No. 25-259

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

JANUARY LITTLEJOHN, *et vir.*,

Petitioners,

v.

SCHOOL BOARD OF LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA, *et al.*,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF OF *AMICI CURIAE* OUR DUTY–USA AND GENSPECT USA SUPPORTING PETITIONERS

C. ERIN FRIDAY
ROMY MANCINI
OUR DUTY–USA
P.O. Box 442
San Carlos, CA 94070

GINA M. D'ANDREA
Counsel of Record
LEIGH ANN O'NEILL
AMERICA FIRST POLICY INSTITUTE
1455 Pennsylvania Avenue NW,
Suite 225
Washington, DC 20005
(516) 993-3154
gdandrea@americafirstpolicy.com

Counsel for Amici Curiae

386342

COUNSEL PRESS
(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether a policy of a public school violates a parent's fundamental rights when it allows the school to participate in the social transition of that parent's child without the knowledge, or consent of the parent or in direct contravention of the parent's directives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page

Cases

Cited Authorities

Page

Page

Statutes

Other Authorities

INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*[1]

Our Duty–USA is a secular nonprofit whose members across the US have varied political backgrounds, ethnicities, and sexual orientations but share the experience of raising formerly and currently trans-identified children. Our Duty members have had schools secretly socially transition their children, deceive them when they inquire about their children's identities, refuse to comply with members' demands to cease affirming their children, and report members to child welfare agencies for refusing to support their child's rejection of their sex.

Genspect USA is a related nonpartisan nonprofit. Genspect's mission is to promote a healthy, evidence-based approach to sex and sex-based stereotypes. It collaborates with a diverse range of professionals from around the world, detransitioners (individuals who have at one point identified as trans and undergone sex-rejecting interventions but have since desisted from identifying as trans), and parent groups. Genspect understands that many schools are not only creating children who reject their sex through instruction that contravenes biological reality, but are also paving a pathway towards the medicalization of perfectly healthy young bodies.

Based on experiences with their own children and clients, amici have personal knowledge that the adoption of transgender identities is a maladaptive coping

1. All parties received notice of the filing of this brief. This brief was not authored in whole or in part by counsel for any party and no person or entity other than *amici curiae* or their counsel has made a monetary contribution toward the brief's preparation or submission.

mechanism often stemming from, *inter alia*, autism, trauma, internalized homophobia, sexual abuse, other mental health ailments, exposure to pornography, and social contagion.[2]

Amici's goal—to ensure children grow up accepting their immutable sex, regardless of whether they conform to traditional stereotypes in dress, expression, careers, studies, or activities—is undermined when schools pursue psycho-social interventions that encourage children to reject their sex.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Few things are more central to parental rights than the decision to raise one's child as his/her sex, a primal aspect of the self that goes to the core of human existence. As one federal court put it, "[i]t is difficult to envision why a school would even claim—much less how a school could establish—a generalized interest in withholding or concealing from the parents of minor children, information fundamental to a child's identity, personhood, and mental and emotional well-being such as their preferred name and pronouns." *Ricard v. USD 475 Geary Cnty., KS Sch. Bd.*, No. 522CV04015HLTGEB, 2022 WL 1471372, at *8 (D. Kan. May 9, 2022).

Many courts, however, have begun rejecting the axiomatic truth that sex is real and immutable. They have instead erroneously determined that parents seeking to

2. *See* Our Duty-USA's Brief Supporting Respondents and Affirmance at 8–15 in *United States v. Skrmetti*, 145 S. Ct. 1816 (2025) (No. 23-477) [hereinafter Our Duty's *Skrmetti* Brief].

raise children to accept their sex is somehow beyond the bounds of their parental rights. In furtherance of this insidious position, courts are, without any basis in law, elevating schools' decisions above those of parents, who exclusively hold the natural and legal rights to raise their children.

Schools are not innocent bystanders in the advancement of the transgender agenda, but are exuberant participants, employing aggressive tactics to encourage a child's rejection of his/her sex.[3] Schools have never before so blatantly intruded into parental rights, showing clear distrust and disdain for parents who do not ascribe to the incoherent ideology of gender identity while making life-altering decisions about their children. Schools contend

---

3. *See, e.g.,* the stories in Section III of this brief; despite this Court's decision in *Mahmoud v. Taylor*, 145 S. Ct. 2332 (2025), Seattle's school district is precluding parents from opting out even kindergarteners from story-time with transgender-themed books. *Opt Out Requests for LGBTQ-Inclusive Instruction*, Seattle Public Schools, https://www.seattleschools.org/departments/health-education/lgbtq/sps-for-all/ (last accessed Oct. 3, 2025). *See also Konen v. Caldeira*, No. 22-cv-1813 (Cal. Super. Ct. Monterey Cnty., June 27, 2022) *removed* (N.D. Cal., removed Sept. 12, 2022) (involving a case in which an eleven-year-old female was socially transitioned without parental knowledge at school and in which two teachers, who encouraged students to adopt transgender identities, were recorded revealing how they "stalked" students' communications on their school-provided tablets to recruit members for their transgender club); Teny Sahakian, *Abigail Shrier: Audio Exposes California Teacher's Efforts to Subvert Parents and Recruit Kids to LGBTQ+ Clubs*, Fox News (Nov. 19, 2021), https://www.foxnews.com/us/abigail-shrier-audio-exposes-california-teachers-efforts-to-subvert-parents-and-recruit-kids-to-lgbtq-clubs.

that they must be "safe spaces" ***from parents*** who simply want their children to grow up accepting themselves as perfectly created. In reality, it is the schools that are unsafe for advancing an ideology that almost invariably leads to extreme body modification with lifelong medical costs and complications.

This Court's intervention is badly needed to re-affirm that parents—not schools—are primarily empowered with the care, custody, and control of their children.

ARGUMENT

I. Schools Wrongly Justify Secret Social Transition Plans on the Unconstitutional Presumption That Parents Are Abusive.[4]

Each school policy and the related secret social transition plans ("SSTPs") that allow students to exclude parents from knowledge of the transition have, at their core, the presumption that parents are "unsafe" and incapable of making appropriate medical decisions for their children. Only parents who believe in and approve of the concept of "gender identity" are worthy of knowing that their child is suffering from gender dysphoria or some other mental distress that is causing them to want to be perceived as something other than their sex.

Parents are thereby prevented from exploring the causes of the child's sex rejection and helping him accept

4. A "Secret Social Transition Plan" or "SSTP" refers to any plan created by a school facilitating a student's sex-rejecting identity without parental knowledge or consent.

his natural body. Instead, parents are secretly adjudicated abusive and afforded no due process against the heinous label while the school medically treats the child and cements the harmful identity of a "transgender child."[5]

Examples of the condemnatory nature of SSTPs can be found in several cases. For example, in *Foote v. Ludlow Sch. Comm.*, the lower court found that the school had a policy that "plausibly creates a space for students to express their identity **without worrying about the parental backlash**." 128 F.4th 336, 357 (1st Cir. 2025) (emphasis added).

Similarly, in this case, the guide to the SSTP instructed staff not to notify parents if a student adopted a "transgender" identity, claiming that "parents **can be very dangerous** to the student[']s health and well-being. . . Outing students . . . can literally make them homeless." *Littlejohn v. Sch. Bd. of Leon Cnty., Fla.*, 132 F.4th 1232, 1236 (11th Cir. 2025) (emphasis added).[6]

---

5. A "transgender child" is a child who is convinced that he/she was born with the wrong body – everything is wrong — his/her facial structure, voice, genitalia, movements and hair growth. He/she must then be affirmed by the impactful adults in his/her life in this self-loathing, learn that he/she can only be "fixed" by arresting his/her endocrine system, injecting or taking powerful drugs in perpetuity, and ultimately undergoing multiple surgeries to remove healthy and vital body parts, or create body parts that don't belong.

6. *See also*, *Doe v. Pine-Richland Sch. Dist.*, No. 2:24-CV-51, 2024 WL 2058437, at *2–3 (W.D. Pa. May 7, 2024), *appeal dismissed*, No. 24-1898, 2024 WL 4764262 (3d Cir. Aug. 16, 2024); *Willey v. Sweetwater Cnty. Sch. Dist.*, 680 F. Supp. 3d 1250, 1266–67 (D. Wyo. 2023).

The presumption that parents are abusive unless proven otherwise is completely at odds with this Court's well-established jurisprudence regarding parental rights, which "historically . . . has recognized that natural bonds of affection lead parents to act in the best interests of their children." *Parham v. J.R.*, 442 U.S. 584, 602 (1979). Moreover, "[t]he statist notion that governmental power should supersede parental authority in *all* cases because *some* parents abuse and neglect children is repugnant to American tradition." *Id.* at 603 (emphasis in original).

Moreover, as this Court recognized in *U.S. v. Skrmetti*, ___ U.S. ___, 145 S. Ct. 1816, 1825 (2025), the appropriate treatment for children who reject their sex is hotly contested. This fact alone makes clear that parental involvement in decision-making about this fundamental aspect of their child's upbringing is essential.

As the district court stated in *Ricard*, even if some parents are not supportive of their child's sex-rejecting identity, "whether the District likes it or not, th[e] constitutional right [of parents to raise their children] includes the right of a parent to have an opinion and to have a say in what a minor child is called and by what pronouns they are referred." 2022 WL 1471372, at *8–9.

Schools lack authority to override parents' decisions on the most basic matter—raising their child as their sex.

II. Lower Courts Are Inconsistent in Their Rulings on Whether Schools or Parents Have Decision-Making Authority Regarding Whether to Raise Their Children as Their Sex.

Courts have been sharply divided in how they rule in cases challenging SSTPs. While some parents' claims have survived motions to dismiss,[7] the vast majority of courts have erroneously rejected parents' claims at the pleading stage. The bases for courts rejecting these claims include: (1) (mis)application of the "shocks the conscience" standard, as in this matter; (2) application of rational basis review despite a recognition that there is a fundamental right at stake; and (3) qualified immunity.[8]

---

7. *Mead v. Rockford Pub. Sch.*, __ F. Supp. 3d __ (W.D. Mich. 2025); *Mirabelli v. Olson*, 691 F. Supp. 3d 1197 (S.D. Cal. 2023); *Willey v. Sweetwater Cnty. Sch. Dist. No. 1 Bd. of Trs.*, 680 F. Supp. 3d 1250 (D. Wyo. 2023).

8. Courts also dispose of the challenges to SSTPs on the basis of lack of standing or mootness. *See John & Jane Parents 1 v. Montgomery Cnty. Bd. of Educ.*, 78 F.4th 622, 626, 630 (4th Cir. 2023), *cert. denied* 144 S.Ct. 2560 (May 20, 2024); *Parents Protecting Our Children, UA v. Eau Claire Area Sch. Dist.*, 95 F.4th 501, 503 (7th Cir. 2024), *cert. denied* 145 S. Ct. 14, 15 (2025); *Short v. New Jersey Dep't. of Educ.*¸ No. 23-cv-21105-ESK-EAP, 2025 WL 984730 (D.N.J. March 28, 2025); *Doe v. Pine-Richland Sch. Dist.*, No. 2:24-cv-51, 2024 WL 2058437, at *4–5 (W.D. Pa. May 7, 2024). *See also Parents Defending Educ. v. Linn-Mar Cmty. Sch. Dist.*, 629 F. Supp. 3d 891, 907 (N.D. Iowa 2022), *opinion vacated, appeal partially dismissed as moot due to new state law prohibiting such policies*, 83 F.4th 658 (8th Cir. 2023); *cf. Doe v. Delaware Valley Reg'l High Sch.*, No. CV 24-00107 (GC)(JBD) 2024 WL 5006711 (D.N.J. Nov. 27, 2024), *appeal docketed*; *Doe v. Madison Metro. Sch. Dist.*, No. 20-cv-454 (Dane Cnty.), *appeals dismissed* No. 22AP2042, 23AP305, 23 AP306.

A. Shocks the Conscience.

The "shocks the conscience" test is a substantive due process standard used by courts to determine when government conduct violates the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause. Originating from *Rochin v. California*, 342 U.S. 165, 172 (1952), the test asks whether official conduct is so egregious that it "shocks the conscience" of a civilized society. The test is fact-specific, requiring courts to assess whether government action crosses the line from merely unreasonable to fundamentally unfair or barbaric. *See Cnty. of Sacramento v. Lewis,* 523 U.S. 833, 846 (1998). Importantly, the test only applies to "executive acts." *Id.* This is crucial because SSTPs are legislative policies that should not be subject to the "shocks the conscience" test.

Here, however, the lower court found that the policy underlying the SSTPs was executive in nature. *Littlejohn,* 132 F.4th at 1242–43. In stark contrast, the First Circuit held that a similar secrecy policy was legislative because it broadly applied to all students and was administered by multiple government actors including teachers and, therefore, the "shocks the conscience" inquiry was inapt. *Foote v. Ludlow Sch. Comm.*, 128 F.4th 336, 346–47 (1st Cir. 2025). On September 18, 2025, a district court in Michigan ruled on a motion to dismiss, finding that "shocks the conscious" test was inapplicable due to the SSTP policy's legislative nature. *Mead v. Rockford Pub. Sch.*, ___ F. Supp. 3d ___ (W.D. Mich. 2025).

In another case, the Ninth Circuit held that the "shocks the conscience" test was inapposite. *Regino v. Staley*, 133 F.4th 951, 960, n.5 (9th Cir. 2025). The *Regino* court noted that "[b]ecause Regino asserts a violation

of her substantive due process rights solely under a fundamental rights theory, [it did] not address the shocks-the-conscience standard and express[ed] no opinion on its applicability." *Id.* Likewise, the Supreme Court of Wisconsin held that "[t]he shocks-the-conscience test is just one of the avenues to attack egregious government conduct, but there are also still the protections in place for conduct that interferes with fundamental rights." *T.F. v. Kettle Moraine Sch. Dist.*, No. 2021 CV 1650, 2023 WL 6544917 (Wis. Cir. Ct. Oct. 3, 2023).

In *Willey v. Sweetwater Cnty. Sch. Dist. No. 1 Bd. of Trs*, a district court held that school employees using a student's chosen name and pronouns did not meet the high bar of reckless and intentional behavior needed to "shock the conscience," but keeping the secret from the parent and not obtaining consent did. 680 F. Supp. 3d 1250, 1279–80 (D. Wyo. 2023).

In this matter, the lower court that neither keeping parents uninformed about their daughter's gender-nonconforming identity nor disregarding their parenting decisions "shocked the conscience." *Littlejohn*, 132 F.4th at 1245–46.

The concurring opinion by Judge Newsom in *Littlejohn* pointed out that uncertainty exists with both Eleventh Circuit and Supreme Court cases on the applicability of the "shocks the conscience" test where there is a claim of an infringement of a fundamental right. Specifically, Judge Newsom asked whether the "shock the conscience" test applies to *all* substantive due process claims or is it inapposite in cases in which a fundamental right is asserted. *Id.* at 1281–1286 (Newsom, J., concurring). The

concurrence also noted that in all state executive action cases, the government will win "because, as the case law bears out, pretty much *nothing* shocks the conscience. That makes *no* sense. There's certainly no textual warrant for such a radical disjunction in the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendments' Due Process Clauses, both of which address the government generally, not a particular branch." *Id.* at 1286 (emphasis in original).

Judge Tjolflat, in his dissent, opined that actions involving fundamental rights do not require a showing that the activity "shocks the conscience" and requiring such a burden eviscerates parental rights. *Id.* at 1308–09

Legal clarity is needed. If "shocks the conscience" is the standard, parental rights are entirely obliterated.

B. Fundamental Rights.

Courts that reach the merits of the parents' arguments are inconsistent in the review afforded these cases and characterize social transition in disparate ways. Several courts properly apply strict scrutiny where schools have adopted SSTPs, concluding that the policies violate parental rights under the 14th Amendment. Others apply a rational basis review in cases with nearly indistinguishable fact patterns. The decisions mainly hinge upon whether the court views the deceptive policies as "curriculum," passive or active participation, or the facilitation of social transition as a medical or mental health treatment.

By way of example, the court in *Mirabelli v. Olson* held that SSTP policies "harms the child who needs parental guidance and possibly mental health intervention to

determine if the incongruence is organic or whether it is the result of bullying, peer pressure, or a fleeting impulse." 691 F. Supp. 3d 1197, 1222 (S.D. Cal. 2023).

Subsequently, the *Mirabelli* court held that the parents who were not informed of their child's sex-rejecting transition at school, and were routinely lied to when they directly queried about their daughter's identity, "*do* have a constitutional right to be accurately informed by public school teachers about their student's gender incongruity that could progress to gender dysphoria, depression, or suicidal ideation, because it is a matter of health." *Mirabelli*, 761 F. Supp. 3d at 1332 (emphasis in original). *See also, Landerer v. Dover Area School Dist.*, No. 1:24-CV-00566, 2025 WL 492002, at *9–11, 17 (M.D. Pa. Feb. 13, 2025); *Kettle Moraine Sch. Dist.*, 2023 WL 6544917 (finding social transition is a "powerful psychotherapeutic intervention."

Other courts have ruled that parents have no fundamental right to be informed of their child's adoption of a sex-rejecting identity, thus rational basis applies. These courts then find that the SSTPs are tantamount to "curriculum," "administration," or a civility code over which a parent has no expectation of control. *See, e.g.*, *City of Huntington Beach v. Newsom*, __ F. Supp. 3d __, (C.D. Cal. 2025); *Vitsaxaki v. Skaneateles Center Sch. Dist.*, 771 F. Supp. 3d 106, 112 (N.D.N.Y. 2025), *appeal docketed*, No. 25-952 (2d Cir. Apr. 18, 2025); *Vesely v. Illinois Sch. Dist. 45*, 669 F. Supp. 3d 706, 714 (N.D. Ill. 2023), *appeal dismissed*, No. 23-2190, 2023 WL 8809305 (7th Cir. July 14, 2023); *Doe v. Manchester Sch. Dist.*, 342 A.3d 921, 923-24, 926 (2024).

Courts that categorize SSTPs as curriculum stretch the definition beyond reason, apparently to justify concealing children's gender identity struggles from parents and preventing parental guidance on sex immutability.[9] Parents have a right to object to any school action affecting their children's mental and physical well-being, regardless of how the school labels its policy.

Courts also erroneously hold that no fundamental right is at stake because schools merely passively affirm a child's sex-rejecting identification. These courts rule that absent coercion or interference, schools are mere spectators—even when actively deceiving parents. *See, e.g.*, *Foote v. Ludlow Sch. Comm.*, 128 F.4th 336, 353–54 (1st Cir. 2025).[10]

These cases ignore schools' affirmative actions to conceal children's sex-related distress from parents, including: (1) adopting secrecy policies around social transitions; (2) actively deceiving parents by altering how they refer to the child; (3) scrubbing records; (4) providing chest binders or "trans tape" with permanent physical consequences; (5) lying when parents request information; (6) disregarding parents' treatment decisions; (7) instructing staff to maintain secrecy and affirm the

9. Some judges mistakenly believe that children can be born "in the wrong body"—a concept Amici categorically reject.

10. *See also City of Huntington Beach v. Newsom*, __ F. Supp. 3d __, 2025 WL 1720210, at *14-15 (C.D., June 16, 2025)*; Short,* 2025 WL 984730, at *18; *Doe v. Delaware Valley Reg'l High Sch. Bd. of Educ.*, No. CV 24-00107 (GC)(JBD) 2024 WL 5006711, at *12 (D.N.J. Nov. 27, 2024) *appeal docketed*.

sex-rejecting identity; and (8) holding covert counseling sessions that discuss and encourage the identity.[11]

Last, courts mistakenly reason that rational basis review applies because SSTPs do not direct the medical treatment of children.

Whenever a school counselor counsels a child about his/her "gender identity," the school is providing a form of medical treatment. Clear evidence that socially transitioning a child, while perhaps not medical in and of itself, most often results in the medicalization of that child thereafter.[12]

This Court must decide whether schools have a right to actively (or passively) intrude into the parental authority to make life-altering decisions for their children.

C. Qualified Immunity.

Where qualified immunity defense is raised, the court must consider two questions: whether the government official violated a statutory or constitutional right, and if so, whether that right was clearly established at the time of the alleged conduct, where a qualified immunity defense is asserted. *See Ashcroft v. al-Kidd*, 563 U.S. 731, 735 (2011). Courts are inconsistent as to whether the doctrine of qualified immunity is applicable to SSTPs, and

---

11. *See, e.g.*, *Lavigne v. Great Salt Bay Cmty. Sch. Bd.*, 146 F.4th 115, 121 (1st Cir. 2025); *Mead v. Rockford Pub. Sch.*, ___ F. Supp. 3d ___ (W.D. Mich. 2025).

12. *See* Our Duty-USA's Brief Supporting Petitioners at 13–16 in *Foote v. Ludlow Sch. Comm.*, Case No. 25-77.

if it is applicable, whether school officials are shielded by the doctrine when they secretively socially transition a student.

In *Regino v. Staley*, the Ninth Circuit ruled that qualified immunity is not an appropriate defense in matters in which a fundamental right is asserted. 133 F.4th 951, 962 (9th Cir. 2025). Whereas, other courts have applied the qualified immunity framework of *Monell v. Dep't of Soc. Servs. of City of N.Y.*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978). *See Lee v. Poudre Sch. Dist. R-1*, *cert. petition docketed* No. 25-89 (July 23, 2025); *Lavigne v. Great Salt Cmty. Sch. Bd.*, No. 2:23-cv-00158-JDL, 2024 WL 1975596 (D. Me. May. 3, 2024), *aff'd* No. 24-1509, 2025 WL 2103993 (1st Cir. July 28, 2025); *Blair v. Appomattox Cnty. Sch. Bd.*, 147 F.4th 484 (4th Cir. 2025). These courts dismissed these parents' claims before any discovery could be conducted, making it nearly impossible to prove the necessary elements to overcome a qualified immunity defense. *See, e.g.*, *Sabir v. Williams*, 52 F.4th 51, 64 (2d Cir. 2022) (stating a qualified immunity defense "faces a formidable hurdle . . . and is usually not successful" and "as a general rule, the defense of qualified immunity cannot support the grant of a [Rule] 12(b)(6) motion")(internal quotation marks omitted).

This Court's guidance is urgently needed to determine whether schools can claim immunity while violating parental rights.

III. Amici's Stories Illustrate the Danger of Schools Engaging in the Social Transition of Children Without Parental Involvement.

The pattern of schools' active indoctrination, participation and deception in promoting the adoption of

"transgender identities" is evident, as is the destructive effect social transition has on a child's acceptance of his sex and his long-term well-being.

A. Stella O'Malley, Founder of Genspect

As a psychotherapist, Stella has facilitated hundreds of online support meetings for parents of trans-identified children, estimating she has spoken with at least 1,000 such parents. Her clinical work repeatedly demonstrates the powerful impact of social transition on a young person's identity development. For some children, adopting a new name and pronouns at school transforms what might have been a temporary phase into a fixed identity. This is particularly true for children with neurodevelopmental conditions such as autism spectrum disorder or ADHD, who are often more literal-minded and prone to fixation. The impact of an authority figure affirming that the child *is* the opposite sex is remarkable, especially when the child is lauded for bravery and "authenticity."

Parents often report that once a school official affirms their child's sex-rejecting identity, the child becomes more entrenched, resistant to exploratory therapy, and hostile toward family. The psychological investment is enormous once trusted adults like teachers affirm the identity, making reversal embarrassing and difficult for the child.

When a school participates in secret social transition, it sidelines parents and creates destructive triangulation among child, parents, and school, pitting the child against parents. A child's distress cannot be understood in isolation, as the family plays a crucial role. Excluding parents harms the child.

Social transition is not neutral but is a psychological treatment and precursor to medicalization that individuals often later regret. Stella has facilitated meetings for detransitioners for five years, interacting with more than 400 individuals who profoundly regret their irreversible medical treatments. Unsurprisingly, their initial mental health problems were not resolved through sex-rejecting interventions but were compounded by them. Detransitioners typically ask why everyone affirmed their "transgender" announcements without exploring *why* they were rejecting their sex.

B. Erin Friday, California—President of Our Duty and Director of Genspect

Erin's daughter, P., was eleven when, following sex-ed class, she and her entire friend group each chose a new identity. P. shifted from pansexual to lesbian, finally landing on transgender at thirteen. Her friends' identities likewise morphed.

During P.'s online freshman year, Erin overheard teachers using a male name and pronouns. When Erin called the school, an official said the school was a "safe space" and would continue using male monikers, while indicating Erin was "unsafe" by calling Child Protective Services ("CPS"). Erin removed P. from school and requested records pursuant to FERPA[13] to test whether the school would produce the SSTP; it didn't.

After getting needed support, P. ceased rejecting her sex and now accepts her body as an adult.

---

13. 20 U.S.C. §1232g.

Erin has contacted hundreds of parents whose children suddenly adopt sex-rejecting identities and who battle schools to stop social transitions. Many parents fear objecting or even asking if their child is being transitioned, due to CPS risk. Parents report school counselors are convincing students they are transgender and that schools relentlessly push transgenderism in every classroom.

Erin advises parents to unenroll from public schools if possible and homeschool. She suggests families move to conservative states, though SSTPs are nearly ubiquitous. Teachers and school board members who disapprove of indoctrinating students and deceiving parents also contact Erin seeking advice on combating SSTPs and state education guidance directing them to hide students' "gender" struggles from parents.

Erin's experience with nearly 500 parents shows they never reject confused children. Rather, children run away, with some schools, LGBTQ centers, and laws encouraging them to seek "chosen families." *See, e.g.,* Cal. Family Code §3427; Wash. Rev. Code §13.32A.082; *Blair*, 147 F.4th at 484.

C. Our Duty Member's Stories[14]

a. Ida Comerford, New York

Ida is a prominent attorney in upstate New York. In 2023, her then fifteen-year-old daughter, M., announced

14. Some pseudonyms are used to protect families from the animus often directed at those who resist the push to pursue a "gender transition."

she was "transgender" and requested he/him pronouns and a male name. She also requested a breast binder and announced she would have a double mastectomy at 18. Her identity crisis coincided with Covid-19 lockdowns during which she spent excessive time on TikTok. With her sex-rejecting identity came a negative, angry, and secretive demeanor.

Concurrently, most of M.'s friend group also claimed sex-rejecting identities. Ida sought help from M.'s school, including the guidance counselor and assistant principal, with the goal of taking a "slow, critical thinking approach" to M.'s sudden pronouncement. However, the counselor objected, stating a slow approach contradicted her training, and advised the parents immediately change their daughter's name and sex on school documents. The assistant principal stated he was obligated to change M.'s name upon request and would withhold information about M.'s "gender identity" from her parents, because of the New York State Department of Education guidance on social transition.[15]

Ida realized the school was steeping children in pro-trans ideology—displaying a large poster titled "How to Be a Better Ally," touting the importance of using "correct" pronouns, and supporting incoherent terms including gender fluid, transgender, nonbinary,

---

15. N.Y. State Educ. Dep't & Univ. of the State of N.Y., *Creating a Safe, Supportive, and Affirming School Environment for Transgender and Gender Expansive Students: 2023 Legal Update and Best Practices*, https://www.nysed.gov/sites/default/files/programs/student-support-services/creating-a-safe-supportive-and-affirming-school-environment-for-transgender-and-gender-expansive-students.pdf (last accessed Oct. 3, 2025).

and demigirl/demiboy. Ida's son also informed her that a female student claiming to be a boy was changing with him in the boys' locker room.

Ida removed M. from public school, eventually moving to another city at great cost and disruption so M. could attend a non-indoctrinating school.

Two years later, M. has completely abandoned the notion of being "trans," returned to a typical female appearance, and is thriving.

b. Lydia McLaughlin, California

Lydia is mixed-race. After her daughter T. adopted a "transgender" identity, T., who had no prior body discomfort, started self-harming. T.'s public high school solidified her sex-rejecting identity with lessons about "transgenderism" while repeatedly using T.'s desired male name and pronouns. By happenstance, Lydia discovered the school was socially transitioning T.

Lydia demanded teachers stop referring to her daughter as male. The teachers assured her they would, but lied. Afterwards, the principal told T. that her transgender identity would be their secret, colluding against Lydia. Lydia made a FERPA request, but the school refused to provide T's records.

As T. fell deeper into the identity, she wore a breast binder and developed an explosive temper. T. accused her parents of abuse and developed an eating disorder.

Despite T.'s vitriol, Lydia refused to affirm her, knowing the danger of surrendering to her daughter's maladaptive identity. T., now a college student, has completely dropped her trans identity.

c. Jill Doe, Washington/Florida

At age 11, Jill's daughter L. adopted a trans identity, then abandoned it by 13. Once again influenced by peers and school instruction, L. re-adopted a transgender identity at 15. The public school secretly participated in L.'s social transition. Teachers and administrators—adults with enormous influence over L.—affirmed L.'s delusion that she was born wrong.

Concurrently, a local teen center, The Garage, encouraged L. to emancipate or enter the runaway/foster care system and move into a host home to transition without parental interference. This center provides "burner" phones to help minors run away. L.'s peer from the center called police on Jill, falsely claiming abuse. After police visited their home, Jill and her husband packed their belongings and drove from Washington State to Florida. Away from Washington peer influences and the "affirming" public school, L. is slowly returning to accepting her sex.

d. Sue Y., California

When Sue Y.'s daughter G. turned 12, her demeanor changed. G. dressed in dark, oversized clothes, became agitated, and suicidal. Amidst these changes, G. announced she was transgender.

Sue promptly took G. to a Kaiser gender clinic. Outside her mother"s presence, a clinician told G. about hormonal treatments and surgeries "to make her authentic." The clinic then told Sue she had to choose between "a dead daughter or a live son." Terrified, Sue followed the clinic's advice and placed G. on puberty blockers. Sue directed G.'s school to cooperate with the social transition, which it did.

Sue committed to G.'s transition for years, but G.'s mental health deteriorated. G. was self-harming, suicidal, borderline anorexic, and in and out of psychiatric hospitals.

After an out-of-state psychiatrist advised that G.'s distress stemmed from mental illness, Sue stopped the blockers and stopped affirming the male identity. The school counselor was furious when Sue instructed her to stop referring to G. as a boy and called CPS, asserting that raising G. as her sex was abuse. Sue removed G. from public school. G. is now a well-adjusted adult woman who embraces her female sex.

e. Jessica E., California/Arizona

At age 13, Jessica E.'s daughter M. was subjected to California's mandated sex education curriculum, exposing her to a wide range of sexual and so-called gender identities. Following class, her friends each selected labels. M. chose "bisexual" and shortly thereafter began cutting herself. The next year, because M. dressed in Anime clothes—skirts, cat ears, chokers, and high socks, sometimes a sign of identity crisis—the school counselor invited her to meet trans-identifying older students. Through these meetings and private counseling without parental consent, M.'s identity shifted to "transgender."

M. informed her mother about her new identity and her mental health plummeted. Jessica discovered M. had been obsessively consuming "transgender" content on social media while being affirmed in her newly adopted identity by the school without parental consent.

Jessica took her phone and unenrolled her from school. The school counselor, however, refused to cease indoctrinating M. and even tried contacting M. through her brother. Jessica then unenrolled her son and moved to Arizona. M., now a high school graduate, shed her "transgender" identity and her mental health improved. She is both angry and embarrassed that she rejected biological reality as she embarks on a career as a firefighter.

f. Lisa Mullins, California

Lisa's daughter M. struggled in middle school as she gained significant weight due to a medical condition. M. was artsy and disliked sports, pushing her out of the "cool" group. When she started high school during Covid-19 lockdowns, she lost all peer interactions.

M. turned to the internet, falling into the transgender world, consuming Anime with transgender themes, YouTube, and TikTok. She changed markedly, wearing cartoon-like makeup, shaving her eyebrows, and changing her bedroom décor to witchcraft imagery. She also started cutting. Worried, Lisa listened to online classes and became alarmed by overt sexual themes with no educational value. She heard the teacher asking whether M. would be comfortable masturbating in a room with another person or engaging in anal sex. Lisa also heard classes espousing transgenderism.

M. began decompensating and cut herself so deeply it required an emergency room visit. A psychiatrist diagnosed M. with depression and anxiety and prescribed medication.

Lisa then discovered M. had changed her name and pronouns at school, using "they/them" and flipping her name regularly between male and female. The school adopted every change without question as M. circulated through myriad sex-rejecting identities.

Lisa met with school officials demanding they stop treating M. as a boy. The school refused, informing Lisa that M. controlled her name and pronouns. But when M. asked teachers to use her real name, they still used M.'s "trans" names, as did the school counselor. Lisa believes the school's goal was exerting power over "bigots and transphobes" like her.

Lisa toured the school, photographing how the Wellness Center enticed students with an "Explore Me" box filled with "trans" tape for binding breasts or penises or creating a fake penis "bulge." They also provided free breast binders. (*See* photograph.)

In college, M. shed her transgender identities, her mental health issues subsided, and her feminine appearance returned.

g. Brette Smith, Illinois

Brette's then-14-year-old daughter Anna struggled during the pandemic. To escape the loneliness of lockdowns she found community in online chat groups and social media, where she quickly discovered transgender identities. She then adopted a sex-rejecting identity, which her public high school affirmed. Anna's entire social group was also trans-identified or non-binary. Having been coached by her teachers to believe that her non-affirming mother was trans-phobic and that teens whose parents will not affirm them often commit suicide, Anna attempted suicide. Thankfully, Anna survived.

Anna's care team determined that her trans identity was due to her depression and autistic traits. When Anna abandoned her transgender identity, Anna's peer group rejected and ruthlessly ridiculed her, and she received death threats.

h. Wendell Perez, Florida[16]

When Wendell's daughter, A., was twelve, Wendell learned that she had attempted suicide for the second time that school year. The school ***had not told him*** about A.'s first attempt. Secretly, A. met with a school counselor weekly for months, who influenced her to socially transition

16. *See*, *Perez v. Broskie*, No. 3:22-cv-83 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 30, 2022)(stayed pending the outcome of this matter).

and instructed A.'s teachers to use her chosen male name in class but not tell the parents.

A. thought that male hormones would protect her from boys. The "cool" LGBTQ posters and materials in the counselor's office had also convinced her that her interest in sports and video games indicated that she was a boy trapped in a girl's body.

A.'s parents removed her from school, and she re-identified with her sex but not without continuing mental health issues.

i. Gabrielle Clark, Nevada/Texas

Gaby Clark noticed that her then 12-year-old daughter J. suddenly became obsessed with TikTok. Gaby discovered J. and her three friends, the only black students in their public school, had simultaneously adopted transgender identities after learning about gender identities from a teacher. Already feeling "othered," J. adopted the identity to distinguish herself and obtain accolades from her teachers. J. demanded that Gaby schedule her for a double mastectomy. J.'s mental health plummeted, as evidenced by a variety of self-harm.

Gaby instructed the school to stop treating J. as a boy; it refused. Gaby removed all social media and moved to Texas with her family. J. returned to being comfortable in her sexed body.

These stories expose schools' systematic invasion of parents' fundamental rights to raise their children as their sex, and the deliberate efforts schools make to deceive parents while championing sex-rejecting identities.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should grant the Petition.

Respectfully submitted,

C. Erin Friday
Romy Mancini
Our Duty–USA
P.O. Box 442
San Carlos, CA 94070

Gina M. D'Andrea
Counsel of Record
Leigh Ann O'Neill
America First Policy Institute
1455 Pennsylvania Avenue NW,
Suite 225
Washington, DC 20005
(516) 993-3154
gdandrea@americafirstpolicy.com

Counsel for Amici Curiae