

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 The Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez  
6  
7

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

WASHINGTON STATE ASSOCIATION OF HEAD  
START AND EARLY CHILDHOOD ASSISTANCE  
AND EDUCATION PROGRAM, ILLINOIS HEAD  
START ASSOCIATION, PENNSYLVANIA HEAD  
START ASSOCIATION, WISCONSIN HEAD  
START ASSOCIATION, FAMILY FORWARD  
OREGON, and PARENT VOICES OAKLAND,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

ROBERT F. KENNEDY, JR., in his official capacity  
as Secretary of Health and Human Services; U.S.  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN  
SERVICES; ANDREW GRADISON, in his official  
capacity as Acting Assistant Secretary of the  
Administration for Children and Families;  
ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND  
FAMILIES; OFFICE OF HEAD START; and TALA  
HOOBAN, in her official capacity as Acting  
Director of the Office of Head Start,

*Defendants.*

Case No. 2:25-cv-00781-RSM

**MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE  
RECORD ON PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY  
INJUNCTION**

NOTE ON MOTION

CALENDAR: December 26, 2025

MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE RECORD  
ON PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR A  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION -- 1  
2:25-CV-00781-RSM

A.C.L.U. OF WASHINGTON  
PO BOX 2728 SEATTLE, WA 98111-2728  
(206) 624-2184

1 Plaintiffs move for leave to supplement the record in support of Plaintiffs' pending Motion  
 2 for a Preliminary Injunction, ECF No. 37, with two declarations and related exhibits. In the last  
 3 three weeks, Plaintiffs have been made aware of additional evidence of the scope of and ongoing  
 4 harm caused by Defendants' DEIA Ban, including an extraordinary six-page list of content that  
 5 Defendants no longer permit Head Start agencies to include in their program funding applications.  
 6 This evidence decisively demonstrates that the Ban extends far beyond the scope of existing anti-  
 7 discrimination laws and that noncompliance puts programs' funding at immediate risk, directly  
 8 contradicting Defendants' repeated assertions to the contrary. It is further evidence that the Ban  
 9 violates the rights of Plaintiffs' members, and forces Head Start Association Plaintiffs' members  
 10 to make the impossible choice between their obligations under the Head Start Act and those under  
 11 the Ban. *See Roe; Ryan Second Supp.* Because this new evidence is relevant, offered in good  
 12 faith, and does not unfairly prejudice Defendants, Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court grant  
 13 the motion to supplement the record.

14 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

15 Since the government reopened on November 12, 2025, Head Start Association Plaintiffs'  
 16 members have informed Plaintiffs that Defendants are rejecting non-competitive grant  
 17 applications for violating the Defendants' DEIA Ban because of aspects of their applications that  
 18 are required by the Head Start Act and Head Start Program Performance Standards.

19 First, Defendant Office of Head Start (OHS) rejected the non-competitive grant  
 20 application of Mary Roe's Head Start Agency, a member of Plaintiff Wisconsin Head Start  
 21 Association, on November 19, 2025. *See Roe ¶¶ 9-10.* A Program Specialist<sup>1</sup> from Defendants'  
 22 OHS instructed Roe's Head Start Agency that in order to have its non-competitive grant  
 23 processed, it had to remove the following words from the application: "Racism," "Race,"  
 24 "Racial," "marginalized," "institutional," "historically," "bias," "Equity," "equitable,"

---

25  
 26 <sup>1</sup> The name of the Program Specialist has been redacted to protect the privacy of the individual employee as the  
 individual's identity is not material to the relevance of the evidence.

1 “diversity,” “diverse,” “belonging,” “inclusion,” “inclusivity,” “gender,” “chestfeeding,”  
 2 “pregnant people,” or “LGBTQIA 25+.” Roe ¶ 10; *id.* Ex. B. Further, Defendants’ Program  
 3 Specialist sent Roe an email with a six-page attachment setting forth “the complete list of words  
 4 to make sure are not in [its] applications.” Roe ¶¶ 11-12; *id.* Ex. C. This list contains 197 banned  
 5 words and concepts, including, but not limited to, “advocate,” “Black,” “cultural competence,”  
 6 “culturally appropriate,” “disability,” “discrimination,” “diverse,” “equal opportunity,” “female,”  
 7 “feminism,” “gender,” “health disparity,” “[H]ispanic minority,” “identity,” “immigrants,”  
 8 “inclusion,” “inclusive,” “intersectional,” “indigenous community,” “Latinx,” “LGBTQ,”  
 9 “mental health,” “multicultural,” “Native American,” “people centered,” “race,” “sense of  
 10 belonging,” “socioeconomic,” “trauma,” “tribal,” “underrepresented,” “victim,” “vulnerable  
 11 populations,” and “women.” *Id.* Ex. C.

12 As Roe explains in her declaration, without being able to use some of the banned words,  
 13 the program is unable to accurately describe the results of its community needs assessment, which  
 14 is a foundational part of both the grant application and the development and ongoing improvement  
 15 of the program’s services. Roe ¶ 15. And the program is unable to appropriately describe how it  
 16 meets the requirements of the Head Start Act and the Head Start Performance Standards—or even  
 17 respond according to the Application Instructions, each of which use many of the words that have  
 18 been banned. Roe ¶¶ 14-18. Unless Roe’s Head Start Agency complies with the Defendants’  
 19 DEIA Ban, its application will not move forward; it has no option to appeal. Roe ¶ 13. But by  
 20 complying with the DEIA Ban, Roe’s application risks being out of compliance with the  
 21 application’s own instructions, the Head Start Act, and the Head Start Performance Standards.  
 22 *See, e.g.*, 45 C.F.R. § 1304.5(a) (“Grounds to terminate financial assistance or deny a grant  
 23 recipient’s application for refunding” include “[t]he grant recipient has failed to comply with  
 24 requirements in the Act”). Thus, the program is put in an impossible double-bind: both options  
 25 put its ability to continue to provide Head Start services to its community at imminent risk. Roe  
 26 ¶ 20.

1       Moreover, the extraordinary list of banned words and concepts has a profound chilling  
 2 effect on the speech and substantive services of HSA Plaintiffs' members. For example, if Roe's  
 3 Head Start Agency is not permitted to include a description of services that the program provides  
 4 for children with disabilities in its application, it suggests the program may also be prohibited  
 5 from continuing to offer these services. Roe ¶ 19. It also suggests that if Roe's Head Start Agency  
 6 continues to use its speech to convey to the public that it offers these services may make the  
 7 Agency a target, chilling their speech. *Id.* The Defendants' clear message is that any services or  
 8 speech that touch on the 197 disfavored words and concepts are a basis for penalty or termination.

9       Second, Defendant OHS returned the grant application of a member of Washington State  
 10 Association of Head Start and Early Childhood Assistance and Education Program (Washington  
 11 HSA), which operates an American Indian and Alaska Native (AIAN) program on a Native  
 12 American reservation. Ryan Second Supp. ¶¶ 4-5. The e-mail from Defendants' Program  
 13 Specialist<sup>2</sup> directed the AIAN Head Start program that they "must" (1) "Remove the Eligibility  
 14 and Selection Criteria document from [their] application package"; (2) "Revise [their] Training  
 15 and Technical Assistance (T/TA) Plan to remove all Diversity and Inclusion-related activities";  
 16 and (3) "Resubmit the corrected application once the revisions were complete." Ryan Second  
 17 Supp. Ex. A. Revisions were required in order to "resubmi[t]" the application. *Id.*

18       Defendants' direction that Plaintiff Washington HSA's member must remove the  
 19 "Eligibility and Selection Criteria" requires the program operated by a tribe on a reservation  
 20 eliminate enrollment prioritization for tribal members and descendants from their "application  
 21 package"—selection criteria explicitly authorized by the Head Start Act and important to the  
 22 program's ability to meet the needs of its community. Ryan Second Supp. ¶¶ 10-13. The Head  
 23 Start Act provides that "an Indian tribe that operates a Head Start program may, at its discretion,  
 24 establish selection criteria, including criteria to prioritize children in families for which a child, a

---

26       <sup>2</sup> The name of the Program Specialist has been redacted to protect the privacy of the individual employee as the  
 individual's identity is not material to the relevance of the evidence.

1 family member, or a member of the same household, is a member of an Indian tribe, to enroll  
 2 children who would benefit from the Head Start program.” Further Consolidated Appropriations  
 3 Act, 2024, Pub. L. No. 118-47, § 238, 138 Stat. 460, 681 (2024),  
 4 <https://www.congress.gov/bill/118th-congress/house-bill/2882>; *see* ACF, ACF-OHS-PI-24-03,  
 5 New Eligibility Provisions for American Indian and Alaska Native Programs (2024).

6 The “Training and Technical Assistance” which Plaintiff Washington HSA’s member was  
 7 required to remove is: (a) professional development for staff on providing trauma-informed  
 8 instruction, which was added at the request of parents and staff members, and is essential to retain  
 9 the trust of families on reservations and meet the specific needs of the community, Ryan Second  
 10 Supp. ¶¶ 15-16, and (b) professional development for staff on working with children with autism  
 11 spectrum disorder, who make up more than 10% of the program, and is necessary for the program  
 12 to provide effective education and equal opportunity to children with disabilities, *id.* ¶¶ 17-20.  
 13 Forced to remove this professional development from the grant application, the Washington HSA  
 14 member does not know how it will be able to provide staff with the tools that they need to meet  
 15 the needs of the children in their program nor how they will comply with their obligations under  
 16 the Head Start Act and Section 504. Ryan Second Supp. ¶¶ 11, 16, 20, 21.

17 Both declarations attest that the respective Head Start programs understand these recent  
 18 instructions from OHS employees to be conditions of continued funding and operation of Head  
 19 Start program for the 2026 program year. Roe ¶ 13; Ryan Second Supp. ¶ 23.

## 20 **LEGAL STANDARD**

21 The district court has discretion in deciding whether to grant a motion to supplement the  
 22 record. *See Resilient Floor Covering Pension Tr. Fund Bd. of Trs. v. Michael's Floor Covering,*  
 23 *Inc.*, 801 F.3d 1079, 1088 (9th Cir. 2015) (“[w]e review for abuse of discretion a district court's  
 24 denial of a motion to supplement the record.” (quoting *E.E.O.C. v. Peabody W. Coal Co.*, 773  
 25 F.3d 977, 982 (9th Cir. 2014))).

1        “In determining whether to grant a motion to supplement the record, district courts  
2 consider: (1) whether the evidence the party is seeking to admit is relevant; (2) whether the motion  
3 is made in good faith; and (3) whether supplementation would unfairly prejudice the non-moving  
4 party.” *Shijiazhuang Hongray Grp. v. World Trading 23 Inc.*, No. 5:21-CV-00972-FWS-KK, 2023  
5 WL 6370924, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 14, 2023); *see also Fellowship of Christian Athletes v. San*  
6 *Jose Unified Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ.*, 82 F.4th 664, 696 n.14 (9th Cir. 2023) (en banc) (holding  
7 district court’s denial of motion to supplement the preliminary injunction record was an abuse of  
8 discretion where the proffered evidence was “highly probative”); *George v. Nw. Mut. Life Ins.*  
9 *Co.*, 2011 WL 3881476, at \*4 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 1, 2011) (granting a motion to supplement where  
10 the new evidence was “directly relevant to the central issues in this matter,” “disregard[ing] it  
11 simply because it was discovered outside the discovery period would not serve the interests of  
12 justice,” and there was no evidence that the moving party “acted in bad faith in failing to bring  
13 the [evidence] to the Court at an earlier date”).

## ARGUMENT

15 The Court should exercise its discretion to allow Plaintiffs to supplement the record in  
16 support of their Motion for a Preliminary Injunction, ECF No. 37, because the evidence is highly  
17 relevant, offered in good faith, and does not unfairly prejudice the non-moving party.

18        Relevance. The evidence contradicts Defendants' repeated assertions about the scope of  
19 the DEIA Ban and confirms the plain meaning and effect of the March 2025 Letter to ban all  
20 activities that "promote" "diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives," without regard to  
21 whether such activities are currently proscribed by anti-discrimination law. *See* Calvo-Friedman  
22 Exs. 5, 6 (ECF Nos. 38-5, 38-6). In their Motion for a Preliminary Injunction, Plaintiffs challenge  
23 Defendants' DEIA Ban and seek an order enjoining Defendants from enforcing or implementing  
24 the DEIA Ban. ECF No. 37, 37-1. The supplemental evidence Plaintiffs offer is directly relevant  
25 to the scope of the DEIA Ban and Defendants' arguments about the ripeness of the challenge and  
26 whether Plaintiffs are suffering irreparable harm. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 401 ("Evidence is relevant if:

1 (a) it has any tendency to make a fact more or less probable than it would be without the evidence;  
 2 and (b) the fact is of consequence in determining the action.”).

3 First, in opposing Plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction, Defendants have argued  
 4 the DEIA Ban only “emphasizes,” “remind[s],” “prioritizes,” “highlights,” and “reinforces,”  
 5 compliance with “preexisting legal obligations” under anti-discrimination laws. Opp. 12, 15, 19,  
 6 22, 27-29, 32 (ECF No. 59). The additional evidence clearly establishes that the meaning and  
 7 scope of the DEIA Ban extend far beyond enforcement of anti-discrimination law. Defendants’  
 8 list of prohibited words and concepts provides additional evidence that their DEIA Ban imposes  
 9 extraordinarily broad restrictions on the very content and programs required by the Head Start  
 10 Act. *Compare* Opp. 27 (DEIA Ban “do[es] not prevent Head Start agencies from serving and  
 11 recruiting from diverse populations, offering services to children with diverse backgrounds, or  
 12 meeting the diverse needs of the population served”) *with* Ryan Second Supp. Second Supp. ¶¶  
 13 10-21 (required by Defendants to remove from grant application policies and programing  
 14 necessary to meet the needs of population served, namely Native American families and children  
 15 with disabilities); Roe ¶¶ 15-20 (required by Defendants to remove portions of application that  
 16 enable it to serve and recruit children most in need of their services and to provide services to  
 17 meet the needs of children with diverse backgrounds).

18 Second, the supplemental evidence also demonstrates that, contrary to Defendants’  
 19 repeated (and unsupported) assertions that Plaintiffs’ claims are not ripe and Plaintiffs are not  
 20 currently being subjected to irreparable harm, Defendants are currently implementing and  
 21 enforcing the DEIA Ban through the grant administration process, by which Defendants renew  
 22 grant funding to agencies already designated to provide Head Start. If Head Start agencies do not  
 23 make the changes Defendants demand, funding and operation of their Head Start programs will  
 24 be put at immediate risk. Ryan Second Supp. ¶¶ 22-23; Roe ¶ 13. When a grant application is  
 25 returned to a Head Start program, they do not have any option to appeal that decision. Their only  
 26  
 27

1 options are to either comply with the instructions from Defendants or have their renewal  
 2 applications not move forward.

3 The supplemental evidence also shows that Defendants' implementation and enforcement  
 4 of the DEIA Ban are causing current irreparable harm, including "actual, substantive  
 5 programmatic changes with consequences that money cannot remedy." *S.F. Unified Sch. Dist. v.*  
 6 *AmeriCorps*, No. 25-CV-02425-EMC, 2025 WL 974298, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 31, 2025) (internal  
 7 quotations omitted); *see Cnty. of Santa Clara v. Trump*, 250 F. Supp. 3d 497, 519 (N.D. Cal. 2017).  
 8 The imminent degradation of critical services because of substantive programmatic changes  
 9 required by the DEIA Ban also causes the Parent Plaintiffs' irreparable harm. *See* ECF No. 65 at  
 10 9. Additionally, Plaintiffs are forced to modify their speech, including communications to the  
 11 communities they serve, to comply with the Ban. *See* ECF No. 37 at 29; ECF No. 65 at 10.  
 12 Moreover, HSA Plaintiffs' members are put to a "Hobson's choice," which will result in "a very  
 13 real penalty" regardless of how they proceed. *Am. Trucking Ass 'ns, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*,  
 14 559 F.3d 1046, 1058 (9th Cir. 2009). Complying with making the changes that Defendants' have  
 15 instructed are required by the DEIA Ban risks penalties for non-compliance with the requirements  
 16 of the Head Start Act and application instructions. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 1304.5(a); Roe Ex. A. Failing  
 17 to comply with the DEIA Ban would at the very least delay funding needed to continue with Head  
 18 Start operations and risks funding and designation status being eliminated. Ryan Second Supp. ¶¶  
 19 22-23; Roe ¶ 13; *see* ECF No. 37 at 28; ECF No. 65 at 8.

20 Good Faith. Plaintiffs make this motion in good faith because the newly discovered  
 21 evidence is highly relevant to the issues presented in their pending Motion for a Preliminary  
 22 Injunction. Plaintiffs have been diligent both in obtaining additional evidence and in promptly  
 23 presenting this evidence to the Court. Plaintiffs have filed this motion to supplement less than  
 24 three weeks after the events described in the supplemental evidence. *See Udd v. City of Phoenix*,  
 25 No. CV-18-01616-PHX-DWL, 2020 WL 1904638, at \*3 (D. Ariz. Apr. 17, 2020) (finding the  
 26  
 27

1 moving party was diligent where party moved to supplement less than a month after discovering  
 2 new evidence).

3 No Unfair Prejudice. Defendants will not be unfairly prejudiced by the supplementation  
 4 of the record because it is evidence of the Defendants' own words and instructions, and thus is  
 5 already known to Defendants. *See George*, 2011 WL 3881476, at \*5 (finding no prejudice when  
 6 opposing party was aware of the evidence).

## 7 CONCLUSION

8 Because the supplemental evidence is relevant to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary  
 9 Injunctive relief, is made in good faith, and would not unfairly prejudice Defendants, Plaintiffs  
 10 respectfully request the Court grant its motion to supplement the record in the Court's  
 11 consideration of Plaintiffs' pending Motion for a Preliminary Injunction.

12 \*\*\*

13 The undersigned certifies that this motion contains 2,491 words, in compliance with the Local  
 14 Civil Rules.

15 Dated: December 5, 2025

16 Respectfully submitted,

17 Ming-Qi Chu (*pro hac vice*)  
 18 Jennesa Calvo-Friedman (*pro hac vice*)  
 19 Linda S. Morris\* (*pro hac vice*)  
 20 \**admitted in State of Maryland*  
 21 Viviana Bonilla López (*pro hac vice*)  
 22 Lee Gelernt (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 23 Omar Jadwat (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
 24 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
 25 UNION FOUNDATION  
 26 125 Broad Street, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 27 New York, NY 10004  
 Tel: (212) 549-2500  
[mchu@aclu.org](mailto:mchu@aclu.org)

25 Laboni A. Hoq (*pro hac vice*)  
 26 HOQ LAW APC  
 27 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
 UNION FOUNDATION  
 MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THE RECORD  
 ON PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR A  
 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION -- 9  
 2:25-CV-00781-RSM

By: /s/ David Montes  
 David Montes (WSBA No. 45205)  
 La Rond Baker (WSBA No. 43610)  
 Brent Low (WSBA No. 61795)  
 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
 UNION OF WASHINGTON  
 P.O. BOX 2728  
 Seattle, Washington 98111-2728  
 Tel: (206) 624-2184  
[baker@aclu-wa.org](mailto:baker@aclu-wa.org)

Kevin M. Fee (*pro hac vice*)  
 Allison Siebeneck (*pro hac vice*)  
 ROGER BALDWIN FOUNDATION OF  
 ACLU, INC.  
 150 N. Michigan Ave, Suite 600  
 Chicago, IL 60601

A.C.L.U. OF WASHINGTON  
 PO BOX 2728 SEATTLE, WA 98111-2728  
 (206) 624-2184

1 (Cooperating Attorney)  
2 P.O. Box 753  
3 South Pasadena, CA 91030  
4 Tel: (213) 977-9004  
5 [laboni@hoqlaw.com](mailto:laboni@hoqlaw.com)

6 S. Starling Marshall (*pro hac vice*)  
7 CROWELL & MORING LLP  
8 Two Manhattan West  
9 375 Ninth Avenue  
10 New York, NY 10001  
11 Tel: (212)223-4000  
12 [Smarshall@crowell.com](mailto:Smarshall@crowell.com)

13 Skye Mathieson (*pro hac vice*)  
14 Lucy Hendrix (*pro hac vice*  
15 forthcoming)  
16 Emily P. Golchini (*pro hac vice*)  
17 CROWELL & MORING LLP  
18 1001 Pennsylvania Ave NW  
19 Washington, DC 20004  
20 Tel: (202) 624-2500  
21 [Smathieson@crowell.com](mailto:Smathieson@crowell.com)

22 Tel: (312) 201-9740  
23 [kfee@aclu-il.org](mailto:kfee@aclu-il.org)

24 Lindsay Nako (*pro hac vice*)  
25 Lori Rifkin (*pro hac vice*)  
26 Fawn Rajbhandari-Korr (*pro hac vice*)  
27 Meredith Dixon (*pro hac vice*)  
Megan Flynn (*pro hac vice*)  
IMPACT FUND  
2080 Addison Street, Suite 5  
Berkeley, CA 94704  
Tel: (510) 845-3473  
[lrifkin@impactfund.org](mailto:lrifkin@impactfund.org)

Edward T. Waters (*pro hac vice*)  
FELDESMAN LEIFER LLP  
1129 20<sup>th</sup> Street NW, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel: (202) 466-8960  
[ewaters@feldesman.com](mailto:ewaters@feldesman.com)