

Nos. 25-8056, 26-2337

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

ELIZABETH MIRABELLI, an individual; LORI ANN WEST, an individual;
JANE ROE, an individual, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated;
JANE BOE, an individual, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated;
JOHN POE, an individual, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated;
JANE POE, an individual on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated;
DR JOHN DOE, an individual, on behalf of himself and all others similarly
situated; MISS JANE DOE, an individual, on behalf of herself and all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

(For Continuation of Caption See Inside Cover)

ON APPEAL FROM AN ORDER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA IN NO. 3:23-cv-00768-BEN-VET,
HONORABLE ROGER T. BENITEZ, DISTRICT JUDGE

**BRIEF OF ADVANCING AMERICAN FREEDOM, INC.; EDWIN MEESE
III, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL, 1985-1988; ALABAMA
POLICY INSTITUTE; ALASKA FAMILY COUNCIL; AMERICAN
ASSOCIATION OF SENIOR CITIZENS; AMERICAN ENCORE; AMERICAN
VALUES; AMERICANS FOR FAIR TREATMENT; AMERICA'S WOMEN;**

(For Continuation of Midline See Inside Cover)

J. MARC WHEAT

Counsel of Record

TIMOTHY HARPER (ADMITTED IN DC)

ADVANCING AMERICAN FREEDOM

Attorneys for Amici Curiae

801 Pennsylvania Avenue NW,

Suite 930

Washington, DC 20004

(601) 467-8617

– v. –

ROB BONTA, in his official capacity as Attorney General of California; TONY THURMOND, in his official capacity as the California State Superintendent of Public Instruction; LINDA DARLING-HAMMOND, in her official capacity as President of the California State Board of Education; CYNTHIA GLOVER WOODS, in her official capacity as Vice President of the California State Board of Education; FRANCISCO ESCOBEDO, in his official capacity as a member of the California State Board of Education; BRENDA LEWIS, in her official capacity as a member of the California State Board of Education; JAMES J. MCQUILLEN, in his official capacity as a member of the California State Board of Education; SHARON OLKEN, in her official capacity as a member of the California State Board of Education; GABRIELA OROZCO-GONZALEZ, in her official capacity as a member of the California State Board of Education; KIM PATTILLO BROWNSON, in her official capacity as a member of the California State Board of Education; HAYDEE RODRIGUEZ, in her official capacity as a member of the California State Board of Education; ALISON YOSHIMOTO-TOWERY, in her official capacity as a member of the California State Board of Education; ANYA AYYAPPAN, in her official capacity as a member of the California State Board of Education,

Defendants-Appellants.

**ASSOCIATION OF MATURE AMERICAN CITIZENS ACTION;
CENTENNIAL INSTITUTE AT COLORADO CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY;
CENTER FOR URBAN RENEWAL AND EDUCATION (CURE);
CHRISTIAN LAW ASSOCIATION; CHRISTIAN MEDICAL & DENTAL
ASSOCIATIONS; COALITION FOR JEWISH VALUES; CONCERNED
WOMEN FOR AMERICA; DEFENSE OF FREEDOM INSTITUTE;
DELAWARE FAMILY POLICY COUNCIL; EAGLE FORUM; FAMILY
COUNCIL IN ARKANSAS; FAMILY INSTITUTE OF CONNECTICUT
ACTION; INDEPENDENT WOMEN’S LAW CENTER; INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE OF EVANGELICAL CHAPLAIN ENDORSERS; JAMES
DOBSON FAMILY INSTITUTE; JCCWATCH.ORG; KANSAS FAMILY
VOICE; LIBERTY JUSTICE CENTER; LOUISIANA FAMILY FORUM;
LUTHERAN CENTER FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY; MARYLAND FAMILY
INSTITUTE; MEN AND WOMEN FOR A REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY
IN AMERICA, INC.; MOMS FOR LIBERTY; NATIONAL APOSTOLIC
CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE; NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
PARENTS, INC. DBA PARENTSUSA; NATIONAL CENTER FOR PUBLIC
POLICY RESEARCH; NATIONAL RELIGIOUS BROADCASTERS; NEW
YORK STATE CONSERVATIVE PARTY; NEW MEXICO FAMILY
ACTION MOVEMENT; NORTH CAROLINA VALUES COALITION;
ORTHODOX JEWISH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE; PALMETTO
PROMISE INSTITUTE; POWER2PARENT UNION; PROTECT THE FIRST
FOUNDATION; RIO GRANDE FOUNDATION; 60 PLUS ASSOCIATION;**

SOUTHEASTERN LEGAL FOUNDATION; STAND FOR GEORGIA VALUES ACTION; STAND UP MICHIGAN; STUDENTS FOR LIFE OF AMERICA; THE CONSCIENCE PROJECT; THE FAMILY FOUNDATION OF VIRGINIA; THE INSTITUTE FOR FAITH & FAMILY; THE JUSTICE FOUNDATION; THE PARENTAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION; THE WAGNER CENTER; TRADITION, FAMILY, PROPERTY, INC.; WISCONSIN FAMILY ACTION, INC.; WOMEN FOR DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA, INC.; YOUNG AMERICA’S FOUNDATION; DELEGATE LAUREN ARIKAN, MARYLAND DISTRICT 7B; GARY L. BAUER, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN VALUES; SHAWNNA BOLICK, ARIZONA STATE SENATOR, DISTRICT 2; DR. BART BROCK, JAMES DOBSON FAMILY INSTITUTE; DELEGATE BRIAN CHISHOLM, DISTRICT 31; CHARLIE GEROW, FORMER VICE CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN CONSERVATIVE UNION; JAY D. HOMNICK, SENIOR FELLOW, PROJECT SENTINEL; TIM JONES, FORMER SPEAKER, MISSOURI HOUSE, FOUNDER, LEADERSHIP FOR AMERICA INSTITUTE; JENNY BETH MARTIN, HONORARY CHAIRMAN, TEA PARTY PATRIOTS ACTION; MELISSA ORTIZ, PRINCIPAL & FOUNDER, CAPABILITY CONSULTING; RICK SANTORUM, FORMER SENATOR 1995-2007; ANN SCHOCKETT, FORMER PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN; DR. GREGORY P. SELTZ, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, LUTHERAN CENTER FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY (LCRL), SPEAKER EMERITUS, THE LUTHERAN HOUR; PAUL STAM, FORMER SPEAKER PRO TEM, NC HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; DELEGATE KATHY SZELIGA, DISTRICT 7A, VICE CHAIR OF THE MARYLAND FREEDOM CAUCUS; RICHARD VIGUERIE, CHAIRMAN, CONSERVATIVEHQ.COM; SUZI VOYLES, PRESIDENT, EAGLE FORUM OF GEORGIA; AND FRANK R. WOLF, U.S. CONGRESS (VA) 1981-2015 AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS-APPELLEES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE.....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	4
ARGUMENT	8
I. The Prevalence of Similar Cases Across the Federal Circuits Warrants Judicial Attention.....	8
II. Parental Rights Are Deeply Rooted in Our Nation's History and Tradition	12
A. Parental rights in education are a part of the Western tradition	12
B. Parental rights in education were ubiquitous in the early Republic	15
C. The Antebellum Period and Reconstruction reaffirmed parental rights in education.....	17
III. Parental Rights are Essential to Liberty and Justice	21
CONCLUSION.....	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases:	
<i>Mahmoud v. Taylor</i> , 606 U.S. 522 (2025)	4
<i>Meyer v. Nebraska</i> , 262 U.S. 390 (1923)	22
<i>Mirabelli v. Bonta</i> , 2026 WL 44874 (9th Cir. Jan. 5, 2026).....	6
<i>Mirabelli v. Bonta</i> , 607 U.S. 492 (2026)	6, 24
<i>Mirabelli v. Olson</i> , 2025 WL 3712993 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2025)	6
<i>Mirabelli v. Olson</i> , 820 F. Supp. 3d 1123 (S.D. Cal. 2025)	5, 6
<i>Palko v. Connecticut</i> , 302 U.S. 319 (1937)	22
<i>Parham v. J.R.</i> , 442 U.S. 584 (1979)	24
<i>Pierce v. Society of Sisters</i> , 268 U.S. 510 (1925)	7, 22, 23
<i>Polk v. Montgomery Cnty. Pub. Schs.</i> , 2026 WL 216479 (4th Cir. Jan. 28, 2026).....	10
<i>Prince v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts</i> , 321 U.S. 158 (1944)	22
<i>Troxel v. Granville</i> , 500 U.S. 57 (2000)	7, 22
<i>Washington v. Glucksberg</i> , 521 U.S. 702 (1997)	12, 22, 24

<i>Wisconsin v. Yoder</i> , 406 U.S. 205 (1972)	23
--	----

Statutes and Other Authorities:

U.S. Const., amend. I	5, 6
U.S. Const., amend. XIII.....	20
U.S. Const., amend. XIV	<i>passim</i>
AB 1955	5
Aristotle, <i>Politics</i> (Benjamin Jowett ed., 1885).....	12
<i>Biographical Directory of the United States Congress</i> (James Wilson)	15
William Blackstone, Vol. 1 <i>Commentaries on the Laws of England</i> 283 (George Sharswood ed., Lippincott Company 1893) (1753).....	14
Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al., as amici curiae, <i>Chino Valley Unified School District v. Newsom</i> , No. 25-3686 (9th Cir. Sept. 10, 2025).....	5
Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae, <i>Foote v. Ludlow School Committee</i> , No. 24-77 (August 21, 2025)	8, 9
Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae, <i>Heaps v. Delaware Valley Regional High Sch. Bd. of Ed.</i> , No. 24-3278 (3d Cir. July 8, 2025)	9
Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae, <i>Lee v. Poudre</i> , No. 25-89 (Aug. 22, 2025)	7
Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae, <i>Littlejohn v. Sch. Bd. of Leon Cnty</i> , No. 25-259 (Oct. 6, 2025)	11
Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as Amici Curiae <i>Mirabelli v. Bonta</i> , 607 U.S. 492 (2026).....	6
Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae, <i>Parents Defending Ed. v. Olentangy Local Sch. Dist. Bd. of Ed.</i> , No. 23-3630 (6th Cir. Dec. 19, 2024).....	10

Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae, <i>Parents Defending Ed. v. Linn-Mar Comm. Sch. Dist.</i> , No. 22-2927 (8th Cir. Nov. 10, 2022)	11
Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae, <i>Parents Protecting Our Children v. Eau Claire Area Sch. Dist.</i> , No. 23-1280 (7th Cir. July 8, 2024).....	10
Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae, <i>Vitsaxaki v. Skaneateles Central Sch. Dist.</i> , No. 25-0952 (2nd Cir. June 17, 2025).....	9
Luray Buckner, <i>A Right Defined by a Duty: The Original Understanding of Parental Rights</i> , 37 NOTRE DAME J.L. ETHICS & PUB. POL'Y 493 (2023)	19
Gershom Carmichael, <i>The Writings of Gershom Carmichael</i> (emphasis added) (James Moore ed., Liberty Fund 2002) (1724)	15
M. Tullius Cicero, <i>De Officiis</i> (Walter Miller ed., 1913).....	13
Cong. Globe, 38th Cong., 1st Sess., 1324 (1864) (Statement of Senator Wilson)	21
Cong. Globe, 38th Cong., 1st Sess., 1439 (1864) (Statement of Senator Harlan).....	20
Cong. Globe, 38th Cong., 1st Sess., 1479 (1864) (Statement of Senator Sumner)	20
Cong. Globe, 39th Cong., 1st Sess., 2773 (1866) (Statement of Representative Eliot)	21
Convention of the Colored Freeman of Ohio (1852: Cincinnati, OH), 275 <i>Proceedings of the Convention, of the Colored Freeman of Ohio, Held in Cincinnati, January 14, 15, 16, 17 and 19, 1852</i> (Colored Conventions Project Digital Records)	19
Convention of the Colored Men of Ohio (1858: Cincinnati, OH), 333 <i>Proceedings of a Convention of the Colored Men of Ohio, Held in the City of Cincinnati, on the 23d, 24th, 25th and 26th days of November, 1858</i> (Colored Conventions Project Digital Records).....	19-20
“Educational Freedom” in <i>The Independence Index: Measuring Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness</i> , Advancing American Freedom.....	3

Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., <i>Conservatives Stalk the House: The Story of the Republican Study Committee</i> 212 (Green Hill Publishers, Inc. 1983).....	1
David Fordyce, <i>The Elements of Moral Philosophy</i> (Thomas Kennedy ed., Liberty Fund 2003) (1754)	13
Gender Identity in Montgomery County Public Schools for 2025-2026	10
John M. Gould, Preface to James Kent, <i>Commentaries on American Law</i> (Little, Brown & Co. 14th ed. 1896)	17
Joseph K. Griffith II, <i>Is the Right of Parents to Direct Their Children’s Education “Deeply Rooted” in Our “History and Tradition”?</i> 28 TEX. REV. L. & POLS. 795 (2024)	20
Thomas Jipping, Sarah Parshall Perry, <i>Public School Gender Policies That Exclude Parents Are Unconstitutional</i> , Legal Mem. No. 355, Jun. 12, 2024.....	4-5
Joint Comm. on Reconstruction, Report of the Joint Committee on Reconstruction, H.R. Rep. No. 30, 39th Cong., 1st Sess. (1866)	21
Henry Kames, <i>Principles of Equity</i> (Michael Lobban ed., The Liberty Fund 2014) (1760)	14
Henry Kames, <i>Sketches of the History of Man Considerably enlarged by the last additions and corrections of the author</i> (James A. Harris ed., Liberty Fund 2007) (1788)	13
James Kent, <i>Commentaries on American Law</i> (Oliver Wendell Holmes ed., Twelfth Edition 1873)	18
Paul J. Larkin, <i>Gender Dysphoria, Public School Responsibilities, and Parental Rights</i> , 32	4
List of School District-Gender Nonconforming Student Policies, Defending Education (updated June 29, 2026)	8
John Locke, <i>Two Treatises on Government</i> , 252 (Hollis ed., 1764) (1689)	12
“Report on Books for Congress, [23 January] 1783,” <i>Founders Online</i> , National Archives	13, 14
Daniel N. Robinson, <i>The Scottish Enlightenment and the American Founding</i> 90 <i>The Monist</i> 170 (2007)	13

Benjamin Rush, <i>A plan for the establishment of public schools and the diffusion of knowledge in Pennsylvania; to which are added thoughts upon the mode of education, proper in a republic: Addressed to the legislature and citizens of the state</i> (1786) in <i>Evans Early American Imprint Collection</i>	16
Benjamin Rush, <i>Essays, literary, moral & philosophical</i> (1798) in <i>Evans Early American Imprint Collection</i> , University of Michigan Library Digital Collections.....	14
Samuel Harrison Smith, <i>Remarks on education: illustrating the close connection between virtue and wisdom. To which is annexed, a system of liberal education</i> (1797).....	16, 17
1 Joseph Story, <i>Commentaries on Equity Jurisprudence</i> 328 (Charles C. Little & James Brown) (4 th ed. 1846) (1836).....	17, 18
“Thomas Jefferson’s Bill for Establishing Elementary Schools [ca. 9 September 1817],” <i>Founders Online</i> , National Archives.....	17
Christian Thomasius, <i>Institutes of Divine Jurisprudence. With Selections from Foundations of the Law of Nature and Nations</i> 466 (Thomas Ahnert ed., Liberty Fund 2011) (1688)	15
Samuel von Pufendorf, <i>The Whole Duty of Man According to the Law of Nature</i> (Ian Hunter & David Saunders eds., Liberty Fund 2003) (1673)	12
Samuel von Pufendorf, <i>Two Books of the Elements of Universal Jurisprudence</i> (Thomas Behme ed., The Liberty Fund 2009) (1660)	14
J. Marc Wheat, <i>Religious Liberty is Essential to American Freedom. So Are Parental Rights</i> , Real Clear Religion (May 6, 2025).....	23
James Wilson, <i>Collected Works of James Wilson</i> (Kermit L. Hall & Mark David Hall ed., Liberty Fund 2007) (1791).....	16

STATEMENT OF INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

Advancing American Freedom (AAF) is a nonprofit organization that promotes and defends policies that elevate traditional American values, including freedom from arbitrary power.¹ AAF “will continue to serve as a beacon for conservative ideas, a reminder to all branches of government of their responsibilities to the nation,”² and believes American prosperity depends on ordered liberty and self-government. AAF files this brief on behalf of its 29,180 members in the Ninth Circuit including 13,628 in the state of California.

Amici Edwin Meese III, United States Attorney General, 1985-1988; Alabama Policy Institute; Alaska Family Council; American Association of Senior Citizens; American Encore; American Values; Americans For Fair Treatment; America's Women; Association of Mature American Citizens Action; Centennial Institute at Colorado Christian University; Center for Urban Renewal and Education (CURE); Christian Law Association; Christian Medical & Dental Associations; Coalition for Jewish Values; Concerned Women for America; Defense of Freedom Institute; Delaware Family Policy Council; Eagle Forum; Family Council in

¹ All parties have consented to the filing of this amicus brief. No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part. No person other than Amicus Curiae and its counsel made any monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief.

² Edwin J. Feulner, Jr., *Conservatives Stalk the House: The Story of the Republican Study Committee* 212 (Green Hill Publishers, Inc. 1983).

Arkansas; Family Institute of Connecticut Action; Independent Women's Law Center; International Conference of Evangelical Chaplain Endorsers; James Dobson Family Institute; JCCWatch.org; Kansas Family Voice; Liberty Justice Center; Louisiana Family Forum; Lutheran Center for Religious Liberty; Maryland Family Institute; Men and Women for a Representative Democracy in America, Inc.; Moms for Liberty; National Apostolic Christian Leadership Conference; National Association of Parents, Inc. dba ParentsUSA; National Center for Public Policy Research; National Religious Broadcasters; New York State Conservative Party; New Mexico Family Action Movement; North Carolina Values Coalition; Orthodox Jewish Chamber Of Commerce; Palmetto Promise Institute; Power2Parent Union; Protect the First Foundation; Rio Grande Foundation; 60 Plus Association; Southeastern Legal Foundation; Stand for Georgia Values Action; Stand Up Michigan; Students for Life of America; The Conscience Project; The Family Foundation of Virginia; The Institute for Faith & Family; The Justice Foundation; The Parental Rights Foundation; The Wagner Center; Tradition, Family, Property, Inc.; Wisconsin Family Action, Inc.; Women for Democracy in America, Inc.; Young America's Foundation; Delegate Lauren Arikan, Maryland District 7B; Gary L. Bauer, President, American Values; Shawna Bolick, Arizona State Senator, District 2; Dr. Bart Brock, James Dobson Family Institute; Delegate Brian Chisholm, District 31; Charlie Gerow, Former Vice Chairman, American Conservative Union;

Jay D. Homnick, Senior Fellow, Project Sentinel; Tim Jones, Former Speaker, Missouri House, Founder, Leadership for America Institute; Jenny Beth Martin, Honorary Chairman, Tea Party Patriots Action; Melissa Ortiz, Principal & Founder, Capability Consulting; Rick Santorum, Former Senator 1995-2007; Ann Schockett, Former President, National Federation of Republican Women; Dr. Gregory P. Seltz, Executive Director, Lutheran Center for Religious Liberty (LCRL), Speaker Emeritus, The Lutheran Hour; Paul Stam, Former Speaker Pro Tem, NC House of Representatives; Delegate Kathy Szeliga, District 7A, Vice Chair of the Maryland Freedom Caucus; Richard Viguerie, Chairman, ConservativeHQ.com; Suzi Voyles, President, Eagle Forum of Georgia; and Frank R. Wolf, U.S. Congress (VA) 1981-2015 believe that the fundamental right of parents to direct the upbringing of their children is essential to liberty and is deeply rooted in American tradition and practice.³

³ See, e.g., “Educational Freedom” in *The Independence Index: Measuring Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness* at 52, Advancing American Freedom available at <https://theindependenceindex.org/>.

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

Parents, whether religious or not,⁴ have the responsibility as well as the right to monitor the ideas to which their children are exposed and to protect them from those ideas likely to confuse and harm them. When officious school officials use their access to children absent parental supervision to instill in those children ideas to which the parents are likely to object, they subvert the trust upon which family strength, and child wellbeing, depend. In this case, as in at least one other, school officials exposed children to gender ideology without parental notice or consent, and one child consequently attempted suicide. The Fourteenth Amendment prohibits school officials from usurping parental decision-making authority about their children's lives in all but the most extreme circumstances.

Yet California has insisted on making itself the final authority in children's intellectual development, presenting to them gender theories as fact, often without parents' knowledge or in direct defiance of their directions.⁵ At issue in this case are

⁴ “[P]arents whose belief in binary sexuality is not religiously based” are “entitled to the same protection against state intrusion” as religious parents received in *Mahmoud v. Taylor*, 606 U.S. 522 (2025). Paul J. Larkin, *Gender Dysphoria, Public School Responsibilities, and Parental Rights*, 32 https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=7302438 (SSRN-7302438).

⁵ California, like other states and many school districts, seeks to “impose upon students and their parents a controversial ideology regarding a profoundly important and highly sensitive subject” that “is unrelated to either curriculum or school administration.” Thomas Jipping, Sarah Parshall Perry, *Public School Gender*

California policies that prohibit schools from telling parents about their child’s social gender transition at school without the student’s consent.⁶ These “parental exclusion policies are designed to create a zone of secrecy around a school student who expresses gender incongruity.” *Mirabelli v. Olson*, 820 F. Supp. 3d 1123, 1133 (S.D. Cal. 2025).

Challenging the parental exclusion policies are two certified classes, one representing teachers and the other representing parents. The teachers, who are not only prohibited from informing parents but may even be required to deceive parents, raise a First Amendment challenge to the policies. *Id.*

The families challenging the parental exclusion policies include the “Poes” and the “Does.” When the Poes attended a back-to-school night in August 2023, teachers used their daughter’s legal name and biologically accurate pronouns. *Id.* at 1148-49. Only later did the parents learn that the school was socially transitioning their daughter, using male pronouns and a different name for her. *Id.* at 1149. When confronted, the principal and school psychologist lied to the Poes. *Id.*

Policies That Exclude Parents Are Unconstitutional, Legal Mem. No. 355, Jun. 12, 2024.

⁶ Though the District in this case defends its parental exclusion policy, state law does not give California school districts a choice. One school district, Chino Valley Unified School District, even sued California seeking relief from AB 1955. See Brief of Amici Curiae Advancing American Freedom et al. at 4, *Chino Valley Unified School District v. Newsom*, No. 25-3686 (9th Cir. Sept. 10, 2025) available at <https://advancingamericanfreedom.com/legal-filings/aaf-stands-for-parents-and-school-districts-against-california>.

“The Poe parents did not learn of their child’s deteriorated mental health until after she attempted suicide.” *Id.* at 1140.

After the Poes learned that the school was treating their daughter as a boy, they spent months trying to get answers. *Id.* at 1149. Finally, in January 2024, they received an email from a school administrator that concluded, “We cannot share the gender identity of the student with the parent even if that gender identity is expressed openly in class.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

The Does, too, sought answers about their daughter’s gender presentation at school and were met with lies and gaslighting. *Id.* at 1149-50.

The district court granted plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment and entered a permanent injunction against the parental exclusion policies, *id.* at 1154; *Mirabelli v. Olson*, 2025 WL 3712993 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2025). This Court stayed that injunction pending appeal. *Mirabelli v. Bonta*, 2026 WL 44874, at *4 (9th Cir. Jan. 5, 2026). The Supreme Court reversed that stay as to parents, ruling that the policies at issue were likely to fail both under the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment and under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.⁷ *Mirabelli v. Bonta*, 607 U.S. 492, 497 (2026).

⁷ See generally, Brief of Amici Curiae Advancing American Freedom et al., *Mirabelli v. Bonta*, 607 U.S. 492, 497 (2026).

The Supreme Court has explained that “[t]he fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction . . . The child is not the mere creature of the State.” *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 268 U.S. 510, 535 (1925). The Supreme Court’s longstanding parental rights precedent makes indisputably clear that “the Fourteenth Amendment protects the fundamental right of parents to make decisions concerning the care, custody, and control of their children.” *Troxel v. Granville*, 500 U.S. 57, 66 (2000).

Nearly identical school policies to those at issue here have recently been challenged in at least ten of the thirteen Federal Circuits.

Further, this is not the first case in which a student attempted suicide after being exposed to transgender ideology at school. In *Lee v. Poudre*, a sixth grader who attempted suicide identified her attendance at a “Gender and Sexualities Alliance” club meeting as the beginning of her suicidal ideation.⁸

Parents around the country reject gender ideology and would protect their children from it, but schools are abusing their time with children apart from parental supervision to expose children to these ideas without parental knowledge or consent, and sometimes in opposition to clear parental guidance to the contrary. Courts have

⁸ Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae at 5, *Lee v. Poudre*, No. 25-89 (Aug. 22, 2025) available at <https://advancingamericanfreedom.com/legal-filings/aaf-fights-back-against-radical-gender-ideologists>.

a responsibility to ensure that the Fourteenth Amendment is not reduced to a mere parchment barrier against government abuse.

The Court should rule for Plaintiffs-Appellees.

ARGUMENT

I. The Prevalence of Similar Cases Across the Federal Circuits Warrants Judicial Attention.

The harm inflicted by school-led secret social transitions is real and widespread. As of June, one database suggested that over 1,200 school districts responsible for more than 12,300,000 children had adopted secret social transition policies.⁹ At least ten of the thirteen Federal Circuits have heard or are hearing challenges to similar gender policies. This Court should ensure that parents in the Ninth Circuit are not deprived of the Fourteenth Amendment's protection.

In the First Circuit, a Massachusetts middle-school facilitated the social transition of an eleven-year-old girl, ignoring her mother's requests that school officials not discuss gender identity with her daughter.¹⁰ Instead, the school

⁹ List of School District-Gender Nonconforming Student Policies, Defending Education (updated June 29, 2026) <https://defendinged.org/investigations/list-of-school-district-transgender-gender-nonconforming-student-policies/>.

¹⁰ Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae, *Foote v. Ludlow School Committee*, No. 24-77 (August 21, 2025) available at <https://advancingamericanfreedom.com/aaf-urges-supreme-court-to-hear-parental-rights-case/>.

counselor texted and messaged the eleven-year-old via online chat to encourage weekly meetings “to discuss any gender-related concerns.”¹¹

In the Second Circuit, school officials assured a mother that no unusual circumstances were to blame for her daughter’s falling grades and distraction from her schoolwork.¹² Even after the mother learned of the school’s social transition campaign and moved her daughter to at-home instruction, school officials continued to speak with the girl about gender issues.¹³

In the Third Circuit, a freshman girl diagnosed with attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder and “high functioning autism” struggled with anxiety stemming from “the childhood trauma of the death of her mother.”¹⁴ After the girl asked the school counselor to help her socially transition at school, the school took steps to ensure that her father would not be informed, including using the girl’s legal name for announcements over the school intercom lest her siblings should find out about her social transition and inform their father.¹⁵

¹¹ *Id.* at 5.

¹² Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae at 4-5, *Vitsaxaki v. Skaneateles Central Sch. Dist.*, No. 25-0952 (2nd Cir. June 17, 2025) available at <https://advancingamericanfreedom.com/aaf-leads-amicus-coalition-defending-the-rights-of-parents-and-children-against-gender-indoctrination/>.

¹³ *Id.* at 5.

¹⁴ Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae at 3-4, *Heaps v. Delaware Valley Regional High Sch. Bd. of Ed.*, No. 24-3278 (3d Cir. July 8, 2025) available at <https://advancingamericanfreedom.com/legal-filings/aaf-fights-for-parental-rights-in-new-jersey>.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 4.

In the Fourth Circuit, Maryland’s Montgomery County Public Schools’ Guidelines for Student Gender Identity adopted before the 2019-2020 school year informed teachers and school staff that “each student” has a “right . . . to keep gender identity private, including from the student’s parents.”¹⁶ *Polk v. Montgomery Cnty. Pub. Schs.*, 2026 WL 216479 at *1 (4th Cir. Jan. 28, 2026).

In the Sixth Circuit, a school district “equate[d] harassment with the ‘intentional use of pronouns inconsistent with a student’s gender identity.’”¹⁷

In the Seventh Circuit, a school district that required written parental authorization to administer over-the-counter medication such as aspirin instituted a policy directing staff to facilitate social transitions without notifying parents or seeking their consent.¹⁸

In the Eighth Circuit, a school district’s policy for gender transitions of students in the seventh grade and above “openly encourage[d] children to deceive their

¹⁶ The 2025-2026 guidelines include substantially similar language. Gender Identity in Montgomery County Public Schools for 2025-2026 at 2, (last visited July 7, 2026) available at <https://www.montgomeryschoolsmd.org/siteassets/district/students/rights/gender-identity/genderidentityguidelinesforstudents.pdf>.

¹⁷ Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae at 3-4, *Parents Defending Ed. v. Olentangy Local Sch. Dist. Bd. of Ed.*, No. 23-3630 (6th Cir. Dec. 19, 2024) available at <https://advancingamericanfreedom.com/legal-filings/parents-v-olentangy>.

¹⁸ Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae at 5, *Parents Protecting Our Children v. Eau Claire Area Sch. Dist.*, No. 23-1280 (7th Cir. July 8, 2024) available at <https://advancingamericanfreedom.com/legal-filings/parents-protecting-our-children-v-eau-claire-area-school-district>.

parents” about their social gender transition “by hiding the name and pronouns that they [were] using at school.”¹⁹ The policy prohibited teachers and school staff from informing parents about their children’s social gender transition unless they were required to do so by law or the child consented.²⁰

In the Tenth Circuit, without seeking consent from parents, two sixth graders were invited to after-school meetings that discussed gender identity.²¹ One tragically attempted suicide and identified her attendance at the meeting as the source of her suicidal ideation.²²

In the Eleventh Circuit, a Florida School District resisted plaintiff-parents’ attempts to direct the school’s response to their daughter’s gender dysphoria in line with the school board’s policy that warned that “[o]uting a student to parents can be very dangerous to the student’s health and wellbeing.”²³

Parents around the country will continue to face threats to their fundamental rights so long as courts fail to implement what the Supreme Court has made clear:

¹⁹ Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae at 8-9, *Parents Defending Ed. v. Linn-Mar Comm. Sch. Dist.*, No. 22-2927 (8th Cir. Nov. 10, 2022) available at <https://advancingamericanfreedom.com/legal-filings/aaf-amicus-brief-in-parents-defending-education-v-linn-mar-community-school-district>.

²⁰ *Id.* at 8.

²¹ Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae, *supra* note 8 at 4-5.

²² *Id.* at 5.

²³ Brief of Advancing American Freedom et al. as amici curiae, at 3-4, *Littlejohn v. Sch. Bd. of Leon Cnty*, No. 25-259 (Oct. 6, 2025) (internal quotation marks omitted) available at <https://advancingamericanfreedom.com/legal-filings/aaf-stands-for-parental-rights-in-secret-social-transition-case>.

parents have a fundamental right protected by the Fourteenth Amendment to direct the upbringing of their children. This case is an opportunity for this Court to do just that.

II. Parental Rights Are Deeply Rooted in Our Nation's History and Tradition.

The Supreme Court has explained that “[o]ur Nation’s history, legal traditions, and practices . . . provide the crucial ‘guideposts for responsible [judicial] decision-making.’” *Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. 702, 721 (1997). Parental rights have been recognized throughout American history and even earlier as among the most fundamental of rights.

A. Parental rights in education are a part of the Western tradition.

Parental authority has long been recognized as the first form of government²⁴ because it is “the most Sacred and Ancient Kind of Authority.”²⁵ This understanding of parental authority in the Western tradition stretches back to antiquity, when Aristotle and Cicero recognized parental authority as the foundation for a free and flourishing state.²⁶ More recently, influential Founding-era philosophers, politicians, and judges recognized that protecting the family was essential to liberty.

²⁴ John Locke, *Two Treatises on Government*, 252-53 (Hollis ed., 1764) (1689) (“The subjection of a minor places in the father a temporary government, which terminates with the minority of the child.”).

²⁵ Samuel von Pufendorf, *The Whole Duty of Man According to the Law of Nature* at 183-184 (Ian Hunter & David Saunders eds., Liberty Fund 2003) (1673).

²⁶ Aristotle, *Politics* at 3-4, 16 (Benjamin Jowett ed., 1885) (“[W]hen several

Lord Kames was the leading British jurist on the eve of the American Revolution and was sympathetic to American concerns. He argued that parental rights are the “corner-stone of society.”²⁷ Scottish Enlightenment thinker David Fordyce, whose books were part of Harvard’s curriculum during the colonial period,²⁸ wrote that the “weak and ignorant State of Children, seems plainly to invest their Parents with such Authority and Power as is necessary to their Support, Protection, and Education.”²⁹ The natural law theorist Samuel von Pufendorf, whose works were bought for the use of the Continental Congress,³⁰ observed that “nature has implanted in parents a tender affection for their offspring, so that no one can be

families are united, and the association aims at something more than the supply of daily needs, the first society to be formed is the village... the first community, indeed... is the family.”). M. Tullius Cicero, *De Officiis* at 54 (Walter Miller ed., 1913) (“For since the reproductive instinct is by Nature's gift the common possession of all living creatures, the first bond of union is that between husband and wife; the next, that between parents and children; then we find one home, with everything in common. And this is the foundation of civil government, the nursery, as it were, of the state.”).

²⁷ Henry Kames, *Sketches of the History of Man Considerably enlarged by the last additions and corrections of the author* at 80 (James A. Harris ed., Liberty Fund 2007) (1788).

²⁸ Daniel N. Robinson, *The Scottish Enlightenment and the American Founding* 90 *The Monist* 170, 174 (2007).

²⁹ David Fordyce, *The Elements of Moral Philosophy* at 8 (Thomas Kennedy ed., Liberty Fund 2003) (1754) <https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/kennedy-the-elements-of-moral-philosophy>.

³⁰ “Report on Books for Congress, [23 January] 1783,” *Founders Online*, National Archives, <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Madison/01-06-02-0031>.

willing readily to neglect that office.”³¹ Lord Kames described the parent-child relationship as “one of the strongest that can exist among individuals.”³²

These writers understood providing an education to be a chief parental right and duty. Sir William Blackstone described education as “the last duty of parents toward their children.”³³ Education, however, did not just mean teaching arithmetic or literacy. At the time of the founding, the end of education was private and civic virtue.³⁴ Christian Thomasius, whose books James Madison ordered for the Continental Congress,³⁵ wrote that parental authority entails “leading the child from first infancy to the maturity of body and mind,” a responsibility that “contains two

³¹ Samuel von Pufendorf, *Two Books of the Elements of Universal Jurisprudence* at 380 (Thomas Behme ed., The Liberty Fund 2009) (1660) <https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/behme-two-books-of-the-elements-of-universal-jurisprudence>.

³² Henry Kames, *Principles of Equity* at 15-16 (Michael Lobban ed., The Liberty Fund 2014) (1760).

³³ William Blackstone, Vol. 1 *Commentaries on the Laws of England* 283 (George Sharswood ed., Lippincott Company 1893) (1753) (available online through the Liberty Fund at https://oll-resources.s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/oll3/store/titles/2140/Blackstone_1387-01_EBk_v6.0.pdf).

³⁴ Benjamin Rush, *Essays, literary, moral & philosophical* at 8 (1798) in *Evans Early American Imprint Collection*, <https://name.umd.umich.edu/N25938.0001.001>. University of Michigan Library Digital Collections. Accessed June 17, 2025. (“I beg leave to remark, that the only foundation for a useful education in a republic is to be laid in Religion. Without this there can be no virtue, and without virtue there can be no liberty, and liberty is the object and life of all republican governments.”).

³⁵ “Report on Books for Congress, [23 January] 1783,” *Founders Online*, National Archives, <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Madison/01-06-02-0031>.

parts, namely, nourishment, which pertains to the infant's body, and learning, which pertains to his mind.”³⁶

According to the legal theorists of the time, the right of parents to directly oversee the education of their children could be delegated, but it could never be destroyed even by those with whom parents entrusted their children. Gershom Carmichael wrote that it is “an indissolubly integral part of parental power.”³⁷ Pufendorf wrote that, although parents may entrust their children's education to others, it is a duty that “the Parent reserve to himself the Oversight of the Person deputed.”³⁸ This recognition of parental authority continued into the nation's infancy.

B. Parental rights in education were ubiquitous in the early Republic.

Parental rights in education were also broadly recognized in America's founding era. James Wilson, a signer of both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution and later a Justice of the Supreme Court appointed by President Washington,³⁹ contrasted, in his 1791 lectures on law, ancient and modern modes of

³⁶ Christian Thomasius, *Institutes of Divine Jurisprudence. With Selections from Foundations of the Law of Nature and Nations* 466-67 (Thomas Ahnert ed., Liberty Fund 2011) (1688).

³⁷ Gershom Carmichael, *The Writings of Gershom Carmichael* at 134-35 (emphasis added) (James Moore ed., Liberty Fund 2002) (1724).

³⁸ Pufendorf, *supra* note 25, at 179-80 (emphasis added).

³⁹ *James Wilson* in *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress*, <https://bioguide.congress.gov/search/bio/W000591>.

education to illustrate the American view of parental rights. Spurning the example of the Spartans where “the care and education of children were taken entirely out of the hands of their parents,” Wilson commended American law which recognized that “to parental affection the care of education may, in most instances, be safely intrusted.”⁴⁰

Benjamin Rush, also a signer of the Declaration of Independence, was one of the foremost advocates for public schooling. In 1786, Rush published a pamphlet setting out a plan for public schools in which teachers were to inculcate morality, but only in “a strict conformity to . . . the inclinations of their parents.”⁴¹

Samuel Harrison Smith, a newspaper publisher and friend of Thomas Jefferson, was one of the few opponents of parental rights in the founding era. In a pamphlet he authored for the American Philosophical Society he argued that “[e]rror is never more dangerous than in the mouth of a parent.”⁴² The solution, according to Smith, was the complete removal of parental oversight: when “education [is] remote

⁴⁰ James Wilson, *Collected Works of James Wilson* 908-910 (Kermit L. Hall & Mark David Hall ed., Liberty Fund 2007) (1791) (Emphasis added).

⁴¹ Benjamin Rush, *A plan for the establishment of public schools and the diffusion of knowledge in Pennsylvania; to which are added thoughts upon the mode of education, proper in a republic: Addressed to the legislature and citizens of the state* at 18 (1786) in *Evans Early American Imprint Collection* <https://name.umdl.umich.edu/N15652.0001.001>. University of Michigan Library Digital Collections (last visited Sept. 9, 2026).

⁴² Samuel Harrison Smith, *Remarks on education: illustrating the close connection between virtue and wisdom. To which is annexed, a system of liberal education* at 64 (1797).

from parental influence, the errors of the father cease to be entailed upon the child.”⁴³

However, Jefferson rejected his friend's theory of education. In the margins of his 1817 draft plan for public schooling in Virginia, Jefferson wrestled with parental rights and influence in education.⁴⁴ Ultimately, he concluded that “it is better to tolerate the rare instance of a parent refusing to let his child be educated, than to *shock the common feelings* & ideas by the forcible asportation & education of the infant against the will of the father.”⁴⁵

This respect for parental rights, including in education, continued through the Reconstruction era and the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment.

C. The Antebellum Period and Reconstruction reaffirmed parental rights in education.

Parental control over the inculcation of virtue in children who attended public schools was reaffirmed throughout the antebellum period, even as changes in American society over questions of race and religion put strains on the tradition. James Kent, first professor of law at Columbia University from 1826-1830, turned

⁴³ *Id.*

⁴⁴ “Thomas Jefferson’s Bill for Establishing Elementary Schools, [ca. 9 September 1817],” *Founders Online*, National Archives, <https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/03-12-02-0007>. (“A question of some doubt might be raised on the latter part of this section, as to the rights & duties of society towards it’s members infant & adult. is it a right or a duty in society to take care of their infant members, in opposition to the will of the parent? how far does this right & duty extend?”).

⁴⁵ *Id.*

his series of lectures into the widely popular *Commentaries on American Law*.⁴⁶ Kent started with antiquity and remarked that some ancient states had refused to trust education to parents.⁴⁷ Such an idea in America was “totally inadmissible.”⁴⁸ Because nature bound parents to “maintain and educate their children, the law has given them a right to such authority.”⁴⁹ This was “the true foundation of parental power.”⁵⁰

Justice Joseph Story agreed. In his *Commentaries on Equity Jurisprudence*, Justice Story quoted the case of *Jenkins v. Peter*: “the presumption ought to be, in the absence of all proof tending to a contrary conclusion, that the advancement of the interest of the child was the object in view.”⁵¹ The “natural and reasonable presumption in all transactions of this kind is, that a benefit was intended the child,

⁴⁶ John M. Gould, Preface to James Kent, *Commentaries on American Law*, at v (Little, Brown & Co. 14th ed. 1896) (stating that “the masterpiece of Chancellor Kent has now become so interwoven with judicial decisions that these commentaries upon our frame of government and system of laws will doubtless continue to rank as the first of American legal classics so long as the present order shall prevail”).

⁴⁷ James Kent, *Commentaries on American Law* 233 (Oliver Wendell Holmes ed., Twelfth Edition 1873).

⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 252.

⁵⁰ *Id.*

⁵¹ 1 Joseph Story, *Commentaries on Equity Jurisprudence* 328 (Charles C. Little & James Brown) (4th ed. 1846) (1836) (internal quotation marks omitted).

because in the discharge of a moral and parental duty.”⁵² Anything else would be “a principle at war with all filial as well as parental duty and affection.”⁵³

The horrors of American slavery became the catalyst for enshrining into the Constitution parental rights to oversee the moral upbringing of one’s children. Slave narratives following the Civil War were replete with the tearing of children from their parents’ oversight.⁵⁴ Freed former slaves organized “Colored Conventions” throughout the antebellum period and through the Civil War, in which they petitioned for laws and amendments to protect their rights as citizens. One of the petitioned grievances was a lack of state protection for black parental rights. The 1851 Colored Convention of Ohio lamented that black Americans had “no parental or filial rights; but husband and wife, parent and child, may be torn from each other.”⁵⁵ Other conventions recognized parental rights and education were intertwined, writing they, as former slaves, were “denied the control of their children” who were “debarred an education.”⁵⁶ Abolitionist and anti-slavery

⁵² *Id.*

⁵³ *Id.*

⁵⁴ Luray Buckner, *A Right Defined by a Duty: The Original Understanding of Parental Rights*, 37 NOTRE DAME J.L. ETHICS & PUB. POL’Y 493, 501 (2023).

⁵⁵ Convention of the Colored Freemen of Ohio (1852 : Cincinnati, OH), 275, 285 *Proceedings of the Convention, of the Colored Freemen of Ohio, Held in Cincinnati, January 14, 15, 16, 17 and 19, 1852*, (Colored Conventions Project Digital Records) <https://omeka.coloredconventions.org/items/show/250> (last visited Jan. 20, 2026).

⁵⁶ Convention of the Colored Men of Ohio (1858: Cincinnati,

Republicans regularly intertwined the denial to educate and oversee one's own children as one of the badges of slavery.⁵⁷

The Congressional debates on the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments make clear that one purpose of the amendments was to protect the fundamental right of parents to oversee the upbringing of their children. Senator James Harlan said that a consequence of slavery was “the abolition practically of the parental relation, robbing the offspring of the care and attention of his parents.”⁵⁸ Senator Charles Sumner, a political leader of the abolitionist movement (who was famously caned nearly to death on the Senate floor after attacking slavery), decried slavery's destruction “of all rights, even . . . the sacred right of family; so that the relation of husband and wife was impossible and no parent could claim his own child.”⁵⁹

When speaking in support of the Thirteenth Amendment, Senator Henry Wilson, author of the bills which outlawed slavery in Washington, D.C., said, “the sacred rights of human nature, the hallowed family relations of husband and wife,

OH), 333, 333 *Proceedings of a Convention of the Colored Men of Ohio, Held in the City of Cincinnati, on the 23d, 24th, 25th and 26th days of November, 1858*, (Colored Conventions Project Digital Records) <https://omeka.coloredconventions.org/items/show/254> (last visited Jan. 20, 2026).

⁵⁷ Joseph K. Griffith II, *Is the Right of Parents to Direct Their Children's Education “Deeply Rooted” in Our “History and Tradition”?* 28 TEX. REV. L. & POLS. 795. 803-04 (2024).

⁵⁸ Cong. Globe, 38th Cong., 1st Sess., 1439 (1864) (Statement of Senator Harlan).

⁵⁹ Cong. Globe, 38th Cong., 1st Sess., 1479 (1864) (statement of Senator Sumner).

parent and child, will be protected by the guardian spirit of that law which makes sacred alike the proud homes and lowly cabins of freedom.”⁶⁰

During the drafting of the Fourteenth Amendment in the 39th Congress, the Joint Committee on Reconstruction inquired into whether certain fundamental rights were being respected in the occupied South. The Joint Committee asked whether Southern whites objected to “the legal establishment of the domestic relations among the blacks, such as the relation of husband and wife, of parent and child, and the securing by law to the negro the rights of those relations?”⁶¹ Likewise, Representative Thomas Dawes Eliot spoke of the need to protect the right of “husband, wife, and parent.”⁶²

Few if any fundamental rights not enumerated in the Constitution are more deeply rooted in American history and tradition than parental rights.

III. Parental Rights are Essential to Liberty and Justice.

The Supreme Court’s precedent demonstrates that parental rights are not only deeply rooted in American history and tradition but are also “‘implicit in the concept of ordered liberty’ such that ‘neither liberty nor justice would exist if they were

⁶⁰ Cong. Globe, 38th Cong., 1st Sess., 1324 (1864) (Statement of Senator Wilson).

⁶¹ Joint Comm. on Reconstruction, Report of the Joint Committee on Reconstruction, H.R. Rep. No. 30, 39th Cong., 1st Sess. (1866) at 171.

⁶² Cong. Globe, 39th Cong., 1st Sess. 2773 (1866) (Statement of Representative Eliot).

sacrificed.” *Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. at 721 (quoting *Palko v. Connecticut*, 302 U.S. 319, 325 (1937)).

In *Meyer v. Nebraska*, the Court explained that “[w]ithout doubt,” the Fourteenth Amendment protects “the right of the individual to . . . marry, establish a home and bring up children.” 262 U.S. 390, 399 (1923). The parental right to educate one’s children is among those essential to liberty, and “[t]he fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children.” *Pierce*, 268 U.S. at 535. Considering its long-established parental rights precedent, the Court in 2000 reiterated that “it cannot now be doubted that the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment protects the fundamental right of parents to make decisions concerning the care, custody, and control of their children.” *Troxel*, 500 U.S. at 66.

The Court has also been clear as to the content of that right. Parents “have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare [the child] for additional obligations.” *Id.* The state may not enter “the private realm of family life” because “the custody, care, and nurture of the child reside[s] first in the parents, whose primary function and freedom include preparation for obligations the state can neither supply nor hinder.” *Prince v. Commonwealth of Massachusetts*, 321 U.S. 158, 166 (1944).

Many of the cases that have contributed to the Court’s parental rights doctrine have been brought by religious parents seeking to ensure that their children’s education does not undermine their religious values. Recently, in *Mahmoud*, No. 24-297 slip op. at 18, the Court explained that the right of religious parents is “not merely a right to teach religion in the confines of one’s own home,” but “extends to the choices that parents wish to make for their children outside the home.” The religious liberty right of parents exists, though, not in exclusion, but in addition, to the rights of all parents.⁶³

For example, in *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, the Court recognized “the fundamental interest of parents, as contrasted with that of the State, to guide the religious future *and education* of their children,” noting that the “history and culture of Western civilization reflect a strong tradition of parental concern for the nurture and upbringing of their children.” 406 U.S. 205, 232 (1972) (emphasis added). Thus, all parents have a fundamental right to raise their children according to their convictions.

“The child is not the mere creature of the state,” *Pierce*, 268 U.S. at 535, and parents, not school officials, have the right and responsibility “to direct the education

⁶³ J. Marc Wheat, *Religious Liberty is Essential to American Freedom. So Are Parental Rights*, Real Clear Religion (May 6, 2025) https://www.realclearreligion.org/articles/2025/05/06/religious_liberty_is_essential_to_american_freedom_so_are_parental_rights_1108436.html.

and upbringing” of their children. *Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. at 720. School officials may not “shut” parents “out of participation in decisions regarding their children’s mental health.” *Mirabelli*, 607 U.S. at 497 (citing *Parham v. J.R.*, 442 U.S. 584, 602 (1979)). The Court’s consistent and clear recognition of parental rights demands on the part of public educators a high regard for the will of parents. The parental exclusion policies at issue here cannot be squared with parents’ fundamental rights.

Parental rights are not only for religious Americans. Americans do not lose their parental rights simply because they are not willing to claim a religious exemption or because they cannot afford to send their children to private schools. As such, the Supreme Court said that the parents in this case were likely to succeed on both their free exercise and their due process claims. This Court should rule for plaintiffs and ensure that parents’ rights in the Ninth Circuit are protected and that teachers are not forced to deceive parents as a condition of keeping their jobs.

CONCLUSION

This Court should rule for Plaintiffs-Appellees.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ J. Marc Wheat

J. Marc Wheat

Counsel of Record

Timothy Harper (Admitted in DC)

Advancing American Freedom, Inc.

801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Suite 930

Washington, D.C. 20004

(202) 780-4848

mwheat@advancingamericanfreedom.com

Counsel for Amici Curiae

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Form 8. Certificate of Compliance for Briefs

Instructions for this form: <http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/forms/form08instructions.pdf>

9th Cir. Case Number(s)

I am the attorney or self-represented party.

This brief contains words, including words

manually counted in any visual images, and excluding the items exempted by FRAP 32(f). The brief's type size and typeface comply with FRAP 32(a)(5) and (6).

I certify that this brief (*select only one*):

- ☐ complies with the word limit of Cir. R. 32-1.
- ☐ is a **cross-appeal** brief and complies with the word limit of Cir. R. 28.1-1.
- ☒ is an **amicus** brief and complies with the word limit of FRAP 29(a)(5), Cir. R. 29-2(c)(2), or Cir. R. 29-2(c)(3).
- ☐ is for a **death penalty** case and complies with the word limit of Cir. R. 32-4.
- ☐ complies with the longer length limit permitted by Cir. R. 32-2(b) because (*select only one*):
- ☐ it is a joint brief submitted by separately represented parties.
- ☐ a party or parties are filing a single brief in response to multiple briefs.
- ☐ a party or parties are filing a single brief in response to a longer joint brief.
- ☐ complies with the length limit designated by court order dated .
- ☐ is accompanied by a motion to file a longer brief pursuant to Cir. R. 32-2(a).

Signature

Date

(use "s/[typed name]" to sign electronically-filed documents)

Feedback or questions about this form? Email us at forms@ca9.uscourts.gov