

This City Wants Your Racist Uncle to Enforce Their Abortion Ban

- Imani Gandy: Hello, fellow law nerds. Welcome to another episode of Boom Lawyered, a Rewire News Group podcast, hosted by the legal journalism team that is together in Boulder, Colorado right now. Yay! I'm Rewire News Group senior editor of law and policy Imani Gandy.
- Jessica Pieklo: I'm Jess Pieklo, Rewire News Group's executive editor. Rewire News Group is the one and only home for expert repro journalism that inspires you to light a candle for Justice Stephen Breyer's retirement. And the Team Legal podcast is part of that mission. So a big thanks to our subscribers and a welcome to our new listeners. All right. So it has been a big news week in abortion land. Congress is apparently stepping up a little bit. First of all, let's all sit with that news because what?
- Imani Gandy: How's that happening? That's odd.
- Jessica Pieklo: This week members of Congress re-introduced the Women's Health Protection Act. And I mean, it's a good time to remind everybody that not everybody who gets an abortion is women, but that's the name of the legislation. So we're talking about the Women's Health Protection Act. Okay. This is a big deal and it could be one of the things that helps really shore up abortion rights in the event that the Supreme Court does what we kind of think they're going to do in the J-Whoop v. Kasey. Sorry, I just gotta J-whoop, whenever.
- Imani Gandy: And you also said J-Whoop versus Kasey.
- Jessica Pieklo: It's JWHO versus the world, as far as I'm concerned, Imani. But seriously, we have had some great coverage of the Women's Health Protection Act, both at the site and on social. And so really, if you don't know about this piece of legislation, I really encourage you to go over to rewirenewsgroup.com and check it out because a lot of folks are asking us, if the Supreme Court goes south on abortion rights, what can be done? And the Women's Health Protection Act is one of the things that can be done to shore up abortion rights. So that is really, really important. Okay. But Imani, you're here.
- Imani Gandy: I know.
- Jessica Pieklo: In Colorado. I'm still...
- Imani Gandy: I know.
- Jessica Pieklo: I still kind of can't believe it.

Imani Gandy: It's so exciting.

Jessica Pieklo: And we might actually get to smash shit. Like we smash shit all the time.

Imani Gandy: We're just steady smashing shit. We're smashing this pod. We're smashing abortion rights. We're smashing being friends for life.

Jessica Pieklo: This is great. But listen to this, listen to this folks. I am so excited about this. I'm literally like jumping out of my skin. Okay. So on Wednesday, June 16th, Imani and I are literally going to break stuff in the name of abortion rights and access. And if you can't tell, and I've said it a couple times, I'm a little bit excited. All right. Okay. So here's the deal. Over the last couple of weeks, many of you listeners and readers have helped us compile a list of what I'll just call anti-choice nonsense. Legislation, lies, that kind of thing. So Rewire News Group took those bad takes and we ranked them with your help. And now we are going to smash them live and in person next Wednesday. So that's next Wednesday, June 16th at 3:00 PM Eastern. Get this, we're going to livestream this whole thing, vicariously smash shit through Imani and I, with us.

But we can only do that if we get to this \$5,000 threshold by June 14th. So that's the thing. Folks have us raising money and we are trying. So if you can help us shatter some lies and I don't know, like a plate or two, this is going to be so fun. I have a year of quarantine rage built up. This is going to be so cathartic. All right. If you're able, please go over to rewirenewsgroup.com/donate. That's rewirenewsgroup.com/donate and help me and Imani smash anti-choice lies for real.

Imani Gandy: Jess and Imani smash.

Jessica Pieklo: Smash.

Imani Gandy: It's so fun. I'd like to give a fan shout out to @XRC who said this about us on Twitter and it's just the most amazing thing: "It's the dorkiest, but I'm so vicariously excited for @hegemommy and @AngryBlackLady to hang out. Maybe I miss hanging out with my friends and it's a vaguely pathetic transference thing?" No, it's not pathetic at all. It's not pathetic at all. We've all been living in quarantine and I find it, personally, I am finding it really, really lovely watching my friends online go out and have fun and see people and meet space and hug. So it's not pathetic. I think it's part of just this journey that we've been on. And thank you XRC. We love dorks. We love nerds. It's just, that's who we are. So thank you very, very much.

Jessica Pieklo: Seriously, this is the Boom Lawyered family, and we have not been able to see folks in a long time. And so it's great that that's happening and you are welcome to be dorky with us any time.

Imani Gandy: Do you know what's happening that's not great? Lubbock, Texas. Can we talk about what is going on in Lubbock, Texas? So Lubbock passed a "sanctuary city for the unborn" ordinance that is basically the same as Texas SB 8. Now, Texas SB 8 is that heartbeat ban that permits ... It's so bad. It's the heartbeat ban that permits basically "any given motherfucker" to quote If/When/How's Andrea Grimes, because that's how she referred to it on Twitter. And I love that. It lets "any given motherfucker" sue to enforce this law, except at the local level.

So let's just talk about this. This law permits literally anyone to sue. It doesn't permit any state actor to sue. And so that's going to be important when I tell you what happened next, which is last week, a federal judge dismissed the lawsuit brought by Planned Parenthood, which is the abortion provider in Lubbock. They brought this lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of this ordinance, that basically deemed Lubbock to be a sanctuary city for the "unborn," and the logic that the court used to dismiss the case is really upsetting and problematic for the future of abortion rights.

Jessica Pieklo: And that's what we're going to talk about on this episode. First, we're going to give you all a quick update on *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, which if you need a quick reminder is the direct challenge to *Roe v. Wade* that the court will hear later this fall.

Imani Gandy: Then we're going to talk about this decision in the Lubbock, Texas case. Specifically, we're going to talk about what it means that the court dismissed Planned Parenthood's challenge on the grounds that it, the federal court, couldn't provide Planned Parenthood any legal relief. Yeah, okay. And then we're going to explain how the Lubbock decision is a precursor to how federal courts are going to be handling the Texas statewide six week ban, that Texas SB 8 bill, which woo. I'm going to have to give that three to four yikes. Maybe five yikes.

Jessica Pieklo: On the scale of one to five, this is a five yikes.

Imani Gandy: This is a five yike critical situation we've got going here.

Jessica Pieklo: All right. So this week in JWHO—always going to throw my hands up for that. So we have had a lot of questions since the Court took the case. Questions like, what the fuck man? And is this really happening? So yes, this is really happening, but we still don't know when exactly this is happening and that can cause some stress. So let's talk about that a little bit. We do know how the Court operates generally. So here's what Imani and I can tell you. We can tell you that the Court is in the process of finishing up its current business and issuing decisions. We're all sweating through June as we're waiting to see if the Court is going to strike down the Affordable Care Act, what they're going to do in *Fulton v. The City of Philadelphia*. There's a lot of cases that the justices are still issuing opinions on. So that's what they're spending the next couple of weeks doing is just releasing those opinions. They're not even thinking about JWHO, even though we are obsessively thinking about it. So that's going to take the month of June.

Then the Court takes the summer recess because they like to take a break like the rest of us. Justices: They're just like us. This is when they do things like speaking tours. Breyer's got a book out. So I'm guessing he's going to do a little bit of a book tour, but the Court itself goes into recess and that's when they start to clean up their administrative stuff. And so that's when they start to look towards setting the calendar for the next year. And that term starts in October always, the first Monday of October is always when the Court starts its business. So we know that in July and in August is when the Court is going to be scheduling arguments so we can expect well, something to happen. I don't know, August, end of summer is probably when the Court is going to be thinking about, now's a good time to schedule the demise of Roe v. Wade.

So TLDR, August is going to be really sweaty and we'll have a lot more in terms of dates because the argument date sets a lot of other things, like when folks are filing their briefs and making their arguments on paper to the Court. But as soon as we have a hearing date, you all will be the first to know.

Imani Gandy: All right, let's move on to our second topic for today, which is what the hell is going on in Lubbock, Texas?

Jessica Pieklo: Seriously.

Imani Gandy: Honestly. So I want to know, how is it that a federal court can decide that it doesn't have the power to hear a case involving the U.S. Constitution? Jess, federal courts answer constitutional questions. That's kind of their whole jam.

Jessica Pieklo: It is kind of their whole jam. And so the answer really sucks, honestly. It's because the anti-abortion folks are trying to fix the system for good this time. I wish I had a different answer, but I don't. That's the truth. So we're going to walk through how they're trying to do that here. All right.

Imani Gandy: So basically we're going to have a little Civ Pro lesson, which is probably making Jess a little sweaty because she hates Civ Pro.

Jessica Pieklo: No, no, I just, I am sorry. I have to butt in. I suffered through an entire year of civil procedure as a 1L and was like, "This is the worst. I'm going to forget all of it." And then abortion happened.

Imani Gandy: And then abortion happened. This abortion case happens...

Jessica Pieklo: All they talk about is civil procedure. Okay, go on. I'm sorry.

Imani Gandy: And now we got to talk about jurisdiction. We got to talk about jurisdiction. So jurisdiction means both where the court hears the case, for example, the Northern district of Texas. And also, if the court has the power to decide whatever it's being asked to decide. So jurisdiction in this case means: can Lubbock ban abortion within its city limits, and does the court have the power to

hear a case that answers the question, whether or not Lubbock can ban abortion within its city limits?

Jessica Pieklo: I wish that you had taught me Civ Pro, Imani, because honestly I would not have hated Civ Pro had you been my teacher. That is the most clear example of jurisdiction, and to think that I suffered through so much. But so, look, the anti-choice advocates in Lubbock did something really sneaky here. They hemmed in the court's jurisdiction entirely.

Imani Gandy: So you're saying that anti-choice advocates basically concocted a scenario that makes it impossible for federal courts to even hear a case about this ridiculous statute that was just passed in Lubbock?

Jessica Pieklo: Imani, that's exactly what I'm saying.

Imani Gandy: Oy vey.

Jessica Pieklo: Really. And they did this in two ways. And it's complicated, but it's like we need to talk about it because this is a real big problem. Okay, so in this Lubbock ordinance, there's a trigger and we've talked about triggers on this podcast before. That's an event that has to happen. So it's a trigger that limits when public officials like district attorneys can enforce the ordinance. All right.

So public officials cannot go and enforce this ordinance until one of three things happen. Those events include the Supreme Court overruling *Roe vs. Wade* and *Planned Parenthood vs. Casey*, so like a big marquee moment. A state or federal court rules that a penalty will not impose an undue burden on a woman seeking abortion, so basically some other court says that they think the Lubbock ordinance or something like it is okay. And third, a state or federal court rules that the party that the penalty could be enforced against, so an abortion provider or person getting an abortion, lacks third party standing. We've talked about third party standing here. That's where abortion providers affirmatively challenged laws on behalf of their patients. So one of the triggers is if a court rules that there's no standing. All right.

Imani Gandy: That was a lot of words. That was a lot of words. There's a lot of legalese. I mean, you say you don't like Civ Pro, but you kind of just gave a whole lot of Civ Pro-ey type of words.

Jessica Pieklo: Fair.

Imani Gandy: So let's reiterate. So this ordinance is unenforceable unless or until, number one, the Supreme Court, overrules *Roe* and *Casey*, and says that abortion is left to the states.

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah.

Imani Gandy: So the trigger means that the ordinance is currently unenforceable.

Jessica Pieklo: By state officials.

Imani Gandy: Okay. So this ordinance is unenforceable by state figures, but is enforceable by this any given motherfucker that's allowed to sue.

Jessica Pieklo: That's what we're going to get to, yes.

Imani Gandy: Okay. So number two, the second trigger is: a state or a federal court declares that enforcing the ordinance wouldn't be an undue burden under Casey. So that means that a prosecutor in Lubbock, let's say the Lubbock DA, would have to decide on his or her own to seek that kind of declaratory judgment, probably from a state court, and then go after Planned Parenthood to close them. So they have to go to state court and say, is this ordinance cool? And the judge will say, because it's in Texas, the judge will probably say, "Yeah, it's super sweet, great ordinance, couldn't be better." And so then that's when these anti-choice forces can go after the Planned Parenthood clinic in Lubbock and close.

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah. So what Imani is talking about happens all the time. Declaratory judgments are really normal routine things that happen in federal and state courts. And you do, you go to a judge and say, "Hey, declare a thing and issue an order on it, a declaratory judgment." And in this case, it would be a declaration that the ordinance does not unduly burden abortion rights. So that could happen in a variety of jurisdictions. They get that. And then the state, the government can start enforcing this. That's important.

Imani Gandy: And then the third thing that would have to happen with respect to the enforceability of this ordinance, is that a court would have to enter a ruling that whatever abortion provider sues challenging this ordinance doesn't have standing to sue. If that happens, then it means the state can come in and start enforcing this ordinance. And that basically makes sure that the clinic in Lubbock is going to close and that no other clinic can ever open up in Lubbock.

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah.

Imani Gandy: So the TLDR about this is that a patient is the only person who can argue undue burden. And we've talked about how hard it's going to be to find a pregnant person who might want an abortion in Lubbock, and to find that person willing to challenge the law. What would even be the point? I want to get an abortion in Lubbock. No, you can't get an abortion in Lubbock. Well, I'm going to sue to get an abortion in Lubbock. That person probably has better things to do like, I don't know, find another clinic where they can go and get the reproductive healthcare that they need.

Jessica Pieklo: Right. And so, this is all really complicated stuff, but to boil it down for you folks, normally it's the state that enforces laws and what this Lubbock ordinance did

was out of the gate, it limits the power of those folks who normally enforce these laws. It limits the power of the state and local government officials to enforce this ordinance until a couple of things happen. So that sounds like, "Hey, this ordinance isn't that big of a deal. It's not enforceable by the state."

But this is where it gets really wild. They added this private enforcement provision. That any old asshole can enforce it. So this Lubbock ordinance says, "Hey, we're going to basically ban abortion within the city limits, but we're not going to empower city officials to enforce it. We're going to empower private citizens instead." So there's a huge accountability thing.

So let's walk through this private enforcement provision. This allows relatives and family members to, for example, sue to block an abortion. The private enforcement provision also allows any private citizen of Texas to bring an action for injunctive relief, so like stop this, statutory damages, money, and also costs and attorney's fees. So their attorneys are paid for them, to bring a lawsuit against anybody other than the patient for providing or helping someone get an abortion. So there's this huge enforcement power that private citizens, disgruntled ex-boyfriends, for example, can have to go after abortion funds, to go after providers, to go after family members who have maybe helped a person access care. It gets worse.

Imani Gandy: If I'm not mistaken, I don't think it's limited to Texas, actually.

Jessica Pieklo: No.

Imani Gandy: I think it's everywhere. So that means if you live in Alaska and you have really strong feelings about Jane Doe getting an abortion in Texas, you can sue from Alaska. That doesn't make any sense. What interest does a person in Alaska have in an abortion that someone may or may not be getting in Texas? That's such a broad swath of people that have been conferred this standing, this power to enforce a law that is not even enforceable by state officials. It's madness. It's literally madness. Even just talking about it makes my brain explode because I can't believe that this is what this city thinks is an appropriate response to abortions taking place in Lubbock.

Jessica Pieklo: There's also, Imani, no statute of limitations for any lawsuit brought under the private enforcement provision.

Imani Gandy: I'm sorry, what?

Jessica Pieklo: No statute of limitations, so that means people can just bring a lawsuit forever, effectively.

Imani Gandy: No, no, no, no, no, no, no.

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah.

Imani Gandy: Are you telling me that... There are statutes of limitation for almost everything except murder. That's what it is. So they're going with the abortion is murder thing. I see. So they're using civ pro to propagate anti-choice propaganda. You must double hate that considering you hate anti-choice propaganda and civ pro.

Jessica Pieklo: I mean, look, you see my face. I wish everybody else could see my face right now. I've got the grimace of a lifetime on. It's so bad. It's so bad. And it's so tricky and it's so sneaky and it's really using the rules again, rules of procedure, against folks who need care. So normally when a law like this gets passed, abortion providers sue before it takes effect. This is what you and I have been writing and talking about for 10 years.

Imani Gandy: Literally 10 years.

Jessica Pieklo: Literally 10 years. And normally when that happens, federal courts hear the case and sometimes like J Woo, it goes all the way to the Supreme court.

Imani Gandy: Right.

Jessica Pieklo: This happens literally all the time, but because the government can't enforce it yet, because of those triggers that we talked about, a ruling that overturns Roe vs. Wade and Planned Parenthood vs. Casey, for example, because those triggers haven't happened yet, when Planned Parenthood in this case sued to try and block the Lubbock ordinance, like is the routine course in every abortion challenge that we cover, the judge looked around and was like, "Hey folks, I'd love to help you out here, but I can't. And that's because you folks at Planned Parenthood aren't under any real legal threat from the government until those triggers happen."

Imani Gandy: But I have a question. So what's the deal with private enforcement? Are you telling me that Planned Parenthood has to wait until it is sued by any given motherfucker and then Planned Parenthood can, in response, counter-sue or seek a declaratory judgment that this ordinance is unconstitutional?

Jessica Pieklo: Right.

Imani Gandy: This is *wild* to me. This is wild to me.

Jessica Pieklo: The federal court effectively said that it does not have the power to decide on its own if this ordinance is unconstitutional until either those triggers happens and it can basically do something against the state. Or Planned Parenthood, an abortion provider, or patient for example, is sued by a private entity, this private enforcement. OK, so then they get to—hold onto your butt, Imani.

Imani Gandy: I don't want to. I don't want it.

Jessica Pieklo: Raise the constitutional right to an abortion as an affirmative defense.

Imani Gandy: I'm sorry, what?

Jessica Pieklo: So, Planned Parenthood gets sued for providing an abortion, and their lawyer says, "Hello. Yes, excuse me. But that's constitutional."

Imani Gandy: If that's not a complete perversion of litigation, of the ways in which the courts are supposed to operate to determine rights among parties, I don't know what is.

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah.

Imani Gandy: It cannot be that we have a constitutional right to an abortion, that some municipality, Lubbock, says, "No, you don't have a constitutional right to an abortion, but also you can't really sue to us to determine whether or not, unless somebody sues, some asshole in Alaska sues you first." So then some asshole in Alaska sues, and then the provider can say, "Oh, but we have a constitutional right to an abortion," as an affirmative defense.

Jessica Pieklo: Basically, basically.

Imani Gandy: That's nonsense.

Jessica Pieklo: So patients and providers in the Lubbock area are under a real and immediate threat here. Accessing reproductive healthcare has opened them up to a lawsuit, a lawsuit that has no statute of limitations, by the way. So a lawsuit that could show up on their door 10 freaking years later, for example, and they are supposed to just go about their lives as if this isn't a threat. There's a constitutional phrase for that. We don't kill constitutional rights. The idea that you could be subject to a lawsuit, to money damages, to jail time for doing something that the constitution allows...

Imani Gandy: Let's put it... I mean, I'm sure not a lot of our listeners are like second amendment types, love the second amendment, but it would be like going hunting.

Jessica Pieklo: Let's go there.

Imani Gandy: Let's go there. It would be like, you take your rifle and you go hunting and you shoot, bam. You shoot the deer right in the fucking face. Sorry, I'm channeling. I'm channeling Mona Lisa Vito.

Jessica Pieklo: I was just going to say that was a little Cousin Vinny, but I'm here for it.

Imani Gandy: So, bam, you shoot the doe right in the head and then you get arrested for unlawful use of a firearm. And so then you go to jail and your defense attorney takes you to court. And as an affirmative defense to this, you're being prosecuted for unlawful use of a firearm, but your criminal defense attorney can

say, "Oh, well, as an affirmative defense, we have a constitutional right to go shoot a deer in the fucking head."

Jessica Pieklo: May I show you the second amendment?

Imani Gandy: That doesn't make any sense. You have these constitutional rights. You don't have to keep going in and proving that you have these constitutional rights because people have decided they don't like that particular constitutional right. That's absurd.

Jessica Pieklo: But this is where we're at. And I think people need to understand just how absurd that is. Folks are literally going to have to raise the U.S. constitutional a right to an abortion as a defense.

Imani Gandy: It's fucking mad. It's mad.

Jessica Pieklo: And you know why it's mad? It's because it's not going to be contained to Lubbock.

Imani Gandy: No, it's not. It's not, it's going to spread. I mean, it's already going to spread all the way out to the rest of Texas. So what's really, really alarming about this Lubbock decision, this judge who said, "Sorry, I don't have jurisdiction to hear this case," is that this is a precursor. This tells us what's going to happen when providers try to challenge SB 8.

Jessica Pieklo: Right.

Imani Gandy: SB 8 is that six week ban that is basically the most restrictive abortion ban in the country right now, the most restrictive abortion restriction—that's too many "restrictive" and "restrictions." But the point is, this law is going to go into effect. You mentioned the word chill. There can be no chilling of constitutional rights. This will absolutely have a chilling effect on providers who would basically have to wait to be sued before they can go to court and say, "No, no, no, no, no. I'm well within my rights to be providing abortions because getting an abortion is constitutional."

But what really concerns me is, what if a bunch of any given motherfuckers throughout the country decide to file a hundred lawsuits suing this one Planned Parenthood clinic all at the same time. There's nothing to stop people from doing that. There's nothing to stop Alliance Defending Freedom from coordinating multiple lawsuits against one clinic in order to overwhelm them.

And so the TLDR is—I'm going to quote Andrea Grimes again. This bill creates an abortion ban that isn't enforced by the state, but is enforced by any random motherfucker anywhere. And because any random motherfucker can sue any random time they want, they can all sue at once—overwhelm a clinic. Which means that clinic is going to be inclined to maybe shut its doors in advance, so as

not to be overwhelmed by lawsuits. Clinics don't have millions and millions and millions of dollars to defend multiple lawsuits on all fronts.

Jessica Pieklo: There's more. Okay. So you mentioned Andrea. This week we published a piece because If/When/How, the reproductive justice organization, has launched a bail fund, the first of its kind bail fund for folks who find themselves in legal troubles for self-managing abortions, and this is an unfortunate necessity. And so we said the third thing that we're going to talk about on the podcast is how this Lubbock situation isn't going to be limited to Lubbock and Texas. Here's the thing. JWHO's lurking in the background, always, in all of these conversations. And the central question in JWHO is, does the state ever have the power to ban abortion before viability? And this Texas bill SB 8 bans abortion at six weeks, very clearly an unconstitutional pre-viability abortion ban. Okay.

So if the Supreme court answers yes to that question in JWHO, then this six week ban can take effect. Okay. And that six week ban can take effect, and the Supreme court Can answer that question without actually overturning Roe. They can modify it.

Imani Gandy: Right.

Jessica Pieklo: So that's an avenue to still hem in state enforcement, but broadly open up private enforcement and have an abortion ban on the books at six weeks. All right. So we know what happens in this space. We've been here a while. This isn't going to just be Texas.

Imani Gandy: Nope.

Jessica Pieklo: We can expect these kinds of provisions to pop up in other abortion-hostile states, places like Ohio, Missouri, Alabama, Louisiana, etc. So this is Lubbock, and Texas is in some ways doing us a favor by giving us a preview and a look at how anti-choice activists are really going to respond and how they're preparing for a post JWHO world.

Imani Gandy: I don't want any of this.

Jessica Pieklo: I just gave Imani a stomachache.

Imani Gandy: You really did. And it's just, after Texas, goeth the world. Well, not the world, the country. But honestly, if you think about it, the reason why I got into this business, when I left private practice, the reason why I got into this business, is because I became friends with a lot of abortion rights advocates in Texas. And Texas had passed the sonogram law in like 2011. But when I sort of started getting into the game, everyone was so focused on Virginia. And all the people in Texas were like, "We told you that this was going to happen when they passed this in Texas. And you guys didn't care because you think Texas is just a red state and it's a flyover state and we don't need to worry about it." So if there's one

thing I can impart to people, is that you really do need to be paying attention to the things that are going on in Texas, because that is going to spread throughout the country, in all of these states that are hostile to abortion rights.

So that was fun. I'm going to do a little wrap up because we did give you a lot of information today. So first we gave you our JWFO update, and we basically told you what to expect in the upcoming months. Then we talked about Lubbock, this case, this statute in Lubbock, that confers standing onto anybody anywhere to sue, to privately enforce this lawsuit. And then we talked about how Lubbock isn't going to be just Lubbock. Lubbock is going to spread to the rest of Texas. And then Texas is going to spread to the rest of the country. So it's five alarm. It's a five alarm time. I don't want to sugarcoat it, but there is an opportunity to make sure you're calling your legislators, make sure you're getting involved, make sure you're demonstrating and whatnot because it is a tough time, but we don't want to get depressed and become inactive. Right?

Jessica Pieklo: Right.

Imani Gandy: Or do we want to get depressed and just eat sheet cake?

Jessica Pieklo: I mean, we can eat sheet cake, too.

Imani Gandy: We can do both. We can do both.

Jessica Pieklo: We can do both. We're multitasking.

Imani Gandy: So that's going to wrap it up for us today. We are, as you know, we're doing this rage room smash event. So we really need you all to help us get to \$5,000 by June 14th. You can do that by going to rewirenewsgroup.com/donate, rewirenewsgroup.com/donate. Please just dig deep because you know you want to watch me and Jess just smashing shit up in a rage room.

Jessica Pieklo: And there's swag. This is the thing too. So the top level donation, \$200, Imani and I are going to give you a video message. Imagine that. And there's a mug.

Imani Gandy: Yeah, there's mugs.

Jessica Pieklo: Temporary tattoos.

Imani Gandy: Temporary tattoos.

Jessica Pieklo: Let's get tatted up.

Imani Gandy: And they're actually really cute. The graphic design is amazing. I can't wait to get multiple versions myself, all of the different temporary tattoos.

Jessica Pieklo: So we have Boom Lawyered swag for you all. That's the headline.

Imani Gandy: That's exciting. So if you want to talk to us about Boom Lawyered swag or temporary Boom Lawyered tattoos, or just being a Boom Lawyered law nerd, you can find me on Twitter at @AngryBlackLady. You can find Jess on Twitter at @hegemommy, H-E-G-E-M-O-M-M-Y. You can find us both in Boulder, Colorado because we're both in Boulder, Colorado right now. You should follow Rewire News Group on Instagram and on Twitter. And aside from that, what are we going to do, Jess?

Jessica Pieklo: See you on the tubes folks.

Imani Gandy: We're going to see you on the tubes, folks.

Boom Lawyered is created and hosted by Jessica Mason Pieklo and Imani Gandy. Marc Faletti produces the show.