

# Q&A: Coe et al. v. Blanche

## Frequently Asked Questions

*UPDATE 7/6/26: The federal district court issued a preliminary injunction on July 6, 2026, blocking the disclosure of plaintiffs' and class members' medical information. The court held that plaintiffs are likely to succeed in their claims that the government's serial attempts to demand their records violate their rights under the Fourth and Fifth Amendments.*

**Since Day One** of President Trump's second term, his administration has used every lever of power available to it to pursue a nationwide crusade against transgender people and the gender-affirming medical care many transgender people need to live happy, fulfilled lives. Starting with an Executive Order during its second week, the Administration has expended significant energy attacking the provision of medical care for transgender youth in particular, focusing on jurisdictions where such healthcare remains lawful and in some cases, like New York, is afforded state-level legal protections.

After several of its initial strategies to attack gender-affirming medical care for transgender youth were blocked by various courts around the country, the Department of Justice (DOJ) shifted course by issuing civil administrative subpoenas to more than twenty healthcare institutions across the country that provide this care. These subpoenas sought identifying information and sensitive medical records of patients and families who received the care. Many of these healthcare institutions and families of their patients filed successful legal actions challenging the subpoenas, with every court to consider them finding that they were not based in any legitimate purpose, but rather a desire to

harass and intimidate the providers and recipients of this care.

Facing these losses, in April 2026, the Administration changed tack once again, filing a motion to enforce an administrative subpoena directed at a hospital in Rhode Island in the federal district court for the Northern District of Texas, which was subsequently blocked by a federal court in Rhode Island. But DOJ escalated their attacks once more. On May 7, 2026, NYU Langone Hospitals received a criminal grand jury subpoena from the U.S. Attorney's Office in the Northern District of Texas directing the hospital to produce seventeen broad categories of records by June 10, 2026, including patient identifying information and sensitive health information that are substantially similar to the information and records sought by the civil subpoenas that have been quashed in federal district courts across the country. Other healthcare institutions in New York City, including Mount Sinai Health System, may have received similar or identical subpoenas.

On June 2, 2026, several families (represented by ACLU, Lambda Legal, and NYCLU) filed a class action against the Department of Justice and Attorney General for violating their constitutional rights, as well as NYU Langone to prevent its release of information protected by doctor-patient privilege. The lawsuit covers ***“all individuals who received any medical treatment for gender dysphoria, ... while they were under eighteen years of age, from January 1, 2020, through May 5, 2026, at a healthcare institution located in New York City, including NYU Langone Hospitals (and any other NYU entity) and Mount Sinai Health System.”***

On June 4, 2026, DOJ and NYU Langone agreed that no documents or materials covered by the lawsuit would be sent to DOJ prior to June 24, 2026.

On June 24, 2026, a judge for the United States District of the Southern District of New York granted plaintiffs' request for a temporary restraining order and provisional class certification, blocking the disclosure of plaintiffs' and class members' medical information.

On July 6, 2026, the district court converted the temporary restraining order, which would have expired on July 8, 2026, to a preliminary injunction, which has no expiration date. The preliminary injunction on behalf of the provisionally certified class blocks disclosure of plaintiffs' and class members' medical information pursuant to the subpoenas at issue or any substantially similar administrative or grand jury subpoenas related to DOJ's claimed investigations into health care offenses related to gender-affirming medical care.

**Q: What information do the grand jury subpoenas seek?**

**A:** The subpoenas demand a wide array of documents and communications from the hospital, spanning from January 1, 2020 through May 5, 2026. As relevant to patients and their families, the subpoena asks the hospital to turn over "documents sufficient to identify each patient who underwent" gender-affirming medical care as a minor, as well as "documents relating to the clinical indications, diagnoses, or assessments that formed the basis for providing" the targeted medical care, and "all documents relating to the" targeted medical care "provided to each patient identified" "from initial consultation to the most recent treatment provided."

The full text of the NYU subpoena is posted on NYU's website and can be found [here](#).

**Q: What impact do the grand jury subpoenas have on Plaintiffs and their families?**

**A:** Although the subpoenas are directed at NYU and other healthcare institutions, they demand the personal health information and records of patients without any good faith law enforcement basis. Transgender minors, young adults, and their parents are understandably terrified that their private information and sensitive medical records will be turned over to the government, potentially exposing them to future targeting and harassment. On July 6, 2026, a district court in New York issued a preliminary injunction blocking the Trump administration from demanding transgender minor patients' identifying and sensitive health information from healthcare institutions in New York City.

**Q: Why are the subpoenas coming from Texas?**

**A:** Although these investigations began at and are being conducted from DOJ's main office in Washington, DC, they were purportedly transferred to the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Texas, even if in name only, after DOJ was unsuccessful in enforcing its unlawfully motivated subpoenas elsewhere.

**Q: Is DOJ directly targeting families with transgender children?**

**A:** The main target of DOJ's efforts here are hospitals and healthcare providers, as part of the Trump Administration's efforts to harass and intimidate them into stopping providing care. There is no indication that DOJ is investigating individual patients or families at this time. DOJ claims that it is investigating healthcare offenses relating to branding, labeling, and billing, and it has set forth a range of theories as to how this may be the case. But DOJ has provided no plausible explanation for why it needs the identity of

patients and their families in order to investigate alleged healthcare offenses by hospitals and providers. Of course, this does not erase that the subpoenas are part of the Administration's relentless attacks against transgender people and impact the families of transgender youth deeply.

At a June 24 hearing, attorneys for the Department of Justice would not say whether or not parents might be investigated, but this was not suggestive of a shift in investigation to target parents. It was more reflective of the federal government's unwillingness to disclose anything about the purported investigation.

**Q: Who are the plaintiffs in this lawsuit?**

**A:** We represent three families with minor adolescent children and two young adults who received gender-affirming medical care as minors at hospitals in New York City during the years targeted by the subpoena. We are also asking the court to certify a class of all impacted patients and families who received care at healthcare institutions in New York City and whose identities and medical records are being sought.

That class is defined, using the language describing gender-affirming care from the subpoena, as:

*All individuals who received any medical treatment for gender dysphoria, including any medical, surgical, pharmaceutical, or clinical intervention that is intended or reasonably expected to suppress, alter, or eliminate endogenous pubertal development, or to modify primary or secondary sex characteristics, for the purpose of aligning with or affirming a minor's asserted gender identity rather than the minor's birth sex, while they were under eighteen years of age, from January 1, 2020, through May 5, 2026, at a healthcare institution located in New York City, including NYU Langone*

*Hospitals (and any other NYU entity) and Mount Sinai Health System.*

The district court provisionally certified this class, so its July 6, 2026, preliminary injunction applies to all class members: DOJ is prohibited from seeking any of their records.

**Q: How many families are impacted by the grand jury subpoenas?**

**A:** We do not have an exact number of the families, but we believe that hundreds of people may be affected.

**Q: What if my family is impacted by the NYU subpoena but I am not a Plaintiff in this case?**

**A:** This lawsuit has been filed as a class action. Because the court agreed to provisionally certify the class, all patients and families who received gender-affirming medical care while they were minors at any NYC healthcare institution between 2020 and 2026 (the date range specified in the subpoena) will be covered by any relief the court provides.

**Q: What if I (or my child) received this medical care from another hospital?**

**A:** At this time, we only have confirmation of two grand jury subpoenas—one sent to Lucile Packard Children's Hospital at Stanford in California and the one sent to NYU Langone. Because it is possible that other healthcare institutions in New York City, including Mount Sinai Health System, received a similar or identical grand jury subpoena, the relief granted by the district court extends to anyone who received gender-affirming medical care as a minor in New York City between 2020 and 2026. If you received care outside of New York City, then this lawsuit does not explicitly cover your circumstances, but the case

may be helpful in future litigation if more grand jury subpoenas are or were sent to other health institutions outside of New York City.

**Q: Are there other grand jury subpoenas targeting other hospitals?**

**A:** Yes. We know that at least Lucile Packard Children’s Hospital at Stanford in California has received a grand jury subpoena also from the Northern District of Texas, which other legal organizations are [challenging there](#). We also are aware that Mount Sinai Health System in New York City may have received a grand jury subpoena, which our lawsuit covers. We don’t know exactly how many other hospitals may have received grand jury subpoenas, though in its public notice, NYU indicated that it was one of “several” institutions to receive such subpoenas.

**Q: What are the legal arguments being made against this grand jury subpoenas?**

**A:** Plaintiffs are arguing that the subpoena violates their right to informational privacy under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, as well as their right to be free from unreasonable invasions of privacy under the Fourth Amendment. Plaintiffs are also arguing that NYU’s potential compliance with the subpoena would be in violation of New York State’s doctor-patient privilege law. The district court has granted a temporary restraining order, finding that plaintiffs are likely to succeed on the merits of their Fourth and Fifth Amendment claims.

**Q: What happens after the Court’s decision from July 6, 2026?**

**A:** The Preliminary Injunction Order from the district court in New York stopping the Trump administration from demanding this information,

and prohibiting NYU Langone Hospitals from handing this information over, will remain in place, with no expiration date, while the case moves forward.

**Q: What can families do to access care for their kids?**

**A:** This is a terrifying time for families with transgender children and for transgender adults. People across the country are uncertain about the future of their needed medical care. For now, this medical care is still lawful and available for young trans people in over half the country and parents should be coming up with backup plans to ensure that their children are not left without treatment if a medical institution unexpectedly ends the provision of this medical care.