
ADVISORY

Are Victim Services Programs Liable for Criminal “Harboring” When they Work with Immigrant Survivors of Crime?

Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence¹
Reviewed and Updated, October, 2022

INTRODUCTION TO FEDERAL HARBORING LAW

1

1. Could victim advocacy programs or their employees face legal consequences for providing services to undocumented immigrants?
2. What does it mean to harbor an undocumented immigrant?
3. What are the legal obligations of programs serving undocumented immigrants?
4. What services are most likely to be construed as evidence of harboring?
5. What services are least likely to be construed as evidence of harboring?
6. How does the law vary from state to state?
7. In which federal courts do programs face the lowest risk of prosecution for providing typical program services?
8. In which circuits are typical crime victim program services less clearly lawful?

NONPROFITS, FAITH-BASED PROGRAMS, AND SANCTUARIES

5

9. How does a program's nonprofit status affect the likelihood of its services being construed as harboring?
10. Are a program's legal risks different if it is located in a "sanctuary" community?
11. Are a program's legal risks different if it is affiliated with a church?
12. Are confidential domestic violence shelters or other program sites considered "sensitive locations" that are off-limits to ICE?

PROTECTING PROGRAMS' AND CLIENTS' RIGHTS

7

13. Are program employees legally obligated to cooperate with federal immigration agents?
14. What sorts of requests for assistance by ICE might program employees be faced with?
15. What steps should directors/employees take when responding to a law enforcement or ICE agent who shows up at a program requesting assistance?
16. What types of common legal documents should program employees be trained to identify and address?
17. Should programs notify clients about ICE or law enforcement requests for information about the clients?
18. How do recent federal policy changes affect a program's risks related to the crime of harboring?
19. How could other recent policy changes affect a program?

BEST PRACTICES, PROGRAM POLICIES, AND NEXT STEPS

12

20. Should programs minimize their liability by requiring a proof of legal immigration status (and consent to disclose that status) as a condition of eligibility for services?
21. Should programs minimize their liability using a “Don't Ask Don't Tell” approach when it comes to clients' immigration status?
22. Should programs minimize their liability by providing immigration advocacy and legal assistance?
23. What policies and strategies other than those specifically related to service eligibility should programs review with undocumented clients in mind?
24. When should programs seek the advice of local immigration attorneys?

¹ The first and second editions of this advisory was written by Emily Cordo, J.D., & Grace Huang, J.D., in 2017 and 2019. Many thanks to Taylor Lin, J.D., Nick Brugge, J.D., and Aileen Ng, J.D., of Alston & Bird, for review, legal research, and support for updates by Grace Huang, J.D., in 2022.

Community-based crime victim advocacy programs that provide services to undocumented immigrant survivors of crimes can minimize risks to their program, funding, employees, and victims by adopting and following policies that take the laws on harboring undocumented immigrants into account.

This Advisory answers common questions about providing shelter and other program services to undocumented victims, describes the law and federal policy (as of the Advisory's publication date), and proposes best practices for programs, but **it is not legal advice**. Immigration and criminal laws vary from region to region, and federal immigration enforcement policies are constantly changing. Each program should analyze its own program-specific risks, its community's particular needs, and the laws in its jurisdiction—including legal duties associated with its funding sources—as it designs or updates program policies. Consulting a local immigration attorney with criminal law experience is highly advisable.

INTRODUCTION TO FEDERAL HARBORING LAW

1. Could victim advocacy programs or their employees face legal consequences for providing services to undocumented immigrants?

In theory, yes, program employees could be charged with the federal crime of “bringing in and harboring certain immigrants.”¹ The primary purpose of the federal harboring law is to prosecute people for facilitating immigrants’ illegal entry into the United States, exploiting their labor, or hiding them from Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), but some of the statute’s language is broad enough that it could potentially be interpreted to include some common victim advocacy program services.

As of the date of publication of this Advisory, there does not appear to be any evidence that a victim services program employee has ever been charged with harboring, and there are very few cases in which **any** person has been convicted of harboring in the absence of a profit motive.² Additionally, many federal and state laws prohibit programs they fund from discriminating on the basis of national origin, and require programs to maintain victim confidentiality, which creates potentially competing legal obligations for programs receiving that funding.³ Therefore, while the harboring statute does create a theoretical legal risk that is impossible for most programs to eliminate entirely, the risk can be minimized to acceptable levels by ensuring that reasonable protective policies are in place.

2. What does it mean to harbor an undocumented immigrant?

The relevant federal law would require a federal prosecutor to prove:

- A program employee knew or recklessly ignored the fact that a client was an undocumented immigrant, and
- The employee:
 - Assisted with an immigrant’s illegal entry into the United States,
 - Encouraged or induced the immigrant’s illegal entry,
 - Provided transportation to facilitate the immigrant’s continued illegal presence, and/or

- Concealed, harbored, or shielded the client from detection by immigration authorities.⁴

The penalty for a felony harboring conviction (with no intent to profit) could range from probation to five years imprisonment for each undocumented immigrant.⁵ Program assets used to harbor the undocumented immigrant could also be seized and forfeited.⁶ Employing undocumented immigrants is also a crime.⁷

3. What are the legal obligations of programs serving undocumented immigrants?

Programs have a legal obligation not to discriminate, to protect victim confidentiality, and to provide meaningful access to all victims. There is no law, regulation, policy, list, comprehensive guideline, or clear-cut test that definitively identifies what kind of assistance could be considered evidence of harboring by individual prosecutors, and jurisdictions vary in how they interpret the law. While this makes it virtually impossible for programs to eliminate all risk of liability, it also gives programs the flexibility to decide for themselves what levels of risk and what types of services will best meet victims' needs in their particular communities.

In adopting program policies on providing services to immigrant victims, including those who might be undocumented, programs should take a comprehensive approach. Best practices require that programs review a wide variety of program policies—such as information gathering, record keeping, confidentiality, security, legal representation, etc.—in light of the issues raised in this Advisory. The last section of this Advisory includes suggestions about where to start.

4. What services are most likely to be construed as evidence of harboring?

Federal prosecutors considering a harboring charge would evaluate a potential defendant's actions on a case-by-case basis, considering the full range of assistance provided to the undocumented immigrant. Examples of for-profit assistance that clearly violate the federal harboring law include:

- Transporting or helping an immigrant (physically, financially, or otherwise) cross the border illegally.⁸
- Transporting an undocumented immigrant within the United States in order to help them evade immigration agents.⁹
- Offering a package of clandestine services to undocumented employees, such as safe housing, employment, transportation, and coaching on how to avoid detection.¹⁰
- Sex trafficking.¹¹
- Falsifying tax or employment records to conceal the employment of undocumented immigrants.¹²
- Helping undocumented immigrants escape immigration enforcement agents by tipping the immigrants off about an agent's presence or by physically obstructing or lying to an agent while an immigrant flees.¹³

The riskiest services provided by typical community-based victim advocacy programs are housing, transportation, and employment of victims by programs. However, because nonprofit victim advocacy programs provide non-income tested services to all victims, regardless of immigration status, certain federal legal restrictions based on immigration status do not apply to most of the services these programs provide, particularly those services necessary for the protection of life and safety (such as short term shelter, housing assistance, and other in-kind

services).¹⁴ Therefore, it would be more difficult for a prosecutor to construe authorized nonprofit services as illegal harboring than it would be for them to pursue charges against an individual providing housing or other analogous services for profit.¹⁵

Therefore, programs should not simply cease providing shelter or transportation for undocumented victims, but when a program reviews its shelter or transportation policies it should take the issues raised in this Advisory into account, and ideally it should consult with a local immigration attorney with criminal law experience. In contrast, programs who employ non-citizens who lack legal work authorization would face a higher risk of prosecution for harboring, because doing so could violate multiple sections of the harboring law, and employment may involve a variety of other fraudulent and illegal actions that further increase the risk of a harboring charge.¹⁶

5. What services are least likely to be construed as evidence of harboring?

Due to the complexity of this area of law, and regional variations in courts' and prosecutors' interpretation of the law, this Advisory cannot provide any guarantees about how an individual prosecutor or judge would view particular services. However, two categories of services that appear to pose virtually no risk are:

1. Immigration services: Helping an immigrant seek legal status cannot be construed as harboring, because an application for immigration relief notifies the government of the immigrant's presence and residence, making it impossible for the undocumented immigrant to remain in the U.S. undetected. Therefore, program employees should not hesitate to assist victims with obtaining U visa certifications, gathering documents to submit as evidence in support of VAWA or asylum petitions, sharing information about the process of seeking legal status, or facilitating referrals to immigration attorneys or programs, for example.
2. Emergency services: Assistance necessary for the protection of the victim's life and safety, such as emergency medical aid, emergency shelter, transitional housing, disaster relief, food pantries, and other 'in-kind' services, is legally permissible.¹⁷ Although some jurisdictions interpret harboring broadly, to include any assistance that makes the immigrant's life easier, federal law and policy explicitly authorizing the provision of these emergency services to undocumented immigrants makes prosecution for doing so overwhelmingly unlikely in the absence of other evidence of harboring.

6. How does the law vary from state to state?

Two major regional variations to keep in mind are state/local laws, as well as differences in the interpretation of the federal harboring law by different federal circuit courts of appeal. States that have passed immigration laws on harboring that are stricter than federal immigration law include Alabama, Arizona, Utah, Georgia, Indiana, and Texas.¹⁸ Other jurisdictions rely on trespassing or human smuggling laws,¹⁹ or could potentially rely on "aiding and abetting" laws, where one might be found criminally liable for another person's criminal activity if they were to encourage, direct, aid, or attempt to aid the other person to commit the offense.²⁰

Federal court review of these laws has produced mixed results, but several have been struck down by the courts in recent years.²¹ In addition, at least one court has found that mere provision of social services would not constitute harboring.²²

In addition to questions of whether victim services programs face criminal liability for illegal harboring, recent news (in 2022) indicates certain state level efforts to examine the potential liability of non-profit organizations for violations of state charitable funding laws if they are utilizing public funding to “aid and abet” the unlawful presence of undocumented individuals.²³ Such examinations could be to determine criminal or civil liability, or potentially to determine funding decisions.

7. In which federal court circuits do programs face the lowest risk of prosecution for providing typical program services?

In some circuits, employees of programs providing services to undocumented immigrants are safe from harboring charges as long as they do not help those clients avoid detection by immigration officials. For example, according to the Seventh Circuit²⁴ Court of Appeals, the term harboring:

has a connotation... of deliberately safeguarding members of a specified group from the authorities, whether through concealment, movement to a safe location, or physical protection. This connotation enables one to see that the emergency staff at the hospital may not be ‘harboring’ an alien when it renders emergency treatment even if he stays in the emergency room overnight, that giving a lift to a gas station to an alien with a flat tire may not be harboring, that driving an alien to the local office of the Department of Homeland Security to apply for an adjustment of status to that of lawful resident may not be harboring, that inviting an alien for a ‘one night stand’ may not be attempted harboring, that placing an illegal alien in a school may not be harboring, and finally that allowing your boyfriend to live with you may not be harboring, even if you know he shouldn't be in the United States.²⁵

In the Seventh Circuit, and others like it, the reason for providing the assistance is key, and “the individual's alien status must be the driving purpose for the provision of shelter such that there also exists the intent by the defendant to help the alien avoid detection by the authorities.”²⁶ Other jurisdictions that have found concealment from immigration authorities to be an essential element of harboring include the Second²⁷ and Third²⁸ Circuit.²⁹ The Ninth³⁰ Circuit took a similar but distinct approach when it recently resolved seemingly conflicting cases, finding that that to be found guilty of harboring a defendant need not act for the *purpose* of helping an immigrant evade authorities, but must be engaged in intentionally unlawful conduct.³¹

8. In which circuits are typical crime victim program services less clearly lawful?

In some circuits, the courts have stated or implied that concealment from immigration authorities is not required for a harboring conviction. For example:

- In the Eighth Circuit,³² overtly employing, housing and assisting an undocumented immigrant with obtaining medical care and banking services was deemed “more than enough to support a conviction for harboring an illegal alien,” and harboring has been defined as “any conduct that ‘substantially facilitate[s] an alien's remaining in the United States illegally.’”³³
- A 2010 decision from the Eleventh Circuit³⁴ clearly indicated that evidence a defendant deliberately hid undocumented immigrants from federal authorities is not necessary to uphold a harboring conviction (although this analysis did not create a binding precedent, because the

defendant not only employed undocumented immigrants, he also provided them false identities and paid them in cash to help them avoid detection).³⁵ The Eleventh Circuit also found that a Georgia immigration attorney had standing to challenge a state anti-harboring law based on a credible risk of prosecution for transporting undocumented immigrants to and from meetings.³⁶

- A broad 2007 decision in the Fifth Circuit³⁷ found that that the conduct prohibited by the federal harboring law could include any effort “to make an alien’s illegal presence in the United States substantially ‘easier or less difficult.’”³⁸ However, that has been interpreted to exclude landlords who rent housing to groups of people that include undocumented immigrants.³⁹ Likewise, a homeless shelter and landlord were found to “face[] no credible risk of prosecution” for harboring in the absence of evidence that they interfered with authorities’ efforts to find the immigrants.⁴⁰ However, a more recent Fifth Circuit case noted that while “mere employment” is legally permissible, *knowing* employment is harboring.⁴¹ The Fifth Circuit has also held that a trafficker’s claim that his motive was to help a woman escape her abusive husband was irrelevant, because his intention, not his motive, was at issue.⁴²

In these jurisdictions, discussing program policies with an immigration attorney with criminal law experience is particularly advisable.

NONPROFITS, FAITH-BASED PROGRAMS, AND SANCTUARIES

9. How does a program’s nonprofit status affect the likelihood of its services being construed as harboring?

Nonprofit employees do not face a risk of prosecution that is even remotely comparable to the risk of prosecution for individuals who profit from undocumented immigrant trafficking. Typical harboring cases involve smugglers or employers of undocumented immigrants who profit from their presence here. Although the overwhelming majority of harboring cases in appellate court records involve defendants who profited from their dealings with undocumented immigrants, the harboring statute does not require profit for conviction, it merely sets a lower maximum sentence if profit is not the motive.

That said, there are extremely few relevant cases involving prosecution of nonprofits or their employees. In the late 1980s the Reverend John Fife and others working with him in the sanctuary movement were prosecuted for smuggling immigrants into the United States, coaching them to avoid and lie to immigration agents, and sheltering them, for which they were convicted and sentenced to probation.⁴³ More recently, activists affiliated with the nonprofit No More Deaths (which provides water and other resources for immigrants crossing the Arizona desert) have been targeted for prosecution.⁴⁴ While the No More Deaths prosecutions are disturbing, that program has been targeted specifically because their mission is to give aid to immigrants who are in the process of unlawful border crossings. There is no evidence that nonprofit crime victim services programs who incidentally provide services to some undocumented immigrants are facing or will face similar scrutiny.

10. Are a program's legal risks different if it is located in a "sanctuary" community?

Not substantially. Sanctuary cities (or counties, or states) have formal or informal community policing policies that limit local police cooperation with federal immigration authorities. They typically commit to providing emergency, life-saving services to all residents, including immigrants. A sanctuary jurisdiction does not have the power to stop the enforcement of federal immigration law, including the law criminalizing harboring. Some states ban cities or counties from adopting sanctuary laws,⁴⁵ and encourage the adoption of cooperation agreements between immigration and local law enforcement.⁴⁶

In practice, a program operating in a sanctuary jurisdiction may face lower risks due to reduced cooperation between local government agencies and federal immigration enforcement agencies. However, even in self-described sanctuary communities, and even within police departments with explicit noncooperation policies, some individual officers may violate those policies and cooperate with ICE.⁴⁷ Therefore, programs in sanctuary jurisdiction should be no less vigilant than other programs in reviewing their program policies on dealing with law enforcement, training their employees, and protecting their clients' rights. In regard to program funding, federal litigation suggests that it may not be permissible for certain federal funding streams to be restricted on the basis of a jurisdiction's policy to limit their employees' cooperation with immigration authorities.⁴⁸

11. Are a program's legal risks different if it is affiliated with a church?

Not substantially. There is no general legal exemption from the harboring law for employees of churches or faith-based programs.⁴⁹ Historically, sanctuary has been a form of civil disobedience by churches, not a legal right. Federal policy guidance on "protected areas" was issued, discouraging immigration enforcement actions at places of worship, among other locations.⁵⁰ However, the policy guidance includes a variety of exceptions, and it does not create any enforceable right allowing churches to sue or otherwise compel ICE officers to follow the guidance. In addition to the Protected Areas guidance, bad publicity may be a factor that helps to deter immigration officials from taking action against victim service providers, particularly faith-based programs, but, like the policy guidance, it is no guarantee of legal immunity.

12. Are confidential domestic violence shelters or other program sites considered "Protected Areas" that are generally off-limits to ICE?

While domestic violence shelters and other program locations cannot legally provide sanctuary from immigration enforcement, there are guidelines limiting ICE's enforcement activities at victim services facilities. An ICE agent with a court-issued arrest warrant has the legal authority to take an undocumented victim into custody at a victim advocacy program location such as a shelter.

However, in order to obtain a warrant to engage in an enforcement action at a victim service agency, ICE policy requires that agents establish they have taken additional precautions regarding the immigrant's identity and status, and must confirm and that they did not discover the victim's presence at that location based on an uncorroborated tip from the victim's abuser.⁵¹

In addition, ICE agents are limited, with some exceptions, from conducting immigration enforcement activities at or near “protected areas,” including hospitals, schools, churches, and public demonstrations, domestic violence shelters, and rape crisis centers are listed as examples of protected areas.⁵² However, courthouses and victim services provided there are not identified at “protected areas,” but are subject to other ICE directives related to *civil* immigration enforcement at court houses.⁵³ Even if a victim or program employee observes an immigration officer attempting to detain a client at a “protected area,” or believes an abuser was responsible for informing ICE of the victim’s location, to avoid increased risk of prosecution for harboring or other substantial consequences the employee should not attempt to assist clients in evading immigration agents.⁵⁴ If the search or arrest was an abuse of ICE’s discretion, that issue should be addressed later in court, not contemporaneously by a program employee.

PROTECTING PROGRAMS’ AND CLIENTS’ RIGHTS

13. Are program employees legally obligated to cooperate with federal immigration agents?

Program employees can and should assert their own (and victims’) constitutional and other legal rights by declining to cooperate with ICE beyond what is explicitly legally required. Employees should never obstruct or provide false information to ICE agents, but they should decline to speak with or assist ICE in the absence of a clear legal mandate.

In fact, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (FVPSA), Victim of a Crime Act (VOCA), Office of Violence Against Women (OVW), and many similar state-level laws require programs to have policies in place to protect the confidentiality of client information.⁵⁵ Failing to protect victim confidentiality—for example by sharing victim information with ICE without obtaining an express confidentiality release from the survivor or being legally mandated to do so (even just confirming that the victim has received services from the program) can result in the loss of program funding. In general, programs with these funding streams must decline to voluntarily share information with ICE about victims unless the program is legally mandated to release the information by state law or court order. Additionally, if programs are forced to release a victim’s information, the program must make reasonable efforts to notify the victim and protect the victim’s privacy and safety.

14. What sorts of requests for assistance by ICE might program employees receive?

When ICE agents, CBP (Customs and Border Patrol) agents, or law enforcement agents working with ICE request assistance, the best practice is for programs to decline the request in the absence of a law or court order mandating that assistance. For example, program employees should typically:

- Decline to speak with ICE agents or provide them any victim information without consulting an attorney, other than to comply with a warrant.
- Assert a Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination in response to any questions that could relate to a charge of harboring.
- File motions to quash subpoenas requesting copies of victim records and subpoenas for program employees to testify or be deposed.

- Refuse to grant ICE agents access to program property that is not available to the public, other than to comply with a court-issued warrant.

In addition to ensuring that the program does not violate its funding-related legal obligations, or risk a lawsuit by a victim, such a policy helps avoid the risk of turning over information that could be used to pursue a harboring charge against the employee or program.

However, program policies should make it clear to employees that while they should decline to cooperate with ICE in the absence of a clear legal mandate, they should never interfere with an ICE agent by physically obstructing the agent, lying to the agent, or affirmatively helping a victim evade an agent.⁵⁶ Employees, particularly front-line staff most likely to be approached by ICE agents, should be trained to ensure they understand the distinction between noncooperation and obstruction.

15. What steps should program directors/employees take when responding to a request for assistance by law enforcement or an ICE agent?

In general, the following precautions will minimize the legal risks to the program, employee, and victim when an immigration agent shows up at a program seeking assistance. Although training front desk staff about these distinctions is critical to ensuring that they act appropriately in the heat of the moment, it is a best practice to minimize their role in interacting with ICE by training them to immediately contact a supervisor, program director, and/or the program's attorney if served with a subpoena, order, or warrant.

1. An employee should immediately inform a supervisor or the program director that an agent is on the premises seeking assistance, access, or information.
2. The program director should insist that any requests for assistance be made in writing, not orally. In the absence of legal paperwork requiring the program's assistance, no assistance should be provided.
3. If paperwork is provided, the program director should read the paperwork to confirm that it properly identifies the program's name and address, and to determine if it is a court-issued warrant requiring immediate compliance or some other sort of document (other documents may allow time for the program to consult legal counsel before complying or objecting).
4. The program director should request essential information that an attorney might need to assist the program or victim. Specifically, the program director should obtain a complete copy of any paperwork claiming to authorize the ICE activity or request and should make note of the time and date of its receipt. Additionally, a program director can ask for and document the agent's name, badge number, and department/employer. If a victim is arrested at the shelter, ask the agents where the victim is being taken, so that information can be provided to the victim's immigration attorney.
5. The program director should comply with court orders mandating immediate compliance, but should not consent to provide any information or access beyond what is clearly and immediately required by the legal document. For example, if the court-issued warrant only authorizes the officer to search common areas in a shelter on a particular date, employees should not give the officer access to private rooms or allow the officer to search on a later date based on an old warrant.
6. The program director and employees should not interfere with any search authorized by a court-issued warrant, but may be able to observe the search without interfering and either record footage of the search or make notes, taking particular care to document any improper

behavior by the agents (such as attempts to search areas outside the scope of a search warrant, or to detain people not listed in an arrest warrant).

16. What types of common legal documents should program employees be trained to identify and address?

Being served with legal paperwork can be stressful and confusing for any employee, particularly when a non-attorney employee is pressured by an ICE or law enforcement officer to comply with oral instructions that may or may not be consistent with the paperwork being served. The best way to avoid legal problems later is to ensure that all employees, but particularly front desk staff, are trained on how to identify and properly comply with four common legal documents that may be served on the agency and know to alert the program director immediately.

1. Subpoena: A document signed by an attorney requiring a person to appear at a particular time and place (such as for a deposition or trial) or requiring the production of documents (sometimes called a subpoena *duces tecum*). Subpoenas typically give a substantial time period for compliance (often 30 days). This means it is important not to panic and to have an attorney review the subpoena issued to the agency and/or the person named in the subpoena. Note that in some jurisdictions attorneys commonly sign unlawful subpoenas that exceed their authority, so programs should promptly consult with a local attorney before assuming they must comply with any subpoena.
2. Court order: A document signed by a judge, for a wide variety of purposes, and with varying deadlines for compliance. Failure to comply with a court order risks contempt of court and a variety of sanctions. However, sometimes a document entitled 'Subpoena' may actually be a court order signed by a judge, and conversely some attorneys serve unsigned copies of proposed court orders (which are not legally effective), so it is important to read any subpoena or court order served on your program carefully to determine how to respond. If possible, programs should consult with a local attorney to determine if there is a way to get the order revoked prior to the date specified for compliance.
3. Search warrant: An order signed by a judge authorizing officers to enter a specific private location to look for a specific object. Warrants typically require immediate compliance, so after confirming that the warrant lists the correct address program employees should allow the search to occur specifically as described in the warrant (while objecting to any search beyond the specified area), and then seek legal counsel to address any consequences of the search. Employees should not answer officers' questions during a search, because they could inadvertently incriminate themselves, the program, or the victim.
4. Arrest warrant: A document authorizing law enforcement officers to find, remove, and detain a person. It is important to determine whether a warrant presented by an ICE agent is an "ICE warrant" (administrative warrant) or a "judicial warrant" (signed by a federal judge), because they differ substantially in terms of the authority they give ICE. An ICE warrant will typically say "U.S. Department of Homeland Security" at the top, whereas a judicial warrant will typically start by naming the court that issued the warrant.⁵⁷ Both ICE warrants and judicial warrants give ICE agents the power to arrest an undocumented immigrant. However, only a judicial warrant can authorize ICE to enter a private location like a house or a domestic violence shelter (without consent) to find the person.⁵⁸ An employee served with a judicial arrest warrant should confirm that the warrant lists the correct address and then allow ICE to enter the property to find the victim whose arrest is authorized.

17. Should programs notify victims about ICE or law enforcement requests for information about them?

In order to comply with funding-related confidentiality laws, programs must inform victims if information about them is released to anyone without their consent (e.g., pursuant to a search warrant). Programs must also notify victims of any pending requests for their information (e.g., a subpoena *duces tecum* for victim records). However, program employees must also avoid assisting an undocumented victim in concealing themselves from or evading immigration enforcement. This tension can make communicating this information to the victim challenging. For example, if a program learns that ICE is looking for an undocumented victim, the program notifies the victim, and then the victim flees, prosecutors could conceivably construe the notification as assistance with evading ICE and a violation of the harboring law, although the confidentiality laws requiring that notification should minimize the risk.

If possible, the notification should be in writing, ideally using a standardized form, to prove that the notification did not in any way encourage the victim to flee. Additionally, this communication should include offers (or document past offers by the program) to facilitate a referral to an immigration lawyer, to assist with obtaining U visa certifications, etc. In the event that the program or employee is accused of harboring, including this information may help prove that the program actively encourages victims to disclose their presence and seek legal status, not to evade discovery by ICE.

18. Is the risk of prosecution for harboring increasing?

No, notwithstanding a few highly publicized cases, it does not appear that the probability of being prosecuted for harboring without a profit motive has grown substantially in recent years. There is no precise, comprehensive data set available on harboring cases. While the rate of prosecutions for “harboring *or bringing in*” immigrants has increased by more than 79% since 2012,⁵⁹ it appears from the news media and the appellate record that these cases continue, overwhelmingly, to involve harboring-for-profit schemes and/or assistance with illegal entry. Federal prosecution data categorizes harboring under “other immigration offenses” (the offenses excluded from this catch-all are smuggling, improper entry, improper reentry, and visa fraud). In recent years, prosecutions filed in the catch-all category peaked in 2013 with 79 cases filed,⁶⁰ and the rate has been less than 100 filings per year since at least 2010.⁶¹ From March 2021-2022 only 64 cases were filed in the “other immigration offenses” category, a substantial decrease and low total number (particularly bearing in mind that the catch-all includes harboring for profit and other offenses).⁶²

The infrequency of these prosecutions is reflected by the substantial media attention received by the rare cases in which individuals have been arrested or charged for assisting undocumented immigrants for humanitarian reasons. For example, in two recent Texas cases individuals (not affiliated with nonprofits) were arrested for transporting undocumented immigrants within the United States without financial gain. In 2019, Teresa Todd, a city attorney/county attorney, was arrested and investigated for allowing immigrants who flagged her car down near the border to wait in her car while she made calls for assistance,⁶³ but it does not appear that she has been charged. Likewise, another woman in south Texas was arrested, but not charged, for giving a ride to undocumented Guatemalans in 2017.⁶⁴

In another highly publicized case, district court judge Shelley Joseph was charged with obstruction of justice for allegedly allowing an undocumented defendant to evade ICE by exiting

through a back door in her courtroom,⁶⁵ though the charged were dismissed after Judge Joseph agreed to refer herself to the state judicial misconduct commission.⁶⁶ In the Joseph case, in the Todd case, and in a case in which a CPB agent was charged with harboring for employing and giving immigration advice to an undocumented housekeeper,⁶⁷ the filings appear to have been motivated by prosecutors' umbrage at government officials, in particular, subverting immigration laws.

Finally, in what may be the most alarming case, federal prosecutors retried their prosecution of a humanitarian aid worker, whose first trial ended in a hung jury.⁶⁸ No More Deaths' volunteer Scott Warren was accused of harboring for giving food, water, and several days' shelter to two recent border-crossers. No More Deaths had been a longstanding target for surveillance and prosecution, due to of the government's opinion that the nonprofit's specific goal is to "thwart the Border Patrol at every possible turn."⁶⁹ At his retrial, Scott Warren was found not guilty on two counts of harboring,⁷⁰ after four other No More Deaths volunteers were convicted in 2019 for trespassing-related offenses for entering protected desert areas to leave water for border crossers.⁷¹

When taken in context of a relatively flat harboring prosecution rate, as well as the government's particular motivations for pursuing these defendants, these cases can be viewed as outliers that do not suggest a generally growing risk of prosecution for crime victim services programs.

19. How do federal policy changes on harboring affect a program's risks related to the crime of harboring?

On January 20, 2021, acting Attorney General Monty Wilkinson rescinded Former Attorney General Jeff Sessions' May 2017 policy memorandum⁷² that had advocated a ramping up of prosecutions for certain forms of harboring.⁷³ At this time, there is no evidence that the 2017 call for increased prosecution of high-priority harboring defendants resulted in unprecedented new efforts to target nonprofit employees of crime victim advocacy programs.

20. How could other recent federal policy changes affect programs?

Recent executive orders and federal policy memoranda continue to alter how immigration law is implemented in many ways.⁷⁴ Some of these changes may affect programs directly, and impact whether or not victims are potentially detained or deported, both in positive and negative ways. For example:

- USCIS has revised U visa policies and protocols that are intended to recognize the barriers to safety that impact them, including seeking to reduce delays in access to employment authorization.⁷⁵
- ICE has issued a directive, instructing to its personnel to exercise prosecutorial discretion in "appropriate circumstances," and refrain from taking civil enforcement action against known beneficiaries and applicants for victim-based immigration benefits, as well as look for evidence that individuals are victims of crime to determine whether they might be eligible for victim-based immigration benefits.⁷⁶
- The administration continues to develop partnerships between federal immigration authorities and local law enforcement agencies through the 287(g) program, allowing local law enforcement to engage in federal immigration enforcement. It is important for victim

services programs to be aware of any law enforcement agencies or individual officers in their jurisdiction that are participating in these programs, and draft program policies that take this into account.

Given the rate of policy change, and the seriousness of these issues for programs, employees, and victims, one of the best protective measures a program can take is to develop a relationship with a local immigration attorney whose job is, in part, to pay attention to these developing issues, explain them clearly, and advise the program about how the changes impact the program's risk management approach.

BEST PRACTICES, PROGRAM POLICIES, AND NEXT STEPS

21. Should programs minimize their risk of harboring charges by requiring proof of legal immigration status (and consent to disclose that status) as a condition of eligibility for services?

No, rationing access to services based on immigration status or willingness to sign a confidentiality waiver is not a best practice for several reasons:

- Denying essential, safety-related services to undocumented immigrants would be cruel, unsafe, and contrary to programs' missions.
- Many victims of abuse, regardless of their immigration status, do not have access to the documents that prove their immigration status, so in practice this overbroad requirement would result in many citizens and lawful immigrants being denied services, in addition to the undocumented victims intentionally excluded.
- Federal policy exempts nonprofits that provide public benefits from requiring verification of immigration status as proof of eligibility for services.⁷⁷
- Policies discriminating on the basis of national origin or requiring consent to disclose personal victim information violate VAWA, FVPSA, and other federal and state laws, which could result in the loss of program funding or other consequences.

A theoretical risk of a novel application of harboring laws by an overeager or malicious prosecutor should not deter programs from providing essential services to victims in need, irrespective of their immigration status.

22. Should programs minimize their liability using a 'Don't Ask Don't Tell' approach when it comes to victims' immigration status?

Not necessarily. It is true that in order to prove a program employee violated the anti-harboring law, the government must prove that the employee knew or recklessly disregarded evidence of the fact that the victim was undocumented.⁷⁸ Therefore, if a program follows a policy of avoiding the subject of immigration status altogether, it would be difficult to prove harboring beyond a reasonable doubt. If a highly risk-averse program (e.g., one in a state with its own anti-harboring law) feels it necessary to take this approach, the program should also adopt a policy of providing referrals for outside immigration assistance to every program client.

However, for most programs, and their clients, there are compelling reasons for determining a victim's immigration status that outweigh the risk. For example, a caseworker may need to know a victim's immigration status to determine what public benefits the victim is eligible for, a counselor may need to discuss trauma related to a victim's border crossing, and a legal advocate may need to determine if the filing deadline for an asylum case has passed. Given the lack of harboring prosecutions of program employees, adopting reasonable program policies will lower most programs' risk to an acceptable level.

23. Should programs minimize their liability by providing immigration advocacy and legal assistance?

Yes, giving clients referrals or direct assistance with seeking legal immigration status is a win-win. Offering these services will benefit many clients. It will also reduce the program's legal risks, because when an undocumented victim is actively seeking legal status their application affirmatively informs the federal government of their presence and residence. Offering these referrals or services to all clients is ideal, as factors like race and ethnicity are not appropriate bases for inferring immigration status.⁷⁹

Individual victims may have their own reasons for not seeking legal status at any given time, and ultimately it is the victim's decision, so it is not appropriate for programs to condition services on a victim submitting an immigration application. However, a policy of encouraging and supporting the pursuit of legal status will reflect positively on the program, creating a record that the program and its employees do not encourage undocumented immigrants to conceal themselves from immigration authorities, even if individual victims decline or delay acceptance of the assistance.

That said, programs should keep in mind that immigration advice should only be given by attorneys with immigration expertise specific to their jurisdiction. Previous challenges in federal circuit courts regarding the constitutionality of the "encouraging or inducing" of someone's continuing unlawful presence element of the harboring statute have generally upheld, so victim advocates should refrain from advising victims directly on this issue.⁸⁰

24. What policies and strategies, other than those specifically related to service eligibility, should programs review with undocumented victims in mind?

Policies not directly related to service provision that programs should review include:

- **Record keeping:** When working with undocumented victims, like any other victims, avoid documenting sensitive information in writing, unless doing so is necessary, to minimize the risk of the information becoming discoverable without the victim's consent. For example, if a victim discloses her undocumented status during a counseling session, in some states the counselor's written notes could be subpoenaed, but the counselor could not be compelled to testify in a deposition or court, so including information about the victim's status in written counseling records might increase the risk to the program, the counselor, and the victim.
- **Confidentiality:** Ensure program policies are compliant with VAWA, FVPSA, VOCA, and other funding-related confidentiality rules (including obtaining consent to release information from clients) and that employees understand and follow them. Policies requiring programs to protect victim privacy to the maximum extent possible, such as by objecting to and seeking

to quash all subpoenas for victim records or testimony by program employees, will protect undocumented clients along with other program clients.

- **Security:** Consider what areas of your program are accessible to the public (and therefore accessible to immigration enforcement) as opposed to being more easily characterized as private spaces.
- **Staff Training:** Ensure program staff are trained and familiar with these policies, so that in a stressful and chaotic moment they will act in compliance with the policies. Front desk staff in particular, but also other employees, should be trained to properly respond to service of subpoenas, court orders, and warrants, as well as on the distinction between obstructing vs. minimally cooperating with an ICE or law enforcement agent. Training staff to notify the program director or attorney immediately when any of these issues arise, rather than relying on their own judgment, is particularly important.
- **Legal Counsel:** Develop guidelines making it clear under what circumstances the program will pay for legal counsel (if *pro bono* representation is unavailable), either for consultation purposes or to represent the program or program employees.
- **Marketing and Publications:** Adjust the language in program documents (both internal and publicly available), if needed, to represent the program's commitment to providing assistance to encourage undocumented immigrants to seek lawful immigration status.
- **Networking:** Build relationships with other programs in your state and region to ensure you are promptly notified of changes in local immigration enforcement tactics. For example, if ICE officers arrest a victim at a shelter or courthouse somewhere in your state, are there communication channels in place to promptly alert other programs in your state? Likewise, build connections with local legal aid programs, volunteer lawyer programs, and bar associations to strengthen the network of legal assistance supporting the program and its clients.

25. When should programs seek the advice of local immigration attorneys?

As early and often as possible. Programs should seek out options for local legal assistance proactively, before a problem arises. If *pro bono* assistance is not available, some private attorneys may offer reduced hourly rates to a nonprofit program. Your program may also consider collaborating with other programs to share cost of consulting with an immigration attorney regarding common policy-related questions that affect multiple local programs. This is especially critical for programs at elevated risk, such as:

- Programs in states with stricter state harboring laws, jurisdictions with stricter interpretations of federal law, or law enforcement agencies or officers cooperating with ICE,
- Programs that provide services exclusively for (or specifically targeted at) undocumented immigrants, or
- Programs that provide services that differ substantially from those provided by a typical program (such as a domestic violence shelter or sexual assault victim advocacy program), particularly services directly related to activities that could be considered harboring (such as arranging for unaccompanied minors to enter the United States to reunify with their families⁸¹).

Working with a local immigration attorney can benefit programs in two ways. First, the attorney can review program policies to confirm that they are in compliance with federal law (as interpreted in the program's jurisdiction), as well state and local harboring laws. Second, having pre-identified local counsel available to call on an emergency basis (e.g., if ICE agents serve a subpoena or warrant) can substantially minimize legal risks to a program resulting from delays

or noncompliance with the complex array of relevant federal and state laws and court rules.

Timeframes for objecting in these situations can be short, so having a relationship and agreement with an attorney in advance can ensure your program receives timely counsel should the need arise.

Arranging for local counsel, reviewing program policies, and fully training staff should enable programs to serve undocumented victims with confidence that those clients—as well as the program and program’s employees—face no substantial legal risks related to the federal harboring law.

ENDNOTES

¹INA §274; 8 U.S.C. §1324.

² A review of prosecutions under 8 U.S.C. § 1324, 18 U.S.C. §§ 751-757, 18 U.S.C. § 1071-1074, failed to yield examples of convictions involving not-for profit organizations.

³ For example, Family Violence Prevention and Services Act (FVPSA) funding includes no restrictions on serving immigrants, FVPSA is not designated as a federal public benefit requiring legal immigration status, and FVPSA prohibits discrimination on the basis of national origin. 42 U.S.C. §10406(c)(2). See also 42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq., 45 CFR Part 80; HHS, *Frequently Asked Questions about Access to FYSB-Funded Services for Survivors of Domestic Violence*, August 10, 2016, available at <https://www.hhs.gov/guidance/document/access-fysb-funded-services-survivors-domestic-violence-faqs>

⁴ INA §274(a)(1)(A); 8 U.S.C. §1324(a)(1)(A). See, e.g., *US v. Sineneng-Smith*, 982 F.3d 766 (9th Cir. 2020), *cert denied*, 142 S.Ct 117, 211 L.Ed. 2d 26 (S.Ct. 2021).

⁵ INA §274(a)(1)(B); 8 U.S.C. §1324(a)(1)(B).

⁶ INA §274(b); 8 U.S.C. §1324(b).

⁷ INA §274(a)(3); 8 U.S.C. §1324(a)(3)(criminal penalty for knowingly hiring at least 10 individuals with actual knowledge they are unauthorized & have been transported to the US to enter at a place other than a designated port of entry....). Employment of fewer immigrants is a misdemeanor. INA §274A; 8 U.S.C. §1324a.

⁸ INA 274A(a)(1)(A)(i), (iv); *E.g., United States v. Aguilar*, 871 F.2d 1436 (9th Cir. 1989). This could also result in charges of alien smuggling. INA § 212(a)(6)(E)(i); INA §237(a)(1)(E)(i).

⁹ Transporting immigrants after they are inside the country is within the scope of the harboring law, but typically is prosecuted when provided for the purpose of evading ICE or border control, or in combination with other acts of harboring, smuggling, fraud, etc. See e.g., *United States v. Ye*, 588 F.3d 411 (7th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Mireles*, 442 F. App'x. 988 (5th Cir. 2011); *United States v. Khalil*, 692 F. App'x. 14 (2nd Cir. 2017). Appellate courts' perspectives on how directly the transportation must be tied to the continued illegal presence vary. See *United States v. Barajas-Chaves*, 162 F.3d 1285 (10th Cir. 1999) (comparing decisions on harboring by providing post-entry transportation in cases in various circuits). Intra-U.S. transportation can also, in rare cases, result in smuggling charges. *Dimova v. Holder*, 783 F.3d 30 (1st Cir. 2015) (holding that a defendant who is tricked into becoming involved in a border crossing plan, backs out, but returns to the pick-up spot on the U.S. side of the border purely out of humanitarian concern, was guilty of knowingly assisting, abetting or aiding an illegal entry).

¹⁰ See e.g., *United States v. Ye*, 588 F.3d 411 (7th Cir. 2009); *United States v. George*, 779 F.3d 113 (2nd Cir. 2015); *United States v. Kim*, 193 F.3d 567 (2nd Cir. 1999); *United States v. Shum*, 496 F.3d 390, 392 (5th Cir. 2007).

¹¹ See e.g., *United States v. Campbell*, 636 F. App'x. 692 (7th Cir. 2016).

¹² See e.g., *United States v. Kahanani*, 502 F.3d 1281 (11th Cir. 2007) (superseded by statute at 18 USC § 1956(c)(9)).

¹³ See e.g., *United States v. Rubio-Gonzalez*, 674 F.2d 1067 (5th Cir. 1982); *United States v. Cantu*, 557 F.2d 1173 (5th Cir. 1977); *United States v. Varkonyi*, 645 F.2d 453 (5th Cir. 1981).

¹⁴ For example, according to a 2016 advisory, “It is important that government-funded and community-based programs, services, or assistance, as specified in the Attorney General Order, remain accessible to all eligible individuals, regardless of immigration status. For example, immigrants experiencing domestic violence or other abuse, including sexual assault, stalking, dating violence, or human trafficking, often face significant obstacles to seeking help and safety. In particular, access to emergency shelter and transitional housing are crucial to a battered immigrant's ability to escape abuse and break the cycle of violence.” Department of Health and Human Services, *HHS, HUD and DOJ Joint Letter to State/Local Agencies regarding Life and Safety Benefits for Immigrants*, August 5, 2016, available at <https://www.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/Joint-Letter-August-2016.pdf>.

¹⁵ Office for Civil Rights, *HHS Domestic Violence Fact Sheet*, August 22, 2012, available at <https://www.hhs.gov/civil-rights/for-individuals/special-topics/national-origin/domestic-violence/index.html#2>

¹⁶ INA § 274(a)(3); 8 U.S.C. § 1324(a)(3); *United States v. Winnie Mae Mfg. Co.* 451 F.Supp. 642 (C.D.Cal. 1978).

¹⁷ See, *supra*, notes 14 & 15. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (hereinafter, PRWORA) and Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (hereinafter, IIRIRA) prohibited undocumented immigrants from receiving most government benefits, but made specific exceptions allowing them to receive state and locally funded services for these kinds of emergency services. Division C of the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1996 (H.R. 3610), Pub. L. No. 104-208, 110 Stat. 3009; Pub.L. No. 104-193, 110 Stat. 2105, Section 411, 8 USC 1621; AG Order No. 2353-2001, 66 Fed. Reg. 3613 (Jan 16, 2001).

¹⁸ See Ala. Code § 31-13-13; Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 13-2510; Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-2901; Ga. Code Ann. § 16-11-2; Ind. Code Ann. § 35-44.1-5-4; Tex. Penal Code § 38.05

¹⁹ See, Tex. Penal Code § 20.05

²⁰ Tex. Penal Code § 7.02(a)(2).

²¹ The U.S. Supreme Court held that several provisions of, Arizona's S.B. 1070, were preempted by federal immigration law *Arizona v. U.S.*, 567 U.S. 387 (2012). See *Fuentes-Espinoza v. People*, 408 P.3d 455 (2017) (striking down Colorado's anti-smuggling statute based on federal preemption); *Valle de Sol v. Whiting*, 732 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 2013); *United States v. South Carolina*, 720 F.3d 518 (4th Cir 2013).

²² The Fifth Circuit, in *Cruz v. Abbott*, 849 F.3d 594 (5th Cir. 2017), opined that “**there is no reasonable interpretation by which merely ... providing social services to an illegal alien constitutes ‘harboring . . . that person from detection,’**” in interpreting Texas Penal Code § 20.05, in a case where social services organizations that provided temporary shelter and legal assistance to needy individuals, regardless of immigration status, sued to have the Texas law declared invalid based on federal preemption. In this case, the Director of the Texas Department of Public Safety, responded that the Department would not investigate, file criminal charges, or otherwise engage in enforcement activity pursuant to this statute against individuals engaged in such conduct, stated that the plaintiffs were not violating the statute, and therefore, faced no credible threat of prosecution. The respondents also maintained that “the statute applies to persons or entities that *hide* undocumented individuals from authorities, **not to those who merely shelter them.**” *Id.* at 599. Ultimately, the Fifth Circuit dismissed the case for lack of standing.

²³ See, Attorney General of Texas (May 6, 2022). *AG Paxton Investigates Texas Bar Foundation for Facilitating Mass Influx of Illegal Aliens* [Press Release]. <https://texasattorneygeneral.gov/news/releases/ag-paxton-investigates-texas-bar-foundation-facilitating-mass-influx-illegal-aliens> (relying on authority under the Texas Constitution and powers as Attorney General to investigate charities and non-profit organizations); Texas Bar Foundation (May 6, 2022) *Texas Bar Foundation statement on AG Paxton Investigation*. [Press Release]. <https://www.courthousenews.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/texas-bar-foundation-response-to-ag-paxton.pdf>.

²⁴ The Seventh Circuit includes the states of Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin.

²⁵ *United States v. Costello*, 666 F.3d 1040 (7th Cir. 2012).

²⁶ *United States v. McClellan*, 794 F.3d 743, 750-51 (7th Cir. 2015) (“[W]e hold that, when the basis for the defendant’s conviction under §1324(a)(1)(A)(iii) is providing housing to a known illegal alien, there must be evidence from which a jury could conclude, beyond a reasonable doubt, that the defendant intended to safeguard that alien from the authorities. Such intent can be established by showing that the defendant has taken actions to conceal an alien by moving the alien to a hidden location or providing physical protection to the alien”).

²⁷ The Second Circuit includes Connecticut, New York, and Vermont.

²⁸ The Third Circuit includes Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

²⁹ *United States v. Vargas-Cordon*, 733 F.3d 366 (2nd Cir. 2013) (“To ‘harbor’ under §1324, a defendant must engage in conduct that is intended both to substantially help an unlawfully present alien remain in the United States—such as by providing him with shelter, money, or other material comfort—and also is intended to help prevent the detection of the alien by the authorities.”); *United States v. Ozcelik*, 527 F.3d 88, 100 (3^d Cir. 2008); *DelRio-Mocci v. Connolly Properties Inc.*, 672 F.3d 241 (3rd Cir. 2012) (holding that actions like cohabitation, providing rental housing, or telling an immigrant to “lay low” do not constitute harboring, which requires more substantial assistance as well as conduct preventing immigration authorities from detecting the immigrant’s presence);

³⁰ The Ninth Circuit includes Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, and Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands.

³¹ *United States v. Tydingco*, 909 F.3d 297 (9th Cir. 2018) (resolving *United States v. You*, 382 F.3d 958, 966 (9th Cir 2004) with *United States v. Acosta De Evans*, 531 F.2d 428 (9th Cir. 1976)) (“*You* requires only an instruction that the defendant intended to violate the law. One way to demonstrate such an intention is to prove that the defendant sought to prevent immigration authorities from detecting an illegal alien’s presence. But that is not the only way. For example, a defendant who chooses to publicize her harboring of an illegal alien in order to call attention to what she considers an unjust immigration law intends to violate the law, even though she does not intend to prevent detection.”). Additionally, in considering a challenge to Arizona’s anti-harboring law, the Ninth Circuit held that a pastor who provided shelter and transportation for undocumented parishioners did have standing to challenge the law because she did face a reasonable risk of prosecution for harboring, *Valle del Sol Inc. v. Whiting*, 732 F.3d 1006 (9th Cir. 2013).

³² The Eighth Circuit includes Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

³³ *United States v. Rushing*, 313 F.3d 428 (8th Cir. 2002); *United States v. Good*, 4:18CR3088 (D. Neb. April 3, 2019) (citing *U.S. v. Tipton*, 518 F.3d 591, 595 (2008)).

³⁴ The Eleventh Circuit consists of Alabama, Florida, and Georgia.

³⁵ *Edwards v. Prime, Inc.*, 602 F.3d 1278 (11th Cir. 2010).

³⁶ *Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights v. Governor of Georgia*, 691 F.3d 1250 (11th Cir. 2012).

³⁷ The Fifth Circuit includes Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

³⁸ *United States v. Shum*, 496 F.3d 390 (5th Cir. 2007); accord *United States v. Louisiana Home Elevations, LLC*, CRIM.A. 11-274, 2012 WL 1033619 (E.D. La. Mar 27, 2012) (“Here, considering the breadth of this standard, the Court cannot hold that knowingly employing illegal aliens is insufficient as a matter of law to constitute the substantial facilitation element.”)

³⁹ *Villas at Parkside Partners v. City of Farmers Branch*, 726 F.3d 524 (5th Cir. 2013) (holding that a local ordinance conflicted with and was preempted by federal law due to it “criminalizing conduct [such as providing rental housing] that does not have the effect of evading federal detection” and noting that undetained but removable aliens need to have a residential address to provide during removal proceedings.

⁴⁰ *Cruz v. Abbott*, 849 F.3d 594 (5th Cir. 2017).

⁴¹ *United States v. Anderton*, 901 F.3d 278, 284 (5th Cir. 2018).

⁴² *United States v. Ruiz-Hernandez*, 890 F.3d 202 (5th Cir. 2018).

⁴³ *United States v. Aguilar*, 883 F.2d 662 (9th Cir. 1989).

⁴⁴ Curt Prendergast, “Border aid volunteers sentenced to probation in Tucson,” *Arizona Daily Star*, March 1, 2019, available at https://tucson.com/news/local/border-aid-volunteers-sentenced-to-probation-in-tucson/article_1160a3c2-3c74-11e9-bd57-873b4471925b.html.

⁴⁵ *City of El Cinizo, Texas v. Texas*, 890 F.3d 164 (5th Cir 2018).

⁴⁶ See, Immigration and Customs Enforcement Delegation of Immigration Authority 287(g), <https://www.ice.gov/identify-and-arrest/287g>

⁴⁷ Corey Pein, *Report: More Sheriff's Deputies Cooperated with ICE*, Willamette Week, February 23, 2017, available at <http://www.wweek.com/news/2017/02/23/report-more-sheriffs-deputies-cooperated-with-ice/>

⁴⁸ *City of Philadelphia v. Attorney General*, 916 F.3d 276 (3d. Cir. 2019); *City of Los Angeles v. Barr*, 941 F.3d 931 (9th Cir. 2019).

⁴⁹ The statute does contain one limited religiously-based exception that allows “a religious denomination having a bona fide nonprofit, religious organization in the United States... to encourage, invite, call, allow, or enable an alien... to perform the vocation of a minister or missionary... as a volunteer... notwithstanding the provision of room, board, travel, medical assistance, and other basic living expenses, provided the minister or missionary has been a member of the denomination for at least one year.” INA §274(a)(1)(C); 8 U.S.C. §1324(a)(1)(C).

⁵⁰ Alejandro Mayorkas, *Guidelines for Enforcement Actions in or Near Protected Areas*, Oct 27, 2021, available at https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/21_1027_opa_guidelines-enforcement-actions-in-near-protected-areas.pdf

⁵¹ John P. Torres, *U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Memorandum on Interim Guidance Relating to Officer Procedure Following Enactment of VAWA 2005*, Jan 22, 2007, available at <https://www.ice.gov/doclib/foia/prosecutorial-discretion/vawa2005.pdf>. Each violation of the VAWA Confidentiality or Victim Safety Protections is punishable by a \$5,000 fine as well as disciplinary action. 8 U.S.C. §1367(c); 8 U.S.C. §1229(e)

⁵² See, *supra*, note 47. See also, <https://www.ice.gov/about-ice/ero/protected-areas>

⁵³ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Civil Immigration Enforcement Actions in or near Courthouses* (April 27, 2021) available at <https://www.ice.gov/sites/default/files/documents/ciEnforcementActionsCourthouses2.pdf>;

⁵⁴ See, e.g., *United States v. Rubio-Gonzalez*, 674 F.2d 1067 (5th Cir. 1982) (upholding a harboring conviction based on the defendant warning undocumented employees that immigration agents were at the office asking about them and encouraging the immigrants to flee); *United States v. Cantu*, 557 F.2d 1173 (5th Cir. 1977); *United States v. Varkonyi*, 645 F.2d 453 (5th Cir. 1981).

⁵⁵ VAWA: The Violence Against Women Act of 1994, Pub. L. No. 103-222, Title IV, 108 Stat. 1902-55 (codified in scattered sections of 8 U.S.C. and 42 U.S.C.) (hereinafter, VAWA); Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (“VAWA 2000”), Pub. L. No. 106-386, Div B, Title V, §1513(d) (2000); Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (“VAWA 2005”), Pub. L. No. 109-162, Title VIII, Subtitle B, §817 (2006). FVPSA: The Family Violence Prevention and Services Act of 1984, Pub. L. No. 98-457 (codified in 42 U.S.C. Section 10401, et seq.); Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-320 (codified in 42 U.S.C. 5101, et seq.) (amending and reauthorizing the FVPSA). VOCA: Victims of a Crime Act, 42 USC 10601 et seq. (grantees must certify that they will comply with regulations set forth by 28 CFR Part 22 which prohibits the disclosure of personal identifying information of crime victims).

⁵⁶ See, *supra* note 35.

⁵⁷ Department of Homeland Security, *Sample Warrant for Arrest of Alien*, Sept 2016, available at https://www.ice.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Document/2017/I-200_SAMPLE.PDF.

⁵⁸ American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California, *ICE Agents At Your Door*, available at <https://www.aclusocal.org/en/know-your-rights/ice-agents-your-door>

⁵⁹ Rates of prosecution for the category that includes both harboring and “bringing in” undocumented immigrants have increased by 79.3% over the past ten years, but the rate in October 22 had decreased by 1.7% from the rate one year earlier. TRACImmigration, *Immigration Prosecutions for 2022: Lead Charge 08 USC 1324 Bringing in and harboring certain aliens*, available at <https://tracfed.syr.edu/results/9x70634f804504.html>.

⁶⁰ United States Courts, *Federal Judicial Caseload Statistics Table D2 – U.S. District Courts — Criminal Defendants Commenced, by Offense — During the 12-Month Periods Ending June 30, 2013 Through 2017*, June 30, 2017, available at https://www.uscourts.gov/sites/default/files/data_tables/stfj_d2_630.2017.pdf.

⁶¹ César Cuauhtémoc García Hernández, *Harboring Prosecutions are Rare, but Attorney General Wants More*, March 13, 2018, available at <http://crimmigration.com/2018/01/29/harboring-prosecutions-are-rare-but-attorney-general-wants-more/>.

⁶² United States Courts, *Federal Judicial Caseload Statistics Table D2 – U.S. District Courts — Criminal Defendants Filed, by Offense — During the 12-Month Periods Ending March 31, 2018 Through 2022*, March 31, 2022, available at <https://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/d-2/federal-judicial-caseload-statistics/2022/03/31>

⁶³ Manny Fernandez, “She Stopped to Help Migrants on a Texas Highway. Moments Later, She Was Arrested, May 10, 2019,” *New York Times*, May 10, 2019, available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/10/us/texas-border-good-samaritan.html>.

⁶⁴ Debbie Nathan, “Good Samaritans Punished for Offering Lifesaving Help to Migrants,” *The Appeal*, April 17, 2019, available at <https://theappeal.org/good-samaritans-punished-for-offering-lifesaving-help-to-migrants/?fbclid=IwAR1TR8GrLc7z44p9n8jIKdxOMVYzhgq7FTDy7ld4dpsUCxjM3z5D1rIRC8A>.

⁶⁵ Maria Cramer, “Low-profile judge, indicted for allegedly helping undocumented immigrant, finds herself in harsh spotlight,” *Boston Globe*, May 21, 2019, available at <https://www.bostonglobe.com/metro/2019/05/21/low-profile-judge-indicted-for-allegedly-helping-undocumented-immigrant-finds-herself-harsh-spotlight/PTHdKNcBoT59uEM1i8W55M/story.html>.

⁶⁶ Alana Durkin Richer, “Feds drop case against Newton Judge Shelley Joseph, charged in immigrant’s escape,” *Boston.com*, September 22, 2022, available at <https://www.boston.com/news/local-news/2022/09/22/feds-drop-case-against-newton-judge-shelley-joseph-charged-in-immigrants-escape/>

⁶⁷ *United States v. Sineneng-Smith*, 910 F.3d 461 (9th Cir. 2018).

⁶⁸ Bob Ortega, “Prosecutors to retry volunteer worker who aided migrants,” *CNN*, July 2, 2019, available at <https://www.cnn.com/2019/07/02/us/scott-warren-migrant-humanitarian-prosecution-invs/index.html>.

⁶⁹ *Id.*

⁷⁰ Jasmine Aguilera, “Humanitarian Scott Warren Found Not Guilty After Retrial for Helping Migrants at Mexican Border,” *Time* (November 21, 2019), available at <https://time.com/5732485/scott-warren-trial-not-guilty/>.

⁷¹ Curt Prendergast, “Border aid volunteers sentenced to probation in Tucson,” *Arizona Daily Star*, March 1, 2019, available at https://tucson.com/news/local/border-aid-volunteers-sentenced-to-probation-in-tucson/article_1160a3c2-3c74-11e9-bd57-873b4471925b.html.

⁷² See, Office of the Attorney General, Renewed Commitment to Criminal Legal Enforcement, (April 11, 2017), retrieved from: <https://www.justice.gov/opa/press-release/file/956841/download>

⁷³ Office of the Attorney General, *Interim Guidance on Prosecutorial Discretion, Charging, and Sentencing* (January 20, 2021), retrieved from: <https://www.justice.gov/ag/page/file/1362411/download>; see also Ryan J. Reilly, “DOJ Pulls Trump Administration’s Harsh Charging and Sentencing Policy,” *Huffpost* (January 29, 2021), https://www.huffpost.com/entry/doj-biden-sentencing-charging-policy_n_601441aac5b63b0fb2808ce7?3dl.

⁷⁴ See, Executive Order on the Revision of Civil Immigration Enforcement Policies and Priorities (January 20, 2021), available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/20/executive-order-the-revision-of-civil-immigration-enforcement-policies-and-priorities/>; Executive Order on Restoring Faith in Our Legal Immigration Systems and Strengthening Integration and Inclusion Efforts for New Americans (February 2, 2021); available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/02/02/executive-order-restoring-faith-in-our-legal-immigration-systems-and-strengthening-integration-and-inclusion-efforts-for-new-americans/>

⁷⁵ U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, National Engagement- U Visa and Bona Fide Determination Process-Frequently Asked Questions (updated Sept 23, 2021), retrieved from: <https://www.uscis.gov/records/electronic-reading-room/national-engagement-u-visa-and-bona-fide-determination-process-frequently-asked-questions>.

⁷⁶ U.S Customs and Immigration Enforcement, *ICE Directive 11005.3: Using a Victim Centered Approach with Noncitizen Crime Victims*, August 10, 2021, available at <https://www.ice.gov/doclib/news/releases/2021/11005.3.pdf>

⁷⁷ See Administration for Children & Families, *Verification of Citizenship and Immigration Status by Non-Profit Organizations and Head Start*, May 2, 2008, available at <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/occ/resource/pi-2008-01>

⁷⁸ Knowledge of or reckless disregard for an immigrant’s undocumented status can be proven by circumstantial evidence. *United States v. De Jesus-Batres*, 410 F.3d 154 (5th Cir. 2005). Reckless disregard means deliberate indifference to facts indicating a high probability of undocumented status. *United States v. Perez*, 443 F.3d 772 (11th Cir. 2006).

⁷⁹ *Sanchez v. Sessions*, 904 F.3d 643, 656 (9th Cir 2017).

⁸⁰ In *United States v. Henderson*, 857 F.Supp.2d 191 (2012), despite the court’s emphatic reluctance, the judge held that a jury could find that a CPB employee “encouraged or induced” an immigrant’s continued residence in the United States by occasionally employing and giving legal advice to an undocumented cleaning woman, but ordered a new trial with jury instructions modified in accordance with *DelRio-Mocci v. Connolly Properties Inc.*, 672 F.3d 241 (3rd Cir. 2012), which was decided during the *Henderson* deliberations, to specify that the encouragement or inducement must be substantial enough to have led the immigrant to reside here “when she might not have done so otherwise.” *Henderson* at 211. Ultimately the charges were dismissed. See also, *United States v. Anderton*, 901 F.3d 278 (5th Cir. 2018)(the “encouraging or inducing” element withstood a claim of unconstitutional vagueness); *United States v. Good*, 4:18CR3088 (D. Neb. April 3, 2019)(The “harboring” provision has also withstood constitutional challenge based on the free religious exercise and speech clauses).

⁸¹ A variety of online resources address these more specific needs. For example, Lutheran Immigrant and Refugee Service supports immigrant children to be reunified with family members. See, <https://www.lirs.org/family-reunification-services/>