

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

October 4, 2024

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 24-40571

STATE OF TEXAS; STATE OF ALABAMA; STATE OF ARKANSAS;
STATE OF FLORIDA; STATE OF GEORGIA; STATE OF IOWA;
STATE OF KANSAS; STATE OF LOUISIANA; STATE OF MISSOURI;
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA; STATE OF OHIO; STATE OF SOUTH
CAROLINA; STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA; STATE OF TENNESSEE;
STATE OF WYOMING; STATE OF IDAHO,

Plaintiffs—Appellees,

versus

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY;
ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS, *in his official capacity as Secretary for DHS*;
UR MENDOZA JADDOU, *in her official capacity as Director of USCIS*;
TROY MILLER, *in his official capacity as the Acting Commissioner of CBP*;
PATRICK J. LECHLEITER, *in his official capacity as the Acting Director of*
ICE; OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET; SHALANDA
YOUNG, *in her official capacity as the Director of the Office of Management*
and Budget,

Defendants—Appellees,

OSCAR SILVA PEREZ; NATALIE TAYLOR; SALVADOR DOE;
JUSTIN DOE; CARMEN MIRANDA ZAYAS; RICARDO OCAMPO
HERNANDEZ; JESSIKA OCAMPO HERNANDEZ; FODAY TURAY;
JAXHIEL TURAY; GENARO VICENCIO PALOMINO; CINDY
SIQUEIROS MADUENA; COALITION FOR HUMANE IMMIGRANT
RIGHTS,

Movants—Appellants.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Texas
USDC No. 6:24-CV-306

Before SMITH, CLEMENT, and HIGGINSON, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM:*

The above-named appellants moved in the district court to intervene as of right or, alternatively, to intervene permissively. In a well-reasoned and comprehensive Opinion and Order, the district court denied intervention on September 3, 2024 (Docket No. 49).

In this expedited appeal, this court received full briefing on the question of intervention and administratively stayed proceedings in the district court awaiting oral argument on the expedited appeal. We directed that the stay issued by the district court would remain in effect pending further order of this court.

We have reviewed the extensive briefing, the record, and the applicable law. There is no reversible error or need for oral argument. The order denying intervention is AFFIRMED. The denial of intervention was without prejudice, but we also note that district court has the option, in its discretion, of allowing these putative intervenors to participate as *amici curiae* in any further proceedings.

This court's stay order of September 11, 2024, is VACATED.

* This opinion is not designated for publication. See 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.