedly confirming his American citizenship. When he couldn't immediately recall his birth hospital, agents racked a rifle, seized his phone, and physically restrained him against a fence. His Real ID was taken and never returned. Jorge Viramontes, managing a car wash visited four times in nine days, was detained for twenty minutes in a warehouse area despite presenting a valid California driver's license. These aren't brief investigative stops—they involve weapons, physical force, and extended detentions. The pattern extends beyond individual incidents to mass seizures where agents would jump from vehicles and tackle people before asking any questions. This evidence becomes crucial when we analyze both the Fourth Amendment reasonableness standard and the balance of harms.

<slide 5>

The Nken v. Holder framework governs when the Supreme Court will grant emergency stays. The four-part test examines likelihood of success on the merits, irreparable harm to the applicant, balance of harms between parties, and the public interest. Critically, the Court has emphasized that success on the merits and irreparable harm are the most critical factors, with a stay being an intrusion into ordinary processes requiring extraordinary circumstances. This high bar exists because emergency relief circumvents normal appellate procedures and comprehensive briefing. Justice Kavanaugh's concurrence suggests the government met this standard, while Justice Sotomayor's dissent argues the opposite. The absence of a majority opinion means we must extrapolate the Court's reasoning from these competing analyses, making this decision particularly challenging for lower courts to interpret and apply.

<slide 6>

Los Angeles v. Lyons establishes crucial limitations on standing for injunctive relief. Adolph Lyons had been choked unconscious by police but the Court held he lacked standing to seek an injunction against future chokeholds because he couldn't demonstrate a realistic threat that he personally would be subjected to a chokehold again. The Court distinguished between standing for damages (past injury) and standing for injunctive relief (future injury). This distinction matters because plaintiffs must show more than subjective fears—they need concrete evidence of a realistic threat of future harm. Lyons has been criticized for making it difficult to challenge systemic police misconduct, but it remains binding precedent. Understanding Lyons is essential because both Justice Kavanaugh's concurrence and Justice Sotomayor's dissent grapple extensively with its application to immigration enforcement patterns.

<slide 7>

Justice Kavanaugh applies Lyons mechanically to this immigration context. He argues that like Lyons, these plaintiffs experienced past harm but cannot demonstrate they will be unlawfully stopped again. His key argument focuses on the multiplicity of factors immigration officers consider. Even if officers continue making stops, Kavanaugh contends, they might rely on other permissible factors beyond the four prohibited ones, making future harm speculative. This analysis reveals a fundamental disagreement about how to characterize the government's enforcement pattern. Kavanaugh treats each stop as an individual officer decision potentially based on various factors, rather than viewing the stops as part of a systematic operation targeting specific profiles. This framing question—individual versus systematic enforcement—becomes central to the standing analysis and reflects broader jurisprudential approaches to constitutional violations.

<slide 8>

Justice Sotomayor's standing analysis reveals why Lyons should not control here. She emphasizes the systematic nature of Operation At Large, where the government targeted specific demographic profiles through coordinated enforcement. Each plaintiff fits the targeted profile and is virtually certain to return to work locations that agents have repeatedly visited. The government's own declarations confirm they will continue targeting the same types of locations. Unlike Lyons, where future police misconduct was speculative, here the government has announced its intention to continue these operations. Sotomayor highlights the district court's factual finding of a 'real and immediate threat that the conduct will continue,' supported by official statements approving these practices. This case-specific evidence distinguishes it from the speculative harm in Lyons and demonstrates how factual development can overcome standing obstacles.

<slide 9>

The Fourth Amendment's reasonable suspicion standard, established in Terry v. Ohio, allows officers to briefly stop individuals for investigation based on specific articulable facts suggesting criminal activity. This standard sits between the low threshold of mere suspicion and the higher standard of probable cause required for arrest. The totality of circumstances test examines all factors together, but critically, as Reid v. Georgia established, those factors cannot describe such a large category of innocent people that the standard becomes meaningless. This principle protects against fishing expeditions where officers could stop anyone fitting broad demographic profiles. The reasonable suspicion analysis requires particularized, objective evidence about the specific individual being stopped, not generalized assumptions about groups of people. Understanding this framework is essential because the Fourth Amendment question turns on whether the four factors can ever collectively satisfy this individualized standard.

<slide 10>

United States v. Brignoni-Ponce directly addresses ethnicity in immigration enforcement. When Border Patrol stopped a vehicle solely because occupants appeared to be of Mexican ancestry, the Supreme Court held this violated the Fourth Amendment. The Court's reasoning remains instructive: large numbers of citizens and legal residents share these physical characteristics, making ethnicity alone an impermissible basis for stops. However, the Court left open that ethnicity could be a relevant factor when combined with other specific, articulable facts. This nuanced approach—ethnicity cannot be the sole factor but might contribute to reasonable suspicion when combined with truly particularized evidence—creates the doctrinal framework both sides invoke in this case. The challenge lies in determining when additional factors provide genuine particularization versus merely dressing up ethnic profiling with additional generalized characteristics.

<slide 11>

Justice Kavanaugh's Fourth Amendment analysis reveals his totality-of-circumstances approach to reasonable suspicion. He emphasizes statistical realities: approximately 15 million people illegally present nationwide, with 2 million in the Los Angeles area representing 10 percent of the local population. He argues these demographics, combined with the tendency for undocumented workers to gather at certain locations and work specific jobs, plus language barriers, can collectively constitute reasonable suspicion under Brignoni-Ponce. Kavanaugh's analysis treats each factor as legitimately probative when combined with others, distinguishing this from impermissible reliance on ethnicity alone. His approach reflects deference to executive branch enforcement priorities and suggests courts should not second-guess reasonable law enforcement judgments about where immigration violations are likely occurring. This statistical approach to constitutional analysis raises important questions about how demographic data should influence individual rights.

<slide 12>

Justice Sotomayor's Fourth Amendment counter-analysis exposes the flaws in treating demographics as reasonable suspicion. Her statistical response is devastating: 47 percent of the Central District identifies as Hispanic or Latino, while 37 percent speaks Spanish at home. These numbers reveal that the government's approach would subject nearly half the population to potential stops based on characteristics shared by millions of law-abiding residents. Sotomayor emphasizes that aggregate statistics cannot substitute for the individualized suspicion the Fourth Amendment requires. Her analysis recalls the Reid v. Georgia principle that factors describing large categories of innocent people cannot constitute reasonable suspicion. The case becomes a clash between statistical probability approaches to law enforcement and constitutional requirements for individualized suspicion. Sotomayor's critique suggests that combining general demographic factors doesn't cure the constitutional problem—it merely multiplies the number of innocent people subject to stops.

<slide 13>

The Equal Protection implications add another constitutional dimension to consider. While not explicitly analyzed under strict scrutiny in this emergency posture, the case raises fundamental questions about when race and ethnicity can factor into law enforcement decisions. Brignoni-Ponce's framework allows ethnicity as a 'relevant factor' but prohibits it from being determinative. The broader concern involves creating what some critics call 'second-class citizenship' where certain groups must carry documentation to prove their right to be present in their own country. The Equal Protection Clause generally requires that government actions treat people as individuals rather than as members of racial or ethnic groups. When immigration enforcement systematically targets Latino communities based on appearance and language, it risks violating equal protection principles even if the immediate purpose is immigration enforcement rather than intentional discrimination. The intersection of immigration law and equal protection remains constitutionally complex.

<slide 14>

The irreparable harm analysis reveals competing visions of government enforcement. The government claims the temporary restraining order chills enforcement efforts by making officers hesitant to conduct stops even when they have reasonable suspicion based on other factors. They argue any judicial constraint on statutory enforcement causes irreparable injury to the government's sovereign interests. However, Justice Sotomayor's response highlights the weakness in this argument. The government offered only hypothetical enforcement actions that might be chilled, without concrete proof of imminent harm. More damaging to the government's position, senior officials publicly vowed that operations would continue unchanged despite the court order. Secretary Noem called the district judge an 'idiot' and declared none of their operations would change, while the Chief Patrol Agent posted social media videos celebrating continued enforcement. This evidence contradicts claims of a chilling effect and suggests the government's irreparable harm argument lacks factual support.

<slide 15>

Justice Kavanaugh's balance of harms analysis reflects his policy-oriented approach to immigration enforcement. He weighs the government's interest in enforcing immigration laws against what he characterizes as the limited interests of individuals subject to brief questioning. Kavanaugh argues that individuals illegally present have an interest in 'evading the law' that deserves little legal weight, while legal residents face only temporary inconvenience during brief stops. His analysis emphasizes the scope of illegal immigration—15 million people unlawfully present—and describes the 'myriad significant economic and social problems' caused by illegal immigration. This framing reveals Kavanaugh's view that immigration enforcement serves substantial government interests that typically outweigh individual liberty concerns. His approach suggests deference to executive branch enforcement priorities and skepticism of judicial interference with immigration policy. The balance of harms becomes a vehicle for broader policy judgments about immigration enforcement.

<slide 16>

Justice Sotomayor's balance of harms analysis presents a starkly different constitutional vision. Rather than brief questioning, she documents aggressive enforcement involving firearms, physical violence, and warehouse detentions. U.S. citizens like Gavidia and Viramontes experienced seizure, physical abuse, and extended detention despite confirming their citizenship. Sotomayor emphasizes that countless people have been 'grabbed, thrown to the ground, and handcuffed simply because of their looks, their accents, and the fact they make a living by doing manual labor.' Her analysis refuses to minimize these constitutional violations as mere inconveniences. The dissent highlights the fundamental constitutional principle that we should not live in a country where the government can seize anyone who looks Latino, speaks Spanish, and works a low-wage job. This framing prioritizes individual constitutional rights over enforcement efficiency and challenges the majority's utilitarian approach to constitutional balancing.

<slide 17>

Justice Kavanaugh's separation of powers analysis reveals his judicial philosophy about courts' role in immigration enforcement. He emphasizes that judges don't set immigration policy or decide enforcement priorities, noting that different administrations take different approaches from 'laissez-faire' to 'more strict.' His argument for consistency suggests the Court previously declined to compel greater enforcement in United States v. Texas, so it should now decline to restrict reasonable enforcement. This symmetrical approach treats judicial deference to executive discretion as constitutionally required regardless of the enforcement direction. Kavanaugh's analysis reflects broader debates about judicial restraint versus judicial protection of constitutional rights. His separation of powers framework suggests courts should rarely interfere with executive immigration enforcement decisions, viewing such judicial intervention as improper policymaking. This approach prioritizes executive branch expertise and democratic accountability over independent judicial review of constitutional violations.

<slide 18>

Justice Sotomayor's critique of the emergency docket process raises institutional concerns about the Supreme Court's role. She argues the Court's appetite for circumventing ordinary appellate processes has grown exponentially while its interest in explaining itself has not. The majority's unsigned order provides no reasoning, leaving lower courts and parties to guess whether the decision rested on standing, merits, or scope of relief issues. This procedural criticism reflects broader concerns about the Court's increasing use of its shadow docket to make important legal decisions without full briefing or explanation. Sotomayor suggests some situations cry out for explanation, particularly when government conduct flagrantly violates constitutional rights or when lower courts need guidance. The emergency docket critique reveals tensions about institutional legitimacy, transparency, and the proper role of unexplained judicial decisions in our legal system. These process concerns matter because they affect how legal decisions are understood and implemented.

<slide 19>

The key legal takeaways from this case span multiple constitutional doctrines. On standing, Lyons remains influential but its application depends heavily on whether courts characterize enforcement as systematic policy or individual officer discretion. The Fourth Amendment reasonable suspicion analysis turns on whether combining general demographic factors can satisfy individualized suspicion requirements, or whether such combinations merely multiply the number of innocent people subject to stops. Equal Protection concerns about race and ethnicity in law enforcement remain unresolved, particularly regarding the level of scrutiny courts should apply to immigration enforcement that disproportionately affects specific ethnic communities. The emergency stay standard requires extraordinary circumstances, but this case demonstrates how that standard can be interpreted differently depending on one's view of government enforcement interests versus individual constitutional rights. These doctrinal tensions remain unresolved, creating uncertainty for future immigration enforcement and constitutional challenges.

<slide 20>

This case leaves us with profound questions about constitutional law in practice. The absence of a majority opinion means the legal principles remain unsettled, creating challenges for district courts, immigration officers, and affected communities. The competing visions of constitutional interpretation—Kavanaugh's deference to executive enforcement priorities versus Sotomayor's emphasis on individual constitutional rights—reflect broader jurisprudential debates about judicial role and constitutional meaning. The case demonstrates how emergency docket decisions can have immediate real-world consequences while leaving fundamental legal questions unanswered. As you continue studying constitutional law, consider how factual records influence legal outcomes, how different constitutional doctrines interact, and how judicial philosophy shapes interpretation of seemingly objective legal standards. The law remains dynamic, shaped by new cases, changing social contexts, and evolving constitutional understanding. This case represents not just a single decision but a window into how constitutional law develops through the interaction of legal doctrine, factual circumstances, and competing judicial philosophies.

*End of narration script.*