

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

BIANKA M.,
Petitioner,

v.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,

Respondent,
GLADYS M.,

Real Party in Interest.

SUPREME COURT
FILED

APR 18 2017

Jorge Navarrete Clerk

Deputy

AFTER A DECISION BY THE COURT OF APPEAL, SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT, DIVISION THREE
CASE No. B267454

APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICI CURIAE BRIEF;
BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE
CALIFORNIA STATE SENATE, SPEAKER OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE
ASSEMBLY, SPEAKER EMERITUS OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE
ASSEMBLY, CHAIR OF THE LATINO LEGISLATIVE CAUCUS, AND
FORMER CHAIR OF THE LATINO LEGISLATIVE CAUCUS
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER

HORVITZ & LEVY LLP

BARRY R. LEVY (BAR No. 53977)

MARK A. KRESSEL (BAR No. 254933)

*ALLISON W. MEREDITH (BAR No. 281962)

3601 WEST OLIVE AVENUE, 8TH FLOOR

BURBANK, CALIFORNIA 91505-4681

(818) 995-0800 • FAX: (844) 497-6592

blevy@horvitzlevy.com • mkressel@horvitzlevy.com

ameredith@horvitzlevy.com

ATTORNEYS FOR AMICI CURIAE

SENATOR KEVIN DE LEÓN, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE
SENATE; ANTHONY RENDON, SPEAKER OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY; SENATOR
TONI ATKINS, SPEAKER EMERITUS OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY; SENATOR
BEN HUESO, CHAIR OF THE LATINO LEGISLATIVE CAUCUS; SENATOR RICARDO LARA,
FORMER CHAIR OF THE LATINO LEGISLATIVE CAUCUS (2013-2014)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	4
APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICI CURIAE BRIEF OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE SENATE, SPEAKER OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY, SPEAKER EMERITUS OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY, CHAIR OF THE LATINO LEGISLATIVE CAUCUS, FORMER CHAIR OF THE LATINO LEGISLATIVE CAUCUS	7
BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE	11
INTRODUCTION.....	11
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	12
LEGAL ARGUMENT.....	16
I. IN 2014, THE LEGISLATURE ENACTED CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 155 TO FACILITATE THE ACCESS OF IMMIGRANT CHILDREN TO SIJS-PREDICATE FINDINGS.	16
II. <i>BIANKA M.</i> MISCONSTRUES SECTION 155 AND THE ROLE OF OUR STATE COURTS IN THE SIJS PROCESS.	21
A. <i>Bianka M.</i> 's holding that <i>Bianka</i> 's request for SIJS-predicate findings was premature misapplied section 155.....	21
B. Section 155 does not require—or permit—the superior courts to determine whether a custody proceeding is “bona fide.”	22
C. <i>Bianka M.</i> 's joinder holdings would make it nearly impossible for many SIJS-eligible children to obtain SIJS-predicate findings and, by extension, SIJS relief.	26

III. THE LEGISLATURE ACTED SWIFTLY TO CLARIFY ITS INTENT FOR SECTION 155 AND THE ROLE OF THE SUPERIOR COURTS. 28

IV. *BIANKA M.* IS NOT MOOT IN LIGHT OF THE REVISIONS TO SECTION 155. AN OPINION EXPLAINING THE ROLE OF THE SUPERIOR COURTS IN THE SIJS FRAMEWORK WOULD BENEFIT CALIFORNIA’S MOST VULNERABLE CHILDREN. 30

 A. The Legislature’s clarification of section 155 resolved one aspect of the erroneous *Bianka M.* opinion. It did not resolve other misguided determinations that interfere with a child’s ability to obtain SIJS-predicate findings..... 30

 B. An opinion clarifying the purpose and goals of section 155, and the role of the superior courts in the SIJS process, would help prevent further harm to children who have already suffered more than any child should..... 31

CONCLUSION 33

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT 34

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>B.F. v. Superior Court</i> (2012) 207 Cal.App.4th 621	18
<i>Bianka M. v. Superior Court</i> (2016) 245 Cal.App.4th 406	<i>passim</i>
<i>California Teachers Assn. v. Governing Bd. of Rialto Unified School Dist.</i> (1997) 14 Cal.4th 627	24
<i>Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com.</i> (1987) 43 Cal.3d 1379	21, 24
<i>Eddie E. v. Superior Court</i> (2013) 223 Cal.App.4th 622	19
<i>Eddie E. v. Superior Court</i> (2015) 234 Cal.App.4th 319	16, 24
<i>Gollust v. Mendell</i> (1991) 501 U.S. 115 [111 S.Ct. 2173, 115 L.Ed.2d 109]	24
<i>Grosset v. Wenaas</i> (2008) 42 Cal.4th 1100	24
<i>In re Marriage of Burgess</i> (1996) 13 Cal.4th 25	32
<i>In re Marriage of Schaffer</i> (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 801	32
<i>In re Y.M.</i> (2012) 207 Cal.App.4th 892	18
<i>Leslie H. v. Superior Court</i> (2014) 224 Cal.App.4th 340	16, 17, 18, 23

<i>Montenegro v. Diaz</i> (2001) 26 Cal.4th 249	32
<i>National Paint & Coatings Assn. v. State of California</i> (1997) 58 Cal.App.4th 753	24

Constitutions

Cal. Consitution., art. VI, § 10	24
--	----

Statutes

8 U.S.C.	
§ 1101(a)(27)(J).....	8, 12, 13, 16, 20, 23
§ 1101(a)(27)(J)(i) & (ii)	13, 17
§ 1101(a)(27)(J)(iii).....	16
§ 1357(h)	28

Code of Civil Procedure

§ 155	<i>passim</i>
§ 155, subd. (a).....	24
§ 155, subd. (a)(1)	13
§ 155, subd. (a)(2)	15
§ 155, subd. (b)(2)	15
§ 1858	22

Family Code

§ 3011	32
§ 3020	32
§ 3020, subd. (a).....	32
§ 3021	32
§ 3022	32

Welfare & Institutions Code, § 13300.....	20
---	----

Rules of Court

California Rules of Court, rule 8.520(f)	7
--	---

Regulations

76 Fed.Reg. § 54985 (Sept. 6, 2011)	23
---	----

Miscellaneous

<i>A Guide to Children Arriving at the Border: Laws, Policies and Responses</i> (June 26, 2015) American Immigration Council < https://goo.gl/UJehS9 >	17
Assembly Bill No. 1603 (2015-2016 Reg. Sess.)	28
Assembly Bill No. 1603 (2015-2016 Reg. Sess.) § 1.....	29
California Senate Democrats, <i>Steinberg, De León, Lara, Torres—Undocumented & Unaccompanied Children</i> (August 21, 2014) YouTube < http://goo.gl/AhQhKn >.....	12, 18, 20, 25, 32
Child, <i>Memorandum: Senate Bill 873 and the Special Immigrant Juvenile Process in the Superior Courts</i> (Sept. 30, 2014) Judicial Council of Cal. < http://goo.gl/vXF0Je >	18
<i>History of SIJS Status</i> (July 12, 2011) U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services < http://goo.gl/Yqy7xK >	17
Legis. Counsel’s Dig., Sen. Bill No. 873 (2013-2014 Reg. Sess.) Stats. 2014, Summary Dig.	20
Press Release, <i>Governor Brown, Attorney General Harris, and Legislative Leaders Announce Unaccompanied Minor Legislation</i> (Aug. 21, 2014) California Latino Legislative Caucus < http://goo.gl/ObFBr3 >	<i>passim</i>
Sen. Bill No. 873 (2013-2014 Reg. Sess.), added by Stats. 2014, ch. 685 (S.B. 873) § 1	19, 20, 21
Sen. Bill No. 873 (2013-2014 Reg. Sess.)	
§ 1, subd. (a).....	20
§ 1, subd. (b).....	20
Stats. 2014, ch. 685, § 1	21, 22, 23
Stats. 2016, ch. 25, § 1	21

**IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA**

BIANKA M.,
Petitioner,

v.

**THE SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,**
Respondent,

GLADYS M.,
Real Party in Interest.

**APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICI CURIAE
BRIEF OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF
THE CALIFORNIA STATE SENATE, SPEAKER OF THE
CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY, SPEAKER EMERITUS
OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE ASSEMBLY, CHAIR OF
THE LATINO LEGISLATIVE CAUCUS, FORMER CHAIR
OF THE LATINO LEGISLATIVE CAUCUS**

Pursuant to rule 8.520(f) of the California Rules of Court, Senator Kevin de León, President pro Tempore of the California State Senate, Assemblyman Anthony Rendon, Speaker of the California State Assembly, Senator Toni Atkins, Speaker Emeritus of the California State Assembly, Senator Ben Hueso, Chair of the Latino Legislative Caucus, and Senator Ricardo Lara, Chair of the Latino Legislative Caucus (2013-2014) (collectively, the Signatories)

respectfully request permission to file the attached brief of amici curiae in support of petitioner Bianka.¹ No parties or their counsel have funded or made a monetary contribution to this proposed brief, in whole or in part.

The Signatories are the leaders of our State Senate, our State Assembly, and the Latino Legislative Caucus. The Signatories were the architects and sponsors of Code of Civil Procedure section 155 (section 155), the statute that the Court of Appeal misinterpreted and misapplied in reaching its conclusion that Bianka was not entitled to the findings that would enable her to apply for Special Immigrant Juvenile Status (SIJS) and obtain relief from removal.

The Signatories are familiar with the content of Bianka's petition for review, the opening brief on the merits, the Brief of *Amicus Curiae* at the Request of the California Supreme Court, and the reply brief on the merits; several of the Signatories also filed an amici curiae letter in support of Bianka's petition for review here. The Signatories seek to file this brief to share with this Court their special knowledge of the Legislature's intent concerning the enactment of section 155, as well as the Legislature's intent that the California courts have a limited, but vital, role in facilitating a child's access to SIJS relief under 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(J). The Signatories are in a unique position to help this Court understand

¹ This application refers to the petitioner as "Bianka" without her last initial, to avoid confusion with the title of the case on appeal, *Bianka M. v. Superior Court* (2016) 245 Cal.App.4th 406, review granted May 25, 2016, S233757 (*Bianka M.*).

that *Bianka M.*'s interpretation of section 155 and the role of the State courts does not effectuate the intent of the Legislature.

Although the Legislature amended section 155 after *Bianka M.*'s publication to clarify the Legislature's intent for that statute, these clarifications do not render this appeal moot. In particular, the amendment to section 155 does not affect *Bianka M.*'s holding that Bianca was required to join her alleged father, who resides in Honduras, as a party to her action to be placed in her mother's custody. Although *Bianka M.* framed this holding as a narrow one, its practical effect is to make it nearly impossible for many SIJS-eligible children to obtain the findings they need to apply for SIJS relief. Because this holding is incorrect and runs contrary to the Legislature's policy of facilitating access to SIJS relief, this Court should address it and the other issues presented by Bianca in this appeal. The Signatories also believe that an opinion from this Court clarifying the Legislature's policy of welcoming immigrant children who were abandoned, abused, or neglected in their countries of origin would help ensure that section 155 is faithfully carried out by our State's courts.

April 7, 2017

HORVITZ & LEVY LLP
BARRY R. LEVY
MARK A. KRESSEL
ALLISON W. MEREDITH

By: 
Allison W. Meredith

Attorneys for Amici Curiae
Senator Kevin de León, President
pro Tempore of the California
State Senate
Assemblyman Anthony Rendon,
Speaker of the California State
Assembly
Senator Toni Atkins, Speaker
Emeritus of the California State
Assembly
Senator Ben Hueso, Chair of the
Latino Legislative Caucus
Senator Ricardo Lara, Chair of the
Latino Legislative Caucus (2013-
2014)

BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE

INTRODUCTION

Senator Kevin de León, President pro Tempore of the California State Senate, Assemblyman Anthony Rendon, Speaker of the California State Assembly, Senator Toni Atkins, Speaker Emeritus of the California State Assembly, Senator Ben Hueso, Chair of the Latino Legislative Caucus, and Senator Ricardo Lara, Chair of the Latino Legislative Caucus (2013-2014), leaders of our State Senate, our State Assembly, and the Latino Legislative Caucus (the Signatories), respectfully submit this brief of amici curiae to request that this Court reverse *Bianka M. v. Superior Court* (2016) 245 Cal.App.4th 406, review granted May 25, 2016, S233757 (*Bianka M.*).

Code of Civil Procedure section 155 (section 155) lies at the heart of the *Bianka M.* opinion. The Signatories—as the architects of section 155 and its amendment in 2016—think that *Bianka M.* misunderstood the intent of the Legislature in interpreting section 155, and therefore wrongfully held that *Bianka*² was not entitled to findings that would allow her to seek relief from removal to Honduras. Section 155 was passed to facilitate access to federal immigration relief and protect vulnerable children from being sent back to their countries of origin where they faced significant

² This brief refers to the petitioner as “Bianka,” to distinguish her from the title of the case on appeal.

challenges to their survival. Although the Legislature acted to amend and clarify section 155 after the *Bianka M.* opinion was published, an opinion from this Court remains necessary to ensure an accurate and fair reading of section 155 and to correct the Court of Appeal's other errors that impede children from obtaining relief from removal. Such an opinion would further the Legislature's policy of protecting abandoned, abused, and neglected children in California by ensuring their ability to seek Special Immigrant Juvenile Status (SIJS) from the federal government. (See 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(J) (the Federal SIJS Statute).)

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

“California wants unaccompanied immigrant children treated as children. We want their well-being ensured, their best interests pursued, and their safety protected.” (Press Release, *Governor Brown, Attorney General Harris, and Legislative Leaders Announce Unaccompanied Minor Legislation* (Aug. 21, 2014) California Latino Legislative Caucus <<http://goo.gl/ObFBr3>> [as of Apr. 4, 2017] (hereafter 8/21/14 Press Release).) And the Legislature believes that “a kid is a kid is a kid. It doesn't matter—it shouldn't matter—their immigration status. We need to go out of our way to make sure that children are safe and give them every benefit of the doubt when it comes to their petition . . . to stay here.” (California Senate Democrats, *Steinberg, De León, Lara, Torres—Undocumented & Unaccompanied Children* (Aug. 21, 2014)

YouTube <<http://goo.gl/AhQhKn>> [as of Apr. 4, 2017] (hereafter 8/21/14 Joint Statement).)

To that end, the Legislature passed section 155. Section 155 empowers the State's courts to "make [those] factual findings necessary to enable a child to petition the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services for classification as a special immigrant juvenile pursuant to Section 1101(a)(27)(J) of Title 8 of the United States Code." (Code Civ. Proc., § 155, subd. (a)(1).) Under that federal statute, a child seeking relief from removal must first obtain findings (SIJS-predicate findings) from a state court that (1) the child is has been declared dependent on a juvenile court or has been placed in the custody of the State or other court-appointed person or entity; (2) the child cannot be reunified with one or both of his or her parents "due to abuse, neglect, abandonment, or a similar basis found under State law"; and (3) it is not in the child's best interest to be returned to his or her country of origin. (8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(J)(i) & (ii).)

Section 155 was drafted to establish " 'unequivocally that California courts have the authority to review cases involving unaccompanied minors seeking the Special Immigrant Juvenile Status.' " (8/21/14 Press Release.) By establishing a streamlined process for SIJS-eligible children to obtain SIJS-predicate findings and thereby seek relief from removal from the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS), the Legislature " '[stood] up for these children who have faced unimaginable hardships.' " (*Ibid.*)

“The systematic challenges addressed by [section 155] . . . without exaggeration, could be the difference between the life and death of a child.’” (8/21/14 Press Release.) The Signatories emphasize that their intention in drafting section 155 was to facilitate access to SIJS-predicate findings and protect children facing unimaginable hardships in their countries of origin. Yet section 155 also recognizes the State’s limited role in the SIJS process: the authority to grant SIJS relief lies solely with USCIS, not with the State. The superior courts’ role, therefore, is limited to issuing SIJS-predicate findings to a child who has established that he or she satisfies those predicates.

Bianka M. misapplied section 155 and the State courts’ role in the SIJS process. *Bianka M.* interpreted section 155 to permit a court to refuse to issue SIJS-predicate findings based on that court’s perception of a child’s motivation for instituting the action, and that court’s guess as to whether USCIS would ultimately grant a child’s SIJS petition. (*Bianka M.*, *supra*, 245 Cal.App.4th at pp. 427-428.) This holding misunderstands the superior courts’ limited role in the federal SIJS framework and the Legislature’s intention that SIJS-predicate findings be accessible to the abandoned, abused, and neglected children who now make California their home.

The Signatories are also disturbed at the extent to which *Bianka M.* fails to embrace section 155’s ethos: that “‘victimized children deserve to be treated with kindness and justice.’” (8/21/14 Press Release.) It is undisputed that *Bianka* has no one to care for her in Honduras and that it is not in her best interest to return

there. (2 AE 311³ [family court finding that “both the overall violence of her city and the lack of available relatives to care for her, is [sic] untenable, and supports a finding that **it would not be in the best interest[] of [Bianka] to be returned to Honduras**” (emphasis in original)].) Yet the opinion establishes several rules or potential rules which, contrary to the Legislature’s intent, make it even more difficult for children to obtain SIJS-predicate findings and, by extension, relief from deportation to the abandonment, abuse, or neglect awaiting them in their countries of origin.

Following the publication of *Bianka M.*, the legislative leaders and the Latino Legislative Caucus immediately moved to clarify section 155 and their intention that “‘these kids have every opportunity to seek permanent residency, including through Special Immigrant Juvenile Status.’” (8/21/14 Press Release.) Within four months of *Bianka M.*’s publication—the blink of an eye in legislative time—the Legislature amended section 155 to clarify that a child could seek SIJS-predicate findings at any point in a superior court proceeding, and that the superior court issuing such findings should not comment on or refer to the child’s perceived motivation for seeking the SIJS-predicate findings. (Code Civ. Proc., § 155, subs. (a)(2) & (b)(2).)

This clarification does not render this case moot, however. As noted above, *Bianka M.* created several rules or potential rules that make it substantially more difficult for SIJS-eligible children to obtain SIJS-predicate findings; not all of these holdings have been

³ References to “AE” are to the Appendices of Exhibits filed by *Bianka* in the Court of Appeal.

remedied by the Legislature's clarification of section 155. For example, *Bianka M.* held that Bianka was required to join her alleged father and to establish his parentage in Bianka's action to be placed in her *mother's* custody, and that, in the absence of such joinder, Bianka could not obtain the SIJS-predicate findings she seeks. (*Bianka M.*, *supra*, 245 Cal.App.4th at pp. 430-431.) Although *Bianka M.* portrayed these holdings as narrow ones, the practical effect of these holdings is to make it nearly impossible for many children with an abusive or neglectful parent outside the country to obtain SIJS-predicate findings. In light of *Bianka M.*'s wide-reaching holdings, this appeal is not moot, and this Court should issue an opinion reversing *Bianka M.*

LEGAL ARGUMENT

I. IN 2014, THE LEGISLATURE ENACTED CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 155 TO FACILITATE THE ACCESS OF IMMIGRANT CHILDREN TO SIJS-PREDICATE FINDINGS.

The Federal SIJS Statute provides a path for abandoned, abused, and neglected immigrant children to obtain relief from removal to a hostile country of origin and to seek lawful permanent residence status. (8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(J); *Leslie H. v. Superior Court* (2014) 224 Cal.App.4th 340, 344 (*Leslie H.*)) The Federal SIJS Statute grants USCIS the exclusive authority to grant or deny SIJS to a child. (8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(J)(iii); *Eddie E. v. Superior*

Court (2015) 234 Cal.App.4th 319, 326 (*Eddie E. II.*) However, the Federal SIJS Statute grants the state courts a narrow, but vital, role in the SIJS process: determining, as a preliminary matter, whether an immigrant child has established that (1) the child has been declared dependent on a juvenile court or has been placed in the custody of the State or other court-appointed person or entity; (2) the child cannot be reunified with one or both of his or her parents “due to abuse, neglect, abandonment, or a similar basis found under State law”; and (3) it is not in the child’s best interest to be returned to his or her country of origin. (8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(J)(i) & (ii); *Leslie H.*, at p. 348.) If the child establishes these factors, the state court issues SIJS-predicate findings, which will be considered by the USCIS in connection with the child’s application for SIJS. (8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(J)(i) & (ii); see *Leslie H.*, at p. 348.)

Although the creation of the SIJS program dates as far back as 1990, the program took on a heightened vitality starting in 2014 with the surging migration of unaccompanied minors from Central America caused by terrible violence and upheaval in the region. (*History of SIJS Status* (July 12, 2011) U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services <<http://goo.gl/Yqy7xK>> [as of Apr. 5, 2017]; *A Guide to Children Arriving at the Border: Laws, Policies and Responses* (June 26, 2015) American Immigration Council <<https://goo.gl/UJehS9>> [as of Apr. 5, 2017].) In the summer of 2014, then-Senate President pro Tempore Darrell Steinberg and a delegation of our State’s lawmakers went on a fact-finding mission to Central America. (8/21/14 Press Release.) The delegation

returned with a heightened understanding of the humanitarian crisis that has engulfed much of Central America and a renewed commitment to protect the children who risked everything to seek a better life in California. (*Ibid.*)

The Legislature immediately commenced its investigation into how to best serve these children, and discovered, “in researching the obstacles for many of these [SIJS-eligible] children . . . a major hole in state law.” (8/21/14 Joint Statement.) At that time, California had no codified procedure through which abandoned, abused, or neglected immigrant children could seek SIJS-predicate findings in the state courts.⁴ And at the same time, “[t]oo many state judges [were not] aware of [the SIJS-predicate order] requirement and [were] denying any form of preliminary . . . state relief because they think this is just a federal immigration issue.” (8/21/14 Joint Statement.) Because of this misunderstanding, many state courts refused to issue SIJS-predicate findings *at all*, preventing California’s SIJS-eligible children from applying for SIJS relief from USCIS. (See, e.g., *B.F. v. Superior Court* (2012) 207 Cal.App.4th 621; *In re Y.M.* (2012) 207 Cal.App.4th 892.) And in many instances, these superior courts improperly injected their own policy considerations into their refusals. (E.g., *Leslie H.*, *supra*, 224 Cal.App.4th at p. 350 [superior court erred by refusing to grant predicate SIJS findings on the basis

⁴ The Judicial Council issued forms to aid in the process in 2007, 2012, and 2013. (Child, *Memorandum: Senate Bill 873 and the Special Immigrant Juvenile Process in the Superior Courts* (Sept. 30, 2014) Judicial Council of Cal. <<http://goo.gl/vXF0Je>> [as of Apr. 5, 2017].)

of its own “misplaced policy considerations”]; see also *Eddie E. v. Superior Court* (2013) 223 Cal.App.4th 622 (*Eddie E. I.*)

To fill this “major hole in state law” and ensure that SIJS-eligible children could obtain the SIJS-predicate findings that would allow them to seek SIJS relief, the legislative leaders and the Latino Legislative Caucus drafted and introduced Senate Bill No. 873 (S.B. 873), which was codified in section 155 later that year. (See Sen. Bill No. 873 (2013-2014 Reg. Sess.), added by Stats. 2014, ch. 685 (S.B. 873) § 1.) The Legislature’s purpose behind S.B. 873 was unambiguous:

“With these bills we’re making it clear California wants unaccompanied immigrant children treated as children. We want their well-being ensured, their best interests pursued, and their safety protected.” . . . “[T]he humanitarian crisis that has brought so many children to our country continues. While the root causes of this crisis are being addressed, these victimized children deserve to be treated with kindness and justice.”

(8/21/14 Press Release.)

S.B. 873 codified the procedures for the superior courts’ role in the overall SIJS framework. S.B. 873 did *not* give the superior courts the authority to decide which abandoned, abused, or neglected children should be granted SIJS relief. (See Sen. Bill No. 873 (2013-2014 Reg. Sess.), added by Stats. 2014, ch. 685 (S.B. 873) § 1.) Instead, S.B. 873 created a streamlined process through which SIJS-eligible children can obtain the SIJS-predicate findings from the superior courts, on the basis of the child’s declaration alone. (*Ibid.*) And consistent with the Legislature’s intention of facilitating access to SIJS-predicate findings, S.B. 873

expressly granted jurisdiction to *any* superior court “to make judicial determinations regarding the custody of children within the meaning of the federal [SIJS statute].” (*Id.* § 1, subd. (a).)

S.B. 873 also incorporated the Legislature’s intention that the superior courts have little discretion to decline to make SIJS-predicate findings: “The bill would *require* the superior court to make an order containing the necessary findings regarding special immigrant juvenile status pursuant to federal law, if there is evidence to support those findings.” (Legis. Counsel’s Dig., Sen. Bill No. 873 (2013-2014 Reg. Sess.) Stats. 2014, Summary Dig., p. 94, emphasis added; Sen. Bill No. 873 (2013-2014 Reg. Sess.) § 1, subd. (b) [if child establishes SIJS-predicate factors, superior court “shall” issue SIJS-predicate findings]; see also 8/21/14 Joint Statement [“So we are clarifying, or seek to clarify in state law, that the state courts—whether it be a family court, a juvenile court, a probate court—must make that requisite finding, if appropriate, to say that a child’s return to their home country would be a danger to themselves, and their futures”].) This provision is consistent with the Federal SIJS Statute, which gives USCIS, not the state courts, the authority to grant or deny an application for SIJS. (See 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(J).)

S.B. 873 also earmarked funds to be used to contract with qualified nonprofit legal services organizations to provide representation for unaccompanied minors navigating the SIJS process. (Legis. Counsel’s Dig., Sen. Bill No. 873 (2013-2014 Reg. Sess.) Stats. 2014, Summary Dig., p. 94; codified at Welf. & Inst. Code, § 13300.) The provision of counsel for unaccompanied minors

underscores the extent to which the Legislature intended to implement a framework to help unaccompanied minors navigate the SIJS process.

S.B. 873 was passed by the Legislature and signed by Governor Brown in near-record time, taking effect on September 27, 2014.

II. *BIANKA M.* MISCONSTRUES SECTION 155 AND THE ROLE OF OUR STATE COURTS IN THE SIJS PROCESS.

A. *Bianka M.*'s holding that *Bianka*'s request for SIJS-predicate findings was premature misapplied section 155.

Bianka M. states that *Bianka*'s request for SIJS-predicate findings was "premature" because the request was made before an evidentiary hearing on *Bianka*'s request to be placed in her mother's custody. (*Bianka M.*, *supra*, 245 Cal.App.4th at p. 424.) *Bianka M.* relied on section 155 to reach this conclusion. (*Id.* at p. 425.) But nothing in section 155, as then in effect or currently, supports *Bianka M.*'s interpretation. (See Code Civ. Proc., § 155, as enacted by Stats. 2014, ch. 685, § 1 and as amended by Stats. 2016, ch. 25, § 1.) The Court of Appeal therefore erred by imposing procedural requirements that the Legislature did not intend. (E.g., *Dyna-Med, Inc. v. Fair Employment & Housing Com.* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 1379, 1386-1387 (*Dyna-Med*) [courts should construe statutes to ascertain

the intent of the Legislature by first looking at the plain meaning of the words in the statute]; Code Civ. Proc., § 1858 [in statutory construction, courts should not “insert what has been omitted”].)

B. Section 155 does not require—or permit—the superior courts to determine whether a custody proceeding is “bona fide.”

The Court of Appeal in *Bianka M.* apparently made its own factual determination in this case: that Bianka filed her custody action with the ulterior motive of seeking SIJS-predicate findings. (*Bianka M.*, *supra*, 245 Cal.App.4th at pp. 427-428.) Based on its impression of Bianka’s motivation, the Court of Appeal in *Bianka M.* concluded that USCIS would determine that the SIJS-predicate findings were not issued in a “bona fide custody proceeding” and that USCIS would reject her application for SIJS. (*Id.* at p. 428.) *Bianka M.* stated that it would therefore “not be useful” to issue Bianka the SIJS-predicate findings, and denied Bianka’s writ petition on that basis. (*Id.* at p. 427.) *Bianka M.* is wrong.

As then in effect, section 155’s plain text did not require a superior court to determine the underlying motivation of a child or whether the underlying state court action was “bona fide.” (See Code Civ. Proc., § 155, as enacted by Stats. 2014, ch. 685, § 1, before amendment.) Nor does the Federal SIJS Statute, or any other authority, make the child’s perceived motivation relevant to a grant of SIJS-predicate findings. *Bianka M.* cites to *proposed*, but

never enacted, USCIS regulations to support its conclusion that USCIS would reject Bianka’s application as not arising from a “bona fide” custody proceeding. (*Bianka M.*, *supra*, 245 Cal.App.4th at pp. 421-422, 427-428; see 76 Fed.Reg. 54985 (Sept. 6, 2011) [proposed regulations for USCIS consideration of SIJS applications]; see also 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(J).) Because no authority supports *Bianka M.*’s conclusions that USCIS would ultimately reject Bianka’s application, or that a child’s motivation for instituting a custody proceeding is relevant in a superior court proceeding for SIJS-predicate findings, the Court of Appeal’s “bona fide” holding is the kind of “misplaced policy consideration[]” that should not be injected into the interpretation of section 155. (E.g., *Leslie H.*, *supra*, 224 Cal.App.4th at p. 350.)

Bianka M.’s “bona fide” determination also invades the federal government’s authority to regulate immigration. *Bianka M.* presumptuously decided that USCIS would reject Bianka’s SIJS application, and denied her the opportunity to even *apply* for SIJS on that basis. (*Bianka M.*, *supra*, 245 Cal.App.4th at pp. 427-428.) However, none of the authorities cited by *Bianka M.* grants state courts the power to preemptively reject a request for SIJS predicate findings based on that court’s guess at how USCIS would decide a SIJS application. (See *id.*, at pp. 422-426; see also Code Civ. Proc., § 155, as enacted by Stats. 2014, ch. 685, § 1, before amendment; 8 U.S.C. § 1101(a)(27)(J); 76 Fed.Reg. 54985 (Sept. 6, 2011) [proposed regulations for USCIS consideration of SIJS applications].) Even if the Legislature had intended to grant the superior courts the power to preempt the USCIS—it did not—such