



Consvoy McCarthy PLLC

1600 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 700  
Arlington, VA 22209  
703.243.9423  
www.consovoymccarthy.com

March 3, 2026

Scott S. Harris  
Clerk of the Court  
Supreme Court of the United States  
One First Street NE  
Washington, D.C. 20543

Re: *January Littlejohn, et vir, v. School Board of Leon County, Florida, et al.*, No. 25-259

Dear Mr. Harris:

I represent Petitioners, January Littlejohn and Jeffrey Littlejohn, in this case. Yesterday, the Court decided *Mirabelli v. Bonta*, holding that parental-exclusion policies “likely violate parents’ rights to direct the upbringing and education of their children.” 2026 WL 575049, at \*3 (U.S. Mar. 2). Petitioners write to express their view on how *Mirabelli* affects their petition, which challenges the same kind of policy on the same ground and is currently scheduled for Friday’s conference.

After *Mirabelli*, this Court should at least GVR the decision below. Like the parents in *Mirabelli*, the Littlejohns challenged a public school’s parental-exclusion policy as a violation of their fundamental parental rights. But while this Court held that these policies “likely” violate due process, the Eleventh Circuit held that the Littlejohns’ complaint failed to even state a claim—a *lower* threshold than “likely.”

The Eleventh Circuit’s distinction between “executive” and “legislative” deprivations of fundamental rights should not deter a GVR. Many of the same considerations that led the Eleventh Circuit to treat this conduct as “executive” were also present in *Mirabelli*, including post-complaint changes to the challenged policy and parents whose children actually had the policy applied to them. *Compare* 2026 WL 575049, at \*1, *with* Pet.App.18-20a. The three-Justice concurrence also supports the Littlejohns’ contention that, when it comes to fundamental rights, *Glucksberg* is the “test” that limits substantive due process; plaintiffs need not also satisfy an impossible shocks-the-conscience overlay. *Compare* 2026 WL 575049, at \*3, *with* Pet.22-23. In all events, the Eleventh Circuit is best positioned to consider the effect or non-effect of *Mirabelli* on its own decision, after a GVR.

With or without a GVR, this petition remains worthy of certiorari. As the Littlejohns explain, the shocks-the-conscience test has bedeviled and split the circuits. That question is cleanly presented and dispositive here, especially if this Court does not GVR after *Mirabelli*. Many parents cannot benefit from *Mirabelli* unless this Court removes the artificial barrier of the shocks-the-conscience test.

Sincerely,

/s/ Cameron T. Norris  
CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC  
cam@consovoymccarthy.com

*Counsel for Petitioners*

cc: All counsel of record