

UCLA School of Law
**Center on Reproductive Health,
Law, and Policy**

**YOUR GIFT TODAY WILL GET
US OVER THE FINISH LINE**

WE'RE ONLY \$6,000 AWAY FROM UNLOCKING THE
FULL \$50,000 MATCH FROM THE LOS ANGELES
GUILD FOR REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH.

HELP US REACH IT AND DOUBLE YOUR IMPACT FOR
THE FUTURE OF REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS.



Give by using the QR code above by
December 31st.

UCLA School of Law
Center on Reproductive
Health, Law, and Policy

Donate Now

Policy News



Photo credit: The Century Foundation

A new working paper published from an important UCLA and Michigan University-led [clinical trial](#) finds that eliminating or deeply lowering contraceptive costs significantly reduces unintended pregnancy and abortion and has large effects on choice of contraceptive method among low-income women. Through the Michigan Contraceptive Access, Research, and Evaluation Study, which randomly assigned Title X patients to receive free or discounted contraception, researchers documented a 16% reduction in pregnancies, a 12% reduction in abortions over two years, and a 12% increase in use of longer-acting contraceptive methods. The study suggests that affordability drives contraceptive choice and that the effects of cost reduction persist after subsidies end. The researchers [emphasize](#) that Title X remains a critical component of the reproductive health safety net and that preserving

and expanding the program is essential to supporting low-income women and reducing inequities in access to evidence-based care.

Legal News



Photo credit: Anna Savchenko

A federal appeals court [has upheld](#) a lower New York federal court ruling that allows National Institute for Family and Life Advocates (NIFLA), a faith-based nonprofit and network of anti-abortion centers (also known as crisis pregnancy centers), and two of its New York centers to continue promoting the unproven theory of “abortion pill reversal.” Abortion pill reversal, typically involving high-dose progesterone, has no supporting clinical evidence, and researchers maintain it is not scientifically substantiated. The NIFLA plaintiffs [sued](#) the New York Attorney General to prevent it from enforcing business laws that prohibit false or misleading practices, as New York has sought to do in a separate lawsuit filed against Heartbeat International, Inc., another organization promoting the idea of abortion pill reversal. In the NIFLA case, a unanimous panel of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals agreed with the lower court that, on the current record, there was no evidence NIFLA was financially motivated to provide information on abortion pill reversal, thus “NIFLA plaintiffs are likely to succeed on their First Amendment claim because the speech at issue is noncommercial speech.” Notably, in its opinion, the panel distinguished the facts in this case from those in a case brought by California Attorney General Bonta. In the California case, a federal judge there found the record evidence established that NIFLA had a “powerful economic motivation,” that weighed “strongly in favor” of finding the speech commercial. Meanwhile, the New York Attorney General’s case against Heartbeat International and 11 of its anti-abortion centers remains pending.



Photo credit: The Associated Press.

A federal judge [has preliminarily enjoined](#) a July provision of the federal budget reconciliation act targeting Planned Parenthood affiliates for elimination from the Medicaid program. The judge granted a preliminary injunction in a multi-state lawsuit led by the California Attorney General, ruling that they were likely to succeed on their claims that the law fails to give states the clear notice the Constitution requires and applies an unconstitutional retroactive condition on their participation in the joint federal/state Medicaid program. Specifically, the court found that Congress likely imposed an unconstitutional burden on states by requiring them to enforce vague criteria about which health providers are “prohibited entities,” prohibited from receiving Medicaid reimbursements. The court found that if not blocked, the law could cause irreparable harm to states that rely heavily on Planned Parenthood for Medicaid services by “reducing the number of providers offering reproductive and family planning healthcare, resulting in fewer patients receiving treatment” and increasing the states’ healthcare costs. The relief granted by the order is limited – it protects only the 22 named plaintiff states and D.C. and includes a seven-day administrative stay, giving the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services time to ask an appellate court to block the preliminary injunction if it seeks an appeal.



Photo credit: The Associated Press.

A Missouri appeals court [rewrote](#) the proposed ballot language for a legislatively proposed constitutional abortion ban set to go to voters in November 2026, in a lawsuit challenging the Secretary of States' wording as misleading. According to Tori Schafer of ACLU of Missouri, and legal counsel in the case, "it is crucial that Missourians know they are being asked to end the protections for reproductive health care that we just passed in the last general election." The court agreed, finding that the ballot language and summary failed to inform voters that the new measure would repeal and replace the reproductive freedom amendment approved in 2024. The court-approved language clarifies that the proposed amendment would eliminate existing constitutional protections for abortion through viability, permit extensive legislative regulation of abortion, allow exceptions to the ban for rape and incest only up to 12 weeks, require parental consent for minors, and ban gender-affirming care for minors. To learn more about Missouri and other state constitutional amendments protecting abortion and reproductive rights more broadly, read our report [The Promise of Reproductive Freedom Amendments](#).

Food for Thought



With so much going on in the world of reproductive health, law, and policy, every week we'll share articles, books, and media you might have missed.

[Her Baby Was In The NICU. She Was In ICE Detention](#)

[How Unemployment Shaped My Reproductive Health Care—analysis](#)

[Why Women In Menopause Can't Find Doctors](#)

[Delayed Care To 2 Black Pregnant Women Highlights Maternal Health Disparities](#)

[Inside The Global Network Of Abortion Doulas Supporting Self-Managed Care](#)



Reimagining the future of reproductive health, law, and policy.

UCLA Center on Reproductive Health, Law, and Policy is a think tank and research center created to develop long-term, lasting solutions that advance all aspects of reproductive justice, and address the current national crisis of abortion access.

[Manage](#) your preferences | [Opt Out](#) using TrueRemove™
Got this as a forward? [Sign up](#) to receive our future emails.
View this email [online](#).

385 Charles E Young Dr E | Los Angeles, CA 90095 US

This email was sent to .
To continue receiving our emails, add us to your address book.

[Subscribe](#) to our email list.