
In The Supreme Court of the United States

ELIZABETH MIRABELLI, *et. al.*

Applicants,

v.

ROB BONTA, Attorney General of California, *et.al.*

On Emergency Application To Vacate Interlocutory Stay Order Issued By The
United States Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit

Brief of Child & Parental Rights Campaign, Inc. and
Our Duty USA as Amici Curiae in Support of Applicants

Erin Friday
OUR DUTY - USA
P.O. Box 442
San Carlos, CA 94070

Mary E. McAlister
Counsel of Record
Vernadette R. Broyles
Kevin R. Smith
CHILD & PARENTAL RIGHTS CAMPAIGN
5425 Peachtree Pkwy, Suite 110
Norcross, GA 30092
(770) 448-4525 mmcalister@childparentrights.org
Attorneys for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTRODUCTION AND INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE.....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
ARGUMENT.....	4
I. The Stay Requires School Employees to Continue to Violate Parental Rights as Part of a Concerted Plan to Prevent Parents From Exercising Their Rights To Direct the Upbringing Of Their Children.....	4
II. Basing Government Policies on a Presumption that Parents of Children Experiencing an Identity Crisis Are Unsafe is Unconstitutional.	10
III. Respondents’ Own Words Demonstrate that Parents Must Be Notified of their Child’s Sex-Rejection while at School for the Safety and Well-Being of the Child.	12
IV. Amici’s Stories of California Parents Illustrate the Danger of Schools Engaging in the Social Transition of Children Without Parental Involvement....	14
A. Erin Friday, President of Our Duty.....	14
B. Abigail Martinez.....	16
C. Lydia McLaughlin	17
D. Sue Y.....	18
E. Jessica E.....	19
F. Lisa Mullins	19
G. Beth Bourne.....	21
H. Aurora Regino	22
I. Jessica Konen.....	23
CONCLUSION.....	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Blair v. Appomattox Cnty. Sch. Bd.</i> , 147 F.4th 484 (4th Cir. 2025).	15
<i>Cal. Dep’t of Educ. v. Rocklin Unified Sch. Dist.</i> , No. S-CV-0052605 (Cal. Super. Ct., Placer Cnty., Apr. 10, 2024);	7
<i>Foote v. Ludlow Sch. Comm.</i> , 128 F.4th 336 (1st Cir. 2025)	3, 4
<i>Kaltenbach v. Hilliard City Sch.</i> , 730 F. Supp. 3d 699 (S.D. Ohio 2024)	13
<i>Konen v. Caldeira</i> , No. 22-cv-1813 (Cal. Super. Ct. Monterey Cnty., June 27, 2022), removed to No. 5:22-cv-5195 (N.D. Cal., Sept. 12, 2022)	6
<i>Lee v. Poudre, Dist. R-1</i> , 135 F.4th 924 (10th Cir. 2025)	13
<i>Littlejohn v. School Bd. of Leon Cnty., Fla.</i> , 132 F.4th 1232 (11th Cir. 2025)	3, 4
<i>Mahmoud v. Taylor</i> , 606 U.S. 522 (2025)	2
<i>Parham v. J.R.</i> , 442 U.S. 584 (1979)	11
<i>People ex rel. Bonta v. Chino Valley Unified Sch. Dist.</i> , No. CIV SB 2317301 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Bernardino Cnty., Aug. 28, 2023)	7, 13
<i>Perez v. Broskie</i> , No. 3:22-cv-83 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 30, 2022)	13
<i>Regino v. Staley</i> , 133 F.4th 951 (9th Cir. 2025)	22
<i>Ricard v. USD 475 Geary Cnty., KS Sch.</i> , No. 522-CV-04015HLTGE, 2022 WL 1471372, at *8 (D. Kan. May 9, 2022)	12
<i>S.E. v. Grey</i> , 782 F. Supp. 3d 939 (S.D. Cal. 2025)	9
<i>Santosky v. Kramer</i> , 455 U.S. 745 (1982)	12
<i>Troxel v. Granville</i> , 530 U.S. 57 (2000)	3, 11
<i>United States v. Skrmetti</i> , 605 U.S. 495 (2025)	11

Statutes

2024 Cal. Stat. ch. 95	7
------------------------	---

Cal. Educ. Code §281.3(c)	8
Cal. Educ. Code §44932(a)(4)	5
Cal. Family Code §3427.....	15
Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 20 U.S.C. §1232g	14
Wash. Rev. Code §13.32A.082	15
Other Authorities	
Arcadia Unified School District, <i>Policy Bulletin: Transgender Students – Ensuring Equity and Nondiscrimination</i> (Apr. 16, 2015),	116
Asaf Orr et al., <i>Schools in Transition - A Guide for Supporting Transgender Students in K-12 Schools</i> , (Aug. 3, 2015),	9
Brad Jones, <i>California School District Emails Reveal Students Were Secretly Gender Transitioned</i> , EPOCH TIMES (Mar. 17, 2023)	6
Brad Jones, <i>Parent Group to Sue California Official Over Alleged Misleading Ballot Title</i> , CALIFORNIA INSIDER, (Jan. 8, 2024)	7
Brief for Amicus Curiae Our Duty Supporting Respondents and Affirmance in <i>United States v. Skrmetti</i> , 605 U.S. 495 (2025) (No. 23-477)	2
Brief for Amici Curiae Our Duty-USA and Colorado Principled Physicians <i>Supporting Petitioner in Foote v. Ludlow</i> , No. 25-77.....	3
Brief of Amicus Curiae Abigail Martinez in Support of Respondents in <i>United States v. Skrmetti</i> , 605 U.S. 495 (2025) (No. 23-477).....	16
California Family Council, <i>Senator Scott Wiener Calls Parents Who Want Parent's Rights "Nasty People"</i> , YouTube (June 3, 2024),.....	7
Colin Wright, <i>BREAKING: New Documents Reveal Shocking Surge in Trans-Identified Students in Davis, CA Schools</i> , Reality's Last Stand (Jan. 17, 2023)...	21
Defending Education, <i>List of School District Transgender – Gender Nonconforming Student Policies</i> (last updated Apr. 21, 2025)	6
Erin Brewer et al., TRANSING OUR CHILDREN 132 (2021).....	8
Greg Burt, <i>CA Legislative Leader Still Refuses to Allow Hearing on Parent Notification</i> , Cal. Family Council (Jan. 7, 2024).....	7
J.L. Herman et al., <i>(How Many Adults and Youth Identity as Transgender in the United States?</i> , The Williams Institute, UCLA Sch. of Law (Aug. 2025)	10

J.L. Herman, et al., <i>Age of Individuals Who Identify as Transgender in the United States</i> , The Williams Institute, UCLA Sch. of Law (Jan. 2017).....	10
Kelci Hobson, <i>A Call to Action: LGBTQ+ Youth Need Inclusive Sex Education</i> , SIECUS (May 25, 2021),	8
Los Angeles County Office of Education, <i>PRISM Advisory Committee Gather to Review PRISM Program Course Content</i> , (Aug. 7, 2023),	8
Robin Respaut et al., <i>Putting Numbers on the Rise in Children Seeking Gender Care</i> , REUTERS (Oct. 6, 2022),	10
SoCal Daily Pulse, <i>Irvine Unified Implements Disturbing Policy of Lying to Parents about Secretive Gender Support Plans</i>	8
Teny Sahakian, <i>Abigail Shrier: Audio Exposes California Teacher’s Efforts to Subvert Parents and Recruit Kids to LGBTQ+ Clubs</i> , FOX NEWS (Nov. 19, 2021)..	6
U.S. Dep’t. of Health and Human Servs., <i>Treatment for Pediatric Gender Dysphoria: Review of Evidence and Best Practices</i> (Nov. 19, 2025)	5

INTRODUCTION AND INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE¹

Child & Parental Rights Campaign, Inc. (CPRC) is a nonprofit, public-interest law firm that represents parents like parent Applicants across the country in challenging governmental actions that threaten parental rights, including, as is true here, legislation and administrative regulations that intentionally withhold from parents vital information regarding their children's upbringing and well-being. In particular, CPRC represents parents who have challenged school district policies, which like the policy and statute at issue here, conceal from parents that their children are being treated as something other than their sex at school, including the use of alternate names and pronouns and permitted use of opposite sex privacy facilities.

Our Duty-USA ("Our Duty") is a nonprofit whose members across the United States have varied political backgrounds (although it skews left), ethnicities, and sexual orientations, but share the experience of raising children who formerly rejected or currently reject their sex. Members have had schools secretly socially transition their children, deceive them when they inquire about their children's identities, refuse to comply with their demands to cease affirming their child's rejection of their sex, and report them to child welfare agencies for refusing to endorse their child's sex rejection.

¹ Under Rule 37.6 of the Rules of this Court, amici state that 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.

Based on experiences with their own children and clients, Amici have personal knowledge that the adoption of transgender identities is a maladaptive coping mechanism often stemming from, *inter alia*, autism, trauma, internalized homophobia, sexual abuse, other mental health ailments, exposure to pornography, and social contagion.² Amici know that children can and often do suffer from identity crises, including gender dysphoria, however, no child is born a different “gender” as their sex (i.e., “transgender”), as even the proponents of the ideology that endorses this belief cannot cogently define these terms nor point to a biological source of such discordance. Likewise, the term “cisgender” is repugnant to biological reality and reason, as it creates an illusion that there are children who were “born in the wrong body.”

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Until recently, the facts that sex is biological and immutable were considered universal truths. *See Mahmoud v. Taylor*, 606 U.S. 522, 583 (2025) (Thomas J., concurring) (stating that the concept of “gender identity” is a recent phenomenon). No parental right is more essential than the authority to raise one’s child as his/her sex – a fundamental dimension of human existence. Parents in California (and nation-wide) confront state and school district policies and laws that mandate school deception regarding children’s identity confusion.³ These laws and policies either

² See Brief for Amicus Curiae Our Duty Supporting Respondents and Affirmance at 8–15 in *United States v. Skrmetti*, 605 U.S. 495 (2025) (No. 23-477) (hereinafter “Skrmetti Brief”).

³ Currently, there have been over 31 lawsuits filed across the country against school districts requesting courts to restore parental rights to raise their children as their sex and control their mental health treatment, including two cases with

require school employees to withhold information from parents or leave disclosure to the employee's discretion based upon that employee's opinion as to whether the parent is worthy of knowing. California schools also refuse to honor parental directives to treat children according to their sex. This government interference is contrary to long-standing constitutional principles. *See Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57, 65 (2000) (“[T]he 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.”). Parents need immediate relief from this governmental intrusion into parental rights to reverse the effects of the social contagion and influence of trusted adults who captivate those children who may not fit neatly in the stereotypes expected of their sex.⁴

California has systematically implemented the transgender ideology with policies throughout its school system, including the one at issue here, resulting in an unnatural and substantial increase in students rejecting their sex (identifying as “transgender”). The Appellate Court abandoned over 100 years of precedent protecting parental rights to direct the upbringing of their children by permitting schools to exclude parents from decisions about their child's identity based solely on

petitions for certification pending, including *Foote v. Ludlow Sch. Comm.*, 128 F.4th 336, 346–47 (1st Cir. 2025) *pet. for cert. filed*, No. 25-77 (July 18, 2025) and *Littlejohn v. School Bd. of Leon Cnty., Fla.*, 132 F.4th 1232, 1242–43 (11th Cir. 2025), *pet. for cert. filed*, No. 25-259 (Sep. 3, 2025); *see also* Brief for Amici Curiae Our Duty-USA and Colorado Principled Physicians Supporting Petitioner in *Foote v. Ludlow*, No. 25-77.

⁴ *See Skrmetti* Brief at 8–15.

speculation of potential harm or parental disagreement with the government's chosen approach for their confused child.

This Court's intervention is urgently needed. Lower courts are in disarray, with a deepening conflict over the application of parental rights in this context. Cases like *Foote v. Ludlow Sch. Committee*, 128 F.4th 336 (1st Cir. 2025), *pet. for cert. filed*, No. 25-77 (July 18, 2025) and *Littlejohn v. School Bd. of Leon Cnty.*, 132 F.4th 1232 (11th Cir. 2025), *pet. for cert. filed*, No. 25-259 (Sep. 3, 2025), currently pending before this Court and presenting similar questions, demonstrate the growing national importance of this issue and the inconsistent and unjust outcomes for families. Unless this Court acts expeditiously, school policies of secrecy that replace parental guidance with a state-enforced ideology will continue and countless more children will be convinced to reject their sex and to undergo life-altering interventions on their disease-free bodies. Time is of the essence for the nation's children. This Court should vacate the stay and reinstate the district court's injunction and grant certiorari on all three cases, Foote, Littlejohn and Mirabelli.

ARGUMENT

I. The Stay Requires School Employees to Continue to Violate Parental Rights as Part of a Concerted Plan to Prevent Parents From Exercising Their Rights To Direct the Upbringing Of Their Children.

The Ninth Circuit egregiously erred in staying the injunction which permits longstanding violations of parental rights that are tearing families apart and irreversibly harming children to continue in California unabated. The Appellate Court has acted contrary to the Constitution and decades of precedent in ruling that school employees must continue to:

1. Lie to parents;⁵
2. Prevent the parent from accessing educational records of the child;
3. Actively deceive parents by switching between names and pronouns when speaking to the parents;
4. Ignore parents' directives to treat their child as his/her sex – i.e., refer to their child by his/her legal name and use pronouns that align with his/her sex;
5. Force employees to violate their religious beliefs and moral consciences and violate California law⁶ by deceiving parents about their child's sex-rejecting interventions while requiring them to use the child's chosen pronouns and name; and
6. Not be instructed of parents' rights to be involved and participate in the decision to socially transition his/her child, a decision that will most likely decide the future course of the child's sexual health.⁷

Applicants' Emergency Application to Vacate Interlocutory Stay Order at App. 23a-25a, *Mirabelli v. Bonta*, No. 25A810 (S. Ct. filed Jan. 8, 2026) ("Appl.").

⁵ Pursuant to Cal. Educ. Code §44932(a)(4), permanent school employees can be terminated for dishonesty.

⁶ See Note 5.

⁷ See U.S. Dep't. of Health and Human Servs., *Treatment for Pediatric Gender Dysphoria: Review of Evidence and Best Practices*, 14, 89 (Nov. 19, 2025) (noting that the risks of medical transition include "infertility/sterility, sexual dysfunction" and that social transition has a strong association with later use of such medical interventions).

School policies keeping secrets from parents about their child experiencing sex-rejecting feelings are ubiquitous in California.⁸ Since at least 2021, California parents have been desperately fighting to simply be notified when the school begins to take steps to affirm their child’s sex-related confusion. The first lawsuit was filed after a leaked video showed that teachers were spying on children as a recruitment method for their transgender club.⁹ Efforts to halt the secrecy and restore parental rights have been thwarted by the Legislature, Respondent Bonta, and the California Department of Education (“CDE”) at every turn. For example, in 2023 when Our Duty proposed and sponsored legislation that would have required parental notification, legislators refused to even schedule a committee hearing, killing the bill before

⁸ See Defending Education, *List of School District Transgender – Gender Nonconforming Student Policies* (last updated Apr. 21, 2025) <https://defendinged.org/investigations/list-of-school-district-transgender-gender-nonconforming-student-policies> (reporting that secret social transitions policies have been adopted at least 21,314 schools affecting approximately 12 million students); Brad Jones, *California School District Emails Reveal Students Were Secretly Gender Transitioned*, EPOCH TIMES (Mar. 17, 2023, updated May 5, 2023), <https://www.theepochtimes.com/us/california-school-district-emails-reveal-students-were-secretly-gender-transitioned-5131093> (reporting that Newport-Mesa Unified School District had 23 secret social transition plans, 8 of which were for elementary students); see also, Note 20.

⁹ See *Konen v. Caldeira*, No. 22-cv-1813 (Cal. Super. Ct. Monterey Cnty., June 27, 2022), removed to No. 5:22-cv-5195 (N.D. Cal., Sept. 12, 2022) (a case in which an eleven-year-old female was socially transitioned without parental knowledge at school and in which two teachers were recorded revealing how they “stalked” students’ communications 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>.

parents could publicly voice their support.¹⁰ School board efforts to implement parental notification policies have faced active opposition from Respondents Bonta and CDE. School boards were threatened and, in some cases, sued by the state for trying to provide parents with notice when their children were rejecting their sex.¹¹ A parent coalition attempted to qualify a ballot initiative to rectify the gross abrogation of parental rights, but Respondent Bonta wielded his power once again to interfere with that attempt. Finally, to guarantee that the secrets continue, the Legislature passed and Governor Newsom signed AB1955,¹² which codified that no school can adopt a policy requiring parental involvement when their child is rejecting his/her sex.¹³ When announcing AB1955, Sen. Scott Wiener claimed that “LGBTQ kids” are **his kids**—that is, the government’s kids, a claim that could come to fruition if the courts do not re-establish parental rights to raise a child as his/her sex.¹⁴

¹⁰ Greg Burt, *CA Legislative Leader Still Refuses to Allow Hearing on Parent Notification*, Cal. Family Council (Jan. 7, 2024), <https://www.californiafamily.org/2024/01/ca-legislative-leader-still-refuses-to-allow-hearing-on-parent-notification/>.

¹¹ See, e.g., *People ex rel. Bonta v. Chino Valley Unified Sch. Dist.*, No. CIV SB 2317301 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Bernardino Cnty., Aug. 28, 2023); *Cal. Dep’t of Educ. v. Rocklin Unified Sch. Dist.*, No. S-CV-0052605 (Cal. Super. Ct., Placer Cnty., Apr. 10, 2024); Cal. Dep’t of Justice, *Legal Alert – Forced Disclosure Policies re: Transgender and Gender Nonconforming Students* (Jan. 10, 2024), https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press-docs/Legal%20Alert%20re%20Forced%20Outing%20Policies.1.10.24_0.pdf.

¹² 2024 Cal. Stat. Ch. 95 (creating Cal. Educ. Code §§ 220.1, 220.3, 220.5).

¹³ Brad Jones, *Parent Group to Sue California Official Over Alleged Misleading Ballot Title*, CALIFORNIA INSIDER, (Jan. 8, 2024, updated Nov. 27, 2024), <https://californiainsider.com/california-news/parent-group-to-sue-california-official-over-alleged-misleading-ballot-title-summary-5560682>.

¹⁴ California Family Council, *Senator Scott Wiener Calls Parents Who Want Parent's Rights "Nasty People"*, YouTube (June 3, 2024), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dUAuHPC8AHI>.

Actions by the Legislature and Respondents reveal a clear goal to use schools to actively promote gender confusion in children and prevent parents from responding in any way other than to “affirm” the confusion. By deliberately hiding the child’s gender confusion from the parents, state actors make it all but impossible for reality-based or religious parents to direct their child toward coming to terms with their sexed body and away from chemically castrating drugs, a lifetime of taking wrong sex hormones, or surgeries that remove healthy body parts to create an appearance that differs from their sex.

To help achieve the goal, CDE partnered with Gender Spectrum and Human Rights Campaign (“HRC”),¹⁵ two of the nation’s most prominent organizations that advocate for sex-rejection in children, to create the PRISM program, its mandated “cultural competency” training.¹⁶ Gender Spectrum has a toolkit describing entry points for gender ideology into the schools, including:

- “Instructional Entry Point: Getting gender ideology into every single classroom;”
- “Institutional Entry Point: Putting into place policies that solidify gender ideology as a permanent fixture in schools.”¹⁷

¹⁵ Kelci Hobson, *A Call to Action: LGBTQ+ Youth Need Inclusive Sex Education*, SIECUS (May 25, 2021), <https://siecus.org/a-call-to-action-lgbtq-youth-need-inclusive-sex-education/> (noting that the Human Rights Campaign (HRC) boasts that it has educated over 11 million students).

¹⁶ See Cal. Educ. Code §281.3(c); 75a; Los Angeles County Office of Education, *PRISM Advisory Committee Gather to Review PRISM Program Course Content*, (Aug. 7, 2023), <https://www.lacoe.edu/news/2023-08-07-prism-advisory-committee-meeting>.

¹⁷ Erin Brewer *et al.*, *TRANSING OUR CHILDREN* 132 (2021).

Gender Spectrum and HRC are also sponsors of *Schools in Transition*, a guide published in 2015.¹⁸ The guide contains a sample Gender Transition Plan¹⁹ that is confidential between the school and the student to the exclusion of their parents. Many school districts have implemented these plans.²⁰

Schools in Transition instructs that:

[T]here are many activities and lessons that can effectively **scaffold a student’s gender transition**. . . while some may assume that elementary students are too young to discuss these issues, experience from schools across the country say otherwise. In fact, in most cases **younger students are much more flexible in their thinking** and capacity for understanding a peer’s assertion of their authentic gender.²¹

In other words, schools should be scaffolding – pushing students towards next steps of transition and “get them when they are young,” all without parental knowledge. An example of how this plays out is seen in an elementary school in Encinitas School District that arranged for a “buddy program” that required that fifth graders read transgender-themed books to their kindergarten “buddies,” *i.e.*, peer to peer indoctrination, without parental knowledge.²²

¹⁸ Asaf Orr et al., *Schools in Transition - A Guide for Supporting Transgender Students in K-12 Schools*, (Aug. 3, 2015), <https://www.ncrights.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Schools-in-Transition-2015-Online.pdf>. (“Schools in Transition”)

¹⁹ *Id.* at 52 - 59.

²⁰ See also SoCal Daily Pulse, *Irvine Unified Implements Disturbing Policy of Lying to Parents about Secretive Gender Support Plans* (n.d.), <https://socaldailypulse.com/post/irvine-unified-implements-disturbing-policy-of-lying-to-parents-about-secretive-gender-support-plans/> (describing a public records request that revealed collaboration of school, LGBTQ groups and gender clinics, and more than 100 social transition plans at the Irvine School District).

²¹ *Schools in Transition*, *supra* n. 18, at 15.

²² *S.E. v. Grey*, 782 F. Supp. 3d 939, 945-46 (S.D. Cal. 2025), *appeal dismissed* (9th Cir. Nov. 19, 2025).

The effect of these techniques is best demonstrated by the extraordinary jump in the number of youth adopting a transgender identity. The percentage of California youth ages 13-17 identifying as “transgender” nearly quadrupled from 0.85% in 2017 to 3.15% in 2025.²³ California youth ages 6 to 17 receiving a gender dysphoria diagnosis tripled between 2017 and 2021.²⁴

Far from merely implementing law and policy, Respondents have employed aggressive and often stealth tactics to usurp parental rights to direct the upbringing of their children to pursue the agenda of encouraging children to reject their sex. Parental rights are being irreparably harmed as long as the injunction issued by the lower court remains stayed and Respondents permitted to continue their efforts unabated.

II. Basing Government Policies on a Presumption that Parents of Children Experiencing an Identity Crisis Are Unsafe is Unconstitutional.

The Appellate Court’s ruling rests, in part, on the insidious and unconstitutional presumption that parents categorically cannot be trusted to know their child is identifying as “transgender.” This presumption contradicts Amici’s experiences and turns a foundational principal of American law, that “the

²³ J.L. Herman, *et al.*, *Age of Individuals Who Identify as Transgender in the United States*, The Williams Institute, UCLA Sch. of Law (Jan. 2017), <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Age-Trans-Individuals-Jan-2017.pdf>; J.L. Herman *et al.*, *(How Many Adults and Youth Identity as Transgender in the United States?)*, The Williams Institute, UCLA Sch. of Law (Aug. 2025). <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Trans-Pop-Update-Aug-2025.pdf>.

²⁴ Robin Respaut *et al.*, *Putting Numbers on the Rise in Children Seeking Gender Care*, REUTERS (Oct. 6, 2022), <https://www.reuters.com/investigates/special-report/usa-transyouth-data/>.

natural bonds of affection lead parents to act in the best interests of their children,” on its head. *Parham v. J.R.*, 442 U.S. 584, 602 (1979). The Court’s precedents operate on a “presumption that parents possess what a child lacks in maturity, experience, and capacity for judgment required for making life’s difficult decisions.” *Id.* The state cannot simply cast this presumption aside based on a generalized fear or an ideological disagreement with a parent’s views on “gender.” As this Court stated in *Parham*, “[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).

Schools cannot create a state-dictated treatment of children who reject their sex. Nor can they force parents to accept that their children are “transgender” and affirm that the sex-rejecting identity is natural, consistent with their religious beliefs, and in the child’s best interest. “Simply because the decision of a parent is not agreeable to a child or because it involves risks does not automatically transfer the power to make that decision from the parents to [the state].” *Parham*, 442 U.S. at 603. “The Due Process Clause does not permit a state to infringe on the fundamental right of parents to make the child rearing decision simply because [the government] believes a ‘better decision’ could be made.” *Troxel*, 530 U.S. at 72-73.

Moreover, as this Court recognized in *United States v. Skrametti*, 605 U.S. 495, 504-505 (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 v. USD 475 Geary County, KS Schools*, 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.” No. 522-CV-04015HLTGE, 2022 WL 1471372, at *8 (D. Kan. May 9, 2022).

California has created a shadow process that deprives parents of legal authority devoid of any due process. School officials (and the child) decide, surreptitiously, if the parents are “safe” enough to be brought into the secret that everyone at the school likely already knows. This severance of parental rights to guide their child through a gender identity crisis lacks the “fundamentally fair procedures” required by law. *See Santosky v. Kramer*, 455 U.S. 745 (1982). Government has never before so blatantly intruded into parental rights, showing clear distrust and disdain for parents who do not ascribe to the ideology of “gender identity” while making life-altering decisions about their children. Staying the injunction permits this unprecedented usurpation of parental rights to continue unabated.

III. Respondents’ Own Words Demonstrate that Parents Must Be Notified of their Child’s Sex-Rejection while at School for the Safety and Well-Being of the Child.

The Appellate Court opined that Respondents do not “categorically forbid disclosure of a child’s adoption of a “transgender” identity while at school. Setting aside the overwhelming evidence that Respondents did, had, and continue to, instruct schools to deceive parents, Respondents’ own statements provide the evidence which

demonstrates that in reality every parent *should* be informed about their child’s identity struggles.

In his complaint in *People ex rel. Bonta v. Chino Valley Unified Sch. Dist.*, No. CIV SB 2317301 (Cal. Super. Ct., San Bernardino Cnty., Aug. 28, 2023), Respondent Bonta stated that 86 percent of “transgender” youth have considered suicide and 56 percent have attempted it.²⁵ Thus, Respondent himself provides the unquestionable justification for requiring parent involvement, as do other cases including the experience of the Poes, whose own daughter attempted suicide while the school was secretly treating her as a boy.²⁶ If children who adopt a “trans-identity” are more susceptible to suicidality, informing parents who do not take breaks from their children over holidays, summers, or after 3 p.m. is imperative.

²⁵ Complaint at 6–7, *People ex rel. Bonta v. Chino Valley Unified Sch. Dist.*, No. CIV SB 2317301 (Cal. Super. Ct. San Bernardino Cnty., Aug. 28, 2023), <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press-docs/Stamped%20-%20CVUSD%20Complaint.pdf>.

²⁶ See also, *Perez v. Broskie*, No. 3:22-cv-83 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 30, 2022) (Florida school hid female twelve-year-old’s sex confusion while affirming her male identity, until she attempted suicide a second time at school); *Kaltenbach v. Hilliard City Sch.*, 730 F. Supp. 3d 699, 701 (S.D. Ohio 2024), *appeal dismissed*, No. 24-3336, 2025 WL 1147577 (6th Cir. Mar. 27, 2025) (It was not until the female student attempted suicide that the school informed the parent that it had been treating her as a boy.); *Lee v. Poudre, Dist. R-1*, 135 F.4th 924, 929 (10th Cir. 2025), *cert denied*, No. 25-89 (Oct. 14, 2025) (wherein the middle school student attempted suicide while being secretly socially transitioned at school.)

IV. Amici’s Stories of California Parents Illustrate the Danger of Schools Engaging in the Social Transition of Children Without Parental Involvement.²⁷

Through these vignettes of parents from different school districts, the pattern of California schools’ active indoctrination, participation and deception in promoting the adoption of “transgender identities” is evident, as is the destructive effect on a child. Fortunately, each of the children presented below avoided a life on synthetic hormones and sterilization.²⁸

A. Erin Friday, President of Our Duty

Erin’s daughter, P., was eleven when, following sex-ed class, she and her entire friend group each chose a new identity. P. shifted through a myriad of identities, ultimately choosing “transgender” at thirteen. Her friends’ identities likewise morphed.

During P.’s online freshman year, Erin overheard teachers using a male name and pronouns. Erin was told by the school that per AB1266, the school was required to follow her daughter’s request while not informing the parents. The school stated that it was a “safe space” for P. while indicating Erin was “unsafe” by calling Child Protective Services (“CPS”).

Erin removed P. from school and requested records pursuant to FERPA²⁹ to test whether the school would produce the social transition plan or evidence that it was socially transitioning her daughter; it did not.

²⁷ Some pseudonyms are used to protect families from the animus often directed at those who resist sex-rejecting transitions.

²⁸ The effect of the puberty blockers on Sue Y. ’s daughter’s fertility is unknown.

²⁹ Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 20 U.S.C. §1232g.

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

Erin has been contacted by 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 the risk of having CPS called against them. Parents report school counselors are convincing students they are “transgender” and that schools relentlessly push transgenderism in the classroom.

Erin advises parents to unenroll from public schools if possible and homeschool. She suggests families move to other states, though secrecy policies are nearly ubiquitous. Teachers and school board members who disapprove of indoctrinating students and deceiving parents also contact Erin seeking advice on combating secrecy policies. The teachers voice confusion as to what the law requires—whether they can be honest with parents or must lie, so most stay silent for fear of retaliation.

Erin’s experience with nearly 500 parents shows they do not reject their gender-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 v. Appomattox Cnty. Sch. Bd.*, 147 F.4th 484 (4th Cir. 2025).

B. Abigail Martinez³⁰

The avoidable tragic story of Abigail and her daughter, Yaeli, began in earnest as Yaeli began high school after a difficult middle school experience riddled with bullying. Yaeli, looking for a place to fit in, found friendship with a sex-rejecting older female student, who directed her to the school's LGBTQ club. Yaeli joined without Abigail's knowledge. Through the club, Yaeli was readily persuaded that her growing severe depression could be resolved if she "transitioned." Yaeli shed her feminine appearance and the public high school, in keeping with its policy, treated Yaeli as a boy without consulting Abigail.³¹ Abigail sought help for her suffering daughter from the school's psychologist, unaware that the psychologist was actually working to solidify Yaeli's sex-rejecting identity, and against Abigail.

When Yaeli attempted suicide, the school's principal met Abigail at the hospital demanding that she call Yaeli her chosen male name, asking "why can't she just capitulate?" But Abigail knew that Yaeli's mental health issues were not because Abigail was not affirming her confusion, but that the adoption of a male identity was a symptom of her depression. The school and a "trans" friend's parent continued their coercive tactics against Abigail, even temporarily "kidnapping" Yaeli as Abigail searched frantically for her missing daughter. Lead by the school psychologist into

³⁰ See also Brief of Amicus Curiae Abigail Martinez in Support of Respondents in *United States v. Skrametti*, 605 U.S. 495 (2025) (No. 23-477).

³¹ Arcadia Unified School District, *Policy Bulletin: Transgender Students – Ensuring Equity and Nondiscrimination* (Apr. 16, 2015), <https://1.cdn.edl.io/hvDPd240Xzy6VJBaj4vFtbmPZi0s9TJ9hfayeEx4lcQOX4Ps.pdf>.

using CPS to get sex-rejecting interventions, Yaeli filed false claims of physical and mental abuse, and she was removed from her mother and three siblings' home.

While CPS quickly cleared Abigail of physical abuse, the emotional abuse claims lingered. While in state custody, Yaeli was placed on testosterone and cycled through foster homes and facilities, sleeping on couches and living in abject poverty. Abigail was granted limited supervised visits with Yaeli but she was forbidden to discuss the harms of sex-rejecting interventions or her faith. After Yaeli spent approximately three years in state custody because Abigail chose to raise her daughter as her sex, Abigail was absolved of all abuse claims. But it was too late. Yaeli's physical suffering from the effects of testosterone in her tiny female body was too much, and she stood in front of an on-coming train. The State Defendants and school set Yaeli's death in motion.

C. Lydia McLaughlin

After Lydia's daughter T. adopted a "transgender" identity despite having no prior body discomfort, she 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 they lied. Afterwards, the principal told T. that her transgender identity would be their secret, colluding against Lydia. Lydia made a FERPA request to determine if the school was continuing to defy her instruction, but

the school refused to provide T's records. After engaging counsel, the school provided the records evidencing that indeed the school was continuing to socially transition T.

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 "trans-identity", knowing the danger of surrendering to her daughter's maladaptive identity. T., now a college student, has completely dropped her trans identity.

D. Sue Y.

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 and 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.

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 non-straight labels. M. chose "bisexual" and shortly thereafter began cutting herself. The next year, because M. dressed in "Anime-themed" clothes—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 removed her phone access 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. M. is both angry and embarrassed that she rejected biological reality as she embarks on a career as a firefighter.

F. Lisa Mullins

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.” It also provided free breast binders.

In college, M. shed her transgender identities, her mental health issues subsided, and her feminine appearance returned. Lisa’s family ultimately fled California to safeguard her other child from school systems that deceive parents.

G. Beth Bourne

Beth is the mother of S., a 20-year-old female who began identifying as a transgender boy at age 13 after a series of other LGBTQ identities. Beth surmises that S. wanted to present as a boy to shield herself from the type of terrible sexual assault suffered by her best friend in sixth grade. S. also has long-standing mental health issues that worsened as her identity crisis emerged. A significant contributing factor to S.’s adoption of a transgender identity was her school - Davis Joint Unified High School, that has one in twenty-five students identifying as transgender, 2.8 times the national average.³² The school was encouraging and counseling Beth that S.’s cutting and anxiety would resolve if she would treat S. as a boy. At first Beth listened to the “experts” in her desperation to help her child, but over time was alarmed to that her daughter’s medical team suggested that her mentally unstable daughter undergo life-changing sex-rejecting interventions before she could even drive a car. The school counselor habitually pressured Beth to move forward in S.’s

³² Colin Wright, *BREAKING: New Documents Reveal Shocking Surge in Trans-Identified Students in Davis, CA Schools*, Reality’s Last Stand (Jan. 17, 2023), <https://www.realitylaststand.com/p/breaking-new-documents-reveal-shocking>.

“transition” creating a wedge between mother and child, while at the same time providing a basis for S.’s affirming father to obtain complete control over the rearing of S. In an extraordinary act of selflessness, Beth gave up visitation with S. to her ex-husband in exchange for a prohibition of sex-rejecting interventions while S. was still a minor, giving her time to mature.

Now, an adult, S. has not medicalized and is showing signs of desistence, moving from trans to non-binary, wearing normal bras instead of breast binders, wearing dresses and typical female make up, and changing her name from a clearly male name to a typical feminine one. Tragically, the chasm created by the systematic encouragement of school and medical providers that S. was “trans” has not been bridged, and S. has no direct contact with Beth.

H. Aurora Regino³³

When Aurora’s daughter was 12 years old, she experienced some traumatic events in her life. Her father was in a debilitating car accident that rendered him brain damaged. In 5th grade, her beloved grandfather passed away, Aurora was battling breast cancer, and A.S. started puberty early.

A.S., feeling distressed at the changes to both her home life and body, turned to her school counselor for solace. The school counselor had encouraged students in A.S.’s class to explore their identities and consider whether they felt like they were not the “gender” associated with their sex. The school counselor had told students that this feeling was normal, and they should embrace the feeling if they had it.

³³ See also *Regino v. Staley*, 133 F.4th 951, 958 (9th Cir. 2025).

The counselor invited A.S. to an “arts and crafts” group. After one of the meetings, A.S. told the school counselor she felt like a boy. The counselor sprang into action. She asked A.S. if she had a boy’s name she wanted the teachers to use. A.S. felt pressured by the school counselor and said she did.

A.S.’s teachers clandestinely started to refer to her as a boy, with a boy’s name and male pronouns. The “arts-and-crafts club” became a club for indoctrination. The school counselor began discussing gender and sexuality in depth with the 12-year-old girls. Without her mother’s permission, A.S. was meeting with the school counselor and being further coached into her transgender belief. The counselor also told A.S. about binding her breasts and “top surgery.”

A.S. told the counselor that she wanted her mom to know about what was going on. The counselor encouraged her to keep it a secret. Finally, A.S. told her grandmother, and she in turn told Aurora.

The school evaded Aurora’s subsequent inquiries, telling her—falsely—that it was required by law to keep its actions secret from her. A.S.’s belief that she was really a boy subsided after leaving the offending school.

I. Jessica Konen³⁴

Jessica is the mother of M., a female. When M. was 11, in 2019, a friend invited her to a Gender Sexuality Club (“GSA”). She quit but rejoined when a teacher personally invited her back. When the Club teachers asked her for her sexuality, to conform M. said she was bisexual, even though she did not understand the meaning

³⁴ See Note 9.

of the term. The teachers convinced her that she was actually a transgender boy and instructed her to choose a male name. The school then called her the male name and created a secret gender support plan that noted that M.'s parent should not be told. M.'s mental health declined.

M.'s club teachers were then caught on tape at a California Teachers Association meeting admitting how they circumvent parents and look at student's Google searches to find members for their club. Jessica discovered that the teachers counseled other teachers to use creative names to mask the true purpose of the GSA clubs, as they had done.

Jessica disenrolled M. from the offending school, and M.'s mental health steadily improved. M. then ceased identifying as "transgender."

CONCLUSION

For the forementioned reasons, Amici Curiae respectfully asks this Court to vacate the Ninth Circuit's interlocutory order staying the district court's injunction until disposition of any petition for certiorari.

January 21, 2026

Erin Friday
OUR DUTY - USA
P.O. Box 442
San Carlos, CA 94070

/s/Mary E. McAlister
Mary E. McAlister
Counsel of Record
Vernadette R. Broyles
Kevin R. Smith
CHILD & PARENTAL RIGHTS CAMPAIGN
5425 Peachtree Pkwy, Suite 110
Norcross, GA 30092
(770) 448-4525 mmcalister@childparentrights.org
Attorneys for Amici Curiae