THANK YOU FOR JOINING US

jfs

INFO SESSION
RESOURCES

*How the Supreme Court's TPS Decision Affects Our Haitian and Syrian Neighbors and the Wider Community*

# Summary of the Supreme Court Rulings

Birthright citizenship: Trump v. Barbara (June 30, 2026) — In a 6-3 decision written by Chief Justice Roberts, the Court struck down Trump's executive order attempting to end birthright citizenship for children born to undocumented or temporarily-present parents. The Court held that children born on American soil and subject to U.S. law are made citizens, reaffirming the framework set out in the 1898 case Wong Kim Ark. This was widely seen as a significant defeat for the administration.

Related earlier ruling: Trump v. CASA — the Court had ruled 6-3 that lower courts cannot issue "universal" or nationwide injunctions, which shaped how the birthright citizenship litigation reached the Court.

Asylum & border policy: Mullin v. Al Otro Lado (June 25, 2026) — 6-3 decision holding that a person standing in Mexico cannot be considered to have "arrived in the United States" simply by attempting and failing to set foot on U.S. soil, and is therefore not entitled to apply for asylum. This clears the way for the administration to revive the border "metering" policy, which limits the number of people who can apply for asylum each day.

Temporary Protected Status (TPS): Mullin v. Doe (June 25, 2026) — 6-3 decision allowing the administration to end Temporary Protected Status for roughly 350,000 Haitians and 4,000 Syrians. The majority held that a provision of the TPS statute limiting lawsuits over TPS "determinations" bars courts from hearing challenges to whether DHS followed required procedures, meaning future TPS terminations may be largely insulated from judicial review. American Immigration Council
Blanche v. Lau (decided June 23, 2026)

The case: Muk Choi Lau, a Chinese national and green card holder since 2007, was charged in New Jersey with trademark counterfeiting. While that charge was still pending, he traveled briefly to China. Upon returning to JFK in 2012, border officers didn't readmit him as a returning resident — instead they "paroled" him in, a more precarious status. He was later convicted, and DHS used that conviction to start removal proceedings, treating him as if he'd been an applicant for admission rather than a returning LPR.

The legal question: Under the INA, LPRs returning from travel abroad are normally treated as already "admitted," not as new applicants — unless one of six exceptions applies (like committing a disqualifying crime). The dispute was over how much evidence border officers need at the moment of reentry to invoke that exception. The Second Circuit had said officers need "clear and convincing evidence" of the disqualifying offense.

The ruling: By a 6-3 vote (majority opinion by Justice Thomas), the Court rejected that heightened standard. It held officers only need a "reason to believe" the person committed a disqualifying offense — a much lower bar — in order to treat a returning green card holder as an applicant for admission rather than automatically readmitting them. Conviction can come later; mere suspicion of "commission" of the offense is enough at the border.

Why it matters: Once someone is classified as an "applicant for admission" and paroled rather than admitted, the burden effectively shifts to them to prove they should be let back in, their physical green card can be confiscated, and they're exposed to stricter deportation grounds — all potentially before any conviction. Justice Jackson's dissent warned this could function as a "massive blank check" for border officers, and advocacy groups like the American Immigration Council note the reasoning could extend beyond criminal-offense cases to the other exceptions covering things like abandoning LPR status or long absences abroad.