

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF
GREATER NEW YORK, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

V.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 1:25-cv-1334-TJK

**BRIEF *AMICUS CURIAE* OF
AMERICA’S FUTURE,
MISSIONARIES TO THE PREBORN, AND
CONSERVATIVE LEGAL DEFENSE AND EDUCATION FUND
IN OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Patrick M. McSweeney
3358 John Tree Hill Rd.
Powhatan, VA 23139

William J. Olson (D.C. Bar # 233833)
Jeremiah L. Morgan (D.C. Bar # 1012943)
William J. Olson, P.C.
370 Maple Avenue West, Suite 4
Vienna, VA 22180-5615
(703) 356-5070
wjo@mindspring.com
Counsel for *Amici Curiae*
Dated: May 30, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI</i>	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
ARGUMENT	
I. THE NOTICE IS LAWFUL AS THE LAW GIVES THE SECRETARY WIDE DISCRETION IN MAKING GRANTS	3
A. The Law Gives the Secretary Wide Discretion in Selecting Grant Recipients	3
B. Since Its Inception, the TPP Program Has Been Beset by Poor Evidence and Abortion Industry Capture, Leading to Questionable “Medical Accuracy.”	7
II. PLANNED PARENTHOOD COMES TO THE COURT WITH UNCLEAR HANDS AND THUS HAS NO ENTITLEMENT TO INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	10
III. PLANNED PARENTHOOD USES ITS “SEX EDUCATION” EFFORTS AS ABORTION CUSTOMER RECRUITING PROGRAMS.	13
CONCLUSION	17
APPENDIX	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
CASES	
<i>Keystone Driller Co. v. General Excavator Co.</i> , 290 U.S. 240 (1933)	10
STATUTES	
42 U.S.C. § 300u.	6,7
MISCELLANEOUS	
<i>ALL About Issues</i> (Dec. 1979)	13
S. Berry, “Former Planned Parenthood Trainer: Sex Ed Book Seeks ‘to Groom Children for Early Onset of Sex,’” <i>Breitbart</i> (Nov. 6, 2019)	14,15
J. Christensen, “Planned Parenthood took \$1.8B in taxpayer money in 3 years — with \$90M from COVID loans: feds,” <i>New York Post</i> (Dec. 12, 2023).	13
M. Cline, “I was a sex educator trained by Planned Parenthood; here is what I taught your kids,” <i>Washington Examiner</i> (Sept. 5, 2019)	15,16
Congressional Research Service, “Teen Pregnancy Prevention: Background and Proposals in the 111th Congress” (Apr. 5, 2011)	5
C. Cooke, “Former Planned Parenthood sex educator warns about the sexualization of children,” <i>LiveAction.org</i> (Aug. 5, 2021)	15
C. Dailard, “Understanding “Abstinence”: Implications for Individuals, Programs and Policies,” <i>Guttmacher.org</i> (Dec. 1, 2003)	5
A. Del Turco and M. Szoch, “Planned Parenthood’s Global Assault on Life Continues, and U.S. Taxpayers Fund It,” <i>Washington Stand</i> (Apr. 24, 2024)	16
G. Etzel, “Planned Parenthood sting video suppressed by Harris released after nine years,” <i>Washington Examiner</i> (Aug. 8, 2024)	12
E. Friedrichs, “How to Talk to Young People About Abortion,” <i>ReWire News Group</i> (July 12, 2019)	14
G. Grant, <u>Grand Illusions: The Legacy of Planned Parenthood</u> (Wolgemuth & Hyatt: 1988) . . .	11
G. Grant, <u>Killer Angel: A Biography of Planned Parenthood’s Founder Margaret Sanger</u> , (2d ed.) (Ars Vitae Press: 1992)	11
J. Hellman, “Abstinence-only education making a comeback under Trump,” <i>The Hill</i> (Mar. 8, 2018)	5
<i>Humanity Magazine</i> (Aug.-Sept. 1979)	13
Institute for Research and Evaluation, “Federally Funded Teen Pregnancy Prevention Programs: Not What They Claim to Be” (Dec. 31, 2010)	7,8
M. Maddoux, <u>Public Education Against America</u> , (Whitaker House: 2006)	14
R. Marshall & C. Donovan, <u>Blessed are the Barren: The Social Policy of Planned Parenthood</u> (Ignatius Press: 1991)	11
T. Moses, “American Birth Control League,” <i>Britannica</i>	10
D. Mulhausen, “The Failure of the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program: Advocates of Evidence-Based Policymaking Ignore the Evidence,” <i>Heritage Foundation</i> (July 31, 2017)	9

iii

National Right to Life Committee, “The State of Abortion in the United States,” (Feb. 2024)	16
M. New, “More Abortion, More Taxpayer Dollars, and Fewer Health Services,” <i>National Review</i> (Apr. 17, 2024)	13
New York Dep’t of Health, “Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) About Condoms”	5
“What’s the best kind of birth control?” <i>PlannedParenthood.org</i>	5
C. Novielli, “New Planned Parenthood Annual Report: Record-high funding as abortions show slight drop,” <i>LiveAction.org</i> (Apr. 25, 2023)	16
Planned Parenthood on Twitter (Oct. 2, 2019)	13
E. Stauffer, “20 million black babies have been aborted since Roe v. Wade. Where is the equity in that?” <i>Washington Examiner</i> (Oct. 14, 2022)	12

INTEREST OF *AMICI*¹

The interest of the *amici curiae* is set out in the accompanying motion for leave to file.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On March 31, 2025, Defendant Department of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) issued a Notice entitled *Guidance for Preparing a Non-Competing Continuation (NCC) Award Application* (“the Notice”).² The Notice instructed grant applications to address the effect of certain Executive Orders and to include information as to any steps applicants had taken to seek to align programs seeking grant funds with those EO’s.³ The Notice included a number of generalized guidelines for applicants to follow in submitting applications for federal funding for the upcoming fiscal year, beginning July 1, 2025, including:

1. Description of changes made to align with Executive Orders, if applicable,
2. Summary of proposed changes in scope,
3. Findings from needs and resource assessment. [Notice at 5.]

The Notice asked applicants to state “goals” and “objectives,” defined as follows:

[a] goal is a broad statement that describes the purpose of your project and the expected long-term impact you hope to achieve as a result of your project.... An objective is a statement describing the results to be achieved and the manner in

¹ Counsel for the government consented to the filing of this brief, while counsel for Plaintiffs takes no position. No party’s counsel authored the brief in whole or in part. No party or party’s counsel contributed money that was intended to fund preparing or submitting the brief. No person other than these *amici curiae*, their members or their counsel contributed money that was intended to fund preparing or submitting this brief.

² Complaint (hereinafter “Compl.”), Exhibit 2.

³ • [Executive Order 14168](#) *Defending Women From Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government*
• [Executive Order 14190](#) *Ending Radical Indoctrination in K-12 Schooling*
• [Executive Order 14187](#) *Protecting Children From Chemical and Surgical Mutilation*
• [Executive Order 14151](#) *Ending Radical and Wasteful Government DEI Programs and Preferencing*
• [Executive Order 14173](#) *Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity*

which these results will be achieved. All objectives should be SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely). [*Id.* at 6.]

It instructed that applications should be submitted by April 15, 2025. Virtually all the guidelines were general, neither specifying “right” or “wrong” answers, nor threatening to cut funding based on information provided in the application. *Id.* at 16.

Upon receiving the Notice, Plaintiffs herein, five Planned Parenthood chapters from around the country, sought injunctive relief, including: staying the implementation of the Notice; preliminarily and permanently enjoining the Notice; postponing the effective date of the Notice; vacating and setting aside the new requirements in the Notice; and requiring HHS to open an “amendment” application period without reference to the Executive Orders.

The injunctive relief sought in Plaintiffs’ proposed Order is truly remarkable as it asks this Court to negate all of President Trump’s Executive Orders as applied to Planned Parenthood applicants. It asks the Court to **enjoin HHS from**: (1) requiring any Tier 1 funding recipients to **modify their programs to align** with Executive Orders; (2) requiring any Tier 1 funding recipients **to demonstrate or certify alignment** with Executive Orders; (3) requiring any Tier 1 funding recipients **to submit program materials demonstrating alignment** with Executive Orders **or to memorialize changes** to the programs they implement **to align** with Executive Orders; or (4) **denying** any Tier 1 non-competing continuation award application **on the ground** that the application **fails to align** with, to document changes to evidence-based programs to align with, or to certify alignment with Executive Orders. *See* Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction at 6 (emphasis added); *see also* Proposed Order at 1–2, ECF No. 8-14.

ARGUMENT**I. THE NOTICE IS LAWFUL AS THE LAW GIVES THE SECRETARY WIDE DISCRETION IN MAKING GRANTS.**

Plaintiffs claim that the Notice is unlawful because it failed to follow Congress' directive that grants must be made to "medically accurate and age appropriate programs that reduce teen pregnancy." Plaintiffs' Memo in Support of Preliminary Injunction (hereinafter "Pl. Memo") at 29 (quoting 138 STAT. at 671). That statute gives the Secretary wide discretion in selecting which programs are to receive grants. The statute never defines "medically accurate," so Plaintiffs provide self-serving declarations that describe its programs as "medically accurate," as if Plaintiffs' opinion is a fact which cannot be challenged. Plaintiffs would no doubt prefer that the Biden Administration was still in charge of this program, but the American People chose to elect a new President in order to take the nation in a new direction with new policies. Plaintiffs bristle at the thought of needing to explain how their programs comport with the presidential directives by the current President, asking the Judiciary to negate the will of the People as expressed by the election of the one constitutional officer chosen by all the People. Many courts have yielded to the temptation to abuse their powers by enjoining President Trump on every front, seeking to run out the clock until a new President is elected. *See* list of injunctions in Appendix. This Court should not yield to Plaintiffs' invitation.

A. The Law Gives the Secretary Wide Discretion in Selecting Grant Recipients.

The appropriation of Teen Pregnancy Prevention (hereinafter "TPP") funds provides for grants for "medically accurate and age appropriate programs ... that have been proven effective through rigorous evaluation to reduce teenage pregnancy, behavioral risk factors underlying

teenage pregnancy, or other associated risk factors.” Pl. Memo at 28. The only limitation on the Secretary’s discretion under the TPP statute is that grant recipient programs provide “medically accurate” information that has “been proven” to reduce “teenage pregnancy” and “risk factors” related to teen pregnancy.

Plaintiffs argue that the Secretary’s grant priorities must accommodate states such as Hawaii, which requires sex education to include “education on abstinence [and] contraception,” and California, which requires “comprehensive sexual health education” that is “appropriate for use with pupils of all ... genders [and] sexual orientations.” Pl. Memo at 35. Although Plaintiffs obviously prefer to convert the federal “teen pregnancy” program to one of “comprehensive sexual health education” or one that promotes the Biden Administration’s “trans” agenda, nothing in the TPP statute mandates those policies.

The TPP statute is not an entitlement program. Nothing in the TPP statute requires the Secretary to prioritize grants to “comprehensive sex education” programs rather than abstinence programs. The term “medically accurate” is not defined in the statute. It is certainly not defined as “required to provide information on every conceivable form of contraception known to the medical community,” or “required to maintain grant equivalence among all applicants who provide at least some medically accurate information,” or “required to provide grants to Planned Parenthood specifically if at least one of its programs can be shown to have prevented at least one teen pregnancy.”

In his first administration, President Trump prioritized abstinence education for federal funding.⁴ It is “medically accurate” that abstinence is 100 percent effective in preventing teen pregnancy when practiced consistently. In 2003, Planned Parenthood’s own Guttmacher Institute conceded that “abstinence is 100% effective if ‘used’ with perfect consistency.”⁵ Planned Parenthood itself concedes that “[t]he only 100% certain way to avoid pregnancy is to not have ... sex....”⁶ Abstinence is, of course, also the only 100 percent certain way to avoid sexually transmitted diseases, as the New York Department of Health also concedes.⁷

A careful survey of the broader statutory context in which the TPP is housed makes this clear. The TPP is administered by HHS’ Office of Adolescent Health (“OAH”), which was created to administer the program:

P.L. 111-117, the Consolidated Appropriations for FY2010, included:

a new discretionary TPP program that provides grants and contracts, on a competitive basis, to public and private entities to fund “medically accurate and age appropriate” programs that reduce teen pregnancy.... The TPP program is administered by the new Office of Adolescent Health within HHS.
[Congressional Research Service, “[Teen Pregnancy Prevention: Background and Proposals in the 111th Congress](#),” at 4 (Apr. 5, 2011).]

The enabling statute for the OAH provides:

With respect to adolescent health, the Secretary shall (1) coordinate all activities within the Department of Health and Human Services that relate to disease

⁴ J. Hellman, “[Abstinence-only education making a comeback under Trump](#),” *The Hill* (Mar. 8, 2018).

⁵ C. Dailard, “[Understanding “Abstinence”: Implications for Individuals, Programs and Policies](#),” *Guttmacher.org* (Dec. 1, 2003).

⁶ “[What’s the best kind of birth control?](#)” *PlannedParenthood.org*.

⁷ New York Dep’t of Health, “[Frequently Asked Questions \(FAQs\) About Condoms](#).”

prevention, health promotion, preventive health services, and health information and education with respect to the appropriate use of health care, including coordinating ... the design of programs, support for programs, and the evaluation of programs ... and (3) support projects, conduct research, and disseminate information relating to preventive medicine, health promotion, and physical fitness. [42 U.S.C. § 300u-7(b).]

The statute further provides, “In carrying out subsection (b)(3), the Secretary may make grants to carry out demonstration projects for the purpose of improving adolescent health....” 42 U.S.C. § 300u-7(c)(1). Nowhere in the remainder of the statute is the Secretary’s discretion limited as Plaintiffs urge this court to do.

The OAH statute is placed within Title 42, Chapter 6A, relating to “Public Health Service,” and specifically within Subchapter XV, “Health information and health promotion.” 42 U.S.C. § 300u, *et seq.* 42 U.S.C. § 300u sets out the “general authority of the Secretary” with regard to health information and promotion. It provides, “No grant may be made or contract entered into under this subchapter unless an application therefor has been submitted to and approved by the Secretary. Such an application **shall be submitted in such form and manner and contain such information as the Secretary may prescribe.**” 42 U.S.C. § 300u(c) (emphasis added). The TPP program, at 42 U.S.C. § 300u-7, is in the same subchapter.

The Notice to which Plaintiffs object and ask the Court to invalidate is precisely the same grant “application” provided for in 42 U.S.C. § 300u, “in such form and manner and contain[ing] such information as the Secretary may prescribe.” **The Notice is not a final agency action covered by the APA; it relates to a grant application seeking information,** authorized by 42 U.S.C. § 300u, which Plaintiffs would prefer not to provide.

The next section, 42 U.S.C. § 300u-1, “Grants and contracts for research programs; authority of Secretary,” spells out in detail the Secretary’s authority in the matter of public health information grants generally. It provides in Subsection (a):

The Secretary is authorized to conduct and support by grant or contract ... research in health information and health promotion, preventive health services, and education in the appropriate use of health care. Applications for grants and contracts under this section shall be subject to appropriate peer review. The Secretary shall also ... determine the best methods of disseminating information concerning personal health behavior, preventive health services and the appropriate use of health care and of affecting behavior so that such information is applied to maintain and improve health, and prevent disease, reduce its risk, or modify its course or severity....

Planned Parenthood seeks, quite prematurely, to shut down even the Notice seeking information, in an attempt to make it impossible for the Secretary to exercise the discretion with which he is vested by statute. The judiciary has no authority to enjoin any aspect of this Notice.

B. Since Its Inception, the TPP Program Has Been Beset by Poor Evidence and Abortion Industry Capture, Leading to Questionable “Medical Accuracy.”

Plaintiffs would prefer to ignore the problems that the TPP program has demonstrated, caring less about the goals of the program than its demands that federal funds keep coming into its bank account. By every indication, TPP has been a troubled program which needs a fresh look by the new Administration.

In 2010, in the early days of the TPP program, HHS, in cooperation with Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., “certified a list of 28 prevention programs” as having been “proven through rigorous evaluation to reduce teenage pregnancy, behavioral risks underlying teenage pregnancy, or other associated risk factors.”⁸

⁸ Institute for Research and Evaluation, [“Federally Funded Teen Pregnancy Prevention Programs: Not What They Claim to Be”](#) at 1 (Dec. 31, 2010).

But as the Institute for Research and Evaluation (“IRE”) pointed out at the time, the claims of “rigorous” evaluation were almost wholly untrue, and in fact, most of the programs were supported by a single “study,” most of which were conducted and funded by the organization providing the program, not by any independent research organization. IRE reported that “[f]or two-thirds of the 28 TPP programs the ‘rigorous proof’ of program effectiveness consists of the evidence from only *one study conducted by the program’s author.*” *Id.* What success the TPP programs even had appeared to be short-lived.

Only one of the 28 TPP programs demonstrated a reduction in teen pregnancy one year after the program. Only 3 of the 28 programs demonstrated any long-term positive impact on the teen population in *a school classroom* setting.... *This lack of demonstrated success was not reported in the TPP documentation. Instead, improvements on less protective or short-term outcomes were cited as “proof” that these programs were effective. [Id.]*

But many programs demonstrated no success at all, as **“nearly one-half (43%) of the comprehensive TPP programs actually demonstrated failure to produce positive effects....”**

Id. at 3 (emphasis added). Thus, Plaintiffs are asking this Court to impede the ability of the Secretary to improve what has failed to achieve the objectives set by Congress.

Rather than focus on preventing teen pregnancy, many of the initial “rigorous” TPP programs contained objectionable content. The “Making a Difference” program, one of the initial 28 programs:

contains references to masturbation and sexual fantasies, in addition to role-plays suggested for 2 lesbian girls, 2 gay boys, and a lesbian girl with a bisexual girl.⁹ For one activity ... the teacher is instructed to put up a poster entitled “How Do People Express Their Sexual Feelings?” It lists: oral sex, dancing, anal sex, talking, sexual intercourse, sexual fantasy, saying ‘I like you,’ hugging, kissing,

⁹ One wonders if Congress had in mind such promotion of homosexual and lesbian sexual behavior as a strategy to avoid teen pregnancy.

holding hands, touching, grinding, massaging, masturbation, caressing, cuddling, and touching each other's genitals. The teacher is supposed to "Be sure students identify oral, anal, and vaginal intercourse as behaviors to avoid when practicing abstinence," but the curriculum then says, "All other behaviors may be good ways to express feelings to another person." [*Id.* at 7.]

Shockingly, "Making A Difference" was "classified as an 'abstinence' curriculum." *Id.* One need not be a licensed psychologist to question the proposition that nothing prevents teen pregnancy like encouraging teens to engage in "sexual fantasies," and "touching, grinding, massaging, masturbation, caressing, cuddling, and touching each other's genitals." When those behaviors are engaged in by teens, is teen pregnancy not the likely result? What could go wrong with this strategy devised by "experts" in the field?

Halfway through the program's life, the Heritage Foundation published a report by one of its Research Fellows, David Mulhausen, on the failure of the teen pregnancy programs. That report provided three key takeaways:

1. Many mistakenly believe that "evidence-based" grants will be effective because they are replicating programs that showed success in the past.
2. The federal Teen Pregnancy Prevention (TPP) grant program funds "evidence-based" sex-education programs intended to reduce teen pregnancy.
3. Overwhelmingly, **evaluations of TPP grants show that replications of "evidence-based" models were ineffective.** Funding for the ineffective TPP should be eliminated. [D. Mulhausen, "[The Failure of the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program: Advocates of Evidence-Based Policymaking Ignore the Evidence](#)," *Heritage Foundation* (July 31, 2017) (emphasis added).]

Indeed, there may be a reason that Planned Parenthood is not a good choice to develop plans to reduce teen pregnancy. Plaintiffs represent themselves to the Court as being "nonprofit organizations" that "provide[] high-quality, affordable, evidence-based sexual and reproductive health care" to "improve [their] communities' sexual and reproductive health outcomes."

Compl. at ¶¶ 17, 20. This description fails to include that Planned Parenthood is the largest

provider of terminating unborn human lives for money in the United States. If Planned Parenthood makes substantial money from providing abortions to teenagers, can it be expected that Planned Parenthood would want to run effective programs that prevent teen pregnancy?

II. PLANNED PARENTHOOD COMES TO THE COURT WITH UNCLEAN HANDS AND THUS HAS NO ENTITLEMENT TO INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.

The U.S. Supreme Court has described clean hands as “one of the fundamental principles upon which equity jurisprudence is founded.” As such, it constitutes a defect in the Plaintiffs’ case that this Court can neither ignore nor waive. *See Keystone Driller Co. v. General Excavator Co.*, 290 U.S. 240, 244-45 (1933) (“courts of equity ... apply the maxim requiring clean hands ... where some unconscionable act of one coming for relief has immediate and necessary relation to the equity that he seeks in respect of the matter in litigation.”). There are many reasons for the Court to conclude that Planned Parenthood does not have clean hands.

Rather than being a conventional healthcare organization, Planned Parenthood is an organization whose founder, Margaret Sanger, is still hailed by the organization as a hero of birth control and women’s rights. But the hidden history of Margaret Sanger is one of a racist and eugenicist, dedicated to the destruction of “inferior” races and classes. Sanger founded the American Birth Control League which later became Planned Parenthood.¹⁰ Sanger’s 1922 book entitled The Pivot of Civilization asserted that:

the “inferior races” were in fact “human weeds” and a “menace to civilization.” She really believed that “social regeneration” would only be possible as the “sinister forces of the hordes of irresponsibility and imbecility” were repulsed. She had come to regard organized charity to ethnic minorities and the poor as a

¹⁰ T. Moses, “[American Birth Control League](#),” *Britannica*.

“symptom of a malignant social disease” because it encouraged the profligacy of those “defectives, delinquents, and dependents” she so obviously abhorred.¹¹

In 1939, Sanger proposed and promoted the “Negro Project,” which proposed to use birth control to address what she viewed as the problem that “[t]he mass of Negroes ... particularly in the South, still breed carelessly and disastrously, with the result that the increase among Negroes, even more than among Whites, is from that portion of the population least intelligent and fit.” *Id.* at 73-74.

Plaintiff Planned Parenthood Mar Monte describes its mission as “targeting BIPOC [black, indigenous and people of color] youth, primarily those who are Black and Latinx.” Compl. at 26. Planned Parenthood has indeed targeted minority communities for reduction throughout its history — at a substantial profit. As George Grant notes, “[d]uring the 1980s when Planned Parenthood shifted its focus from community-based clinics to school-based clinics, it again targeted inner-city minority neighborhoods.”¹² In 1992, Grant made the shocking discovery that “[o]f the more than one hundred school-based clinics that have opened nationwide in the last decade, none have been at substantially all-White schools. None have been at suburban middle-class schools. All have been at Black, minority, or ethnic schools.” *Id.* The targeting has worked spectacularly well to achieve Planned Parenthood’s initial goals:

Nearly 40% of women who seek abortions are African American, which is astounding, considering this demographic made up just 13.6% of the population at the time of the 2020 census. This likely means that over 20 million black babies

¹¹ Quoted in G. Grant, Killer Angel: A Biography of Planned Parenthood’s Founder Margaret Sanger (2d ed.) at 70 (Ars Vitae Press: 1992). *See also* R. Marshall & C. Donovan, Blessed are the Barren: The Social Policy of Planned Parenthood (Ignatius Press: 1991).

¹² G. Grant, Grand Illusions: The Legacy of Planned Parenthood at 94 (Wolgemuth & Hyatt: 1988).

have been aborted during the past 50 years. 20 million equates to 6% of the total U.S. population. It's also approximately 45% of the current black American population of 45 million. And, had these children been born, blacks would represent about 20% of the total population. Clearly, abortion has had an enormous effect on blacks in America.¹³

One wonders if these African-American communities are the very communities which Plaintiffs described as being “underserved” and “marginalized.” Compl. at ¶¶ 42-43.

In an undercover video released in August 2024, David Daleiden of the Center for Medical Progress spoke with Dr. Ann Schutt-Ainé, the chief medical officer of Planned Parenthood Gulf Coast, and the branch's vice president of abortion access, Tram Nguyen, showing:

both Schutt-Ainé and Nguyen describing how they take measures to avoid prosecution under the federal **partial-birth abortion ban** [PBA] by dismembering the fetus while it is partially outside the womb to **preserve the internal organs of the fetus for harvesting**. “If I’m doing a procedure, and I’m seeing that I’m in fear that it’s about to come to the umbilicus [navel], I might ask for a second set of forceps to **hold the body at the cervix and pull off a leg, or two, so it’s not PBA**,” Schutt-Ainé said in the video.¹⁴

In more honest moments, Planned Parenthood reports that its focus on abortion grows while the actual health care services it provides shrinks, revealing that “in the past ten years, the number of abortions performed by Planned Parenthood has increased by 20 percent. Meanwhile, cancer screenings fell by more than 58 percent, and prenatal services declined by more than 67

¹³ E. Stauffer, “[20 million black babies have been aborted since Roe v. Wade. Where is the equity in that?](#)” *Washington Examiner* (Oct. 14, 2022).

¹⁴ G. Etzel, “[Planned Parenthood sting video suppressed by Harris released after nine years](#),” *Washington Examiner* (Aug. 8, 2024) (emphasis added).

percent.”¹⁵ Planned Parenthood’s commitment to abortion is underwritten by more than a half-billion federal taxpayer dollars each year.¹⁶

III. PLANNED PARENTHOOD USES ITS “SEX EDUCATION” EFFORTS AS ABORTION CUSTOMER RECRUITING PROGRAMS.

The failure of TPP programs to actually prevent teen pregnancy, as documented by the Institute for Research and Evaluation, may be no accident. Eugenecist Alan Guttmacher, former medical director of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, for whom Planned Parenthood named its Guttmacher Institute, once said that “[t]he only avenue the International Planned Parenthood Federation and its allies could ... win the battle for abortion on demand is through sex education.”¹⁷

Planned Parenthood has long used its “sex education” programs in schools to develop a youthful clientele of girls who begin sexual activity at younger and younger ages, believing it is “safe,” and then “need” abortions. In 2019, Planned Parenthood posted on X, “Abortion is health care — and it needs to be included in conversations about sex and sexual health ... in the classroom.”¹⁸ It then linked to a story advocating that teachers “[s]tart talking about abortion early,” decried an Ohio law promoting the “humanity of the unborn child,” which would “prevent

¹⁵ M. New, “[More Abortion, More Taxpayer Dollars, and Fewer Health Services](#),” *National Review* (Apr. 17, 2024).

¹⁶ J. Christensen, “[Planned Parenthood took \\$1.8B in taxpayer money in 3 years — with \\$90M from COVID loans: feds](#),” *New York Post* (Dec. 12, 2023).

¹⁷ *Humanity Magazine* at 11 (Aug.-Sept. 1979); *ALL About Issues* at 2 (Dec. 1979).

¹⁸ [Planned Parenthood on Twitter](#) (Oct. 2, 2019).

teachers from discussing most aspects of abortion,” and called for teachers to have a “nuanced conversation [that] destigmatizes abortion.”¹⁹

Carol Everett, who owned and operated several abortion clinics in Texas in the 1970s before experiencing a conversion to Christianity, tells of how she used Planned Parenthood sex education materials to develop a clientele base in the schools. Everett “said her unwritten goal was three to five pregnancy terminations from every girl between the ages of thirteen and eighteen.... If she got to a girl early enough, pregnancy termination would come to be her method of contraception and ensure business for her clinics through her childbearing years.”²⁰ Everett stated, “Girls do not automatically get pregnant when they are thirteen years old. It must be encouraged. We accomplished that objective by interesting the boys and girls in sexual activity through sex education.” *Id.* After giving a talk at a school, she recalled, “the next day, my phone would start ringing” at the clinics. “We’ve got to understand that birth control [for children] sells abortions.” *Id.* at 183. “Abortion isn’t about choice,” Everett said. “It’s about money.” *Id.* at 182.

Monica Cline is a former Planned Parenthood sex educator and now a whistleblower. She “left Planned Parenthood after she learned the organization’s main goal was to develop a continued stream of abortions.”²¹ While working for Planned Parenthood, Cline discovered that “the goal was not to educate children about sex, but to encourage it with the use of

¹⁹ E. Friedrichs, “[How to Talk to Young People About Abortion](#),” *ReWire News Group* (July 12, 2019).

²⁰ M. Maddoux, *Public Education Against America*, p. 182 (Whitaker House: 2006).

²¹ S. Berry, “[Former Planned Parenthood Trainer: Sex Ed Book Seeks ‘to Groom Children for Early Onset of Sex](#),” *Breitbart* (Nov. 6, 2019).

contraceptives. The end goal was to prepare teens to have abortions at Planned Parenthood if they became pregnant. When she began questioning if this teaching helped or hurt children, she was rebuffed and told that if she wasn't pro-abortion, she didn't belong."²²

Cline notes that sex education in schools has become "the perfect vehicle for Planned Parenthood ... to proselytize youth toward sexual promiscuity and abortion. It's **the perfect business plan for a lifelong customer....**"²³

To that end, many of Planned Parenthood's "teen pregnancy prevention" programs are instead "teen pregnancy preparation" programs. Cline warns that Planned Parenthood's programs offer "a whole lot of hypersexualized answers to groom children for early onset of sex."²⁴

Cline noted, "[t]hese programs are created to teach children about sexuality in order for them to become sexually active.... These programs are about sexualizing children and leading them to abortion. That is what sex education is. Comprehensive sexuality education is all about grooming children, and using it as a marketing tool to lead to abortion."²⁵

²² C. Cooke, "[Former Planned Parenthood sex educator warns about the sexualization of children](#)," *LiveAction.org* (Aug. 5, 2021).

²³ M. Cline, "[I was a sex educator trained by Planned Parenthood; here is what I taught your kids](#)," *Washington Examiner* (Sept. 5, 2019) (emphasis added).

²⁴ S. Berry, *supra*.

²⁵ C. Cooke, *supra*.

According to the Guttmacher Institute, 65 million babies have lost their lives to abortion in the United States since the *Roe v. Wade* decision in 1973.²⁶ Just since 2000, “Planned Parenthood has committed over 6.7 million abortions and received nearly \$10 billion from taxpayers.”²⁷

Nor are Planned Parenthood’s efforts limited to the United States. “Planned Parenthood Global” works in scores of nations around the world to promote its “business model.” In 2022, “it bragged about weakening 112 policies that protected the unborn in eight different countries.”²⁸ Of course, “[w]hen Planned Parenthood reports 112 policy victories, that is 112 places that they can rake in more money. Planned Parenthood may paint its efforts as benevolent humanitarian work, but make no mistake: this is a business — a deadly one that should not be exported abroad.”

As Monica Cline warns, “[o]rganizations like Planned Parenthood do not aspire for more in our children’s lives. Their answer to happiness and empowerment is to have sex, use a condom, get tested, treated, and have an abortion,” she said.²⁹ “Planned Parenthood and other like-minded organizations have been collaborating for years to establish illicit sex education in our schools and communities. Remember, it’s big money for them.” *Id.*

²⁶ National Right to Life Committee, “[The State of Abortion in the United States](#)” at 6 (citing “data reported by the Guttmacher Institute”) (Feb. 2024).

²⁷ C. Novielli, “[New Planned Parenthood Annual Report: Record-high funding as abortions show slight drop](#),” *LiveAction.org* (Apr. 25, 2023).

²⁸ A. Del Turco and M. Szoeh, “[Planned Parenthood’s Global Assault on Life Continues, and U.S. Taxpayers Fund It](#),” *Washington Stand* (Apr. 24, 2024).

²⁹ M. Cline, *supra*.

Of course, none of these human costs, these millions of lives lost, are part of Planned Parenthood’s calculus of the “success” of “medically accurate and age appropriate programs ... that have been proven effective through rigorous evaluation.” If the Secretary determines that changes to the TPP program are required, the statute gives him that authority which this Court should not impede.

CONCLUSION

Planned Parenthood’s motion for injunctive relief should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick M. McSweeney
3358 John Tree Hill Road
Powhatan, VA 23139

/s/ William J. Olson
William J. Olson (D.C. Bar # 233833)
Jeremiah L. Morgan (D.C. Bar # 1012943)
William J. Olson, P.C.
370 Maple Avenue West, Suite 4
Vienna, VA 22180-5615
(703) 356-5070
wjo@mindspring.com
Counsel for *Amici Curiae*
Dated: May 30, 2025

APPENDIX

App.1

**FEDERAL COURT INJUNCTIONS AGAINST
THE TRUMP ADMINISTRATION**
(Partial List: January 20, 2025 through May 23, 2025)

BIRTHRIGHT CITIZENSHIP

1. [*New Hampshire Indonesian Community Support v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00038](#) — Judge Joseph N. Laplante (G.W. Bush) of the District of New Hampshire enjoined any enforcement of Trump’s birthright citizenship EO within the state.
2. [*Washington v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-00127](#) — Judge John C. Coughenour (Reagan) of the District of Washington enjoined any enforcement of Trump’s birthright citizenship EO nationwide. The case was appealed to the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court, where argument on the universal injunction was held May 15.
3. [*New Jersey v. Trump; Doe v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-10139](#) — Judge Leo T. Sorokin (Obama) of the District of Massachusetts enjoined any enforcement of Trump’s birthright citizenship EO within the state. The case was appealed to the First Circuit and the Supreme Court, where argument on the universal injunction was held May 15.
4. [*CASA Inc. v. Trump*, No. 8:25-cv-00201](#) — Judge Deborah L. Boardman (Biden) of the District of Maryland enjoined any enforcement of Trump’s birthright citizenship EO nationwide. The case was appealed to the Fourth Circuit and the Supreme Court, where argument on the universal injunction was held May 15.

IMMIGRATION

5. [*J.G.G. v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00766](#) — Judge James E. Boasberg (Obama) of the District of D.C. ordered flights of gang members and terrorists rerouted back to the United States, and then ordered that Trump cannot deport anyone under the Alien Enemies Act without a hearing. This was upheld by D.C. Circuit, then on April 7, the Supreme Court [vacated the district court’s](#) TROs. Judge Boasberg on April 16 [threatened the Trump administration](#) with criminal contempt charges, but on April 18 the DC Circuit issued an [administrative stay](#) in the appeal from Judge Boasberg’s Apr. 16 contempt-related order. Plaintiffs filed an [April 24 amended complaint](#) including a habeas petition for a class of individuals and an April 25 [motion for a permanent injunction](#).
6. [*Chung v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-02412](#) — Judge Naomi R. Buchwald (Clinton) of the Southern District of New York issued a temporary restraining order preventing Trump from deporting a Columbia University student for pro-Hamas activism.

App.2

7. [*Phila. Yearly Meeting of The Religious Soc’y of Friends v. U.S. Dep’t of Homeland Sec.*, No. 8:2025-cv-00243](#) — Judge Theodore D. Chuang (Obama) of the District of Maryland enjoined ICE raids in houses of worship.

8. [*M.K. v. Joyce*, No. 1:25-cv-01935](#) — Judge Jesse M. Furman (Obama) of the Southern District of New York issued a temporary restraining order forbidding the removal of a prisoner from the U.S. to Venezuela until the court could rule on the merits of the removal. This case was transferred on March 19 as [*Khalil v. Joyce*, 2:25-cv-01963](#) — Judge Michael E. Farbiarz (Biden) of the District of New Jersey ordered on that same day that “Petitioner shall not be removed from the United States unless and until the Court issues a contrary Order.”

9. [*Parra v. Castro*, No. 1:24-cv-00912](#) — Judge Kenneth J. Gonzales (Obama) of the District of New Mexico issued a [temporary restraining order](#) on February 9 blocking the transfer of three Venezuelans to Gitmo. They were then removed to their home country instead and voluntarily dismissed their case.

10. [*Vizguerra-Ramirez v. Choate*, No. 1:25-cv-00881](#) — Judge Nina Y. Wang (Biden) of the District of Colorado enjoined the ICE deportation of a Mexican citizen.

11. [*National TPS Alliance v. Noem*, No. 3:25-cv-01766](#) — Judge Edward M. Chen (Obama) of the Northern District of California enjoined ending Temporary Protected Status (“TPS”) for 350,000 to 600,000 Venezuelans. After the 9th Circuit denied a stay, the Supreme Court on [May 19 stayed the district court](#) decision.

12. [*Pacito v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-00255](#) — Judge Jamal N. Whitehead (Biden) of the Western District of Washington granted a nationwide preliminary injunction on February 28 blocking President Trump’s Executive Order indefinitely halting entry through the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP). On appeal, the Ninth Circuit [partially granted](#) the Trump administration’s emergency motion to stay, and filed an [order clarifying their stay](#) on April 21.

13. [*City and County of San Francisco v. Donald J. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-01350](#) — Judge William H. Orrick III (Obama) of the Northern District of California granted a [preliminary injunction](#) April 24 enjoining President Trump’s efforts to have the Department of Justice investigate and prosecute “sanctuary cities” policies and government officials interfering with immigration enforcement.

14. [*D.V.D. v. U.S. Department of Homeland Security*, No. 1:25-cv-10676](#) — Judge Brian E. Murphy (Biden) of the District of Massachusetts on March 28 issued a [temporary restraining order](#) enjoining the Trump administration over the recent policy of deporting non-citizens with final removal orders to a third country, specifically El Salvador, without first providing an opportunity to contest removal. [First Circuit](#) denied stay pending appeal April 7. Judge Murphy granted class certification and issued a [preliminary injunction](#) April 18, and further orders on [May 20](#), May 21, May 23, and May 26. [SCOTUS Application](#) for Stay filed May 27.

App.3

15. [*Community Legal Services in East Palo Alto v. U.S. Dep't of HHS*, No. 3:25-cv-02847](#) — Judge Araceli Martinez-Olguin (Biden) of the Northern District of California issued a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 1 blocking Defendants from terminating funding for Department of Health and Human Services' (HHS) Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) funding for legal representation services for unaccompanied immigrant children through April 16, then on April 10 [extended the TRO](#) through April 30. Defendants' appeal of the TRO to the Ninth Circuit [was denied](#), as was a petition for [rehearing en banc](#). On April 29, the District Court granted a [preliminary injunction](#) blocking Defendants from withdrawing the services or funds provided by ORR until a final judgment in the matter is issued. Defendants appealed the PI to the [9th Circuit](#) on Apr. 30.

16. [*J.A.V. v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00072](#) — Judge Fernando Rodriguez (Trump) of the Southern District of Texas on April 9 [temporarily enjoined](#) the Trump administration from deporting Venezuelans outside of the district under the Alien Enemies Act. On May 1, Judge Rodriguez certified a class and granted a [permanent injunction](#).

17. [*G.F.F. v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-02886](#) — Judge Alvin Hellerstein (Clinton) of the Southern District of New York granted a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 9 on behalf of a class of all persons in the district subject to deportation under the Alien Enemies Act. A [Preliminary Injunction](#) was granted May 6.

18. [*Doe v. Noem*, No. 1:25-cv-10495](#) — Judge Indira Talwani (Obama) of the District of Massachusetts, on April 14, granted a [motion to stay](#) the Department of Homeland Security's blanket revocation of Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Venezuela parole programs (the "CHNV parole programs") and ordering case-by-case review of any termination of work authorization permits to remain in the United States.

19. [*Viloria Aviles v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-00611](#) — Judge Gloria Maria Navarro (Obama) of the District of Nevada issued a [preliminary injunction](#) on April 17 prohibiting the government from removing the Petitioner from the United States under the Alien Enemies Act until after his merits hearing.

20. [*D.B.U. v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-01163](#) — Judge Charlotte Sweeney (Biden) of the District of Colorado issued a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 22 forbidding the administration from removing Venezuelan illegal aliens from Colorado for deportation under the Aliens Enemies Act. A motion for a preliminary injunction is pending. On [appeal to the 10th Circuit](#), a panel on [April 29 denied an emergency motion](#) for stay.

21. [*A.S.R. v. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-00113](#) — Judge Stephanie Haines (Trump) of the Western District of Pennsylvania granted a [temporary restraining order on April 25](#) on behalf of a class of all persons in the district subject to deportation under the Alien Enemies Act that they must be given 14 days' notice and hearing before any removal from the district, pursuant to the Supreme Court's decision in *J.G.G. v. Trump*.

App.4

22. [*Mahdawi v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-00389](#) — Judge Geoffrey W. Crawford (Obama) of the District of Vermont extended a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 24 “for a period of 90 days or until dismissal of this case or grant of a preliminary injunction, whichever is earliest ... no respondent... shall remove [Mohsen Mahdawi, a Palestinian] from Vermont without further order from this court.”

23. [*Yostin Sleiker Gutierrez-Contreras v. Warden Desert View Annex*, No. 5:25-cv-00911](#) — Judge Sunshine S. Sykes (Biden) of the Central District of California, issued a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 16 preventing the government from removing a Venezuelan at risk of being deported to El Salvador under the Alien Enemies Act. On April 28, the TRO was dissolved since the Plaintiff was in Texas when the petition was filed.

*NOTE: [According to Politico](#), there have been over 100 lawsuits and 50 restraining orders related to the F-1 visas and the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) in 23 states. The Trump Administration is working to resolve this situation, so these cases are not included here.

TRANSGENDER

24. [*Talbott v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00240](#) — Judge Ana C. Reyes (Biden) of the District of D.C., a lesbian, enjoined Trump’s rule preventing “transgender” persons from serving in the military. The case is on appeal to the D.C. Circuit.

25. [*PFLAG v. Trump*, No. 8:25-cv-00337](#) — Judge Brendan A. Hurson (Biden) of the District of Maryland granted an injunction against Trump’s order denying federal funding to institutions performing chemical or surgical “transgender” mutilation on minors.

26. [*Washington v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-00244](#) — Judge Lauren J. King (Biden) of the Western District of Washington enjoined Trump’s order denying federal funding to institutions performing chemical or surgical “transgender” mutilation on minors. The case is on appeal to the Ninth Circuit.

27. [*Ireland v. Hegseth*, No. 1:25-cv-01918](#) — Judge Christine P. O’Hearn (Biden) of the District of New Jersey enjoined the Air Force from removing two “transgender” service members pursuant to Trump’s order banning “transgender” service members.

28. [*Doe v. McHenry*; *Doe v. Bondi*, No. 1:25-cv-00286](#) — Judge Royce C. Lamberth (Reagan) of the District of D.C. enjoined the transfer of twelve “transgender women” to men’s prisons under Trump’s order, and terminating their taxpayer-funded hormone treatments. The injunction has been appealed to the D.C. Circuit.

App.5

29. [*Moe v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-10195](#) — Senior Judge George A. O’Toole Jr. (Clinton) of the District of Massachusetts enjoined the transfer of a “transgender woman” to a men’s prison under Trump’s order. This case has been transferred to another, unidentified, district.

30. [*Jones v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-401](#) — Judge Royce C. Lamberth (Reagan) of the District of D.C. enjoined the transfer of three “transgender women” to men’s prisons and termination of their taxpayer-funded hormone treatments under Trump’s order.

31. [*Shilling v. Trump*, No. 2:25-cv-00241](#) — Judge Benjamin H. Settle (G.W. Bush) of the Western District of Washington enjoined Trump’s order to remove “transgender” service members. The Ninth Circuit denied a request for a stay of the injunction; an Application for Stay filed at the Supreme Court ([24A1030](#)), and the stay was granted May 6.

32. [*Maine v. Department of Agriculture*, No. 1:25-cv-00131](#) — Judge John Woodcock (G.W. Bush) of the District of Maine granted a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 11 on behalf of Maine, in its lawsuit against Trump’s federal education funding freeze to Maine for its refusal to ban boys from girls’ teams.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

33. [*Dellinger v. Bessent*, No. 1:25-cv-00385](#) — Judge Amy B. Jackson (Obama) of the District of D.C. issued a restraining order invalidating Trump’s firing of U.S. special counsel Hampton Dellinger. The order was upheld by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court, then was temporarily lifted by the Court of Appeals on March 5; on March 6, Dellinger announced that he was dropping his case.

34. [*American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO v. U.S. Office of Personnel Management*, No. 3:25-cv-01780](#) — Judge William H. Alsup (Clinton) of the Northern District of California enjoined Trump’s order for six federal agencies to dismiss thousands of probationary employees. The injunction was upheld by the [Ninth Circuit](#), and the Supreme Court issued a [stay based on standing](#).

35. [*Wilcox v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00334](#) — Judge Beryl A. Howell (Obama) of the District of D.C. enjoined Trump’s firing of National Labor Relations Board member Gwynne Wilcox, a Democrat, and ordered her reinstated to finish her term. The [D.C. Circuit](#) stayed the injunction, then reinstated it, and an [application for a stay](#) at the Supreme Court was [granted by Chief Justice Roberts](#) on April 9, and by the [Supreme Court on May 22](#).

36. [*Harris v. Bessent*, No. 1:25-cv-00412](#) — Judge Rudolph Contreras (Obama) of the District of D.C. enjoined Trump’s firing of Merit Systems Protection Board member Cathy Harris and ordered her reinstated. The [D.C. Circuit](#) stayed the injunction, then reinstated it, an [application for a stay](#) at the Supreme Court was [granted by Chief Justice Roberts](#) on April 9, and by the [Supreme Court on May 22](#).

App.6

37. [*American Foreign Service Association v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00352](#) — Judge Carl J. Nichols (Trump) of the District of D.C. issued a temporary restraining order against Trump’s firing of USAID employees. He later vacated the TRO and denied a preliminary injunction against the firings.
38. [*Does 1-9 v. Department of Justice*, No. 1:25-cv-00325](#) — Judge Jia M. Cobb (Biden) of the District of D.C. enjoined Trump from releasing the names of any FBI agents who worked on the January 6 investigation.
39. [*Doctors for America v. U.S. Office of Personnel Management*, No. 1:25-cv-00322](#) — Judge John D. Bates (G.W. Bush) of the District of D.C. ordered that CDC and FDA webpages that “inculcate or promote gender ideology” be restored after Trump ordered them removed.
40. [*Perkins Coie v. DOJ*, No. 1:25-cv-00716](#) — Judge Beryl A. Howell (Obama) of the District of D.C. enjoined Trump’s directive barring government agencies doing business with Perkins Coie and banning PC attorneys from federal buildings.
41. [*Jenner Block v. DOJ*, No. 1:25-cv-00916](#) — Judge John D. Bates (G.W. Bush) of the District of D.C. on March 28 granted a [temporary restraining order](#) against Trump’s directive barring government agencies from doing business with Jenner Block and banning that firm’s attorneys from federal buildings. Judge Block granted Jenner’s motions for summary judgment and [permanent injunction on May 23](#).
42. [*Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP v. Executive Office of the President*, No. 1:25-cv-00917](#) — Judge Richard J. Leon (G.W. Bush) of the District of D.C. enjoined Trump’s directive barring government agencies from doing business with Wilmer and banning that firm’s attorneys from federal buildings.
43. [*Susman Godfrey LLP v. Executive Office of the President*, No. 1:25-cv-01107](#) — Judge Loren L. AliKhan (Biden) of the District of D.C. on [April 15 enjoined](#) Trump’s directive barring government agencies from doing business with Susman Godfrey and banning that firm’s attorneys from federal buildings.
44. [*American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO v. Ezell*, No. 1:25-cv-10276](#) — Senior Judge George A. O’Toole Jr. (Clinton) of the District of Massachusetts issued a temporary restraining order against Trump’s buyout of federal employees. The judge later lifted the TRO and denied an injunction, allowing the buyout to go forward.
45. [*Maryland v. US Dep’t of Agriculture*, No. 1:25-cv-00748](#) — James K. Bredar (Obama) of the District of Maryland issued a TRO ordering 38 agencies to stop firing employees and reinstate fired employees. On April 9, the Fourth Circuit [stayed the district court injunction](#), noting the Supreme Court’s stay in [*AFGE, AFL-CIO v. OPM and Ezell*](#)).

App.7

46. [*Does 1-26 v. Musk*, No. 8:25-cv-00462](#) — Judge Theodore D. Chuang (Obama) of the District of Maryland ordered DOGE to reinstate email access for fired USAID employees.

47. [*American Federation of Teachers v. Bessent*, No. 8:25-cv-00430](#) — Judge Deborah L. Boardman (Biden) of the District of Maryland enjoined DOE and Office of Personnel Management from disclosing personal information of employees to DOGE. On April 7, the Fourth Circuit [granted a stay](#) to the Defendants pending the appeal.

48. [*American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO v. Social Security Administration*, No. 1:25-cv-00596](#) — Judge Ellen L. Hollander (Obama) of the District of Maryland granted an injunction forbidding the Social Security Administration from providing personal information to DOGE. The [Fourth Circuit](#) dismissed an appeal for [lack jurisdiction](#). On May 2, the Trump administration filed an [Application for a Stay](#) of the Injunction and Requested an Emergency stay.

49. [*Brehm v. Marocco*, No. 1:25-cv-00660](#) — Judge Richard J. Leon (G.W. Bush) of the District of D.C. issued a temporary restraining order forbidding Trump from removing Brehm from, and appointing Marocco to, the U.S. African Development Foundation.

50. [*American Oversight v. Hegseth*, No. 1:25-cv-00883](#) — Judge James E. Boasberg (Obama) of the District of D.C. issued an order “as agreed by the parties,” for the government to preserve all Signal communications related to the leak to an *Atlantic* editor of DoD conversations in Houthi strike.

51. [*National Treasury Employees Union v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00935](#) — Judge Paul Friedman (Clinton) of the District of D.C., on April 25, [enjoined agencies](#) from implementing Trump’s executive order limiting collective bargaining rights for many federal employees, but specifically did not enjoin President Trump.

52. [*Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council v. Department of Agriculture*, No. 1:25-cv-00097](#) — Judge Mary McElroy (Trump) of the District of Rhode Island issued a [preliminary injunction](#) against Trump’s federal funding freeze for various departments including the EPA. The Trump administration [appealed to the 1st Circuit](#) on May 1.

53. [*Associated Press v. Budowich*, No. 1:25-cv-00532](#) — Judge Trevor McFadden (Trump) of the District of D.C. on [April 8 enjoined](#) the White House from keeping AP reporters out of the White House press briefings until it agrees to refer to the “Gulf of America.”

54. [*Novedades Y Servicios, Inc. v. FinCEN*, 3:25-cv-00886](#) — Judge Janis L. Sammartino (G.W. Bush) of the Southern District of California granted a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 22 against Department of Treasury FinCEN’s Geographic Targeting Order which requires businesses along the southern border to file Currency Transaction Reports with FinCEN at a \$200 threshold.

App.8

55. [*New York, et al. v. Donald J. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-01144](#) — Judge Jeannette A. Vargas (Biden) of the Southern District of New York issued a [preliminary injunction](#) on February 21 blocking DOGE’s access to certain Treasury Department payment records. Then on April 11, Judge Vargas [partially dissolved her preliminary injunction](#) since “based on existing record” mitigation, training and vetting procedures were adequate to satisfy her concerns.

56. [*American Federation Of Government Employees, AFL-CIO v. Trump*, No. 3:25-cv-03698](#) — Judge Susan Y. Illston (Clinton) of the Northern District of California granted a [Temporary Restraining Order](#) on May 9 to pause the Defendants’ reductions in force under EO 14210. Defendants immediately appealed this order to the [Ninth Circuit](#), and filed an Application for a stay at the [US Supreme Court on May 19](#).

FUNDING

57. [*National Treasury Employees Union v. Vought*, No. 1:25-cv-00381](#) — Judge Amy B. Jackson (Obama) of the District of D.C. halted Trump’s budget cuts and layoffs at the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. On March 31, the [government appealed](#) Judge Jackson’s preliminary injunction order to the D.C. Circuit; which on April 11 ordered a [partial stay](#) of the preliminary injunction.

58. [*AIDS Vaccine Advocacy Coalition v. Department of State*, No. 1:25-cv-00400](#) — Judge Amir H. Ali (Biden) of the District of D.C. ordered Trump to unfreeze and spend \$2 billion in USAID funds. The Supreme Court, in a 5-4 ruling with Justices Alito, Thomas, Kavanaugh, and Gorsuch dissenting, left the [order in place](#). On Apr. 2, [defendants appealed](#) Judge Ali’s Mar. 10 preliminary injunction order to the D.C. Circuit.

59. [*Colorado v. US Dep’t of Health and Human Services*, No. 1:25-cv-00121](#) — Judge Mary S. McElroy (Trump) of the District of Rhode Island, issued a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 5 reinstating payments to a coalition of states which sued the Trump administration over the cancellation of \$11 billion in public health funding.

60. [*National Council of Nonprofits v. OMB*, No. 1:25-cv-00239](#) — Judge Loren L. AliKhan (Biden) of the District of D.C. blocked Trump’s order to pause federal aid while reviewing to determine if it aligned with administration policy. Appeal to the D.C. Circuit [docketed April 25](#).

61. [*Massachusetts v. NIH*, No. 1:25-cv-10338](#) — Judge Angel Kelley (Biden) of the District of Massachusetts issued a preliminary injunction on March 5 prohibiting implementation of the NIH Guidance “in any form with respect to institutions nationwide.”

62. [*New York v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00039](#) — Judge John J. McConnell Jr. (Obama) of the District of Rhode Island enjoined Trump’s order to freeze federal spending while reviewing to determine that it aligned with administration policy. The [First Circuit](#), on March 26, denied defendants’ motion for a stay pending appeal of the district court’s preliminary injunction order.

App.9

63. [*RFE/RL, Inc. v. Lake*, No. 1:25-cv-00799](#) — Judge Royce C. Lamberth (Reagan) of the District of D.C. issued a temporary restraining order forbidding Trump from cutting funds to Voice of America.
64. [*Widakuswara v. Lake*, No. 1:25-cv-01015](#) — Judge Royce C. Lamberth (Reagan) of the District of D.C. issued a [preliminary injunction on April 22](#) requiring the reinstatement of employment positions and funding for Voice of America and U.S. Agency for Global Media. The government [appealed to the DC Circuit](#) April 24.
65. [*Radio Free Asia v. United States of America*, No. 1:25-cv-00907](#) — Judge Royce C. Lamberth (Reagan) of the District of D.C. issued a preliminary injunction requiring restoration of funding of Radio Free Asia and Middle East Broadcasting Networks on April 25. The government immediately filed an [appeal to the D.C. Circuit](#), which granted a [stay pending appeal](#) on May 3.
66. [*Massachusetts Fair Housing Ctr. v. HUD*, No. 3:25-cv-30041](#) — Judge Richard G. Stearns (Clinton) of the District of Massachusetts enjoined Trump’s cuts to HUD grant funding and ordered spending reinstated.
67. [*Climate United Fund v. Citibank, N.A.*, No. 1:25-cv-00698](#) — Judge Tanya S. Chutkan (Obama) of the District of D.C. issued a temporary restraining order enjoining EPA’s Termination of Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund Grants.
68. [*Association of American Medical Colleges v. NIH*, No. 1:25-cv-10340](#) — Judge Angel Kelley (Biden) of the District of Massachusetts enjoined Trump’s NIH grant funding cuts. The Case has been [appealed to the First Circuit](#).
69. [*American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education v. McMahon*, No. 1:25-cv-00702](#) — Judge Julie R. Rubin (Biden) of the District of Maryland issued an injunction requiring reinstatement of terminated education grant funds. [Defendants appealed](#) the preliminary injunction to the Fourth Circuit. On April 1, the Fourth Circuit denied Plaintiffs’ motion to place the case in abeyance, and on April 10, granted the defendants’ motion for stay pending appeal.
70. [*Mayor and City Council of Baltimore et al. v. Vought*, No. 1:25-cv-00458](#) — Judge Matthew J. Maddox (Biden) of the District of Maryland issued a TRO preventing Trump from defunding the CFPB.
71. [*Association of American Universities v. Department of Health and Human Services*, No. 1:25-cv-10346](#) — Judge Angel Kelley (Biden) of the District of Massachusetts issued a nationwide injunction against Trump’s NIH funding cuts. [Defendants appealed](#) to the First Circuit on April 9.

App.10

72. [*Association of American Universities v. Dep't of Energy*, No. 1:25-cv-10912](#) — Judge Allison D. Burroughs (Obama) of the District of Massachusetts issued a [temporary restraining order](#) on April 16 against the cap instituted on reimbursements for indirect costs for federal research grants from the Department of Energy.

73. [*American Library Association v. Sonderling*, No. 1:25-cv-01050](#) — Judge Richard J. Leon of the District of D.C. granted a [temporary restraining order](#) on May 1 against the executive order which requires spending reduction of the Institute for Museum and Library Services.

74. [*Rhode Island v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00128](#) — Chief Judge John J. McConnell, Jr. (Obama) of the District of Rhode Island, granted a preliminary injunction on May 6 to a coalition of states which sued over an Executive Order which requires 7 agencies to reduce their functions.

75. [*State of New York v. U.S. Dep't of Education*, No. 1:25-cv-02990](#) — Judge Edgardo Ramos (Obama) of the Southern District of New York granted a preliminary injunction that prohibits the U.S. Department of Education from cancelling over \$1 billion in unspent COVID-19 pandemic funding grants extended past the original deadline by the prior administration.

76. [*San Francisco U.S.D. v. AmeriCorps*, 3:25-cv-02425](#) — Judge Edward M. Chen (Obama) of the Northern District of California granted a [temporary restraining order](#) on March 31 after San Francisco Unified School District sued over actions taken to fire employees and freeze grant funding at AmeriCorps.

77. [*Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington v. U.S. DOGE Service*, 1:25-cv-00511](#) — Judge Christopher R. Cooper (Obama) of the District of D.C. issued a [preliminary injunction](#) on March 10 in a lawsuit against DOGE and Elon Musk regarding compliance with FOIA and the Federal Records Act.

ELECTIONS

78. [*League of United Latin American Citizens v. EOP*, No. 1:25-cv-00946](#) — Judge Colleen Kollar-Kotelly (Clinton) of the District of D.C. granted a [universal injunction](#) on April 24 against Executive Order 14,248, requiring documentary proof of United States citizenship to vote in Federal elections. This case consolidates three suits brought by racial minority associations and by Democrat Party, campaigns, and elected officials.

DEI-RELATED PROGRAMS

79. [*Nat'l Ass'n of Diversity Officers in Higher Educ. v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-00333](#) — Judge Adam B. Abelson (Biden) of the District of Maryland enjoined Trump's order blocking federal funding for DEI programs. On [March 14, the Fourth Circuit granted](#) the government's motion for a stay of the preliminary injunction pending appeal.

App.11

80. [*California v. Department of Education*, No. 1:25-cv-10548](#) — Judge Myong J. Joun (Biden) of the District of Massachusetts granted a temporary restraining order blocking Trump’s withdrawal of funds to schools teaching DEI. The First Circuit [denied a motion](#) for stay pending appeal. On April 4, the [Supreme Court granted a stay](#) pending appeal, writing “the Government is likely to succeed in showing the District Court lacked jurisdiction” and that the case may need to be brought in the Court of Federal Claims.

81. [*Chicago Women in Trades v. Trump*, No. 1:25-cv-02005](#) — Senior Judge Matthew F. Kennelly (Clinton) of the Northern District of Illinois entered a temporary restraining order commanding the reinstatement of DEI grants.

82. [*Doe 1 v. Office of the Director of National Intelligence*, No. 1:25-cv-00300](#) — Judge Anthony J. Trenga (G.W. Bush) of the Eastern District of Virginia issued an “administrative stay” against firing DEI employees with CIA and DNI. The court then considered and rejected imposing a TRO to the same effect. On March 31, Judge Trenga granted a [preliminary injunction](#) enjoining the defendants. On May 6, defendants filed [notice of appeal](#) to the 4th Circuit.

83. [*American Federation of Teachers v. U.S. Department of Education*, No. 1:25-cv-00628](#) — Judge Stephanie A. Gallagher (Trump) of the District of Maryland enjoined the U.S. Department of Education’s February 14, 2025 “Dear Colleague Letter” ending diversity, equity, and inclusion practices in schools by threatening to withhold federal funding from those that refuse to comply.

84. [*National Education Association v. US Department of Education*, No. 1:25-cv-00091](#) — Judge Landya B. McCafferty (Obama) of the District of New Hampshire enjoined the U.S. Department of Education’s February 14, 2025 “Dear Colleague Letter” ending diversity, equity, and inclusion practices in schools by threatening to withhold federal funding from those that refuse to comply.

85. [*NAACP v. U.S. Department of Education*, No. 1:25-cv-01120](#) — Judge Dabney L. Friedrich (Trump) of the District of D.C. enjoined the U.S. Department of Education’s February 14, 2025 “Dear Colleague Letter” ending diversity, equity, and inclusion practices in schools by threatening to withhold federal funding from those that refuse to comply.