

To: Interested Parties

From: Progressive State Leaders Committee

Date: 9.9.25

Re: State attorneys general file 50th lawsuit against the Trump administration

State attorneys general have been incredibly busy since January 20, 2025. As Donald Trump and his administration continue attempting to impose illegal or unconstitutional policies on Americans almost every day, these AGs have been instrumental in stopping executive actions that threaten the well-being of residents across this country—from attempts to strip funds from education and cancer research to abusing sensitive personal and medical data and indiscriminately firing hundreds of thousands of federal workers.

By the Numbers

Since Inauguration Day, state AGs have led 50 lawsuits challenging the Trump administration's illegal actions.

Harmful policies are actively blocked in 21 of the 30 cases that have achieved at least preliminary results; the AGs await rulings in other cases.

During the first Trump administration, progressive state AGs filed more than 150 multi-state lawsuits and won 80% of those. They are looking forward to a similarly strong track record for Trump 2.0.

Litigation Overview

State AGs have filed 42 coalition and eight single-state lawsuits against the Trump administration across seven categories: immigration, executive overreach (federal funding, DOGE, federal employees, tariffs), education, LGBTQ+ rights, environment/climate, health care, elections, and public safety.

Litigation Detail

These 50 AG lawsuits challenge the following illegal actions (sorted by topic):

- **Immigration**
 - **Trump's executive order to remove birthright citizenship (*Washington v. Trump* and *New Jersey v. Trump*)**
 - 23 AGs argued in two separate cases that the ban on birthright citizenship violates the Fourteenth Amendment.

♣ *Result: Judges in both cases awarded preliminary injunctions blocking Trump's executive order. The Supreme Court issued a decision on the question of nationwide injunctions finding that they "likely exceed the equitable authority that Congress has granted to federal courts" and instructed the lower court to determine whether a narrower injunction is appropriate. On July 23, 2025, a three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit ruled in Washington v. Trump that Trump's executive order to end birthright citizenship is unconstitutional and upheld a nationwide ban on his administration from implementing the measure. On July 25, 2025, in the birthright citizenship case New Jersey v. Trump, the District Court Judge reaffirmed the earlier preliminary injunction and reiterated that Trump's executive order purporting to end birthright citizenship is unconstitutional. The judge decided that his earlier injunction could not be narrowed in a way that would adequately protect the plaintiff states from harm.*

○ **Unlawful conditions on federal transportation funding over immigration policies (*California v. Department of Transportation*)**

- 20 AGs sued the Department of Transportation over threats to cut off billions in transportation funding to states that do not fully comply with Trump's immigration agenda.

♣ *Result: Court granted a preliminary injunction on June 19, 2025, and modified it on July 17, 2025, to include the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, the latter joining the suit through the office of Governor Beshear.*

○ **Threats to withhold counterterrorism, emergency response, and disaster relief funding over immigration policies (*Illinois v. FEMA*)**

- 20 AGs sued to block new DHS conditions that unlawfully tie emergency management and disaster relief funding to state immigration actions.

♣ *Result: Case filed May 13, 2025.*

○ **Restrictions to Head Start and other federally funded services requiring immigration status verification (*New York v. Department of Justice*)**

- 21 AGs sued the DOJ to block restrictions, issued without notice, requiring immigration status verification before federally funded public services like Head Start and Meals on Wheels can be provided

to individuals under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act.

- ♣ *Result: On July 25, 2025, the federal government agreed to temporarily halt the implementation of these new restrictions on access to public benefits until at least September 4, 2025.*

- **Executive overreach (federal funding cuts and DOGE)**

- **Trump's federal funding freeze (*New York v. Trump*)**

- 23 AGs argued the sudden loss of more than a trillion dollars in funds would harm state residents as they would lose access to health clinics, low-income housing assistance, policing efforts, educational services, and so much more.

- ♣ *Result: A judge issued a preliminary injunction and later ordered the Trump administration to comply by releasing the frozen funds after the AGs showed evidence the administration was defying the court order. The government appealed, and arguments continue in the Circuit Court.*

- **DOGE's access to the U.S Treasury Department's payment system data (*New York v. Trump*)**

- 19 AGs sued to block DOGE and Elon Musk from accessing sensitive data that could pose a cybersecurity risk.

- ♣ *Result: Court granted defendant's motion to partially dissolve the preliminary injunction blocking DOGE's data access after the administration demonstrated that one DOGE employee had completed the required security clearance and training and financial disclosures. The plaintiff states filed an amended complaint on May 23, 2025.*

- **Elon Musk's leadership of DOGE (*New Mexico v. Musk*)**

- 14 AGs argued it is unlawful for Elon Musk to lead the Department of Government Efficiency because, among other reasons, he has not been confirmed by the U.S Senate

- ♣ *Result: A judge temporarily declined to invalidate Musk's authority while the case is pending but has not ruled on the underlying case.*

- **Dismantling of agencies that support libraries and museums (*Rhode Island v. Trump*)**

- 21 AGs sued to stop the Trump administration's dismantling and defunding of 7 federal agencies, including the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

- ♣ *Result: Court granted preliminary injunction, blocking the dismantling and defunding of these agencies.*

- **Trump's tariffs (*Oregon v. Trump*)**

- 12 AGs sued to rein in Trump's tariff actions, arguing that the Constitution assigns Congress the power to impose tariffs and since Congress has not granted the president authority to impose these tariffs, Trump has violated the law by imposing them through EO, memos, social media posts, and agency decrees.

- ♣ *Result: On May 28, 2025, the United States Court of International Trade granted a permanent injunction halting the tariffs. However, the federal Appeals Court stayed the lower court decision, allowing tariffs to proceed as litigation continues. Appellate arguments took place on July 31, 2025, and the Federal Circuit reaffirmed the lower court's decision that the Trump tariffs were illegal. This decision is Stayed until October 14, 2025, so the government has time to appeal to the Supreme Court.*

- **Dismantling of AmeriCorps (*Maryland v. Americorps*)**

- 23 AGs, alongside the governors of Pennsylvania and Kentucky, sued to block Trump's attempts to dismantle the landmark AmeriCorps program, a congressionally created and funded agency. AmeriCorps provides both opportunities for public service and support for vulnerable populations across the country.

- ♣ *Result: Preliminary injunction issued June 5, 2025, halting the dismantling of Americorp in the plaintiff states. On August 29, the government agreed to the release the funds, ending the case with a victory for the AGs.*

- **National Science Foundation cuts (*New York v. National Science Foundation*)**

- 16 AGs sued to stop the National Science Foundation's cuts to programs and funding to organizations supporting women, minorities, the disabled, in STEM fields. The announced cap on "indirect costs" would also cut millions of dollars for groundbreaking research across the country.

- ♣ *Result: On August 1, 2025, the district court denied the AGs motion for preliminary injunction, citing lack of jurisdiction because the financial claims must be filed in the Court of Federal Claims. On August 22, 2025, the coalition of attorneys*

general filed a motion to dismiss the lawsuit without prejudice, which would allow them to refile the case in the future if they so choose.

- **Federal grant cuts under “agency priority” redesignation (*New Jersey v. Office of Management and Budget*)**
 - 21 AGs, alongside the governors of Pennsylvania and Kentucky, sued the Office of Management and Budget and numerous federal agencies to stop them from unlawfully asserting that existing appropriated grants “no longer effectuate agency priorities” to justify withholding billions of dollars in federal funding to states.
 - ♣ *Result: Case filed June 24, 2025.*
- **FEMA infrastructure mitigation grant cuts (*Washington v. Federal Emergency Management Agency*)**
 - 19 AGs, alongside the governor of Pennsylvania, sued the Federal Emergency Management Agency and its administrator over the unlawful termination of the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) program that provides billions in funding for disaster mitigation projects to states.
 - ♣ *Result: A preliminary injunction was issued on August 5, 2025, blocking FEMA from spending any of the funding for the BRIC grant program on non-related purposes while litigation continues.*
- **Disseminating sensitive personal data of SNAP recipients (*California v. USDA*)**
 - 20 AGs, alongside the governor of Kentucky, sued the U.S. Department of Agriculture over its demand that states turn over personal and sensitive information about millions of SNAP recipients.
 - ♣ *Result: Case filed July 28, 2025. Oral argument is currently scheduled for September 16, 2025.*
- **Federal energy grant cuts (*New York et al. v. Dept. of Energy*)**
 - 21 AGs sued the Department of Energy for arbitrarily and unlawfully capping indirect and fringe benefit costs at 10% in grants made to states to support energy conservation projects.
 - ♣ *Result: Case filed August 15, 2025. Oral argument is currently scheduled for September 29, 2025.*
- **Federal Employees**
 - **Administration’s mass firing of probationary employees (*Maryland v. Department of Agriculture*)**

- 20 AGs argued that the administration violated federal law and regulations by terminating employment *en masse* without cause.
 - ♣ *Result: Preliminary injunction issued on April 1, 2025; on April 9, 2025, the Fourth Circuit stayed the injunction, allowing the firings to move forward, and on September 8, 2025, the Fourth Circuit held that the AGs did not have standing to sue and returned the case to the district court for dismissal.*

- **Education**

- **Department of Education's firing half the staff of the department (*New York v. McMahon*)**
 - 21 AGs sued the Department of Education to stop its efforts to fire at least half of the employees through Reduction in Force mechanisms in an attempt to dismantle the department.
 - ♣ *Result: Preliminary injunction issued May 22, 2025. On July 14, 2025, in New York v. McMahon, the Supreme Court stayed the lower court's injunction 6-3. The Supreme Court ruled that the Trump administration's plans to dismantle the Department of Education, beginning with laying off half its employees, could proceed as the case continues.*
- **Department of Education's termination of teacher training grant program (*California v. Department of Education*)**
 - 8 AGs sued to release grant funding for teacher training programs, arguing that the Department unlawfully terminated congressionally created grant programs in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act.
 - ♣ *Result: On April 4, 2025, the Supreme Court granted an emergency motion for a stay of the lower court's temporary restraining order pending appeal in 5-4 decision, temporarily blocking the grant funding as the case proceeds.*
- **Department of Education's rescission of education grant funds (*New York v. Department of Education*)**
 - 16 AGs sued after the Department of Education unilaterally and without notice rescinded COVID-19-related education grant funds that were intended to be available through March 2026.
 - ♣ *Result: Court granted preliminary injunction, protecting the grant funding as the case moves forward.*
- **Department of Education's withholding federal funds over DEI programs in schools (*New York v. Department of Education*)**

- 19 AGs sued the Department of Education challenging the Department's efforts to withhold federal funding from state and local agencies that refuse to ban practices that advance diversity, equity, and inclusion.
 - ♣ *Result: Case filed April 25, 2025.*
 - **Department of Education's discontinuation of school mental health grant funding (*Washington v. Department of Education*)**
 - 19 AGs sued over the Department of Education's decision to discontinue grants awarded through congressionally established school mental health funding programs
 - ♣ *Result: Case filed June 30, 2025. A hearing on the Motion for a Preliminary Injunction took place September 5, 2025.*
 - **Department of Education funding freeze (*California v. McMahon*)**
 - 23 AGs sued after the Department of Education's decision to freeze \$6 billion in funding for six longstanding programs administered by the U.S. Department of Education.
 - ♣ *Result: On August 25, 2025, after the attorneys general successfully secured an agreement requiring the Trump administration to release the full balance of the remaining education funds by October 3, 2025, the coalition filed a motion to dismiss the case.*
 - **LGBTQ+ Rights**
 - **Trump's executive order defunding transgender care for young people (*Washington v. Trump*)**
 - 4 AGs sued to stop the abuse of power that puts children's lives in danger by cutting off lifesaving care.
 - ♣ *Result: A judge issued a preliminary injunction, temporarily blocking the executive order and maintaining the funding.*
 - **Attacks on gender-affirming care (*Massachusetts v. Trump*)**
 - 16 AGs, alongside the governor of Pennsylvania, sued to challenge the Trump administration's efforts to restrict access to gender affirming care for transgender, intersex, and nonbinary individuals under the age of 19. They challenged the executive order threatening civil and criminal prosecution for healthcare providers providing this care.
 - ♣ *Result: Case filed August 1, 2025.*
 - **Environment/Climate**

- **EPA and Citibank's freeze and attempted cancellation of \$20 billion in greenbank funding (*California Infrastructure Bank v. Citibank, EPA*)**
 - 4 AGs sued Citibank and the EPA to release billions of dollars awarded to state agencies and nongovernmental organizations for green energy projects, which the EPA had attempted to claw back.
 - ♣ *Result: On September 2, 2025, a DC Circuit panel ruled that the district court exceeded its authority in issuing an injunction and the case should be filed in the Court of Federal Claims, thus allowing the funding cuts and claw backs to proceed.*
- **Trump's attempt to block wind energy (*New York v. Trump*)**
 - 18 AGs sued to stop the Trump administration's "Wind Directive" cancelling all wind energy projects, federal funding and permitting for such projects, and stopping the wind development industry in its tracks.
 - ♣ *Result: Case filed May 5, 2025. A hearing was held on September 4, 2025.*
- **Cancellation of electric vehicle charging infrastructure (*Washington v. Department of Transportation*)**
 - 17 AGs sued to challenge the Trump administration's cancellation of funds for electric vehicle charging infrastructure.
 - ♣ *Result: Preliminary injunction issued June 24, 2025, ordering the Trump administration to resume funding for the program for 14 of the 17 plaintiff states.*
- **National Emergency Executive Order (*Washington v. Trump*)**
 - 15 AGs sued the Trump administration over the Executive Order declaring a "national energy emergency" to fast-track permits and approvals for fossil fuel extraction in sensitive areas.
 - ♣ *Result: Case filed May 9, 2025.*
- **Recission of California's EPA waivers (*California v. Environmental Protection Agency*)**
 - 11 AGs sued the Trump administration over its unlawful recission of California's EPA waivers for its fuel vehicle standards, later adopted by the other Plaintiff states.
 - ♣ *Result: Case filed June 12, 2025.*
- **Stop work order for multi-state wind development (*Rhode Island v. Dept. of Interior*)**
 - AGs of CT and RI sued the Trump administration over its unlawful stop work order halting construction of the interstate Revolution Wind

project, which was fully permitted and already 80% completed, and which would have provided affordable and sustainable energy to state residents.

♣ *Result: Case filed September 4, 2025.*

- **Health Care**

- **Trump's executive order attempting to cut health and medical research funding (*Massachusetts v. National Institutes of Health*)**

- 22 AGs brought a lawsuit challenging Trump's cuts to NIH funding, which could affect lifesaving medical research

- ♣ *Result: A judge issued a permanent injunction, blocking the cuts and maintaining the funding.*

- **Department of Health and Human Services' cancellation of \$11 billion in public health funding (*Colorado v. Department of Health and Human Services*)**

- 22 AGs, alongside the governors of Pennsylvania and Kentucky, sued to block the Department of Health and Human Services' abrupt cancellation of \$11 billion in critical public health funding, arguing that the cuts are illegal and the federal government did not provide a "rational basis" for them.

- ♣ *Result: A judge issued a preliminary injunction, restoring the public health funding as the case progresses.*

- **Department of Health and Human Services and NIH's termination and withholding of billions in medical and health research grants (*Massachusetts v. Kennedy, Department of Health and Human Services*)**

- 16 AGs sued to block the cancellation of grants.

- ♣ *Result: Supreme Court ruled for the federal government and stayed the district court's decision to stop cuts to NIH grants allegedly related to DEI, meaning that challenges to contract cancellations must be filed with Court of Federal Claims, while allowing the district court ruling to stand that held the underlying policy guidance was unlawful. The order blocking cancellation of grants was reversed.*

- **Dismantling of HHS (*New York v. Department of Health and Human Services*)**

- 20 AGs sued to stop the Trump administration's mass termination of 10,000 employees and shuttering of dozens of agencies.

- ♣ *Result: Preliminary injunction granted July 1, 2025; clarified August 13, 2025, to reduce the scope of the preliminary injunction so that it only applies to six of the agency's centers, allowing for potentially thousands of other workers to still have their jobs terminated.*

- **HHS sharing data with DHS (*California v. Department of Health and Human Services*)**

- 20 AGs sued challenging HHS's decision to share personal health data with the Department of Homeland Security.

- ♣ *Result: Court granted a preliminary injunction on August 12, 2025, blocking the agency from sharing this sensitive personal data with DHS.*

- **Rule changes to ACA (*California v. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services*)**

- 20 AGs, alongside the governor of Pennsylvania, sued to stop the implementation of new rules that would make obtaining health coverage through the ACA marketplace more difficult and more expensive for enrollees and states alike.

- ♣ *Result: Case filed July 17, 2025.*

- **Stripping Medicaid funding from Planned Parenthood (*California v. Department of Health and Human Services*)**

- 22 AGs, alongside the governor of Pennsylvania, sued HHS to block a provision from the reconciliation bill that blocks Medicaid reimbursements from being paid to Planned Parenthood health centers.

- ♣ *Result: Case filed July 29, 2025.*

- **Elections**

- **Trump's executive order seeking to impose sweeping voting restrictions (*California v. Trump* and *Washington v. Trump*)**

- 21 AGs (Washington and Oregon in *Washington*, 19 in *California*) sued to block Trump's executive order that would impose sweeping voting restrictions across the country and impose documentary proof-of-citizenship requirements when Americans seek to register to vote.

- ♣ *Result: Complaints filed April 3, 2025, and April 4, 2025, respectively. Preliminary injunction granted in California v. Trump blocking the Trump administration from implementing proof-of-citizenship requirements; one provision constraining*

federal agencies modified on July 18 to apply only to plaintiff states.

- **Public Safety**

- **ATF plan to end ban on triggers (*New Jersey v. Bondi*)**

- 17 AGs sued to block the Trump administration's decision to reverse a Biden-era ATF rule designating Forced Reset Triggers as "prohibited machine guns" under federal law.

- ♣ *Result: Plaintiffs withdrew motion for a preliminary injunction when Defendants agreed not to return or sell forced reset triggers in plaintiff states. On August 15, 2025, the parties moved to stay proceedings for six months.*

- **Imposition of immigration enforcement conditions on Victims of Crime Act grants (*New Jersey v. Department of Justice*)**

- 21 AGs sued to block the Trump administration's decision to condition funds used to support victims and survivors of crimes on support for Trump's immigration enforcement efforts.

- ♣ *Result: Case filed August 18, 2025*

Individual AG-led cases

- **Military Occupation of US Cities**

- **Deployment of National Guard (*California v. Trump*)**

- California AG Rob Bonta and Governor Gavin Newsom sued the Trump administration for illegally deploying the California National Guard to Los Angeles during protests against Trump's immigration policy.

- ♣ *Result: Case filed June 9, 2025. Court of appeals ruled unanimously that Trump acted within his authority and indefinitely blocked Governor Newsom's attempt to reclaim control of the National Guard. On July 11, 2025, the Circuit Court ordered a rehearing En Banc. On September 2, 2025, the district court held that the deployment was illegal and unconstitutional but briefly delayed implementation of the ruling. On September 4, 2025, the Ninth Circuit further delayed implementation of the district court ruling, allowing National Guard actions to continue while the case is appealed.*

- **Deployment of National Guard (*District of Columbia v. Trump*)** D.C. AG Brian Schwalb sued to stop the illegal deployment of the National Guard,

arguing they are engaged in law enforcement activity in clear violation of the Posse Comitatus acts and the Constitution.

■ *Result: Case filed September 4, 2025.*

- **Executive overreach (federal funding cuts and DOGE)**

- **Trump's tariffs (*California v. Trump*)**

- California AG Rob Bonta and Governor Gavin Newsom sued the Trump administration over the tariff regime implemented under Trump's use of emergency economic powers.

- ♣ *Result: Case filed April 16, 2025. Oral argument is currently scheduled for September 17, 2025.*

- **NOAA eliminating climate grants (*Washington v. Department of Commerce*)**

- Washington State AG Nick Brown sued the Commerce Department and the Trump Administration for canceling more than \$9 million in climate resilience grants.

- ♣ *Result: Case filed August 8, 2025.*

- **Administration takeover of DC Metropolitan Police (*District of Columbia v. Trump*)**

- ■ District of Columbia AG Brian Schwalb sued Trump and the administration for their unlawful attempt to commandeer the DC Metropolitan Police Department and overrule District policies.

- ♣ *Result: Case filed August 15, 2025. Court forced DOJ to rescind order replacing chief of police that same day.*

- **LGBTQ**

- **Funding cuts due to Maine's transgender athlete policy (*Maine v. Department of Agriculture*)**

- Maine AG Frey sued the Department of Agriculture and the Trump administration for funding cuts over Maine's transgender athlete policy

- ♣ *Result: Maine signed a deal with the Department of Agriculture to unfreeze money for child nutrition programs and moved to dismiss the case.*

- **Trump's use of Title IX to impose anti-trans athlete bans (*Minnesota v. Trump*)**

- Minnesota AG Keith Ellison sues the Trump administration over its decision to use Title IX to punish states that allow trans students to play sports.

- ♣ *Result: Case filed April 22, 2025.*

- **Attempts to interfere with California schools' transgender athlete policy**
(California v. Department of Justice)
 - California AG Rob Bonta sued the Trump administration over its demand that California ban transgender children and teens from participating in school sports in accordance with their gender identity.
 - ♣ *Result: Case filed June 9, 2025.*