



Institute for  
**Policy Integrity**

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

**FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE – April 26, 2019**

Contact: Derek Sylvan | (212) 998-6085 | [derek.sylvan@nyu.edu](mailto:derek.sylvan@nyu.edu)

## **STATEMENT ON TITLE X RULE INJUNCTION**

Last night, the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington State issued a nationwide injunction to temporarily block a Trump administration rule limiting funding for many women’s health care providers. The rule makes detrimental revisions to the federal Title X program, which funds free or low-cost reproductive health services for millions of women each year. Under the rule, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) would impose onerous restrictions that will likely force the shutdown of key health clinics that rely on federal funding.

The Institute for Policy Integrity at NYU School of Law [filed amicus briefs in multiple court challenges](#) to the rule, and [our brief is referenced in Judge Stanley A. Bastian’s reasoning for the injunction](#).

**Madison Condon, Legal Fellow at the Institute for Policy Integrity at NYU School of Law, has released the following statement on the injunction:**

*“This is a significant victory for low-income women whose health care is being threatened by the Trump administration’s rule. The injunction noted that HHS failed to consider major consequences of its changes to the Title X program. Title X grantees like Planned Parenthood serve as the sole health care provider for many women, and the rule would deprive low-income women of a wide range of services beyond contraceptive access, including life-saving screening and testing.”*

**Jason Schwartz, Legal Director at the Institute for Policy Integrity at NYU School of Law, has released the following statement on the injunction:**

*“Not only is the preliminary injunction an important win for protecting reproductive health, but it shows that courts will hold federal agencies responsible when they grossly underestimate the consequences that their regulatory actions have on everyday people. The court recognized that HHS flunked legal standards and best practices for regulatory analysis. Not only did HHS turn a blind eye to the rule’s massive health impacts, but the agency also undercounted the compliance costs by hundreds of millions of dollars. In doing so, HHS ignored even its own internal handbook on how to count up regulatory costs.”*

The Institute for Policy Integrity at New York University School of Law has closely followed both this case and the development of the rule. Please let me know if you’d like to speak with one of our attorneys about this issue.

###

**The Institute for Policy Integrity** at New York University School of Law is a non-partisan think tank dedicated to improving the quality of government decisionmaking. The institute produces original scholarly research in the fields of economics, law, and regulatory policy; and advocates for reform before courts, legislatures, and executive agencies.