

1-2-2024

Federal Court Blocks Parts of Iowa's 'Don't Say Gay' Law

Arthur S. Leonard
arthur.leonard@nyls.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.nyls.edu/fac_other_pubs

Recommended Citation

Leonard, Arthur S., "Federal Court Blocks Parts of Iowa's 'Don't Say Gay' Law" (2024). *Other Publications*. 931.

https://digitalcommons.nyls.edu/fac_other_pubs/931

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at DigitalCommons@NYLS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Other Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@NYLS. For more information, please contact camille.broussard@nyls.edu, farrah.nagrampa@nyls.edu.

Federal court blocks parts of Iowa's 'Don't Say Gay' law

gcn By Arthur S. Leonard

Posted on January 2, 2024



US District Judge Stephen H. Locher ruled against several parts of a recently-enacted anti-LGBTQ state law in Iowa.

RELATED NEWS: - Federal court blocks parts of Iowa's 'Don't Say Gay' law

US SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Sign up for our **Gay City News** delivered straight to your inbox.

vol

its

US District Judge Stephen H. Locher ruled against several parts of a recently-enacted anti-LGBTQ state law, Senate File 496, from going into effect. Signed into law on May 26, 2023, the statute is slated to require removal of books and other materials from school libraries if they include descriptions of “sex acts” and to ban any “programs, promotion and instruction relating to gender identity and sexual orientation” for students in grades K-6.

Anticipating the law’s effective date of Jan. 1, 2024, some Iowa school districts had already begun removing hundreds of books from library shelves, and elementary school teachers were preparing to alter curriculums and class decorations accordingly. Teachers who maintain library collections in their classrooms were also removing books that they believed would be covered by the law, since violations could subject them to criminal prosecution and penalties, and they were anticipating changes in their subject matter coverage and even in the way they would address students in their classes.

However, the court abstained from ruling on the constitutionality of a provision of the law that would require schools to notify parents if their children requested any “accommodation” relating to gender identity, such as asking to use different pronouns or names than those in school registration records.

Judge Locher found that the interpretation of the library and curricular provisions varied drastically across the state due to ambiguities in the statutory language and misinterpretations of the actual language of the statute, as well as statutory wording that was so vague and inconsistent with the stated purposes of the law as to defy the requirements of the 14th Amendment’s Due Process Clause. The problems with the law were compounded by guidance published by state agencies. At a hearing on the plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction, attorneys for the state struggled to challenge the broad interpretation of the law suggested by the plaintiffs, but the judge found that the state’s suggested interpretations were inconsistent with the statutory language and with recent US Supreme Court decisions purporting to rely on “textualism” as more important than “legislative intent” when interpreting statutes

RELATED NEWS: - Federal court blocks parts of Iowa's 'Don't Say Gay' law

Judge Locher described the removal of books as a “sweeping” violation of the First Amendment and asserted that the “sweeping” removal of books designed to help students understand history, including classic world history books, classic world novels, books that regular libraries carry, and even books designed to help students understand the First Amendment and its history, is a “sweeping” violation of the First Amendment and should be enjoined while the case is pending. The judge remarked that he has been unable to locate “a single case upholding the constitutionality of a school library restriction even remotely similar to Senate File 496.”

Addressing the curricular provision of the law, he pointed out that “there appears to be a severe misunderstanding — in two different ways — by some of

appointed by President Barack Obama. Even if an appeal goes to a three-judge panel that includes senior circuit judges or a judge from outside the Eighth Circuit appointed to sit by “designation,” the three senior Eighth Circuit judges who remain active to sit on appellate panels are all Republican appointees. Thus, any Eighth Circuit panel that gets the application of a stay or an appeal will have a majority of Republican-appointed judges. Judge Locher, by contrast, was appointed to the US District Court in Iowa by President Biden.

Judge Locher was actually ruling on motions for preliminary injunctions in two separate cases which he considered together because they both attack Senate File 496. One broader case was filed by an organization called “GLBT Youth in Iowa Schools Task Force” together with a handful of transgender students and their parents. The other case, focused mainly on the library issues, was filed by a publishing company, Penguin Random House LLC, and a collection of authors, students, parents, and the state’s teachers’ union.

The defendants, sued in their official capacities, are the governor of Iowa, president of the Iowa State Board of Education, the Director of the Iowa Department of Education, the chair of the Iowa State Board of Educational Examiners, and two local boards of education that have already been directing removal of books from their school libraries anticipating application of the statute.

RELATED NEWS: - [Federal court blocks parts of Iowa's 'Don't Say Gay' law](#)