

RAÚL R. LABRADOR
ATTORNEY GENERAL

JAMES E. M. CRAIG, ISB #6365
Chief, Civil Litigation and
Constitutional Defense

JAMES J. SIMERI, ISB #12332
GREGORY E. WOODARD, ISB #11329
MATTHEW L. MAURER, ISB #12575
DAVID J. MYERS, ISB #6528
Deputy Attorneys General
Office of the Attorney General
P. O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0010
Telephone: (208) 334-2400
james.craig@ag.idaho.gov
james.simeri@ag.idaho.gov
greg.woodard@ag.idaho.gov
matthew.maurer@ag.idaho.gov
david.myers@ag.idaho.gov

Attorneys for State Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF IDAHO**

ROBINSON, *et al.*

Plaintiffs,

v.

RAÚL LABRADOR, in his official
capacity as Attorney General of the State
of Idaho; *et al.*

Defendants.

Case No. 1:24-cv-00306-DCN

**RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'
EMERGENCY MOTION FOR
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
ORDER [DKT. 193]**

State Defendants oppose Plaintiffs’ emergency motion for a temporary restraining order (Dkt. 193). State Defendants understood the reasons for and did not oppose Plaintiffs’ request for additional time to reply to State Defendants’ response to Plaintiffs’ motion for an eighth preliminary injunction (Dkt. 194)—reasons that included State Defendants’ own extension of time to respond to Plaintiffs’ motion (Dkt. 189). And State Defendants understand that the effect of the briefing extensions is a gap between the expiration of the seventh preliminary injunction and the Court’s ability to consider the parties’ arguments regarding a possible eighth injunction. State Defendants, however, cannot agree to a temporary restraining order prohibiting enforcement of a validly enacted state law to bridge that gap.

To avoid repetition, State Defendants incorporate here their arguments for opposing an eighth preliminary injunction (Dkt. 191) as grounds for denying the temporary restraining order too. Both motions are governed by the same four-factor test. Memorandum Decision and Order, Dkt. 13 at 3 (“A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction or TRO must establish” the same four factors) (quoting *CTIA-The Wireless Ass’n v. City of Berkeley*, 854 F.3d 1105, 1114 (9th Cir. 2017)). As set forth in the State Defendants’ opposition to the motion for an eighth preliminary injunction, Plaintiffs have not shown that they will suffer irreparable harm in the absence on an injunction and have not shown a likelihood of success on the merits. *See generally* Dkt. 191. Thus, the State Defendants ask the Court to deny the motion for a Temporary Restraining Order.

DATED: May 22, 2026

STATE OF IDAHO
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

By: /s/ David J. Myers
DAVID J. MYERS
Deputy Attorney General

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on May 22, 2026, the foregoing was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which sent a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following persons:

Paul Carlos Southwick
psouthwick@acluidaho.org

Christina M. Hesse
cmh@dukeevett.com

Emily Myrei Croston
ecroston@acluidaho.org

Michael J. Bentley
mbentley@bentley.com

Malita Picasso
mpicasso@aclu.org

*Attorneys for Defendants Centurion of Idaho,
LLC and Centurion Health*

Chase B. Strangio
cstrangio@aclu.org

Leslie J. Cooper
lcooper@aclu.org

Alexandra Johnson
a.johnson@aclu.org

Antonia Gales
galesa@ballardspahr.com

Harlan T. Mechling
mechlingh@ballardspahr.com

Chloe Nakaya
nakayac@ballardspahr.com

Pilar C. French
frenchp@lanepowell.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

/s/ David J. Myers

DAVID J. MYERS