No. 25-840

In the Supreme Court of the United States

INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS FOR ETHICAL CARE, INC., et al.,
Petitioners,

v.

BOB FERGUSON,
Governor of Washington, et al.,
Respondents.

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

BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* DEFENDING EDUCATION IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS

J. Michael Connolly
Counsel of Record
Paul R. Draper
CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC
1600 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 700
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 243-9423
mike@consovoymccarthy.com

February 17, 2026 *Attorneys for Amicus Curiae*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Cases

Statutes

Other Authorities

INTEREST OF *AMICUS CURIAE*[*]

Defending Education is a national, nonprofit, grassroots association. Its members include many parents with school-aged children. DE uses advocacy, disclosure, and litigation to combat the increasing politicization and indoctrination of America's youth.

The bond between parent and child is "the most universal relation in nature." 1 Blackstone's Commentaries 446 (10th ed. 1787). Accordingly, the common law "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). In turn, as parents are bound to care for their children and guarantee their well-being, "the law has given them a right to such authority." 2 James Kent, *Commentaries on American Law* 203 (12th ed. 1873). And the Constitution enshrines that right in the Fourteenth Amendment. Indeed, "the interest of parents in the care, custody, and control of their children" is "perhaps the oldest of the fundamental liberty interests recognized by this Court." *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57, 65 (2000).

DE exists to defend that right. It has a significant interest in thwarting policies (like Washington's) that take responsibility for critical decisions about a child's mental and physical well-being away from parents and give it to state bureaucrats. The Ninth Circuit's

---

[*] Per Rule 37.2, *Amicus Curiae* gave sufficient notice of its intention to file this brief to counsel for all parties. No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no person other than *Amicus Curiae*, its members, or its counsel made a monetary contribution to its preparation or submission.

decision, however, will prevent parents, including DE's members, from vindicating their fundamental rights in court.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Washington's new laws encourage gender-confused children to run away from home to seek so-called "gender-affirming treatment." Wash. Rev. Code §13.32A.082(2)(d). When children *do* run away from home, the State promises that it will hide them from their parents and refer them for controversial medical care designed to confirm their non-biological gender identities. *Id.* §13.32A.082(1)(b)(i), (2)(c)(ii), (d). In other words, Washington has sent a message to parents who hold traditional views on sex and gender and want to raise their children consistent with that belief: Be quiet, or we will hide your child from you.

Though Washington's parental exclusion laws are shocking, the State is—sadly—not alone. According to Defending Education's research, thousands of school districts and many states have adopted policies that empower government bureaucrats to transition students from one gender to another. Worse, they do so secretly and often in direct contravention of parents' wishes, bucking the historical consensus that parents are in the best position to make such decisions.

Parental exclusion policies cause serious harm to parents and children alike. *See Lee v. Poudre Sch. Dist. R-1*, 2025 WL 2906469, at *1 (U.S. Oct. 14, 2025) (Alito, J., statement) (the practice of transitioning children without parental consent is "troubling" and

"tragic"). Parents know their children better than anyone, but when they are isolated from their children, they can't provide critical emotional support or secure the medical care they believe is most appropriate. Instead, jurisdictions like Washington ignore parents' wishes and push children onto a conveyer belt of increasingly invasive "gender-affirming treatments" with significant and irreversible consequences.

Washington's policies plainly violate the Constitution. Parents, not the State, have the right to "make decisions concerning" their children's upbringing and care. *Troxel*, 530 U.S. at 66. Laws that conceal critical information about a child's condition, deny parents input on the child's medical care, and delay the return of runaway children make it impossible for parents to effectively exercise that right.

But according to the Ninth Circuit, Petitioners have no standing to challenge Washington's laws because it is not certain that the State will *actually* hide their children and *actually* give them "gender-affirming treatment" without their parents' permission. *See* Pet.App.14a-25a.

That's wrong. Washington's new parental exclusion scheme, which strips parental rights from parents who are insufficiently "gender-affirming," compels Petitioners and other like-minded parents to alter their parenting practices. That is a *current* injury. And Petitioners face a substantial risk of *future* injury in the event any of their children run away from home and fall prey to Washington's laws. Petitioners need not wait until the State has taken their children from

them before they are allowed to sue. This Court should grant the petition.

ARGUMENT

I. More and more jurisdictions are transitioning children without parental consent.

Unfortunately, Washington is not the first jurisdiction to adopt parental exclusion policies. Jurisdictions across the country, at all levels of government, are adopting policies that empower government bureaucrats to secretly transition children from one gender to another without informing parents. And those policies have drawn dozens of lawsuits from families who want to protect their children and vindicate their constitutional rights. No one can doubt that, as members of this Court have said, this is an issue of "great and growing national importance." *Parents Protecting Our Children, UA v. Eau Claire Area Sch. Dist.*, 145 S. Ct. 14, 14 (2024) (Alito, J., dissenting from the denial of certiorari); *see also Lee*, 2025 WL 2906469 at *1 (Alito, J., statement) (same).

A. Defending Education is at the front of this issue, tracking the proliferation of parental exclusion policies across the United States. Such policies are especially (and concerningly) common in public schools. At last count, more than 12,000,000 American students, in more than 21,000 schools across more than 1,200 districts, were subject to policies that allow school employees to facilitate a child's gender transition without notifying parents. *See List of School District Transgender – Gender Nonconforming Student Policies*, DE (updated Apr. 21, 2025), bit.ly/4lxd9gL. To put those figures in context, that means that a

quarter of American students live in districts where they can be transitioned without their parents ever knowing. See *Fast Facts*, Nat'l Ctr. for Educ. Statistics (archived Feb. 13, 2026), perma.cc/K2M7-8GLB. And that number is on the rise. *See Eau Claire*, 145 S. Ct. at 14 (noting that, just one year ago, only "1,000 districts" had such policies).

Though government policies designed to transition children behind their parents' back often arise in the context of schools, *see* Pet.22, the problem does not stop there. Many states have adopted parental exclusion laws as well. A number of states, for example, have "refugee" laws that override the jurisdiction of other states' family courts when children travel to the state for so-called gender-affirming care—effectively stripping parents who reside in another state of their parental rights. *See* Ferguson et al., *Minnesota to join at least 4 other states in protecting transgender care this year*, NPR (Apr. 23, 2023), perma.cc/S7JP-SVRN; *Transgender Healthcare "Shield" Laws*, Movement Advancement Project (archived Feb. 13, 2026), perma.cc/Z5RU-NXTP; *Shield Laws for Reproductive and Gender-Affirming Health Care: A State Law Guide*, UCLA Sch. of Law Williams Inst. (archived Feb. 13, 2026), perma.cc/ZQU8-8E4E. These laws "pit children against their parents" and effectively "encourage abduction of children" across state lines. Sharp, *California Thinks It Can Raise Your Kids Better Than You Can*, Alliance Defending Freedom (June 7, 2024), bit.ly/4bUm2zQ.

Washington has decided to follow the same unfortunate path. But instead of "shielding" children who

arrive from other states, Washington's laws affirmatively encourage children *in* the State to run away from their parents and seek out potentially dangerous medical procedures without their parents' consent (but with State approval). *See* Pet.30.

That more and more jurisdictions are separating children from their parents and transitioning them against the parents' wishes is especially troubling given the simultaneous rise in the number of American children who experience gender dysphoria. *See Gender Dysphoria Statistics In The United States*, Bright Path Behavioral Health (updated Apr. 7, 2025), perma.cc/542H-YFD8 (noting a "nearly threefold increase in diagnoses of gender dysphoria among children and adolescents in the U.S." from "2017 to 2021"). When increasing numbers of children experience confusion about their gender, and jurisdictions increasingly hide that fact from parents, that is a recipe for a mental health crisis.

This explosion in parental exclusion policies has been driven by groups that encourage jurisdictions to facilitate youth gender transitions without parental knowledge or consent. One advocacy guide, for example, instructs schools to "educate" and, if necessary, work around "unsupportive parents" who would prefer to affirm their child's biological sex. *Schools in Transition: A Guide for Supporting Transgender Students in K-12 Schools*, NEA et al., at 2, 32 (archived Aug. 17, 2025), perma.cc/JX43-R8ZN. The guide warns schools to "have a plan in place to avoid" notifying parents about a child's gender identity issues

and encourages school officials to testify in child custody proceedings against "biase[d]" parents. *Id.* at 16, 34. These groups have likewise promoted the adoption of state laws—like Washington's—that strip parents of the authority to direct their child's healthcare. *E.g.*, Sciacca, *A Proposed Law Would Give Trans Youth Refuge in California*, The Imprint (Aug. 22, 2022), bit.ly/4tyncHC.

B. Parental exclusion policies like Washington's harm parents and children alike. They authorize government officials to make significant choices about a child's mental and physical health—including, in Washington's case, whether the child may seek out particular medical treatments, *see* Pet.6-11; Wash. Rev. Code §13.32A.082(2)(d), (3)(b)(i)—without involving or even notifying the child's parents. In other words, they outsource decisionmaking authority from the people who care most about the child to faceless state functionaries.

By hiding critical information about a child's well-being from parents—or even hiding information about a child's whereabouts, as Washington's laws do—parental exclusion policies prevent parents from helping their children. "Parents across many political beliefs" agree that "they can't be supportive if no one tells them that their child" is suffering from "gender identity" issues. St. George, *Gender Transitions at School Spur Debates Over When, Or If, Parents Are Told*, Wash. Post (July 18, 2022), perma.cc/BVZ5-T3PK. According to experts, including those who support so-called gender-affirming care, "leaving parents in the

dark is not the answer." *Id.* "'If there are issues between parents and children, they need to be addressed.'" *Id.* Using them to instead drive a wedge between parents and children "'only postpones … and aggravates any conflict that may exist." *Id.*

Parents are usually the ones *best* positioned to make decisions about their child's care. They "'are often the only people who have frequently and regularly interacted with a child or adolescent throughout'" his or her life and therefore have a full "'view of the child's development over time.'" *Mirabelli v. Olson*, 691 F. Supp. 3d 1197, 1208 (S.D. Cal. 2023). They know better than anyone "'how long the child or adolescent has been experiencing gender incongruence,'" "'whether there might be any external cause of those feelings,'" and "'how likely those feelings are to persist.'" *Id.* "'[T]o place [youth shelters and state bureaucrats] in the position of accepting without question'" a minor's gender preference and then "'direct[ing]'" them "'to withhold'" information about the minor's whereabouts and health status from parents "'is hugely problematic.'" *Id.*

"Transitioning" a child's gender can also have significant (and negative) consequences for their mental and physical health. The best available evidence suggests there is no mental health benefit associated with transitioning. *E.g.*, James Morandini et al., *Is Social Gender Transition Associated with Mental Health Status in Children and Adolescents with Gender Dysphoria?*, 52 Archives of Sexual Behavior 1045, 1045 (2023), perma.cc/ 6EKW-26V8. And the vast majority of children "with gender dysphoria grow out of it."

Eknes-Tucker v. Governor of Alabama, 114 F.4th 1241, 1268 (11th Cir. 2024) (Lagoa, J., concurring). But when a child transitions, even just socially, they are very likely to continue "to identify as transgender" years later. *Independent Review of Gender Identity Services for Children and Young People*, The Cass Review, at 162 (Apr. 2024), perma.cc/74EA-L76V. Transitioning, in other words, has a profound and often irrevocable impact on a child's psyche and self-perception.

And when children receive "invasive" physical treatment to affirm their non-biological gender identity—like puberty blockers, cross-sex hormones, or medically controversial genital surgeries—the consequences are even worse. *See* deMayo et al., *Stability and Change in Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation Across Childhood and Adolescence*, 90 Monographs Soc'y for Research in Child Dev. 7, 39-40 (2025), bit.ly/45kQTC2 (explaining that children who are socially transitioned are likely to seek out medical procedures next). These "treatments" can have lasting harmful effects, including loss of bone density, impaired brain development, increased cardiovascular risk, altered vocal chords, and loss of fertility. *See United States v. Skrmetti*, 605 U.S. 495, 532-36 (2025) (Thomas, J., concurring). But Washington's new laws empower State officials to facilitate such treatment for runaway children in direct contravention of their parents' wishes. *See* Pet.6-11; Wash. Rev. Code §13.32A.082(3)(b)(i).

Of course, none of this does anything to inspire trust in public authorities. The possibility that one's

child may run away from home is frightening enough. But Washington's laws (like laws in other states that "shield" children from "non-affirming" parents) tell parents that, if their child *does* leave the home, they will not be allowed to know where the child is or decide what kind of medical care they should receive. Parents who hear that message are rightfully worried. After all, the overwhelming majority of Americans agree that parents, not government bureaucrats, should make decisions about their children's well-being. *Survey: Voters Overwhelmingly Support Parents' Rights*, Parental Rights Foundation (May 31, 2022), perma.cc/G6J2-3M8S. But government officials like those in Washington think they know better.

II. Washington's laws violate the Constitution.

Parental exclusion policies don't just harm children and their families. They also violate parents' constitutional rights. The Constitution recognizes that the authority to make decisions about a child's physical and mental well-being rests with the child's parents, not with the government. *Troxel*, 530 U.S. at 65. But parental exclusion policies like Washington's flout those well-established rights by keeping parents in the dark and excluding them from decisionmaking whenever a child's "gender identity" is involved.

The Constitution, through the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause, "guarantees more than fair process." *Washington v. Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. 702, 719 (1997). It also protects certain "fundamental," even if unenumerated, "rights and liberty interests." *Id.* at 720. To qualify for such protection, a

right must be "objectively, deeply rooted in this Nation's history and tradition.'" *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Org.*, 597 U.S. 215, 239 (2022).

This Court has often been "'reluctant' to recognize rights that are not mentioned in the Constitution." *Id.* But one right that it has never been reluctant to acknowledge is the "fundamental right of parents to make decisions concerning the care, custody, and control of their children." *Troxel*, 530 U.S. at 66. In fact, the parental right "is perhaps the oldest of the fundamental liberty interests recognized by this Court," *id.* at 65, with deep roots in the common law and the Western legal tradition. *E.g.*, *Parham*, 442 U.S. at 602 ("Our jurisprudence historically has reflected Western civilization concepts of the family as a unit with broad parental authority over minor children."); Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* II-II, q.10, a.12, bit.ly/471Azr2 ("[I]t would be contrary to natural justice" if anything were "done to [a child] against its parents' wish."); John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, Ch.VI, §71, bit.ly/4oJsH3N ("[P]arents in societies … retain a power over their children.").

Equally clear is that a parent's rights include the right to make decisions about their child's "need for medical care and treatment." *Parham*, 442 U.S. at 603. That makes sense. "Parents can and must make those judgments" because "[m]ost children, even in adolescence, simply are not able to make sound judgments concerning" their medical condition. *Id.*; *Schall v. Martin*, 467 U.S. 253, 265 (1984) ("Children, by definition, are not assumed to have the capacity to take care of themselves.").

The right of parental control is particularly strong in circumstances involving "fundamental values," such as "religious beliefs." *Arnold v. Bd. of Educ. of Escambia Cnty.*, 880 F.2d 305, 312 (11th Cir. 1989). (Which makes the constitutional injuries particularly salient in this case, where the families allege violations not only of their parental rights under the Fourteenth Amendment, but also of their free exercise rights under the First Amendment. *See* Pet.App.115a-21a.) Parents' rights "presumptively includ[e] counseling [their children] on important decisions." *H.L. v. Matheson*, 450 U.S. 398, 410 (1981). In such circumstances, parents are presumed to be fit to make decisions for their children absent strong evidence to the contrary. *Troxel*, 530 U.S. at 68-69.

The decision whether to affirm a child's biological sex or non-biological gender identity, and seek medical care consistent with that decision, strikes at the core of this parental authority. A child's gender identity implicates the most fundamental issues about the child, including the child's religion, medical care, mental health, sense of self, and more. But Washington's laws interfere with parents' ability to make those decisions in several ways. *See* Pet.6-16.

To start, the laws deprive Washington parents of critical information about their children's whereabouts, condition, and plans. In most situations, parents are promptly notified when a runaway child arrives at a youth shelter. Wash. Rev. Code §13.32A.082(1)(b)(i). They are given the child's location, "a description of the youth's physical and emotional condition, and the circumstances surrounding

the youth's contact with the shelter." *Id.* But if the child claims to be seeking "gender-affirming treatment," then parents get *none* of that information and the shelter "must instead notify the" Department of Children, Youth and Family Services. *Id.* §13.32A.082(1)(b)(i), (2)(c)(ii), (d); *see also* Pet.11-14. Concealing this information is itself a violation of parental rights: it is impossible for parents to direct the "care, custody, and control of their children" when the government deliberately withholds critical information from them. *Troxel*, 530 U.S. at 65.

Worse, even if parents somehow learn about their child's location or condition, Washington's laws take away *any* input or control that those parents have regarding their child's "gender identity." Without seeking parental input or consent—indeed, even if a child's parents specifically and explicitly disagree—the State can "make referrals on behalf of the minor for appropriate behavioral health services," Wash. Rev. Code §13.32A.082(3)(b)(i), which "can include 'gender-affirming' treatment," Pet.App.53a (Tung, J., dissenting). Parents, in other words, are directly prohibited from exercising their "righ[t] … to make important medical decisions for their children," and the children are deprived of the right "to have those decisions made by their parents rather than the state." *Wallis v. Spencer*, 202 F.3d 1126, 1136, 1141 (9th Cir. 2000).

Finally, Washington's laws significantly delay a child's reunification with his or her parents. In fact, there is *no* statutory deadline for reunification. The State need only, at a time seemingly of its own choosing, "[o]ffer services designed to resolve the conflict

and accomplish a reunification of the family." Wash. Rev. Code §13.32A.082(3)(b)(ii). Again, it is impossible for a parent to exercise their constitutionally protected rights when they are not allowed contact with their child. *Cf. Kottmyer v. Maas*, 436 F.3d 684, 691 (6th Cir. 2006) ("A parent is necessarily deprived of his or her right to custody and control of their child, either permanently or temporarily, when a child is removed from the home.").

Federal courts have recognized violations of parents' constitutional rights in far less shocking circumstances. For example, violations occurred when state social workers failed to notify parents of, and give them the opportunity to attend, their child's medical examination that included a genital inspection, *Benavidez v. San Diego*, 993 F.3d 1134, 1150 (9th Cir. 2021), and when school counselors persuaded a minor to disclose a reproductive health condition and then "with[e]ld information of this nature from the parents," *Gruenke v. Seip*, 225 F.3d 290, 306-07 (3d Cir. 2000). More recently, the Fifth Circuit held that government programs that provide contraceptives to minors without parental involvement violated the "parental righ[t] to notice and consent." *Deanda v. Becerra*, 96 F.4th 750, 754-55, 759 (5th Cir. 2024); *see also* Pet.28-29 (explaining why the Fifth Circuit's decision in *Deanda* cannot be reconciled with the Ninth Circuit's decision here).

In short, Washington and other jurisdictions with parental exclusion policies "not only fai[l] to presume" that parents will "act in the best interest of their children, [they] assum[e] the exact opposite." *Doe v. Heck*,

327 F.3d 492, 521 (7th Cir. 2003). In doing so, they threaten the very harm that the Fourteenth Amendment's guarantee of parental rights is meant to avoid: "Pitting the parents and child" against each other "as adversaries." *Parham*, 442 U.S. at 610.

III. The Ninth Circuit's decision frustrates parents' ability to vindicate their constitutional rights.

The Constitution recognizes that the authority to make significant decisions about a child's physical and mental well-being—including on issues of gender identity—rests with the child's parents, not with the government. *Troxel*, 530 U.S. at 65. Federal courts have accordingly held that parents like Petitioners have standing to challenge policies that strip them of that authority. *See, e.g.*, *Deanda*, 96 F.4th at 755-60. But the panel's decision here denies Petitioners similar recourse to vindicate their constitutional rights. This Court should step in to remedy that error.

Petitioners have standing for at least two reasons: (1) they are *currently* being injured because Washington's laws compel them to alter their parenting practices, and (2) they face a substantial risk of *future* injury were their children to run away and be subjected to the State's parental exclusion policy. *See* Pet.23-31 Both of these injuries are rooted in Washington's statutorily embodied promise that, if runaway children express a desire for "gender-affirming treatment," the State will conceal the child's location and indefinitely delay reunification with the child's parents. In other words, "[t]he parents' fear that [the State] might make decisions for their children without their knowledge

and consent is not 'speculative.' They are merely taking the [State] at its word." *Eau Claire*, 145 S. Ct. at 14.

The Ninth Circuit's contrary rationales fall flat. The panel rejected Petitioners' claims of future injury because that injury (being compelled to alter their parenting practices) was supposedly "inflicted by their own hand." Pet.App.14a-19a. Not so. "It is undisputed that" the Constitution affords Petitioners the "right" to direct and "consent to [their] minor children's medical care." *Deanda*, 96 F.4th at 756. And Washington's law "purports to obliterate [those] parental rights." *Id.* at 757. Formerly, Petitioners could encourage their children to feel comfortable with their biological sex and could secure them treatment consistent with that view. Under Washington's new law, however, that "right … will disappear." *Id.* "That is the concrete interest" that Washington is *presently* injuring. *Id.*

In other words, Petitioners allege "they cannot raise their children as they see fit because of Washington's regulatory scheme." Pet.App.43a-44a. (Vandyke, J., dissenting from the denial of rehearing en banc). "The very existence" of Washington's statutory scheme "that encourages and facilitates the transition of children without the consent of their parents *presently* interferes with the protected parent-child relationship by subverting a parent's authority to direct the upbringing of her child." *Id.*

The panel also rejected Petitioners' allegation of *future* injury because, according to the panel, Petitioners did not "provide concrete details" or specify exactly "*when*" the State might use its new laws to hide their

children from them. Pet.App.22a. But that places an impossible (and not constitutionally required) burden on Petitioners and similarly situated parents. To establish standing, Petitioners need not show that an injury is "certainly impending," only that "there is a substantial risk that the harm will occur." *SBA List v. Driehaus*, 573 U.S. 149, 158 (2014) (cleaned up); *see also In re Supervalu, Inc.*, 870 F.3d 763, 769 n.3 (8th Cir. 2017) ("The Supreme Court has at least twice indicated that both the 'certainly impending' and 'substantial risk' standards are applicable in future injury cases."). And even if Petitioners were required to show a certainly impending injury, they would not need to predict how that injury will unfold at the level of granular detail that the Ninth Circuit seemingly expects.

At bottom, the Ninth Circuit's demand that Petitioners explain precisely when, where, and how the State will take their children from them amounts to a requirement that Petitioners wait until the law is used against them before they can sue. But Petitioners "need not first expose [themselves] to actual" harm "to be entitled to challenge the statute." *Babbitt v. United Farm Workers Nat'l Union*, 442 U.S. 289, 302 (1979) (cleaned up). "[R]equiring" actual harm "would run afoul of the Supreme Court's admonition" and "put the challenger to the choice between abandoning his rights or risking" harm. *Vitagliano v. County of Westchester*, 71 F.4th 130, 139 (2d Cir. 2023) (cleaned up). That danger is especially present here, where Petitioners may have *no* contact with their children, and thus no way to persuade them not to pursue what Petitioners believe are harmful medical treatments, once

the children run away and the State conceals their location.

Unless this Court intervenes to correct the panel's standing errors, parents in the Ninth Circuit and elsewhere will have little hope of vindicating their constitutional rights. Indeed, the threat to parental rights is growing worse, as more and more states and school districts adopt policies designed to sever the parent-child relationship where "gender identity" is involved. *See Shield Laws for Reproductive and Gender-Affirming Health Care: A State Law Guide*, UCLA Sch. of Law Williams Inst. (archived Feb. 13, 2026), perma.cc/ZQU8-8E4E; *List of School District Transgender – Gender Nonconforming Student Policies*, DE (updated Apr. 21, 2025), bit.ly/4lxd9gL.

"In this country, … the doctrine of judicial review protect[s] individuals who cannot obtain legislative change." *Mahmoud v. Taylor*, 606 U.S. 522, 563 (2025). When jurisdictions like Washington violate parents' right to direct their children's upbringing, those parents have "every right to file a suit to protect that right." *Id.*

* * *

Bottom line: Parental exclusion policies take issues that are "fundamental to a child's identity, personhood, and mental and emotional well-being" and place them solely in the hands of the government. *Ricard v. USD 475 Geary County*, 2022 WL 1471372, at *8 (D. Kan. May 9, 2022). They bulldoze "the traditional presumption that a fit parent will act in the best interest of his or her child" and "fai[l] to provide any protection for [parents'] fundamental constitutional

right to make decisions concerning the rearing of" their children. *Troxel*, 530 U.S. at 69-70. They significantly harm children and parents, drive a wedge between families, and violate the Fourteenth Amendment. Parents plainly have standing to challenge such policies.

CONCLUSION

This Court should grant the petition for a writ of certiorari.

J. Michael Connolly
Counsel of Record
Paul R. Draper
CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC
1600 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 700
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 243-9423
mike@consovoymccarthy.com

February 17, 2026 *Attorneys for Amicus Curiae*