1	ALBERT M. FLORES		
2	ALBERT M. FLORES LAW OFFICE		
	337 N 4th Ave		
3	Phoenix, AZ 85003		
4	Telephone: (602) 271-0070 amflegal@aol.com		
	Attorney No. 005653		
5	HENRY L. SOLANO*		
6	CARLA GORNIAK*		
_	CHRISTOPHER R. CLARK*		
7	DEWEY & LEBOEUF LLP		
8	1301 Avenue of the Americas		
9	New York, NY 10019		
	Telephone: (212) 259-8000 Facsimile: (212) 632-0162		
10	hsolano@DL.com		
11	cgorniak@DL.com		
12	crclark@DL.com		
12	Counsel for Amicus Curiae		
13	*Amaliantian for admission and has	ui a a familia a main a	
14	*Application for admission <i>pro hac</i>	vice forthcoming.	
1.5			
15	UNITED S	TATES DISTRICT COURT	
16	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA		
17			
18			
19	Friendly House, et al.,		
20	Plaintiffs,	CASE NO. CV-10-01061-MEA	
20	Trantitis,		
21	v.	MOTION FOR LEAVE	
22	Michael B. Whiting, et al.,	TO FILE AND BRIEF OF THE	
	Tricinaci D. Williams, & al.,	UNITED MEXICAN STATES	
23	Defendants.	AS AMICUS CURIAE	
24		IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	MOTIC	ON OF AMICUS CURIAE FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF IN SUPPORT	
3	OF PLAINTIFFS		
4	INTER	EST OF AMICUS CURIAE	
5	SUMM	IARY OF ARGUMENT	
6		MENT	
7	ARGO	WILINI	
8	I.	SB 1070 Impedes International Relations; There Needs to Be One Cohesive, Consistent and Controlling United States Voice	
9		A. SB 1070 Will Severely Hinder Trade and Tourism Between Mexico and Arizona	
10		und i in zonu	
11		B. SB 1070 Derails Efforts Towards Comprehensive Immigration Reform	
12		C. SB 1070 Obstructs International Collaboration to Combat Drug-	
13		Trafficking Organizations and Drug-Related Violence	
14	II.	Mexico's Has a Legitimate Interest Protecting Its Citizens' Rights Under the U.S. Constitution	
15		A. SB 1070's Results in Racial Profiling Reminiscent of African-American Discrimination	
16			
17		B. SB 1070's Harmful Effects Lead to Dangerous Harms Spanning From Physical Violence to Promotion of Negative, Ill-Conceived	
18		Stereotypes	
19	CONC	LUSION	
20	APPEN	NDIX A: INDEX OF CITED AUTHORITIES	
21	APPEN	DIX B: CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
22			
23			
24			
25			

MOTION OF AMICUS CURIAE FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1

As amicus curiae, the United Mexican States ("Mexico"), respectfully moves for leave of Court to file the accompanying brief. Amicus curiae has two significant sovereign interests as imposed by the Defendants' actions. Mexico has a substantial and compelling interest in ensuring that its bilateral diplomatic relations with the government of the United States of America ("U.S." or "United States") be transparent, consistent and reliable, and not frustrated by the actions of individual U.S. states, herein Arizona and its government officials. Amicus curiae's substantial and compelling interest also encompasses ensuring that its citizens are accorded human and civil rights when present in the United States in accordance with federal immigration law. In particular, Mexico has an interest in protecting its citizens and ensuring that their ethnicity is not used as basis for state-sanctioned acts of bias and discrimination. Therefore, amicus curiae respectfully requests that the Court grant leave to file this brief.

16 Respectfully submitted,

17

Albert M. Flores

337 N 4th Ave

Phoenix, AZ 85003

18 ALBERT M. FLORES

19

20

21

22

__

23

24

25

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

Telephone: (602) 271-0070

ALBERT M. FLORES LAW OFFICE

Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP

HENRY L. SOLANO
CARLA GORNIAK
CHRISTOPHER R. CLARK
DEWEY & LEBOEUF LLP

1301 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10019

Telephone: (212) 259-8000

¹ No person other than *amicus curiae* or its counsel authored this brief in whole or in part, or made a monetary contribution to its preparation or submission.

Counsel for Plaintiffs has consented to the filing of this brief.

INTEREST OF THE AMICUS CURIAE

The United Mexican States ("Mexico") respectfully submits this *amicus curiae* brief to express its grave concerns over Arizona Senate Bill 1070, 49th Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess., Ch. 113 (Az. 2010), as amended ("SB 1070"), and to underscore the importance of declaring SB 1070 unconstitutional in its entirety.

Mexico seeks to ensure that its bilateral diplomatic relations with the United States of America ("U.S." or "United States") are transparent, consistent and reliable, and not frustrated by individual U.S. states' actions, in particular the Arizona Defendants herein. SB 1070 substantially impacts Mexico, its officials and citizens, by inappropriately burdening the uniform and predictable sovereign-to-sovereign relations, opening the door to divergent requirements among the different states, and with respect to the national government.

Under Article 5(a) of the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, to which both countries are signatories, Mexico has a right to protect the interests of its nationals within the limits of international law.² Mexico seeks to assure that its citizens, present in the United States, are accorded the human and civil rights granted under the U.S. Constitution; having therefore a substantial and compelling interest in protecting its citizens and ensuring that their ethnicity is not used as basis for state-sanctioned acts of discrimination, including the inequitable application of civil and criminal laws and state's law enforcement powers. SB 1070 creates an imminent threat of state-sanctioned bias or

² Vienna Convention on Consular Relations art. 5, Apr. 24, 1963, 596 U.N.T.S. 261.

discrimination, resulting not only in individual injury, but also in broader social and economic harms to its citizens, undermining Mexico–U.S. relations.

The enactment of SB 1070 has been closely followed at the highest levels of the Mexican government and throughout Mexican society. The issues raised herein are of great importance to the people of Mexico, including the almost twenty million Mexican workers, tourists and students lawfully admitted to the United States throughout 2009, those already present or who will similarly be admitted to the U.S in the future, and the countless millions affected by international trade, immigration policies and drug violence.

The government of Mexico respectfully submits that SB 1070 adversely impacts the bilateral relations between Mexico and the United States, as well as law abiding Mexican citizens and other people of Latin-American descent present in Arizona as argued by Plaintiffs.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Through the enactment of SB 1070, Arizona has taken action that decisively departs from the collective immigration policy of the United States for the purpose of imposing Arizona's own independent and conflicting set of requirements. Such action directly and indirectly interferes with the bilateral economic, immigration and security policies of Mexico and the U.S. federal government. Thus, SB 1070 raises substantial challenges to the bilateral diplomatic relations between Mexico and the U.S.

In addition, Mexico is gravely concerned that SB 1070 will lead to disparate treatment among Mexican nationals in the U.S., as well as disparate treatment as compared to U.S. citizens. This disparate treatment will be in the form of racial profiling

and detentions of Mexican citizens without regard to whether they have taken any actions or exhibited any behavior indicating they are guilty of a crime or "unlawfully present" in the U.S.

ARGUMENT

I. SB 1070 Impedes International Relations; There Needs to Be One Cohesive, Consistent and Controlling United States Voice

"The Federal Government, representing as it does the collective interests of the [fifty] states, is entrusted with full and exclusive responsibility for the conduct of affairs with foreign sovereignties." Through SB 1070, Arizona imposes its own independent and conflicting requirements. Arizona does this despite specific provisions of federal immigration law that permit Arizona to assist with the enforcement of immigration law after receiving federal approval and appropriate training to ensure constitutionality.⁴ Arizona's unilateral action burdens Mexico enormously by forcing its officials and citizens to respond to divergent requirements imposed by the different divisions of the U.S. government. In order to conduct effective diplomatic relations with the U.S., countries such as Mexico need and depend on transparent, consistent and reliable bilateral negotiations. Amicus cannot effectively collaborate with the United States on a sovereign basis to address inherently international matters such as immigration, trade and security, if U.S. political subdivisions establish their own requirements that conflict not only with each other but also with the efforts, priorities and commitments of the U.S. federal government.

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

²³²⁴

³ Hines v. Davidowitz, 312 U.S. 52, 63 (1941); see also Meissner Decl. ¶¶ 13-14 (asserting that States' interventions frustrate the federal government's ability to achieve its objectives).

⁴ See 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g) (2006).

SB 1070 adversely impacts U.S. relations with foreign countries, directly interfering with the U.S. Department of State's ability to conduct foreign affairs and policy. 5 As conveyed by U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, although SB 1070 is not yet in effect, it is already straining U.S.-Mexico relations. Mexico's ambassador to the U.S. Arturo Sarukhan explains that SB 1070 "threatens to poison the well from which our two nations have found and should continue to find inspiration for a joint future of prosperity, security, tolerance and justice."⁷ A. SB 1070 Will Severely Hinder Trade and Tourism Between Mexico and Arizona One area of great concern to Mexico relates to the repercussions of SB 1070 on trade and commercial relations with the United States. Growth in U.S. trade with Latin America has historically outpaced that of all other regions. Mexico is the third largest

13 14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

⁵ Meissner Decl. ¶¶ 32–33. 18

trading partner of the United States and the second purchaser of U.S. exports. ⁹ The

interaction of labor markets, tourism, business travel, and student migration between the

- 5 -

23

24

⁶ See Meet the Press with Secretary Clinton [Transcript] (May 2, 2010), available at http://secretaryclinton.wordpress.com/2010/05/02/meet-the-press/.

⁷ Instituto Cultural Mexicano, Entrega de los premios Ohtli, at 3 (May 4, 2010), www.ime.gob.mx/documentos/Entrega Ohtlis.doc; CNN, U.S., Mexican Presidents Say Key Issues Must be Tackled Together (May 20, 2010),

http://www.cnn.com/2010/US/05/19/ mexico.president.visit/index.html. See also Lowenthal Decl. ¶ 10.

⁸ J. F. Hornbeck, U.S.-Latin America Trade: Recent Trends and Policy Issues, Congressional Research Service, at 1 (Sept. 3, 2009), available at http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/98-840.pdf.

⁹ M. Angeles Villarreal, U.S.-Mexico Economic Relations: Trends, Issues, and Implications, Congressional Research Service, at 1 (Mar. 31, 2010), available at http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL32934.pdf.

http://ebr.eller.arizona.edu/research/ mexican visitors to arizona 2007 08.pdf.

¹³ Hornbeck, *supra* note 8, at 5; Villarreal, *supra* note 9, at 16-18.

times." ¹⁴ Strained diplomatic ties substantially impede the ability of the U.S. and Mexico 1 2 to collaboratively develop, enhance and maintain commercial ties critical to their 3 economies. 4 B. SB 1070 Derails Efforts Towards Comprehensive Immigration Reform 5 With over eleven million nationals in the U.S., Mexico has a significant interest in 6 U.S. comprehensive immigration reform. The United States is equally interested in 7 Mexico's involvement. In fact, one of the five immigration principles of the Obama 8 administration is to collaborate with Mexico.¹⁵ Immigration was a principal topic discussed by the presidents of Mexico and the 10 U.S. in their May 19, 2010 meeting. As President Barack Obama acknowledged, both 11 countries share a responsibility to address the issue. Among the responsibilities, he noted 12 Mexico's efforts to create jobs and the United States' efforts to "fix our broken 13 immigration system[.]",16 Both presidents expressed their belief that SB 1070 is a 14 "misdirected effort" to address immigration concerns, and that collaboration among the 15 two federal governments is essential to ensure that immigration reform "does not have an 16 17 adverse impact on the economies of [the border] regions."17 18 19 ¹⁴ Press Release, The White House, Remarks by President Calderón of Mexico at 20 Official Arrival Ceremony (May 19, 2010), available at 21 http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-calder-n-mexicoofficial-arrival-ceremony. See also Dep't of Transp. v. Pub. Citizen, 541 U.S. 752, 770 22 (2004) (removing blockade to cross-border trucking); and Villarreal, supra note 9, at 20-24 (discussing Mexico-U.S. trade issues). 23

 17 *Id*.

¹⁵ The White House, *Immigration* (last visited June 10, 2010),

¹⁶ Remarks by Presidents Obama and Calderón, supra note 10.

http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/immigration.

²⁴ 25

The effects of U.S.–Mexico migration to labor markets, tourism, business travel, 1 and education is of great importance to both the U.S. and Mexico. ¹⁸ Mexican citizens 2 3 comprised the highest percentage (12%) of the 163 million non-immigrants legally 4 admitted into the United States in 2009, including tourists, business travelers, specialty 5 workers and students. ¹⁹ Furthermore, as noted by President Obama, the countries also 6 profit from the intellectual exchange.²⁰ 7 Immigration policy is crucial to the communities of the 2000-mile U.S.-Mexico 8 border. As noted by President Obama, "there are enormous flows of trade and tourists and people along the border region; the economies are interdependent[.]"²¹ In addition to 10 immigration, law enforcement policies are critical to border areas highly susceptible to 11 drug-related violence. Accordingly, 12 [r]ecognizing the importance of securing and facilitating the lawful flow of goods, 13 services, and people between their countries[,] [u]nderstanding that joint and collaborative administration of their common border is critical to transforming 14 management of the border to enhance security and efficiency[, and u]nderstanding 15 that law enforcement coordination between the Participants is essential to preventing crime and to disrupting and dismantling transnational criminal 16 organizations[,]" 17 on May 19, 2010, amicus and the United States entered into the Declaration by The 18 Government Of The United States Of America and The Government Of The United 19 Mexican States Concerning Twenty-First Century Border Management to express their 20 ¹⁸ Id. See also, Jacoby, supra note 10, at 54-58 (noting that foreign labor has 21 complemented, not competed with, the U.S. labor force). ¹⁹ Randall Monger and MacReadie Barr, Nonimmigrant Admissions to the United 22 States: 2009, Department of Homeland Security Office of Immigration Statistics

(April 2010), available at http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/

23

24

25

publications/ni_fr_2009.pdf.

 $^{^{20}}$ Remarks by Presidents Obama and Calderón, supra note 10 (highlighting Calderón's U.S. education). 21 Id.

commitment to strengthen collaboration to enhance economic exchange, lawful travel, and to dismantle criminal organizations.²²

It is due to the social, economic, intellectual and security benefits of international collaboration, that the United States federal government and Mexico recognize the importance of comprehensive immigration reform.²³ Through SB 1070, Arizona impinges upon the US-Mexico bilateral agenda and obstructs the bi-national collaboration to tackle immigration and border problems, while preserving the benefits of economic and intellectual exchange. SB 1070 institutes an independent state system of immigration enforcement that not only derails bilateral economic, social and security efforts, but imperils the U.S. federal government's efforts at a comprehensive solution for immigration policy. Mexico cannot effectively cooperate or engage in meaningful bilateral relations with the U.S. when states are permitted to interfere with the sovereigns' bilateral efforts.

C. SB 1070 Obstructs International Collaboration to Combat Drug-Trafficking Organizations and Drug-Related Violence

For over thirty years, the war against drug-trafficking organizations has been a critical issue for the U.S. and Latin American governments.²⁴ Recently, the fight against

²⁰ Press Release, The White House, Declaration by The Government Of The United States Of America and The Government Of The United Mexican States Concerning
21 Twenty-First Century Border Management (May 19, 2010), available at

Twenty-First Century Border Management (May 19, 2010), available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/declaration-government-united-states-america-and-government-united-mexican-states-c.

 $^{^{23}}$ Remarks by Presidents Obama and Calderón, supra note 10.

²⁴ Clare Ribando Seelke, Liana Sun Wyler and June S. Beittel, *Latin America and the Caribbean: Illicit Drug Trafficking and U.S. Counterdrug Programs*,

Congressional Research Service (Feb. 3, 2010), available at

http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/R41215_ 20100430.pdf; see also Steven E. Hendrix,

Mexican drug-trafficking organizations has taken the spotlight. Approximately seven thousand people were killed by drug-related violence in Mexico in the past year;²⁵ 31% took place in the border State of Chihuahua.²⁶ The current and previous U.S. administrations have recognized the shared responsibility for drug-related violence, and determined that "it is absolutely critical that the United States joins as a full partner in dealing with this issue."²⁷ As numerous scholars highlight, "without changes in U.S. drug policy, efforts to combat DTOs [drug-trafficking organizations] or to address Mexico's own growing domestic demand for drugs will be futile."²⁸

To this end, following extensive negotiations between the U.S. and Mexico, the Merida Initiative was announced on October 22, 2007. This initiative is a training and equipment bilateral cooperation package intended to collaboratively strengthen the counter-narcotic efforts of both governments.²⁹ In connection with the Merida Initiative, former U.S. President George W. Bush stated: "The United States is committed to this joint strategy to deal with a joint problem. I would not be committed to dealing with this if I wasn't convinced that President Felipe Calderón had the will and the desire to protect

The Merida Initiative for Mexico and Central America, 5 Loy. U. Chi. Int'l L. Rev 107, 108-09 (2007-2008).

²⁵ David A. Shirk, *Drug Violence in Mexico: Data and Analysis from 2001-2009*, Trans-Border Institute, at 1 (Jan. 2010), *available at* http://www.justiceinmexico.org/resources/pdf/drug_violence.pdf.

 $^{||^{26}}$ *Id.* at 2, 6-7.

^{22 |} Times, at 1-3 (Apr. 17, 2009), available at http://www.timesonline. co.uk/tol/news/world/us and americas/article6108394.ece.

^{23 | 28} Shirk, *supra* note 25, at 12.

²⁹ Hendrix, *supra* note 24, at 109-10, 112; Clare Ribando Seelke, Mark P. Sullivan and June S. Beittel, *Mexico-U.S. Relations*, Congressional Research Service, at 14 (Feb. 3, 2010), *available at* http://www.hsdl.org/?view&doc= 19141&coll=public.

his people from narco-traffickers."³⁰ Cooperation under the Merida Initiative has made great strides, leading the United States and Mexico to successfully make over a thousand arrests, including top-members of multiple drug-trafficking organizations, as well as to intelligence-sharing, and strengthening the implementation of weapon tracing and cash seizure initiatives.³¹

As the U.S. and Mexico attempt to strengthen trust and collaboration among binational federal, state and local law enforcement to attack drug-trafficking organizations and drug-related violence, SB 1070 threatens the U.S.–Mexico efforts by straining and encumbering bilateral collaboration. Moreover, SB 1070 will further obstruct international goals to control drug-related violence by raising a very real risk of reducing crime-reporting in Arizona, including by Mexican nationals, 32 thereby impeding law enforcement's efforts to continue making arrests and seizures on both sides of the border. Former U.S. President Bush's opinion – regarding the U.S.'s inability to unilaterally commit to a project – is a sentiment shared on both sides of the border. Mexico equally cannot in good faith negotiate and collaborate with the United States without certainty

 $^{^{30}}$ Id. at 113.

³¹ Roberta S. Jacobson, *U.S.-Mexico Security Cooperation*, Statement Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs (May 27, 2010), *available at* http://www.state.gov/p/wha/rls/rm/2010/142297.htm; Seelke, *Mexico-U.S. Relations*, *supra* note 29, at 1-6, 13-20.

³² See Phillip Atiba Goff, Liana Maris Epstein, Chris Burbank, and Tracie L. Keesee, Deputizing Discrimination?, The Consortium for Police Leadership in Equity (May 3, 2010) (on file with authors) (analyzing the chilling effects on crime reports of a Utah statute permitting state law enforcement to identify and detain individuals whose immigration status may be in question); see also Chris Burbank, Phillip Atiba Goff, and Tracie L. Keesee, Policing Immigration: A Job We Do Not Want, HUFFINGTON POST (June 7, 2010), available at

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/chief-chris-burbank/policing-immigration-a-jo b 602439.html.

that the bilateral efforts will not be obstructed by divergent political subdivisions, like Arizona. This interference with federal policies is of particular concern in U.S. border states including Arizona, which play a significant operations role regarding the Merida Initiative's goal of controlling weapons traffic into Mexico.³³

"[T]he interest of the cities, counties and states, no less than the interests of the people of the whole nation, imperatively requires that federal power in the field affecting foreign relations be left entirely free from local interference." For this reason, James Madison expressed: "If we are to be one nation in any respect, it clearly ought to be in respect to other nations." As a foreign nation, Mexico has a compelling interest in maintaining its bilateral relations based on respect for the constitutional law of the United States, and in the invalidation of SB 1070.

II. Mexico Has a Legitimate Interest Protecting Its Citizens' Rights Under the U.S. Constitution

The Mexican government respectfully submits that history demonstrates the state sanctioned actions, like SB 1070, violate the basic tenets of the U.S. Constitution that guaranteeing freedom, liberty and equal protection of the law. Sovereign actions by the United States against minority populations at perceived times of threat have proven unwarranted. For example, the actions taken toward African-Americans during and prior

trafficking organizations).

nwsource.com/html/nationworld/2004396644_apguntraffickingbust.html (describing

arrest of gun shop owner in Phoenix who knowingly sold firearms to Mexican drug-

Drug Cartels, Seattle Times (May 6, 2008), available at http://seattletimes.

³³ See e.g., Amanda Lee Meyers, Officials: Phoenix Gun Dealer Sold to Mexican

³⁴ Hines v. Davidowitz, 312 U.S. at 63.

³⁵ The Federalist No. 42 (James Madison) (concerning regulation of intercourse with foreign nations); *see also* The Federalist No. 4 (John Jay) (concerning dangers from foreign force and influence).

to the Civil Rights movement underscore the potential harm and lasting negative effects of SB 1070.

Discriminatory and biased legal enforcement have adverse legal, social, economic and political implications, and underline Mexico's legitimate interest in assuring that its citizens are not deprived of protection under the U.S. Constitution and not subjected to hostile attitudes or action by U.S. society. As of 2008, there were 11.4 million Mexicanborn individuals living in the United States, 5.4% of them live in Arizona.³⁶ Moreover, the Ninth Circuit acknowledged in 2000 that "[t]he Hispanic population of the nation and of the Southwest and Far West in particular, has grown enormously — at least five-fold in the four [border] states referred to in the Supreme Court's decision [Arizona, California, New Mexico and Texas]."³⁷ In fact, recent preliminary demographic information establishes that minorities represent more that fifty percent of the population in Hawaii, New Mexico, California and Texas, making use of race and ethnicity as a law enforcement factor inappropriate.³⁸

Alongside these demographic changes, the 9th Circuit also noted that there have been "significant changes in the law restricting the use of race as a criterion in government decision-making," with the court concluding that the "use of race and

2010), *available at* http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2010/06/11/minority_population_growing_census_says/.

³⁶ Aaron Terrazas & Jeanne Batalova, Migration Policy Institute, Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States (2009), http://www.migrationinformation.org/ feature/display.cfm?ID=747#3b.

³⁷ *United States v. Montero-Camargo*, 208 F.3d 1122, 1133 (9th Cir. 2000). The court pointed out that race "may be considered when the suspected perpetrator of a specific offense has been identified as having such an appearance." *Id.* at 1134 n.22. ³⁸ Hope Yen, *Minority Population Growing, Census Says*, Associated Press (June 11,

ethnicity for such purposes has been severely limited."³⁹ The Court further opined that even at border check stops, "at this point in our nation's history, and given the continuing changes in our ethnic and racial composition, Hispanic appearance is, in general, of such little probative value that it may not be considered as a relevant factor where particularize or individualized suspicion is required...[to be used] in determining which particular individuals among the vast Hispanic populace should be stopped by law enforcement officials on the lookout for illegal aliens.⁴⁰ Given the public rhetoric by the Arizona Governor and other state officials, together with the implied reference in A.R.S. Sec. 11-1051(B), sending an impermissible impression of U.S. and Arizona Constitutional support for using race and ethnicity pursuant to SB 1070, Mexico is rightfully concerned for the civil rights of its citizens in Arizona. Until *Montero-Camargo*, as late as 2000, U.S. Border Patrol agents impermissibly used Hispanic appearance as a singularly sufficient basis to stop Hispanics for immigration purposes.

A. SB 1070's Results in Racial Profiling Reminiscent of African-American Discrimination

SB 1070 gives local officers *carte blanche* authority to stereotype and to rely on the popular perception that appearances of "foreign-ness" are justifiable means for disparate treatment. These "[n]egative stereotypes are further promulgated because profiling prompts more investigations, which will inevitably result in more arrests and convictions of members of the targeted group."⁴¹ Commentators note that immigration

⁴⁰ *Id.* at 1134.

³⁹ Montero-Camargo, 208 F.3d at 1143 (citing Adarand Constructors v. Pena, 515)

U.S. 200 (1995); City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., 488 U.S. 469 (1989).

⁴¹ See John Dwight Ingram, Racial and Ethnic Profiling, 29 T. Marshall L. Rev 55, 76 (2003).

enforcement, especially in the Southwest, regularly imposes indignities on U.S. citizens and lawful immigrants of Mexican ancestry not also imposed on the white, non-Hispanic population.⁴²

Mexico is justifiably concerned that stereotypes and bias will be used by law enforcement as state sanctioned. When Arizona Governor Jan Brewer was asked what criteria will be used as reasonable suspicion of a person's legal status in the U.S., she focused on the physical appearance of "illegal immigrants," stating:

I do not know what an illegal immigrant looks like. I can tell you that there are people in Arizona that assume they know what an illegal immigrant looks like. I don't know if they know that for a fact or not, but I know that if AZPosts [Arizona Peace Officers] gets themselves together, works on this law, puts down the description that the law will be enforced civilly, fairly and without discriminatory points to it.⁴³

Giving state police the authority to simply create a description of what an illegal immigrant looks like is plainly racial profiling, which is why Mexico is concerned.⁴⁴ This inevitably will lead to casting an overbroad net in the pursuit of "illegal immigrants," with individuals being stopped based on appearance.

This unfair and disproportionate targeting of Hispanics and Latin-Americans in immigration enforcement is similar to that witnessed by young African-American males in criminal law enforcement. One federal judge has analogized the dangers of racial profiling in immigration (border patrol enforcement) to the experience of *driving while* black: "How is this practice distinguishable from the former practice of Southern peace

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

 $^{^{42}}$ *Id*.

⁴³ CNN Wire Staff, Arizona Governor Signs Immigration Bill, CNN, Apr. 24, 2010, available at http://www.cnn.com/2010/POLITICS/04/23/ 24 obama.immigration/index.html.

⁴⁴ See Montero-Camargo, 208 F.3d 1122.

officers who randomly stopped black pedestrians to inquire, 'Hey, boy, what are you doin' in this neighborhood?'."

B. SB 1070's Harmful Effects Lead to Dangerous Harms Spanning From Physical Violence to Promotion of Negative, Ill-Conceived Stereotypes

Finally, Mexico, as a sovereign, needs to protect its people. SB 1070 endangers this goal. First, as demonstrated by New York City's experience in the mistaken shooting deaths of two black men, Amadou Diallo and Sean Bell, and the brutal torture of a third black man, Abner Louima, one small mishap of racial profiling by law enforcement can lead to public outcry and distrust of law enforcement by local communities. Additionally, racial profiling by law enforcement may encourage private organizations or citizens to target Mexican citizens, as seen when armed ranchers in Douglas, Arizona used unjustified force to arrest Hispanic persons crossing their land.

Second, SB 1070 promotes negative, ill-conceived stereotypes about "Mexican appearance." The statute gives untrained local officials the authority to determine who fits "Mexican appearance" and who does not. By sanctioning pre-textual detainment and questioning of Hispanics or Latin Americans perceived to be "illegal aliens", the bill creates a social and political hotbed for further acts of discrimination or rights abrogation,

- 16 -

⁴⁵ United States v. Zapata-Ibarra, 223 F.3d 281, 285 (5th Cir. 2000) (Wiener, J., dissenting). See Joan W. Howarth, Representing Black Male Innocence, 1 J. Gender, Race & Just. 97, 106 (1997). "The stereotype that all Latino's are 'foreigners' of suspicious immigration status influences immigration law." Similarly, "the deeply imbedded idea of a frightening Black man has some influence on every person in America, including every person in the criminal justice system. Each stage of [the

American] criminal justice process reflects and reinforces the 'knowledge' that Black male means criminal."

⁴⁶ See Kevin R. Johnson, How Did You Get to be Mexican? A White/Brown Man's Search for Identity 46 (1999).

⁴⁷ See Smita P. Nordwall & Elliot Blair Smith, Mexico Threatens to Sue Arizona Ranchers, USA Today, May 3, 2000 at 19A.

1	perpetuating the cycle of exclusion. ⁴⁸ Fo	or example, "[m]ost [persons of Mexican	
2	ancestry] are of dark complexion with black hair [b]ut many are blond, blue-eyed an		
3	'white', while others have red hair and hazel eyes." Furthermore, when aligned with		
4	other drastic measures, such as the recently enacted bill intended to ban the multicultural		
5	studies program in the Tucson Unified School District, it becomes unavoidable to see the		
6	Arizona's legislative efforts constitute a discriminatory policy. SB 1070's discriminatory		
7		ights of people living in the United States.	
8			
9		NCLUSION	
10	For the foregoing reasons, <i>amicus curiae</i> respectfully requests that this Court		
11	declare SB 1070 unconstitutional in its e	entirety.	
12	Respectfully submitted,		
13			
14	Albert M. Flores	Dewey & LeBoeuf LLP	
15	ALBERT M. FLORES ALBERT M. FLORES LAW OFFICE	HENRY L. SOLANO CARLA GORNIAK	
16	337 N 4th Ave	CHRISTOPHER R. CLARK DEWEY & LEBOEUF LLP	
17	Phoenix, AZ 85003 Telephone: (602) 271-0070	1301 Avenue of the Americas	
18		New York, NY 10019 Telephone: (212) 259-8000	
19	Counsel for Amicus Curiae		
20			
21			
22			
23	48 Fli I Kay Olinhant Commont Con	nsidering Race in American Immigration	
24	Jurisprudence, 54 Emory L.J. 681, 70	8 (2005).	
25	49 See Julian Samora & Patricia Vandel Simon, A History of the Mexican-American People 8 (rev. ed. 1993).		

- 17 -

ATTACHMENT A

2	INDEX OF CITED AUTHORITIES
3	CASES
	Adarand Constructors v. Pena, 515 U.S. 200 (1995)
4	City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co., 488 U.S. 469 (1989)
5	Dep't of Transp. v. Pub. Citizen, 541 U.S. 752 (2004)
6	Hines v. Davidowitz, 312 U.S. 52 (1941)
	<i>United States v. Montero-Camargo</i> , 208 F.3d 1122 (9th Cir. 2000) 13-15
7	United States v. Zapata-Ibarra, 223 F.3d 281 (5th Cir. 2000)
8	STATUTE AND TREATY
9	8 U.S.C. § 1357(g) (2006)
10	Vienna Convention on Consular Relations art. 5, Apr. 24, 1963, 596 U.N.T.S.
10	261
11	OTHER AUTHORITIES
12	Aaron Terrazas & Jeanne Batalova, Migration Policy Institute, Frequently Requested
13	Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States (2009), http://www.migrationinformation.org/feature/display.cfm?ID=747
	#3b
14	Amanda Lee Meyers, Officials: Phoenix Gun Dealer Sold to Mexican Drug
15	Cartels, Seattle Times (May 6, 2008), available at http://seattletimes.
16	nwsource.com/html/nationworld/2004396644_apguntraffickingbust.html 12 Clare Ribando Seelke, Liana Sun Wyler and June S. Beittel, <i>Latin America</i>
	and the Caribbean: Illicit Drug Trafficking and U.S. Counterdrug
17	Programs, Congressional Research Service (Feb. 3, 2010), available at
18	http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/R41215_20100430.pdf
19	Clare Ribando Seelke, Mark P. Sullivan and June S. Beittel, <i>Mexico-U.S. Relations</i> , Congressional Research Service, at 14 (Feb. 3, 2010), <i>available</i>
	at http://www.hsdl.org/?view&doc=119141&coll=public 10, 11
20	CNN, U.S., Mexican Presidents Say Key Issues Must be Tackled Together
21	(May 20, 2010), http://www.cnn.com/2010/US/05/19/mexico.president. visit/ index.html
22	CNN Wire Staff, <i>Arizona Governor Signs Immigration Bill</i> , CNN, Apr. 24,
	2010, available at http://www.cnn.com/2010/POLITICS/04/23/obama.
23	immigration/index.html
24	

1	Chris Burbank, Phillip Atiba Goff, and Dr. Tracie L. Keesee, <i>Policing Immigration: A Job We Do Not Want</i> , Huffington Post (June 7, 2010),
2	available at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/chief-chris-burbank/policing-immigration-a-jo_b_602439.html
3	David A. Shirk, <i>Drug Violence in Mexico: Data and Analysis from 2001-2009</i> ,
4	Trans-Border Institute, at 1 (Jan. 2010), available at http://www. justiceinmexico.org/resources/pdf/drug_violence.pdf
5	Eli J. Kay-Oliphant, Comment, Considering Race in American Immigration Jurisprudence, 54 Emory L.J. 681, 708 (2005)
7	The Federalist No. 4 (John Jay) (concerning dangers from foreign force and influence)
8	The Federalist No. 42 (James Madison) (concerning regulation of intercourse with foreign nations)
9	Giovanni Peri, The Impact of Immigrants in Recession and Economic
10	Expansion, University of California Davis 10 (June 2010), available at http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/Peri-June2010.pdf) 6
11 12	Hope Yen, <i>Minority Population Growing, Census Says</i> , Associated Press (June 11, 2010), <i>available at</i> http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2010/06/11/minority_population_growing_census_says/
13	Instituto Cultural Mexicano, <i>Entrega de los premios Ohtli</i> 3 (May 4, 2010), www.ime.gob.mx/documentos/Entrega_Ohtlis.doc
14 15	J. F. Hornbeck, <i>U.SLatin America Trade: Recent Trends and Policy Issues</i> , Congressional Research Service 1 (Sept. 3, 2009), <i>available at</i> http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/98-840.pdf
16	Joan W. Howarth, <i>Representing Black Male Innocence</i> , 1 J. Gender, Race & Just. 97, 106 (1997)
17	John Dwight Ingram, <i>Racial and Ethnic Profiling</i> , 29 T. Marshall L. Rev 55, 76 (2003)
18 19	Julian Samora & Patricia Vandel Simon, <i>A History of the Mexican-American</i> People 8 (rev. ed. 1993)
20	Kevin R. Johnson, How Did You Get to be Mexican? A White/Brown Man's Search for Identity 46 (1999)
21 22	M. Angeles Villarreal, <i>U.SMexico Economic Relations: Trends, Issues, and Implications</i> , Congressional Research Service, at 1 (Mar. 31, 2010), <i>available at</i> http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/ RL32934.pdf 5-7
23	Meet the Press with Secretary Clinton [Transcript] (May 2, 2010), available
24	at http://secretaryclinton.wordpress.com/2010/05/02/meet-the-press/
- 1	

1	Phillip Atiba Goff, Liana Maris Epstein, Chris Burbank, and Tracie L. Keesee, Deputizing Discrimination?, The Consortium for Police Leadership in
2	Equity (May 3, 2010)
3	Press Release, The White House, Declaration by The Government Of The United States Of America and The Government Of The United Mexican
4	States Concerning Twenty-First Century Border Management (May 19, 2010), available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/
5	declaration-government-united-states-america-and-government- united-mexican-states-c
6 7	Press Release, The White House, Remarks by President Calderón of Mexico at Official Arrival Ceremony (May 19, 2010), available at
8	http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-calder-n-mexico-official-arrival-ceremony
9	Press Release, The White House, Remarks by President Obama and President Calderón of Mexico at Joint Press Availability (May 19,
10	2010), available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-obama-and-president-calder-n-mexico-joint-press-
11	availability
12	Randall Monger and MacReadie Barr, <i>Nonimmigrant Admissions to the United States: 2009</i> , Department of Homeland Security Office of
13	Immigration Statistics (April 2010), available at http://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/statistics/publications/ni_fr_2009.pdf
1415	Roberta S. Jacobson, <i>U.SMexico Security Cooperation</i> , Statement Before the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs (May 27, 2010), <i>available at</i> http://www.state.gov/p/wha/rls/rm/2010/142297.htm
1617	Smita P. Nordwall & Elliot Blair Smith, <i>Mexico Threatens to Sue Arizona Ranchers</i> , USA Today, May 3, 2000 at 19A
18	Steven E. Hendrix, <i>The Merida Initiative for Mexico and Central America</i> , 5 Loy. U. Chi. Int'l L. Rev 107, 108-09 (2007-2008)
19	Tamar Jacoby, <i>Immigration Nation</i> , 85 Foreign Affairs 50, 54-58 (2006) 6, 8
20	Tom Baldwin, Barack Obama Arrives in Mexico Amid Drugs Violence, Times, at 1-3 (Apr. 17, 2009), available at http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/
21	news/ world/us_and_americas/article6108394.ece
22	Vera Pavlakovich-Kochi and Alberta H. Charney, <i>Mexican Visitors to Arizona</i> , Economic and Business Research Center (Dec. 2008), <i>available at</i> http://ebr.eller.arizona.edu/research/ mexican_visitors_to_arizona_2007_
23	08.pdf
24	The White House, <i>Immigration</i> (last visited June 10, 2010), http://www.whitehouse.gov/issues/immigration
25	- iii -

APPENDIX B

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

3

1

2

I hereby certify that on June 21, 2010, a copy of the attached *amicus*curiae brief was served by U.S. Mail and/or electronically transmitted (to

recipients where e-mail addressed were on file) to the following parties:

7

8

9

10

11

12

Mary R. O'Grady Solicitor General Christopher A. Munns Assistant Attorney General 1275 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2997 Telephone: (602) 542-3333 Mary.OGrady@azag.gov Christopher.Munns@azag.gov John J. Bouma (#001358)
Robert A. Henry (#015104)
Joseph G. Adams (#018210)
SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
400 E. Van Buren
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202
Phone: (602) 382-6000
Fax: (602) 382-6070
jbouma@swlaw.com
bhenry@swlaw.com

jgadams@swlaw.com

13

14

15

16

17

18

Lance B. Payette
Deputy County Attorney
Navajo County Attorney's Office
P. 0. Box 668
Holbrook, AZ 86025-0668
Telephone: (928) 524-4002
Lance.Payette@NavajoCountyAZ.gov

Daniel J. Pochoda Anne Lai ACLU FOUNDATION OF ARIZONA 77 E. Columbus Street, Suite 205 Phoenix, Arizona 85012

Telephone: (602) 650-1854

Facsimile: (602) 650-1376

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	Omar C. Jadwat Lucas Guttentag	Cecillia D. Wang Harini P. Raghupathi
2	Tanaz Moghadam AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES	AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
3	UNION FOUNDATION IMMIGRANTS'	FOUNDATION IMMIGRANTS' RIGHTS
4	RIGHTS	PROJECT
5	PROJECT 125 Broad Street, 18th Floor	39 Drumm Street San Francisco, California 94111
6	New York, New York 10004 Telephone: (212) 549-2660	Telephone: (415) 343-0775 Facsimile: (415) 395-0950
7	Facsimile: (212) 549-2654	
8	Julie A. Su	Nina Perales
9	Ronald Lee Yungsuhn Park	Ivan Espinoza-Madrigal MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGAL
10	Connie Choi Carmina Ocampo	DEFENSE AND EDUCATIONAL FUND
11	ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN LEGAL	110 Broadway Street, Suite 300 San Antonio, Texas 78205
12	CENTER, a member of Asian American	Telephone: (210) 224-5476 Facsimile: (210) 224-5382
13	Center for Advancing Justice 1145 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 200	
14	Los Angeles, California 90017 Telephone: (213) 977-7500	
15	Facsimile: (213) 977-7595	
16	Thomas A. Saenz	Chris Newman
17	Cynthia Valenzuela Dixon Victor Viramontes	Laura D. Blackburne NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR
18	Gladys Limon Nicholas Espiritu	THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED
19	MEXICAN AMERICAN LEGAL DEFENSE	PEOPLE (NAACP) 4805 Mt. Hope Drive
20	AND EDUCATIONAL FUND 634 S. Spring Street, 11th Floor	Baltimore, Maryland 21215 Telephone: (410) 580-5700
21	Los Angeles, California 90014 Telephone: (213) 629-2512	
22	Facsimile: (213) 629-0266	
23		

1	Lisa Kung	Linton Joaquin
2	NATIONAL DAY LABOR ORGANIZING	Karen C. Tumlin Nora A. Preciado
	NETWORK	Melissa S. Keaney
3	675 S. Park View Street, Suite B	Vivek Mittal
4	Los Angeles, California 90057 Telephone: (213) 380-2785	Ghazal Tajmiri NATIONAL IMMIGRATION LAW
5	Facsimile: (213) 380-2787	CENTER 3435 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite
6		2850 Los Angeles, California 90010
7		Telephone: (213) 639-3900 Facsimile: (213) 639-3911
8	Phil A Thomas	Bradley S. Phillips
9	Robert S Remar LEONARD CARDER LLP	Paul J. Watford Joseph J. Ybarra
10	1188 Franklin St. Ste. 201	Elisabeth J. Neubauer
11	San Francisco, CA 94109 415-771-6400	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
12	Fax: 415-771-7010	355 South Grand Avenue Thirty-Fifth Floor
	Email: pthomas@leonardcarder.com	Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
13		Telephone: (213) 683-9100 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702
14		D : 1D O
15	Susan Traub Boyd Yuval Miller	Daniel R. Ortega, Jr. ROUSH, MCCRACKEN,
	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON	GUERRERO
16	LLP	MILLER & ORTEGA
17	560 Mission Street Twenty-Seventh Floor	1112 E. Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85034
10	San Francisco, CA 94105-2907	Telephone: (602) 253-3554
18	Telephone: (415) 512-4000	Facsimile: (602) 340-1896
19	Facsimile: (415) 512-4077	
20	Mr. Kenny Angle Graham County Attorney	Mr. Preston Allred c/o Legal Liaison
21	800 West Main Street Safford, AZ 85546	Graham County Sheriff 523 10th Avenue
22	Surford, Tiz 03340	Safford, AZ 85546
23		

1	Mr. Kenny Angle	Mr. Larry A. Dever
2	Graham County Attorney 800 West Main Street	c/o Legal Liaison Cochise County Sheriff
3	Safford, AZ 85546	205 North Judd Drive Bisbee, AZ 85603
4	Mr. Joseph M. Arpaio	Mr. Clarence Dupnik
5	c/o Legal Liaison Maricopa County Sheriff	c/o Legal Liaison Pima County Sheriff
6	100 West Washington Phoenix, AZ 85003	1750 E. Benson Highway Tucson, AZ 85714
7	Mr. Joseph M. Arpaio	Mr. Tony Estrada
8	c/o Legal Liaison	c/o Legal Liaison
9	Maricopa County Sheriff 100 West Washington	Santa Cruz County Sheriff 1250 N. Hohokam Drive
10	Phoenix, AZ 85003	Nogales, AZ 85621
11	Mr. Jon R. Smith Yuma County Attorney	Ms. Daisy Flores Gila County Attorney
12	250 West 2nd Street, Suite G Yuma, AZ 85364	1400 East Ash Street Globe, AZ 85501
13	Ms. Barbara LaWall	Mr. Edward G. Rheinheimer
14	Pima County Attorney	Cochise County Attorney
15	32 North Stone Avenue, Suite 1400 Tucson, AZ 85701	150 Quality Hill Road, 2nd Floor Bisbee, AZ 85603
16	Mr. Donald Lowery	Mr. Richard M. Romley
17	c/o Legal Liaison La Paz County Sheriff	Maricopa County Attorney 301 West Jefferson Street, Suite 800
18	1109 Arizona Avenue Parker, AZ 85344	Phoenix, AZ 85003
19	Mr. Joseph Dedman, Jr.	Mr. Matthew J. Smith
20	c/o Legal Liaison	Mohave County Attorney 315 North 4th Street
21	Apache County Sheriff 370 South Washington	Kingman, AZ 86401
22	St. Johns, AZ 85936	
23		

1	Mr. Joseph Dedman, Jr. c/o Legal Liaison	Mr. George Silva
2	Apache County Sheriff	Santa Cruz County Attorney 2150 North Congress Drive, Suite 201
3	370 South Washington St. Johns, AZ 85936	Nogales, AZ 85621
4	Mr. Ralph Ogden	Mr. George Silva
5	c/o Legal Liaison Yuma County Sheriff	Santa Cruz County Attorney 2150 North Congress Drive, Suite 201
6	141 S. 3rd Avenue Yuma, AZ 85364	Nogales, AZ 85621
7	Ms. Sheila Polk	Mr. Steven N. Tucker
8	Yavapai County Attorney 2830 North Commonwealth Drive	c/o Legal Liaison Greenlee County Sheriff
9	Suite 106	223 Fifth Street
10	Camp Verde, AZ 86322	Clifton, AZ 85533
11	Mr. Bill Pribil c/o Legal Liaison	Mr. Sam Vederman La Paz County Attorney
12	Coconino County Sheriff 911 E. Sawmill Rd.	1320 Kofa Avenue Parker, AZ 85344
13	Flagstaff, AZ 86001	,
14	Mr. Derek Rapier Greenlee County Attorney	Mr. Steve Waugh c/o Legal Liaison
15	223 Fifth Street	Yavapai County Sheriff
16	Clifton, AZ 85533	255 E. Gurley Street Prescott, AZ 86301
17		
18	Mr. Michael B. Whiting	Mr. James Walsh
19	Apache County Attorney 245 W. 1st South	Pinal County Attorney 30 North Florence Street, Building D
20	St. Johns, AZ 85936	Florence, AZ 85132
21	Mr. David Rozema	Mr. Tom Sheahan
22	Coconino County Attorney 110 East Cherry Avenue	c/o Legal Liaison Mohave County Sheriff
23	Flagstaff, AZ 86001	600 W. Beale Street Kingman, AZ 86402
24		

1	Laura D. Blackburne NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR	Bradley S. Phillips Paul J. Watford
2	THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED	Joseph J. Ybarra Elisabeth J. Neubauer
3	PEOPLE (NAACP)	MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON
4	4805 Mt. Hope Drive Baltimore, Maryland 21215	LLP 355 South Grand Avenue
5	Telephone: (410) 580-5700	Thirty-Fifth Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
6		Telephone: (213) 683-9100 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702
7	Phil A Thomas	Susan Traub Boyd
8	Robert S Remar LEONARD CARDER LLP	Yuval Miller MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON
9	1188 Franklin St. Ste. 201	LLP 560 Mission Street
10	San Francisco, CA 94109 415-771-6400	Twenty-Seventh Floor San Francisco, CA 94105-2907
11	Fax: 415-771-7010 Email: pthomas@leonardcarder.com	Telephone: (415) 512-4000 Facsimile: (415) 512-4077
12		raesimile. (410) 512-4077
13		
14		
15		/s/ Christopher R. Clark Christopher R. Clark
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		