

Shayla R. Myers (SBN 264054)
Ana Zuniga (SBN 281768)
LEGAL AID FOUNDATION
OF LOS ANGELES
1550 W. Eighth Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 640-3983
Email: smyers@lafla.org
azuniga@lafla.org

Robyn C. Crowther (SBN 193840)
Mary Katherine Planchet (SBN 341006)
Abigail Falk Orozco (SBN 352267)
STEPTOE LLP
633 W Fifth Street, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 349-9400
Email: rcrowther@steptoe.com
mplanchet@steptoe.com
aorozco@steptoe.com

Mark Rosenbaum (SBN 59940)
Faizah Malik (SBN 320479)
Amanda Mangaser Savage (SBN 325996)
Jonathan Jager (SBN 318325)
Cassidy Bennett (SBN 347811)
PUBLIC COUNSEL
610 South Ardmore Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90005
(213) 385-2977
Email: mrosenbaum@publiccounsel.org
fmalik@publiccounsel.org
asavage@publiccounsel.org
jjager@publiccounsel.org
cbennett@publiccounsel.org

*Attorneys for Proposed Plaintiff-Intervenor
Los Angeles Continuum of Care*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION

LOS ANGELES HOMLESS
SERVICES AUTHORITY, a joint
powers authority,

Plaintiff,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official
capacity as President of the United
States of America; UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT; SCOTT
TURNER, in his official capacity as
Secretary of the U.S. Department of
Housing and Urban Development; and
DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:26-cv-07056-DOC-ARJ

Hon. David O. Carter

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND
MOTION OF PROPOSED
INTERVENOR LOS ANGELES
CONTINUUM OF CARE TO
INTERVENE AS A PLAINTIFF;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES**

[Declaration of Ben Kay, [Proposed]
Complaint in Intervention, and
[Proposed] Order filed concurrently]

Date: August 6, 2026
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Courtroom: One

NOTICE OF MOTION

**TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF
RECORD:**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that as soon as the matter may be heard before the Honorable David O. Carter, or consistent with Judge Carter’s ruling on Proposed-Intervenor’s Ex Parte Application for Shortened Briefing Schedule and Submission on the Papers filed concurrently with this motion, which seeks to shorten time for a hearing and requests the hearing be waived or scheduled on August 6, 2026 at 9:00 a.m. in Courtroom One of the U.S. District Court, Central District of California, located at 350 W First Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012, proposed Plaintiff-Intervenor Los Angeles Continuum of Care (“LA CoC”), by and through its counsel of record, will and hereby does move this Court pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24 for an order granting leave to intervene as Plaintiff-Intervenor in this action.

This Motion is supported by the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, Plaintiffs’ Proposed Complaint in Intervention, Declaration of Ben Kay, any oral argument this Court may allow, and any other matter of which this Court takes notice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND	2
A. Overview of the Los Angeles Continuum of Care	2
B. HUD’s Fiscal Year 2026 Notice of Funding Opportunity	4
C. HUD’S Suspension of LAHSA and its effects on LA CoC	6
III. ARGUMENT	11
A. LA CoC Is Entitled to Intervene as a Matter of Right.	11
1. The request is timely.	11
2. LA CoC has a significant protectable interest in this litigation.	13
3. A decision in this Action may impair LA CoC’s ability to protect its interests.	16
4. Plaintiff LAHSA does not fully represent LA CoC’s interests.	17
B. In the Alternative, LA CoC Should Be Granted Permissive Intervention.	20
1. LA CoC meets the three threshold requirements.	20
2. The discretionary factors weigh in favor of intervention.	21
IV. CONCLUSION	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Cases	Page(s)
1		
2		
3	<i>Arakaki v. Cayetano,</i>	
4	<u>324 F.3d 1078</u> (9th Cir. 2003)	17, 18, 20
5		
6	<i>Bacoka v. Best Buy Co.,</i>	
7	CV 18-866-R, <u>2018 WL 6430533</u> (C.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2018)	23
8	<i>BlueTriton Brands v. U.S. Forest Serv.,</i>	
9	No. 24-CV-9720, <u>2025 WL 746247</u> (C.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2025).....	23
10	<i>Citizens for Balanced Use v. Mont. Wilderness Ass’n,</i>	
11	<u>647 F.3d 893</u> (9th Cir. 2011)	11, 19, 22
12		
13	<i>E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Biden,</i>	
14	<u>993 F.3d 640</u> (9th Cir. 2021)	23
15	<i>In re Estate of Ferdinand E. Marcos Human Rights Litigation,</i>	
16	<u>536 F.3d 980</u> (9th Cir. 2008)	13
17	<i>Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Santa Barbara Cty. Board of Supervisors,</i>	
18	No. CV 22-3225-DMG, <u>2022 WL 17886021</u> (C.D. Cal. Nov. 1, 2022).....	21
19		
20	<i>Ford Gum and Machine Co., Inc. v. Smackin’ Snacks LLC,</i>	
21	No. CV 25-01529-MWF, <u>2025 WL 2019827</u> (C.D. Cal. June 3, 2025)	22
22	<i>Freedom from Religion Found., Inc. v. Geithner,</i>	
23	<u>644 F.3d 836</u> (9th Cir. 2011)	20
24	<i>Idaho Farm Bureau Fed. v. Babbitt,</i>	
25	<u>58 F.3d 1392</u> (9th Cir. 1995)	12
26		
27	<i>California ex rel Lockyer v. U.S.,</i>	
28	<u>450 F.3d 436</u> (9th Cir. 2006)	16

1	<i>N. American Meat Institute v. Becerra,</i>	
2	<u>420 F. Supp. 3d 1014</u> (C.D. Cal. 2019)	20
3	<i>National Alliance to End Homelessness v. Trump,</i>	
4	1:26-CV-00426	9
5	<i>Orange County v. Air Cal.,</i>	
6	<u>799 F.2d 535</u> (9th Cir. 1986)	20
7		
8	<i>Perry v. Schwarzenegger,</i>	
9	<u>630 F.3d 898</u> (9th Cir. 2011)	22
10	<i>Smith v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist.,</i>	
11	<u>830 F.3d 843</u> (9th Cir. 2016)	11, 12
12		
13	<i>Spangler v. Pasadena City Bd. of Educ.,</i>	
14	<u>552 F.2d 1326</u> (9th Cir. 1977)	20, 22, 24
15	<i>Sw. Ctf. for Biological Diversity v. Berg,</i>	
16	<u>268 F.3d 810</u> (9th Cir. 2001)	16
17	<i>Trbovich v. United Mine Workers of Am.,</i>	
18	<u>404 U.S. 528</u> (1972).....	17, 20, 23
19		
20	<i>United States v. State of Washington,</i>	
21	<u>86 F.3d 1499</u> (9th Cir. 1996)	12
22	<i>W. States Trucking Ass’n v. Becerra,</i>	
23	No. 19 Civ. 2447, <u>2020 WL 1032348</u> (C.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2020).....	21
24	Statutes	
25		
26	<u>42 U.S.C. § 11360a</u>	2
27	<u>42 U.S.C. § 11381</u>	2
28		

1	<u>42 U.S.C. § 11386a(b)(2)(B)</u>	5
2	McKinney-Vento Homeless Services Act	2
3		
4	Court Rules	
5	<u>Fed. R. Civ. P. 24</u>	<i>passim</i>
6		
7	<u>Fed. R. Civ. P. 82</u>	20
8	Regulations	
9		
10	<u>24 C.F.R. § 578.5(b)</u>	3
11	<u>24 C.F.R. § 578.7</u>	4
12	<u>24 C.F.R. § 578.13(a)</u>	7
13		
14	<u>24 C.F.R. § 578.15(b)</u>	3, 4
15	<u>24 C.F.R. § 578.107</u>	15

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

This case challenges the Administration’s attempt to use the suspension of Los Angeles’s homeless services agency to gain control of hundreds of millions of dollars in federal homelessness funding for the Los Angeles region—replacing Congress’s Continuum of Care (“CoC”) framework that prioritizes research-backed homelessness prevention strategies and vests control with local communities to develop comprehensive and balanced solutions to the crisis, with its own agenda that favors temporary and transitional shelters, institutionalization, and the use of law enforcement to clear encampments. At stake is the future of Los Angeles’s homelessness response system and the well-being of the thousands of individuals, families, children, veterans, domestic violence survivors, and people with disabilities who rely on it to obtain and maintain housing. The outcome of this case will directly affect thousands of Angelenos currently experiencing homelessness, more than 11,000 formerly unhoused residents whose housing stability depends on CoC-funded programs, and countless vulnerable individuals at risk of homelessness.

The Los Angeles Continuum of Care (“LA CoC”) is entitled to intervene as the entity actually mandated by Congress to coordinate the region’s homelessness response and establishes community funding priorities. HUD has made it explicitly clear that its action to suspend LAHSA will effectively deprive LA CoC of its ability to perform this duty, which in turn will strip the LA region of the community control vested by Congress over millions of dollars in federal funding and give that authority to HUD itself. In fact, this is the goal of HUD’s suspension of LAHSA, not an unintended consequence. It is also simply HUD’s latest attempt to seize control of this funding away from local communities, after prior attempts failed in court and in Congress. While LAHSA seeks to challenge its suspension, LA CoC is uniquely positioned to represent the broader interests of the Continuum, its member organizations, the projects competing for funding, and the thousands of Angelenos

1 whose housing and future stability depend on the outcome of this case.

2 **II. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

3 **A. Overview of the Los Angeles Continuum of Care**

4 The Los Angeles Continuum of Care (“LA CoC”) is an unincorporated
5 association of stakeholders in Los Angeles County that plays a critical yet
6 underappreciated role in Los Angeles’s homeless response system. *See* Declaration
7 of Ben Kay (“Kay Decl.”) ¶¶ 2–3, Ex. A. LA CoC brings together a wide range of
8 stakeholders throughout the Los Angeles region, including people with lived
9 experience, nonprofit service providers, and local governments, to “address[] critical
10 issues related to homelessness through a coordinated community-based process of
11 identifying and addressing needs utilizing U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
12 Development (HUD) funding, as well as other sources of funding.” *Id.* ¶¶ 2–3, Ex.
13 A. Membership in LA CoC is made up of “persons and entities interested in
14 collaborative, solution-oriented planning to address homelessness in LA County
15 (with the exception of Glendale, Long Beach, and Pasadena).” *Id.* ¶ 4.

16 The creation of LA CoC is mandated by Congress under the McKinney-Vento
17 Homeless Services Act. Congress created the CoC program in 2009 to promote
18 housing stability by providing a renewing funding source for effective projects in
19 local communities that provide permanent housing for people experiencing
20 homelessness. The CoC program provides the largest and most consistent source of
21 federal funding to combat homelessness. *Id.* ¶ 8. The implementing statute for the
22 CoC program prioritizes permanent housing, stability, and a strong role for local
23 decision-making, including the renewal of existing permanent supportive housing
24 grants to ensure stability of those projects, and importantly, for the formerly
25 unhoused residents who call those units home. *Id.* ¶12.

26 A primary purpose of the CoC program is to “promote community-wide
27 commitment to the goal of ending homelessness.” [42 U.S.C. § 11381](#). The local CoC
28 coordinates a single consolidated application for federal funds. 42 U.S.C. §

1 11360a(a). Projects included in the application are ranked by the CoC based on local
2 priorities and the needs of the community. Only applicants designated by the CoC
3 can apply for CoC grant funding. 24 C.F.R. § 578.15(b).

4 LA CoC is the largest Continuum of Care in the country, receiving more than
5 200 million dollars in federal funding each year to fund over 8,000 units of
6 permanent supportive housing that serve over 11,000 unhoused and formerly
7 unhoused residents. Kay Decl. ¶ 9. LA CoC includes 85 of the 88 cities in Los
8 Angeles County, including the City of Los Angeles. *Id.* ¶ 7. It is led by a board that
9 is legally required to represent the community and designed to ensure that there is
10 genuine collaboration among stakeholders in the region. *See* 24 CFR § 578.5(b)
11 (2026); Kay Decl. ¶¶ 2-3, Exh. A.

12 Under LA CoC’s Charter, there are 21 members of the board who are all
13 “committed to the communitywide goal of ending homelessness in Los Angeles
14 County.” *Id.* ¶ 5. To ensure geographic representation, eight (8) board members are
15 elected by the community to represent each of the eight service planning areas
16 (SPAs) throughout the region. *Id.* There are also eight (8) system partner seats
17 representing significant partner-members of LA CoC, including the Los Angeles
18 County, the City of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority
19 (“LAHSA”), the Department of Mental Health, the Housing Authority of the City of
20 Los Angeles, and the Los Angeles County Development Authority, which is the
21 convening housing authority for nineteen regional housing authorities in the County.
22 *Id.* There are also five (5) at-large members. *Id.* Importantly, at least three (3) of the
23 21 members of the Board must be people who are currently or formerly experiencing
24 homelessness, each representing one of the three main subpopulations (Adults,
25 Families, and Youth). *Id.* This representative board is consistent with federal
26 requirements and is a uniquely representative body that help ensure collaboration
27 when it comes to setting the region’s priorities for federal funding. 24 CFR §
28 578.5(b) (2026).

1 LA CoC's responsibilities are set forth in federal law. *See* 24 CFR 578.7
2 (2026). Most importantly, LA CoC is responsible for setting priorities for LA CoC's
3 consolidated application for federal funding and selecting a collaborative applicant
4 to submit the application on behalf of LA CoC. *Id.* ¶¶ 8, 14. LA CoC is also charged
5 with conducting the region's annual "point in time" count of people experiencing
6 homelessness in the region; managing the region's Homeless Management
7 Information System ("HMIS"); and managing the Coordinated Entry System
8 ("CES"). *Id.* ¶ 17–18.

9 LA CoC has currently designated LAHSA as its collaborative applicant. Kay
10 Decl. ¶ 14. In addition, because of the complicated nature of homeless services in
11 Los Angeles, LA CoC has also delegated the CoC's other core functions to LAHSA.
12 *Id.* ¶ 16–18. Importantly, however, while LAHSA plays a crucial role as the
13 collaborative applicant and LA CoC has delegated a number of critical functions to
14 LAHSA, the responsibility for these duties remains with LA CoC. And through its
15 charter, LA CoC retains the authority to designate new entities to perform these
16 roles, including the role of collaborative applicant. Kay Decl. ¶ 19. Regardless of
17 which entity LA CoC designates as the collaborative applicant, LA CoC retains
18 responsibility over the region's application for CoC funding. 24 CFR 578.15(b).

19 **B. HUD's Fiscal Year 2026 Notice of Funding Opportunity**

20 In Fiscal Year 2026, Congress allocated \$4.1 billion dollars in competitive
21 funding to the CoC program to provide housing and supportive services for people
22 experiencing homelessness nationally. Because CoC funding is intended to provide
23 stability and consistency to local communities, Congress has prioritized renewal
24 grants to existing projects, with an emphasis on local decision-making about which
25 projects should receive continued funding. Every year, HUD is required to determine
26 how much funding is necessary to provide one year of renewals for all of the CoC's
27 grants. Kay Decl. ¶ 33. That amount is the annual renewal demand ("ARD") for each
28 CoC. *Id.* In 2026, Los Angeles's ARD is \$239,403,584. *Id.*

1 In its appropriation of funds, Congress also mandates the minimum
2 percentage of the ARD that will be allocated to local CoCs for renewal projects
3 through a two-tiered system. *Id.* ¶ 34. Projects that fall within the minimum
4 percentage, or Tier One, are presumptively funded, provided they pass a minimal
5 threshold review by HUD, without having to go through the national competition.
6 *Id.* ¶ 34. Projects that fall into the next tier, Tier Two, are subject to the national
7 competition and are not guaranteed funding. *Id.* ¶ 34.

8 Because of this tiered funding structure, one of the most important tasks
9 performed by the local CoC is to set the ranking priorities for the community and to
10 score projects applying for funding based on those priorities. *Id.* ¶ 10. The CoC is
11 tasked with ranking all of the projects within the region that are eligible for renewal
12 funding, using its own local priorities and assessments about each project's
13 performance. *Id.* Through these rankings, the CoC chooses which projects fall within
14 Tier One. 42 U.S.C. § 11386a(b)(2)(B). This process allows local communities to
15 prioritize the projects that will make the greatest impact for the region and balance
16 federal funding dollars with other sources of funding to ensure a sustainable mix of
17 funding for different types of services. Kay Decl. ¶ 10. CoC funding in Los Angeles
18 has historically been used to fund permanent housing, and CoC funding is currently
19 used to keep more than 11,000 formerly unhoused residents in stable housing and
20 off the streets. *Id.* ¶ 9.

21 In FY 2026, the CoC's role is even more significant. The FY 2026 Notice of
22 Funding Opportunity ("NOFO") for the CoC program was released on June 1, 2026,
23 spelling out the process for CoCs around the country to rank their priorities and apply
24 for CoC funds. *Id.* ¶ 35. As in past years, the FY 2026 includes the two-tier system
25 for project applications. *Id.* However, Congress set the minimum threshold for Tier
26 One at 60%, compared to past years' 90%. *Id.* ¶ 36. As a result, Tier One only has
27 room for 60% of projects that were previously funded. *Id.* ¶ 36. Moreover, HUD has
28 indicated that the remaining 40% of funding (Tier Two) will be allocated to new

1 projects only, not renewals. *Id.* Thus, the only projects likely to receive renewal
2 funding in FY 2026 are the projects that LA CoC determines fall within Tier One of
3 the consolidated application. *Id.* ¶ 37.

4 In Los Angeles, LA CoC's ranking and funding priorities are drafted by the
5 CoC Board, which is a uniquely collaborative and representative body in the Los
6 Angeles region. Kay Decl. ¶ 10. The Board is currently in the process of setting the
7 ranking priorities which will guide the evaluation and ranking of projects for the FY
8 2026 NOFO. *Id.* ¶ 11. Based on these rankings, LA CoC's collaborative applicant
9 submits the application on behalf of LA CoC. *Id.* ¶ 14.

10 On July 15, LA CoC approved preliminary priorities for Tier One and Tier
11 Two. *Id.* ¶ 38. In Tier One, which will be presumptively funded, LA CoC's
12 preliminary ranking policy prioritizes funding site-based permanent supportive
13 housing projects, projects that serve special populations (domestic violence and
14 youth homelessness), projects to manage HMIS and CES, and tenant-based PSH
15 projects. *Id.* ¶ 39.¹ These ranking priorities are consistent with LA CoC's prior year
16 rankings, but because of the change in minimum threshold from 90% to 60%, fewer
17 projects and services are within Tier One than in years past. *Id.* ¶ 40.

18 **C. HUD'S Suspension of LAHSA and its effects on LA CoC**

19 After HUD released the FY 2026 NOFO on June 1 with a deadline of August
20 26 to apply for funds, LAHSA and LA CoC began the work of compiling LA CoC's
21 consolidated application—a monumental task that requires drafting LA CoC's
22 narrative application and compiling CoC-wide data, compiling 14 separate
23 applications, setting ranking priorities, and ranking 140 separate projects to
24 determine which projects fall into Tier One and will be presumptively funded, and
25 which ones fall into Tier Two and likely will not. Kay Decl. ¶ 11.

26 On June 11, 2026, only ten days into the FY 2026 competition period, this
27

28 ¹ The final Ranking Priorities will be voted on and approved by no later than
August 7, 2026. Kay Decl. ¶ 39.

1 work was called into question when HUD took the unprecedented step of notifying
2 LAHSA that it was immediately suspending LAHSA and preventing it from
3 engaging in any transactions with the federal government. Kay Decl. ¶¶ 20–21. This
4 includes preventing LAHSA from serving as LA COC’s collaborative applicant and
5 submitting LA COC’s consolidated application. According to HUD, the suspension
6 of LAHSA took effect immediately, without any prior notice to either LAHSA or
7 LA CoC, let alone an opportunity to challenge the suspension before it went into
8 effect. *Id.* HUD has also taken the position that the suspension prevents LAHSA
9 from performing duties delegated to it by LA CoC, which include the operation of
10 HMIS and CES, both critical segments of Los Angeles’s homelessness response
11 system without which LA CoC cannot function, let alone the rest of Los Angeles’s
12 homelessness response system. Kay Decl. ¶ 21, Exh. B, June 11 Letter.

13 On June 18, 2026, only a week after HUD notified LAHSA of its suspension,
14 HUD sent a letter to LA CoC, informing the Board Chair that HUD had determined
15 that because LAHSA was suspended, LAHSA could not serve as the collaborative
16 applicant or perform its “other delegated duties.” Kay Decl. ¶ 23, Exh. C, June 18
17 Letter. As such, HUD took the position that LA CoC is de facto out of compliance
18 with federal law and regulations. *Id.* ¶ 23. HUD stated that it was invoking its
19 authority to take remedial measures against LA CoC, citing 42 U.S.C. 11360a(c) and
20 24 C.F.R. Section 578.13(a). *Id.* Specifically, HUD concluded that “it was in the
21 public interest to allow eligible entities to submit their grant requests directly to
22 HUD.” *Id.* ¶ 23, Exh. C, June 18 Letter.

23 This means that in the course of suspending LAHSA, HUD effectively
24 suspended LA CoC as well, taking community control away from the entity
25 congressionally mandated to identify, assess, and carry out community priorities and
26 solutions to homelessness in Los Angeles. *Id.* ¶ 24. HUD’s purported “remedial
27 measure” effectively strips the entire LA region of its ability to make its own
28 decisions about how approximately \$144 million in dedicated Tier One federal funds

1 will be spent in Los Angeles County. *Id.*

2 The effects of HUD’s intended remedial measure against LA CoC were made
3 clear to LA CoC on July 16, 2026, when HUD issued a notice of its intent to amend
4 the FY 2026 NOFO to include a “direct-to-HUD” application process for individual
5 applicants within LA CoC’s geographic area. *Id.* ¶ 29. Allowing entities to apply
6 directly to HUD, a process that finds no support in federal law, would completely
7 bypass the CoC ranking and prioritization process, effectively disbanding LA CoC.
8 *Id.* ¶ 29-30.

9 On July 17, 2026, LA CoC sent its response to HUD’s June 18, 2026 Notice
10 of Proposed Remedial Actions. LA CoC presented its case that remedial measures
11 against LA CoC were inappropriate. *Id.* ¶ 31. LA CoC requested that HUD withdraw
12 the June 18 letter and allow LA CoC to participate in the CoC competition consistent
13 with the FY 2026 NOFO. *Id.* ¶ 31, Exh. 3, July 17 Letter. Further, LA CoC requested
14 that in the event the Court allows the suspension of LAHSA to remain place (which
15 it should not), that HUD provide LA CoC with reasonable time to cure any
16 deficiencies caused by LAHSA’s suspension of LAHSA before enacting remedial
17 measures against LA CoC, including designating a new collaborative applicant and
18 other entities to perform the CoC’s duties as required by federal law and regulations.
19 *Id.*

20 Rather than respond to LA CoC directly, on July 21, 2026, HUD responded
21 to a status report form LAHSA in these proceedings and clarified that it had not yet
22 made a decision about whether it would proceed with remedial measures against LA
23 CoC. *See Dkt. 33*, Def.’s Obj’n to Pl.’s [Proposed] Order, 3:5-10. But significantly,
24 HUD has made it crystal clear that if LAHSA remains suspended, it will move
25 forward with the direct-to-HUD application process for applicants within LA CoC’s
26 geographic area, forgoing the collaborative application process, stripping LA CoC
27 of its congressionally mandated role in ranking applications and funding priorities,
28 and taking away community control over homelessness funding from almost the

1 entire Los Angeles region. Kay Decl. ¶ 29–3042 Exh. G, Amended NOFO and
2 Appendix III.

3 As outlined in LA CoC’s complaint in intervention, Exhibit A, the new NOFO
4 would have dramatic consequences for LA CoC. The new NOFO not only prevents
5 LA CoC from applying for federal funds, it would apply HUD’s own ranking factors
6 for evaluating new projects, which diverge significantly from the factors LA CoC
7 has used to rank projects in the local competition. *Id.* ¶ 43. This will likely result in
8 the loss of millions of dollars to Los Angeles and a dramatic shift in the projects that
9 are funded in the region. *Id.* ¶ 46. Moreover, the new NOFO is inconsistent with
10 federal law and HUD’s own regulations. It institutes blanket remedial measures
11 against any CoC found out of compliance with federal regulations and usurps local
12 control of the CoC application process from local CoCs. *Id.* ¶ 42, Exh. G, Amended
13 NOFO and Appendix III. If LAHSA remains suspended, LA CoC will be subjected
14 to this illegal NOFO.

15 This result can only be viewed as intentional, rather than an unintended
16 consequence of HUD’s suspension of LAHSA. HUD’s actions against LAHSA and
17 tLA CoC come on the heel of numerous failed attempts by the Administration to
18 radically shift the CoC program away from funding renewal projects that are based
19 on community-supported and research-backed strategies, and towards its own
20 theories to address the homelessness crisis—ideas that are often at odds with local
21 priorities, especially in locations like Los Angeles.

22 HUD’s prior efforts have been thwarted—first by the U.S. District Court in
23 Rhode Island, which struck down the Administration’s first attempt to seize control
24 of the CoC program through radical changes to the national competition process in
25 2025,² and then by Congress, which in its 2026 allocation of homeless assistance

27 ² HUD’s FY 2026 Notice of Funding Opportunity (“NOFO”) that is at the center of
28 this litigation, faces another legal challenge, based on many of the same
allegations as the successful challenge to the FY 2025 NOFO for the CoC
program. The case, *National Alliance to End Homelessness v. Trump*, 1:26-CV-
00426, is pending before the same U.S. District Court in Rhode Island, and a

1 funding, continued to invest billions of dollars in the CoC program and its research
2 backed solutions, and importantly, to leave the majority of funding decisions in the
3 hands of local communities—the backbone of the CoC program.

4 Likewise, there is no basis for HUD’s latest attempts to seize control of the
5 CoC program, this time at the local funding. HUD’s attempt to divest LA CoC of
6 community control of CoC funding priorities is unprecedented and unsupported by
7 evidence or findings of any kind. Regardless of whether HUD may suspend
8 LAHSA, HUD set out no allegations of wrongdoing or deficiencies by LA CoC
9 itself. Nor did LAHSA’s suspension relate to the duties LAHSA performed as the
10 collaborative applicant for LA CoC. Kay Decl. ¶ 25. The letter also included no
11 findings that LA CoC itself could not operate effectively. *Id.* HUD did not provide
12 any grace period for LA CoC to identify a new collaborative applicant, even though
13 the HUD regulations and the NOFO itself allows a CoC to change its collaborative
14 applicant at any time, including where, as here, the collaborative applicant can no
15 longer perform its role. *Id.* ¶¶ 26, 35, Exh. F, FY 2026 NOFO. And critically, HUD
16 made no finding that the remedial measure HUD chose to take against LA CoC
17 would actually remediate the harm caused by LAHSA’s suspension—which it will
18 not. *Id.* ¶ 27. Allowing individual applicants will not remediate the harm caused to
19 LA CoC by HUD’s suspension of LAHSA because it has no bearing on the HMIS
20 and CES systems, which HUD has said are also currently suspended. *Id.* ¶.

21 HUD’s actions against LA CoC, based on its already suspect actions against
22 LAHSA, threaten to disrupt one of the most functional and stable tent poles of the
23 Los Angeles’s regional response to homelessness, without any support in the record
24 or the law.

25
26
27 _____
28 ruling on the challenge is expected by August 10, 2026. See Dkt. 27, Joint
Motion for Scheduling Order and to Waive Statements of Undisputed Facts
(setting an expedited briefing schedule that “will make it possible for the Court
to rule by August 10, 2026”); Dkt. 28, text order granting [27] Joint MOTION
for Scheduling Order and to Waive Statements of Undisputed Facts.

1 **III. ARGUMENT**

2 The Federal Rules recognize that persons whose interests may be substantially
3 affected by pending litigation should be afforded an opportunity to participate when
4 the requirements of Rule 24 are satisfied. *See* Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 24. Here, LA CoC
5 seeks to intervene as a plaintiff in this action, which directly concerns the
6 administration of the FY 2026 Continuum of Care funding process and decisions
7 that affect LA CoC’s congressionally mandated authority and responsibilities for the
8 Los Angeles region.

9 **A. LA CoC Is Entitled to Intervene as a Matter of Right.**

10 Rule 24(a) provides that a party “who claims an interest relating to the
11 property or transaction that is the subject of the action and is so situated that
12 disposing of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the movant’s
13 ability to protect its interest” must be allowed to intervene in a case “unless existing
14 parties adequately represent that interest.” Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 24(a)(2).

15 To be granted intervention as a matter of right, intervenors must demonstrate
16 that (1) the request to intervene is timely; (2) they have a “significant protectable
17 interest” relating to the matter that is the subject of the action; (3) a decision in the
18 action may, as a practical matter, impair or impede proposed intervenor’s ability to
19 protect its interest; and (4) the existing parties may not adequately represent
20 proposed intervenor’s interest. *Smith v. Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist.*, 830 F.3d
21 843, 853 (9th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Freedom from Religion Found., Inc. v. Geithner*,
22 644 F.3d 836, 841 (9th Cir. 2011)). The requirements are “broadly interpreted in
23 favor of intervention.” *Citizens for Balanced Use v. Mont. Wilderness Ass’n*, 647
24 F.3d 893, 897 (9th Cir. 2011). LA CoC easily satisfies each of these elements.

25 **1. The request is timely.**

26 A motion made “at an early stage of the proceedings” will generally satisfy
27 the timeliness requirement. *Citizens for Balanced Use*, 647 F.3d at 897. In evaluating
28 timeliness, courts consider: “(1) the stage of the proceeding at which an applicant

1 seeks to intervene; (2) the prejudice to other parties; and (3) the reason for and length
2 of the delay.” *Smith*, 830 F.3d at 854 (citations omitted); *see also United States v.*
3 *State of Washington*, 86 F.3d 1499, 1503 (9th Cir. 1996). Each factor supports
4 timeliness.

5 First, this case remains at the earliest stage of proceedings. The complaint was
6 filed on June 29, 2026, together with LAHSA’s *ex parte* application for a temporary
7 restraining order (“TRO”). *See Dkt. 15*, Pl.’s Ex Parte Appl. for Prelim. Relief. On
8 July 2, 2026, the Court converted the TRO application into a motion for preliminary
9 injunction and scheduled a hearing for August 6, 2026. *See Dkt. 21*, Order Setting
10 Prelim. Inj. Briefing Schedule. LA CoC seeks intervention before that hearing,
11 before any discovery has occurred, before any merits determination, and before the
12 Court has issued any substantive ruling. *See e.g., Idaho Farm Bureau Fed. v. Babbitt*,
13 58 F.3d 1392, 1397 (9th Cir. 1995) (finding intervention timely when applicant
14 moved to intervene prior to hearing on a preliminary injunction motion, before any
15 hearings or rulings on substantive matters).

16 Second, intervention will not prejudice any party. The Ninth Circuit has
17 recognized that the relevant prejudice inquiry focuses on prejudice caused by the
18 proposed intervenor’s delay in seeking intervention. *Smith*, 830 F.3d at 857. LA CoC
19 moved promptly after HUD’s actions threatened the CoC’s role in the FY 2026
20 funding competition. Intervention will not disrupt the proceedings or require
21 revisiting any prior decisions. By contrast, denial of intervention would prejudice
22 LA CoC because the outcome of this case directly affects its ability to carry out its
23 congressionally mandated functions of ranking projects and setting community
24 funding priorities for the FY 2026 CoC competition.

25 Third, the length of and reason for any delay strongly supports intervention.
26 Courts measure delay from the point at which the proposed intervenor knew or
27 should have known that its interests were no longer adequately protected.
28 *Washington*, 86 F.3d at 1503. LA CoC acted promptly once it became clear that the

1 litigation would directly affect LA CoC's interests and administration of the FY
2 2026 funding cycle. Since the filing of the Complaint, HUD has clarified the breadth
3 of the remedial measures it intends to direct at the LA CoC, identified CA-600 (LA
4 CoC's HUD-designed CoC Number), by issuing an amended FY 2026 specifically
5 targeted at the LA CoC. That NOFO spells out a potential direct-to-HUD application
6 process that HUD intends to apply to the LA CoC if the Court declines to stay HUD's
7 suspension of LAHSA and establishes deadlines that directly affect LA CoC's
8 ability to conduct the FY 2026 competition. LA CoC's motion immediately followed
9 these developments, which clarified that the harm to the CoC is distinct and
10 significant and as such, that LAHSA cannot adequately represent LA CoC's
11 interests. As such, the motion is timely.

12 **2. LA CoC has a significant protectable interest in this litigation.**

13 Rule 24(a) does not require that the protectable interest at stake in the
14 litigation be a specific legal or equitable interest. Rather, "the 'interest' test directs
15 courts to make a practical, threshold inquiry, and is primarily a practical guide to
16 disposing of lawsuits by involving as many apparently concerned persons as is
17 compatible with efficiency and due process." *In re Estate of Ferdinand E. Marcos*
18 *Human Rights Litigation*, [536 F.3d 980, 984–85](#) (9th Cir. 2008) (quoting *S. Cal.*
19 *Edison Co. v. Lynch*, [307 F.3d 794, 803](#) (9th Cir. 2002)).

20 The practical inquiry strongly supports intervention here. LA CoC serves as
21 the congressionally mandated body through which local stakeholders, including
22 people with lived experience of homelessness, service providers, and housing
23 agencies, collectively establish community priorities and determine how federal
24 Continuum of Care funding is ranked and allocated throughout most of Los Angeles
25 County. LA CoC is charged with coordinating the community's homelessness
26 response, conducting the local competition for federal funds, evaluating and ranking
27 projects, and designating a collaborative applicant to submit the consolidated
28 application to HUD on behalf of the LA CoC. See Compl. ¶¶ 28–32, [Dkt. 1](#).

1 Consistent with those responsibilities, LA CoC and LAHSA share the same
2 overarching objective in this litigation: preserving the integrity of the regional
3 Continuum of Care system.

4 HUD's attempt to immediately suspend LAHSA directly affects LA CoC.
5 HUD's June 18, 2026 letter and subsequent notices on July 16th and July 21st spell
6 out the consequences of the suspension on LA CoC, specifically targeting LA CoC's
7 governance, administration, and operation. See Compl. ¶¶ 9–11, 13, 14, 50, 62, 65,
8 69, 83–86, 114, 117, 133, 144, Dkt. 1. HUD has taken the position that its suspension
9 of LAHSA as a principle or participant in any federal contracts prevents LAHSA
10 from serving as the collaborative applicant for LA COC, which in turn prevents LA
11 CoC from proceeding through the FY 2026 funding process in the manner
12 contemplated by federal law. This gives HUD the authority to determine how over
13 \$140 million in federal funds will be allocated in Los Angeles, instead of vesting
14 that authority with LA CoC as Congress intended.

15 Moreover, LAHSA's suspension directly affects how LA CoC carries out its
16 federally assigned responsibilities, such as administration of the HMIS and
17 Coordinated Entry systems, which have been delegated by LA CoC to LAHSA.
18 LAHSA's interest in remaining eligible to perform these functions is distinct from
19 LA CoC's interest, which includes the ability to meet its obligations under federal
20 law and to remain eligible to seek funding for the region based on the priorities the
21 CoC sets for the community. Though LAHSA and LA CoC share a common interest
22 in preserving the regional homelessness response system and preventing disruption
23 to federal funding, their legal interests are not identical for purposes of Rule 24(a).
24 LAHSA's interest is centered on the lawfulness of its suspension and its continued
25 ability to perform delegated functions. LA CoC, by contrast, has an independent
26 interest in protecting its federally assigned governance role, satisfying its statutory
27 and regulatory obligations, preserving its authority to set community funding
28 priorities, and maintaining the integrity of the competition process.

1 Indeed, both HUD and LAHSA have recognized throughout this dispute that
2 LAHSA and LA CoC are distinct entities with distinct functions. As HUD itself
3 stated in its opposition to LAHSA's motion for preliminary injunction, "LAHSA is
4 not the LA CoC." Dkt. 25, Def's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary
5 Injunction at 33. See also Dkt. 1, Complaint at 4 (discussing the impact of HUD's
6 actions on LA CoC). The interests of the CoC therefore cannot be fully reduced to,
7 or assumed to be identical with, those of LAHSA. Rather, LA CoC seeks to protect
8 interests that are complementary to, and substantially aligned with, LAHSA's
9 requested relief. Intervention is necessary precisely because HUD's actions affect
10 both entities, albeit in different ways.

11 HUD's suspension of LAHSA will trigger remedial measures directly against
12 LA CoC as well as lead to related consequences that affect LA CoC's administration
13 of the FY 2026 competition and the treatment of projects competing for federal
14 funding. See Kay Decl. ¶ 22–23, Ex. C, June 18 Letter. The changes to HUD's
15 funding criteria, remedial requirements, and decision-making processes that HUD
16 has stated it will implement threaten to displace community priorities and
17 performance-based rankings with HUD's own standards that are dramatically
18 different from CoC's.

19 Further, the suspension of LAHSA occurred in the midst of an active funding
20 cycle, shortly before critical competition deadlines and with insufficient opportunity
21 for LA CoC to address any perceived deficiencies through ordinary administrative
22 processes. Had HUD proceeded through standard debarment procedures or
23 procedure for taking remedial measures or issuing sanctions against a recipient of
24 CoC funds that is spelled out in HUD's own regulation, see 24 CFR 578.107, LA
25 CoC would have had the ability to prepare for any resulting changes. Instead, the
26 immediate LAHSA suspension and attendant remedial measures have disrupted LA
27 CoC's ongoing administration of the FY 2026 competition at a critical stage,
28 creating uncertainty for project applicants and placing the continued operation of

1 housing programs serving Los Angeles’s most precariously housed residents at risk.
2 To the extent funding is reduced, withheld, or redirected as a result of HUD’s
3 actions, individuals presently housed with LA CoC funds could be forced to return
4 to the streets.

5 HUD’s actions affect the Los Angeles community’s ability to exercise its
6 congressionally authorized role in determining how federal homelessness funds are
7 prioritized and distributed. The consequences will be borne not only by LA CoC and
8 participating providers, but also by the individuals and families who depend on
9 housing and homelessness services funded through the Continuum of Care program.
10 As such, LA CoC possesses a direct, substantial, and legally protectable interest
11 sufficient to satisfy Rule 24(a).

12 **3. A decision in this Action may impair LA CoC’s ability to protect**
13 **its interests.**

14 To satisfy the third prong of the test for intervention as a matter of right, an
15 intervenor must show that “the disposition of this case will, as a practical matter,
16 affect” the interest at stake. *California ex rel Lockyer v. U.S.*, 450 F.3d 436, 442 (9th
17 Cir. 2006). Again, as with all the factors, the proposed intervenors need not
18 demonstrate their interest would be impaired in a legal sense, only that their interest
19 “would be substantially affected in a practical sense.” *Sw. Ctf. for Biological*
20 *Diversity v. Berg*, 268 F.3d 810, 822 (9th Cir. 2001) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 24,
21 Advisory Committee Notes).

22 Here, the disposition of this action may, as a practical matter, substantially
23 affect LA CoC’s ability to carry out its federally mandated responsibilities. The relief
24 requested by LAHSA goes directly to the validity and effect of HUD’s suspension
25 decision and related actions governing the FY 2026 CoC funding process. Under
26 HUD’s current schedule, LA CoC must finalize project rankings by August 11,
27 2026, and CoC Program applications are due shortly thereafter on August 26, 2026.
28 Kay Decl. ¶ 36. The outcome of this litigation will determine, among other things,

1 whether LAHSA may continue serving as collaborative applicant during the FY
2 2026 competition and whether HUD will require a different application process for
3 projects within CA-600. These outcomes would materially affect LA CoC's
4 competition administration and ability to secure funding for projects in Los Angeles.

5 Further, the Court's resolution of LAHSA's request for injunctive relief could
6 effectively determine LA CoC's rights before LA CoC has an opportunity to be
7 heard. HUD has made it explicitly clear that it intends to move forward with remedial
8 measures against LA CoC if this Court does not stay LAHSA's suspension.
9 Therefore, a ruling upholding HUD's actions against LAHSA would result in the
10 alteration of the procedures under which LA CoC conducts the FY 2026 competition
11 before the CoC could otherwise challenge those procedures. As outlined in the
12 proposed Complaint in Intervention, even if LAHSA remains suspended, the
13 implementation of remedial measures against the CoC raise serious concerns under
14 the APA, and the intended NOFO is illegal as a matter of law. If LA CoC is allowed
15 to join this case, it will be in the best position to raise these issues should HUD take
16 its intended remedial measures against LA CoC. Accordingly, the impairment
17 requirement of Rule 24(a) is satisfied.

18 **4. Plaintiff LAHSA does not fully represent LA CoC's interests.**

19 Finally, because LA CoC and LAHSA are separate entities, LAHSA cannot
20 adequately represent LA CoC's interests. Whether another party's representation of
21 intervenor's interests is adequate depends on: "(1) whether the interest of a present
22 party is such that it will undoubtedly make all of a proposed intervenor's arguments;
23 (2) whether the present party is capable and willing to make such arguments; and (3)
24 whether a proposed intervenor would offer any necessary elements to the proceeding
25 that other parties would neglect." *Arakaki v. Cayetano*, 324 F.3d 1078, 1086 (9th
26 Cir. 2003) (citations omitted). The burden to show that a party's interests may not
27 be adequately represented is minimal. *See Trbovich v. United Mine Workers of Am.*,
28 404 U.S. 528, 538 n.10 (1972) ("The requirement of the Rule is satisfied if the

1 applicant shows that representation of his interest ‘may be’ inadequate; and the
2 burden of making that showing should be treated as minimal.”). Here, LA CoC and
3 LAHSA are aligned in their argument that HUD did not have grounds to immediately
4 suspend LAHSA and that doing so was not in the public’s interest. But that is not all
5 that is at stake in this litigation; HUD’s proposed remedial measure are aimed
6 specifically at the LA CoC. As such, LAHSA cannot adequately represent LA CoC’s
7 interests under any of the factors identified in *Arakaki*.

8 **First**, there is no basis to conclude that LAHSA will “undoubtedly make all
9 of” LA CoC’s arguments. *Arakaki*, [324 F.3d at 1086](#). LAHSA’s objective in this
10 litigation is to overturn its suspension. LA CoC’s interests are materially different.
11 HUD has informed LA CoC that it considers the Continuum itself to be out of
12 compliance and has invoked remedial authority against LA CoC. HUD further
13 announced a potential “direct-to-HUD” application process that would completely
14 bypass LA CoC’s ranking authority altogether and transfer funding decisions from
15 local communities to HUD. Thus, while LAHSA seeks relief from its suspension,
16 LA CoC seeks to preserve its congressionally mandated role as the entity responsible
17 for establishing community funding priorities, and that interest remains, even if
18 LAHSA remains suspended. Because LAHSA’s interest is principally focused on
19 combatting its suspension, and LA CoC’s interest is focused on preserving the
20 institutional authority and governance structure of the Continuum itself, LAHSA
21 cannot be expected to “undoubtedly make all” of LA CoC’s arguments. *Arakaki*, [324](#)
22 [F.3d at 1086](#).

23 **Second**, LAHSA is not positioned to make the same arguments as LA CoC.
24 LA CoC will raise issues that LAHSA is not fully capable to present, including (1)
25 the structure and governance of LA CoC; (2) the impact of eliminating LA CoC’s
26 ranking authority; (3) the consequences for more than 8,000 households currently
27 residing in permanent housing funded through CoC grants; (4) the effect of HUD’s
28 remedial measures on LA CoC’s ability to designate an alternative collaborative

1 applicant, administer HMIS, conduct the Homeless Count, and oversee CES
2 functions; (5) the legality of the amendment to the FY2026 NOFO and the “direct-
3 to-HUD” process HUD intends to deploy in the LA CoC and more broadly; and (6)
4 the practical consequences of replacing community-developed priorities with
5 HUD’s newly adopted ranking criteria. As LAHSA outlines in its complaint, these
6 are injuries to LA CoC itself. *See* Dkt. Pl.’s Ex Parte Appl. for Prelim. Relief 43:4-
7 7, Dkt. 15-1.

8 **Third**, “[t]he ‘most important factor’ in assessing the adequacy of
9 representation is ‘how the interest compares with the interests of existing parties.’”
10 *Citizens for Balanced Use*, 647 F.3d at 898 (quoting *Arakaki*, 324 F.3d at 1086).
11 Though LA CoC and LAHSA share the same overarching objective, their alignment
12 on that objective does not mean that their interests are identical for purposes of Rule
13 24(a). LA CoC is the federally recognized Continuum of Care responsible for the
14 supplication for federal funds administered through the FY 2026 competition and
15 must protect its governance authority, its compliance obligations, and the continued
16 availability of federal funding for LA CoC as a whole. Accordingly, because
17 Plaintiff LAHSA cannot be expected to fully represent LA CoC’s distinct interests,
18 LA CoC satisfies Rule 24(a)’s inadequate-representation requirement.

19 In sum, HUD’s actions threaten to dismantle the very role Congress assigned
20 to local Continuums of Care. Congress created the CoC framework to ensure that
21 local communities—not the federal government—make the critical decisions
22 concerning homelessness funding. LA CoC’s central purpose is to facilitate local
23 collaboration and develop community-driven funding priorities. HUD’s
24 contemplated direct-to-HUD process would remove those decisions from Los
25 Angeles and place them directly in HUD’s hands. No existing party currently
26 represents that community interest. Because LA CoC’s statutory responsibilities,
27 governance, funding, and institutional interests are distinct from those of LAHSA,
28 LA CoC has satisfied Rule 24(a)’s “minimal” burden of showing that representation

1 of its interests “may be” inadequate. *Trbovich*, 404 U.S. at 538 n.10. Intervention as
2 of right should therefore be granted.

3 **B. In the Alternative, LA CoC Should Be Granted Permissive**
4 **Intervention.**

5 If the Court concludes that LA CoC is not entitled to intervene as a matter of
6 right, LA CoC should be granted permissive intervention. A party seeking
7 permissive intervention under Rule 24(b)(1)(B) must meet three threshold
8 requirements: “(1) an independent ground for jurisdiction; (2) a timely motion; and
9 (3) a common question of law and fact between the movant’s claim or defense and
10 the main action.” *Freedom from Religion Found., Inc. v. Geithner*, 644 F.3d 836,
11 843 (9th Cir. 2011) (internal quotation marks omitted). If a court determines that
12 these requirements are met, it may then consider other factors in deciding whether
13 to exercise its “broad discretion” to permit intervention. *Orange County v. Air Cal.*,
14 799 F.2d 535, 539 (9th Cir. 1986); see *Spangler v. Pasadena City Bd. of Educ.*, 552
15 F.2d 1326, 1329 (9th Cir. 1977). “Rule 24 traditionally receives liberal construction
16 in favor of applicants for intervention.” *Arakaki*, 324 F.3d at 1083. LA CoC easily
17 satisfies the threshold requirements for permissive intervention, and the
18 discretionary factors all weigh in its favor.

19 **1. LA CoC meets the three threshold requirements.**

20 The first requirement asks whether there is an “independent ground for
21 jurisdiction,” to ensure that intervention does not “enlarge inappropriately the
22 jurisdiction of the district courts.” *Freedom from Religion Found*, 644 F.3d at 843
23 (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 82). Where, as here, the case is a federal-question case and
24 jurisdiction is “grounded in the federal question(s) raised by the plaintiff,” the
25 jurisdictional requirement for intervention only precludes a proposed intervenor
26 from “seek[ing] to bring new state-law claims.” *Id.* at 844 (citations omitted). Where
27 the intervenor “brings no new claims, the jurisdictional concern drops away.” *Id.*;
28 accord *N. American Meat Institute v. Becerra*, 420 F. Supp. 3d 1014, 1021 (C.D.

1 Cal. 2019). Because LA CoC brings no state-law claims and challenges HUD’s
2 executive actions on the same grounds as LAHSA, the first element is satisfied.

3 LA CoC also satisfies the second requirement—timeliness of motion—
4 because as outlined above, it “seeks to intervene at the very outset of litigation.” *W.*
5 *States Trucking Ass’n v. Becerra*, No. 19 Civ. 2447, 2020 WL 1032348, at *2 (C.D.
6 Cal. Mar. 2, 2020).

7 Lastly, LA CoC satisfies the third threshold requirement of a common
8 question of law or fact. Where an intervenor shares “common questions” regarding
9 the constitutionality of the challenged government action, the third requirement is
10 met. *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Santa Barbara Cty. Board of Supervisors*, No. CV 22-
11 3225-DMG (MRWx), 2022 WL 17886021, at *3 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 1, 2022)
12 (concluding that the court has “discretion to allow intervention if...the applicant’s
13 claim or defense and the main action share common questions of law or fact”). Here,
14 LA CoC challenges the same executive actions that Plaintiff LAHSA challenges.
15 See Compl. ¶¶ 110–52, Dkt. 1.

16 In sum, LA CoC readily satisfies each of the threshold requirements for
17 permissive intervention. This action arises under federal law, LA CoC brings no
18 separate state-law claims, and its motion is timely in light of both the early stage of
19 the litigation and Defendants’ recent actions directly affecting LA CoC’s interests.
20 Moreover, LA CoC’s claims and defenses share the same factual and legal questions
21 presented by LAHSA’s challenge to Defendants’ executive actions. Because Rule
22 24(b) is to be construed liberally in favor of intervention, and because LA CoC’s
23 participation will assist the Court in resolving the important legal and practical issues
24 presented in this case, the Court should grant LA CoC permissive intervention under
25 Rule 24(b).

26 **2. The discretionary factors weigh in favor of intervention.**

27 While the threshold requirements are sufficient for the Court to grant
28 permissive intervention, the discretionary factors also weigh in favor of permissive

1 intervention. These include: (1) the nature and extent of the intervenors' interest; (2)
2 their standing to raise relevant legal issues; (3) the legal position they seek to
3 advance and its probable relation to the merits of the case; (4) whether the
4 intervenors' interests are adequately represented by other parties; (5) whether
5 intervention will prolong or unduly delay the litigation; and (6) whether the
6 intervenors will significantly contribute to full development of the underlying factual
7 issues and to the just and equitable adjudication of the legal questions presented.
8 *Spangler*, 552 F.2d at 1329; *accord Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 630 F.3d 898, 905
9 (9th Cir. 2011). Here, all the discretionary factors firmly weigh in favor of permitting
10 intervention.

11 **The nature and extent of interest.** Whether an applicant for intervention
12 demonstrates a sufficient interest is a "practical, threshold inquiry," and "no specific
13 legal or equitable interest need be established." *Citizens for Balanced Use*, 647 F.3d
14 at 897 (cleaned up). Indeed, interest in preserving the status quo on which LA CoC
15 and the unhoused citizens of Los Angeles depend is sufficient. As discussed above,
16 LA CoC has delegated a significant number of duties to LAHSA, which HUD has
17 taken the position its suspension prevents LAHSA from performing. LAHSA is
18 critical to LA CoC's role in creating the system of connecting unhoused people to
19 housing and services and maintaining the HMIS system to carry out key
20 responsibilities. LA CoC's interest in defending its ability to perform these
21 functions, which directly relate to basic human needs, is undeniably significant.

22 **Standing.** Rule 24 "plainly dispenses with any requirement that the intervenor
23 shall have a direct personal or pecuniary interest in the subject of the litigation."
24 *Ford Gum and Machine Co., Inc. v. Smackin' Snacks LLC*, No. CV 25-01529-MWF
25 (SKx), 2025 WL 2019827, at *3 (C.D. Cal. June 3, 2025). Here, HUD's remedial
26 measures are explicitly aimed at LA CoC, causing direct harm to LA CoC as an
27 organization. Likewise, LAHSA's suspension also causes harm to LA CoC. Without
28 relief, in the face of exceptional need from the homeless communities of Los

1 Angeles, LA CoC will be unable to submit a consolidated application for HUD
2 federal grants related to critical homelessness services in Los Angeles. *See E. Bay*
3 *Sanctuary Covenant v. Biden*, [993 F.3d 640, 663](#) (9th Cir. 2021) (“[A]n organization
4 has direct standing to sue where it establishes that the defendant’s behavior has
5 frustrated its mission and caused it to divert resources in response to that frustration
6 of purpose.”).

7 **Relevance of legal position to merits of case.** LA CoC’s legal position is
8 clearly in concert with LAHSA’s position: both seek to preserve the CoC’s ability
9 to apply for federal funds on behalf of the region’s thousands of unhoused residents
10 who rely on the funding for stable and healthy housing and who stand to lose it if
11 HUD’s suspension is upheld. LA CoC seeks to intervene to ensure that the breadth
12 of immediate harms caused by Defendants’ actions are fully presented to the Court
13 and that injunctive relief extends to the CoC.

14 **Adequacy of representation by other parties.** As discussed above, LAHSA
15 cannot adequately represent LA CoC’s interests. Although both challenge the same
16 executive actions, LA CoC may advance different theories and seek different relief
17 despite sharing LAHSA’s ultimate objective. *See BlueTriton Brands v. U.S. Forest*
18 *Serv.*, No. 24-CV-9720, [2025 WL 746247](#), at *3 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2025). Thus, LA
19 CoC has shown that LAHSA’s representation of its interests “may be” inadequate.
20 *Trbovich*, [404 U.S. at 538](#) n.10.

21 **Prejudice.** When an action is at the pleading stage, intervention does not
22 unduly delay the litigation. *Bacoka v. Best Buy Co.*, CV 18-866-R, [2018 WL](#)
23 [6430533](#), at *1 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2018) (“[I]ntervention would not prolong or
24 unduly delay the litigation but would instead likely have the practical benefit of
25 consolidating discovery, motions and trial on the same legal claims and factual
26 questions into a single action”). Because LA CoC timely seeks to intervene at this
27 early stage, LA CoC causes no cognizable prejudice to the parties.
28

Contributions to full development of underlying factual issues. The final factor considers whether “the parties seeking intervention will significantly contribute to full development of the underlying factual issues in the suit and to the just and equitable adjudication of the legal questions presented.” *Spangler*, 552 F.2d at 1329. LA CoC is uniquely positioned to speak to the impact the suspension will have on LA CoC, which carries the ultimate responsibility for applying for hundreds of millions of dollars in funding used to house thousands of formerly unhoused people in Los Angeles, including many disabled and older individuals, veterans, and families. See Compl. ¶ 22, Dkt. 1. As the congressionally mandated body responsible for establishing community funding priorities, ranking projects, and coordinating the Continuum of Care process in Los Angeles County, LA CoC plays a distinct role in the community-driven process that has been disrupted by HUD’s actions against LAHSA and the CoC. Its participation in this litigation will assist the Court in resolving the factual and legal issues presented. Accordingly, the discretionary factors weigh decisively in favor of granting permissive intervention. The Court should exercise its broad discretion under Rule 24(b) and permit LA CoC to intervene.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the Court should grant LA CoC’s motion to intervene.

Dated: July 31, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

LEGAL AID FOUNDATION OF LOS ANGELES

/s/ Shayla Myers

Shayla Myers

Attorneys for Proposed Plaintiff-Intervenor

Los Angeles Continuum of Care

1 PUBLIC COUNSEL

2
3 /s/ Mark Rosenbaum

4 Mark Rosenbaum

5 *Attorneys for Proposed Plaintiff-Intervenor*
6 *Los Angeles Continuum of Care*

7 STEPTOE LLP

8 /s/ Robyn C. Crowther

9 Robyn C. Crowther

10 *Attorneys for Proposed Plaintiff-Intervenor*
11 *Los Angeles Continuum of Care*

12 **Local Rule 5-4.3.4 Attestation**

13 I hereby attest that all signatories listed, and on whose behalf the filing is
14 submitted, concur in the filing's content and have authorized the filing.

15
16 DATED: July 31, 2026

STEPTOE LLP

17 /s/ Robyn C. Crowther

18 Robyn C. Crowther