



October 9, 2025

The Honorable Chuck Grassley
Chair
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
224 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington D.C. 20510

The Honorable Dick Durbin
Ranking Member
Senate Committee on the Judiciary
711 Hart Senate Building
Washington D.C. 20510

RE: Lambda Legal Opposes the Confirmation of Edmund LaCour, Jr. for the District Court for the Northern District of Alabama

Dear Senator:

Lambda Legal urges you to oppose the nomination of Edmund LaCour, Jr. for the District Court for the Northern District of Alabama. Founded in 1973, Lambda Legal is the oldest and largest national legal organization dedicated to achieving full recognition of the civil rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (“LGBTQ+”) people and everyone living with HIV, through impact litigation, policy advocacy, and public education.

Approximately 4.6% of Alabama’s population identifies as LGBTQ+. ¹ Consequently, the views of this nominee on the equal dignity of LGBTQ+ people and their families are highly relevant to whether LGBTQ+ people living in the state will receive fair and impartial justice if Mr. LaCour is confirmed to the Northern District of Alabama.

After a comprehensive review of Mr. LaCour’s record, we believe his views, particularly with respect to civil rights issues, reflect a deep hostility to the principles of equality, liberty, justice and dignity under the law for LGBTQ+ people and others seeking to vindicate their civil rights. As the Solicitor General of Alabama, he has defended anti-LGBTQ+ laws within Alabama. He has also taken a special interest in ensuring that anti-LGBTQ+ laws in other states are upheld by courts and that pro-LGBTQ+ decisions are overturned. He’s joined amicus briefs supporting laws that ban transgender youth from playing sports with their peers, accessing medically necessary health care, and using the restrooms and other facilities that match who they are. In addition to his attacks on LGBTQ+ rights, particularly focused on transgender and nonbinary people, Mr. LaCour has focused on dismantling voting rights and other civil rights in Alabama.

¹ Andrew R. Flores & Keith J. Conron, *Adult LGBT Population in the United States*, The Williams Institute (December 2023), available at <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/publications/adult-lgbt-pop-us/>.



While the work of a state solicitor general differs from that of a federal judge, Mr. LaCour's work makes clear that his animosity towards LGBTQ+ rights would impact how he judges cases. He is not qualified for a lifetime position on the federal courts.

Mr. LaCour defended a 2022 Alabama law that criminalizes the provision of gender affirming health care to youth. The law makes it a felony to provide this medically necessary health care. It additionally requires that schools inform parents if their child identifies as transgender, which can place youth in danger at home. Mr. LaCour fought to keep the law in place at the trial court and the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, which upheld it. But his interest in harming transgender youth extends beyond Alabama's borders. In *U.S. v. Skrametti*, at the U.S. Supreme Court, Mr. LaCour included Alabama on an amicus brief supporting Tennessee and its efforts to uphold its ban on gender affirming health care for transgender youth. He has also joined or written amicus briefs in *West Virginia v. B.P.J.*, urging the Supreme Court to uphold West Virginia's ban on transgender students in athletics, *Little v. Hecox*, asking the Supreme Court to overturn the Ninth Circuit's decision to allow a transgender girl to participate in sports in Idaho, and *Metro. Sch. Dist. of Martinsville v. A.C. by M.C.*, asking the Supreme Court to uphold a school district's decision to bar transgender students from using the restroom consistent with their gender identity.

Mr. LaCour has demonstrated an ideology defined by a disregard of the rights or wellbeing of transgender and nonbinary people. Last summer, Mr. LaCour was part of a presentation to the Federal Trade Commission titled, "The Dangers of 'Gender-Affirming Care' for Minors." There he co-presented a section called, "The Politicization of Science"² He called gender affirming health care for youth "untested treatments," despite years of evidence to the contrary. Additionally, he said that the World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH), the international organization that publishes the Standards of Care for the Health of Transgender and Gender Diverse People, using the terms "evidence based" and "medically necessary" is "almost meaningless," despite the rigorous process used to develop these Standards of Care. He also said that when it comes to transgender children, "wants are being treated as needs," and that "medical necessity" has been redefined under the WPATH Standards of Care. These statements reflect contempt for medical evidence, the judgment of medical professionals, and the wellbeing of patients.

In terms of voting rights, Mr. LaCour has defended Alabama against lawsuits challenging the state's racially discriminatory redistricting maps.³ In *Allen v. Milligan*,⁴ which Mr. LaCour argued on behalf of Alabama at the U.S. Supreme Court, the Court found that Alabama's

² "The Politicization of Science," Federal Trade Commission, Washington, DC. July 9, 20205. Video available at, <https://www.ftc.gov/media/dangers-gender-affirming-care-minors>.

³ *Singleton v. Allen*, No:21-cv-1291 (N.D. Ala.), <https://clearinghouse.net/doc/155633/>; *Milligan v. Allen*, No.2:21-cv-1530AMM (N.D. Ala.), <https://clearinghouse.net/doc/140600/>; *Caster v. Allen*, No:23-cv-1536-AMM (N.D. Ala.), https://vhdsf2oms2wcnsvk7sdv3so.blob.core.windows.net/thearp-media/documents/AL_221-cv-1536_417.pdf.

⁴ *Allen v. Milligan*, 599 U.S. 1 (2023).





congressional redistricting maps, which denied a second majority Black district, had violated Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, discriminating against Black voters. Despite the Court's decision, which required an additional majority Black district be created, Mr. LaCour unsuccessfully defended a new set of discriminatory maps in Alabama.⁵ His anti-civil rights agenda has no place on the federal bench.

Thank you for considering our views on this important matter. Please do not hesitate to reach out if we can provide additional information throughout the confirmation process. You can reach us through Ethan Rice, Senior Attorney, erice@lambdalegal.org

Sincerely,

Lambda Legal

⁵ *Singelton v. Allen*, No:2:21-cv-01291-AMM, 2025 WL 1342947 (N.D. Ala. May 8, 2025).

