

Paul Carlos Southwick (ISB No. 12439)
Emily Myrei Croston (ISB No. 12389)
ACLU of Idaho Foundation
P.O. Box 1897
Boise, ID 83701
Tel: (208) 344-9750
psouthwick@acluidaho.org
ecroston@acluidaho.org

Chase B. Strangio*
Malita Picasso*
Leslie Cooper*
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FOUNDATION
125 Broad St.
New York, NY 10004
Tel: (212) 549-2584
cstrangio@aclu.org
mpicasso@aclu.org
lcooper@aclu.org

Pilar C. French*
Harlan Mechling*
Antonia Gales*
Chloe Nakaya*
BALLARD SPAHR LLP
601 S.W. Second Avenue, Suite 2100
Portland, OR 97204
Tel: (503) 778-2100
frenchp@ballardspahr.com
mechlingh@ballardspahr.com
galesa@ballardspahr.com
nakayac@ballardspahr.com

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

ROBINSON, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

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

Defendants.

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

**PLAINTIFF'S REPLY ISO
MOTION FOR NINTH
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

This Court is authorized to issue a ninth preliminary injunction that parallels the injunctions it issued on September 3, 2024 (Dkt. 58); December 3, 2024 (Dkt. 96); March 3, 2025 (Dkt. 120); May 30, 2025 (Dkt. 137); August 29, 2025 (Dkt. 150); November 25, 2025 (Dkt. 180); February 27, 2026 (Dkt. 186); and June 12, 2026 (Dkt. 204). None of the material facts have changed for the purpose of determining whether another preliminary injunction is warranted, as was true when

this Court issued the second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth preliminary injunctions in this case. Defendants cite no new case law since this Court granted the eighth preliminary injunction.

Defendants' response to Plaintiffs' motion for a ninth preliminary injunction is to again suggest hormone therapy to treat gender dysphoria is "risky and ineffective[.]" (Dkt. 219 at 2.) This is not the case. In Plaintiffs' first request for a preliminary injunction, which this Court granted (Dkt. 58), Plaintiffs submitted substantial evidence that this treatment is well-accepted in the medical field (*see* Dkt. 2-1 at 7-10), including the fact that this treatment is supported by every major medical association in the United States (*see* Dkt. 2-5 at 10-11). Moreover, since that first preliminary injunction, Plaintiffs have introduced additional evidence that this care is essential (*see* Dkts. 114-5, 114-6, 114-7), which the Court has credited (*see* Dkt. 120 at 7).

To support their opposition to another preliminary injunction, Defendants state that "this Court has 'consistently held . . . that the record shows a genuine debate in the medical community about using cross-sex hormones to treat gender dysphoria.'" (Dkt. 219 at 2 (citing Memorandum Decision and Order (Dkt. 204 at 8)).) While Plaintiffs believe that the evidence will show that there is no genuine debate within the medical community about hormone therapy for the treatment of gender dysphoria, Defendants' Response fails to acknowledge this Court's conclusion on the next page: that such a debate, even if it exists, meets the first prong of the preliminary injunction test by raising "a serious question going to the merits here." (Dkt 204 at 9 ("[t]he Court finds this factor weighs in favor of another preliminary injunction"); *see also* Dkt. 96 at 9 ("Until the parties present the Court with more definitive evidence one way or another as to the medical necessity of hormone therapy to individuals with gender dysphoria, there continues to be a serious question as to the merits of this case, and this factor weighs in favor of granting another preliminary injunction."); *see also* Dkt. 58 at 9 (similar); Dkt. 120 at 7 (similar).)

The Court has previously found, and should continue to find, that the parties are in a period of "deliberative investigation" weighing in favor of issuing another preliminary injunction.

(Dkt. 58 at 9; Dkt. 120 at 7; Dkt. 137 at 6; Dkt. 150 at 6; Dkt. 180 at 5; Dkt. 186 at 5; Dkt. 204 at 4.)

Defendants “incorporate here their arguments opposing the previous injunctions.” (Dkt. 219 at 2.) Plaintiffs thus incorporate their responses to said arguments. (*See* Dkts. 25, 90, 118, 136, 148, 179, 185, and 202.)

CONCLUSION

Plaintiffs have made the requisite showing that a preliminary injunction against enforcement of Idaho Code § 18-8901 continues to be necessary in this case. Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court issue a ninth preliminary injunction prior to the eighth preliminary injunction’s expiration on September 10, 2026.

DATED: September 3, 2026

By: s/ Harlan T. Mechling

Pilar C. French (*pro hac vice*)

frenchp@ballardspahr.com

Harlan Mechling (*pro hac vice*)

mechlingh@ballardspahr.com

Antonia Gales (*pro hac vice*)

galesa@ballardspahr.com

Chloe Nakaya (*pro hac vice*)

nakayac@ballardspahr.com

BALLARD SPAHR LLP

601 S.W. Second Avenue, Suite 2100

Portland, Oregon 97204

Telephone: 503.778.2100

Chase Strangio (*pro hac vice*)

cstrangio@aclu.org

Leslie Jill Cooper (*pro hac vice*)

lcooper@aclu.org

Malita Vencienzo Picasso (*pro hac vice*)

mpicasso@aclu.org

**AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FOUNDATION**

125 Broad Street, 18th Floor

New York, NY 10004

Telephone: 212.549.2500

Paul Carlos Southwick
psouthwick@acluidaho.org
Emily Myrei Croston
ecroston@acluidaho.org
ACLU OF IDAHO FOUNDATION
P.O. Box 1897
Boise, ID 83701
Telephone: 208.344.9750

Attorneys for Plaintiffs