

As Alabama's Solicitor General, Federal Judicial Nominee Edmund LaCour Defended The State's Abortion Ban And Fought For Racial Gerrymandering

SUMMARY:

In August 2025, President Trump [announced](#) the nomination of Edmund LaCour to the Northern District of Alabama. LaCour has served as the solicitor general of Alabama since 2019, where he has led the state in extreme anti-abortion, anti-trans, and anti-civil rights lawsuits. Previously, he was a partner at Kirkland & Ellis and worked at Bancroft PLLC and Baker Botts LLP.

In 2019, Alabama passed a bill [banning nearly all abortions](#) and punishing abortion providers with up to 99 years in prison if convicted. LaCour represented Alabama in a challenge from the ACLU and Planned Parenthood, where he [wrote](#) that “each human life, from the moment of conception, is worthy of protection from lethal violence” and argued that previous Supreme Court abortion precedents were wrongly decided cases. LaCour also [represented](#) Alabama in a lawsuit seeking to stop the Equal Rights Amendment, where he warned that abortion rights would be expanded if the ERA was ratified.

LaCour has defended Alabama in multiple cases restricting the civil rights of Black residents. In 2022, he [argued](#) for Alabama's gerrymandered maps before the U.S. Supreme Court, which [found](#) that the state unconstitutionally diluted the power of Black voters in its maps. LaCour has helped draw maps and distribute talking points to Republicans, serving as an [architect](#) of gerrymandering outside the courtroom. LaCour also represented Alabama in a case where Black plaintiffs attempted to challenge the discriminatory intent behind a law blocking Birmingham from raising their minimum wage.

LaCour has vehemently defended Alabama in anti-trans cases, including in a [lawsuit](#) seeking to block the Biden administration's anti-discrimination protections for LGBTQ+ students and an [amicus brief](#) in the transgender health care case *United States v. Skrmetti*.

In private practice, LaCour also [represented](#) a group seeking to block Seattle from creating a \$15 minimum wage. LaCour also [worked](#) with anti-LGBTQ+ group Alliance Defending Freedom in a case involving a Christian student group.

President Trump Nominated Alabama Solicitor General Edmund LaCour To The Northern District Of Alabama

President Trump Nominated Alabama Solicitor General Edmund LaCour To The Northern District Of Alabama

August 2025: Trump Nominated Edmund LaCour, Alabama's Solicitor General, As A U.S. District Judge For The Northern District Of Alabama. “President Donald Trump announced on Tuesday his intent to name three U.S. District Judge nominees in the Middle and Northern Districts of Alabama. Trump nominated Edmund LaCour, Solicitor General for Alabama, as a U.S. District Judge for the Northern District.” [1819 News, [8/13/25](#)]

LaCour Was Previously Nominated To An Alabama Seat In 2020 But Was Blocked By Senator Doug Jones (D-AL), And Again Unsuccessfully Nominated By Trump In January 2021. “The new picks include Edmund LaCour, Alabama's solicitor general, whom Trump sought in his first term to appoint to the bench in 2020 only to be stymied when then-Senator Doug Jones, a Democrat in Alabama, declined to return a ‘blue

slip' backing him. By Senate custom, blue slips must be returned by both home state senators of a district court nominee for them to advance. Trump in his final days in office in January 2021 re-nominated LaCour, though Democratic President Joe Biden withdrew that nomination a month later." [Reuters, [8/12/25](#)]

LaCour Served As Solicitor General Of Alabama Since 2019 And Previously Was A Partner At Kirkland & Ellis, And Worked At Bancroft PLLC And Baker Botts LLP. "LaCour has served as Solicitor General of Alabama since May 2019, following his tenure as Deputy Solicitor General. Prior to his work in the Attorney General's Office, LaCour was a partner at Kirkland & Ellis LLP in Washington, D.C., where he represented clients in high-profile matters before the U.S. Supreme Court, federal courts of appeals, and trial courts. His earlier legal practice included positions at Bancroft PLLC in Washington and Baker Botts LLP in Houston." [AG Steve Marshall Press Release, [8/12/25](#)]

Edmund LaCour And His Wife Have Been Tied To Leonard Leo

Edmund And Alice LaCour Have Been Tied To Leonard Leo, Working As Fellows At The Leonine Forum Where He Was A Board Member And Being Involved With The Catholic Information Center Which Has Awarded Leo. "Edmund and Alice LaCour were fellows with the Opus Dei-affiliated Leonine Forum, where Leo is a board member. They also have been involved with the Catholic Information Center, a hub for Opus Dei—a small, ultra-conservative and controversial Catholic community—in the nation's capital and which has given Leo its highest award. Both LaCours gave tribute remarks at the Catholic Information Center's John Paul II New Evangelization Award Ceremony in 2017." [Alabama Political Reporter, [9/18/23](#)]

LaCour's Wife, Alice Shih LaCour, Worked On Neil Gorsuch And Brett Kavanaugh's Confirmations. "LaCour's wife, Alice Shih LaCour, is also a Federalist Society contributor, and her Federalist Society profile notes that she 'served on the confirmation teams [at the Justice Department] to 'elevate Neil Gorsuch and Brett Kavanaugh to the U.S. Supreme Court.'" [Alabama Political Reporter, [9/18/23](#)]

LaCour Defended Alabama's Abortion Ban And Argued Against The Equal Rights Amendment

LaCour Defended Alabama's Abortion Ban In Court

May 2019: Alabama Passed A Bill Banning Nearly All Abortions And Punishing Abortion Providers With Up To 99 Years In Prison. "Alabama Gov. Kay Ivey signed a controversial bill that bans nearly all abortions into law Wednesday evening. It's considered the most restrictive abortion law in the United States. The law makes it a crime for doctors to perform abortions at any stage of a pregnancy, unless a woman's life is threatened or there is a lethal fetal anomaly. Under the new law, doctors in the state face felony jail time up to 99 years if convicted. But a woman would not be held criminally liable for having an abortion." [NPR, [5/14/19](#)]

The ACLU And Planned Parenthood Filed A Lawsuit Challenging The Law. "The ACLU of Alabama, ACLU National, and Planned Parenthood Federation of America filed a lawsuit challenging an extreme law that bans abortion in nearly every case and punishes doctors with up to 99 years in prison for providing care." [ACLU, accessed [8/13/25](#)]

LaCour Represented The Attorney General Steven Marshall In The Case.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Marshall
Attorney General

s/ Edmund G. LaCour Jr.
Edmund G. LaCour Jr. (ASB-9182-U81L)
Solicitor General
James W. Davis (ASB-4063-I58J)
Deputy Attorney General
Brad A. Chynoweth (ASB-0030-S63K)
Assistant Attorney General

Office of the Attorney General
501 Washington Avenue
Montgomery, Alabama 36130-0152
(334) 242-7300
elacour@ago.state.al.us
jimdavis@ago.state.al.us
bchynoweth@ago.state.al.us

Counsel for Attorney General Steve Marshall

[Middle District of Alabama, Robinson v. Marshall, Defendants' Response, filed [8/5/19](#)]

- **LaCour Wrote That Alabama Believed “Each Human Life, From The Moment Of Conception, Is Worthy Of Protection From Lethal Violence.”** “This case is about whether the Constitution forbids Alabama from protecting human life. At the Framing, the common law criminalized many abortions, and by the time the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted, ‘at least 28 of the then-37 States and 8 Territories’ protected unborn human life through ‘statutes banning or limiting abortion.’ Planned Parenthood of Se. Penn. v. Casey, 505 U.S. 833, 952 (1992)(Rehnquist, C.J., concurring in the judgment and dissenting in part). Earlier this year, Alabama enacted the Alabama Human Life Protection Act, which reflects the judgment of the State that each human life, from the moment of conception, is worthy of protection from lethal violence.” [Middle District of Alabama, Robinson v. Marshall, Defendants' Response, filed [8/5/19](#)]
- **LaCour Wrote That Supreme Court Abortion Precedents Were Wrongly Decided Cases.** “Because the Supreme Court’s abortion precedents are binding on this Court, Plaintiffs’ challenge to the Act as applied to abortions of unborn children who have not reached viability is likely to succeed in this Court. Attorney General Steve Marshall will show that these cases were wrongly decided, as they rest on (1) an improper and incomplete history of the protection afforded fetal human life under the common law and state statutes from the mid-nineteenth century up until *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), (2) the arbitrary ‘viability’ line for which neither the constitutional text nor structure provide any support, and (3) the demonstrably false proposition that it is unclear whether a fetus is a human life.” [Middle District of Alabama, Robinson v. Marshall, Defendants' Response, filed [8/5/19](#)]

October 2019: A Judge Blocked The Near-Total Ban On Abortion From Taking Effect In Alabama. “A federal judge on Tuesday blocked a near-total ban on abortions from taking effect next month in Alabama, ensuring the procedure remains legal and available in the state while the case winds its way through the courts. In ruling against the Alabama law — the most far-reaching anti-abortion measure passed by state lawmakers this year — Judge Myron H. Thompson of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Alabama wrote that it violates Supreme Court precedent and ‘defies’ the Constitution.” [New York Times, [10/29/19](#)]

LaCour Signed Onto Alabama’s Lawsuit Challenging The Equal Rights Amendment Because It Could Expand Abortion Rights

December 2019: Alabama, Louisiana, And South Dakota Filed A Lawsuit To Stop The Equal Rights Amendment As It Neared Ratification. “Three conservative-leaning states have filed a federal lawsuit in an attempt to stop the Equal Rights Amendment from being added to the US Constitution as it nears potential ratification. [...] Opponents have said the amendment isn’t needed and would enable the removal of abortion restrictions, and the three states behind the lawsuit announced Wednesday – Alabama, Louisiana and South Dakota – argue that the deadline for ratification expired in 1982, when only 35 states had signed off.” [CNN, [12/19/19](#)]

Alabama Argued That Activists Would Use The Equal Rights Amendment To Overturn Abortion Regulations And Mandate State Funding Of Abortions. “For example, if the ERA were ratified today, activists would urge courts to use the amendment to overturn legitimate regulations of abortion and to mandate state funding of abortions. New Mexico, for example, has interpreted its ERA to provide a broader right to abortion than U.S. Supreme Court precedent.” [Northern District of Alabama, Alabama et al. v. Ferriero, Complaint, filed [12/16/19](#)]

LaCour Signed Onto The Brief.

Dated: December 16, 2019

STEVE MARSHALL
Attorney General of Alabama

/s/ Edmund G. LaCour Jr.
Edmund G. LaCour Jr.
Solicitor General

[Northern District of Alabama, Alabama et al. v. Ferriero, Complaint, filed [12/16/19](#)]

February 2023: Alabama Declared Victory After The DC Circuit Court Held That The Ratification Deadline Had Passed And The ERA Expired. “Alabama Attorney General Steve Marshall announced that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit affirmed Alabama’s win defending against a lawsuit that sought to compel the U.S. Archivist to certify the long-expired Equal Rights Amendment as part of the Constitution. [...] Today, the D.C. appellate court affirmed Alabama’s position, holding that the challenging states had not shown a clear legal right to have a federal court order the Archivist to certify the proposed amendment. The court noted that the ratification deadline had long ago expired, and it rejected the challenging states’ argument that the deadline was invalid or could otherwise be ignored.” [AG Steve Marshall Press Release, [2/28/23](#)]

LaCour Defended Alabama In Cases Restricting Civil Rights, Including Unsuccessfully Defending The Anti-Black Gerrymandered Congressional Maps Before The Supreme Court

2022: LaCour Unsuccessfully Defended Alabama’s Racially Discriminatory Congressional Maps

November 2021: The ACLU And Other Groups Sued Alabama To Challenge The State’s New Congressional District Boundaries As Racially Discriminatory To Black Voters. “In November 2021, the ACLU, ACLU of Alabama, Legal Defense Fund, Hogan Lovells LLP, and Wiggins Childs LLC sued Alabama on behalf of four individual voters—Evan Milligan, Shalela Dowdy, Letetia Jackson, and Khadidah Stone—as well

as Greater Birmingham Ministries and the NAACP of Alabama, challenging Alabama's new congressional district boundaries as racially discriminatory under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Despite having seven congressional districts and a Black voting-age population of over 27% in a state where voters still vote largely along racial lines, Alabama drew districts where Black voters have an opportunity to elect a representative of their choosing in only one district, or 14% of the state's delegation. It accomplished this largely by 'cracking,' or breaking up into several districts, a region of the State called the Black Belt—a largely rural area that encompasses 18 counties (including Montgomery) where most counties have majority Black populations—into four different districts." [ACLU, [5/8/25](#)]

- **January 2022: A Court Granted Preliminary Injunction To The Plaintiffs And Gave Alabama An Opportunity To Redraw The Map By Creating A Second District That Was Fair To Black Voters.** "In January 2022, a three-judge court unanimously granted a preliminary injunction to the Plaintiffs, finding that Plaintiffs were substantially likely to prove that Alabama violated the Voting Rights Act because the districts it drew denied Black Alabamians an equal opportunity 'to elect representatives of their choice.' The court then provided Alabama a first opportunity to redraw the map in time for 2022 elections by creating a second district in which Black voters would have a fair opportunity to elect a candidate of their choosing." [ACLU, [5/8/25](#)]
- **Alabama Obtained A Stay By The Supreme Court, Allowing The 2022 Elections To Proceed With Alabama's Initial Maps.** "Alabama sought and obtained a stay in the Supreme Court, which put the district court's decision on hold and allowed the 2022 elections on to proceed on Alabama's current maps, while also accepting the case to have briefing and argument on the merits." [ACLU, [5/8/25](#)]

October 2022: *Allen v. Milligan* Was Argued Before The Supreme Court By Edmund LaCour. "Argued. For appellants/petitioners: Edmund G. LaCour, Jr., Solicitor General, Montgomery, Ala. For appellees: Deuel Ross, Washington, D. C. For respondents: Abha Khanna, Seattle, Wash. For United States, as amicus curiae, supporting appellees/respondents: Elizabeth B. Prelogar, Solicitor General, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. VIDED." [Supreme Court, [10/4/22](#)]

June 2023: The Supreme Court Ruled That Alabama Diluted The Power Of Black Voters. "The Supreme Court, in a surprise decision, ruled on Thursday that Alabama had diluted the power of Black voters in drawing a congressional voting map, reaffirming a landmark civil rights law that had been thought to be in peril. Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr., who has often voted to restrict voting rights and is generally skeptical of race-conscious decision making by the government, wrote the majority opinion in the 5-to-4 ruling, stunning election-law experts. [...] *Allen v. Milligan*, No. 21-1086" [New York Times, [6/8/23](#)]

LaCour Continued To Defend The State's Maps From Other Unconstitutional Racial Gerrymander Challenges

Depositions And Sworn Testimony Show LaCour Helped Draw Maps And Hand Out Talking Points To Republicans. "But depositions in that court record show LaCour has played a bigger role than Alabama's courtroom lawyer. In sworn testimony, lawmakers said LaCour helped draw maps, inserted pages of legislative findings into the enabling legislation, and handed out talking points for Republican lawmakers to use on the State House floor." [Op-ed - AI.com, [8/16/23](#)]

***Singleton v. Allen* Was Initially Consolidated With *Milligan* Only For Preliminary Injunction, And The Continued Separately.** "*Singleton v. Allen* (was Merrill) [...] This challenge was consolidated with *Milligan v. Merrill*, but only for preliminary injunctive claims. [...] Because of the finding of discriminatory intent, the court considered putting Alabama back under federal preclearance under Section 3(c) of the VRA, but on August 7, 2025, declined to do so. " [All About Redistricting, [8/14/25](#)]

Singleton Plaintiffs Challenged The State's Maps As Unconstitutional Racial Gerrymanders On Different Grounds Than The Milligan Plaintiffs. "Like the Milligan plaintiffs, the Singleton plaintiffs are challenging the state's maps as unconstitutional racial gerrymanders, but on different grounds. Where the Milligan plaintiffs are challenging the state's maps under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, the Singleton plaintiffs argue that the maps violate their equal protection rights under the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution." [Alabama Reflector, [8/16/23](#)]

LaCour Represented The State, Arguing That Racial Gerrymandering Intent Would Be A "Near Impossible Burden" To Prove. "Attorneys from the Attorney General's office argued it would be a 'near impossible burden' to prove intent towards racial gerrymandering by the Legislature. Alabama Solicitor General Edmund LaCour said that the Singleton map did not perform as well on the Legislature's stated priorities, like communities of interest or compactness." [Alabama Reflector, [8/16/23](#)]

2023: The District Court Issued An Injunction Barring The 2023 Plan From Being Used In Future Elections. "On September 5, 2023, the district court issued an injunction barring the 2023 plan from being used in future elections after finding it failed to remedy the § 2 VRA violation. The court appointed a special master and directed them to file 3 proposed remedial plans by September 25, 2023. Alabama sought an emergency stay from SCOTUS but it was rejected on September 26. The district court held a hearing on the special master's remedial plans on October 3, 2023, and two days later the district court selected the special master's 'Remedial Plan 3' to be used in the 2024 elections." [American Redistricting Project, [8/7/25](#)]

August 2025: A Federal Court Ordered Alabama To Continue To Use An Independently Drawn Congressional Map For The Rest Of The Decade. "A federal court has unanimously ordered that Alabama must continue to use an independently drawn congressional map for the rest of the decade. This court-ordered map includes two districts where Black voters have a fair opportunity to elect candidates of their choice. The map was used in the 2024 elections, and resulted in Alabama electing two Black representatives to Congress for the first time in history. The court's order bars Alabama from using a separate map drawn in 2023 by the state legislature." [Legal Defense Fund, [8/8/25](#)]

LaCour Worked On A Case Where Black Plaintiffs Alleged Discriminatory Intent Behind A Law Blocking Birmingham From Raising Their Minimum Wage

December 2019: The Eleventh Circuit Court Of Appeals Ruled That Several Black Plaintiffs Lacked Standing To Challenge The Discriminatory Intent Behind An Alabama Law That Blocked Birmingham From Raising Its Local Minimum Wage. "Fast food workers can't sue the Alabama attorney general over a 2016 state law that blocked a minimum wage increase in the state's largest city, a federal appeals court ruled Friday. The 11th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals sided with the state of Alabama, saying the workers do not have standing to sue over the 2016 state law that prohibited cities from setting their own minimum wage. The lawsuit centers on a 2016 state law passed in response to Birmingham's attempts to raise the hourly minimum wage. The city of Birmingham planned to raise the minimum wage to \$10.10 per hour. Alabama lawmakers responded by swiftly passing a state law that prevented cities from doing so. Fast food workers, the Alabama Chapter of the NAACP and others sued state officials, saying the state law violated the voting rights and civil rights of Birmingham residents. They contended it was racially discriminatory and another example of the majority-white Legislature exerting control over majority-black cities such as Birmingham. The court only ruled that the plaintiffs did not have standing to sue, and not on the other claims." [Associated Press, [12/13/19](#)]

AG Marshall Thanked LaCour For His Work On The Case. "Attorney General Marshall commended members of his staff, including Alabama Solicitor General Edmund LaCour and Deputy Attorney General Jim Davis, as well as former Assistant Attorney General Will Parker, for their hard work in handling this important case." [AG Steve Marshall Press Release, [12/13/19](#)]

LaCour Represented Alabama In Anti-LGBTQ+ Briefs, Including In A Lawsuit To Block Anti-Discrimination Protections**LaCour Represented Alabama In A Lawsuit Aiming To Block The Biden Administration's Anti-Discrimination Protections For LGBTQ+ Students**

July 2024: An Alabama Judge Refused To Block The Biden Administration From Enforcing New Anti-Discrimination Protections For LGBTQ+ Students. “A federal judge in Alabama on Tuesday refused to block the Biden administration from enforcing new anti-discrimination protections for LGBTQ students in four Republican-led states, breaking with six other judges who have said the rules are invalid. U.S. District Judge Annemarie Axon in Birmingham in a 122-page ruling, opens new tab rejected various arguments that the four states led by Alabama made in challenging U.S. Department of Education regulations that say a federal law barring sex discrimination in education extends to gender identity.” [Reuters, [7/30/24](#)]

LaCour Represented Alabama In The Case. “The case is Alabama v. Cardona, U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama, No. 7:24-cv-00533. For the states: Edmund LaCour of the Alabama attorney general's office; and Cameron Norris of Consovoy McCarthy” [Reuters, [7/30/24](#)]

LaCour Praised The Supreme Court For Uphold Restrictions On Youth Gender Affirming Care

LaCour Praised The Supreme Court's Decision In *US v. Skrametti* Which Upheld Tennessee's Law Restricting Gender Affirming Care For Minors. “Edmund LaCour, solicitor general of Alabama, in a statement: ‘The Supreme Court today recognized that Tennessee's law placing age limits on sex-change treatments is not subject to heightened judicial review. The Biden Administration's contrary position depended on the obvious fallacy that providing testosterone to treat a boy's endocrine disorder is the ‘same treatment’ as using the drug to disrupt the normal physical development of an adolescent girl suffering from psychological distress. The Supreme Court recognized that these are different medical treatments.’” [Newsweek, [6/18/25](#)]

LaCour Discussed Alabama's Role In “Shining A Light On The Politicization Of The World Professional Association For Transgender Health's (WPATH) Standard Of Care” Through An Amicus Brief In *Skrametti* At A DC Event. “Alabama Attorney General Steve Marshall filed a friend-of-the-court brief in support of Tennessee at the Supreme Court. In his concurring opinion, SCOTUS Associate Justice Clarence Thomas cited evidence uncovered by Marshall in his defense of Alabama's ban that was reported on extensively by 1819 News. LaCour discussed Alabama's role in shining a light on the politicization of the World Professional Association for Transgender Health's (WPATH) standards of care for surgeries on a The Dangers of ‘Gender-Affirming Care’ for Minors panel hosted by the Federal Trade Commission in Washington, D.C. on Wednesday.” [1819 News, [7/9/25](#)]

LaCour Touted His Brief As Being Extensively Cited By Justice Thomas In His Concurrence In The *Skrametti* Transgender Care Case. “‘In October of last year, we filed an Amicus brief in *Skrametti*, laying all this out, really calling the United States to task for making their representations to the court when they knew what we knew, and explaining what we had uncovered about WPATH, which again had been cited multiple times by the private plaintiffs and by the United States in getting the court to take the case and in making their case at the court. That brief was cited extensively by Justice Thomas in his excellent concurrence, and so it was an honor to be able to do that work,’ LaCour said on the panel on Wednesday.” [1819 News, [7/9/25](#)]

In Private Practice, LaCour Worked With The Alliance Defending Freedom, A Hate Group Designated By The Southern Poverty Law Center, And Represented A Group Suing Seattle To Block A \$15 Minimum Wage**LaCour Worked With Alliance Defending Freedom, A Southern Poverty Law Center-Designated Hate Group, On A Case Involving A Christian Student Group Challenging Campus Speech Permits**

Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) Is A Conservative Christian Organization That Wages Legal Battles Championing The Causes Of America's Religious Far-Right. "Founded three decades ago as a legal-defense fund for conservative Christian causes, A.D.F. had become that movement's most influential arm. In the past dozen years, its lawyers had won fourteen Supreme Court victories, including overturning Roe v. Wade; allowing employer-sponsored health insurance to exclude birth control; rolling back limits on government support for religious organizations; protecting the anonymity of donors to advocacy groups; blocking pandemic-related public-health rules; and establishing the right of a baker to refuse to make a cake for a same-sex wedding." [The New Yorker, [10/2/23](#)]

- **ADF Is Designated An Anti-LGBTQ+ Hate Group By The Southern Poverty Law Center.** "The Alliance Defending Freedom is a so-called 'legal alliance of Christian attorneys' with a history of funding and representing cases targeting LGBTQ people, youth and protections. It is listed as an anti-LGBTQ hate group by the Southern Poverty Law Center, which also notes ADF's efforts against abortion access and that its CEO, Michael Farris, fought equal rights for women. Farris also coordinated efforts to discredit the 2020 presidential election, in which LGBTQ voters were a deciding faction." [GLAAD, [12/4/24](#)]

2016: Alliance Defending Freedom Represented A Christian Student Group Which Filed A Federal Lawsuit Against North Carolina State University Over The School's Policy Requiring A Permit For Student Speech On Campus. "Alliance Defending Freedom attorneys representing a Christian student group at North Carolina State University filed a federal lawsuit against school officials Tuesday over its policy requiring a permit for any kind of student speech or communication anywhere on campus. The university only selectively enforces the policy and did so against Grace Christian Life, a registered student organization, when officials told members of the group that they needed a permit to speak with other students in the student union." [Alliance Defending Freedom, [4/26/16](#)]

LaCour Served As Co-Counsel In The Case. "Edmund LaCour of Bancroft PLLC is serving as co-counsel in the lawsuit, Grace Christian Life v. Woodson, filed with the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina." [Alliance Defending Freedom, [4/26/16](#)]

The Case Was Withdrawn After A Settlement Revised The School's Solicitation Policy. "As part of a settlement with a Christian student group, officials with North Carolina State University have revised the school's solicitation policy so that it no longer unconstitutionally censors the free speech of students. In light of the policy change, Alliance Defending Freedom attorneys representing the student group, Grace Christian Life, withdrew their lawsuit against the university on Tuesday." [Alliance Defending Freedom, [7/19/16](#)]

2016: LaCour Represented A Group Suing Seattle To Block The City's New \$15 Minimum Wage

The International Franchise Association (IFA) Sued The City Of Seattle Seeking To Enjoin The City's New \$15 Minimum Wage. "Challengers of Seattle's minimum wage ordinance were dealt a second blow in September 2015, when the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit rejected their arguments that the law's

classification of franchisees violates the Dormant Commerce Clause, the Equal Protection Clause, the First Amendment, the Lanham Act, and the Washington State Constitution. The International Franchise Association (IFA) and a handful of local Seattle franchisees sued the City of Seattle seeking to enjoin enforcement of the ordinance, but their motion was denied for failure to show a likelihood of success on the merits. [...] The law, which seeks to raise the minimum wage to \$15 per hour, went into effect April 1, 2015.” [ABA, [3/18/16](#)]

2016: LaCour Represented The IFA In A Petition Before The Supreme Court.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

PAUL D. CLEMENT
Counsel of Record
H. CHRISTOPHER BARTOLOMUCCI
D. ZACHARY HUDSON
EDMUND G. LACOUR JR.
BANCROFT PLLC
500 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Seventh Floor
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 234-0090
pclement@bancroftpllc.com

Counsel for Petitioners

January 25, 2016

[Supreme Court, International Franchise Association v. City of Seattle, Petition for Writ of Certiorari, filed [1/25/16](#)]

The Petition Was Denied. “May 2 2016 Petition DENIED.” [Supreme Court, [5/2/16](#)]

###