

BRIAN D. NETTER  
Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
STEPHANIE HINDS  
United States Attorney  
MARCIA BERMAN  
Assistant Branch Director  
R. CHARLIE MERRITT  
STUART J. ROBINSON  
Trial Attorneys  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
1100 L Street NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 616-8098  
E-mail: robert.c.merritt@usdoj.gov

*Attorneys for Defendants*

JOSEPH JARAMILLO (SBN 178566)  
jjarmillo@heraca.org  
HOUSING & ECONOMIC RIGHTS  
ADVOCATES  
3950 Broadway, Suite 200  
Oakland, CA 94611  
Tel.: (510) 271-8443  
Fax: (510) 868-4521

EILEEN M. CONNOR (SBN 248856)  
econnor@ppsl.org  
REBECCA C. ELLIS (*pro hac vice*)  
rellis@ppsl.org  
REBECCA C. EISENBREY (*pro hac vice*)  
reisenbrey@ppsl.org  
PROJECT ON PREDATORY STUDENT  
LENDING, INC.  
769 Centre Street, Suite 166  
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130  
Tel.: 617-390-2669  
Fax: 781-218-9625

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

THERESA SWEET, *et al.*,  
  
Plaintiffs,

v.

MIGUEL CARDONIA, in his official capacity  
as Secretary of Education, and the UNITED  
STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Defendants.

No. 3:19-cv-03674-WHA

**JOINT STATUS REPORT**

On July 31, 2022, the Court entered an order requiring the parties to provide a joint statement answering three questions. ECF No. 299. The parties respond to the numbered questions as follows.

1  
2 **Question One:** Whether the class-member relief recited in Paragraph IV.A of the proposed  
3 settlement agreement qualifies as an “approved” or “successful” borrower defense claim as  
4 contemplated by 34 C.F.R. Sections 685.206, 685.222, and 685.308.

5 **Response:** No. Settlement relief does not constitute an approved or successful borrower  
6 defense claim for purposes of 34 C.F.R. Sections 685.206, 685.222, and 685.308. Class  
7 members covered by Paragraph IV.A of the proposed settlement agreement will instead  
8 receive Full Settlement Relief, as defined in Paragraph II.S of the proposed settlement  
9 agreement, in compromise of their borrower defense claims. *See Proposed Settlement*  
10 *Agreement* ¶ II.S, ECF No. 246-1 (“Proposed Agreement”).  
11

12  
13 **Question Two:** If the relief in Paragraph IV.A does *not* qualify as a successful borrower defense  
14 claim, where the proposed settlement explicitly (or implicitly) recognizes that fact.

15 **Response:** The Proposed Agreement implicitly recognizes that settlement relief is  
16 different from a successful borrower defense claim. It refers to the relief described in  
17 Paragraph IV.A as “Full Settlement Relief,” as explicitly defined in the agreement.  
18 Paragraph IV.A does not reference the Department of Education’s borrower defense  
19 regulations. In specifying the notice that must be provided to class members, the Proposed  
20 Agreement requires that class members be notified that they “will receive Full Settlement  
21 Relief, as defined in the Agreement.” Proposed Agreement ¶ IV.A.3. The relief specified  
22 in Paragraph IV.A does not require the Department to provide a class member with a  
23 decision “approving” the class member’s claim. To the extent the Proposed Agreement  
24 references “decisions,” it defines such decisions as “approving or denying settlement relief  
25 to a borrower under the terms of this Agreement,” *id.* ¶ II.O, not approving or denying  
26 claims through the regulatory process. This is in contrast to Post-Class Applicants, who  
27 will receive “a final decision on the merits” of their borrower defense claims according to  
28 “the standards in the borrower defense regulations.” *Id.* ¶ IV.D.1.

1 **Question Three:** Whether the proposed settlement agreement explicitly (or implicitly)  
2 recognizes, as the Department declarant asserts, that “[i]n any action or proceeding that the  
3 Department might take in the future against an institution . . . the fact that an institution is included  
4 on Exhibit C to the Settlement Agreement does not itself provide any evidentiary support or basis  
5 for initiating such action[.]”

6 **Response:** The Proposed Agreement represents a comprehensive resolution of the claims  
7 at issue in this litigation, regarding the Department’s processing of borrower defense applications  
8 submitted by class members. It provides a framework for the Department to resolve those  
9 applications and provide relief to class members on terms specified in the Proposed Agreement.  
10 The Proposed Agreement does not address the Department’s relationship with the institutions  
11 named in the underlying borrower defense claims. That relationship is defined by statute and  
12 regulation, and any “action or proceeding that the Department might take in the future against an  
13 institution” must be in accordance with the Department’s governing regulations—which include  
14 specific procedures, standards, and other requirements that define how the Department fulfills its  
15 regulatory role vis-à-vis regulated institutions. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 668.87; *see also* 34 C.F.R. part  
16 668, subparts G & H; Proposed Agreement ¶ XVI.B (Agreement “shall be construed in a manner  
17 to ensure its consistency with Federal law”). The Department’s declaration clarified what was  
18 already true as a legal matter and implicit in the structure of the Proposed Agreement: that merely  
19 appearing on Exhibit C itself imposes no legal consequences on the listed schools. For those  
20 schools, any hypothetical sanction in the future would proceed in accordance with the procedures  
21 and standards specified in the Department’s governing regulations and would be based on findings  
22 supported by independent evidence relevant to applicable regulatory standards. That is, any future  
23 findings or disciplinary proceedings would not be based, in whole or in part, on the mere fact of  
24 an institution’s inclusion in Exhibit C.  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Dated: August 2, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

2  
3 /s/ Rebecca C. Ellis  
EILEEN M. CONNOR (SBN 248856)  
4 econnor@ppsl.org  
REBECCA C. ELLIS (*pro hac vice*)  
5 rellis@ppsl.org  
REBECCA C. EISENBREY (*pro hac vice*)  
6 reisenbrey@ppsl.org  
PROJECT ON PREDATORY STUDENT  
7 LENDING, INC.  
769 Centre Street, Suite 166  
8 Jamaica Plain, MA 02130  
Tel.: 617-390-2669  
9 Fax: 781-218-9625

10 JOSEPH JARAMILLO (SBN 178566)  
jjarmillo@heraca.org  
11 HOUSING & ECONOMIC RIGHTS  
ADVOCATES  
12 3950 Broadway, Suite 200  
Oakland, CA 94611  
13 Tel.: (510) 271-8443  
Fax: (510) 868-4521

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

BRIAN D. NETTER  
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

MARCIA BERMAN  
Assistant Branch Director

/s/ R. Charlie Merritt  
R. CHARLIE MERRITT  
STUART J. ROBINSON  
Trial Attorneys  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
1100 L Street NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: (202) 616-8098  
E-mail: robert.c.merritt@usdoj.gov

*Attorneys for Defendants*