1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR KING COUNTY 9 LEGAL COUNSEL FOR YOUTH AND CHILDREN, a nonprofit organization; 10 LAVENDER RIGHTS PROJECT, a nonprofit No. 24-2-11540-4 SEA organization; MOMSRISING, a nonprofit 11 organization; OASIS YOUTH CENTER, a [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING nonprofit organization; PEOPLE OF COLOR 12 TEMPORARY RESTRAINING AGAINST AIDS NETWORK, a nonprofit ORDER organization; SEXUAL VIOLENCE LAW 13 CENTER, a nonprofit organization; 14 SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON EQUITY COALITION, a nonprofit organization; KARI LOMBARD, in her individual capacity; JANE 15 DOE, in her individual capacity; and, SOUTH WHIDBEY SCHOOL DISTRICT, a public 16 school district, 17 Plaintiffs, 18 v. 19 STATE OF WASHINGTON, 20 Defendant. 21 22 I. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS 23 This matter comes before the Court on the Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order filed 24 25 by Plaintiffs LCYC, LRP, MomsRising, Oasis Youth Center, POCAAN, SVLC, SWEC, Kari 26 Lombard, Jane Doe, and SWSD ("Plaintiffs"). The Court, having thoroughly considered Plaintiffs' 27

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF

WASHINGTON FOUNDATION

P.O. Box 2728 SEATTLE, WA 98111 (206) 624-2184

ORDER GRANTUNG TEMPORARY

RESTRAINING ORDER- 1

motion, and the declarations and exhibits filed in support of the Motion, Washington State's opposition (if any), the applicable law, the relevant portions of the record, and the arguments,

- 1. The Court finds that Defendant Washington State was provided notice of this motion.
- 2. The Court finds that a date for the preliminary injunction hearing has been set for June 21, 2024, at 1:30 p.m.
- 3. The Court concludes Plaintiffs have shown all five factors necessary for the issuance of the restraining order. (1) There is an inadequacy of legal remedies; 2) a clear legal or equitable right; (3) a well-grounded fear of immediate invasion of that right; (4) the acts complained of have or will result in actual and substantial injury; and (5) the relative equities of the parties in the public interest favor granting the injunction. *Kucera v. State, Dep't of Transp.*, 140 Wn.2d 200, 210, 995 P.2d 63, 69 (2000).
- 4. Plaintiffs have shown there is an inadequate legal remedy;
- 5. Plaintiffs have shown a clear legal or equitable right;
- 6. Plaintiffs have shown a well-grounded fear of immediate invasion of that right;
- 7. The acts complained of have or will result in actual and substantial injury; and
- 8. The relative equities of the parties in the public interest favor granting the injunction.
- 9. The Court also finds that the Parties agree that good cause has been shown for an injunction to remain in place until the Court has had opportunity to render a ruling on a motion to be heard at the preliminary injunction hearing, currently scheduled for June 21, 2024, at 1:30 pm.

1	LEGAL VOICE
2	By: /s/ Julia Marks
3	Julia Marks, WSBA #59704
4	Legal Voice 907 Pine Street, Ste. 500
5	Seattle, Washington 98101 Tel: (206) 682-9552
6	jmarks@legalvoice.org
7	AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF WASHINGTON FOUNDATION
8	
9	By: /s/ Adrien Leavitt Adrien Leavitt, WSBA #44451
10	Taryn Darling, WSBA #38276
11	La Rond Baker, WSBA #43610 ACLU of Washington Foundation
	P.O. Box 2728
12	Seattle, Washington 98111 Tel: (206) 624-2184
13	aleavitt@aclu-wa.org
14	tdarling@aclu-wa.org baker@aclu-wa.org
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
16	Allorneys for T lumilys
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

27