

1 HARMEET K. DHILLON  
2 Assistant Attorney General  
3 JESUS A. OSETE  
4 Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
5 JEFFREY MORRISON  
6 Acting Chief, Educational Opportunities Section  
7 JOHN P. MERTENS (CA No. 252762)  
8 Deputy Chief, Educational Opportunities Section  
9 Civil Rights Division  
10 U.S. Department of Justice  
11 950 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
12 Washington, DC 20530  
13 Telephone: (202) 598-9726  
14 Email: john.mertens@usdoj.gov

15 TODD BLANCHE  
16 Deputy Attorney General  
17 BILAL A. ESSAYLI  
18 First Assistant United States Attorney  
19 JULIE A. HAMILL (CA No. 272742)  
20 Assistant United States Attorney  
21 United States Attorney's Office  
22 300 North Los Angeles Street, Suite 7516  
23 Los Angeles, California 90012  
24 Telephone: (213) 894-2464  
25 E-Mail: julie.hamill@usdoj.gov

26 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF-INTERVENOR  
27 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

28 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

29 DO NO HARM, et al.,  
30 *Plaintiffs,*  
31 and

32 UNITED STATES OF  
33 AMERICA,  
34 *Plaintiff-Intervenor,*  
35 v.

36 DAVID GEFFEN SCHOOL OF  
37 MEDICINE AT UCLA, et al.,  
38 *Defendants.*

39 Case No. 2:25-cv-04131-JWH-JDE

40 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA'S  
41 REPLY IN SUPPORT OF UNOPPOSED  
42 MOTION TO INTERVENE [DKT. 77]

43 Hearing Date: February 27, 2026  
44 Hearing Time: 9:00 a.m.  
45 Ctrm: 9 D  
46 Hon. John W. Holcomb

1       On January 28, 2026, the United States moved under Federal Rule of Civil  
2 Procedure 24 to intervene in this action to remedy significant violations of the U.S.  
3 Constitution arising from the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA’s (“UCLA  
4 Med”) use of racial and ethnic preferences in admission to medical school.

5       On February 6, 2026, Defendant filed its Response to the United States’  
6 Motion to Intervene (Dkt. 79). Defendant’s Response “takes no position on the  
7 Motion to Intervene,” rendering the Motion to Intervene unopposed. Dkt. 79 at 2.  
8 Defendant’s Response also requests a case management conference on the litigation  
9 schedule, the intervention, the United States’ Title VI investigation. *Id.* Such a  
10 conference would be unproductive and should not be scheduled.

11       **A. The Motion to Intervene is Unopposed and Should Be Granted Without  
12 Further Consideration.**

13       Defendant filed its Response on February 6, 2026, before the deadline to  
14 oppose the United States’ Motion to Intervene. See LR 7-9. However, Local Rule 7-  
15 9 requires that such an opposition must include “either (a) the evidence upon which  
16 the opposing party will rely in opposition to the motion..., or (b) a written statement  
17 that the party will not oppose the motion.” Defendant’s Response contains neither.  
18 See Dkt. 79. The Response’s absence of a substantive opposition to the motion, and  
19 its statement that Defendant “takes no position on the Motion to Intervene,” can only  
20 reasonably be construed as “a written statement that the party will not oppose the  
21 motion” under Local Rule 7-9. Dkt. 79 at 2. Any other interpretation of the Response  
22 would render it non-compliant. Thus, this Court should immediately grant the  
23 Motion to Intervene as unopposed.

24       **B. A Conference on Intervention and the Title VI Investigation is  
25 Unnecessary.**

26       On page 2 of its Response, Defendant requests a “hearing or case management  
27 conference” on the intervention and the United States’ Title VI investigation,  
28 “including whether and how the case schedule should be adjusted to account for [the

1 intervention].” Dkt. 79.

2 The Title VI investigation is outside of the scope of the United States’  
3 Proposed Complaint in Intervention (Dkt. 77-2) and need not be addressed at this  
4 time by the Court. Concerning the case schedule, the United States intends to comply  
5 with the existing Scheduling Order in this case (Dkt. 68). Defendant has articulated  
6 no reason why the present case schedule would prejudice its interests. Accordingly,  
7 there is no reason to conduct a hearing or case management conference on any of  
8 the issues raised in the Defendant’s Response.

9 **C. Waiver of Oral Argument.**

10 Because the Motion to Intervene is unopposed, the United States hereby  
11 waives oral argument on the Motion under Local Rule 7-15. Defendant has not  
12 explicitly waived oral argument on the Motion. However, their lack of opposition to  
13 the Motion should be construed as a waiver. See Local Rules 7-15 and 7-16.  
14 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant the United States’ Motion to  
15 Intervene and order its intervention in this action, without oral argument and without  
16 ordering a scheduling conference.

17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 DATED: February 10, 2026.

Respectfully submitted:

2 HARMEET K. DHILLON  
3 Assistant Attorney General  
4 JESUS A. OSETE  
5 Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney  
6 General  
7 JEFFREY MORRISON  
8 Acting Chief, Educational Opportunities  
9 Section  
/s/ *John P. Mertens*  
JOHN P. MERTENS  
Deputy Chief, Educational Opportunities  
Section  
Civil Rights Division

10 TODD BLANCHE  
11 Deputy Attorney General  
12 BILAL A. ESSAYLI  
13 First Assistant United States Attorney  
/s/ *Julie A. Hamill*  
14 JULIE A. HAMILL  
15 Assistant United States Attorney  
16 United States Attorney's Office  
17 ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF-  
INTERVENOR  
18 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

19 **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

20 The undersigned, counsel of record for Plaintiff-Intervenor, certifies that this brief  
21 contains 499 words, which complies with the word limit of L.R. 11-6.1

22 Dated: February 10, 2026

/s/ *Julie A. Hamill*  
JULIE A. HAMILL  
Assistant United States Attorney