With Crucial Federal Funding on the Line, Minnesota's Attorney General Fights Back

Authors: AG Studies' Staff and Policy Fellows

While Minnesotans have been standing up to federal intimidation on the streets, Minnesota's Attorney General has been challenging it in court. He, like many state attorneys general who have countered illegal federal cuts, has fought to keep vast sums of funding flowing to critical services and infrastructure residents rely on every day.

I. From the Streets to the Courts: Minnesota Pushes Back

Renee Good. Alex Pretti.

Their deaths became rallying points in Minnesota's resistance to the Trump administration's unprecedented deployment of roughly 3,000 federal immigration agents to the state.

Thousands of Minnesotans took to the streets. Neighbors organized to monitor immigration-enforcement activity and help vulnerable families. Faith groups, labor unions, and businesses mobilized. Communities delivered food and medical supplies, provided rides, and watched over children getting to school.

While protests and the killings of two Minnesotans by federal agents dominated national headlines, another high-stakes conflict over federal overreach was unfolding in court.

Since 2025, Minnesota Attorney General Keith Ellison has fought to protect crucial federal funding for his state across a multitude of cases challenging the Trump administration. The cases affect everything from whether financially squeezed families can make ends meet to whether communities can preserve access to vital services like health care, maintain transportation systems, and respond effectively to disasters.

Taken together, they show the extent to which Minnesota, like all states, counts on federal funding to help meet residents' basic needs and sustain essential public services and infrastructure.

While the underlying legal disputes vary widely, they share a common thread.

Minnesota has gone to court when it alleges that the federal government has attempted to withhold funding, impose new conditions, or otherwise use its control over federal dollars in ways that exceed its legal authority.

Minnesota has also alleged in several cases that political targeting lay behind the challenged actions, characterizing them as efforts to punish states or officials the administration disfavored.

The following examples demonstrate how Minnesota—like approximately half the states across the country—has countered illegal federal action by suing to protect its programs and its people.

II. The Dollars at Stake—and the People Behind Them

Court orders and dollar figures alone cannot capture what this litigation means in the everyday lives of Minnesotans.[1] Three cases underline the stakes for families struggling to pay for groceries, afford child care, and keep the lights on.

1. Feeding Hungry Children, Seniors, and Families

Federal funding battles can reach all the way to the dinner table. Minnesota's fight to protect the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, is a powerful example.

Why SNAP Matters to Minnesotans

SNAP, often called food stamps, is the nation's largest anti-hunger program, designed primarily to help low-income households afford groceries. In Minnesota, it is a critical lifeline for hundreds of thousands of people, including children, seniors, and people with disabilities.[2]

---

[1] The federal funding directly at issue in these cases does not fully capture the potential economic impact of the challenged actions. Those effects can extend beyond the face value of the funding through downstream economic activity, costs shifted to other public systems, and longer-term benefits generated by the funded programs.

[2] Unless otherwise indicated, all program-specific data, factual information, and legal arguments described in this section are drawn from the court record in *State of Minnesota v. United States Department of Agriculture*, No. 0:25-cv-04767-LMP-JFD (D. Minn.).

That support is especially vital at a time when rising grocery prices are forcing many Americans to rethink what they can afford to put in their carts.

For fiscal year 2024, Minnesota reported providing SNAP benefits to an average of approximately 440,000 people every month, including nearly 182,000 children and 67,000 seniors. The state distributed roughly $75 million in SNAP benefits each month.

Annualized, that amounts to approximately $900 million a year in food assistance flowing to Minnesota households. The federal government also provides approximately $80 million a year to help Minnesota administer the program.

Those funds support families who need help affording groceries, food retailers and farmers markets that benefit from SNAP spending, and the state, counties, and Tribal Nations that administer the program and keep the system running.

A 30-Day Demand to Recertify 106,000 Households

Then, in December 2025, the federal government put that support at risk.

On December 16, Agriculture Secretary Brooke Rollins, head of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), sent Minnesota Governor Tim Walz a letter requiring the state to recertify every SNAP household in four counties within 30 days and conduct an in-person interview with each household.[3]

The directive covered approximately 106,000 SNAP households, representing about 191,000 Minnesotans and 45% of all SNAP households statewide.

Under Minnesota's ordinary SNAP system, households are recertified on a rolling basis as their eligibility periods expire, with the affected counties typically processing about one-twelfth of their SNAP caseload each month. USDA's directive would compress the state's year-round process into just 30 days, while still requiring the state to comply with federal requirements governing notice, scheduling, verification, and recertification.[4]

---

[3] Letter from Brooke L. Rollins, Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, to Tim Walz, Governor of Minnesota (Dec. 16, 2025), ECF No. 1-1, *State of Minnesota v. United States Department of Agriculture*, No. 0:25-cv-04767-LMP-JFD (D. Minn.).

[4] The directive would also require counties to repeat eligibility reviews they had only just completed. Minnesota noted that a household recertified on December 15 would have to go through the entire process again sometime between December 16 and January 15, potentially just one day after its eligibility had already been verified.

That compressed timeline would also make Minnesota's ordinary 45-day notice period impossible, leaving recipients less time to receive notices when mail-delivery delays occur, a particular concern for SNAP recipients experiencing homelessness.

The directive's blanket in-person requirement also created other challenges. Typically, Minnesota counties conduct recertification interviews by telephone, but the directive barred them from doing so despite federal SNAP regulations expressly permitting that option and even requiring states to offer it in certain hardship circumstances.

USDA threatened the loss of federal administrative funding and warned that noncompliance could jeopardize Minnesota's continued participation in SNAP.

The stakes were enormous.

> **"Food assistance for roughly 440,000 Minnesotans could be at risk."**

For families facing hardship, losing SNAP is not a technical change in a government program. It can mean fewer groceries, missed meals, or choosing between food and other necessities.

The potential harms extend well beyond hunger itself. Research has linked food insecurity among children to adverse health outcomes and problems with concentration, behavior, attendance, and academic performance. Among adults, food insecurity has been associated with chronic disease and higher health care costs.

The economic effects can ripple outward as well, reaching grocers, farmers markets, and other businesses that accept SNAP benefits. For example, in Minnesota, every $1 in SNAP benefits can generate up to $1.50 in local economic activity.

Minnesota Takes USDA to Court

Attorney General Ellison took legal action.

On December 23, 2025, the state filed *State of Minnesota v. United States Department of Agriculture*, challenging the recertification directive and USDA's threatened penalties.

Minnesota argued that the 30-day deadline was not merely daunting. It was impossible to meet.[5]

More than 100,000 households. Mandatory in-person interviews. And federal procedures that still had to be followed.

In practice, Minnesota said, the state did not even have the full 30 days to comply. Federal rules required households to have at least 10 days after an interview to provide verification documents, meaning the interviews had to be completed by January 5.

The compressed timeline would also run through the heart of a Minnesota winter, when severe weather can make travel difficult or impossible, and during a 30-day period that included Christmas, Hanukkah, and New Year's Day. Minnesota argued that holiday travel would further reduce the availability of both county employees and SNAP recipients.

Even without those barriers, the affected counties simply did not have enough office space to conduct that many in-person interviews while preserving recipients' privacy and confidentiality.

At the same time, federal immigration enforcement was intensifying in the same communities where many affected SNAP recipients lived. The four counties subject to the directive included the Twin Cities and surrounding metropolitan area where the Trump administration's immigration crackdown was underway.

Minnesota argued that widespread reports of racial profiling, including people being stopped and detained regardless of citizenship or immigration status, had left many residents afraid to leave their homes, including U.S. citizens and others with lawful status.

Now, some of those same Minnesotans were being told they had to appear in person before a government official or risk losing food assistance. That fear could deter many SNAP recipients from completing the required in-person interview.

Minnesota argued that USDA had exceeded its legal authority and violated the Administrative Procedure Act by imposing the new requirements without following the procedures federal law requires. It also argued that threatening Minnesota's SNAP funding based on new conditions imposed after the state joined the program violated the Constitution's Spending Clause.

---

[5] One county, for example, said its SNAP-trained staff would have to work almost 20 hours a day, including weekends and holidays, to meet the deadline. Even assuming it was feasible for staff to work those hours, committing all of the trained employees to the recertification effort would disrupt other essential programs and mandates. The state also pointed out that for some recipients who qualified for hardship accommodations, interviews would have to take place in their homes, adding travel time for county workers.

Then the dispute escalated.

Minutes before a hearing on Minnesota's request for emergency relief, USDA sent an enforcement letter informing the state that it was immediately withholding federal administrative funding.

The December case was not Minnesota's first fight over SNAP, but it brought the stakes into especially sharp focus.[6] Failure to comply with the extraordinarily compressed timeline could mean losing federal support for a program serving nearly half a million Minnesotans.

Minnesota asked the court to step in immediately.

A Federal Judge Blocks the Immediate Funding Threat

On January 16, 2026, a federal judge granted that relief, issuing a preliminary injunction and finding that Minnesota was likely to succeed on at least one of its claims under the Administrative Procedure Act.[7]

The preliminary order blocked USDA from penalizing Minnesota for failing to carry out the recertification directive and prohibited the agency from withholding any of the state's first-quarter administrative funding as threatened in the enforcement letter.

Although the case remains ongoing, the preliminary injunction stopped the immediate threat to Minnesota's SNAP funding.

For the families who rely on SNAP, that meant they could still buy groceries and put food on the table. And for Minnesota, it meant protecting one of the state's most important safeguards against hunger.

2. Keeping Child Care Within Reach and Families Afloat

Food assistance was not the only essential support Minnesota's Attorney General went to court to protect at a time when household budgets were already under enormous pressure.

---

[6] Earlier in 2025, Minnesota joined other states in challenging federal demands for sensitive SNAP recipient data, federal guidance that the states argued unlawfully restricted eligibility for certain noncitizens, and the federal government's attempted suspension of SNAP benefits during the government shutdown.

[7] Order Granting Motion for Preliminary Injunction, *State of Minnesota v. United States Department of Agriculture*, No. 0:25-cv-04767-LMP-JFD (D. Minn. Jan. 16, 2026), ECF No. 44.

A Safety Net for Families and Vulnerable Minnesotans

Child-care prices climbed 29% from 2020 to 2024, leaving many parents to question whether working or going to school still penciled out. Brookings' research estimates that child-care costs push more than 4 million families with young children into financial instability.

The Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF), administered by the Administration for Children and Families (ACF), helps make that equation work. The fund subsidizes child care for families with lower incomes so parents can work, attend school, or pursue job training. In fiscal year 2025, it served more than 18,000 Minnesota families, providing child-care assistance for nearly 35,000 children through more than 3,000 providers.[8]

Those dollars also helped create and preserve child-care openings where they were most needed, train and retain child-care workers, and support high-quality care. In practical terms, CCDF made it possible for participating parents to access affordable, reliable child care.

A Federal Freeze Threatens Three Essential Programs

That support was among the federal funds threatened in January 2026, when ACF froze access to more than $10 billion for California, Colorado, Illinois, Minnesota, and New York, citing concerns about fraud and misuse of federal money.[9]

A press release said the funds would remain frozen until ACF completed a review and determined that the states "are in compliance with federal requirements."

The freeze covered the CCDF and two other crucial programs: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG).

Minnesota uses TANF funds to help eligible low-income families meet basic needs and weather financial crises, helping them cover necessities like food, housing, utilities, diapers, and clothing. As of October 2025, about 23,000 Minnesota families, including about 44,000 children, were receiving that assistance. [10]

---

[8] Unless otherwise indicated, all program-specific data, factual information, and legal arguments described in this section are drawn from the court record in *State of New York v. Administration for Children & Families*, No. 1:26-cv-00172 (S.D.N.Y.).

[9] U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, *HHS Freezes Child Care and Family Assistance Grants in Five States for Fraud Concerns* (Jan. 6, 2026).

[10] Declaration of Kathryn Weeks, *State of New York v. Administration for Children & Families*, No. 1:26-cv-00172 (S.D.N.Y.), ECF No. 40-23.

TANF funds also support services for families with children and pregnant women facing challenges such as homelessness, substance abuse, or a history of child abuse or neglect. Those services are designed to promote self-sufficiency while preventing child abuse and neglect.

SSBG, in turn, supports a broader network of protective and social services for Minnesota residents. For example, SSBG helps counties intervene when a child may not be safe at home or when a vulnerable adult is experiencing abuse or exploitation. In fiscal year 2025, SSBG-funded services reached nearly 400,000 Minnesotans, including about 215,000 children.

For that same fiscal year, the three recurring funding streams represented roughly $470 million in federal support for programs serving hundreds of thousands of vulnerable Minnesotans.[11]

A prolonged freeze would disrupt the support families relied on to afford child care and stay afloat during difficult times. And without SSBG funding, children and vulnerable adults facing abuse, neglect, or exploitation risked having less of a safety net to catch them.

Minnesota and Four Other States Take ACF to Court

Together, the attorneys general for the five affected states filed *State of New York v. Administration for Children and Families*, arguing that ACF lacked authority to freeze the funds based on "mere allegations or suspicion of fraud."

The states did not dispute the federal government's authority to investigate fraud.

Rather, the states noted that the three programs already had extensive systems for audits, monitoring, and oversight, along with procedures the government had to follow before imposing penalties or withholding funds. Those procedures varied by program, but included requirements such as notifying states of suspected violations, giving them an opportunity to respond, and providing hearings or appeals in certain circumstances.

The states highlighted how ACF restricted access to the funds *before* undertaking the review it said was necessary to determine whether the states were complying with federal requirements.

[11] This estimate combines approximately $180 million in FY 2025 CCDF funding, approximately $260 million in FY 2025 TANF funding, and approximately $27 million in FY 2025 SSBG funding. Minnesota's declaration reports the CCDF and SSBG allocations for FY 2025 and describes TANF funding as approximately $260 million annually, consistent with HHS's FY 2025 TANF grant records. The complaint separately lists Minnesota's FY 2025 CCDF allocation as $185 million. This article uses the declaration's figures throughout for consistency and, because each underlying figure is itself approximate, rounds the aggregate to approximately $470 million.

For all three programs, the agency requested that Minnesota produce "the complete universe" of existing administrative data in the state's possession within two weeks. Minnesota's Assistant Commissioner told the court that, to her knowledge, no oversight body had ever conducted a quality-control, audit, or other program-integrity review of that scope in relation to CCDF, TANF, or SSBG.

To the states, the extraordinarily broad request reinforced their argument that the investigation was following the funding restriction rather than preceding it. Calling both the requested task and its timeline "impossible," they argued that the demand itself was offered only as a "pretext to maintain the freeze."

The states' argument went further. ACF could not impose penalties against the entire state based solely on a finding of substantiated fraud by individual bad actors. Only findings of noncompliance in a state's administration of a program could justify such penalties. Even then, Congress limited how much of a state's funding ACF could take away at once.

And the states could not simply wait for the review to run its course and collect the money later.

> **"The freeze did not pause the urgent, ongoing needs these programs were designed to meet."**

The states generally incurred program costs before seeking federal reimbursement, leaving them financially exposed even to temporary disruptions in funding. Minnesota reported that more than $2.1 million in child-care reimbursement requests had already been denied by mid-January, while nearly $1.45 million in TANF requests remained pending.

The state warned that the loss of CCDF funding could force child care providers to reduce capacity or close, leaving parents without affordable care and jeopardizing their ability to work or attend school.

Losing TANF assistance risked putting rent and basic necessities like diapers, food, and clothing even further out of reach for families already in hardship, while placing greater strain on food banks, shelters, schools, and hospitals and driving up costs across those systems.

And because Minnesota had no replacement funding for SSBG, local agencies could eventually be forced to end services for vulnerable children, teenagers, and adults supported by the program.

With those harms looming, the states asked the court for immediate relief.

A Federal Judge Halts the Funding Freeze

On February 6, 2026, the court stepped in, ordering the administration to remove the challenged funding restrictions and barring it from reimposing them while the litigation proceeded.[12] In its March 10 opinion explaining the preliminary injunction, the court found that the states were likely to succeed in showing that ACF's funding freezes were unlawful.[13]

Most strikingly, the court found that ACF had imposed the freeze without identifying a single concrete example of fraud or misuse in its letters to the states. The government could not point to "a single dollar" sent to any of the states that had been used fraudulently, or offer "any concrete evidence of fraud" during the litigation.

Instead, ACF's sudden and sweeping information requests suggested that the agency was trying to gather the very information that should have informed its decision before it restricted the funds.

The court also found that ACF had bypassed required findings, notice, and opportunities for states to respond or appeal before imposing what it called "essentially a punishment." And even if ACF had followed those procedures and found noncompliance, the court noted that Congress still limited the penalties the government could impose for some of the programs. For TANF, for example, the government could not reduce a state's quarterly payment by more than 25 percent.

The litigation is ongoing. But the injunction secured by the state attorneys general prevented the freeze from immediately becoming a crisis for the families and communities that depend on these programs.

For Minnesotans, that means the funding at stake can continue to pay for child care that allows parents to work, cash assistance that helps families afford rent and basic necessities, and local services that step in when children or vulnerable adults are at risk.

---

[12] Order, *State of New York v. Administration for Children & Families*, No. 1:26-cv-00172 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 6, 2026), ECF No. 71.
[13] Opinion & Order, *State of New York v. Administration for Children & Families*, No. 1:26-cv-00172 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 10, 2026), ECF No. 80.

3. Cutting Energy Bills, Expanding Job Opportunities, and Curbing Air Pollution

The third funding fight centered on another cost that has become increasingly difficult for Minnesotans to absorb: energy bills. Collectively, residents have fallen more than $120 million behind.

That problem extends far beyond Minnesota. In some parts of the country, Americans can now pay more to keep the lights on than to keep a roof over their heads. The pressure is only getting worse, with residential electricity prices climbing nearly 40% since 2021, including a 7% increase in 2025 alone.

In Minnesota, about 90,000 households had their electricity or gas shut off due to nonpayment in 2025, almost matching the record set the year before. Behind those shutoffs are tens of thousands of Minnesotans struggling to afford the utilities that keep their homes safe and livable when temperatures soar or plunge to dangerous levels.

What Solar for All Promised Minnesotans

Solar for All—a federal program that sought to expand access to solar energy—was created to help. In 2024, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) awarded Minnesota a $62.45 million grant to reduce energy costs for low-income and disadvantaged households across the state.[14]

Minnesota expected to cut electricity bills by 20% for 11,000 low-income households, saving each household an estimated $250 to $300 a year or more.[15]

Those savings illustrate why the economic value of federal funding cannot always be measured by the size of the grant itself. EPA estimated that Solar for All would generate more than $8 billion in household savings nationwide over the 25-year lifetime of the solar projects.[16]

If Minnesota's projected annual savings held over that same period, then the 11,000 households the state expected to serve would save roughly $69 million to $83 million on electricity bills.[17]

---

[14] Unless otherwise indicated, all program-specific data, factual information, and legal arguments described in this section are drawn from the court record in *Maryland Clean Energy Center v. United States*, No. 1:25-cv-01738 (Fed. Cl.).

[15] Declaration of Melissa Pawlisch, *Maryland Clean Energy Center v. United States*, No. 1:25-cv-01738 (Fed. Cl.), ECF No. 72-13.

[16] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Biden-Harris Administration Announces Over $156 Million to Deliver Residential Solar, Lowering Energy Costs and Advancing Environmental Justice Across Nevada* (Apr. 22, 2024).

[17] The 25-year calculation is an extrapolation, not an official Minnesota projection. The estimate multiplies the stated annual savings per participating household by 11,000 households over 25 years—the asset life EPA used for its

> **"The economic value of federal funding cannot always be measured by the size of the grant itself."**

Lower energy bills were only part of what Minnesota expected the program to deliver.

The projects were expected to increase demand for Minnesota-manufactured solar panels while generating work for local solar installers, construction workers, and electricians. The state also planned to use $2.6 million of the grant to expand job training in the solar industry, helping residents pursue well-paying careers in the clean-energy field.[18]

But even those economic benefits did not capture everything at stake.

The state noted that its analysis did not account for the public-health savings that come from generating electricity without air pollution.[19]

In Minnesota, as across the nation, the burdens of air pollution are far from evenly shared. According to the state's January 2025 air-quality report, 53% of low-income communities and 78% of Indigenous communities and communities of color are exposed to air pollution above health-risk guidelines, compared with 36% statewide.

Solar for All was designed to deliver benefits on multiple fronts: financial relief, economic opportunity, improved public health, and environmental justice.

EPA Cancels Solar for All

But on August 7, 2025, the EPA announced that it was cancelling Solar for All.[20]

---

nationwide Solar for All savings estimate. While Minnesota expected annual savings of $250–$300 "or more" per household, the calculation uses only the stated range and does not attempt to quantify potentially higher savings. The resulting range is $68.75 million to $82.5 million.

[18] A national analysis of 2019 wages found that clean energy jobs paid 25 percent more than the national median and were more likely to offer health and retirement benefits.

[19] Researchers estimated that air pollution from burning fossil fuels was responsible for more than 8 million deaths worldwide in 2018. Air pollution has also been linked to serious health problems, from asthma and heart disease to cancer and depression.

[20] For more on the Trump administration's rollback of clean-energy policies and how state attorneys general are responding, see the Leadership Center for Attorney General Studies, *The Price of Power: State AGs Clash Over Soaring Energy Costs, Green Jobs, and Toxic Toll*.

The next day, it terminated Minnesota's grant, and three days later, the agency withdrew more than $57.6 million from the state's federal payment account.

That left Minnesota in a bind.

The state said that without the money it could no longer fund solar installations for low-income homeowners or projects serving low-income renters in affordable housing.

It would also lose the ability to finance community solar projects that extend solar savings to residents regardless of whether they own their homes, have access to solar, or can afford their own solar arrays.

Minnesota Challenges the Termination in Court

Minnesota challenged the termination on more than one legal front.

In October 2025, it joined other states and public entities in *Maryland Clean Energy Center v. United States*, a breach-of-contract case in the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, seeking money damages on the ground that EPA had violated binding contractual obligations when it terminated the competitive grants awarded under Solar for All.

The next day, Minnesota joined another coalition in federal district court, this time asking the court to set aside the agency's decision to terminate the program. In June 2026, that court dismissed the case for lack of jurisdiction without deciding whether EPA acted unlawfully, concluding that the states' claims belonged exclusively in the Court of Federal Claims.[21]

Minnesota appealed the ruling and continues to pursue its breach-of-contract claim in the Court of Federal Claims.[22]

Federal Judges Reject the Program-Wide Termination

Meanwhile, in September 2026, two federal judges considering separate challenges to EPA's cancellation of Solar for All ruled that its program-wide termination was unlawful.

---

[21] Order on Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment, *State of Arizona v. Environmental Protection Agency*, No. 2:25-cv-02015-TMC (W.D. Wash. June 1, 2026), ECF No. 156.
[22] Notice of Appeal to Ninth Circuit (No. 26-4975), *State of Arizona v. Environmental Protection Agency*, No. 2:25-cv-02015-TMC (W.D. Wash. July 30, 2026), ECF No. 159.

One judge also rejected EPA's argument that Congress had left it without the funding needed to administer the grants, noting that the agency retained more than $3 billion in other funding for necessary expenses, including personnel and related grant-administration costs.[23]

While the breach-of-contract case remains pending, the two rulings could allow Minnesota to regain access to the funds it needs to bring lower electric bills, new career opportunities, and cleaner air back within reach.

III. Protecting the Dollars That Keep States Running

The conflict that opened this story was palpable in Minnesota's streets.

The fight over federal funding has unfolded more quietly, through lawsuits, legal arguments, and court orders. But its effects can be just as tangible.

The three cases highlighted here illustrate just some of what Minnesota stands to lose: federal funding that can help Minnesotans afford basics like groceries, child care, and energy bills at a time when household budgets are being squeezed from every direction.

If those supports disappear, the losses do not necessarily stop there.

They can ripple through workplaces, local businesses, service providers, and public systems across the state.

Minnesota's litigation underscores the growing significance of state attorneys general in protecting not only the federal dollars that keep states running, but the people, businesses, and communities that depend on that funding.

When federal action threatens funding that Congress has set aside to help put food on the table, support working families, keep essential services operating, and strengthen local economies, state attorneys general can take the fight to the courts.

The financial stakes may be measured in dollars, but the consequences are felt one household and one community at a time.

---

[23] Memorandum and Order, *Rhode Island AFL-CIO v. United States Environmental Protection Agency*, No. 1:25-cv-00510-MSM-PAS (D.R.I. Sept. 18, 2026), ECF No. 48; Memorandum Opinion, *Harris County, Texas v. United States Environmental Protection Agency*, No. 1:25-cv-03646-TSC (D.D.C. Sept. 22, 2026), ECF No. 58.

The Leadership Center for Attorney General Studies is a non-partisan organization dedicated to educating the public about the important role state attorneys general play in addressing pressing issues, enforcing laws, and bringing about change.