## Rule 14-721. Admission of undocumented immigrants.

- 2 An applicant who is an undocumented immigrant; and
- 3 (a) a recipient of:
- 4 (i) deferred action status pursuant to the United States' Policy of
  5 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or
  - (ii) deferred action status, whether granted on an individualized, case by case basis or pursuant to national policy, based in part upon such applicant having arrived in the United States as a minor; and
    - (b) authorized by the United States to accept employment at the time of application;

will be eligible for admission to the Utah Bar if they meet all other requirements for admission.

## **Utah Supreme Court statement:**

Two individuals who assert that they qualify for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) status petitioned this Court to adopt a rule that would allow them to be admitted to practice law in Utah. The Utah Bar does not limit admission to United States citizens, but it verifies an applicant's legal presence in the United States and denies admission to those who cannot establish that they are legally present. Petitioners cannot provide this verification and therefore cannot presently be admitted to the Utah Bar.

8 U.S.C. section 1621(a), part of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, prohibits certain unqualified aliens, including aliens who are not lawfully present in the United States, from receiving certain state or local public benefits. This includes professional licenses. *Id.* § 1621(c). However, section 1621(d) allows a state to "opt out" of this prohibition through the "enactment of state law" and provide a state or local benefit, such as a law license, to an alien not lawfully present in the United States. Petitioners ask us to adopt a rule that would take advantage of section 1621(d)'s opt out and permit the Utah Bar to issue licenses to practice law in Utah to qualified DACA recipients.

It is beyond dispute that the Utah Supreme Court possesses the constitutional authority to govern the practice of law. *See* UTAH CONST. art. VIII, 4 ("The Supreme Court by rule shall govern the practice of law, including admission to practice law and the conduct and discipline of persons admitted to practice law.") But a question arose if a court-adopted rule would qualify as the "enactment of a state law" that section

1621(d) would recognize as a state law permitting Utah to opt out and provide law licenses to qualified applicants with DACA status. There is also a question whether Utah's attorney licensing structure—a privately funded bar association overseen by a state Supreme Court—falls with section 1621(d)'s ambit.

In response to that concern, we solicited briefing. We appreciate the assistance, research, and arguments from those who submitted briefs: Petitioners Jane and Mary Doe; Utah State Bar; Office of the Utah Attorney General; United States Department of Justice; Ad Hoc Coalition of Utah Professors; University of Utah, S.J. Quinney College of Law; Utah Minority Bar Association; Latino Justice; American Civil Liberties Union/ACLU Of Utah; and Parr Brown Gee & Loveless. We also appreciate the input of the Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel on behalf of the Utah Legislature. The Legislature, citing the constitutional authority granted to this Court, opined that this Court could enact a rule that would meet the requirements of 8 U.S.C. section 1621(d).

We then heard presentations from a number of those who provided briefs. We again appreciate the input we received from counsel for the Petitioners, the Utah State Bar, the Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel, the United States Department of Justice, and the Utah Minority Bar Association.

We have considered the question and the materials presented to us, and are confident that 8 U.S.C. 1621(d) does not prohibit this Court, pursuant to the authority the people of Utah gave us in article VIII, section 4 of the Utah Constitution, from adopting a rule that would permit those with DACA status to practice law in Utah. In so doing, we join New York and Pennsylvania, which have reached the same conclusion about their ability to act on this question. Accordingly, we move forward on the petition for a rule change and invite public comment on a proposed rule.