

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

# Litigation Tracker for the Charitable Sector

## Independent Sector

Updated as of April 21, 2026

This document tracks litigation on the federal and state levels that affects nonprofits and philanthropies.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<b>CHALLENGES TO EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND ACTIONS</b>			
<b><i>City of Shoreline v. U.S. Dep't of Transportation et al., No. 2:26-cv-1311 (W.D. Wash.)</i></b>  <a href="#">(Filed 4/17/26)</a>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendant, DOT, has unlawfully imposed new funding conditions on recipients of Federal Highway Administration ("FHWA") funds in an effort to further the administration's agenda enumerated in EOs 14151, 14168, and 14173. Plaintiffs argue Defendant's actions violate Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, the Fifth and Tenth Amendments, the Administrative Procedure Act, and are ultra vires.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with administration priorities.
<b><i>Commonwealth of Mass. et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Agric. et al.</i></b>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendant, the USDA, has unlawfully imposed new funding conditions on all federal programs administered by the	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b>No. 1:26-cv-11396 (D. Mass)</b>   <a href="#">(Filed 3/23/26)</a></p>		<p>Department in an effort to further the administration’s agenda enumerated in EOs 14151, 14168, 14173, 14201, and 14218. Plaintiffs argue Defendant’s actions violate the Spending Clause and the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	<p>contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with administration priorities.</p>
<p><b><i>Underground Railroad History Project of the Capitol Region v. Nat’l Endowment for the Humanities et al., No. 1:26-cv-00447 (N.D.N.Y.)</i></b>   <a href="#">(Filed 3/20/26)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs alleges that Defendant unlawfully withdrew a grant it had previously awarded because the grant would have funded projects related to Black history, civil rights, DEI or other topics disfavored by EO 14151. Plaintiffs allege Defendants’ actions violate the First and Fifth Amendment and the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with administration priorities.</p>
<p><b><i>Metropolitan Transp. Auth. v. USA No. 1:26-cv-00422 (Fed. Cl.)</i></b>   <a href="#">(Filed 3/17/26)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs challenge DOT’s suspension of reimbursement funds promised as a part of a Full Funding Grant Agreement. They allege that the DOT’s explanations for suspending the funds were vague and inconsistent and that the suspension constitutes a breach of the Agreement.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with administration priorities.</p>
<p><b><i>Univ. Corp. for Atmospheric Rsch. v. Nat’l Sci. Found. Et al.,</i></b></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiff, a nonprofit research consortium of American colleges and universities, have sued alleging Defendants have</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b>No. 1:26-cv-01061 (D. Colo)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 3/16/26)</a></p>		<p>committed several adverse actions against them as part of an ongoing campaign of retaliation by the administration against the state of Colorado. Plaintiffs allege Defendants' actions violate the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	<p>charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with administration priorities.</p>
<p><b><i>State of Illinois et al. v. United States Dep't of Hous. and Urban Dev. et al.</i>, No. 3:26-cv-02262 (N.D. Cal.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 3/16/26)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs challenge the HUD's new "Guidance Package" which threatens to decertify existing Fair Housing Assistance Program agencies and imposes new certification conditions on funding. The Guidance requires certifications that recipients align with administration priorities on gender ideology (EO 14168), abortion, illegal immigration, and disparate impact (EO 14281). Plaintiffs allege Defendants' actions violate the Spending Clause and the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with administration priorities.</p>
<p><b><i>Bd. of Tr. Of the Cal. State Univ. v. Dep't of Educ. et al.</i>, No. 5:26-cv-01970 (N.D. Cal.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 3/6/26)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendant, the Department of Education, seeks to unlawfully discontinue certain federal funding unless it complies with Department demands. The Department alleges that Plaintiff violated Title IX by allowing transgender athletes to compete in sports, in defiance of EOs</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		14168 and 14201. Plaintiffs allege these actions violate the First Amendment, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Spending Clause.	
<p><b><i>Coal. For Indep. Tech. Rsch. v. Rubio et al., No. 1:26-cv-00815 (D.D.C.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 3/9/26)</a></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs challenge the implementation of Defendant’s “Censorship Policy,” an evolution of the policy goals put forward by EOs 13818, 13825, 14149, 14150, and 14161. They argue the Policy serves to illegally target non-US citizen members of NGOs who express opposition towards the administration’s viewpoints. Plaintiffs allege the Censorship Policy violates the First and Fifth Amendments, and the Administrative Policy Act	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which charitable organizations who employ non-citizens may express viewpoints that differ from the administration’s.
<p><b><i>State of Minnesota et al. v. Oz et al., No. 0:26-cv-01701 (D. Minn.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 3/2/26)</a></p>	Temporary Block of Government Action Denied	Plaintiffs allege that Defendant has unlawfully deferred hundreds of millions dollars of Medicaid funds over vague claims of “noncompliance.” Plaintiffs allege these actions violate the Fifth Amendment, the Spending Clause, the Administrative Procedure Act, and are <i>ultra vires</i> .	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with administration priorities.
<p><b><i>State of Colorado et al. v. USA, No. 1:26-cv-00315 (Fed. Cl.)</i></b></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendant, US acting through DHS and FEMA, have unlawfully discontinued Targeted Violence and Terrorism Prevention grant	The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions terminating

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
(Filed 2/25/26)		funds based on an assertion that the grants were inconsistent with Department priorities. Plaintiffs allege the termination of grants are a breach of the grant agreements and the duty of good faith and fair dealing.	federal programs without Congressional authorizations and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.
<b>City of Fresno et al. v. Noem, No. 5:26-cv-1535 (N. D. Cal.); 3:25-cv-08330 (N. D. Cal.)</b>  (Filed 2/20/26)	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege new funding conditions imposed by DHS, FEMA, DOJ, and DOI that prohibit DEI, restrict "gender ideology," require immigration-enforcement cooperation, and mandate compliance with executive orders (EOs 14173, 14218, 14168, 14332) as award conditions. Plaintiffs allege violations of Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, the Tenth Amendment, the Fifth Amendment's void-for-vagueness doctrine, and the APA.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<b>State of Calif. et al. v. Wright et al., No. 3:26-cv-1417 (N.D. Cal.)</b>  (Filed 2/18/26)	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs challenge an alleged policy to terminate or abandon hundreds of energy and infrastructure awards via a DOE "Secretarial Policy" memo and related actions tied to EOs 14154 and 14156. Plaintiffs argue these actions violate Separation of Powers, the First and Fifth Amendment, the Administrative Procedure Act, and are <i>ultra vires</i> .	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>World Pro. Ass'n of Transgender Health v. FTC et al.</i>, No 1:26-cv-00532 (D.D.C)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 2/18/26)</a></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that the FTC unlawfully served them Civil Investigative Demand and investigative subpoenas in retaliation for their support of transgender and gender diverse people, and gender affirming care in contradiction to EOs 14168 and 14187. Plaintiffs allege violation of the First and Fourth Amendment.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration can utilize executive agencies to investigate organizations that do not comply or align with the administration's priorities.
<p><b><i>Am. Acad. Of Pediatrics v. FTC et al.</i>, No. 1:26-cv-00508 (D.D.C)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 2/17/26)</a></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that the FTC unlawfully served them Civil Investigative Demand and investigative subpoenas as retaliation for their voiced support of transgender and gender diverse people, and gender affirming care in contradiction to EOs 14168 and 14187. Plaintiffs allege violation of the First and Fourth Amendment.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration can utilize executive agencies to investigate organizations that do not comply or align with the administration's priorities.
<p><b><i>The Endocrine Soc'y v. FTC et al.</i>, No. 1:26-cv-00512 (D.D.C.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 2/17/26)</a></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that the FTC unlawfully served them Civil Investigative Demand and investigative subpoenas as retaliation for their voiced support of transgender and gender diverse people, and gender affirming care in contradiction to EOs 14168 and 14187. Plaintiffs allege violation of the First and Fourth Amendment.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration can utilize executive agencies to investigate organizations that do not comply or align with the administration's priorities.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>State of Il. et al. v. Vought et al.</i>, No. 1:26-cv-01566 (N.D. Ill.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 2/11/26)</a></p>	<p>Government Action Temporarily Blocked.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs, allege that Defendant’s “Targeting Directive,” seeks to unlawfully deny them federal grant funds because of their sanctuary jurisdiction policies. They claim the Directive is a culmination of the ongoing campaign started by EOs 14159 and 14287 and allege violation of the Tenth Amendment, State Sovereignty, Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, and the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with administration priorities.</p>
<p><b><i>State of Cal. v. U.S Dep’t of Educ. et al.</i>, No. 3:26-cv-01259 (N.D. Cal.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 2/10/26)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiff alleges that Defendants have unlawfully expanded FERPA requirements by imposing an affirmative duty to turnover student records as a condition for federal funding. Plaintiff claims Defendants initiated a sham investigation into California’s educational agencies’ compliance with FERPA motivated by discriminatory animus against transgender students, as evidenced by EO 14168. Plaintiff seeks a declaratory judgment that California is not out of compliance with FERPA, and argues that Defendant’s actions are ultra vires, violate the Spending Clause, and are unconstitutional and exceeds their statutory authority.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration can utilize executive agencies to investigate organizations that do not comply or align with the administration’s priorities.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>State of N.Y. et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Health and Human Services et al.</i>, No. 1:26-cv-00022 (D.R.I.)</b></p> <p>(Filed 1/13/26)</p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that HHS unlawfully withheld federal funding to states in order to force them to adopt and enforce a national policy that recognizes only two non-changing sexes to align with EO 14168. Plaintiffs argue that these actions by HHS target transgender and gender-diverse youth and violate the Administrative Procedure Act, Separation of Powers, and the Spending Clause.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.</p>
<p><b><i>State of N.Y. et al. v. Admin. Children and Families et al.</i>, No. 1:26-cv-00172 (S.D.N.Y.)</b></p> <p>(Filed 1/8/26)</p>	<p>Government Action Temporarily Blocked.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendant has unlawfully frozen billions of dollars appropriated by Congress for social programs including the Child Care and Development Fund, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, and the Social Services Block Grant based on pretextual allegations of fraud. Plaintiffs claim these actions violate the Administrative Procedure Act, Separation of Powers, Take Care Clause, the Appropriations Clause, the Spending Clause, and are ultra vires.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.</p>
<p><b><i>State of MD et al. v. Dep't of Educ. et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-04298, (D. Md.)</b></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendant, the Department of Education, has unlawfully discontinued certain federal funding based on an assertion that the grants were inconsistent with Department</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
(Filed 12/30/25)		priorities. Plaintiffs allege the termination of the grants violates the Administrative Procedure Act and the Spending Clause.	organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<b><i>Brighton Park Neighborhood Council et al. v. McMahon et al., No. 1:25-cv-04523-SLS, (D.D.C.)</i></b>  (Filed 12/29/25)	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs, education non-profits, allege that Defendant, the Department of Education, unlawfully discontinued certain federal funding based on an assertion that the grants were inconsistent with Department priorities. Plaintiffs allege the termination of the grants violates the Administrative Procedure Act and seek a writ of mandamus to compel fulfillment of grants.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<b><i>Am. Academy of Pediatrics v. Dep't of Health and Human Services et al., No. 1:25-cv-04505 (D.D.C.)</i></b>  (Filed 12/24/25)	Government Action Temporarily Blocked.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendant has unlawfully discontinued certain federal funding as retaliation based on statements by Plaintiff contradicting Health and Human Service's views on high-profile health policy issues as enumerated in EO 14187. Plaintiffs allege the termination of the grants violates the First and Fifth Amendments and the Administrative Procedure Act.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<b><i>State of OR et al. v. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., et al., No. 6:25-cv-02409 (D. Or.)</i></b>	Case Closed in Favor of Plaintiffs.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendant's Declaration allowing Health and Human Services to bar healthcare providers from participating in Medicare, Medicaid, and	The outcome of this case may impact the ability of any charitable organizations that engage in gender affirming

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p>(<a href="#">Filed 12/23/25</a>)</p>		<p>other federal healthcare programs if they provide children or adolescents gender affirming care violates the Administrative Procedure Act and the Medicare and Medicaid statutes.</p>	<p>healthcare to access federal funding.</p>
<p><b><i>Institute for Applied Ecology et al. v. Burgum et al., No. 6:25-cv-02364-AP (D. Or.)</i></b></p> <p>(<a href="#">Filed 12/18/25</a>)</p>	<p>Government Action Temporarily Blocked.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendant, the Department of the Interior, has unlawfully cut previously issued grants based on an “unexplained misalignment between Plaintiffs’ awards and agency priorities pursuant to EO 14151. Plaintiffs argue that the terminations were caused by statements the Department believed were connected to DEI or other disfavored topics. Plaintiffs allege that the Department’s actions violate the First and Fifth Amendments.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.</p>
<p><b><i>Lucky Shoals Community Ass’n Inc. v. U.S. Env’tl. Prot. Agency et al., No. 1:25-cv- 7221 (N.D. Ga.)</i></b></p> <p>(<a href="#">Filed 12/17/25</a>)</p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiff alleges that Defendants illegally and unconstitutionally terminated the Climate Justice Block Grant program, which was authorized by the Inflation Reduction Act and intended to “benefit disadvantaged communities,” and refused to disburse over 100 grants already awarded pursuant to the program to comply with EOs including EO 14151. Plaintiffs claim these actions violate the</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions terminating federal programs without Congressional authorization and may impact charitable organizations’ access to federal funding.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>State of Cal. et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Transportation et al.</i>, No. 2:25-cv-2574 (W.D. Wash.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 12/16/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>APA, Separation of Powers, and are ultra vires.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants indefinitely suspended the Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Program, placing \$1.8 billion in federal awards to dozens of state and local governments in jeopardy without a public explanation. Plaintiffs claim these actions violate Separation of Powers, Presentment Clauses, Take Care Clause, APA, and writ of mandamus.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions terminating federal programs without Congressional authorizations and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.</p>
<p><b><i>Chicago et al. v. Dep't of Justice et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-13863 (N.D. Ill.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 11/12/25)</a></p>	<p>Government Action Temporarily Blocked.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs challenge Defendants for inserting conditions on Plaintiffs' receipt of "COPS" grants under the Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act, specifically barring Plaintiffs from activities related to DEI, and forcing them to comply with executive orders, an immigration-related statute, and use of funding in a way that advances Defendants' policy goals but contradicts the purpose of the grants. Plaintiffs allege Defendants actions violate the APA.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with administration priorities.</p>
<p><b><i>Saint Paul et al. v. Wright et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-3899 (D.D.C.)</b></p>	<p>Case Closed in Favor of Plaintiffs in Part.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs challenge Defendants for planned termination of previously awarded grants for politically motivated</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
(Filed <a href="#">11/10/25</a> )		reasons. Plaintiffs allege Defendants' actions violate the Fifth Amendment Equal Protection Clause and First Amendment.	charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with administration priorities.
<b><i>Robert F. Kennedy Ctr. for Justice and Human Rights v. McMahon, No. 1:25-cv-03860 (D.D.C.)</i></b>  (Filed <a href="#">11/04/25</a> )	Awaiting Court Ruling	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants final rule threatening to strip Public Service Loan Forgiveness eligibility from employees at organizations whose "activities have a substantial illegal purpose" violates the Administrative Procedure Act and exceeds Defendant's legal authorities.	The outcome of this case may impact the ability of employees at charitable organizations to access Public Service Loan Forgiveness benefits.
<b><i>Commonwealth of Massachusetts v. United States Dep't of Ed., No. 1:25-cv-13244 (D. Mass.)</i></b>  (Filed <a href="#">11/03/25</a> )	Awaiting Court Ruling	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants final rule threatening to strip Public Service Loan Forgiveness eligibility from employees at organizations whose "activities have a substantial illegal purpose" violates the Administrative Procedure Act and exceeds Defendant's legal authorities.	The outcome of this case may impact the ability of employees at charitable organizations to access Public Service Loan Forgiveness benefits.
<b><i>National Council of Nonprofits v. McMahon, No. 1:25-cv-13242 (D. Mass.)</i></b>  (Filed <a href="#">11/03/25</a> )	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants final rule threatening to strip Public Service Loan Forgiveness eligibility from employees at organizations whose "activities have a substantial illegal purpose" violates the Administrative	The outcome of this case may impact the ability of employees at charitable organizations to access Public Service Loan Forgiveness benefits.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		Procedure Act and exceeds Defendant's legal authorities.	
<p><b><i>San Francisco et al. v. United States Dep't of Justice et al.</i>, No. 3:25-cv-09277 (N.D. Cal.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 10/28/25)</a></p>	Government Action Temporarily Blocked.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants have imposed conditions on Plaintiffs' grant money that are overly vague and allegedly only exist to further Defendants' domestic political agenda. Plaintiffs allege Defendants' actions violate the Separation of Powers doctrine, the Spending Clause, the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause, and the APA.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with administration priorities.
<p><b><i>Ethical Society of Police et al. v. Bondi et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-13115 (D. Mass.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 10/24/25)</a></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs challenge Defendants for dismantling the Community Relations Service agency based on claims that its "mission does not comport with Attorney General and Administration law enforcement and litigating priorities." Plaintiffs claim Defendants' actions violate the APA, the Separation of Powers doctrine, and are ultra vires.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with administration priorities.
<p><b><i>Chicago et al. v. Noem et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-12765 (N.D. Ill.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 10/20/25)</a></p>	Government Action Temporarily Blocked.	Plaintiffs challenge the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), FEMA, and Secretary Kristi Noem for placing allegedly new, controversial, and unauthorized political conditions on DHS/FEMA-administered disaster	The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions terminating federal programs without Congressional authorizations,

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		<p>preparedness, emergency management, and security grants. Plaintiffs claim that due to EOs 14151, 14173, 14168, and 14332 grantees are now required to (a) certify that they do not operate any program that “advances or promotes DEI, DEIA, or discriminatory equity ideology,” and (b) agree to comply with all existing and future Executive Orders “related to grants.”</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that the actions violate Separation of Powers, Spending Power, Administrative Procedure Act, and are Ultra Vires.</p>	<p>and may impact charitable organizations’ access to federal funding, particularly those that perform environmental and climate work.</p>
<p><b><i>Norman v. Trump et al., No. 1:25-cv-03414 (D. Md.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 10/15/25)</a></p>	<p>Case Closed in Favor of Government.</p>	<p>Plaintiff, Dr. Obed Norman, challenges the termination or denial of federal research grants awarded or recommended for funding, alleging that the terminations were made at President Trump’s direction, via EOs 14151, 14173, and 14222. Plaintiff alleges the actions violate the Separation of Powers, First Amendment, Fifth Amendment, and Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions terminating federal programs without Congressional authorizations and may impact charitable organizations’ access to federal funding.</p>
<p><b><i>Am. Assoc. of Univ. Professors et al. v. Trump et al., No. 3:25-</i></b></p>	<p>Government Action Temporarily Blocked Pending Appeal.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs, comprising a coalition of labor unions and associations representing faculty, students, and staff at the University of California (“UC”), allege that</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b>cv-07864 (N.D. Cal.); 26-263 (9th Cir.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 9/16/25)</a></p>		<p>the Trump administration is unlawfully using the threat of federal funding cuts to coerce the UC into suppressing free speech and academic freedom. The administration is accused of unlawfully terminating \$584 million in research grants to UCLA, citing a Title VI investigation into antisemitism allegations, and threatening further funding cuts unless the UC complies with its demands. Plaintiffs claim the administration's actions violate the First Amendment, Fifth Amendment, Separation of Powers, Spending Clause, Title VI, Title IX, and the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	<p>contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities, and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.</p>
<p><b><i>Nat'l All. to End Homelessness et al. v. Turner et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00447 (D.R.I.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 9/11/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) reversed its decision to award \$75 million in funds for permanent supportive housing, opting instead to seek new applicants based on criteria aligned with EOs 14159, 14218, and 14287. Plaintiffs allege HUD's actions violate the Administrative Procedure Act, Separation of Powers, Spending Clause, First Amendment, Tenth Amendment, and are Ultra Vires actions.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions targeting employee rights without Congressional authorizations, and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>Am. Federation of Teachers v. Dep't of Educ., No. 1:25-cv-00628 (D. Md.); No. 25-2228 (4th. Cir.)</i></b></p> <p>(Filed 2/25/25)</p>	<p>Government Action Temporarily Blocked in Part Pending Appeal.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that the Defendant's February 14, 2025 "Dear Colleague" letter on "nondiscrimination obligations of schools and other entities that receive federal financial assistance" and subsequent April 3, 2025 notice to state education agencies requiring that they certify compliance with the Department's views outlined in the "Dear Colleague" letter violated the Administrative Procedure Act, the First Amendment and Fifth Amendment, and exceeded agency authority.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the administration's stance on "unlawful discrimination" and diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives.</p>
<p><b><i>State of N.J. et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Justice et al., No. 1:25-cv-00404 (D.R.I.)</i></b></p> <p>(Filed 8/18/25)</p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiff alleges that the U.S. DOJ and its associated offices have imposed new conditions on the Victims of Crime Act funds, requiring states to assist in federal immigration enforcement to access these funds. Plaintiffs argue that these restrictions are due to EO 14159, which directed the AG and Secretary of Homeland Security to "ensure that so-called 'sanctuary' jurisdictions []do not receive access to Federal funds" and to take "any other lawful actions, criminal or civil, that they deem warranted." Plaintiffs claim these new conditions violate the Administrative Procedure Act,</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that serve immigrant communities and/or are involved in immigration advocacy.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>State of Wash. v. U.S. Dep't of Com. et al., No. 2:25-cv-01507 (W.D. Wash.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 8/8/25)</a></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	<p>the Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, and are Ultra Vires.</p> <p>Plaintiff alleges that Defendants unlawfully terminated two of Plaintiff's federal funding awards intended to support climate resilience after President Donald Trump directed agencies to advance his policies, including EO 14153, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Appointment Clause, the Spending Clause, and the Separation of Powers Doctrine.</p>	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities, particularly those that perform environmental and climate work.
<p><b><i>Commonwealth of Mass. et al. v. Trump et al., No. 1:25-cv-12162 (D. Mass.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 8/1/25)</a></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs challenge EO 14187 and related directives, alleging that they harm transgender individuals by targeting gender-affirming healthcare for those under age 19, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act and the Tenth Amendment.	The outcome of this case may impact the application of EO 14187 which will in turn impact the work of any charitable organizations that engage in gender affirming healthcare.
<p><b><i>City of Seattle v. Trump et al., No. 2:25-cv-1435 (W.D. Wash)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 7/31/25)</a></p>	Government Action Temporarily Blocked.	Plaintiff challenges EO 14173 and EO 14168 for allegedly imposing unconstitutional and unlawful requirements on Plaintiff as a recipient of federal contracts and grants in violation of Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, the Due Process Clause, the Tenth Amendment, and the Administrative Procedure Act.	The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions terminating federal programs without Congressional authorizations, and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>Planned Parenthood of Greater New York et al. v. Dep't of Health and Human Services et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-2453 (D.D.C)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 7/29/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs challenge Defendants' imposition of new requirements on grantees under the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program, which conditions federal funding on alignment with EOs 14151 and 14173, and introduces additional content-based restrictions that are vague and fundamentally incompatible with the statutory mandate Congress established for the TPP program, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act and Fifth Amendment.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.</p>
<p><b><i>State of N.Y. et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Just. et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00345 (D.R.I.); 25-02099 (1st Cir.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 7/21/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs challenge the implementation of EO 14218, which directed the revocation of exemptions under the Personal Responsibility of Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. These exemptions previously allowed individuals to access community-based programs, such as soup kitchens and domestic violence shelters, without providing proof of citizenship or immigration status. Plaintiffs claim that that Defendants' actions violates the Administrative Procedure Act and the Spending Clause.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that serve immigrant communities and/or are involved in immigration advocacy.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>State of Wash. et al. v. Fed. Emergency Mgmt. Agency et al., No. 1:25-cv-12006 (D. Mass.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 7/16/25)</a></p>	<p>Case closed in favor of Plaintiff. Awaiting Court Ruling re Motion to Enforce Judgment.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants unlawfully terminated the Building Resilient Infrastructure and Communities (BRIC) program. The BRIC was a pre-disaster mitigation initiative designed to fortify communities against natural disasters. Plaintiffs claim that the shutdown of the BRIC program has reportedly forced communities to delay, scale back, or cancel hundreds of mitigation projects, increasing the risk of harm from natural disasters. Plaintiffs allege the termination of BRIC violates the Administrative Procedure Act, Separation of Powers, Appropriations Clause, Spending Clause, and Appointments Clause, and is ultra vires.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are interpreting the legality of executive actions terminating federal programs without Congressional authorizations, and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding, particularly those that perform environmental and climate work.</p>
<p><b><i>Right To Be et al. v. Bondi et al., No. 1:25-cv-03676 (E.D.N.Y.); No. 1:25-cv-03248 (D.D.C.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 7/2/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' termination of the Anti-Hate Crimes Grant Program was part of a broader effort by the Department of Justice to comply with "recent Executive Orders" in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Fifth Amendment, the Separation of Powers, the Due Process Clause and are ultra vires.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.</p>
<p><b><i>Appalachian Voices et al. v. U.S. Env't'l. Prot.</i></b></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that the Environmental Protection Agency and its Administrator</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may inform the way courts are</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b>Agency et al., No. 1:25-cv-01982 (D.D.C.); 25-05333 (D.C. Cir.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 6/25/25)</a></p>		<p>violated the Separation of Powers, the Presentment Clauses, and the Administrative Procedure Act by unlawfully terminating the Environmental and Climate Justice Block Grant program when implementing various EOs, including EO 14154 and EO 14151.</p>	<p>interpreting the legality of executive actions that target specific organizations, and impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding, particularly those that perform environmental and climate work.</p>
<p><b>State of New Jersey et al. v. U.S. Office of Management and Budget et al., No. 1:25-cv-11816 (D. Mass.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 6/24/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs, consisting of multiple states and the District of Columbia, allege that Defendants unlawfully terminated federal funding previously awarded to Plaintiffs to comply with EOs 14158, 14222, 14151, 14168, 14242, 14287 in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.</p>
<p><b>Am. Ass'n of Physics Teachers Inc. et al. v. Nat'l Science Found. et al., No 1:25-cv-1923 (D.D.C.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 6/18/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants unlawfully engaged in mass termination of grants aimed at expanding participation of women and underrepresented groups in STEM, through the implementation of EO 14151, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Fifth Amendment, and is ultra vires. Plaintiffs seek an injunction against the termination of grants.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities, and may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.</p>
<p><b>Rhode Island Coal. Against Domestic Violence et al. v. Bondi</b></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that the Office on Violence Against Women has imposed new grant conditions in response to</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00279 (D.R.I.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 6/16/25)</a></p>		<p>various EOs, including EO 14173 and EO 14168, that conflict with the Violence Against Women Act and violate the Administrative Procedure Act, Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, the First Amendment, and the Fifth Amendment.</p>	<p>charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities, and may impact charitable organizations’ access to federal funding.</p>
<p><b><i>Am. Bar Ass’n v. Exec. Off. of the President</i>, No. 1:25-cv-01888 (D.D.C.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 6/16/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiff alleges that recent executive action unlawfully retaliates against law firms and legal organizations, including the ABA, for engaging in protected speech and association in violation of the First Amendment, and also encroaches on the judiciary’s authority by attempting to influence or penalize legal representation and litigation in violation of Separation of Powers.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact how courts interpret executive actions that target specific organizations, and may impact charitable organizations’ access to federal funding and/or legal services.</p>
<p><b><i>Thakur et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 3:25-cv-4737 (N.D. Cal.); 25-04249 (9th Cir.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 6/4/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that EOs 14151, 14154, 14158, 14168, 14173, 14217, 14238, and/or 14222 interfere with congressionally appropriated funds for research grants in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, Impoundment Control Act of 1974, Fifth Amendment, First Amendment, and Separation of Powers.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities, and may impact charitable organizations’ access to federal funding.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>Nat'l Job Corps et al. v. Dep't of Labor</i>, No. 1:25-cv-4641 (S.D.N.Y); No. 25-2295 (2d. Cir.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 6/3/25)</a></p>	<p>Government Action Temporarily Blocked Pending Appeal.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants' elimination of Job Corps was unlawful under the Administrative Procedure Act and Separation of Powers doctrine, and an ultra vires action.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that perform work with Job Corps and impact access to federal funding and courts' interpretation of such executive actions without Congressional approval under the APA.</p>
<p><b><i>Nat'l Public Radio, Inc. et al. v. Trump et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-01674 (D.D.C.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 5/27/25)</a></p>	<p>Government Action Blocked in Part.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that EO 14290, which withholds all federal funding from NPR and PBS and prohibits local stations receiving federal grants from using those funds to acquire NPR or PBS programming or otherwise support them, constitutes "view-point based discrimination" and "textbook retaliation" in violation of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, the Administrative Procedure Act, the First Amendment, the Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, and the Due Process Clause.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with administration priorities, and may impact charitable organizations that operate in public media or partner with NPR, PBS, or local affiliates, including non-profits that depend on the CPB pass-through grants or collaborative programming.</p>
<p><b><i>Am. Ass'n of Physicians for Human Rights, Inc. et al. v. Nat'l Instes. of Health et al.</i>, No. 8:25-cv-01620 (D. Md.)</b></p>	<p>Government Action Temporarily Blocked in Part Pending Appeal.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that Defendants cancelled research grants dedicated to the health of LGBTQI+ Americans, "decreeing that the government will not fund research addressing their health needs[.]" in violation of the Equal</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
(Filed 5/20/25)		Protection Clause, the Affordable Care Act, the Due Process Clause, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Separation of Powers.	administration priorities, and may may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding, particularly those involved in public health and community services.
<b>State of Illinois et al. v. Fed. Emergency Mgmt. Agency et al., No. 1:25-cv-00206 (D.R.I.); 25-02131 (1st Cir.)</b>  (Filed 5/13/25)	Government Action Blocked Pending Appeal.	Plaintiffs allege that the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and its sub-agencies, particularly the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) by conditioning grants on state cooperation in immigration enforcement measures, in part by implementing EOs 14159 and 14287, violates the Administrative Procedure Act, the Spending Clause, and are ultra vires actions.	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that serve immigrant communities and/or are involved in immigration advocacy, legal aid, education, and community services, especially those organizations located in states and local jurisdictions identified as Sanctuary Jurisdictions as defined in EO 14159.
<b>King Cnty., et al. v. Turner, et al., No. 2:25-cv-814 (W.D. Wash); 25-3664 (9th Cir.); 25-6428 (9th Cir.); 26-01689 (9th Cir.)</b>  (Filed 5/2/25)	Government Action Temporarily Blocked. Pending Appeal	Plaintiffs, which include several counties and cities, challenge grant conditions imposed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Transportation, and Federal Transit Administration, alleging that the conditions, tied to various EOs that impose federal funding restrictions, “coerce grant recipients” to comply with President Trump’s “policy agenda” which includes “opposition to all forms of DEI	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		policies and initiatives, participation in aggressive and lawless immigration enforcement, exclusion of transgender people, and cutting off access to lawful abortions,” in violation of the Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, the Tenth Amendment, the Fifth Amendment, and the Administrative Procedure Act.	
<p><b><i>Am. Council of Learned Societies, et al. v. McDonald, et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-3657 (S.D.N.Y.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 5/1/25)</a></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants are “wholesale dismantling” the National Endowment for the Humanities by eliminating entire programs, conducting mass firings of staff, and terminating funding for grants in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Separation of Powers, the Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the Appropriations Act, and the First Amendment.	The outcome of this case will impact charitable organizations that receive funding from and/or work with the National Endowment for the Humanities.
<p><b><i>Wash. State Ass’n of Head Start and Early Childhood Educ. and Assistance Program et al. v. Kennedy et al.</i>, No. 2:25-cv-00781 (W.D. Wash.); 25-07072 (9th Cir.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 04/28/25)</a></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that the administration’s cancellation of federal public health funding (including for Head Start providers) and other actions, including the closure of five regional Head Start offices, violates the Separation of Powers, the Spending Clause, the Fifth Amendment, the First Amendment, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization’s federal contracts and/or funding on the organization’s compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		Rehabilitation Act, and are ultra vires actions.	
<b><i>Harris Cnty. et al., v. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., et al., No. 1:25-cv-1275 (D.D.C.)</i></b>  (Filed 4/24/25)	Government Action Temporarily Blocked in Part.	Plaintiffs allege that Defendants unlawfully terminated over \$11 billion in Centers for Disease Control and Prevention grants intended for COVID-19 recovery and public health preparedness, in violation of the Separation of Powers doctrine, Spending Clause, and Administrative Procedure Act.	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding, particularly those involved in public health and community services.
<b><i>State of Minnesota v. Trump et al., No. 0:25-cv-01608 (D. Minn.)</i></b>  (Filed 4/22/25)	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs challenge several EOs and associated government actions, arguing that their reversal of civil rights protections for transgender people and conditioning of federal funding on compliance, violates the Separation of Powers, Title IX, the Tenth Amendment, and Administrative Procedure Act.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<b><i>President and Fellows of Harvard Coll. v. US Dep't. of Health and Hum. Servs et al., No. 1:25-cv-11048 (D. Mass.); 25-2230 (1st Cir.)</i></b>  (Filed 4/21/25)	Case dismissed in favor of Plaintiffs, Pending Appeal.	The lawsuit challenges the administration's freeze of \$2.2 billion in federal research grants and threats to cut additional funding, alleging the funding freezes are "an attempt to coerce and control Harvard" after it refused to comply with government "demands" relating to hiring and admission practices, in violation of the First Amendment, the Administrative Procedure Act, and Title	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>Am Ass'n of People with Disabilities v. Dudek, No. 1:25-cv-00977 (D.D.C.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 4/2/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>VI, and further alleging the Defendants' actions are an ultra vires action.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that DOGE has engaged in actions that undermine the Social Security Administration's (SSA) ability to serve individuals with disabilities, including older adults who rely on Social Security benefits. Plaintiffs allege that DOGE has dismantled key SSA offices, such as the Office of Civil Rights and Equal Opportunity and the Office of Transformation, which are essential for meeting the needs of beneficiaries with disabilities.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege that these actions violate the Rehabilitation Act, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Fifth Amendment, as they strip vital protections from individuals with disabilities.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations that work with individuals with disabilities or who otherwise receive Social Security benefits.</p>
<p><b><i>Somerville Pub. Schs. et al. v. Trump et al., No. 1:25-cv-10677 (D. Mass); 25-1500 (1st Cir.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 3/24/25)</a></p>	<p>Temporary Block of Government Action Vacated.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants are unlawfully dismantling the Department of Education, which (1) violates the separation of powers; (2) violates the Take Care Clause; (3) is outside the Defendants' constitutional and/or statutory authority, constituting an ultra vires action; (4) violates the</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the work of charitable organizations that provide or receive funding for, or otherwise perform work relating to educational institutions.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		Administrative Procedure Act; and (5) violates the Spending and Appropriations Clauses.	
<p><b><i>Nat'l Assoc. for the Advancement of Colored People et al. v. US et al.</i></b>, No. 8:25-cv-00965 (D. Md.)</p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 3/24/25)</a></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that the Defendants are unlawfully dismantling the Department of Education, which (1) violates the separation of powers; (2) violates the Take Care Clause; (3) is outside the Defendants' constitutional and/or statutory authority, constituting an ultra vires action; (4) violates the Administrative Procedure Act; and (5) violates the Spending and Appropriations Clauses.	The outcome of this case may impact the work of charitable organizations that provide or receive funding for, or otherwise perform work relating to educational institutions.
<p><b><i>State of Cal. et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Educ. et al.</i></b>, No. 1:25-cv-10548 (D. Mass.); 25-1244 (1st Cir.)</p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 3/6/25)</a></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs, eight states, allege that the Department of Education unlawfully terminated certain federal funding based on an assertion that the grants were inconsistent with Department priorities. Plaintiffs allege that the grants were terminated because they "appear to encompass [the administration's] 'policy objectives' of ending disfavored but lawful efforts to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion." Plaintiffs allege the termination of the grants violates the Administrative Procedure Act. They also allege that the terms and conditions of	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		the grants do not allow for termination based on failure to effectuate agency priorities.	
<p><b><i>Am. Ass'n of Colls. for Teacher Educ. et al. v. McMahon et al.</i>, No. 1:25-cv-00702 (D. Md.); 25-1281 (4th Cir.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 3/3/25)</a></p>	Settled.	Plaintiffs American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and National Center for Teacher Residencies allege that the Department of Education unlawfully terminated certain federal funding based on an assertion that the grants were inconsistent with Department priorities. Plaintiffs allege the termination of the grants violates the Administrative Procedure Act.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with executive orders and/or other administration priorities.
<p><b><i>Chi. Women in Trades v. Trump</i>, No. 1:25-cv-02005 (N.D. Ill.); 1:25-cv-02144 (7th Cir.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 2/26/25)</a></p>	Government Action Temporarily Blocked, Pending Appeal.	Plaintiff is a non-profit organization that alleges it is a recipient of multiple federal grants, some of which were initially frozen after the executive orders were issued. The Plaintiffs claim that EOs 14151 and 14173 (1) violate the First Amendment because they are unconstitutionally vague and overbroad, are a form of viewpoint discrimination, and place unconstitutional conditions on federal funds; (2) violate the Plaintiffs' Fifth Amendment due process rights due to vagueness; (3) violate the Spending Clause by attempting to unilaterally terminate grants or contracts without	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with EOs 14151 and 14173.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		congressional authority; and (4) violate the separation of powers doctrine by imposing conditions on federal funding that are within the purview of Congress, not the executive branch.	
<p><b><i>San Francisco Aids Foundation v. Trump</i>, No. 4:25-cv-01824 (N.D. Cal.)</b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 2/20/25)</a></p>	Government Action Temporarily Blocked in Part, Pending Appeal.	Plaintiffs allege that EOs 14151, 14168 and 14173 (1) violate the First Amendment by imposing viewpoint and content discrimination; (2) violate the Plaintiffs' Fifth Amendment due process rights due to vagueness; and (3) violate the separation of powers doctrine by imposing conditions on federal funding that are within the purview of Congress, not the executive branch. Plaintiffs also allege that EO 14168 violates the Equal Protection Clause by discriminating against transgender people. Plaintiffs also allege that the EOs conflict with existing statutes that support the HIV Health Care Services Program (also known as the "Ryan White Program"), the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS program, and funding for Federally Qualified Health Centers under Section 330 of the Public Health Services Act.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with EOs 14151, 14168, and 14173.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>Nat'l Urban League et al. v. Trump et al., No. 1:25-cv-00471 (D.D.C.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 2/19/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that EOs 14151, 14168 and 14173 falsely assert that DEI programs and activities are illegal and put them at significant risk of losing federal funds that they use to help people in need.</p> <p>Plaintiffs allege the EOs (1) violate the First Amendment by imposing viewpoint and content discrimination; (2) violate Plaintiffs' Fifth Amendment due process rights due to vagueness; (3) violate the Separation of Powers doctrine by imposing conditions on federal funding that are within the purview of Congress, not the executive branch; (4) violate the Equal Protection Clause by discriminating based on protected characteristics; and (5) are ultra vires Presidential Actions.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with EOs 14151, 14168, and 14173.</p>
<p><b><i>PFLAG, INC., et al. v. Donald Trump, et al., No. 8:25-cv-00337 (D. Md.); 25-01279 (4th Cir.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 2/4/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>Plaintiffs allege that EOs 14187 and 14168, which prohibit federal funding for institutions that provide certain medical care for transgender patients under the age of nineteen, (1) violate the First Amendment by imposing viewpoint discrimination; (2) violate the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of the Fifth Amendment by discrimination</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition any non-profit healthcare organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with EOs 14187 and 14168.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		based on sex and transgender status and infringing on parental rights; (3) violate the separation of powers doctrine by imposing conditions on federal funding that are within the purview of Congress, not the executive branch; and (4) conflict with the Affordable Care Act and Public Health Service Act, which prohibit discrimination based on sex and disability.	
<p><b><i>Nat'l Ass'n of Diversity Officers in Higher Educ. et al. v. Donald Trump et al.</i></b>, No. 1:25-cv-00333 (D. Md.); No. 25-01189 (4th Cir.)</p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 2/3/25)</a></p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that EOs 14151 and 14173 (1) violate the First Amendment because they are a form of viewpoint discrimination and chill free speech; (2) violate Plaintiffs' Fifth Amendment due process rights due to vagueness; (3) violate the Spending Clause by attempting to unilaterally terminate grants or contracts without congressional authority; and (4) violate the separation of powers doctrine by imposing conditions on federal funding that are within the purview of Congress, not the executive branch.	The outcome of this case may impact the extent to which the administration may condition a charitable organization's federal contracts and/or funding on the organization's compliance with EOs 14151 and 14173.
<p><b><i>National Council of Nonprofits v. OMB</i></b>, No. 1:25-cv-00239</p>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that OMB unlawfully paused all federal financial assistance. Plaintiffs allege that the funding pause violated the Administrative Procedure	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
(D.D.C.); No. 25-05148 (D.C. Cir.)  <a href="#">(Filed 1/28/25)</a>		Act and Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights by conditioning the receipt of federal funding on the recipients' political and moral viewpoints.	
<b>CHALLENGES TO GRANT PROGRAMS</b>			
<i>Roberts v. Progressive Preferred Insurance Co.</i> , No. 1:23-cv-01597 (N.D. Ohio), No. 24-3454 (6th Cir.)  <a href="#">(Filed 8/16/23)</a>	Motion to Dismiss Granted; Affirmed on Appeal; Rehearing En Banc Pending.	Plaintiffs, a trucking business and its white male owner, sought to enjoin a program that offered \$25,000 grants to Black-owned trucking businesses, alleging that the grant program violated Section 1981 of the Civil Rights Act.	The outcome of this case may provide guidance regarding when litigants have standing to challenge an organization's grant program, especially when that grant program has already ended.
<b>CHALLENGES TO HOUSING PROGRAMS</b>			
<i>Nat'l All. to End Homelessness et al. v. United States Dep't of Hous. and Urban Dev. et al.</i> , No. 1:25-cv-00636 (D.R.I.)  <a href="#">(Filed 12/1/25)</a>	Government Action Temporarily Blocked.	Plaintiffs allege that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) rescinded a two-year notice of funding opportunity (NOFO) and that the new FY25 NOFO significantly reduced funding for permanent housing by two-thirds, contrary to Congressional direction, and shifted funding to unproven and punitive models, threatening housing stability for over 170,000 people by imposing new criteria and conditions that excluded long-time grantees who adhered to previous HUD regulations, in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Separation of Powers, the	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		Spending Clause, and the First Amendment.	
<b><i>National Fair Housing Alliance et al. v. Dep't of Housing and Urban Development, et al., No. 1:25-cv-01965 (D.D.C.)</i></b>  <a href="#">(Filed 6/24/25)</a>	Awaiting Court Ruling.	Plaintiffs allege that the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is refusing to administer the Fair Housing Initiatives Program (FHIP) grants in violation of the Administrative Procedure Act, the Appropriations Clause, the Separation of Powers, and the Due Process Clause.	The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
<p><b><i>Massachusetts Fair Housing Center, et al. v. Dep't of Housing and Urban Development, et al., No. 3:25-cv-30041 (D. Mass.); No. 25-01368 (1st Cir.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 3/13/25)</a></p>	<p>Awaiting Court Ruling.</p>	<p>On February 27, 2025, HUD terminated 78 Fair Housing Initiatives Program grants, citing a directive from the Department of Government Efficiency and claiming the grants no longer effectuated program goals or agency priorities. This termination was communicated through a form letter and was effective immediately. The grants are used by fair housing organizations to combat housing discrimination. These grants support activities such as enforcement, education, outreach, and litigation to ensure compliance with the Fair Housing Act. Plaintiffs allege the termination of the grants violate the Administrative Procedure Act and the actions are ultra vires.</p>	<p>The outcome of this case may impact charitable organizations' access to federal funding.</p>
<b>CHALLENGES TO OTHER PROGRAMS</b>			
<p><b><i>Am. Alliance for Equal Rights v. Bennett et al., No. 1:25-cv-00669 (N.D. Ill.); No. 25-02461 (7th Cir.)</i></b></p> <p><a href="#">(Filed 1/21/25)</a></p>	<p>Temporary Block of Government Action Denied Pending Appeal.</p>	<p>Plaintiff challenges the constitutionality of Illinois Senate Bill 2930 which requires nonprofits to publicly disclose their demographic data, arguing that the law violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments and requires nonprofits to engage in racial discrimination. Plaintiff argues that by requiring organizations to publish their demographics, the law</p>	<p>The outcome of this case will impact any charitable organization that operates in Illinois and is presently required to comply with the law that the Plaintiff challenges.</p>

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.

**Note:** Items with a dark green background indicate new actions added since the last version of this tracker was published.

Case	Status	Description of Claims	Potential Impact on Charitable Organizations
		“pushes them to hire candidates based on race.” Plaintiff also argues that the law “forces” organizations to “speak about a host of controversial demographic issues that they don’t want to discuss, advertise, or endorse.”	

These materials are for general information only. The materials do not constitute legal advice and do not create an attorney-client relationship. Readers should consult directly with an attorney for advice on the application of particular provisions to their specific circumstances.