

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

Civil Action No. 24-cv-00913

GAYS AGAINST GROOMERS, a non-profit corporation;  
ROCKY MOUNTAIN WOMEN'S NETWORK, an unincorporated association;  
RICH GUGGENHEIM, an individual; and  
CHRISTINA GOEKE, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LORENA GARCIA, in her individual and official capacities as a Colorado State Representative;  
MIKE WEISSMAN, in his individual and official capacities as a Colorado State Representative and Chair of the House Judiciary Committee;  
LESLIE HEROD, in her individual and official capacities as a Colorado State Representative;  
JULIE GONZALES, in her individual and official capacities as a Colorado State Senator and Chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee; and  
DAFNA MICHAELSON JENET, in her individual and official capacities as a Colorado State Senator,

Defendants.

---

**PLAINTIFFS' REPLY RE: MOTION TO SUSPEND RMR  
CIV. PRACTICE STANDARDS 43.1A(a)(1) & (2)(D)**

---

## REPLY ARGUMENT

Given that this is a case about government officials mandating the use of preferred pronouns and censoring those who do not comply with their views on a contested ideological matter, it comes as no surprise that Defendants state “that they are quite comfortable with the Practice Standards in question and intend to fully comply with them.” Dkt. 21 at 2. That is because the practice standards reflect a similar bias in favor of trans ideology on the issue of preferred pronouns, which, however, remains an issue on which many Americans disagree. Dkt. 15 at 5-10.

That those standards could create a problem in a case that is, in significant part, about pronoun usage, as well as a wider adoption of trans ideology in public discourse, should not be itself controversial. It is plausible to imagine a situation where a witness or party could demand that Plaintiffs or their counsel comply with the practice standard in question. See Dkt. 15 at 7 (example of Duane Powell (a.k.a. “Tiara”) testifying in court). Defendants have not explained why that scenario is implausible or really made any legal argument against Plaintiffs’ motion to suspend.

In any event, because this motion implicates the right to speak and associate for the purposes of pro bono litigation against the government, neither Plaintiffs’ nor their counsel are required to wait to raise this issue when they are facing sanctions. See *NAACP v. Button*, 371 U.S. 415, 452-53 (1963); *Wyo. Gun Owners v. Gray*, 83 F.4th 1224, 1239-40 (10th Cir. 2023).

## CONCLUSION

This Court should grant Plaintiffs' request to suspend RMR Civ. Practice Standards 43.1A(a)(1) & (2)(D) during the pendency of this lawsuit.

Dated: May 24, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

s/Endel Kolde

Endel Kolde

Brett R. Nolan

Courtney Corbello

INSTITUTE FOR FREE SPEECH

1150 Connecticut Ave., NW

Suite 801

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 301-1664

(202) 301-9500

(202) 985-1644

[dkolde@ifs.org](mailto:dkolde@ifs.org)

[bnolan@ifs.org](mailto:bnolan@ifs.org)

[ccorbello@ifs.org](mailto:ccorbello@ifs.org)

*Attorneys for Gays Against Groomers, Rocky Mountain Women's Network, Rich Guggenheim and Christina Goeke*