



HEATHER FERBERT
CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF SAN DIEGO

PRESS RELEASE

IMMEDIATE RELEASE
NOVEMBER 25, 2025

Ibrahim Ahmed
(619) 666-4161
iaahmed@sandiego.gov

 [heatherferbert.ca](https://www.instagram.com/heatherferbert.ca) | sandiego.gov/cityattorney

FEDERAL COURT ISSUES PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION ON EMERGENCY AND DISASTER FUNDING CONDITIONS IN LAWSUIT FILED BY 28 LOCAL GOVERNMENTS, INCLUDING THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Court order blocks the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and FEMA from placing unlawful conditions on hundreds of millions of dollars in emergency preparedness funding

SAN DIEGO — Last Friday, a federal judge issued a preliminary injunction order preventing the Trump administration from imposing unlawful conditions on more than \$350 million in federal emergency and disaster preparedness funds administered by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

The injunction is the first major ruling in the lawsuit filed on September 30 by the City of San Diego and 28 other local governments nationwide. The lawsuit challenges the administration's attempt to require local jurisdictions to abandon diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives as a condition of receiving DHS and FEMA funds. The plaintiffs argue these demands are unconstitutional and exceed the executive's authority, falling far outside what Congress authorized.

"This preliminary injunction is an important step for public safety and for upholding the rule of law," said **San Diego City Attorney Heather Ferbert**. "The court recognized that emergency funds should not be used as political leverage. San Diegans rely on these resources to prepare for wildfires, floods, and other disasters, and my office will continue working to ensure those protections remain secure."

"As local governments, we take our responsibility seriously to protect all members of the community from the ravages of disaster, no matter their politics," said **Santa Clara County Counsel Tony LoPresti**. "We are grateful for the Court's recognition that the Trump administration's political agenda has no role to play in the funding that Congress appropriates every year for emergency response and recovery. Governments shouldn't have to pass a political litmus test to be able to care for their communities, especially in the face of a disaster."

"Today's decision provides essential protection for the communities who need support to prevent and recover from disasters," said **Jill Habig, founder and CEO of Public Rights Project**. "The court found these FEMA conditions likely unlawful, allowing our local partners to keep doing what they do best — protect their residents."

The coalition of 29 plaintiffs includes major cities, counties, and regional agencies responsible for the safety and well-being of tens of millions of residents. These jurisdictions prepare for and respond to a wide range of emergencies — from wildfires, floods, earthquakes, and severe weather to infectious disease outbreaks, mass shootings, acts of terrorism, and threats to critical infrastructure such as ports, airports, and transit systems. The administration's conditions would require local governments to adopt federal political directives or risk losing essential funding needed to protect their communities.

The County of Santa Clara and the City and County of San Francisco are the lead plaintiffs. Public Rights Project represents most of the additional plaintiffs. The plaintiffs are:

Alameda, Calif.; Bellingham, Wash.; Berkeley, Calif.; City and County of San Francisco, Calif.; Culver City, Calif.; King County, Wash.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Los Angeles County, Calif.; Los Angeles County Fire District, Calif.; Marin County, Calif.; Oakland, Calif.; Palo Alto, Calif.; Pasadena, Calif.; Petaluma, Calif.; Pierce County, Wash.; Sacramento, Calif.; San Diego, Calif.; San Diego County, Calif.; San José, Calif.; San Mateo County, Calif.; Santa Clara County, Calif.; Santa Monica, Calif.; Santa Rosa, Calif.; Snohomish County, Wash.; Sonoma County, Calif.; Sonoma County Community Development Commission, Calif.; Sonoma Sanitation, Calif.; Sonoma Water, Calif.; and Tucson, Ariz.

The case is County of Santa Clara v. Noem (Case No. 3:25-cv-8330). A copy of the complaint is available [here](#).

###



SAN DIEGO CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
1200 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1620
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101



heatherferbert.ca



LinkedIn

Press releases can be accessed on the San Diego City Attorney's website: www.sandiego.gov/cityattorney