

No. 19-1392

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

THOMAS E. DOBBS, STATE HEALTH OFFICER OF
THE MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, *et al.*,

Petitioners,

v.

JACKSON WOMEN'S HEALTH ORGANIZATION, *et al.*,

Respondents.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES
COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

**BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE* 896 STATE
LEGISLATORS IN SUPPORT OF
RESPONDENTS**

CLAUDE G. SZYFER
Counsel Of Record
MICHELE L. PAHMER
DARYA D. ANICHKOVA
JESSICA L. DUBOWSKI
GILANA R. KELLER
JULIE G. MATOS
STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP
180 Maiden Lane
New York, New York 10038
(212) 806-5400
cszyfer@stroock.com

Counsel for Amici Curiae

307369



COUNSEL PRESS

(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

i

A complete list of the 896 State Legislators participating as *amici curiae* is provided as an appendix to the brief.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES	iv
INTERESTS OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	1
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....	4
ARGUMENT.....	6
I. THIS COURT’S PRECEDENT RECOGNIZES THAT THE CONSTITUTION GUARANTEES EACH PERSON THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE WHETHER TO CONTINUE HER PRE-VIABILITY PREGNANCY.	6
II. IF THIS COURT FAILS TO UPHOLD <i>ROE</i> AND <i>CASEY</i> IN THEIR ENTIRETY, IT WILL EMBOLDEN STATE LEGISLATURES TO FURTHER ENGAGE IN SYMBOLIC POLITICS AT THE EXPENSE OF REAL PRIORITIES.	9
III. PRE-VIABILITY BANS WOULD UPEND THE ALREADY-PRECARIOUS PATCHWORK OF ABORTION CARE NATIONWIDE, ALSO JEOPARDIZING ACCESS IN STATES THAT PROTECT ABORTION RIGHTS.	19

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
IV. FAILURE BY THIS COURT TO UPHOLD THE RULE OF LAW AND PRECEDENT WILL BE DISASTROUS FOR WOMEN SEEKING ABORTIONS AND THEIR FAMILIES.	27
CONCLUSION	34
APPENDIX.....	1a

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

	<i>Page</i>
CASES	
<i>Bush v. Orleans Par. Sch. Bd.</i> , 190 F. Supp. 861 (E.D. La. 1960), <i>aff'd</i> , 365 U.S. 569 (1961), <i>aff'd sub. nom.</i> , <i>City of New Orleans, Louisiana v. Bush</i> , 366 U.S. 212 (1961)	1, 10
<i>Cooper v. Aaron</i> , 358 U.S. 1 (1958).	1, 10
<i>Jackson Women’s Health Org. v. Dobbs</i> , 379 F. Supp. 3d 549 (S.D. Miss. 2019), <i>aff'd</i> , 951 F.3d 246 (5th Cir. 2020)	12
<i>June Med. Servs. L. L. C. v. Russo</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2103 (2020).	<i>passim</i>
<i>Planned Parenthood of Se. Pa. v. Casey</i> , 505 U.S. 833 (1992).	<i>passim</i>
<i>Roe v. Wade</i> , 410 U.S. 113 (1973)	<i>passim</i>
<i>United States v. Peters</i> , 5 Cranch 115, 136 (1809)	11
<i>Whole Woman’s Health v.</i> <i>Austin Reeve Jackson, Judge</i> , 594 U.S. __ (2021).	9, 10, 15

Cited Authorities

Page

Whole Woman’s Health v. Hellerstedt,
136 S. Ct. 2292 (2016)..... *passim*

STATUTES AND OTHER AUTHORITIES

ABORTION CARE NETWORK, *Communities Need
Clinics: The Essential Role of Independent
Abortion Clinics in the United States*
(2020)..... 20, 25, 26, 27

America’s Health Rankings, United Health
Foundation, *2018 Health of Women and
Children Report, Louisiana*29, 30

America’s Health Rankings, United Health
Foundation, *2019 Health of Women and
Children Report, Mississippi*28

Associated Press, *With Texas as model, Noem
seeks more abortion restrictions*, THE
BROOKINGS REG. (Sept. 9, 2021).....9, 10

Breeanna Hare & Lisa Rose, *Where Rapists
Can Gain Parental Rights* (Nov. 17, 2016)31, 32

Bryce Covert, *Mississippi Abortion Ban
Endangers Low-Income Women, Women of
Color*, REWIRE NEWS (Mar. 21, 2018)22

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
Center for Mississippi Health Policy, <i>Postpartum Medicaid, Addressing gaps in coverage to improve maternal health</i> (Feb. 15, 2021)	28
Center for Reproductive Rights, <i>What if Roe Fell</i> (1992-2021).	17, 18
Diana Greene Foster et. al., <i>Effects of Carrying an Unwanted Pregnancy to Term on Women's Existing Children</i> , 205 J. OF PEDIATRICS (Feb. 2019).	32
Elizabeth Nash, <i>Louisiana Has Passed 89 Abortion Restrictions Since Roe: It's About Control, Not Health</i> , GUTTMACHER INSTITUTE (Nov. 2020 updated June 2020).	17
Elizabeth Raymond & David Grimes, <i>The Comparative Safety of Legal Induced Abortion and Childbirth in the United States</i> , 119 Obstetrics & Gynecology (Feb. 2012)	27
Evan Donovan, <i>Florida lawmakers to consider abortion bill similar to Texas, Senate president says</i> , NEWS CHANNEL 8 (Sept. 3, 2021).	9, 10
Evelyn Angel Aztlan et al., <i>Subsequent Unintended Pregnancy Among US Women Who Receive or Are Denied a Wanted Abortion</i> , 63 J. OF MIDWIFERY & WOMEN'S HEALTH (2018)	16, 31

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
F.A. Althaus & S.K. Henshaw, <i>The effects of mandatory delay laws on abortion patients and providers</i> , Family Planning Perspectives (1994)	24
Getty Israel, <i>Mississippi More Concerned With Ending Abortion Than Infant, Maternal Deaths</i> , CLARION LEDGER (Apr. 22, 2018).....	28
GUTTMACHER INST., <i>Abortion patients are disproportionately poor and low income</i> (2016)	33
GUTTMACHER INST., <i>Counseling and Waiting Periods for Abortion</i> (Sept. 1, 2021)	23, 26
GUTTMACHER INST., <i>Impact of Texas Abortion Ban: A 20-Fold Increase in Driving Distance to Get an Abortion</i> (2021).....	21
GUTTMACHER INST., <i>Mississippi Is Attacking Roe v. Wade Head On-the Consequences Could be Severe</i> (Aug. 2021)	21
GUTTMACHER INST., <i>Waiting Periods for Abortion</i> (Jan. 22, 2020)	22, 23, 24, 26
H.B. 401, 2020 Leg., 135th Sess. (Miss. 2020)	12
H.B. 1280, 87th Leg. (Tex. 2021)	18

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
Ibis Reproductive Health, Center for Reproductive Rights, <i>Evaluating Abortion Restrictions and Supportive Policy Across the United States</i> (2021)	13, 14, 15, 16
In Our Own Voice: National Black Women’s Reproductive Justice Agenda, <i>Our Bodies, Our Lives, Our Voices: The State of Black Women & Reproductive Justice</i> (June 27, 2017).....	30, 33
Jenna Jerman et al., <i>Barriers to Abortion Care and Their Consequences For Patients Traveling for Services: Qualitative Findings from Two States</i> , 49 GUTTMACHER INSTITUTE 95, Issue No. 2 (June 2017)	19, 22
Jenna Jerman et al., <i>Characteristics of U.S. Abortion Patients in 2014 and Changes Since 2008</i> , GUTTMACHER INST. (May 2016)	32, 33
John Hanna, <i>Patient Influx from other states increases Kansas abortions</i> , AP NEWS (June 2, 2021)	25
Kaiser Family Foundation, <i>State Profiles for Women’s Health</i> [U.S.] (July 25, 2018).....	28
Kaiser Family Foundation, <i>Status of State Medicaid Expansion Decisions: Interactive Map</i> (Sept. 8, 2021)	15

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
Kim Chandler & Sudhin Thanawala, <i>New abortion laws sow confusion and uncertainty at clinics</i> , ASSOCIATED PRESS (May 21, 2019)	18
LA. STAT. ANN. § 14:87 (2018)	3, 14
LA. STAT. ANN. § 40:1061.1.3 (2019)	14
Lauren Ralph et. al., <i>A Prospective Cohort Study of the Effect of Receiving versus Being Denied an Abortion on Educational Attainment</i> (Nov. 2019)	31
Liz Ford, <i>Number of women dying in childbirth way off track to meet worldwide targets</i> , THE GUARDIAN (Sept. 19, 2019)	29
Lyn Kieltyka et al., <i>2011-2016 Maternal Mortality Report</i> , Louisiana Dep't of Health (Aug. 2018)	29, 30
MISS. CODE ANN. § 41-41-34.1 (2019)	12
MISS. CODE ANN. § 41-41-191 (2018)	3, 12
Mississippi State Dep't of Health, <i>Infant Mortality Report</i> (2018)	29
NOLA, <i>Tulane researcher to study why women in Louisiana die more often from pregnancy than in other states</i> (Nov. 6, 2018)	29

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
S.B. 4, 87th Leg. 2nd Called Sess. (Tex. 2021)	15
S.B. 8, 87th Leg. (Tex. 2021)	9, 15
Sarah Miller et. al., <i>The Economic Consequences of Being Denied Having an Abortion</i> , Na'l. Bureau of Econ. Research (Jan. 2020)	31
TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 171.208(a)	2
TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. §§ 171.204-212 (2021)	3, 14, 15
Tex. Health and Human Servs., <i>Induced Terminations of Pregnancy</i>	30, 31
Tex. Health and Human Servs., <i>Texas Maternal Mortality and Morbidity Review Comm. and Dep't of State Health Servs. Joint Biennial Report</i> (Sept. 2020)	30
Theodore J. Joyce et al., <i>The impact of Mississippi's mandatory delay law on abortions and births</i> , J. OF AM. MED ASS'N, 278(8) (1997)	24
Theodore J. Joyce et al., <i>The Impact of State Mandatory Counseling and Waiting Period Law on Abortion: A Literature Review</i> , GUTTMACHER INST. (April 2009).	23

Cited Authorities

	<i>Page</i>
Ushma D. Upadhyay et. al., <i>Denial of Abortion Because of Provider Gestational Age Limits in The United States</i> , Am. J. Pub. Health (Sept. 2014)	22

INTERESTS OF *AMICI CURIAE*¹

Amici curiae are State Legislators throughout the nation who are bound to protect and adhere to the United States Constitution, and who share a concern for the continued vitality and advancement of constitutional protections of individual rights. State legislators take an oath to uphold the Constitution and are, thus, “under constitutional mandate to take affirmative action to accord the benefit of this right to all those within their jurisdiction.”² As a result, and as this Court held in *Cooper v. Aaron*, constitutional rights “can neither be nullified openly and directly by state legislators or state executive or judicial officers, nor nullified indirectly by them through evasive schemes . . . whether attempted ‘ingeniously or ingenuously.’”³

The constitutional precepts which State Legislators must protect include the principle enunciated by this Court, as firmly encompassed by the right to privacy, that a woman has the right to decide to terminate a pre-viability pregnancy without undue governmental

1. *Amici* affirm that no counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no counsel or party made a monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief. No person other than *amici* or their counsel made a monetary contribution to its preparation or submission. Written consent by the parties for all *amicus curiae* briefs is on file with the Clerk.

2. *Bush v. Orleans Par. Sch. Bd.*, 190 F. Supp. 861, 864 (E.D. La. 1960), *aff'd*, 365 U.S. 569 (1961), and *aff'd sub. nom.*, *City of New Orleans, Louisiana v. Bush*, 366 U.S. 212 (1961).

3. *Cooper v. Aaron*, 358 U.S. 1, 17 (1958) (citing *Smith v. Texas*, 311 U.S. 128, 132 (1940)).

interference. Accordingly, *amici* defend the principles recognized by this Court in *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), and reaffirmed as the law of the land in *Planned Parenthood of Se. Pa. v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833 (1992), *Whole Woman’s Health v. Hellerstedt*, 136 S. Ct. 2292 (2016) and most recently in *June Med. Servs. L. L. C. v. Russo*, 140 S. Ct. 2103 (2020). As a fundamental right guaranteed by the Constitution, and one that strikes at the heart of ordered liberty and individual autonomy, a woman’s right to decide whether to terminate a pre-viability pregnancy should be insulated from the rhetoric and interests of groups whose sole purpose is to undermine *Roe* and eliminate the fundamental rights enunciated in that case. *Roe*’s holding should also be protected from state legislators purposefully enacting laws designed exclusively to flout this Court’s foundational principles, and engineered to evade constitutional review by the judiciary—such as occurred recently in Texas with the enactment of Texas’s Senate Bill 8 (“S.B. 8”).⁴

Amici also have a particularly strong interest in this case, because this Court’s interpretation of the Constitution and its guarantees of individual rights directly affect how state legislators draft, consider, and enact laws. This Court’s constitutional review of legislation is an essential component of our federalist system of government and the checks and balances that sustain it. Compliance with this Court’s precedent is incumbent on all state legislatures, and their failure to adhere to such precedent endangers the foundations of our federalist system.

4. See S.B. 8 § 3 (codified at Tex. Health & Safety Code § 171.208(a)).

Moreover, as legislators, *amici* seek to protect the integrity of the legislative process, which is undermined when unnecessary, politically targeted, and intentionally unconstitutional legislation is enacted for pretextual reasons—like the abortion ban at fifteen weeks as enacted by Mississippi.⁵ Similar abortion bans have been passed in Louisiana and Texas.⁶ As legislators, *amici* attach considerable significance to legislative intent in the review and construction of statutory provisions. The true, and often overt, intent behind pretextual laws like those passed in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, is to severely restrict, and ultimately eliminate, access to legal abortion under the guise of protecting life. Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas state legislatures have flagrantly exceeded the constitutional boundaries recognized by this Court. *Amici* have a profound interest in ensuring the legislative process is faithful to our constitutional system of government and the fundamental protections therein.

Amici are also mindful of the importance of protecting against improper interference with a woman’s right to seek lawful medical care. *Amici* recognize that Mississippi’s 15-week ban, and other laws like it in Louisiana, Texas, and elsewhere, often disproportionately disempower the most vulnerable women who are most in need of protection. Like all legislation that contravenes bedrock principles of the Constitution, Mississippi’s ban should be invalidated as unconstitutional.

5. See MISS. CODE ANN. § 41-41-191 (2018).

6. See, e.g., LA. STAT. ANN. § 14:87 (2018); TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. §§ 171.204-212 (2021).

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

Mississippi's law prohibiting abortion after fifteen weeks is an unconstitutional ban on abortion during the period before fetal viability and is impermissible under *Roe v. Wade*, as reaffirmed by this Court in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt* and *June Med. Servs. L. L. C. v. Russo*. This Court has consistently held that the principles espoused in *Roe* remain firmly in place, despite direct attacks by state legislatures that enact blatantly unconstitutional laws like Mississippi's 15-week ban. The Court should adhere to its established precedent and uphold the rule of law by affirming the judgment of the Fifth Circuit and striking down Mississippi's statute.

While repeatedly attempting to ban abortion under the guise of protecting life, Mississippi and other states have eschewed policies shown to improve the health of women⁷ and children. Meanwhile, Mississippi has one of the worst rates of maternal and infant mortality in the country, with outcomes disproportionately worse for women and children of color. Failure by this Court to strike down Mississippi's ban will further embolden states in the Fifth Circuit—and across the country—to engage in symbolic politics at an unprecedented rate, seeking to enact laws intended to increase barriers to reproductive healthcare, sexual education, and support for pregnant women and their families. If allowed by this Court, pre-viability bans would further exacerbate

7. This brief uses the term “women,” but the denial of reproductive and abortion care also affects transgender men and some gender nonconforming people.

already poor health outcomes for women in those states, while generating other disastrous consequences for women and their families.

Any limitation on *Roe* and *Casey* by this Court may also empower state governments around the country to enforce so-called trigger bans and/or pre-*Roe* bans, which would ban abortion outright in those states. As a result, women would be forced to travel increasingly long distances to neighboring states or even across entire regions to obtain legal abortion care. Many will not afford the cost. Those who do will face delayed care and a greater likelihood of complications. Meanwhile, many existing abortion providers are already serving an ever-increasing out-of-state population. States that would protect legal abortion even in the absence of *Roe* would have to contend with the resulting surge of out-of-state patients, resulting in longer waiting periods and delays in accessing care for what is time-sensitive, essential healthcare.

Far from promoting women's health, Mississippi's brazenly unconstitutional ban will inflict serious harm especially on women in marginalized communities in the Fifth Circuit and around the country. We urge this Court to vindicate the rights of women by affirming the decision of the Fifth Circuit invalidating the 15-week ban.

ARGUMENT**I. THIS COURT’S PRECEDENT RECOGNIZES THAT THE CONSTITUTION GUARANTEES EACH PERSON THE RIGHT TO CHOOSE WHETHER TO CONTINUE HER PRE-VIABILITY PREGNANCY.**

This Court should adhere to its established precedent and uphold the rule of law by striking down Mississippi’s blatantly unconstitutional statute.

Forty-six years ago in *Roe v. Wade*, this Court held that the right of personal privacy embedded in our Constitution, which this Court had applied to decisions relating to “marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education,”⁸ also “encompass[es] a woman’s decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy” prior to viability.⁹

Nearly two decades later, this Court reinforced the constitutional guarantee recognized in *Roe*. In *Planned Parenthood of Se. Pa. v. Casey*, this Court made clear that “[t]he woman’s right to terminate her pregnancy before viability is the most central principle of *Roe v. Wade*” and “is a rule of law and a component of liberty we cannot renounce.”¹⁰ Five years ago, in *Whole Woman’s Health*, this Court again reaffirmed the viability standard recognized

8. *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. at 152-53 (internal citations and quotations omitted).

9. *Id.* at 153.

10. *Casey*, 505 U.S. at 871.

in *Roe* and emphasized that a woman’s fundamental right to choose whether to continue her pre-viability pregnancy must be shielded from state interference that unduly burdens that right.¹¹ And just last year, in *June Medical Services*, this Court reaffirmed its decision in *Whole Woman’s Health*, finding that Louisiana’s Act 620—a law nearly identical to the one stricken in *Whole Woman’s Health*—was likewise unconstitutional because it imposed an undue burden on women seeking to exercise the right to pre-viability abortion.¹²

This unbroken line of cases since *Roe* demonstrates this Court’s recognition of established precedent of a woman’s constitutional right to terminate her pre-viability pregnancy. “The legal doctrine of *stare decisis* requires [this Court], absent special circumstances, to treat like cases alike.”¹³ Such “respect for precedent promotes the evenhanded, predictable, and consistent development of legal principles, fosters reliance on judicial decisions, and contributes to the actual and perceived integrity of the judicial process.”¹⁴ Further, “[a]dherence to precedent is necessary to avoid an arbitrary discretion in the courts,” thus “distinguish[ing] the judicial method and philosophy from those of the political and legislative process.”¹⁵ In short, “[i]t has long been an established rule to abide by

11. *Whole Woman’s Health*, 136 S. Ct. at 2309.

12. *June Med. Servs. L. L. C.*, 140 S. Ct. at 2108.

13. *June Med. Servs.*, 140 S. Ct. at 2134 (Roberts, J., concurring).

14. *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

15. *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

former precedents . . . as well as to keep the scale of justice even and steady, and not liable to waver with every new judge’s opinion.”¹⁶

In *Casey*, this Court underscored the reliance interest at stake should *Roe* be overruled, finding immeasurable “the certain costs of overruling *Roe* for people who have ordered their thinking and living around that case[.]”¹⁷ During the intervening 27 years since *Casey*, this reliance interest and the costs of overruling *Roe* have multiplied substantially, particularly in the wake of this Court’s recent decisions in *Whole Woman’s Health* and *June Medical*. As this Court observed, “overruling *Roe*’s central holding would not only reach an unjustifiable result under principles of *stare decisis*, but would seriously weaken the Court’s capacity to exercise the judicial power and to function as the Supreme Court of a Nation dedicated to the rule of law.”¹⁸ If *stare decisis* is to mean anything, it must be that this Court’s prior decisions are entitled to a measure of deference such that they are not freely jettisoned simply because current members of the Court would have decided them differently. This Court has consistently held that *Roe* and *Casey*’s principles remain firmly in place, despite direct attacks by state legislatures that enact flatly unconstitutional laws like Mississippi’s 15-week ban. The ban blatantly and indisputably runs afoul of this Court’s unequivocal precedent. It is unconstitutional and cannot stand.

16. *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

17. *Casey*, 505 U.S. at 835.

18. *Id.* at 865.

II. IF THIS COURT FAILS TO UPHOLD *ROE* AND *CASEY* IN THEIR ENTIRETY, IT WILL EMBOLDEN STATE LEGISLATURES TO FURTHER ENGAGE IN SYMBOLIC POLITICS AT THE EXPENSE OF REAL PRIORITIES.

Since *Roe* and *Casey* are well-established precedent, failure by this Court to fully and unequivocally strike down Mississippi's 15-week ban will only serve to embolden states in the Fifth Circuit—and across the country—to engage in symbolic politics at an unprecedented rate, spending a disproportionate amount of time seeking to enact laws designed to reduce access to reproductive healthcare, sexual education, and support for pregnant women and their families at the expense of pressing legislative priorities.

This process is already well underway. In the wake of this Court's recent decision not to enjoin enforcement of Texas's S.B. 8¹⁹—which bans abortions in the state at six weeks while outsourcing enforcement to the public—states have announced their intent to pass similar legislation designed to avoid judicial review, thereby inflicting significant harm on women seeking abortions.²⁰ As a result

19. S.B. 8, 87th Leg. (Tex. 2021); *Whole Woman's Health v. Austin Reeve Jackson, Judge*, 594 U.S. __ (2021).

20. See, e.g., Evan Donovan, *Florida lawmakers to consider abortion bill similar to Texas, Senate president says*, NEWS CHANNEL 8 (Sept. 3, 2021), <https://www.wfla.com/news/florida/florida-lawmakers-to-consider-abortion-bill-similar-to-texas-state-senate-president-says/>; Associated Press, *With Texas as model, Noem seeks more abortion restrictions*, THE BROOKINGS REG. (Sept. 9, 2021), <https://brookingsregister.com/article/with-texas-as-model-noem-seeks-more-abortion-restrictions>.

of S.B. 8, many abortion providers in Texas have already ceased providing abortion care after more than six weeks or have stopped providing abortions entirely.²¹ This case provides the Court an opportunity to unequivocally stand behind the constitutional right to pre-viability abortion and check the ongoing assault on nearly fifty years of its own precedent by patently unconstitutional state laws.

State legislators take an oath to uphold the Constitution and are, thus, “under constitutional mandate to take affirmative action to accord the benefit of this right to all those within their jurisdiction.”²² As a result, and as this Court held in *Cooper v. Aaron*, constitutional rights “can neither be nullified openly and directly by state legislators or state executive or judicial officers, nor nullified indirectly by them through evasive schemes . . . whether attempted ‘ingeniously or ingenuously.’”²³

Legislative disobedience with this Court’s constitutional pronouncements undermines the integrity of, and the public’s confidence in, the legislature and the legislative process, as well as the judiciary that fails to correct legislative overreach. State adherence to constitutional principles is “indispensable for the protection of the freedoms guaranteed by our fundamental charter for all of us.”²⁴ Thus, “Chief Justice Marshall spoke

21. See, e.g., Donovan, *supra* note 20; Associated Press, *supra* note 20; *Whole Woman’s Health v. Austin Reeve Jackson, Judge*, 594 U.S. __ (2021).

22. *Bush.*, 190 F. Supp. at 864.

23. *Cooper*, 358 U.S. at 17 (citing *Smith v. Texas*, 311 U.S. 128, 128 (1940)).

24. *Id.* at 20.

for a unanimous Court in saying that: ‘If the legislatures of the several states may, at will, annul the judgments of the courts of the United States, and destroy the rights acquired under those judgments, the [C]onstitution itself becomes a solemn mockery’²⁵ Where, as here, state legislatures pass patently unconstitutional laws, this Court must step in and uphold the Constitution against the political whims of rogue state legislators. Failure by this Court to act renders the basic constitutional principle of separation of powers meaningless.

Emboldened by what they disingenuously assert as the unsettled and precarious status of *Roe*, states like Mississippi, Texas, and Louisiana are limiting abortion access under the guise of protecting life, including banning abortion well before viability. At the same time, these states show little genuine regard for women and their families once children are born, and actively work to undercut access to education, contraception, and healthcare more generally (including via failing to expand Medicaid and the Children’s Health Insurance Program (“CHIP”). By throwing *Roe* and *Casey* into doubt, this Court enables escalation of this destructive behavior and disregard for the rule of law.

Mississippi has repeatedly legislated and re-legislated the issue of reproductive rights, often doubling down when one law is blocked or found unconstitutional by a federal court. Most recently, after the District Court enjoined the state from enforcing the 15-week abortion ban at issue here, Mississippi responded by passing the even more restrictive S.B. 2116, which purports to ban abortion at six

25. *Id.* at 18 (quoting *United States v. Peters*, 5 Cranch 115, 136 (1809)).

weeks.²⁶ Another Mississippi bill introduced in 2020 would have suspended the license of any provider who performs an abortion after the detection of a fetal heartbeat—effectively introducing another proposed six-week ban.²⁷

Lower courts, in Mississippi and elsewhere, have been inundated with challenges to these repeated attempts by legislatures to blatantly undermine this Court’s precedent. As described by the district court that enjoined the enforcement of S.B. 2116, the six-week ban, Judge Reeves wrote:

Here we go again. Mississippi has passed another law banning abortions prior to viability. The latest iteration, Senate Bill 2116, bans abortions in Mississippi after a fetal heartbeat is detected, which is as early as 6 weeks lmp.²⁸ The parties have been here before. Last spring, plaintiffs successfully challenged Mississippi’s ban on abortion after 15 weeks lmp. The Court ruled that the law was unconstitutional and permanently enjoined its enforcement. The State responded by passing an even more restrictive bill, S.B. 2116.²⁹

26. MISS. CODE ANN. § 41-41-191 (2018); MISS. CODE ANN. § 41-41-34.1 (2019).

27. H.B. 401, 2020 Leg., 135th Sess. (Miss. 2020).

28. Lmp refers to “[t]he common measure of fetal gestational age . . . from the first day of the woman’s last menstrual period (‘lmp’).” *Jackson Women’s Health Org. v Dobbs*, 379 F. Supp. 3d 549, 551 n.1 (S.D. Miss. 2019), *aff’d*, 951 F.3d 246 (5th Cir. 2020).

29. *Id.* at 551 (citing *Jackson Women’s Health Org. v Currier*, 349 F. Supp. 3d 536 (S.D. Miss. 2018)).

The injunction against the 15-week ban, however, failed to deter the Mississippi State Legislature from passing the patently unconstitutional six-week ban after the 15-week ban was blocked.

While repeatedly attempting to ban abortion under the guise of protecting life, Mississippi has eschewed policies that have been shown to improve the health of women and children. The state has not approved Affordable Care Act Medicaid expansion, expanded family medical leave beyond the Family and Medical Leave Act (“FMLA”), or adopted paid sick leave, all of which would actually protect and benefit women and children.³⁰ Meanwhile, aside from its attempted abortion bans, Mississippi already has the second highest number of abortion restrictions in the country, a dubious distinction it shares with Texas, Louisiana, and four other states.³¹ These barriers to access include, *inter alia*, provider restrictions (such as ambulatory surgical center standards imposed on facilities providing abortion, and restrictions on which health care providers may provide abortions); procedure restrictions (such as medication abortion restrictions); and restrictions on abortion coverage in Medicaid, private health insurance plans, and public employee health insurance plans, and on the allocation of public funds to fund abortion.³² As discussed in Point III, *infra*, Mississippi has also adopted various requirements that undermine patient autonomy

30. Ibis Reproductive Health, Center for Reproductive Rights, *Evaluating Abortion Restrictions and Supportive Policy Across the United States* (2021), <https://evaluatingpriorities.org/>.

31. *Id.*

32. *Id.*

and decision-making, including mandatory counseling and a waiting period prior to obtaining an abortion.³³

Like Mississippi, Louisiana has also banned abortion at 15 weeks, with the statute contingent on the enforcement of the Mississippi ban at issue in this litigation.³⁴ When Mississippi’s 15-week ban was blocked as unconstitutional by the lower courts, Louisiana instead banned abortion at six weeks.³⁵ At the same time, Louisiana also ranks low on instituting policies shown to be truly supportive of women’s and children’s health.³⁶ Children cannot enroll in CHIP without a waiting period; the state does not have sex education or HIV education mandates, and does not offer paid sick leave.³⁷ However, like Mississippi, Louisiana has adopted a high number of abortion restrictions—including provider restrictions, procedure restrictions, coverage restrictions, mandatory waiting periods and counseling.³⁸

Texas similarly banned abortion at six weeks in 2021.³⁹ S.B. 8, known as the “sue thy neighbor” ban, “equates to a near-categorical ban on abortions beginning six weeks after a woman’s last menstrual period . . . and months

33. *Id.*

34. LA. STAT. ANN. § 14:87 (2018).

35. LA. STAT. ANN. § 40:1061.1.3 (2019).

36. Ibis Reproductive Health, Center for Reproductive Rights, *supra* note 30.

37. *Id.*

38. *Id.*

39. S.B. 8; TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. §§ 171.204-212 (2021).

before fetal viability,” and provides a private right of action for any Texan to bring a lawsuit against anyone who “aids or abets the performance or inducement of an abortion. . . .”⁴⁰ By banning abortion well before many women even know they are pregnant, the law “immediately prohibits care for at least 85% of Texas abortion patients and will force many abortion clinics to close,” effectively eliminating abortion in the state of Texas.⁴¹ Most recently, Texas Governor Greg Abbott signed into law a ban on medication abortion at seven weeks.⁴² At the same time, Texas has failed to expand family and medical leave beyond the FMLA, failed to adopt paid sick leave, failed to implement a sex education or HIV education mandate, and failed to raise the Medicaid income limit for pregnant women to at least 200% of the federal poverty line.⁴³ Children in Texas face a detrimental waiting period when applying for CHIP during which they receive no needed benefits.⁴⁴ Texas is also in the minority of states that have not expanded Medicaid.⁴⁵ Yet, it is simultaneously

40. S.B. 8; TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE ANN. §§ 171.204-212 (2021); *Whole Woman’s Health v. Austin Reeve Jackson, Judge*, 594 U.S. __ (2021) (Sotomayor, J., dissenting).

41. *Whole Woman’s Health v. Austin Reeve Jackson, Judge*, 594 U.S. __ (2021) (Sotomayor, J., dissenting).

42. S.B. 4, 87th Leg. 2nd Called Sess. (Tex. 2021), <https://capitol.texas.gov/BillLookup/Actions.aspx?LegSess=872&Bill=SB4>.

43. Ibis Reproductive Health, Center for Reproductive Rights, *supra* note 30.

44. *Id.*

45. Kaiser Family Foundation, *Status of State Medicaid Expansion Decisions: Interactive Map* (Sept. 8, 2021), <https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/status-of-state-medicaid-expansion-decisions-interactive-map/>.

trying to cut funding for women’s healthcare. The Texas Legislature’s actions ignore the reality that “if reducing multiple unintended pregnancies is a societal and clinical goal, restricting access to abortion is unlikely to be an effective strategy. Instead, helping women . . . to obtain mental health-inclusive health care services, care for the children they have, and pursue educational goals should be the focus of clinicians who want to improve women’s reproductive trajectories.”⁴⁶ Rather, the state, which already has fewer abortion providers than the national average,⁴⁷ places an outsized focus on abortion and has adopted provider restrictions, procedure restrictions, coverage restrictions, and waiting period and counseling restrictions, among others.

In addition to encouraging further anti-abortion legislation at the expense of legislation that supports the well-being of *amici*’s constituents, any limitation on *Roe* and *Casey* by this Court may also empower state governments around the country to enforce so-called trigger bans and/or pre-*Roe* bans. Trigger bans are total abortion bans passed after *Roe* that are not currently in effect but could become effective if *Roe* is weakened or overturned. To date, at least twelve states have passed

46. Evelyn Angel Aztlan et al., *Subsequent Unintended Pregnancy Among US Women Who Receive or Are Denied a Wanted Abortion*, 63 J. OF MIDWIFERY & WOMEN’S HEALTH 45, 52 (2018), [https://urldefense.com/v3/_https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jmwh.12723_!!N5JjT8_g!PwL_DEKpnwU9jsQkqyY4n-RKHrC7WOM_gYsRakAVsk9vuKkmXbg2_C7F6JZF8g81\\$](https://urldefense.com/v3/_https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/jmwh.12723_!!N5JjT8_g!PwL_DEKpnwU9jsQkqyY4n-RKHrC7WOM_gYsRakAVsk9vuKkmXbg2_C7F6JZF8g81$).

47. Ibis Reproductive Health, Center for Reproductive Rights, *supra* note 30.

such bans: Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Missouri, Tennessee, Kentucky, Idaho, Utah, North Dakota, and South Dakota.⁴⁸ Tripping the *Roe* switch would affect all states within the Fifth Circuit as well as states to the north and east, resulting in a broad, uninterrupted swath in the middle of the country where it will be nearly impossible for a pregnant woman to obtain an abortion. Many pregnant women seeking a pre-viability abortion will be unable to obtain one in their home state, or in a neighboring state.

Moreover, should this Court destabilize the holdings in *Roe* and *Casey*, state officials may seek to enforce pre-*Roe* laws that criminalize abortion in those states where they remain on the books—currently numbering seven, including Mississippi.⁴⁹ And in states where pre-*Roe* bans have been blocked or declared unconstitutional as a result of *Roe*, state officials may take action to reinstitute them.

Mississippi has both a trigger ban and a pre-*Roe* ban on abortion, both of which could be used to prohibit abortion in nearly all situations if allowed to take effect.⁵⁰ Louisiana has a trigger ban, adopted in 2006, that would prohibit abortion in almost all situations if *Roe* were overturned.⁵¹ Texas enacted a trigger ban in June 2021,

48. Center for Reproductive Rights, *What if Roe Fell* (1992-2021), <https://maps.reproductiverights.org/what-if-roe-fell>.

49. *Id.*

50. *Id.*

51. *Id.*; Elizabeth Nash, *Louisiana Has Passed 89 Abortion Restrictions Since Roe: It's About Control, Not Health*, GUTTMACHER INSTITUTE (Nov. 2020 updated June 2020), <https://>

shortly after this Court granted certiorari in this case. The Texas law is intended to prohibit abortion in almost all situations and would come into effect, *inter alia*, thirty days following a decision by this Court to overrule *Roe* entirely or in part, or recognizing the authority of the states to prohibit abortion.⁵² Constituents of *amici* in these states should have the right to access vital health services without overreaching government interference from legislators seeking only to advance their partisan—and unconstitutional—agenda.

The onslaught of often-contradictory anti-abortion legislation and the fractured landscape of trigger bans in Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and other states, have the additional negative effect of confusing the public, providers, and patients about the legal status of abortion and how to obtain care. State laws that have been blocked by the courts or not yet gone into effect nonetheless sow confusion among the populations in those states about whether abortion is still legal and whether clinics are still open.⁵³ In one recent study, published before the six-week ban, patients in Texas reported confusion about where

www.guttmacher.org/article/2020/02/louisiana-has-passed-89-abortion-restrictions-roe-its-about-control-not-health.

52. H.B. 1280, 87th Leg. (Tex. 2021); Texas Legislature Online History, <https://capitol.texas.gov/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=87R&Bill=HB1280>; Center for Reproductive Rights, *supra* note 48.

53. *See, e.g.*, Kim Chandler & Sudhin Thanawala, *New abortion laws sow confusion and uncertainty at clinics*, ASSOCIATED PRESS (May 21, 2019), <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/new-abortion-laws-sow-confusion-and-uncertainty-at-clinics>.

to obtain abortion care in light of clinic closures which forced some to delay or even forego care.⁵⁴ *Amici* have an interest in clarity for their constituents regarding the constitutional right to obtain a pre-viability abortion, free of the confusion that exacerbates negative outcomes for patients. For this reason too, this Court should reaffirm the right to pre-viability abortion established in *Roe* and repeatedly reaffirmed in *Casey*, *Whole Woman's Health*, and *June Medical*.

III. PRE-VIABILITY BANS WOULD UPEND THE ALREADY-PRECARIOUS PATCHWORK OF ABORTION CARE NATIONWIDE, ALSO JEOPARDIZING ACCESS IN STATES THAT PROTECT ABORTION RIGHTS.

Access to a legal abortion in practice often depends on the patient's domicile or bank account. Due to existing abortion bans and restrictions, state legislators across the country are already seeing their constituents forced to travel long distances or even out of state to access legal abortions. At the same time, other state legislators throughout the United States represent districts where in-state abortion providers are inundated by out-of-state patients seeking legal abortions in addition to those within their home state. The influx of patients to states with accessible abortion clinics will continue to rise dramatically if the Court overturns or limits *Roe*.

54. Jenna Jerman et al., *Barriers to Abortion Care and Their Consequences For Patients Traveling for Services: Qualitative Findings from Two States*, 49 GUTTMACHER INSTITUTE 95, Issue No. 2 (June 2017), <https://www.guttmacher.org/journals/psrh/2017/04/barriers-abortion-care-and-their-consequences-patients-traveling-services#13-21a>.

In Mississippi and other states hostile to abortion rights, existing barriers to access and financial challenges make it nearly impossible for abortion clinics to stay open.⁵⁵ Since 2015, 127 independent abortion clinics nationwide have closed, with only 337 open as of November 2020.⁵⁶ The number of independent abortion clinics—which provide 58 percent of all abortion procedures nationwide and “operate the majority of abortion clinics in the states most politically hostile to abortion access,” as well as the majority of clinics providing abortion care after the first trimester—has fallen by over one-third since 2012.⁵⁷ As of 2020, five states have only one abortion clinic remaining: Mississippi, North Dakota, West Virginia, Missouri and South Dakota.⁵⁸ As a result, many women are already forced to travel long distances or even out of state for abortion care.

Permitting Mississippi’s pre-viability ban would further exacerbate this situation for many of *amici*’s constituents. For the nearly 600,000 women of reproductive age in Mississippi, a ban on abortion would mean an increase of 42%, or from 78 miles to 111 miles each direction, in the average driving distance to reach any

55. ABORTION CARE NETWORK, *Communities Need Clinics: The Essential Role of Independent Abortion Clinics in the United States* (2020), <https://abortioncarenetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/CommunitiesNeedClinics-2020.pdf> (“Communities Need Clinics”) at 9 (citations omitted).

56. *Id.* at 4, 8-9.

57. *Id.*

58. *Id.* at 4.

abortion clinic.⁵⁹ Meanwhile, increasingly hostile bans in surrounding states undermine women’s ability to obtain a legal abortion even for those able to travel long distances and out of state. The cumulative effect of active legislative abortion bans will be that clinics in Mississippi and surrounding states will close and abortions will become effectively unavailable to pregnant women.

Likewise, Texas’s S.B. 8 ban makes it virtually impossible for Mississippi residents—let alone the approximately seven million women of reproductive age in Texas⁶⁰—to obtain an abortion in Texas. With legal abortion now effectively banned in Texas under S.B. 8, the estimated average one-way driving distance for Texas women to an abortion clinic will increase from 12 miles to 248 miles, and the driving time will increase by nearly 3.5 hours each way on average (if driving nonstop at 70 miles per hour).⁶¹ If this Court upholds Mississippi’s abortion ban, it will create a broad region where barriers to access are so high that they are virtually insurmountable.

By limiting or eliminating legal abortion services in-state and thus increasing the distance women must travel for abortion care, abortion bans place possibly

59. GUTTMACHER INST., *Mississippi Is Attacking Roe v. Wade Head On-the Consequences Could be Severe* (August 2021) <https://www.guttmacher.org/article/2021/08/mississippi-attacking-roe-v-wade-head-consequences-could-be-severe>.

60. GUTTMACHER INST., *Impact of Texas Abortion Ban: A 20-Fold Increase in Driving Distance to Get an Abortion* (2021), <https://www.guttmacher.org/article/2021/08/impact-texas-abortion-ban-20-fold-increase-driving-distance-get-abortion>.

61. *Id.*

insurmountable burdens on *amici*'s most vulnerable constituents. Bans force pregnant women seeking abortions—who are disproportionately low income or living in poverty, women of color, and/or young women—to pay attendant costs beyond the price of the abortion itself. In addition to facing increased travel time, women must pay travel expenses such as transportation and lodging. Compounding these costs, women may need to pay for additional childcare expenses while facing financial loss from missed work.⁶² In addition to cost, other system navigation issues impede access to abortions, such as logistics involved in securing an appointment, lack of information, limited clinic options (including unavailable appointment times because of overbooking due to excessive demand), encountering crisis pregnancy centers that delayed abortion care, and state-imposed waiting periods.⁶³ In states such as Mississippi, that require abortion patients to abide by a waiting period between their initial clinic visit and the procedure, patients must either pay for an overnight stay and further child care costs or make two separate hours-long trips back and forth to the clinic, incurring additional transportation costs.⁶⁴

62. Bryce Covert, *Mississippi Abortion Ban Endangers Low-Income Women, Women of Color*, REWIRE NEWS (Mar. 21, 2018), <https://rewirenewsgroup.com/article/2018/03/21/mississippi-abortion-ban-will-absolutely-affect-low-income-women-women-color/>; see Ushma D. Upadhyay et. al., *Denial of Abortion Because of Provider Gestational Age Limits in The United States*, *Am. J. Pub. Health* (Sept. 2014).

63. Jerman et al., *supra* note 54; GUTTMACHER INST., *Waiting Periods for Abortion* (Jan. 22, 2020), <https://www.guttmacher.org/evidence-you-can-use/waiting-periods-abortion>.

64. *Id.*

Thirty-three states, including Mississippi, have abortion counseling requirements,⁶⁵ and 24 of these require at least 24 hours between counseling and procedure.⁶⁶

These barriers in turn lead to delayed care and patients obtaining abortions at later gestations, with attendant higher costs and greater likelihood of complications.⁶⁷ Those unable to obtain timely abortions may consider

65. Theodore J. Joyce et al., *The Impact of State Mandatory Counseling and Waiting Period Law on Abortion: A Literature Review*, GUTTMACHER INST. (April 2009), <https://www.guttmacher.org/report/impact-state-mandatory-counseling-and-waiting-period-laws-abortion-literature-review>. Counseling requirements not only add an additional layer to the logistical burdens of seeking abortion care, but often require medically inaccurate and misleading information. Eight states require medically inaccurate information that a medication abortion can be stopped after the patient takes the first dose of pills. GUTTMACHER INST., *Counseling and Awaiting Periods for Abortion* (Sept. 1, 2021), <https://www.guttmacher.org/print/state-policy/explore/counseling-and-waiting-periods-abortion>. Five states inaccurately assert a link between abortion and an increased risk of breast cancer, and three states inaccurately reflect the associated risks of future fertility due to an abortion. *Id.* Five of the thirty-three states that require abortion counseling do not include information on the health risks of continuing a pregnancy. *Id.*

66. Joyce et al., *supra* note 65.

67. According to an expert panel convened by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine in 2018, requiring a waiting period before receiving an abortion may increase both the risk of complications for the patient and cost of the procedure, with no evidence that waiting periods improve abortion safety. *Waiting Periods for Abortion*, *supra* note 63.

ending their pregnancies on their own.⁶⁸ The intersection of barriers to abortion care creates a cascade of harmful effects for those of *amici*'s constituents who are forced to travel and/or wait for abortion care, including, importantly, adverse health consequences.

Following the implementation of Mississippi's counseling and waiting periods, Mississippi abortions fell by approximately 12-14% for residents, with overall abortions in the state falling by 10%.⁶⁹ The decline in abortions was greatest among Mississippi women with less than 12 years of education.⁷⁰ The number of women going out of state to Tennessee or Alabama rose by 17%.⁷¹ Among women who desired an abortion, the law prevented approximately 11-13% of them from successfully obtaining one.⁷²

68. *Id.* (in a study of 29 women who had sought abortion services in Michigan and New Mexico and traveled across state lines or more than 100 miles within the state to do so, six considered ending the pregnancy on their own, either with medications (misoprostol, herbs, or home remedies) or by blunt-force physical trauma).

69. Theodore J. Joyce et al., *The impact of Mississippi's mandatory delay law on abortions and births*, J. OF AM. MED ASS'N, 278(8):653–658 (1997).

70. F.A. Althaus & S.K. Henshaw, *The effects of mandatory delay laws on abortion patients and providers*, Family Planning Perspectives, 26(5):228–231 & 233 (1994).

71. *Id.*

72. Joyce, et al., *supra* note 69.

Barriers to abortion access and healthcare inequities are further exacerbated by the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, which has increased restrictions on travel, lodging and transportation, and the unpredictability of appointment wait times, while simultaneously decreasing available childcare options, volunteer network capacities, and appointment availability.⁷³ These conditions have forced pregnant women to travel even further to access essential abortion care and necessary practical support.

Meanwhile, as more patients are forced to travel because they cannot access services in their home states due to COVID restrictions or abortion bans, many remaining abortion providers are serving an ever-increasing out-of-state population. For instance, the number of abortions performed in Kansas increased by 9.1% in 2020, as more women traveled from Oklahoma and Texas for procedures following new abortion bans in those states, and patients from out of state outnumbered Kansas patients for the first time since 1973.⁷⁴ Oklahoma and Texas residents had 566 abortions in Kansas in 2020, an increase from 110 in 2019, accounting for most of the total increase in abortions in the state.⁷⁵ Meanwhile, Missouri patients accounted for 42% of the total abortions performed in Kansas in 2020.⁷⁶ If *Roe* is overturned or limited, abortion providers will undoubtedly see a further

73. *Communities Need Clinics*, *supra* note 55, at 11.

74. John Hanna, *Patient Influx from other states increases Kansas abortions*, AP NEWS (June 2, 2021), <https://apnews.com/article/ok-state-wire-kansas-lifestyle-travel-health-046fe86893322c77fef7c6f0e9a1210f>.

75. *Id.*

76. *Id.*

surge of patients from states that adopt pre-viability abortion bans. States that would protect legal abortion even in the absence of *Roe* would have to grapple with the resulting influx of out-of-state patients, leading to longer waiting periods⁷⁷ and delays in accessing care for what is time-sensitive, essential healthcare. In turn, later abortions are more expensive, resulting in an even greater financial burden, especially for low-income patients.⁷⁸

The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic previews the spillover effect that pre-viability bans are likely to have in states that would protect abortion rights. At the beginning of the pandemic, executive orders in multiple states—including Mississippi and Texas—declared abortion as a “non-essential” service, restricting abortion access and care.⁷⁹ As appointments were canceled or rescheduled, patients were forced to travel out of state in the midst of a pandemic to seek the services of which they were deprived in their home state.⁸⁰ Providers in nearby states,

77. These longer wait times are on top of the waiting periods already required by many states. 33 states require that patients receive counseling prior to receiving an abortion, and 26 of those states require a waiting period ranging from 24 to 72 hours between the counseling and the abortion procedure. GUTTMACHER INST., *Counseling and Awaiting Periods for Abortion* (September 1, 2021), <https://www.guttmacher.org/state-policy/explore/counseling-and-waiting-periods-abortion>. 13 of those states require counseling to be provided in person, and for counseling to occur before the waiting period begins, thus effectively requiring two separate trips to the clinic. *Id.*

78. For example, in 2011 and 2012, the median charge for a surgical abortion was \$495 at 10 weeks’ gestation, compared with \$1,350 at 20 weeks. *Waiting Periods for Abortion*, *supra* note 63.

79. *Communities Need Clinics*, *supra* note 55, at 12.

80. *Id.* at 13.

like New Mexico, saw a surge in patients from out of state, which taxed their resources.⁸¹ Pre-viability bans will not eliminate abortion, they will simply force women—at least those with funds, time and logistics—to obtain abortions elsewhere, threatening compromised care for all.

**IV. FAILURE BY THIS COURT TO UPHOLD THE
RULE OF LAW AND PRECEDENT WILL
BE DISASTROUS FOR WOMEN SEEKING
ABORTIONS AND THEIR FAMILIES.**

If permitted by this Court, pre-viability bans would further exacerbate already poor health outcomes for women in those states.

The risk of death associated with childbirth, 8.8 per 100,000 live births, is 14 times *greater* than the risk of death associated with abortion.⁸² This Court acknowledged this disparity in striking Texas’s ambulatory surgical center requirement for abortion providers in *Whole Woman’s Health*.⁸³ Yet, many states focus on limiting or eradicating access to abortions rather than improving maternal health during pregnancy and postpartum. Despite the preventability of three out of five maternal deaths in the

81. *Id.*

82. Elizabeth Raymond & David Grimes, *The Comparative Safety of Legal Induced Abortion and Childbirth in the United States*, 119 *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 215, 216 (Feb. 2012) (using national data).

83. *Whole Woman’s Health*, 136 S. Ct. at 2315 (“Nationwide, childbirth is 14 times more likely than abortion to result in death”) (citations omitted).

United States,⁸⁴ Mississippi has done little to address actual and urgent threats to pregnant women's health, including the well-documented dangers of giving birth in Mississippi.⁸⁵ Mississippi's maternal mortality rate is one of the highest in the country, with an average of approximately 27 deaths for every 100,000 live births.⁸⁶ Health outcomes are significantly and disproportionately worse for women of color. Between 2013 and 2016, Black women in Mississippi were three times as likely to die from pregnancy complications than white women.⁸⁷ And while the state touts its concern about protecting the unborn, Mississippi's infant mortality rate is the highest in the country at 8.8 deaths per 1,000 live births.⁸⁸ The infant mortality rate for Black infants (11.9 per 1,000 live births)

84. Center for Mississippi Health Policy, *Postpartum Medicaid, Addressing gaps in coverage to improve maternal health* (Feb. 15, 2021), <https://mshealthpolicy.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Post-Partum-Medicaid-Feb-2021.pdf> (citation omitted).

85. Getty Israel, *Mississippi More Concerned With Ending Abortion Than Infant, Maternal Deaths*, CLARION LEDGER (Apr. 22, 2018), <https://www.clarionledger.com/story/opinion/columnists/2018/04/23/mississippi-moreconcerned-ending-abortion-than-infant-maternal-deaths/537859002/>.

86. America's Health Rankings, United Health Foundation, *2019 Health of Women and Children Report, Mississippi*, <https://assets.americashealthrankings.org/app/uploads/health-of-women-and-children-2019.pdf> at 97.

87. *Postpartum Medicaid*, *supra* note 84, at 3 (citation omitted).

88. Kaiser Family Foundation, *State Profiles for Women's Health [U.S.]* (July 25, 2018), <https://www.kff.org/interactive/womens-health-profiles/?activeState=USA&activeDistributionIndex=0&activeStateDistributionIndex=0&activeView=chart&activeCategoryIndex=0/>.

is drastically higher than that for white infants (6.2 per 1,000 live births).⁸⁹

Likewise, the Louisiana Department of Health recently acknowledged the state is in the midst of a maternal mortality crisis.⁹⁰ The Louisiana maternal mortality rate increased at a higher rate than that of the U.S.,⁹¹ which itself is alarmingly high and rising.⁹² In 2018, there were 44.8 maternal deaths per 100,000 births in Louisiana, more than double the national average of 20.7 maternal deaths per 100,000 births in the same period.⁹³ Maternal mortality in Louisiana also disproportionately impacts Black women;

89. Mississippi State Dep't of Health, *Infant Mortality Report* (2018), https://msdh.ms.gov/msdhsite/_static/resources/8015.pdf.

90. Lyn Kieltyka et al., *2011-2016 Maternal Mortality Report*, Louisiana Dep't of Health (Aug. 2018), http://ldh.la.gov/assets/oph/Center-PHCH/Center-PH/maternal/2011-2016_MMR_Report_FINAL.pdf.

91. *Id.* at 13.

92. Liz Ford, *Number of women dying in childbirth way off track to meet worldwide targets*, THE GUARDIAN (Sept. 19, 2019), <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2019/sep/19/number-women-dyingchildbirth-off-track> (“The US has seen maternal deaths rise from 12 per 100,000 live births in 2000 to 19 in 2017.”).

93. America's Health Rankings, United Health Foundation, *2018 Health of Women and Children Report, Louisiana*, <https://www.americashealthrankings.org/learn/reports/2018-health-of-women-and-childrenreport/state-summaries-louisiana>; NOLA, *Tulane researcher to study why women in Louisiana die more often from pregnancy than in other states* (Nov. 6, 2018), https://www.nola.com/news/article_8065e057-d591-5d60-b06a-c821abef7ab2.html.

between 2011 to 2016, Black women were 4.1 times as likely to die of pregnancy-related deaths as white women.⁹⁴ Lack of access to health care providers or facilities was the leading cause of all maternal deaths in Louisiana—a risk factor that is especially prevalent among low-income women of color.⁹⁵

Texas also has a disproportionately high rate of maternal mortality which is exacerbated for Black women and women of color. In a study of pregnancy-related deaths in 2015, Texas had a rate of 18.1 maternal deaths per 100,000 live births, with Black women disproportionately impacted.⁹⁶ The study found that pregnancy-related deaths were preventable and occurred in later stages of pregnancy and childbirth.⁹⁷

94. Kieltyka et al., *supra* note 90, at 22; *Health of Women and Children Report, Louisiana*, *supra* note 93.

95. Kieltyka et al., *supra* note 90; In Our Own Voice: National Black Women’s Reproductive Justice Agenda, *Our Bodies, Our Lives, Our Voices: The State of Black Women & Reproductive Justice* 6, 14-15, 32 (June 27, 2017), http://blackrj.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/FINALInOurVoices_Report_final.pdf (noting Black people are twice as likely than whites to be uninsured, and are less likely to receive timely medical treatment, compared to their white counterparts; and citing experience of one indigent Louisiana Black woman who reported “seeing preventive and prenatal care providers is nearly impossible.”).

96. Tex. Health and Human Servs., *Texas Maternal Mortality and Morbidity Review Comm. and Dep’t of State Health Servs. Joint Biennial Report* (Sept. 2020), <https://www.dshs.texas.gov/legislative/2020-Reports/DSHS-MMMRC-2020.pdf> at 8, 12.

97. *Id.*; Tex. Health and Human Servs., *Induced Terminations of Pregnancy*, <https://www.hhs.texas.gov/about-hhs/records-statistics/data-statistics/itop-statistics>.

In addition to imposing increased risks associated with childbirth, denying a woman the right to an abortion produces many other disastrous consequences, including economic, physical and mental health effects both for her and her family. For example, women who carry unintended pregnancies to term are more likely to enter prenatal care late and have fewer prenatal visits; more likely to smoke cigarettes; and may be at greater risk of maternal depression and anxiety than women who continue intended pregnancies.⁹⁸ Further, a recent study found evidence of a significant increase in financial distress for women who were denied an abortion, suggesting that “births occurring after an abortion denial carry additional economic penalties over and above what is typically experienced by disadvantaged women when they have a new child.”⁹⁹ Furthermore, Mississippi is one of a handful of states without legislation terminating or limiting parental rights when a child is born from rape.¹⁰⁰ If this Court reverses the Fifth Circuit, a person in Mississippi pregnant from

98. See *Aztlan et. al.*, *supra* note 46.

99. Sarah Miller et. al., *The Economic Consequences of Being Denied Having an Abortion*, Na'l. Bureau of Econ. Research (Jan. 2020); see also Lauren Ralph, et. al., *A Prospective Cohort Study of the Effect of Receiving versus Being Denied an Abortion on Educational Attainment* (Nov. 2019) (Study participants who obtained a wanted abortion were much more likely to complete a post-high school (postsecondary) degree (71%) than those denied abortion care (27%)—a difference that influences “lifelong educational attainment and earnings potential for these individuals”).

100. See Breeanna Hare & Lisa Rose, *Where Rapists Can Gain Parental Rights* (Nov. 17, 2016), <https://www.cnn.com/2016/11/17/health/parental-rights-rapists-explainer/>.

rape could not only be forced into motherhood, but also potentially forced to continuously confront her attacker in custody hearings, parenting and/or child visitations.¹⁰¹

Preventing a person from accessing an abortion also can have detrimental effects on her existing family. Approximately 60% of women in the U.S. who have abortions are already mothers, and approximately one-third of women seeking an abortion say their reason for wanting to terminate the pregnancy is to care for children they already have. Research demonstrates that unintended births have adverse effects on a woman's existing children, who are already more likely to live in households without enough money to provide for their food, housing and transportation.¹⁰² *Amici* thus have an interest in protecting their constituents from the confluence of negative consequences associated with denying access to abortions.

In addition to disproportionately affecting women of color, who already experience significantly worse health outcomes with respect to maternal and infant mortality, pre-viability abortion bans would also disproportionately affect members of low-income communities. In 2014, “[f]orty-nine percent of [abortion] patients had family incomes of less than 100% of the federal poverty level,” compared to 42% in 2008.¹⁰³ Moreover, “[a]n additional

101. *Id.*

102. Diana Greene Foster et. al., *Effects of Carrying an Unwanted Pregnancy to Term on Women's Existing Children*, 205 J. OF PEDIATRICS 183, 183-187 (Feb. 2019).

103. Jenna Jerman et al., *Characteristics of U.S. Abortion Patients in 2014 and Changes Since 2008*, GUTTMACHER INST. 7 (May

26% of patients in 2014 had incomes that were 100-199% of the poverty threshold.”¹⁰⁴ Notably, over the same time period, the percentage of abortion patients with family incomes of 200% or more of the federal poverty level decreased by six percentage points, to 25%.¹⁰⁵ At the same time, because of state and federal restrictions, Medicaid will not pay for most abortions, leaving most Mississippi women paying out of pocket for the procedure.¹⁰⁶ In 2014, nationally, “53% of patients reported that they paid for the abortion themselves.”¹⁰⁷ However, given that the majority of abortion patients are poor or low income,¹⁰⁸ paying for an abortion out of pocket is a near-prohibitive burden for many. Allowing abortion bans will impose additional barriers to obtaining abortion care on those least able to shoulder those additional burdens.

Amici from Mississippi and other states where the right to pre-viability abortion is at risk if this Court limits or overturns *Roe* have a duty to protect the constitutional rights of their constituents. The burden of pre-viability bans would fall disproportionately on communities already

2016), https://www.guttmacher.org/sites/default/files/report_pdf/characteristics-us-abortion-patients-2014.pdf.

104. *Id.*

105. *Id.*

106. *State of Black Women*, *supra* note 95, at 6, 22-23.

107. Jerman et al., *supra* note 103, at 9.

108. GUTTMACHER INST., *Abortion patients are disproportionately poor and low income* (2016), <https://www.guttmacher.org/infographic/2016/abortion-patients-are-disproportionately-poor-andlow-income>.

disadvantaged because of race, gender, or income, further exacerbating the inequalities and outcomes for State Legislators' most vulnerable constituents.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the judgment of the Fifth Circuit should be AFFIRMED.

Respectfully submitted,

CLAUDE G. SZYFER
Counsel Of Record
MICHELE L. PAHMER
DARYA D. ANICHKOVA
JESSICA L. DUBOWSKI
GILANA R. KELLER
JULIE G. MATOS
STROOCK & STROOCK & LAVAN LLP
180 Maiden Lane
New York, New York 10038
(212) 806-5400
cszyfer@stroock.com

Counsel for Amici Curiae

APPENDIX

**APPENDIX — *AMICI CURIAE* 896 STATE
LEGISLATORS**

Alabama State Legislators

Rep. Merika Coleman

Rep. Neil Rafferty

Alaska State Legislators

Sen. Elvi Gray-Jackson

Rep. Harriet Drummond

Rep. Zack Fields

Rep. Sara Hannan

Rep. Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins

Rep. Ivy Spohnholz

Rep. Geran Tarr

Arizona State Legislators

Sen. Lela Alston

Sen. Rosanna Gabaldon

Sen. Sally Ann Gonzales

2a

Appendix

Sen. Juan Mendez

Sen. Martin Quezada

Sen. Jamescita Peshlakai

Sen. Rebecca Rios (Minority Leader)

Sen. Victoria Steele

Rep. Richard Andrade

Rep. Kelli Butler

Rep. Andres Cano

Rep. Andrea Dalessandro

Rep. Charlene Fernandez

Rep. Melody Hernandez

Rep. Daniel Hernandez

Rep. Jennifer Longdon (Assistant Democratic Leader)

Rep. Pamela Powers Hannley

Rep. Athena Salman

Rep. Judy Schwiebert

3a

Appendix

Rep. Amish Shah

Rep. Stephanie Stahl Hamilton

Rep. Raquel Teran

California State Legislators

Sen. Toni Atkins (President Pro Tempore)

Sen. Josh Becker

Sen. Anna Caballero

Sen. Dave Cortese

Sen. Bill Dodd

Sen. John Laird

Sen. Connie M. Leyva

Sen. Monique Limón

Sen. Mike McGuire

Sen. Dave Min

Sen. Anthony J. Portantino

Sen. Nancy Skinner

4a

Appendix

Sen. Thomas J. Umberg

Sen. Scott Wiener

Asm. Cecilia Aguiar-Curry

Asm. Rebecca Bauer-Kahan

Asm. Steve Bennett

Asm. Marc Berman

Asm. Tasha Boerner Horvath

Asm. Mia Bonta

Asm. Isaac G. Bryan

Asm. Autumn Burke

Asm. Lisa Calderon

Asm. Wendy Carillo

Asm. Sabrina Cervantes

Asm. David Chiu

Asm. Laura Friedman

Asm. Jesse Gabriel

5a

Appendix

Asm. Cristina Garcia

Asm. Eloise Gomez Reyes (Majority Leader)

Asm. Lorena Gonzalez

Asm. Jacqui Irwin

Asm. Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer Sr.

Asm. Ash Kalra

Asm. Alex Lee

Asm. Marc Levine

Asm. Evan Low

Asm. Brian Maienschein

Asm. Jose Medina

Asm. Kevin Mullin (Speaker Pro Tempore)

Asm. Patrick O'Donnell

Asm. Cottie Petrie-Norris

Asm. Sharon Quirk-Silva

Asm. Anthony Rendon (Speaker)

6a

Appendix

Asm. Robert Rivas

Asm. Miguel Santiago

Asm. Mark Stone

Asm. Christopher M. Ward

Asm. Akilah Weber, MD

Asm. Buffy Wicks

Colorado State Legislators

Sen. Janet Buckner

Sen. James Coleman

Sen. Steve Fenberg (Majority Leader)

Sen. Rhonda Fields

Sen. Joann Ginal

Sen. Julie Gonzales

Sen. Chris Hansen

Sen. Sonya Jaquez Lewis

Sen. Chris Kolker

7a

Appendix

Sen. Dominick Moreno

Sen. Brittany Pettersen

Sen. Tammy Story

Sen. Faith Winter

Sen. Rachel Zenzinger

Rep. Judy Amabile

Rep. Jennifer Bacon

Rep. Tracey Bernett

Rep. Shannon Bird

Rep. Andrew Boesenecker

Rep. Lisa A. Cutter

Rep. Lindsey Daugherty

Rep. Monica Duran

Rep. Daneya Esgar

Rep. Dominique Jackson

Rep. Serena Gonzales-Gutierrez

8a

Appendix

Rep. Matt Gray

Rep. Iman Jodeh

Rep. Cathy Kipp

Rep. Susan Lontine

Rep. Julie McCluskie

Rep. Karen McCormick

Rep. Barbara McLachlan

Rep. Dafna Michaelson Jenet

Rep. David Ortiz

Rep. Naquetta Ricks

Rep. Dylan Roberts

Rep. Emily Sirota

Rep. Brianna C. Titone

Rep. Steven Woodrow

Rep. Mary Young

Appendix

Connecticut State Legislators

Sen. Julie Kushner

Sen. Matt Lesser

Sen. Marilyn Moore

Rep. Raghiv Allie-Brennan

Rep. Robin Comey

Rep. Lucy Dathan

Rep. Eleni Kavros DeGraw

Rep. Jillian Gilcrest

Rep. Maria Horn

Rep. Anne Hughes

Rep. Jennifer Leeper

Rep. Cristin McCarthy Vahey

Rep. Stephen Robert Meskers

Rep. David Michel

Rep. Christine Palm

10a

Appendix

Rep. Quentin “Q” Phipps

Rep. Jason Rojas

Rep. Kevin Ryan

Delaware State Legislators

Sen. Bruce Ennis

Sen. Kyle Evans Gay

Sen. Stephanie L. Hansen

Sen. S. Elizabeth Lockman

Sen. Sarah McBride

Sen. Marie Pinkney

Sen. Nicole Poore

Sen. David P. Sokola

Sen. Laura Sturgeon

Sen. Bryan Townsend

Sen. John J. Walsh III

Sen. Paul Baumbach

11a

Appendix

Sen. Eric Morrison

Florida State Legislators

Sen. Lori Berman

Sen. Shevrin Jones

Sen. Tina Polsky

Sen. Annette Taddeo

Rep. Kristen Arrington

Rep. Christopher Benjamin

Rep. Kevin Chambliss

Rep. Ben Diamond

Rep. Anna V. Eskamani

Rep. Yvonne Hinson

Rep. Carlos Guillermo Smith

Rep. Susan L. Valdes

Georgia State Legislators

Sen. Gail Davenport

12a

Appendix

Sen. Sonya Halpern

Sen. Sally Harrell

Sen. Lester George Jackson III

Sen. Harold Jones II

Sen. Jen Jordan

Sen. Nikki Merritt

Sen. Nan Grogan Orrock

Sen. Elena C. Parent

Rep. Erick Allen

Rep. Teri Anulewicz

Rep. Debra Bazemore

Rep. Karen Bennett

Rep. James Beverly

Rep. William Boddie

Rep. Roger Bruce

Rep. Rhonda Burnough

13a

Appendix

Rep. Park Cannon

Rep. Jasmine Clark, PhD

Rep. Viola Davis

Rep. Demetrius Douglas

Rep. David Dreyer

Rep. Stacey Evans

Rep. Becky Evans

Rep. Gloria Butler

Rep. Gloria Frazier

Rep. Spencer Frye

Rep. Carl W. Gilliard

Rep. Betsy Holland

Rep. El-Mahdi Holly

Rep. CaMia Hopson

Rep. Shelly Hutchinson

Rep. Kim Jackson

Appendix

Rep. Donzella James

Rep. Emanuel D. Jones

Rep. Sheila Jones

Rep. Angelika Kausche

Rep. Darshun Kendrick

Rep. Marvin Lim

Rep. Derek Mallow

Rep. Dewey L. McClain

Rep. Donna McLeod

Rep. Billy Mitchell

Rep. Rebecca Mitchell, DVM, PhD

Rep. Angela Moore

Rep. Beth Moore

Rep. Sheila C. Nelson

Rep. Bee Nguyen

Rep. Miriam Paris

15a

Appendix

Rep. Shea Roberts

Rep. Mary Robichaux

Rep. Kim Schofield

Rep. Sandra G. Scott

Rep. Rhonda Taylor

Rep. Erica Thomas

Rep. David Wilkerson (Minority Whip)

Rep. Mary Frances Williams

Rep. Matthew Wilson

Hawaii State Legislators

Sen. Laura Acasio

Sen. Rosalyn H. Baker

Sen. Stanley Chang

Sen. Lynn DeCoite

Sen. Gilbert S.C. Keith-Agaran

16a

Appendix

Sen. Michelle N. Kidani

Sen. Chris Lee

Sen. Bennette Misalucha

Sen. Karl Rhoads

Sen. Maile Shimabukuro

Rep. Linda Ichiyama

Rep. Jeanné Kapela

Rep. Matthew S. LoPresti, Ph.D.

Rep. Nicole Lowe

Rep. Lisa Marten

Rep. Nadine K. Nakamura

Rep. Joy A. San Buenaventura

Rep. Tina Wikdberger

Idaho State Legislators

Sen. Ali Rabe

Sen. Melissa Wintrow

17a

Appendix

Rep. Brooke Green

Rep. Chris Mathias

Rep. Colin Nash

Rep. Lauren Necochea

Rep. Ilana Rubel

Illinois State Legislators

Sen. Melinda Bush

Sen. Jacqueline Y. Collins

Sen. Sara Feigenholtz

Sen. Laura Fine

Sen. Adriane Johnson

Sen. Robert F. Martwick

Sen. Michelle Mussman

Sen. Cristina H. Pacione-Zayas

Sen. Mike Simmons

Sen. Elgie R. Sims, Jr.

Appendix

Sen. Celina Villanueva

Rep. Dagmara Avelar

Rep. Kambium Buckner

Rep. Jonathan Carroll

Rep. Kelly Cassidy

Rep. Deb Conroy

Rep. Terra Costa Howard

Rep. Eva-Dina Delgado

Rep. Daniel Didech

Rep. Marcus C. Evans, Jr.

Rep. Robyn Gabel

Rep. Jennifer Gong-Gershowitz

Rep. Edgar Gonzalez, Jr.

Rep. Will Guzzardi

Rep. Greg Harris (Majority Leader)

Rep. Stephanie Kifowit

Appendix

Rep. Lindsey LaPointe

Rep. Theresa Mah

Rep. Joyce Mason

Rep. Rita Mayfield

Rep. Anna Moeller

Rep. Robert Peters

Rep. Delia Ramirez

Rep. Anne Stava-Murray

Rep. Emanuel Chris Welch (Speaker of the House)

Rep. Ann M. Williams

Rep. Kathleen Willis

Indiana State Legislators

Sen. J.D. Ford

Sen. Timothy S. Lanane

Sen. Fady Qaddoura

Sen. Karen Tallian

20a

Appendix

Sen. Greg Taylor

Sen. Shelli Yoder

Rep. Sue Errington

Rep. Gregory W. Porter

Rep. Vernon G. Smith

Iowa State Legislators

Sen. Joe Bolkcom

Sen. Nate Boulton

Sen. Claire Celsi

Sen. Bill Dotzler

Sen. Sarah Trone Garriott

Sen. Eric Giddens

Sen. Jim Lykam

Sen. Janet Petersen

Sen. Herman C. Quirmbach

Sen. Jackie Smith

21a

Appendix

Sen. Todd Taylor

Sen. Zach Wahls

Rep. Marti Anderson

Rep. Bruce Hunter

Rep. Mary Mascher

Kansas State Legislators

Sen. Mary Ware

Rep. Hon. John Carmichael

Rep. Gail Finney

Rep. Rui Xu

Kentucky State Legislators

Sen. Morgan McGarvey

Rep. McKenzie Cantrell

Rep. Mary Lou Marzian

Rep. Ruth Ann Palumbo

Rep. Hon. Rachel Roberts

22a

Appendix

Rep. Attica Scott

Rep. Cherlynn Stevenson

Louisiana State Legislators

Rep. Aimee Adatto Freeman

Rep. Royce Duplessis

Rep. Jason Hughes

Rep. Mandie Landry

Rep. Matthew Willard

Maine State Legislators

Sen. Donna Bailey

Sen. Stacy Brenner

Sen. Matthea Daughtry (Assistant Senate Majority
Leader)

Sen. Chloe Maxmin

Rep. Seth Berry

Rep. Anne Carney

Rep. Lydia V. Crafts

23a

Appendix

Rep. Scott Cuddy

Rep. Ryan M. Fecteau

Rep. Hon. Lois Galgay Reckitt

Rep. Lori K. Gramlich

Rep. Thom Harnett

Rep. Grayson Lookner

Rep. Kristi Mathieson

Rep. Joyce “Jay” McCreight

Rep. Genevieve McDonald

Rep. Rebecca Millett

Rep. Victoria Morales

Rep. Maggie O’Neil

Rep. Laurie Osher

Rep. Sarah Pebworth

Rep. Amy Roeder

Rep. Melanie Sachs

24a

Appendix

Rep. Erin Sheehan

Rep. Mike Sylvester

Rep. Rachel Talbot Ross (Assistant House Majority
Leader)

Rep. Denise A. Tepler

Rep. Charlotte Warren

Maryland State Legislators

Sen. J. Sandy Bartlett

Sen. Kumar Barve

Sen. Lisa Belcastro

Sen. Regina T. Boyce

Sen. Al Carr

Sen. Brian J. Feldman

Sen. Katie Fry Hester

Sen. Shelly Hettleman

Sen. Clarence Lam, MD, MPH

Sen. Susan Lee

25a

Appendix

Sen. Will Smith

Sen. Jeff Waldstreicher

Sen. Mary Washington

Del. Lorig Charkoudian

Del. Eric Ebersole

Del. Jessica Feldmark

Del. David Fraser-Hidalgo

Del. Michele Guyton

Del. Terri L. Hill, MD

Del. Anne Kaiser

Del. Ariana Kelly

Del. Mary A. Lehman

Del. Jazz Lewis

Del. Robbyn Lewis

Del. Brooke E. Lierman

Del. Sara Love

Appendix

Del. Eric Luedtke (Majority Leader)

Del. Maggie McIntosh

Del. David Moon

Del. Julie Palakovich Carr

Del. Joseline A. Pena-Melnyk

Del. Sheila Ruth

Del. Emily Shetty

Del. Stephanie M. Smith

Del. Jared Solomon

Del. Vaughn Stewart

Del. Kriselda Valderrama

Del. Jheanelle Wilkins

Del. Nicole Williams

Massachusetts State Legislators

Sen. Sonia Chang-Diaz

Sen. Jo Comerford

27a

Appendix

Sen. Brendan P. Crighton

Sen. Jamie Eldridge

Sen. Patricia Jehlen

Sen. Rebecca L. Rausch

Rep. Christine P. Barber

Rep. Peter L. Capano

Rep. Michelle Ciccolo

Rep. Mike Connolly

Rep. Carol Doherty

Rep. Dylan Fernandes

Rep. Brandy Fluker Oakley

Rep. Tami Gouveia, PhD

Rep. Danielle W. Gregoire

Rep. Jim Hawkins

Rep. Natalie Higgins

Rep. Sally P. Kerans

Appendix

Rep. David H. A. LeBoeuf

Rep. Jack Patrick Lewis

Rep. Kate Lipper-Garabedian

Rep. Adrian C. Madaro

Rep. Paul Mark

Rep. Liz Miranda

Rep. Tram T. Nguyen

Rep. Steven C. Owens

Rep. Lindsay N. Sabadosa

Rep. Danillo A. Sena

Michigan State Legislators

Sen. Jim Ananich (Minority Leader)

Sen. Rosemary Bayer

Sen. Winnie Brinks

Sen. Stephanie Chang

Sen. Erika Geiss

29a

Appendix

Sen. Curtis Hertel, Jr.

Sen. Adam Hollier

Sen. Jeff Irwin

Sen. Sean McCann

Sen. Mallory McMorrow

Sen. Jeremy Moss

Sen. Dayna Polehanki

Sen. Sylvia A. Santana

Sen. Paul Wojno

Rep. Abraham Aiyash

Rep. Sarah Anthony (Democratic Caucus Chair)

Rep. Felicia Brabec, Psy.D., MSW

Rep. Kelly Breen

Rep. Julie Brixie

Rep. Darrin Camilleri

Rep. Tyrone A. Carter

30a

Appendix

Rep. Mary Cavanagh

Rep. Kevin Coleman

Rep. Jim Ellison

Rep. Alex Garza

Rep. Jim Haadsma

Rep. Rachel Hood

Rep. Kara Hope

Rep. Cynthia A. Johnson

Rep. Matt Koleszar

Rep. Padma Kuppa

Rep. Donna Lasinski (Democratic Leader)

Rep. Mari Manoogian

Rep. Christine Morse

Rep. Amos O'Neal

Rep. Laurie Pohutsky

Rep. Ranjeev Puri

31a

Appendix

Rep. Yousef Rabhi (Democratic Floor Leader)

Rep. Julie Rogers

Rep. Helena Scott

Rep. Bill Sowerby

Rep. Samantha Steckloff

Rep. Lori M. Stone

Rep. Shri Thanedar

Rep. Regina Weiss

Minnesota State Legislators

Sen. Jim Carlson

Sen. Chris Eaton

Sen. Omar Fateh

Sen. Ann Johnson Stewart

Sen. Mary Kunesh

Sen. Ron Latz

Sen. Melisa Lopez Franzen (Minority Leader)

32a

Appendix

Sen. John Marty

Sen. Jennifer A. McEwen

Sen. Erin Murphy

Sen. Jerry Newton

Sen. Sandra Pappas

Sen. Lindsey Port

Rep. Tina Liebling

Rep. Jamie Long

Rep. Sandra Masin

Missouri State Legislators

Sen. Jill Schupp

Rep. LaDonna Appelbaum

Rep. Ashley Aune

Rep. Jo Doll

Rep. Trish Gunby

Rep. Tracy McCreery

Appendix

Rep. Maggie Nurrenbern

Rep. Barbara J. Phifer

Rep. Annette Turnbaugh

Rep. Sarah Unsicker

Montana State Legislators

Sen. Mary McNally

Rep. Mary Ann Dunwell

Rep. Thomas France

Rep. Jessica Karjala

Rep. Andrea Olsen

Rep. Edward “Ed” Stafman

Rep. Danny Tenenbaum

Nebraska State Legislators

Sen. Machaela Cavanaugh

Sen. Megan Hunt

Sen. Terrell McKinney

Appendix

Nevada State Legislators

Sen. Fabian Doñate

Sen. Dallas Harris

Sen. Roberta Lange

Sen. Dina Neal

Sen. Julia Ratti

Sen. Pat Spearman

Asm. Natha Anderson

Asm. Teresa Benitez-Thompson

Asm. Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod

Asm. Maggie Carlton

Asm. Lesley Cohen

Asm. Venicia Considine

Asm. Edgar Flores

Asm. Jason Frierson

Asm. Cecelia González

35a

Appendix

Asm. Michelle Gorelow

Asm. Sandra Jauregui

Asm. Susan Martinez

Asm. Elaine Marzola

Asm. Tracy Brown May

Asm. Brittney Miller

Asm. C.H. Miller

Asm. Daniele Monroe-Moreno

Asm. Rochelle Nguyen

Asm. David Orentlicher

Asm. Sarah Peters

Asm. Clara “Claire” Thomas

Asm. Selena Torres

Asm. Howard Watts, III

Asm. Steve Yeager

Appendix

New Hampshire State Legislators

Sen. Cindy Rosenwald

Sen. David Watters

Sen. Rebecca G. Whitley

Rep. Richard M. Abel

Rep. Susan Almy

Rep. Debra Altschiller

Rep. Richard Ames

Rep. Paul Berch

Rep. Lisa Bunker

Rep. Jacqueline Chretien, PhD

Rep. Bruce Cohen

Rep. Daniel A. Eaton

Rep. Manny Espitia

Rep. Nicole Klein Knight

Rep. Tony Labranche

37a

Appendix

Rep. Rebecca McWilliams

Rep. Megan Murray

Rep. Mark Paige

Rep. Cecilia Rich

Rep. Laurel Stavis

Rep. Linda L. Tanner

Rep. Hon. Susan Treleaven

Rep. Lawrence Welkowitz, PhD

New Jersey State Legislators

Sen. Vin Gopal

Sen. Loretta Weinberg

Asm. Mila M. Jasey

Asm. Raj Mukherji

Asm. Verlina Reynolds-Jackson

New Mexico State Legislators

Rep. Deborah Armstrong

Appendix

Rep. Gail Chasey

Rep. Joanne J. Ferrary

Rep. Georgene Louis

Rep. Kristina Ortez

Rep. Andrea Romero

Rep. Linda M. Serrato

Rep. Elizabeth “Liz” Thomson

Rep. Dayan Hochman-Vigil

New York State Legislators

Sen. Jamaal T. Bailey

Sen. Alessandra Biaggi

Sen. Jabari Brisport

Sen. Samra G. Brouk

Sen. James F. Gaughran

Sen. Michael Gianaris (Deputy Majority Leader)

Sen. Andrew Gounardes

39a

Appendix

Sen. Pete Harckham

Sen. Michelle Hinchey

Sen. Brad Hoylman

Sen. Robert Jackson

Sen. Todd Kaminsky

Sen. Anna M. Kaplan

Sen. Timothy M. Kennedy

Sen. Liz Krueger

Sen. John Liu

Sen. Rachel May

Sen. Shelley Mayer

Sen. Zellnor Myrie

Sen. Kevin S. Parker

Sen. Roxanne J. Persaud

Sen. Jessica Ramos

Sen. Elijah Reichlin-Melnick

40a

Appendix

Sen. Gustavo Rivera

Sen. Julia Salazar

Sen. James Sanders, Jr.

Sen. Luis R. Sepulveda

Sen. James Skoufis

Sen. Toby Ann Stavisky

Sen. Kevin Thomas

Asm. Harry B. Bronson

Asm. Kevin A. Cahill

Asm. Jeffrey Dinowitz

Asm. Harvey Epstein

Asm. Patricia Fahy

Asm. Sandra Galef

Asm. Deborah J. Glick

Asm. Jessica González-Rojas

Asm. Richard N. Gottfried

41a

Appendix

Asm. Anna R. Kelles, PhD

Asm. Jennifer Lunsford

Asm. Donna A. Lupardo

Asm. Hon. William B. Magnarelli

Asm. Karen M. McMahon

Asm. Catherine Nolan

Asm. Steven Otis

Asm. Amy Paulin

Asm. Karines Reyes

Asm. Linda B. Rosenthal

Asm. Nily Rozic

Asm. Rebecca Seawright

Asm. Gina L. Sillitti

Asm. Jo Anne Simon

Asm. Steve Stern

Asm. Fred W. Thiele, Jr.

42a

Appendix

Asm. Monica P. Wallace

North Carolina State Legislators

Sen. Sydney Batch

Sen. Dan Blue

Sen. Jay J. Chaudhuri

Sen. Sarah Crawford

Sen. Kirk deViere

Sen. Valerie P. Foushee

Sen. Michael Garrett

Sen. Natasha Marcus

Sen. Julie Mayfield

Sen. Mujtaba A. Mohammed

Sen. Natalie S. Murdock

Sen. Wiley Nickel

Sen. DeAndrea Salvador

Sen. Mike Woodard

43a

Appendix

Rep. Gale Adcock

Rep. John Ager

Rep. Vernetta Alston

Rep. John Autry

Rep. Amber M. Baker, PhD

Rep. Cynthia Ball

Rep. Mary G. Belk

Rep. Terry M. Brown, Jr.

Rep. Deb Butler

Rep. Becky Carney

Rep. Linda Cooper-Suggs

Rep. Carla Cunningham

Rep. Allison Dahle

Rep. Terence Everitt

Rep. Susan C. Fisher

Rep. Terry Garrison

44a

Appendix

Rep. Rosa U. Gill

Rep. Wesley Harris

Rep. Pricey Harrison

Rep. Zach Hawkins

Rep. Rachel Hunt

Rep. Ricky Hurtado

Rep. Verla Insko

Rep. Brandon Lofton

Rep. Carolyn G. Logan

Rep. Nasif Majeed

Rep. Graig Meyer

Rep. Marcia H. Morey

Rep. Robert T. Reives, II (Democratic Leader)

Rep. James Roberson

Rep. Kandie D. Smith

Rep. Evelyn Terry

45a

Appendix

Rep. Brian Turner

Rep. Julie von Haefen

Rep. Ashton Wheeler Clemmons

Ohio State Legislators

Sen. Nickie J. Antonio

Sen. Teresa Fedor

Rep. Juanita Brent

Rep. Sedrick Denson

Rep. Tavia Galonski

Rep. Stephanie Howse

Rep. Catherine Ingram

Rep. Brigid Kelly

Rep. David Leland

Rep. Michele Lepore-Hagan

Rep. Lisa A. Sobecki

Rep. Emilia Strong Sykes

Appendix

Rep. Casey Weinstein

Rep. Thomas E. West

Oregon State Legislators

Sen. Lee Beyer

Sen. Michael Dembrow

Sen. Chris Gorsek

Sen. Elizabeth Steiner Hayward, MD

Sen. Kayse Jama

Sen. Kate Lieber

Sen. James I. Manning, Jr.

Sen. Deb Patterson

Sen. Floyd Prozanski

Sen. Rob Wagner

Rep. Wlnsvey Campos

Rep. Julie Fahey

Rep. David Gomberg

47a

Appendix

Rep. Zach Hudson

Rep. Jason Kropf

Rep. Pam Marsh

Rep. Susan McLain

Rep. Courtney Neron

Rep. Rob Nosse

Rep. Khanh Pham

Rep. Dan Rayfield

Rep. Lisa Reynolds, MD

Rep. Andrea Salinas

Rep. Sheri Schouten

Rep. Barbara Smith Warner (Majority Leader)

Rep. Janeen Sollman

Rep. Andrea Valderrama

Rep. Marty Wilde

Rep. Brad Witt

Appendix

Pennsylvania State Legislators

Sen. Amanda M. Cappelletti

Sen. Maria Collett

Sen. Carolyn Comitta

Sen. Jay Costa (Democratic Leader)

Sen. Wayne Fontana

Sen. Art Haywood

Sen. Vincent Hughes (Democratic Appropriations
Chair)

Sen. John I. Kane

Sen. Tim Kearney

Sen. Katie J. Muth

Sen. Steven J. Santarsiero

Sen. Nikil Saval

Sen. Judy Schwank

Sen. Sharif Street

Sen. Anthony H. Williams

49a

Appendix

Sen. Lindsey M. Williams

Rep. Jessica L. Benham

Rep. Matt Bradford (Appropriations Chair)

Rep. Tim Briggs

Rep. Donna Bullock

Rep. Morgan Cephas

Rep. Mary Jo Daley

Rep. Tina Davis

Rep. Pamela A. DeLissio

Rep. Dan Frankel

Rep. Nancy Guent

Rep. Dianne Herrin

Rep. Joseph Hohenstein

Rep. Kristine C. Howard

Rep. Sara Innamorato

Rep. Mary Isaacson

50a

Appendix

Rep. Malcolm Kenyatta

Rep. Emily Kinhead

Rep. Rick Krajewski

Rep. Joanna McClinton (Democratic Leader)

Rep. Jennifer O'Mara

Rep. Chris Rabb

Rep. Ben Sanchez

Rep. Michael Schlossberg

Rhode Island State Legislators

Sen. Jonathon Acosta

Sen. Kendra Anderson

Sen. Valarie J. Lawson

Sen. Tiara Mack

Sen. Joshua Miller

Sen. Melissa Murray

Sen. Bridget Valverde

51a

Appendix

Rep. Edith H. Ajello

Rep. Lauren Carson

Rep. Liana Cassar

Rep. Terri-Denise Cortvriend

Rep. Susan Donovan

Rep. Rebecca Kislak

Rep. Michelle McGaw

Rep. David Morales

Rep. Brandon Potter

Rep. Deborah Ruggiero

Rep. Teresa Tanzi

South Carolina State Legislators

Sen. Marlon Kimpson

Sen. Margie Bright Matthews

Sen. Mia McLeod

Rep. Justin T. Bamberg

52a

Appendix

Rep. Beth Bernstein

Rep. Wendy Brawley

Rep. Gilda Cobb-Hunter

Rep. Kambrell Garvin

Rep. Rosalyn Henderson-Myers

Rep. Patricia Moore Henegan

Rep. Joseph H. Jefferson, Jr.

Rep. John Richard King

Rep. Krystle Matthews

Rep. Chardale Murray

Rep. Seth Rose

Rep. J. Todd Rutherford (Minority Leader)

Rep. Deon Tedder

Rep. Elizabeth Spencer Wetmore

South Dakota State Legislators

Rep. Jennifer Keintz

Appendix

Tennessee State Legislators

Sen. Raumesh Akbari

Rep. John Ray Clemmons

Rep. Vincent Dixie

Rep. London Lamar

Texas State Legislators

Rep. Alma Allen

Rep. Michelle Beckley

Rep. Diego Bernal

Rep. Rhetta Bowers

Rep. Garnet Coleman

Rep. Nicole Collier

Rep. Jasmine Crockett

Rep. Alex Dominguez

Rep. Art Fierro

Rep. Barbara Gervin-Hawkins

54a

Appendix

Rep. Mary Gonzalez

Rep. Jessica Gonzalez

Rep. Vikki Goodwin

Rep. Ana Hernandez

Rep. Gina Hinojosa

Rep. Donna Howard (Chairwoman of the Texas
Women's Health Caucus)

Rep. Celia Israel

Rep. Ann Johnson

Rep. Julie Johnson (Vice-Chairwoman of the Texas
Women's Health Caucus)

Rep. Trey Martinez-Fischer

Rep. Ina Minjarez (Texas Women's Health Caucus
Whip)

Rep. Joe Moody

Rep. Christina Morales

Rep. Ana-Maria Ramos

Rep. Eddie Rodriguez

55a

Appendix

Rep. Toni Rose

Rep. Jon Rosenthal (Treasurer of the Texas Women's
Health Caucus)

Rep. Shawn Thierry

Rep. Senfronia Thompson

Rep. Chris Turner (Democratic Caucus Chair)

Rep. Gene Wu

Rep. Erin Zwiener

Utah State Legislators

Sen. Jani Iwamoto (Assistant Minority Whip)

Rep. Angela Romero

Vermont State Legislators

Sen. Kesha Ram Hinsdale

Rep. Erin Brady

Rep. Mari Cordes, RN

Rep. Brian Cina

Rep. Selene Colburn

56a

Appendix

Rep. Maxine Grad

Rep. Emma Mulvaney-Stanak

Rep. Ann Pugh

Rep. Barbara Rachelson

Rep. Taylor Small

Rep. Tanya Vyhovsky, LICSW

Virginia State Legislators

Sen. John J. Bell

Sen. Jennifer B. Boysko

Sen. Barbara Favola

Sen. Ghazala Hashmi

Sen. Janet D. Howell

Sen. Mamie E. Locke

Sen. Dave Marsden

Sen. Jennifer L. McClellan

Sen. Scott Surovell

57a

Appendix

Del. Shelly A. Simonds

Del. Joshua Cole

Del. Elizabeth Guzman

Del. Kaye Kory

Del. Ibraheem S. Samirah

Del. Kathy Tran

Washington State Legislators

Sen. Jeannie Darneille

Sen. Mona Das

Sen. Manka Dhingra

Sen. Sam Hunt

Sen. Karen Keiser

Sen. Patty Kuderer

Sen. Marko Liias

Sen. Liz Lovelett

Sen. T'wina Nobles

58a

Appendix

Sen. Jamie Pedersen

Sen. Rebecca Saldaña

Rep. Liz Berry

Rep. Davina Duerr

Rep. Joe Fitzgibbon

Rep. Nicole Macri

Rep. Mia Su-Ling Gregerson

Rep. Amy Walen

Rep. Emily Wicks

West Virginia State Legislators

Del. Barbara Evans Fleischauer

Del. Danielle Walker

Del. Kayla Young

Del. Cody Thompson

Wisconsin State Legislators

Sen. Kelda Roys

59a

Appendix

Sen. Lena C. Taylor

Rep. Jimmy Anderson

Rep. Jill Billings

Rep. Jonathan Brostoff

Rep. Sue Conley

Rep. Jodi Emerson

Rep. Evan Goyke

Rep. Dianne Hesselbein

Rep. Francesca Hong

Rep. LaKeshia N. Myers

Rep. Greta Neubauer

Rep. Supreme Moore Omokunde

Rep. Katrina Shankland

Rep. Kristina Shelton

Rep. Christine Sinicki

Rep. Lee Snodgrass

60a

Appendix

Rep. Mark Spreitzer

Rep. Lisa Subeck