DACA Repeal: What Comes Now?
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The acronym for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA, was created by the Obama administration in 2012. The immigration policy allows young people unwittingly brought across the border without documentation by others to receive a temporary reprieve from deportation and permission to work, study, and obtain a driver’s license. Individuals could only receive protections from DACA after meeting a series of requirements. Applicants need to have been younger than 31 years of age at the date of program implementation. Applicants must prove they have lived in the United States continuously since June 15, 2007 and that they have not been convicted of a felony, certain significant misdemeanors (2.3%), they have clean criminal records; applicants must show they had arrived in the U.S. before the age of 16. Further, applicants must show they have not been convicted of a felony, certain significant misdemeanors (including a single DUI), or three or more misdemeanors of any kind 1. Recipients of the program must also be enrolled or have completed high school, a GED program, or college, or serve in the military. These administrative requirements help to narrow eligible recipients to individuals most likely to further the declared purpose of the program, which was to protect from deportation eligible immigrant youths who came to the United States when they were children. A DACA beneficiary’s status was renewable every two years based on information supplied and recorded by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. This same information may now be used by the United States Justice Department to deport unprotected recipients beginning in 2018. In following its implementation, DACA provided relief from deportation and granted work permits to unauthorized immigrants than any other immigration policy since the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act. 2 There are approximately 800,000 DACA recipients now living in the U.S. Since 2015, the vast majority (81.3%) of DACA applications have been renewals. Most DACA beneficiaries arrived from Mexico (78.5%), El Salvador (3.6%), Guatemala (2.5%), and Honduras (2.5%). They live primarily in California, Texas, and Illinois. The average recipient of DACA protections is 22 years old and employed. The majority is students and 37% are pursuing advanced degrees. 4 After the implementation of DACA in 2012, academics began to monitor its effects. Many found the immigration policy directly translated into positive outputs in the education and employment sectors. Research conducted by Roberto Gonzales, a professor at Harvard’s Graduate School of Education, focused on the factors that promote and impede educational progress for immigrants and Latino students. Gonzales noted that DACA has provided a “tremendous boost” to its recipients, helping them contribute to their families, communities, and the U.S. economy. 5 DACA had large effects on eligible individuals’ labor market outcomes, and there is evidence that suggests it altered recipients’ education decisions. Many respondents to Gonzales’ research study reported that DACA allowed them to enroll in college community or in job-training programs sponsored by community based organizations. Education has been and remains a key barrier for undocumented immigrant children, with 40% failing around north grounds
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- Thumbs up to Florida, camping each other face Hurricane Irma. While ANG wishes that we didn’t need a natural disaster to come together, ANG loves the Floridians being #strong.
- Thumbs down to the Law School administration for forcing the Law School Procrastinators to repeat Civ Pro yet again. The Law School’s tyrannical insistence that ANG be able to recite and apply this archaic code has prevented ANG from graduating for too long. Three generations of imbeciles are enough! Wait...
- Thumbs side-ways to Princess Diana’s former apartment. While ANG’s chances of being adopted keep decreasing, ANG’s chances of marrying into the royal family keep increasing.
- Thumbs up to softball, starting! ANG has already joined five teams... but like ANG’s teammates, ANG will stop showing up to games as soon as they pass out jerseys.
- Thumbs down to the Rod and Gun club for going on a dove hunt on a dove hunting field. ANG is staying away from any kind of symbol in these tumultuous times? If you must shoot something, shoot the snakes in WB (Please don’t guns, are not allowed on grounds).
- Our hearts go out to the Red Wings on 9/11 and their families. We will never forget.

Is DACA Constitutional? Who was it, President Donald Trump announced this week that he was ending the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program instituted under his predecessor, a reaction from critics understood to be focused on the consequences of the executive action. With DACA rescinded, approximately 800,000 unauthorized immigrants living in the United States will now be subject to deportation. Although DACA recipients were permitted a semblance of legal presence in the United States. Under DACA, those 800,000 or so immigrants were permitted to obtain driver's licenses, attend college, and pay income tax.\(^1\) With DACA now facing a March 2018 execution date, those immigrants’ continued protection from deportation and lawful presence in the United States operated as a part of legislative fix he has in mind. While the ramifications of the DACA rescission raise grave and receive more immediate concern, the order, States has already had already successfully sued to retain DACA’s more wide-reaching twin, Deferred Action for Parents of Long Term Unlawful Presence (DAPA), which offered protection from deportation to the parents of lawful permanent residents.\(^2\) The position of those attorneys general challenging DACA’s legality can be summarized by a statement of one of their own, Attorney General Derek Schmidt of Kansas. Schmidt, in a statement to the Lawrence (Kan-) san Journal-World, said, “The problem with DACA is that you are under our Constitution, only Congress, not the president, has the power to change immigration law. Those who understand fully strongly that the law should accommodate the children brought to the U.S. as young age and raised here would be well-advised to focus on persuading Congress. Mr. Schmidt’s statement sums up the legal opposition to DACA: Congress has acted and declared that those who immigrate to the United States without legal authorization are to be subject to deportation. The president, they argue, lacks the power to unilaterally grant a sort of quasi-legal status to a group of immigrants whose presence in the United States is unlawful, that the program’s recipients are not a kind of legal status. Erwin Chemerinsky, dean of the University of California at Berkeley School of Law, summed up by a statement in the “Is DACA Constitutional?” section, in which the department refers to DACA “as a programmatical discretionary.”\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. “Failure to Ask Questions” section, in which the research refers to DACA “as a programmatic discretionary.”\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. “Failure to Ask Questions” section, in which the research refers to DACA “as a programmatic discretionary.”\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. “Failure to Ask Questions” section, in which the research refers to DACA “as a programmatic discretionary.”\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. “Failure to Ask Questions” section, in which the research refers to DACA “as a programmatic discretionary.”\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. “Failure to Ask Questions” section, in which the research refers to DACA “as a programmatic discretionary.”\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. “Failure to Ask Questions” section, in which the research refers to DACA “as a programmatic discretionary.”\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. “Failure to Ask Questions” section, in which the research refers to DACA “as a programmatic discretionary.”\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. “Failure to Ask Questions” section, in which the research refers to DACA “as a programmatic discretionary.”\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. “Failure to Ask Questions” section, in which the research refers to DACA “as a programmatic discretionary.”\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. “Failure to Ask Questions” section, in which the research refers to DACA “as a programmatic discretionary.”\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. "Failure to Ask Questions" section, in which the department refers to DACA "as a programmatic discretionary."\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. "Failure to Ask Questions" section, in which the department refers to DACA "as a programmatic discretionary."\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. "Failure to Ask Questions" section, in which the department refers to DACA "as a programmatic discretionary."\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. "Failure to Ask Questions" section, in which the department refers to DACA "as a programmatic discretionary."\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. "Failure to Ask Questions" section, in which the department refers to DACA "as a programmatic discretionary."\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name. Not so fast, say DACA advocates. Writing in The New York Times, columnist Linda Qiu points to the Department of Homeland Security’s own Research. "Failure to Ask Questions" section, in which the department refers to DACA "as a programmatic discretionary."\(^3\) Scholars who support DACA’s constitutionality dispute the decision, that it should be null in Congress’s name.
The Sad Decline of Nelson Mandela’s Party

In April of this year, South African President Jacob Zuma survived a vote of no confidence in the National Assembly, the lowest point in the history of the Parliament of South Africa. Mr. Zuma is no stranger to votes of no confidence; he has now survived eight since his election to the presidency in 2009. Throughout his political career, Mr. Zuma has been dogged by an unceasing stream of allegations of impropriety and corruption. Claims including ones of rape, arms dealing, use of taxpayer money for home improvements, and illegal business collaboration with the shadowy Gupta brother-
ers. A few weeks prior to his election in 2009, prosecutors dropped 166 counts of corrup-
tion against Mr. Zuma, though South African courts have since ordered that at least some of the counts should be reinstated.2

How, in a period of less than twenty years, did South Africa’s presidency go from be-
ing occupied by the late states-
man and Nobel laureate Nelson
Mandela to its degradation under Mr. Zuma? The answer lies with the state of the party
Mandela, and Mandela
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Exhibit 1

1. Excluding offers and curtailing offers of Thompson Sacher.
2. A pseudonym to protect the identity of employees of Thompson Sacher.
3. Two claims on which this Court now passes judgment.
4. An uncomfortable chair at an uncomfortable place.
5. Whose egos are big enough to make allowances for the small stuff, like I always say, ‘Don’t get bogged down in IRAC’!
6. ‘How many of you are 1Ls? Good, none.’
7. ‘That’s no good-you were so wrong that we don’t even need to talk about it.’
**Toward Resilience in the Face of Hate**

When I was a growing up, I had a chaotic, cramped, frightening train ride to some unknown, yet familiar destination. I always woke up, deeply distressed, before I got there.

At first, my parents did not know what to make of the terror they saw in me. They asked my grandmother's stories.

She had been deported to Auschwitz, the Nazis' largest concentration camp, with her family in the spring of 1944. After days in a cramped cattle car without food or water, they arrived. One of her brothers was shot in front of her. Her younger brother, who was named, was sent with her parents to the gas chambers. I grew up hearing her stories.

I can only imagine what she must have been alive to hear of white supremacists marching by the thousands through the streets where I now live.

That my wife and I were going to have a white supremacist as a counter-protesters was never in question. It was a surreal scene, white supremacists in militia outfits with military gear. David Duke, former head of the KKK, spewed his racist rhetoric. David Duke, for decades, to the estimations of the fringes of society, almost never accept new DACA applicants and the American economy.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has scheduled a six-month phase-out for the program. DHS has already declared that it will canker the suit against the government. Starting September 6, 2017, DHS will not accept new DACA applications. Current beneficiaries whose status expires between September 5, 2017 and January 13, 2018 must seek renewal by October 5, 2017. Individuals who renew their status by October 5, 2017 can keep their DACA protections for two years. The unlikeliness of DACA recipients will keep their DACA protections on March 6, 2018. The final group of DACA recipients will lose their status on January 13, 2019. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has announced a phase-out period for the DACA program. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has scheduled a six-month phase-out for the program. DHS has already declared that it will cannot accept new DACA applicants. Current beneficiaries whose status expires between September 5, 2017 and January 13, 2018 must seek renewal by October 5, 2017. Individuals who renew their status by October 5, 2017 can keep their DACA protections for two years. The unlikeliness of DACA recipients will keep their DACA protections on March 6, 2018. The final group of DACA recipients will lose their status on January 13, 2019.

**LEGAL STATUS**

The liberal thinkProgress calls that "nonsensical," citing longstanding federal regulations from 1981 that allow an unauthorized immigrant granted deferred status the right to work, but not to vote. A fix, it seems likely that a future Democratic President would implement a similar plan.

Critics argue that granting access to benefits, including the right to work, encourages illegal immigration and the ability to obtain a driver's license to vote, Registrar's Office, called an example of nonviolence. Antifa extremism promises recruiting material for the alt-right and makes it much harder to persuade white supremacists of the error of their ways.

We should also not allow the white supremacists to appropriate the debate over historic monuments. Before the white supremacists in Charlottesville, shielding themselves from the conversation, the debate was a respectful dialogue between immigrants who will be present on both sides, a model for the rest of the South to follow and avoid its reckons with its tragic past.

At its core, the divide on the issue is a question of perception. To some, the monuments are a statement of the South's evil Jim Crow history. To others, the monument is a symbol of the valor of those who fought with valor on behalf of their home, hearth, and state, a set of statues in the landscape that evoke a mystical sense of the region's history, not the evils of racism. So it's no surprise that the former group passions on this issue must go on, and the latter that they must stay. The white supremacists should not be viewed as exotic to this debate and should not be allowed to dominate it.

If we're to be true to Charlottesville values, we must stand up to the hiss and reach a shared understanding on what the monument means in the context of a bulldozing opposition. The main reason our country is divided over the monuments is that people of good will have lost the capacity to understand those with whom they disagree. Those seeking to take the monuments down are not on an Orwellsian mission to destroy history, and most importantly, not exercising the right to argue for legitimate reasons.

Irrespective of how one feels about historic monuments, I think all can agree that the South needs more statues to its heroes, not less. I was heartened by the many statues in the landscape of the United States. Charlottesville was once a segregated institution. It's high time the Law Office reoriented with its Jim Crow past and honored the trailblazers who broke those barriers here. Gregory Swanson, the first black UVa law student, and John F. Merchant, the first black UVa law graduate, were a testament to the progress that has been made in the administration of justice in Virginia. The best insult imaginable is to be ignored. And create a false perception of strength. The best insult imaginable is to be understood; a few thousand people up, as they have done at similar counter-protests across the country. We need to exorcise from our minds that this is an issue of the moral high ground and disregard the great Martin Luther King, Jr. said, "If we fight the bulldozing opposition.

The main reason our country is divided over the monuments is that people of good will have lost the capacity to understand those with whom they disagree. Those seeking to take the monuments down are not on an Orwellsian mission to destroy history, and most importantly, not exercising the right to argue for legitimate reasons.

The legal status of unauthorized immigrants attending public universities for DACA beneficiaries. Texas has already declared it will canker the suit against the government. Starting September 6, 2017, DHS will not accept new DACA applications. Current beneficiaries whose status expires between September 5, 2017 and January 13, 2018 must seek renewal by October 5, 2017. Individuals who renew their status by October 5, 2017 can keep their DACA protections for two years. The unlikeliness of DACA recipients will keep their DACA protections on March 6, 2018. The final group of DACA recipients will lose their status on January 13, 2019. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has announced a phase-out period for the DACA program. The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has scheduled a six-month phase-out for the program. DHS has already declared that it will cannot accept new DACA applicants. Current beneficiaries whose status expires between September 5, 2017 and January 13, 2018 must seek renewal by October 5, 2017. Individuals who renew their status by October 5, 2017 can keep their DACA protections for two years. The unlikeliness of DACA recipients will keep their DACA protections on March 6, 2018. The final group of DACA recipients will lose their status on January 13, 2019.
COPA continued from page 4

UVA Law Class of 2022 v. UVA Law Faculty, xx __ __ xxxx (TBD, 2018) ("This Court
acknowledges even the iciest of special little snowflakes may suffer on the hot seat of professorial old colds; truly extreme examples of such may result in liability for the tort known as douchebaggery. However, this Court warns that such liability could result in legend status for the professor and shuns backlash against plaintiff-victim, so really, just do the reading—we’re not here to
help."). Regardless, inflicted douchebaggery may result in liability for the tort known as douchebag.

However, this Court comprises mostly reasonable individuals who are in no way biased by their membership in the Student Body, and thus, we do not hesitate in applying a reasonable-person standard and recoiling in horror at the douchebaggery behavior on display on Bilt’s tabletops. Pa-
rading around your offers of Big Law jobs with full knowl-
edge there are people nearby verydefinition of douchebag who neither know nor, more importantly, care to know about your success is the very definition of douchebaggery. While We hesitate to

Having determined Thimpson Sacher’s liability on both
counts, this Court now turns to the matter of damages. Compensatory damages be-
ing impossible to determine, this Court will solely award punitive
damages, which it acknowledges will do little to
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TIME EVENT LOCATION COST FOOD?

WEDNESDAY – September 13, 2017
1:00 PM An Epic Conversation with Professor Ortiz Purcell Free Yes.
5:00 PM Lone Star Lawyers Welcome Event WB/104 Free No.
5:00 PM – 7:00 PM Supreme Court Roundup Caplin Pavilion Free Wine and snacks

THURSDAY – September 14, 2017
12:00 PM The Reliability of Eyewitness Testimony Caplin Pavilion Free Yes, Bellar Market
5:00 PM Student Bar Association Thursday Social Spies Garden Free They say so but we remember Glendon’s donuts.
5:00 PM Spouse/Partner Panel Purcell Free tbd, but babysitting available upon request

FRIDAY – September 15, 2017
12:00 PM Enforcing Civil Rights under the Trump Administration Caplin Pavilion Free Yes.
6:00 PM Light House Studio Presents: 16th Annual Youth Film Festival Paramount Theater $15 Tears from realizing youth are more talented than you
8:00 PM Sylvan Esso w/ Helado Negro Jeffrey Theater $25 No.

SATURDAY – September 16, 2017
7:30 PM ASC’s Peter and the Starcatcher American Shakespeare Center $29-$59 No.

SUNDAY – September 17, 2017
5:00 PM WTJU and The Charlottesville Jazz Society: The Mingus Awareness Project Brooks Hall at UVa $10 No.

MONDAY – September 18, 2017
11:00 PM The Real Deal: Prosecution Purcell Free Yes, but RSVP

TUESDAY – September 19, 2017
11:00 AM Immigration Law Program Ice Cream Social Purcell Free Read the event title

SUDOKU

Solution