

I. Summary

1. Following the third UPR cycle in 2020, the U.S. federal government has issued policies that impede state and local government implementation of human rights obligations, particularly in regard to (1) funding cuts for welfare programs, (2) the environment, (3) and immigration.
2. U.S. taxpayers pay into the federal budget, and the federal government reallocates a significant portion of this tax revenue back to state and local governments to support social and welfare programs. While the federal government holds authority over national immigration enforcement, it cannot compel state and local governments to participate in these activities, nor can it punish states by withholding essential federal funds.
3. Since January 2025, the U.S. federal government has deliberately undermined states' efforts to meet human rights obligations by cutting congressionally mandated funding for vital welfare programs and climate change mitigation programs. These discriminatory divestments deliberately target Democratic-led states as a form of political punishment. Instead of policing federal funds, the U.S. should instead invest more resources to alleviate personal, social, and environmental injustices.
4. Changes in environmental regulation have compounded these harms. On February 12, 2026, the U.S. government revoked the 2009 Environmental Protection Agency Endangerment Finding, which enabled the agency to regulate greenhouse gases. The revocation creates a regulatory vacuum that prevents federal and state governments from meeting climate obligations and protecting citizens from adverse climate harm. The U.S. should instead recommit to and cooperate with the international community to combat climate change.²
5. Since the previous UPR cycle, the U.S. enacted policies that systematically constrained local, city, and state governments from upholding their human rights obligations. The federal government conditioned funding on immigration enforcement compliance and initiated litigation against local, city, and state governments that did not comply with federal policies. The U.S. must adopt policies that are consistent with international human rights obligations to protect migrant human rights and cease actions that deter other levels of government from implementing these obligations.

II. Funding Cuts: Welfare and Climate Programs

A. The U.S. federal government's discriminatory divestment of federal funds politically punishes Democrat-led states and undermines local human rights and climate obligations.

6. The U.S. government has executed a clear pattern of human rights infringement with regard to federal funding cuts. The federal government has cut funding from, or terminated, a number of crucial social welfare programs, often only from Democrat-led states and from sub-national governments that enact stronger human rights protections than the limited protections in the 1968 Fair Housing Act. These discriminatory policies undermine sub-national authority and democracy while also impeding rather than supporting U.S. compliance with international human rights law and standards. Moreover, they prevent the U.S. from upholding its obligation to ensure the progressive realization of human rights.

7. These funding cuts deny states' and municipalities' ability to carry out their own human rights obligations, in that they dismantle state programs and services, strain budgets, and generate administrative burdens and staffing cuts that fuel public distrust. Such explicit attacks require litigation by state, municipal, and NGO advocates, to protect constituents' human rights. These lawsuits cite concerns regarding human rights, discrimination, and a variety of abuses of executive power. Though many cases are ongoing, many have succeeded in winning temporary restraining orders or preliminary injunctions to restore funding until the case is decided; however, the federal government has withheld funding in the interim, causing uncertainty and gaps in service. Thus, unlawful federal actions have obstructed state and local governments from fulfilling their own international human rights obligations. (Tables detailing this pattern and the content of the lawsuits can be found in the Annex).

8. The government's "Ask forgiveness, not permission" approach means that funding is denied as litigation is ongoing, whether it is a few weeks before a preliminary injunction is in place, or months before the case is finally resolved. When it comes to critical welfare, even the smallest lapse in funds can bring direct and lasting harm to individuals, families, and communities. In many instances the federal government refused to release funds even after a court ordered it. For example, the federal government refused to restore emergency relief (FEMA) funds after a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction required them to do so.³

i. Freezing funds for social services in Democrat-led states disproportionately affects marginalized groups.

9. On Jan. 6, 2026, U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services froze \$10 billion in child care and family assistance for California, Colorado, Illinois, Minnesota and New York.⁴ This includes \$2.4 billion from the Child Care and Development Fund, \$7.35 billion from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, and \$869 million from the Social Services Block Grant. In their lawsuit, the five states detailed the importance of these funds in combating poverty, and outlined the harms to state ability to enforce human rights.⁵ It stated that the cuts "have drastic consequences for Plaintiff States' ability to administer critical benefits programs, manage their budgets and plan for the future," along with causing administrative burden and public distrust that will make it harder to provide other crucial social services. The court has granted a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction to continue funding while the case is tried, recognizing that the states would "suffer irreparable harm" otherwise.^{6 7}

10. The lawsuit details how the federal government used allegations of fraud to cut funding from programs as a form of political punishment. These allegations stemmed from a YouTube video "exposing" fraud in Minnesotan child care centers and a litigated case of fraud amongst portions of Minnesota's Somali diaspora.⁸ This does not constitute adequate reason to cut whole swaths of funding in Minnesota, much less that of other states, especially when it was done without adequate investigation of fraud. The administration has made multiple statements making it clear these cuts are intended as punishment of political rivals.

11. On January 4th, 2026, the President stated to the press, "but think of it, \$19 billion, at least they [Somali-Americans] have stolen from Minnesota and from the United States.... And we're not going to pay it anymore. We're going to have [Minnesota Governor] Walz go pay. We're not

going to pay them, and we're not going to pay California, and we're not going to pay Illinois with a big slob of a governor that they have."⁹

12. On January 5th, 2026 the President stated in a Truth Social post, "Governor Walz has destroyed the State of Minnesota, but others, like Governor Gavin Newsom, JB Pritzker, and Kathy Hochul, have done, in my opinion, an even more dishonest and incompetent job. NO ONE IS ABOVE THE LAW!"¹⁰

13. Withholding funds in Democrat-led states violates ICERD Articles 2 and 5, because the policy prevents an equal enjoyment of services. Article 2 prohibits governments from enacting racially discriminatory policies, and Article 5 further guarantees the right to equal enjoyment of rights (welfare).¹¹ The U.S. funding cuts unfairly discriminated against children of Somali descent and disproportionately inhibited their enjoyment of the right to social services.

ii. The U.S. government's attempts to dismantle state public health and climate infrastructure violates human rights law.

14. On February 4th, 2026, the federal Office of Management and Budget ordered the Department of Transportation to cancel more than \$943 million for infrastructure, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to cancel at least \$602 million in funding for health and environmental programs in California, Colorado, Illinois and Minnesota. Major cuts include those to electric vehicle charging infrastructure, 24 programs for HIV and STI prevention, and the Public Health Infrastructure Grant (PHIG).^{12 13}

15. In their lawsuit against the CDC cuts, the four states detail the importance of these funds in promoting public health, and outline the harms to state ability to enforce human rights.¹⁴ It describes how "the PHIG is the backbone of federal public health funding, providing critical financial support, not only to Plaintiff States directly, but to hundreds of local public health agencies through pass-through funding," and that "essential public health workers would lose their jobs—and Plaintiff States would lose their services, expertise, and institutional knowledge." It goes on to list a variety of other state services that will be harmed, such as a "Minnesota grant listed for termination that funds the collection and publication of state injury data, which State and local health departments use to inform injury prevention efforts" and "Illinois' HIV surveillance system" without which "Illinois would have no reliable way of tracking the spread of HIV within the State, and the State's capacity to detect and respond to HIV outbreaks would collapse." The court has granted a temporary restraining order to continue funding before a preliminary injunction hearing is held, recognizing the states would "suffer irreparable harm" otherwise.¹⁵

16. The lawsuit details how the Trump administration has cut funds "to punish Plaintiff States because of political animus." It began as a campaign against sanctuary jurisdictions; political opponents that harbor and protect illegal immigrants. In January and early February of 2026, the President made multiple public statements claiming he would no longer pay sanctuary cities and states. Between February 1st and 4th, the Office of Management and Budget released a targeting directive cutting funding from a variety of programs in Democrat states, including the \$943 million and \$602 million mentioned above.

17. On January 20th, 2026 the President stated at a press conference, “you’ve got to get rid of your sanctuary cities, and I hope our people know that we’re not going to pay sanctuary cities. We’re not going to pay them anymore. They are sanctuary for criminals.”¹⁶

18. Similarly, on February 2, 2026 the President stated on a podcast that “sanctuary cities are a disaster, so I put out an order, anybody that does a sanctuary city is not getting any money.”¹⁷

19. The U.S. violates the ICCPR obligations of non-discrimination and equality before the law because the federal government is only targeting Democrat-led states with funding cuts. Under Articles 2 and 26 of the ICCPR, States must ensure all persons can enjoy the enumerated rights without any distinction; these provisions also prohibit discrimination of any kind, including political affiliations.¹⁸ The federal government violates international human rights law by withholding funds to punish Democrats over political differences.

iii. Cutting funding for clean energy initiatives violates human rights because it targets states that have political differences with the federal government and undermines ratified climate commitments.

20. On October 1st 2025, the Department of Energy terminated \$7.56 billion in funding for 223 projects promoting clean energy and emissions reduction in 16 Democrat-led states.¹⁹ The City of St. Paul, Minnesota and local NGOs filed suit, as did 13 of the states.^{20 21}

21. The two lawsuits detail the importance of these funds in combating climate change, and outline the harms to state and local ability to enforce human rights. *California et al. v. Wright et al.* lists harms to each state, including termination of clean energy projects, staffing cuts, and diminished regulatory ability, all resulting in a diminished ability to “meet climate goals.” *City of Saint Paul, Minnesota et al. v. Wright et al.* states “it will be devastating to Plaintiffs and the other awardees who had structured their work in reliance on the federal government upholding its promises to provide this funding” and lists NGO and city efforts harmed by the cuts. While *California et al. v. Wright et al.* is ongoing, *City of Saint Paul, Minnesota et al. v. Wright et al.* succeeded in reinstating funding for 7 green projects (\$27.6 million).²²

22. The ruling in the St. Paul case stated, “Defendants freely admit that they made grant-termination decisions primarily—if not exclusively—based on whether the awardee resided in a state whose citizens voted for President Trump in 2024. There is no rational relationship between that classification and Defendants stated governmental interest. Defendants’ decisions to terminate Plaintiffs’ grants therefore violate the Fifth Amendment.” This finding resulted from a series of public statements made by the administration, and an opinion issued in court where they defend their consideration of partisan politics.

23. On October 1st 2025, in an X post, Russell Vought, director of the Office of Management and Budget, stated, “nearly \$8 billion in Green New Scam funding to fuel the Left’s climate agenda is being cancelled.”²³

24. On October 2nd 2025, in a Truth Social post the President said, “I have a meeting today with Russ Vought, of PROJECT 2025 Fame, to determine which of the many Democrat Agencies, most of which are a political SCAM, he recommends to be cut...”²⁴

25. Likewise, on October 9th 2025, in a Cabinet meeting the President stated, “we’re only cutting Democrat programs” and that they will “get a little taste of their own medicine.”²⁵

26. Terminating funding for clean energy initiatives because of political rivalries violates Articles 6 and 26 of ICCPR. Article 6 stipulates that all, human beings have an inherent right to life that must be protected by law, and “no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of... life.”²⁶ Failing to properly mitigate foreseeable environmental dangers violates the right to life. The federal government also violates the obligation to ensure equal protection under the law irrespective of political opinion²⁷ by deliberately cutting funds for environmental programs in Democrat-led states.

B. Past recommendations and U.S. government inaction

27. In the previous UPR cycle the U.S. received several recommendations addressing access to welfare programs such as health care. Specifically, that the U.S. should “combat all forms of discrimination by guaranteeing equitable access to justice, medical care and quality education”.²⁸ Many countries reiterated that the U.S. needs to redirect its attention to its healthcare programs and ensure that marginalized groups are supported by such programs.²⁹

28. In response, the U.S. stated that it was “committed to combating discrimination”³⁰ and that they support investing in direct solutions to alleviate the personal and social problems surrounding issues of poverty.”³¹ While the federal government initially worked in accordance with these recommendations, in the past year the government has undone many of those efforts.

C. Current recommendations

29. The U.S. must cease its efforts to cut funding from welfare, environmental, and disaster prevention programs.

30. As recommended in the previous cycle, the U.S. should take further measures to make health-care services accessible to vulnerable people not supported by the current health system.³²

31. If the federal government wishes to root out fraud, they must conduct proper legal investigations and deny aid only to proven fraudsters. Funding cuts must not be used as a pretext to cut funding for entire states, localities, or regions.

32. The federal government should not enact policies that permit discriminatory distribution of necessary federal funds.

33. The federal government should not abuse its power and enact policy simply because of political animus.

III. Environmental Regulation

A. By directing the EPA to rescind the Endangerment Finding, the federal government undermined federal climate protections and preempted state-level environmental authority, and increased the risk of harm to U.S. residents due to climate change.

34. On February 12, 2026, the Environmental Protection Agency issued its Final Rule rescinding the Endangerment Finding.³³ Originally made in 2009, the Finding declared that greenhouse gas emissions endanger public health and safety, and provided the legal basis for federal regulation of greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act.³⁴ Not only does this rescission abandon widely accepted science, it repeals all current greenhouse gas regulations and removes federal authority to regulate greenhouse gases in the future.

35. Now that Final Rules claims the EPA is no longer responsible for regulating greenhouse gases, state authority is left in a legal gray area. In 2025, the federal government filed various lawsuits against state attempts to regulate the climate, arguing it is federal, not state, authority to regulate national emissions and interstate commerce (i.e., Vermont and New York's Climate Superfunds; Hawaii and Michigan's plans to sue fossil fuel corporations).³⁵ The President also signed three Congressional Review Act resolutions, banning states from setting higher emission standards than the federal government.

36. Environmental organizations and states have made the argument that the EPA's abdication of authority leaves regulation up to state discretion.³⁶ However, the EPA asserts in its Final Rule that the Clean Air Act "continues to preempt"³⁷ state authority, potentially depriving states of the power to regulate greenhouse gases.

37. Under Article 6 of the ICCPR, "every human being has the inherent right to life, and this right shall be protected by law. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his life."³⁸ The U.S. is in violation of Article 6 because the federal government's rescission of the EPA Finding arbitrarily removed the legal basis for regulating greenhouse gases and leaves residents unprotected from the dangers of climate change.

38. Regardless of how courts resolve the question of state authority over greenhouse gas regulation, the U.S. is leading a campaign against environmental regulation on federal and state levels. This leaves current residents and future generations in severe danger from the harms of climate change.

B. Past recommendations and U.S. government inaction

39. In the previous UPR cycle, various countries³⁹ sent recommendations to the U.S. regarding climate change. It was recommended that the U.S. "advance towards the implementation of instruments to combat climate change and its negative impacts on human rights."⁴⁰ States also recommended that the U.S. should "intensify efforts to develop and strengthen the necessary legislative frameworks that address cross-sectoral environmental challenges."⁴¹ The U.S. supported these recommendations and stated "addressing climate change is a core priority for the U.S. We intend to take action consistent with U.S. law to develop and implement an ambitious plan to combat the climate crisis."⁴²

40. Initially the previous administration immediately worked toward fulfilling these recommendations by rejoining the Paris Agreement and promoting helpful domestic legislation to fund climate mitigation measures, but as of January 2025 the federal government reinitiated action to withdraw the U.S., cancelled most of the climate-related funding, and rescinded the

Endangerment Finding.

C. Current recommendations

41. The Environmental Protection Agency must reinstate its Endangerment Finding and allow state-level climate regulation.

42. Congress must overturn the three CRA resolutions, and allow all states to create regulations above federal minimum.

43. The U.S. must intensify efforts to develop and strengthen the necessary legislative frameworks that address cross-sectoral environmental challenges, including climate change adaptation and mitigation efforts.

IV. Immigration

A. Forcing states to implement inhumane immigration practices through coercive measures violates human rights obligations.

44. The U.S. has executed a clear and escalating pattern of human rights infringement with regard to immigration enforcement. Rather than enforcing federal immigration law, the federal government has weaponized that authority to coerce local and state governments into active participation in enforcement practices that conflict with their own human rights obligations—threatening funding cuts, filing federal lawsuits, and publicly blacklisting jurisdictions that decline to comply.

45. This results in a structurally unequal denial of human rights protections, where immigrants residing in cities and states that attempt to protect them, find those efforts systematically dismantled by federal pressure. These actions deny municipalities' ability to carry out their own human rights obligations by stripping them of the fiscal resources, legal autonomy, and practical tools needed to serve their populations. Such explicit federal attacks have necessitated responses from cities, states, and NGOs through litigation—and while many cases have achieved preliminary relief, the administration has repeatedly defied court orders, extended harm through delay, and continued its enforcement agenda while litigation proceeds.

i. “Protecting the American People Against an Invasion” Executive Order infringes on migrants’ human rights

46. On January 20, 2025, the President signed Executive Order (E.O.) 14159 “Protecting the American People Against an Invasion”), which threatens to cut federal funding to so-called “sanctuary” jurisdictions and directs the Attorney General to pursue civil or criminal action against any jurisdiction that “interferes” with federal immigration enforcement (Congressional Research Service, 2025).⁴³ By February 2025, the DOJ had issued guidance confirming sanctuary jurisdictions would be denied DOJ grants; by August 2025, a formal public blacklist had been published naming 13 states, 18 cities, and 4 counties. In early 2025, the federal government filed federal lawsuits against Chicago, Cook County, and the state of Illinois, as well as New York, for maintaining sanctuary policies.⁴⁴

47. This financial coercion sits in direct legal tension with the anti-commandeering doctrine established in *Printz v. United States* (1997), in which the Supreme Court held that the federal government cannot commandeer state or local officers to enforce federal law, and reaffirmed in *NFIB v. Sebelius* (2012), where the Court ruled that conditioning catastrophic funding loss on state compliance amounts to unconstitutional coercion.⁴⁵

48. The U.S. is in violation of Articles 2 and 26 of the ICCPR,⁴⁶ which prohibits discrimination in the exercising of certain rights, and prohibits discrimination of any kind, political or otherwise. Since the federal government is targeting Democrat-led states, specifically sanctuary states/cities, it violates the obligation to protect all actors equally without political prejudice.

49. Multiple federal courts have blocked portions of the administration's funding threats on these grounds. Yet the administration has continued to pursue its agenda through litigation and executive action, leaving local governments to choose between fiscal survival and their human rights obligations.

ii. Termination of CBP One and the Refugee Admission Program violated migrants' human rights

50. On January 20, 2025, as part of E.O. 14165 ("Securing Our Borders"), the federal government terminated the CBP One application—the primary legal pathway by which asylum seekers could schedule appointments to present at ports of entry. Approximately 30,000 existing appointments were canceled on inauguration day alone, leaving tens of thousands of asylum seekers stranded in Mexico without legal recourse.⁴⁷ That same day, EO 14163 ("Realigning the United States Refugee Admissions Program") indefinitely suspended the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP), effective January 27, 2025, halting refugee processing, canceling approved travel, and cutting funding to resettlement agencies.⁴⁸

51. By February 26, 2025, the administration had terminated the Welcome Corps program and ended cooperative agreements with resettlement agencies nationwide—organizations that had spent decades building the local infrastructure needed to integrate refugees into American communities.⁴⁹ By October 2025, the administration set the lowest ever refugee admissions cap in USRAP history at 7,500 slots, prioritizing Afrikaners from South Africa, and by November 2025 had paused processing of approximately 4 million pending asylum applications.⁵⁰

52. The termination of CBP One and USRAP suspension devastated local resettlement infrastructure. Cities and counties that had built programs, housing pipelines, employment partnerships, and social services around refugee arrivals were left with abrupt funding gaps and service collapses, with no advance notice or transition period.⁵¹

53. These actions directly implicate the prohibition on refoulement under Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture (CAT)⁵² and Articles 6 and 7 of the ICCPR,⁵³ which prohibit return to places where an individual face the risk of serious harm, torture, or arbitrary deprivation of life.

54. By eliminating legal pathways and stranding approved refugees in dangerous conditions abroad, the federal government has made it structurally impossible for local resettlement partners

and governments to fulfill the reception, protection, and integration obligations they are positioned—and in many cases legally contracted—to provide.

B. Past recommendations and U.S. government inaction

50. During the last cycle, the U.S. received multiple recommendations in regard to migrant human rights. El Salvador recommended that the U.S. “make efforts in favor of the human rights of migrants, asylum seekers, and refugees.”⁵⁴ Myanmar emphasized that the U.S. should “step up measures to protect and ensure the rights of migrants.”⁵⁵

53. The U.S. supported both recommendations and stated “the U.S. supports efforts to protect the human rights of non-citizens in immigration detention, consistent with our international obligations as well as the appropriate use of alternatives to detention.”⁵⁶

54. However, since 2025 the U.S. completely abandoned this commitment and has enacted policies that violate immigrants’ human rights while, attempting to force state compliance by conditioning federal funding.

55. There are no previous recommendations regarding the federal government coercing local or state compliance.

C. Current recommendations

56. The U.S. should uphold its commitment from the previous cycle to enforce “safe, humane, and lawful immigration enforcement, including access to asylum and family unity.”⁵⁷

57. The federal government should stop incarceration of migrants and seek alternatives.⁵⁸

58. The federal government should not threaten divestment to coerce state compliance with federal immigration efforts and should respect sanctuary jurisdictions.

59. The federal government should not enact policies to punish political adversaries.

¹ Report prepared by: Grace Janczak, University of Pittsburgh, Sophie Lu, University of Pittsburgh, Britton Schwartz Deputy Director International Human Rights Clinic (IHRC) Santa Clara Law, Zunish Sardar J.D. IHRC SCU Fellow, Léocadia Tchouaffé Southern Poverty Law Center Fellow

² “Rescission of the Greenhouse Gas Endangerment Finding and Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards Under the Clean Air Act”, United States Environmental Protection Agency, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2026-02-18/pdf/2026-03157.pdf>, February 18, 2026.

³ Attorney General James Takes Action to Stop Trump from Withholding Critical Disaster Relief Funding. Letitia James New York State Attorney General, <https://ag.ny.gov/press-release/2025/attorney-general-james-takes-action-stop-trump-withholding-critical-disaster> March 25, 2025.

⁴ HHS Freezes Child Care and Family Assistance Grants in Five States for Fraud Concerns, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, <https://www.hhs.gov/press-room/hhs-freezes-child-care-family-assistance-grants-five-states-fraud-concerns.html>, January 6, 2026.

⁵ Complaint for Declaratory And Injunctive Relief, United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Case No 26-cv-00172, <https://ag.ny.gov/sites/default/files/court-filings/state-of-new-york-et-al-v-administration-for-children-and-families-et-al-complaint-2026.pdf>, January 8, 2026.

⁶ Arun Subramanian, United States District Judge, United States District Court Southern District of New York, Case

No 26-cv-172 (AS),

https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nysd.655886/gov.uscourts.nysd.655886.22.0_1.pdf , January 8, 2026.

⁷ Vernon S. Broderick, United States District Judge, United States District Court of Southern District of New York, Case No 1:26-cv-00172. (VSB),

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.nysd.655886/gov.uscourts.nysd.655886.80.0.pdf> , March 10, 2026.

⁸ How Fraud Swamped Minnesota's Social Services System on Tim Walz's Watch, The New York Times, Ernesto Londono, <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/11/29/us/fraud-minnesota-somali.html>, January 7, 2026.

⁹ President Trump Gaggles with Press on Air Force One", Video, 4 Jan. 2026,

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9XVjd3R2T3g&t=1157s>.

¹⁰ Donald J. Trump, Truth Social Post, Jan. 6th, 2026, <https://perma.cc/PC25-UDED>.

¹¹ ICERD art. 2 and 5.

¹² White House instructs DOT, CDC to cut \$1.5B in grants for Dem States citing, citing waster and management, <https://nypost.com/2026/02/04/us-news/white-house-instructs-dot-cdc-to-cut-1-5b-in-woke-green-grants-for-dem-states/>, February 6 2026.

¹³ Trump Administration to Cut \$600 Million in Health Funding From Four States, The New York Times, Apoorva Mandavilli, https://www.nytimes.com/2026/02/09/health/trump-public-health-cuts-california.html?campaign_id=9&emc=edit_nn_20260210&instance_id=170857&nl=the-morning®i_id=291654856&segment_id=215048&user_id=e0396231c62f89c18961fa06693cb643, February 9th, 2026.

¹⁴ United States District Court Northern District of Illinois Eastern Division, State of Illinois et al. v. Russel Vought et al., Case No. 26-cv-1566, Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief,

https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press-docs/1%20Complaint_0.pdf , 11 February 2026.

¹⁵ United States District Court Northern District of Illinois Eastern Division, State of Illinois et al. v. Russel Vought et al., Case No. 26-cv-1566, Temporary Restraining Order, https://illinoisattorneygeneral.gov/News-Room/Current-News/2022%2002%2012%20TRO%20CDC%20grants.pdf?language_id=1 , 12 February 2026.

¹⁶ The White House, "Press Secretary Karoline Leavitt Briefs Members of the Media, Jan. 20, 2026", video, 20 January 2026, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/videos/press-secretary-karoline-leavitt-briefs-members-of-the-media-jan-20-2026/>.

¹⁷ Dan Bongino Show, "I'm Back" (Ep. 2443), podcast, <https://rumble.com/v756t38-im-back-ep.-2443-02022026.html> , February 2, 2026.

¹⁸ ¹⁸ ICCPR art. 2 and 26.

¹⁹ U.S. Department of Energy, "Energy Department Announces Termination of 223 Projects, Saving Over \$7.5 Billion", <https://web.archive.org/web/20260221140823/https://www.energy.gov/articles/energy-department-announces-termination-223-projects-saving-over-75-billion> , 1 October 2025.

²⁰ United States District Court for the District of Columbia, City of Saint Paul Minnesota et al. v. Christopher Wright et al., Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, Case No. 25-cv-03899.

(APM), <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.dcd.286703/gov.uscourts.dcd.286703.1.0.pdf> , November 10, 2025.

²¹ United States District Court for the District of Columbia, City of Saint Paul Minnesota et al. v. Christopher Wright et al., Memorandum/Opinion and Order, Case No. 25-cv-03899

(APM), https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.dcd.286703/gov.uscourts.dcd.286703.28.0_5.pdf , January 12, 2026.

²² United States District Court for the District of Columbia, City of Saint Paul Minnesota et al. v. Christopher Wright et al., Memorandum/Opinion and Order, Case No. 25-cv-03899 (APM), 12 January

2026, https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.dcd.286703/gov.uscourts.dcd.286703.28.0_5.pdf.

²³ Russell Vought, X post, <https://x.com/russvought/status/1973450301236715838?s=20> , October 1, 2025.

²⁴ Donald J. Trump, Truth Social post, <https://truthsocial.com/@realDonaldTrump/posts/115304455138824245> , 2 October 2025.

²⁵ Kevin Breuninger, "Trump threatens to use government shutdown to cut 'popular Democrat programs', CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2025/10/09/trump-government-shutdown-programs.html> , 9 October 2025.

²⁶ ICCPR art. 6.

²⁷ ICCPR art. 26.

²⁸ A/HRC/46/15/ Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 114.

²⁹ Switzerland, Ethiopia, Azerbaijan, Poland, Portugal, Angola, Iraq, Singapore, Turkey, Venezuela, China, and Cuba gave recommendations regarding welfare programs specifically health and sanitation related.

A/HRC/46/15/ Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 114, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298.

³⁰ A/HRC/46/15/Add.1. Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. Addendum: Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments, and replies presented by the State under review. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 6.

³¹ A/HRC/46/15/Add.1. Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. Addendum: Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments, and replies presented by the State under review. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 12.

³² A/HRC/46/15/ Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 290.

³³ "Rescission of the Greenhouse Gas Endangerment Finding and Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards Under the Clean Air Act", United States Environmental Protection

Agency, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2026-02-18/pdf/2026-03157.pdf>, February 18, 2026.

³⁴ "Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act", Environmental Protection Agency, <https://www.epa.gov/climate-change/endangerment-and-cause-or-contribute-findings-greenhouse-gases-under-section-202a>.

³⁵ United States District Court for the District of Vermont, United States v. Vermont et al., Civil Action No. 2:25-cv-463, Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, 01 May 2025, <https://www.justice.gov/opa/media/1398811/dl?inline>.

³⁶ United States District Court for the District of Vermont, United States v. Vermont et al., Civil Action No. 2:25-cv-00463, Intervenor-Defendants' Notice of Supplemental Authority, <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/27422731-vermont/>, 27 February 2026.

³⁷ "Rescission of the Greenhouse Gas Endangerment Finding and Motor Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards Under the Clean Air Act", United States Environmental Protection Agency, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2026-02-18/pdf/2026-03157.pdf> 18 February 2026.

³⁸ ICCPR art 6.

³⁹ The Bahamas, Fiji and Haiti were the states provided recommendations regarding climate change.

A/HRC/46/15/ Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 150, 151, 152.

⁴⁰ A/HRC/46/15/ Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 150.

⁴¹ A/HRC/46/15/ Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 152.

⁴² A/HRC/46/15/Add.1. Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. Addendum: Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments, and replies presented by the State under review. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 12.

⁴³ Congressional Research Service, "Sanctuary Jurisdictions: Legal Overview," 4 March 2025, <https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/LSB11321>.

⁴⁴ National Immigration Forum, "Are Sanctuary Policies Unlawful? State and Municipal Prerogatives to Collaborate with Federal Immigration Authorities," 21 February 2025, <https://forumtogether.org/article/are-sanctuary-policies-unlawful-state-and-municipal-prerogatives-to-collaborate-with-federal-immigration-authorities/>.

⁴⁵ Human Rights Research, "Sanctuary Within the Context of Immigration Law Enforcement," 2 May 2025, <https://www.humanrightsresearch.org/post/sanctuary-within-the-context-of-immigration-law-enforcement>.

⁴⁶ ICCPR, art 2 and 26.

⁴⁷ American Immigration Council, "CBP One: An Overview," March 2025, <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/fact-sheet/cbp-one-overview/>.

⁴⁸ International Refugee Assistance Project, "Pacito v. Trump: Challenging Trump's Suspension of USRAP," 12 September 2025, <https://refugeerights.org/news-resources/pacito-v-trump-challenging-trumps-suspension-of-usrap>.

⁴⁹ International Rescue Committee, "How Have the Trump Administration's Policies Impacted Refugees?," 27

January 2026, <https://www.rescue.org/article/how-have-trump-policies-impacted-refugees>.

⁵⁰ NPR, "Trump Rolls Back Pause on Asylum Decisions Imposed After D.C. National Guard Shooting," 30 March 2026, <https://www.npr.org/2026/03/30/nx-s1-5766344/trump-rolls-back-pause-on-asylum-decisions>.

⁵¹ Global Refuge, "The Human Consequences of the Executive Order on Refugee Resettlement," 20 January 2025, https://www.globalrefuge.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Resettlement_EO.pdf.

⁵² CAT art. 3.

⁵³ ICCPR art 6 and 7.

⁵⁴ A/HRC/46/15/ Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 327.

⁵⁵ A/HRC/46/15/ Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 328.

⁵⁶ A/HRC/46/15/Add.1. Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. Addendum: Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments, and replies presented by the State under review. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 18.

⁵⁷ A/HRC/46/15/Add.1. Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. Addendum: Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments, and replies presented by the State under review. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 18.

⁵⁸ A/HRC/46/15/Add.1. Report of the Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review, United States of America. Addendum: Views on conclusions and/or recommendations, voluntary commitments, and replies presented by the State under review. UN Human Rights Council forty-sixth session, February - March 2021. Para. 337, 338.