

Boom! Lawyered: Will the Supreme Court Block Abortion Providers from Suing on Behalf of Their Patients?

Imani Gandy: Hello, fellow law nerds! Welcome to another episode of Boom! Lawyered, a Rewire.News podcast hosted by the legal journalism team that is really into Outlander fan fiction. There's a lot of good smut out there, and I'm really sad that Jess refuses to watch Outlander, and it's actually causing a bit of a rift in our relationship, but we've committed to working through it. I'm Imani Gandy.

Jessica Pieklo: And I'm Jess Pieklo. Rewire.News is dedicated to bringing you the best reproductive rights and social justice news, commentary, and analysis on the web. The Team Legal podcast is part of that mission, so a big thanks to our subscribers and a welcome to our new listeners.

Imani Gandy: Unless you've been trapped under something heavy or, say, hiding under your desk, drinking wine and eating sheet cake, which given the news cycle is absolutely fair-

Jessica Pieklo: Totally.

Imani Gandy: ... but you probably know that next spring the Supreme Court is going to hear the first abortion rights challenge since Brad McBeer joined the bench.

Jessica Pieklo: June Medical Services v. Gee is the case, and it is a doozy. It involves a challenge to Act 620, a Louisiana law that mandates abortion providers get admitting privileges at a hospital within 30 miles or face legal sanction. Act 620 is identical, identical, the very same bill, to an anti-abortion restriction the court struck just a few years ago in Whole Women's Health v. Hellerstedt.

Imani Gandy: But because nothing seems to matter anymore when it comes to the federal courts and abortion rights, instead of Act 620 being dead in the water thanks to Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt, in March, Justice Kagan is going to get to weigh in on the fate of abortion access for Louisiana and, well, the rest of the country, frankly.

Jessica Pieklo: So, even if you haven't been under a rock and you know that the court is going to hear June Medical Services, you might have missed that when the justices are busy deciding if they should uphold an identical law ... Did I say it's identical?

Imani Gandy: You said-

Jessica Pieklo: Identical to-

Imani Gandy: ... identical!

Jessica Pieklo: Identical to the one they struck just a few years ago. The justices are also going to decide if abortion providers have standing to sue to challenge abortion restrictions on behalf of their patients.

Imani Gandy: Standing is a sleeper of an issue in the case and one that has the potential to blow up almost 50 years of abortion rights jurisprudence, and that's what we're going to talk about today: standing in abortion rights cases. We're also going to talk about why, if the court sides with Louisiana in June Medical Services, challenging unconstitutional abortion restrictions will get even tougher.

Jessica Pieklo: Okay, Imani. So, let's talk about this standing issue. What in the hell is Louisiana's deal?

Imani Gandy: Before we get into what is Louisiana's deal, we should give just a brief refresher on what standing is.

Jessica Pieklo: Oh, that's a good idea. Okay. We'll get into this more later, but briefly ... Article III of the Constitution grants federal courts judicial power of the United States, but only the power to hear cases and controversies, which is a fancy term of art for disputes. So, one component of the case or controversy requirement is standing, and the point of standing is to ensure that the plaintiff has a personal stake in the outcome of the litigation. Usually plaintiffs can only bring a claim to a court that seeks to vindicate their own rights, but sometimes a plaintiff can bring a claim on behalf of someone else, a third party. That's called third-party standing, and we're going to talk about that more in detail later, too.

Imani Gandy: Right. So, back to what Louisiana's deal is. So, they filed a Hail Mary cross-petition with the Supreme Court challenging abortion providers standing to sue on behalf of their patients, even though they had never before in the five years of litigation contested it. Five years of litigation. They didn't contest standing for five years. In fact, they repeatedly conceded that plaintiffs had standing. This cross-petition is bad, and not just because it's procedurally fucked up, but because the arguments that attorneys for Louisiana are making will lead to further stigma of abortion providers. We're going to come back to this point about stigma, but let's just give an overview of what some of these arguments are.

Jessica Pieklo: One of the arguments Louisiana is making is that there is little evidence that the interests of providers' patients actually align with plaintiff's position, that the burdens of the admitting privileges law exceeds their benefits.

Imani Gandy: And, you know, let's just hold space for the fact that the Supreme Court already decided that Texas's identical law has no benefit. There's no benefit.

Jessica Pieklo: Zero.

Imani Gandy: There was no evidence-

Jessica Pieklo: None.

Imani Gandy: ... at all that it was enacted or that it actually did improve the health and safety of pregnant people, so it's a bullshit law.

Jessica Pieklo: It is a bullshit law.

Imani Gandy: Another argument that plaintiffs are making is that there is record evidence of abortion providers' poor safety record, their inadequate credentialing practices, and their questionable efforts to undermine the admitting privileges law. Louisiana is claiming that plaintiffs are directly adverse to their patients' interests.

Jessica Pieklo: And the doctors are saying, quite rightly, that none of this is true.

Imani Gandy: Nope.

Jessica Pieklo: "We are actually looking out for our patients' interests all the time."

Imani Gandy: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

Jessica Pieklo: And, I mean, here's the worst part of it. They claim that providers are in it for the money, literally in it for the money. This is what they have to say: "Plaintiff's own interest and that of other Louisiana abortion providers is to reduce their present and future compliance obligation while providing as many abortions as possible."

Imani Gandy: Because that's what's happening, right?

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah.

Imani Gandy: We've got just scores of abortion providers who are like, "Regulations? Patient health and safety? Screw you. We just want to abort all the things, consequences, safety be damned." It's ridiculous. That's just not how it works.

Jessica Pieklo: You know who are a bunch of high rollers? Abortion providers.

Imani Gandy: Oh, yeah. They're just rolling in it and rolling in the dough, just aborting shit and buying Lamborghinis. That's what they do. It's just absurd, but we should talk about why it is that abortion providers sue on behalf of their patients, why it is that third-party standing is so important when it comes to challenging abortion restrictions.

Jessica Pieklo: It's really important, and there are a lot of good reasons why providers bring these claims. First of all, restrictions are often directly targeting providers rather than pregnant people so they can do it all at the same time. Also, people seeking abortions face obstacles to asserting their own rights, particularly low

income people and people of color who are disproportionately seeking abortions and are more vulnerable to the impact of the abortion restrictions like Act 620. Providers are in a better position to bear the burden of bringing the lawsuit.

Imani Gandy: That's absolutely right, and if providers didn't have third-party standing, it would make these laws much more difficult to challenge.

Jessica Pieklo: So much.

Imani Gandy: So, let's just think about what the situation is now. Currently, as soon as bills restricting abortion are signed into law, they are almost immediately challenged by providers. If providers didn't have third-party standing to sue on behalf of their patients, then those laws would go unchallenged until a pregnant person was willing to sue in their own name and decided, "We're going to do that. We're going to go find a lawyer. I'm going to take time off of work. I'm going to take time away from my kids." Remember, most of the people who are seeking abortions got other ... They have other shit going on, right? They don't have time-

Jessica Pieklo: Other stuff is happening.

Imani Gandy: They're pregnant, for one; they're trying to find someone to perform an abortion, for two; and for three, they usually have kids, families, jobs. They just don't want to be the center of attention, the subject of some big abortion rights lawsuit. Given the stigma associated with abortion and that pregnant people have their own shit going on, it would be really hard for ACLU or Planned Parenthood or Center for Reproductive Rights to find a pregnant person who's willing to sue. So, while these organizations are trying to find that perfect plaintiff, these laws are going unchallenged and will go into effect and will close clinics, therefore decimating abortion access even further.

Jessica Pieklo: I mean, that's just ... The idea of forcing a pregnant person to throw themselves on the mercy of the court for an abortion and challenger restriction is ridiculous.

Imani Gandy: It is.

Jessica Pieklo: So, that's the tip of the iceberg, but really why is standing such a big deal?

Imani Gandy: Well, as you mentioned earlier, standing is a constitutional requirement under Article III of the Constitution. You can't have a lawsuit without standing.

Jessica Pieklo: Nope. No standing, no law suit.

Imani Gandy: No standing, no lawsuit, no soup for you. So, let's just ... It's going to get a little bit nerdy right now, so everyone adjust your glasses, straighten your tie. We're

going to do a little bit of first year civil procedure, and we're going to talk to you about subject matter jurisdiction.

Jessica Pieklo: Okay. I actually hated civil procedure-

Imani Gandy: I loved civil procedure.

Jessica Pieklo: ... but I'm going to-

Imani Gandy: You're an admin law. I'm a civ pro gal.

Jessica Pieklo: Civ pro was my worst grade in law school. I'm just going to admit it. I really hated it.

Imani Gandy: My teacher ... Can we just stop for a second? My civ pro teacher is Amy Wax. If you Google Amy Wax, she's the woman-

Jessica Pieklo: She's bananas.

Imani Gandy: She's bananas. She's decided that she's just a white supremacist now, which she wasn't in 1998 when I was in law school, so I don't know what's going on. But subject matter jurisdiction, lay it on me.

Jessica Pieklo: We are going to make civ pro so much more fun for you, listeners, than it was for me. All right. So, subject matter jurisdiction is pretty much what it sounds like. A federal court must have jurisdiction or power over the subject matter of the lawsuit or claim that's before the court. If the federal court doesn't have that subject matter jurisdiction, it can't hear the case. It doesn't have the power to decide it on the merits, and that means the case has to get thrown out of court.

Imani Gandy: So, what does subject matter jurisdiction have to do with standing? That's what you're probably asking, listener, and I'm going to tell you because that's what we do here at Boom! Lawyered. So, a federal court does not have subject matter jurisdiction over a claim if the claimant does not have constitutional standing under Article III of the Constitution. That's pretty straightforward. Now, as we've said before, the issue of standing determines whether or not a federal court has the power or jurisdiction to hear the claim that a party has brought before the court, and it also determines whether or not that court has the power to provide a remedy. So, in other words, a plaintiff must have a sufficient interest in the dispute.

Jessica Pieklo: I'm having flashes. I'm fanning myself. Flashes to my first year in law school of, like ... It's subject matter jurisdiction, and you need standing for subject matter jurisdiction. This is all mushy in my brain. Okay, so I'm going to walk through it again. For a dispute to be within the power ... That's subject matter jurisdiction, right? Jurisdiction is power of a federal court. The plaintiff has to have standing.

No standing, no power to hear the case. Now, standing requires three elements. You know lawyers love elements and tests, so we have one. Three elements.

Imani Gandy: We have elements. We got three-pronged tests.

Jessica Pieklo: Give me some prongs! All right. First, the plaintiff has suffered a concrete injury. Something has happened to them that the court can fix. Two, that injury is fairly traceable to actions of the defendant. You have to love lawyers using language like fairly traceable.

Imani Gandy: Fairly traceable.

Jessica Pieklo: It's not traceable. It's perhaps it's traceable, fairly traceable. There's some ability to trace it, but we won't say how far. This is why people spend months fighting over standing in courts. And three, that it must be likely, not just speculative, but likely that that injury will be redressed by a favorable decision. So, you can't just have something happen and then go to the federal court to file a grievance. That's not how it works.

Imani Gandy: Right. The Supreme Court is not about Festivus. You don't just go there and air your grievance. Not the Supreme Court, any federal court. All right, so what is third-party standing, then? I'm going to tell you. I'm going to tell you right now. Want to hear about it? Here it goes. So, third-party standing is a judicially created, or prudential standing, judicially claiming-

Jessica Pieklo: Lawyers and our terms.

Imani Gandy: Prudential. Lawyers, we're so pompous. Honestly, just say judicially created. You don't need to say prudential. But usually litigants have to litigate on their own behalf, right? They're not going to litigate-

Jessica Pieklo: Yep.

Imani Gandy: ... a case on behalf of someone who's not present before the court. You have to have a stake.

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah. I can't just go sue on behalf of Imani's rights.

Imani Gandy: Right. Exactly. Generally.

Jessica Pieklo: Generally you can't.

Imani Gandy: But sometimes you can. Sometimes a litigant's interests are so aligned with third parties that aren't in court that courts will permit that litigant who is before the court to sue on behalf of the third party who is not before the court. This has been the case with abortion providers and patients for nearly 40 years. I mean, it's just ... That's just the way it goes. Abortion providers-

Jessica Pieklo: It is.

Imani Gandy: ... and their patients have been seen to be so aligned in their interests, it just makes sense for abortion providers to sue not only challenging regulations that affect them, but also regulations that affect their patients, which then in turn affects them. I mean, it's just ... It seems like common sense to me.

Jessica Pieklo: It is common sense, and it's super-efficient too, right? That way you just have the claim right out of the gates and you don't have a bunch of piecemeal litigation which the federal courts doesn't like, anyway. So, setting aside all the technical civ pro talk we just threw at you like I have tried to do for the last, I don't know, 20-some-odd years since being out of law school, Louisiana's arguments about why plaintiffs don't have third-party standing in this case, why doctors can't sue on behalf of their patients is, and I'm going to use a legal term of art here, Imani-

Imani Gandy: Yep.

Jessica Pieklo: ... bullshit.

Imani Gandy: Yes, yes. I think coming from the Latin bullshittius. I believe that's what it is, but it's absolutely horseshit. Attorneys for Louisiana are accusing providers of not even trying to get admitting privileges. I mean, it's just these providers, they're just waltzing around, ignoring these regulations that Louisiana has foisted upon them-

Jessica Pieklo: Regulations, smegulations.

Imani Gandy: They're like, "Eh, who gives a shit?" That is not the case. I mean, based on the record that plaintiffs have put before the Supreme Court, the record that has been developed over the last five years, that is absolutely not true. These providers have a really hard time getting admitting privileges for reasons that we've discussed on the podcast before. For example, a lot of hospitals are run by Catholics, which have a Catholic directive that say, "We don't do abortion." So, if you're a provider looking to get admitting privileges to prop up your abortion practice, Catholic hospitals aren't going to let you do that. Other hospitals, because they're profit-making organizations, will only allow you to get admitting privileges if you agree to admit a certain number of patients per year. But because abortion is so safe, it is almost impossible for abortion providers to say, "We're going to be able to admit this number of patients a year," because we just don't have that many complications. So, attorneys for Louisiana, as far as plaintiffs have argued it, are just making shit up.

Jessica Pieklo: And, I mean, I'm having flashbacks. Haven't we talked about the relative safety of abortion in relationship to admitting privileges laws before? This all feels so familiar.

Imani Gandy: It does.

Jessica Pieklo: Right?

Imani Gandy: Yep. Yep.

Jessica Pieklo: Why are we here? [inaudible 00:15:59] court, what are you doing?

Imani Gandy: Is that like ... Do you mean why are we here right now, or is this an existential question?

Jessica Pieklo: I'm having an existential dread moment, but this is the thing. Let's talk about the nugget of the standing claim that Louisiana is asserting here because it is really monstrous. They're claiming that when it comes to abortion restrictions that are designed to promote the health, safety, and wellbeing of a patient, that providers and patients don't have a common enough interest to allow doctors to sue on their behalf again. So, let me break that down. That means that Louisiana's claiming that doctors can't advocate for their patients because they are too selfish or too self-interested that the court cannot trust doctors to affirmatively represent their patients' interests. It's offensive, it's wrong, and it is an attack on the entire practice of medicine.

Jessica Pieklo: Louisiana's attacking this in multiple ways. So, we're talking about June Medical Services. Because everything is confusing in abortion laws, there's actually a June Medical Services two case. There's another case being litigated in Louisiana, and that one's challenging a bunch of other restrictions like their D&E ban, for example. Now, in that litigation, there's some testimony that's under seal, which means the court has said, "Nobody gets to see this while this litigation is going on. It's disputed evidence." Attorneys for the state of Louisiana are trying to do procedural end runs to get this information before the Supreme Court because they say that it's going to impact this standing claim. They say that they can prove that there's not an alignment of interest, and it's just ... It's tactical garbage, and it needs to be called out for what it is.

Imani Gandy: And let me just explain why it's tactical garbage because in this other case, this June Medical Services part two case, that case is still ongoing. They're still in the discovery phase. They're hammering out pretrial motions and all of that. So, for Louisiana-

Jessica Pieklo: It's a real live fight.

Imani Gandy: ... to try to marshal evidence from another case that isn't even fully formed yet, to use provider testimony, deposition testimony, and declarations and affidavits in order to prove their case here before the Supreme Court is absurd. The reason why it's absurd is because Louisiana had every possible chance to make the same claims that they're making in that other case in this case. They could have said-

Jessica Pieklo: Years' worth.

Imani Gandy: ... "Providers don't have standing," and then they could have spent the last five years litigating whether or not providers have standing, but they didn't do that. Instead, they conceded standing. Again and again, they conceded it in the district court. They conceded it in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Now for the first time at the Supreme Court, they're saying, "Nah. Actually, you know what? We want to go back and just sort of ... We want to take all of that back. We actually now want to litigate standing"-

Jessica Pieklo: Whoopsie.

Imani Gandy: ... "in this case." You can't do that. That's just not how appellate law works. You can't bring issues of first impression. That's a legal term of art that basically means it's the first fucking time a court has heard this shit. You can't bring an issue of first impression to the Supreme Court because the Supreme Court is not a fact-finding court, right? It's-

Jessica Pieklo: Right.

Imani Gandy: It's, it's, it's, it's ... Oh, God. It gives me an aneurysm.

Jessica Pieklo: I mean, fair.

Imani Gandy: Here's another reason why Louisiana's claim is ridiculous. Okay, so Louisiana is claiming that abortion providers and abortion providers' patients don't have aligned interests because they say that this admitting privileges law is meant to promote the health and safety of pregnant people and that abortion providers are trying to skirt compliance with that law. But that argument necessarily depends on determining that the Louisiana law actually promotes health and safety, and that determination is what is at issue in the case. So, you can't say, "Providers and patients interests aren't aligned because this law is for health and safety, and providers hate health and safety," when the very crux of the case is whether or not this law actually promotes health and safety. It's just a circle of fuckery is what it is.

Jessica Pieklo: A circle of fuckery. I'm going to go whiskey up my coffee at this point, thanks to these arguments-

Imani Gandy: [crosstalk 00:20:18]

Jessica Pieklo: ... because oh, my God. Even if they're not successful, they are ... The state of Louisiana is very successful in its attempt to smear and besmirch abortion providers in this petition. They will be getting rhetoric in front of the court that says abortion providers are profit hungry, sort of money seeking, not looking out for their patients' best interests, not able effectively deliver the standard of care. I mean, it's a sideways attack on the entire industry.

Imani Gandy: Right, and this whole idea ... I mean, if you were to ask any abortion provider if they're making bank off of providing abortions, you're going to find that they're not. That's just not the way it is. Abortion providers as a general matter do this work because they know that it's important to the economic wellbeing, the mental wellbeing, the health of pregnant people. They do it because they care about patients. What Louisiana is essentially trying to do is Kermit Gosnell-ify all abortion providers, right? They're trying to make it seem like this one outlier asshole murderer that no provider would look to and be like, "Oh, yeah, here's a great guy who cared about the health and safety of his patients," they're trying to make Kermit Gosnell be the symbol, sort of. That's just the way abortion providers are.

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah. He's like the spokesperson-

Imani Gandy: Right, exactly.

Jessica Pieklo: ... for the abortion providers.

Imani Gandy: He's the mascot-

Jessica Pieklo: Stupid.

Imani Gandy: ... for abortion providers, and they're all murderous assholes who are just trying to abort everything in sight so that they can make money, and that's just-

Jessica Pieklo: I ... Yeah.

Imani Gandy: That's just not even true.

Jessica Pieklo: I hear Alito typing at his keyboard in response to this.

Imani Gandy: Oh, yeah. Gosnell is-

Jessica Pieklo: You know you're going to get something.

Imani Gandy: ... absolutely going to come up at some point, I bet. I just-

Jessica Pieklo: We need to make a bingo card for the arguments ahead of time, so let's put a square for Gosnell on the June Medical Services bingo card. But, so-

Imani Gandy: And I was just going to say, and frankly, even if the person asserting the rights on behalf of a third party, even if ... I mean, abortion providers do have some pecuniary interest because they are paid for their services-

Jessica Pieklo: Mm-hmm (affirmative). Yeah, people are-

Imani Gandy: ... just like everyone.

Jessica Pieklo: ... entitled to earn a living.

Imani Gandy: Usually most people are paid for their services, so it does ... I mean, even if there's some sort of pecuniary interest, that doesn't necessarily mean that that interest is going to outweigh the Hippocratic oath that they took to fucking take care of their patients. It's casting abortion providers as evil, as somehow outside the practice of medicine, and it's really nefarious.

Jessica Pieklo: It is. It's nefarious. It heaps stigma on top of stigma. It's all really bad. So, what would it mean for the Supreme Court to agree with Louisiana, though, and find that these kind of restrictions that providers just can't sue, that if it's a health safety, a wellbeing restriction, that, sorry, patients, you got to do that?

Imani Gandy: Well, at a minimum, these kinds of trap laws and the related laws, laws like telemedicine bans and funding bans and these forced disclosures, these forced informed consent laws, it's going to be really, really hard to challenge because, as I said earlier, you got to find a person who's willing to challenge those laws. You're going to be real hard-pressed to find a pregnant person who's willing to do that. Abortion providers are just better suited for taking on these kinds of fights.

Jessica Pieklo: I mean, we've mentioned this in other podcast episodes before, but there is an end to being pregnant, right?

Imani Gandy: Right.

Jessica Pieklo: Litigation takes a long time.

Imani Gandy: Five ... This case has been going for five years. Do you know anyone who's been pregnant for five years?

Jessica Pieklo: Shoot me if I was pregnant for five years. Oh, my God.

Imani Gandy: Jesus Christ.

Jessica Pieklo: Seriously. That would've been a nightmare. So, yeah, absolutely. Also, knowing what we know about the anti-choice community, I guarantee you it would be only a matter of time before those advocates tried to make the same standing challenges in anti-abortion restrictions that are passed to, quote-unquote, "promote fetal life," right? Like D&E bans, six-week bans, total abortion bans. You're going to have to have a pregnant person in those instances come forward as the person bringing the lawsuit as well.

Imani Gandy: And who wants to do that? I mean, honestly, who wants to do that? Would you have wanted to do that when you were pregnant?

Jessica Pieklo: Oh, my God. All I wanted to do was take a nap and eats Saltines and Snickers bars. I ate a lot of Snickers bars when I was pregnant. So many Snickers bars.

Imani Gandy: The argument is bad. The cross-petition-

Jessica Pieklo: So bad.

Imani Gandy: ... is bad. I'm confused as to-

Jessica Pieklo: So bad.

Imani Gandy: ... why the Supreme Court even took it, but the Supreme Court is going to do what the Supreme Court is going to do because the institutional norms apparently don't mean anything anymore. If the Supreme Court has a brain, they will just knock this cross-petition. They're just going to smack it down and say, "Hey, man, stare decisis. We've been letting this shit go on for 50 years. There's literally no reason now for you to be claiming that all of a sudden abortion providers are trying to just abort, abort the planet, so that they can make money." It's just-

Jessica Pieklo: Abort the planet. I am making that a T-shirt.

Imani Gandy: It's like hack the planet, but abort the planet.

Jessica Pieklo: So, the court's going to hear arguments in this case on March 4th, and it's a big high-ticket abortion rights case, so that means we're probably not going to get a ruling until the summer. Given the fact that it's a big high-ticket abortion rights case and the makeup of the court has changed, I'm guessing that all eyes are going to be on John Roberts again. People are talking to him in these arguments. If you're going to upend 40-ish years of precedent, Johnny, it better be a good reason.

Imani Gandy: Johnny Boy. We've said this before. John Roberts, do you want to be that guy? Do you want to be that guy that upends-

Jessica Pieklo: Don't be that guy.

Imani Gandy: ... 50 years of standing a jurisprudence? Do you want to be that guy who ignore a stare decisis? Don't be that guy.

Jessica Pieklo: No.

Imani Gandy: Just-

Jessica Pieklo: Don't be that guy.

Imani Gandy: ... don't be that guy.

Jessica Pieklo: You can do plenty to decimate abortion access without having to be that guy on standing.

Imani Gandy: Yeah, exactly. I mean, we'd prefer that you didn't, but-

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah, just don't generally, but look. You've got options is what I'm saying.

Imani Gandy: Exactly. So, that's going to wrap it up for us today. If you want to talk to us about standing or any other abortion-related issue, or if you would like to talk about Outlander fan fiction, you can find me-

Jessica Pieklo: Find Imani for that.

Imani Gandy: You can find me on Twitter, @angryblacklady. You can talk to Jess, not about Outlander fan fiction, on Twitter, @hegemommy, H-E-G-E-M-O-M-M-Y. You can follow Rewire.News, @rewire_news. You should join our Facebook group. Please answer the questions. Some of you just refuse to answer the questions, and it breaks my heart because I want you in the group.

Jessica Pieklo: We even dropped some hints.

Imani Gandy: Justice Kegstand. That's all you need to know. But join our Facebook group. We've got a lot of people in there talking a lot of good stuff, and it's fun. It's a good time.

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah, it's a great community. Join it.

Imani Gandy: Aside from that, what are we going to do, Jess?

Jessica Pieklo: We will see you on the tubes, folks.

Imani Gandy: We will see you on the diggity dog tubes.

Imani Gandy: Boom! Lawyered is created and hosted by Jessica Mason Pieklo and Imani Gandy. Marc Faletti is our producer, and Jess is also the Rewire.News interim president and editor-in-chief.