

**APPEAL NO. 24-3278
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT**

CHRISTIN HEAPS,
Plaintiff-Appellant

v.

DELAWARE VALLEY REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL BOARD OF EDUCATION, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees

**BRIEF OF FAMILY POLICY ALLIANCE AND STATE FAMILY POLICY
COUNCILS AS AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF-
APPELLANT AND REVERSAL**

RANDALL L. WENGER, PA 86537
LAUREN L. HACKETT, PA 306380
INDEPENDENCE LAW CENTER
23 N. Front St. Fl 1
Harrisburg, PA 17101
(717) 657-4990
(717) 545-8107 Fax
rwenger@indlawcenter.org
lhackett@indlawcenter.org

Counsel for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
STATEMENT OF INTEREST.....	1
INTRODUCTION	2
ARGUMENT	5
I. The “Shocks-the-Conscience” Test Does Not Apply to Appellant’ Claims.....	5
A. Substantive Due Process Claims are Divided Between Challenges to “Executive” and “Legislative” Action.....	5
B. The “Shocks-the-Conscience” Test Applies Only to “Executive” Infringements of Substantive Due Process Rights, Not “Legislative” Infringements.	6
C. Appellant Alleges a Legislative Violation of His Substantive Due Process Rights.	6
i. Government Action Applying Preestablished Policy is “Legislative”; Only Government Actions that are Individualized can be Considered “Executive.”	7
ii. Appellant Has Challenged Appellees’ Preestablished, Generally Applicable Policy to Conceal Information from Parents.....	9
II. Board Policy 5756 Violates Appellant’s Substantive Due Process Rights Under the Legislative Test.....	11
A. Parents Have a Fundamental Right to Direct the Upbringing and Care of Their Children.	11
B. Board Policy 5756 Undermines the Fundamental Right of Parents to Direct the Upbringing and Care of Their Children.	15

C. Board Policy 5756 is Not Narrowly Tailored to Serve a Compelling
State Interest.17

CONCLUSION.....21

CERTIFICATES OF COMPLIANCE.....23

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>C.N. v. Ridgewood Board of Education</i> , 430 F.3d 159 (3d Cir. 2005).....	16
<i>Collins v. Harker Heights</i> , 503 U.S. 115 (1992)	6
<i>County of Sacramento v. Lewis</i> , 523 U.S. 833 (1998)	5, 6, 8, 9
<i>Daniels v. Williams</i> , 474 U.S. 372 (1986)	8
<i>DePoutot v. Raffaelly</i> , 424 F.3d 112 (1st Cir. 2005).....	7
<i>Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization</i> , 142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022)	5
<i>Ginsberg v. New York</i> , 390 U.S. 629 (1968)	14
<i>Gruenke v. Seip</i> , 225 F.3d 290 (3d Cir. 1999).....	16
<i>H.L. v. Matheson</i> , 450 U.S. 398 (1981)	14
<i>Hancock v. Cnty. of Rensselaer</i> , 882 F. 3d 58 (2d Cir. 2018).....	7
<i>Hawkins v. Freeman</i> , 195 F.3d 732 (4th Cir. 1999)	8
<i>May v. Anderson</i> , 345 U.S. 528 (1953)	13
<i>McKinney v. Pate</i> , 20 F.3d 1550 (11th Cir. 1994)	8
<i>Meyer v. Nebraska</i> , 262 U.S. 390 (1923)	12, 13

Nicholas v. Pa. State Univ.,
 227 F.3d 133 (3d Cir. 2000) (Alito, J.) 7

Parham v. J.R.,
 442 U.S. 584 (1979) 15

Paul v. Davis,
 424 U.S. 693 (1976) 9

Pierce v. Society of the Sisters of the Holy Name of Jesus and Mary,
 268 U.S. 510 (1925) 12, 13, 16

Prince v. Massachusetts,
 321 U.S. 158 (1944) 13

Putnam v. Keller,
 332 F.3d 541 (8th Cir. 2003) 8

Quillion v. Walcott,
 434 U.S. 246 (1978) 14

Reyes v. North Texas Tollway Authority,
 861 F.3d 558 (5th Cir. 2017) 7

Ricard v. USD 475 Geary Cty.,
 No. 5:22-cv-04015-HLT-GEB, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 83742
 (D. Kan. May 9, 2022) 18, 19

Rochin v. California,
 342 U.S. 165 (1952) 8

Skinner v. Oklahoma,
 316 U.S. 535 (1942) 13

Stanley v. Illinois,
 405 U.S. 645 (1972) 13

Stantosky v. Kramer,
 455 U.S. 745 (1982) 14

Troxel v. Granville,
 530 U.S. 57 (2000) 3, 12, 14, 18, 19

Washington v. Glucksberg,
 521 U.S. 702 (1997) 5, 6, 7, 12

Wisconsin v. Yoder,
406 U.S. 205 (1972) 2, 13, 14, 16

Statutes

N.J.S.A. 10:5-1 et seq. 17

Other Authorities

ABIGAIL SHRIER, *IRREVERSIBLE DAMAGE: THE TRANSGENDER CRAZE SEDUCING OUR DAUGHTERS* (Regnery Publishing, 2020) 20

Lee Farnsworth, *Conscience Shocking in the Age of Trump*,
2020 WIS. L. REV. 805, 821, 824 (2020)..... 9

Leor Sapir, et al., Letter to the Editor, *The U.S. Transgender Survey of 2015 Supports Rapid-Onset Gender Dysphoria: Revisiting the “Age of Realization and Disclosure of Gender Identity Among Transgender Adults,”* 53 ARCH SEX BEHAV 863 (Dec. 18, 2024), <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10508-023-02754-9> (last visited July 7, 2025) 20

Pamela Paul, *As Kids They Thought They Were Trans. They No Longer Do.*, N.Y. TIMES, Feb. 4, 2024 (last visited July 7, 2025)..... 20

STATEMENT OF INTEREST¹

Amici curiae are the Family Policy Alliance, a national nonprofit advocating for families, and various state organizations with the same mission, Alaska Family Council, Center for Arizona Policy, Family Institute of Connecticut, Delaware Family Policy Council, Florida Family Voice, Frontline Policy Council (Georgia), Hawaii Family Forum, Indiana Family Institute, The Family Leader (Iowa), Kansas Family Voice, The Family Foundation (Kentucky), Louisiana Family Forum, Christian Civic League of Maine, Maryland Family Institute, Massachusetts Family Institute, Michigan Family Forum, Minnesota Family Council, Montana Family Foundation, Nebraska Family Alliance, Cornerstone Action (New Hampshire), New Jersey Family Policy Center, New York Families Foundation, North Carolina Family Policy Council, North Dakota Family Alliance, Oklahoma Council of Public Affairs, Pennsylvania Family Institute, Palmetto Family Council (South Carolina), South Dakota Family Voice, Texas Values, The Family Foundation (Virginia), Family Policy Institute of Washington, and Wyoming Family Alliance. These organizations understand that children do best when they receive care and support from their parents. Except in those tragic and rare circumstances of abuse or neglect, the adults who care most and best understand a child are the parents of that child.

¹ No counsel for any party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no person or entity, other than amici curiae or its counsel, contributed money to fund the brief's preparation or submission. The parties have consented to the filing of this brief.

When other institutions interfere with the parent-child relationship, separating children from that support structure (including parental decision-making in the lives of their children) children suffer.

Amici curiae therefore believe it is the parents, rather than the state, who know what is in the best interests of their minor children. To that end, amici advocate for laws and public school policies that protect parents' fundamental right to nurture and make decisions concerning the welfare of their children. Amici are united in their interest in ensuring that public schools do not continue to implement policies that interfere with the fundamental rights of parents in the upbringing of their children—policies that conceal information fundamental to a child's identity, personhood, and mental and emotional well-being such as their preferred names and pronouns. Amici curiae's expertise in school policies and legislation that protect parental rights will aid in the Court's consideration of this case.

INTRODUCTION

Over fifty years ago, the Supreme Court declared the “primary role of . . . parents in the upbringing of their children is now established beyond debate as an enduring American tradition.” *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, 406 U.S. 205, 232 (1972). Unfortunately, the decision of the district court in this case suggests that even the most fundamental and obvious lessons sometimes need to be learned again.

The fundamental right of parents to make decisions concerning the upbringing, care, custody, and control of their children “is perhaps the oldest of the fundamental liberty interests recognized by th[e] Court.” *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57, 65 (2000) (plurality op.). “[E]xtensive precedent” establishes that it is one of the fundamental rights protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Id.* at 66.

Appellees, Delaware Valley Regional High School and its Board, have violated and are continuing to violate these fundamental rights by adopting and implementing Board Policy “5756 – Transgender Students” (hereinafter “Board Policy 5756”), which allows school officials to actively conceal the social transitioning of minor children from the children’s parents and explicitly disregard directives from parents regarding the upbringing of their children.

Under the framework established by the Supreme Court, violations of fundamental rights are assessed under one of two standards. “Executive” actions are evaluated based on whether the action is arbitrary or “shocks-the-conscience.” “Legislative” violations are assessed under the appropriate level of scrutiny for the nature of the right claimed, with violations of fundamental rights subject to strict-scrutiny analysis.

As other federal appellate courts have recognized, the distinction between “executive” and “legislative” action is properly functional, not formalist. When state

actors act in accordance with a preestablished, generally applicable policy, their actions are properly evaluated under the standard for “legislative” actions. In contrast, the “shocks-the-conscience” test is properly reserved for individualized determinations.

Appellant, Christin Heaps, has alleged that Appellees acted according to Board Policy 5756, which constitutes a preestablished, generally applicable policy to conceal information from parents and disregard their instructions regarding the upbringing of their children. Accordingly, the state actions at issue in this case are “legislative.” Therefore, if the liberty interest is fundamental, then the government has the burden to show that any infringement of it is narrowly tailored to a compelling state interest.

Appellant’s Amended Verified Complaint sets forth sufficient facts that, when granting all reasonable inferences, states a claim that Appellees have violated his fundamental right to direct the upbringing of his child. Appellees have not argued that this infringement is narrowly tailored to a compelling state interest, and the arguments they do make are insufficient to establish as much.

Accordingly, the decision of the district court should be reversed, and this matter should be remanded for further proceedings.

ARGUMENT

I. The “Shocks-the-Conscience” Test Does Not Apply to Appellant’s Claims.

A. Substantive Due Process Claims are Divided Between Challenges to “Executive” and “Legislative” Action.

The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment requires heightened judicial scrutiny for infringements on fundamental rights—*i.e.*, those rights that are “‘deeply rooted in this Nation’s history and tradition’ and ‘implicit in the concept of ordered liberty.’” *Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization*, 142 S. Ct. 2228, 2243 (2022) (quoting *Washington v. Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. 702, 721 (1997)). Infringements on fundamental rights must be narrowly tailored to serve a compelling state interest. *Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. at 721.

In *County of Sacramento v. Lewis*, the Court drew a distinction between “legislative” and “executive” actions for purposes of substantive due process analysis. 523 U.S. 833, 846 (1998). The Court stated, “[w]hile due process protection in the substantive sense limits what the government may do in both its legislative . . . and its executive capacities . . . criteria to identify what is fatally arbitrary differ depending on whether it is legislation or a specific act of a governmental officer that is at issue.” *Id.* (citations omitted).

B. The “Shocks-the-Conscience” Test Applies Only to “Executive” Infringements of Substantive Due Process Rights, Not “Legislative” Infringements.

The Court’s “cases dealing with abusive executive action have repeatedly emphasized that only the most egregious official conduct can be said to be ‘arbitrary in the constitutional sense.’” *Id.* (quoting *Collins v. Harker Heights*, 503 U.S. 115, 129 (1992)). Accordingly, “the substantive component of the Due Process Clause is violated by executive action only when it ‘can be characterized as arbitrary or conscience shocking, in a constitutional sense.’” *Id.* at 847 (quoting *Collins*, 503 U.S. at 128).

In contrast, substantive due process challenges to *legislative* actions are not subject to the shocks-the-conscience test. Instead, challenges to the exercise of legislative power ask first, if the right at issue is “fundamental” based on our Nation’s history and tradition and inherent in the concept of ordered liberty and, if so, whether the legislative act at issue is narrowly tailored and serves a compelling state interest. *Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. at 721.

C. Appellant Alleges a Legislative Violation of His Substantive Due Process Rights.

As Appellant’s Prayer for Relief in his Amended Verified Complaint makes clear, he is challenging the continued application of a board-enacted, generally applicable policy. Under a functional analysis, preestablished, generally applicable

policies are properly considered “legislative” rather than executive and should be analyzed under the rubric set forth in *Glucksberg* and its progeny.

i. Government Action Applying Preestablished Policy is “Legislative;” Only Government Actions that are Individualized can be Considered “Executive.”

The Supreme Court has not fully defined what makes actions “executive” or “legislative” for purposes of a substantive due process claim. The Second Circuit has noted that the distinction between legislative and executive action is “a functional differentiation,” with “[s]ome types of executive action, such as regulations . . . more akin to legislative action.” *Hancock v. Cnty. of Rensselaer*, 882 F.3d 58, 65 n.2 (2d Cir. 2018).

Like the Second Circuit, the Fifth Circuit takes a functional approach to “legislative” versus “executive” action. In *Reyes v. North Texas Tollway Authority*, the Fifth Circuit summarized: “Although we have not always been transparent as to why we land on one test over the other, we have generally been consistent: . . . government action that is *individualized* to one or a few plaintiffs [is evaluated according to the] shocks the conscience” standard. 861 F.3d 558, 562 (5th Cir. 2017) (emphasis added). The court went on to observe that this dichotomy “is in sync with the many circuits that expressly apply . . . shocks the conscience to executive action (government acts that are more individualized).” *Id.* (citing *Nicholas v. Pa. State Univ.*, 227 F.3d 133, 139 (3d Cir. 2000) (Alito, J.); *DePoutot v. Raffaelly*, 424 F.3d

112, 118 (1st Cir. 2005); *Hawkins v. Freeman*, 195 F.3d 732, 738 (4th Cir. 1999); *Putnam v. Keller*, 332 F.3d 541, 547 (8th Cir. 2003); *McKinney v. Pate*, 20 F.3d 1550, 1557 n.9 (11th Cir. 1994)).

The Fifth Circuit’s distinction between individualized government actions and the application of preestablished policy accords with the context, purpose, and justification for the “shocks-the-conscience” test. In *Lewis*, the Court drew a distinction between individualized actions and matters of broader policy, observing that “[o]ur Constitution deals with the large concerns of the governors and the governed, but does not purport to supplant traditional tort law in laying down rules of conduct to regulate liability for injuries that attend living together in society.” 523 U.S. at 848 (quoting *Daniels v. Williams*, 474 U.S. 372, 332 (1986)).

Lewis did not involve a preestablished policy but instead addressed allegations that a motorcycle passenger was deprived of his substantive due process rights when he was killed in an accident resulting from a high-speed police chase. *Id.* at 836. Similarly, *Rochin v. California*, which first articulated the shocks-the-conscience test, concerned a highly individualized action: the forced pumping of a suspect’s stomach to extract capsules the suspect was believed to have swallowed. 342 U.S. 165 (1952).

The purpose and justification for the “shocks-the-conscience” test also supports limiting its application to individualized actions. In *Lewis*, the Court was

concerned that an expansive interpretation of substantive due process would impermissibly constitutionalize tort claims. 523 U.S. at 848. The Court stated, “the Fourteenth Amendment is not a ‘font of tort law to be superimposed upon whatever systems may already be administered by the States.’” *Id.* (quoting *Paul v. Davis*, 424 U.S. 693, 701 (1976)). The Court went on to note that “liability for negligently inflicted harm is categorically beneath the threshold of constitutional due process.” *Id.* Put differently, *Lewis*’s shocks-the-conscience test is effectively a heightened mens rea requirement for individual torts by state actors. *See* Lee Farnsworth, *Conscience Shocking in the Age of Trump*, 2020 WIS. L. REV. 805, 821, 824 (2020) (asserting that the shocks-the-conscience test “gets at a possible difference in mens rea between executive and legislative enactments” and examining the difference between broad policies and traditional tort claims). This framework does not make sense for preestablished, generally applicable policy determinations. After all, whatever one may think of their legislators and the wisdom of their choices, legislative bodies and rulemaking authorities do not “negligently” pass a bill or adopt regulations.

ii. Appellant Has Challenged Appellees’ Preestablished, Generally Applicable Policy to Conceal Information from Parents.

While Appellant cites to his own personal experiences to establish standing and allege an entitlement to compensatory damages, he also challenges the

constitutionality of a preestablished, generally applicable policy that is properly categorized as “legislative” for purposes of due process analysis. In his Amended Verified Complaint, Appellant challenges Board Policy 5756 as it pertains to the confidentiality of student information, which permits both concealment and even deception about a child’s stated gender identity and social transition measures at school. Specifically, Appellant alleges that the policy prohibits parents from being informed when their child wishes to be identified and treated as the opposite sex unless the child, rather than the parent, consents:

The school district **shall** accept a student’s asserted gender identity; **parental consent is not required**. A student need not meet any threshold diagnosis or treatment requirement to have his or her gender identity recognized and respected by the school district, school, or staff members. In addition, a legal or court-ordered name change is not required. **There is no affirmative duty for any school district staff member to notify a student’s parent of the student’s gender identity or expression.**

Am. Compl. ¶ 23 (emphasis added). Therefore, even if a parent becomes aware of his child’s use of a different name and pronoun and objects, Board Policy 5756 requires that staff should continue to refer to the student in accordance with the student’s chosen name and pronoun at school.

Appellant specifically alleges that Board Policy 5756 violates his “fundamental constitutional rights under the Fourteenth Amendment’s Due Process Clause . . . since it promotes the substitution of the judgment of school districts, school administrators, and school staff members for that of parents with respect to

important aspects of their children’s mental health, welfare, and ultimately physical health, should social transitioning lead to the child’s desire to progress with medical transitioning, and, thus, is void and unenforceable.” Am. Compl. ¶ 72.

Appellant’s Prayer for Relief in his Amended Verified Complaint sets forth, in part, a facial challenge to a legislative action. Appellant plainly seeks to change Appellees’ policies with respect to *all* students, not just challenge a one-off, individualized action taken against him. Under a functional analysis, the written policy in this case is a preestablished, generally applicable, broad policy. Accordingly, the case should be analyzed under the rubric for legislative determinations.

II. Board Policy 5756 Violates Appellant’s Substantive Due Process Rights Under the Legislative Test.

As alleged in the Amended Verified Complaint, Board Policy 5756 violates parents’ fundamental right to direct the care and upbringing of their children. Moreover, Board Policy 5756 is not narrowly tailored to a compelling state interest. Accordingly, Appellant’s Amended Verified Complaint properly states a claim and should be allowed to proceed.

A. Parents Have a Fundamental Right to Direct the Upbringing and Care of Their Children.

“The liberty interest at issue in this case—the interest of parents in the care, custody, and control of their children—is perhaps the oldest of the fundamental

liberty interests recognized by [the Supreme] Court.” *Troxel*, 530 U.S. at 65 (plurality op.). The fundamental right “to direct the education and upbringing of one’s children” is so deeply rooted in our Nation’s history and tradition and implied in concepts of ordered liberty that it is one of the handful of fundamental rights explicitly recognized by the Court as protected by substantive due process. *Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. at 720.

For nearly a century, the Supreme Court has consistently recognized the basic liberty interest of parents to direct the care and upbringing of their children. The Court first recognized this right in *Meyer v. Nebraska*, stating that the Due Process Clause protects “not merely freedom from bodily restraint but also the right of the individual to . . . establish a home and bring up children.” 262 U.S. 390, 399 (1923). The Court went on to refer to a “right of control” in relation to a parents’ dominion over their children. *Meyer*, 262 U.S. at 400.

In *Pierce v. Society of the Sisters of the Holy Name of Jesus and Mary*, the Court cited “the doctrine of *Meyer*” for the proposition that “the liberty of parents and guardians to direct the upbringing and education of children under their control” is a protected liberty interest. 268 U.S. 510, 534 (1925). The Court went on to state, in no uncertain terms, that “[t]he child is not the mere creature of the state; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations.” *Id.* at 535 (emphasis added).

Building upon *Meyer* and *Pierce*, in *Prince v. Massachusetts*, the Court stated, “It is cardinal with us that the custody, care, and nurture of the child reside first in the parents, whose primary function and freedom include preparation for obligations the state can neither supply nor hinder. And it is in recognition of this that these decisions have respected the private realm of family life which the state cannot enter.” 321 U.S. 158, 166 (1944) (cleaned up).

In *Stanley v. Illinois*, the Court recognized that “[t]he private interest here, that of a man in the children he has sired and raised, undeniably warrants deference and, absent a powerful countervailing interest, protection.” 405 U.S. 645, 651 (1972). Accordingly, “[t]he rights to conceive and to raise one’s children have been deemed ‘essential’ . . . ‘basic civil rights of man,’ . . . and ‘[r]ights far more precious . . . than property rights.’” *Id.* (quoting *Meyer*, 262 U.S. at 399; *Skinner v. Oklahoma*, 316 U.S. 535, 541 (1942); *May v. Anderson*, 345 U.S. 528, 533 (1953)).

Given this long history, it is little surprising that just over a month after *Stanley*, the Court declared, “The primary role of the parents in the upbringing of their children is now established beyond debate as an enduring American tradition.” *Yoder*, 406 U.S. at 232. The Court further reiterated that “the values of parental direction of the religious upbringing and education of their children in their early and formative years have a high place in our society.” *Id.* at 213-14.

Citing *Yoder*, in *Quillion v. Walcott*, the Court again reiterated, “We have recognized on numerous occasions that the relationship between parent and child is constitutionally protected.” 434 U.S. 246, 255 (1978). This language was cited by the Court three years later in *H.L. v. Matheson*, which declared that “constitutional interpretation has consistently recognized that the parents’ claim to authority in their own household to direct the rearing of their children is basic in the structure of society.” 450 U.S. 398, 410 (1981) (quoting *Ginsberg v. New York*, 390 U.S. 629, 639 (1968)).

In light of this “extensive precedent, 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*, 530 U.S. at 66 (plurality op.). The scope of this fundamental right is broad, even when it intersects with the rights of the child. In *Stantosky v. Kramer*, the Court explained “[t]he fundamental liberty interest of parents in the care, custody, and management of their child does not evaporate simply because they have not been model parents . . . [e]ven when blood relationships are strained, parents retain a vital interest in preventing the destruction of their family life.” 455 U.S. 745, 753 (1982).

Based on this venerable line of cases, the right of parents to direct the upbringing and care of their children is a fundamental right protected by the Fourteenth Amendment.

B. Board Policy 5756 Undermines the Fundamental Right of Parents to Direct the Upbringing and Care of Their Children.

As the Court recognized in *Parham v. J.R.*, “The law’s concept of the family rests upon a presumption that parents possess what a child lacks in maturity, experience, and capacity for judgment required for making life’s difficult decisions.” 442 U.S. 584, 602 (1979). The Court rejected “[t]he statist notion that governmental power should supersede parental authority in *all* cases because *some* parents abuse and neglect children” as “repugnant to American tradition.” *Id.* at 603 (emphases in original). Rather, “[s]imply 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 some agency or officer of the state.” *Id.*

Board Policy 5756 attempts to do precisely what the Court in *Parham* forbade: supersede parental authority to direct the upbringing of their children merely because such authority is not agreeable to the child. Parents have a necessary and vital role in decisions concerning the social transitioning of their children because “parents possess what a child lacks in maturity, experience, and capacity of judgment required for making life’s difficult decisions.” *Id.* at 602. Even if state officials believe that

the decision of parents is wrong or “involves some risk,” it is still “repugnant to American tradition” to unilaterally arrogate such decisions to the state.

Moreover, this Circuit has always taken the parental primacy approach in circumstances such as here where “school policies might come into conflict with the fundamental right of parents to raise and nurture their child.” *Gruenke v. Seip*, 225 F.3d 290, 305 (3d Cir. 1999). In those cases “where such collisions occur, the primacy of the parents’ authority must be recognized and should yield only where the school’s action is tied to a compelling interest.” *Id.* Relying on *Pierce* and *Yoder*, this Circuit has emphasized that:

It is not educators, but parents who have the primacy of rights in the upbringing of children. School officials have only a secondary responsibility and must respect those rights. State deference to parental control over children is underscored by the Court’s admonitions that the child is not the mere creature of the State, and it is the parents’ responsibility to inculcate moral standards, religious beliefs, and elements of good citizenship.

Id. at 307 (emphasis added) (cleaned up). As such, this Circuit has applied strict scrutiny using the parental primacy framework when a school’s actions strike at the heart of parental decision-making authority on matters of the greatest importance. *Id.* at 307, *see also C.N. v. Ridgewood Board of Education*, 430 F.3d 159, 185 (3d Cir. 2005). This is especially important in circumstances such as here where secret social transition policies are directly aimed at the parent-child relationship, causing division within the family by eroding trust between the parent and child. The district

court nonetheless ignored this Circuit’s explicit authority governing this collision of interests—even where no compelling interest was asserted by the school district.

The school district here is seeking to socially transition students without informing, and in some cases—like Appellant’s—actively *misleading* parents that such transitioning is occurring. On these facts, Appellant has sufficiently pled that the school, pursuant to Board Policy 5756, has violated his fundamental right to direct the upbringing and care of his child.

C. Board Policy 5756 is Not Narrowly Tailored to Serve a Compelling State Interest.

Board Policy 5756 is not justified by New Jersey law, the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination, *N.J.S.A. 10:5-1 et seq.* (hereinafter “NJLAD”), or the guidance offered by the New Jersey Department of Education. First, neither state statute nor guidance document trump the federal Constitution. Second, neither NJLAD nor the guidance document *require* Board Policy 5756. Though New Jersey seeks to honor equal protection and eliminate discrimination, Board Policy 5756’s insistence on socially transitioning children without parental consent and under deception is wholly unrelated to those interests.

Discrimination refers to the unequal treatment of individuals based on their membership in a protected class. Instead, what Appellant seeks is transparency about a child’s life-altering decisions and cooperation with the school so that it refrains from participation in these life-altering changes in the absence of parental consent.

If granted, all parents will have access to relevant information about their children, and all classes of individuals will be treated equally. By contrast, it is Board Policy 5756 that introduces *inequality* by treating the decisions of students identifying with the opposite sex differently from other students, uniquely affording those decisions secrecy and deception. Appellees completely miss the mark in advancing any interest in discrimination as that concept is properly understood, let alone narrowly tailoring their policy to any compelling interest. *See Ricard v. USD 475 Geary Cty.*, No. 5:22-cv-04015-HLT-GEB, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 83742, at *20 (D. Kan. May 9, 2022) (“It is difficult to envision why a school would even claim—much less how a school could establish—a generalized interest in withholding or concealing from the parents of minor children, information fundamental to a child’s identity, personhood, and mental and emotional well-being such as their preferred names and pronouns.”).

Appellees’ vague references to discrimination eviscerate the protections carved out in *Troxel v. Granville*—that a fit parent is presumed to know what is in the best interests of his child, and this presumption attaches until it is proven that he otherwise lacks fitness. 530 U.S. at 68-69 (holding that absent any finding from a court that the parents are unfit, then the parent has the fundamental right, pursuant to the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment, to make decisions concerning the care, custody, and control of their children).

While the state can insert itself in the parent-child relationship in cases of abuse or neglect, there is no evidence suggesting that is the case here, since no court has made a decision that Appellant is unfit to raise his child. Rather, Appellees have applied an unconstitutional presumption opposite to that of *Troxel* by inferring that Appellant and others similarly situated are unfit to know these important decisions relating to their children—without the ordinary protections of due process. *Id.* at 72-73 (“[T]he Due Process Clause does not permit a State to infringe on the fundamental right of parents to make childrearing decisions simply because a state judge believes a ‘better’ decision could be made.”); *see also Ricard*, at *21 (“[W]hether the District likes it or not, that constitutional right 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.”). Many school policies across the country, like the one at issue here, make a broad leap by treating every parent as a threat to their child without any due process. While some students may fear parental disapproval, discomfort, or disagreement, those concerns do not rise to the level of abuse or neglect.

Rather than keeping parents in the dark, schools should involve parents because it is precisely situations like these where parental involvement can make all the difference. Except in the case of abuse or neglect, a child’s parents are the adults who care most about that child, have the most invested in the child, and know the child best.

Parental involvement is particularly critical when a child is questioning his or her gender. Teenagers are increasingly being encouraged to adopt stereotypes about the opposite sex and then to adopt new gender identities based on those stereotypes. What at first was a phenomenon mostly affecting biological males has now shifted to primarily affecting biological females.² And as time has elapsed to contemplate the effects of transition, it is clear that many regret the decisions to socially and medically transition.³ Additionally, it has been observed that those who are transitioning as teens often experience other psychological issues or are affected by social media or those in their social circles.⁴ Parental involvement can help to connect the dots for their kids so that they can get the appropriate help in order to avoid unnecessarily embarking on irreversible, life-altering changes. Parental involvement is not only required constitutionally, but it is in the best interest of children to broadly protect that right.

² ABIGAIL SHRIER, *IRREVERSIBLE DAMAGE: THE TRANSGENDER CRAZE SEDUCING OUR DAUGHTERS* (Regnery Publishing, 2020).

³ Pamela Paul, *As Kids They Thought They Were Trans. They No Longer Do.*, N.Y. TIMES, Feb. 4, 2024, <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/02/02/opinion/transgender-children-gender-dysphoria.html>.

⁴ Leor Sapir, et al., Letter to the Editor, *The U.S. Transgender Survey of 2015 Supports Rapid-Onset Gender Dysphoria: Revisiting the “Age of Realization and Disclosure of Gender Identity Among Transgender Adults,”* 53 ARCH SEX BEHAV 863 (Dec. 18, 2024), <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10508-023-02754-9>.

Board Policy 5756 is not narrowly tailored to or the least restrictive means to any compelling government interest. Instead, the school adopted a blanket approach based on ideological considerations, not the real needs of children. The danger of allowing such speculative justifications to satisfy strict scrutiny is clear: it reduces the fundamental right of parents to a nullity whenever the government disagrees with parents' worldview. But constitutional rights do not yield to bureaucratic preferences. The school's blanket approach violates the Constitution by overriding parental authority.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, Board Policy 5756 and Appellees' actions should be evaluated as a legislative infringement on fundamental rights. Because Board Policy 5756 and Appellees' actions based on that policy fail strict scrutiny, the decision to grant Appellees' Motion to Dismiss should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of July, 2025.

By: /s/ Randall L. Wenger
RANDALL L. WENGER, PA 86537
LAUREN L. HACKETT, PA 306380
INDEPENDENCE LAW CENTER
23 N. Front St. Fl 1
Harrisburg, PA 17101
(717) 657-4990
(717) 545-8107 Fax
rwenger@indlawcenter.org
lhackett@indlawcenter.org

Counsel for Amici Curiae

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit.

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 32(g), I hereby certify that this document complies with the type-volume limitations set forth in Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B) because, excluding the parts of the document exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f), this document contains 4,770 words.

I further certify that this document complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because this document has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2021 in a 14-point Times New Roman font.

I further certify that the text of the electronic Brief filed by ECF and the text of the hard copies filed or to be filed with the Court are identical. The electronic copy of the Brief has been scanned for viruses using Trend Micro Virus Protection.

/s/ Randall L. Wenger
RANDALL L. WENGER

Counsel for Amici Curiae

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on July 7, 2025, the foregoing was filed electronically and served on the other parties via the court's ECF system.

/s/ Randall L. Wenger
RANDALL L. WENGER

Counsel for Amici Curiae