

EDMUND LACOUR

Edmund LaCour, who currently serves as the Alabama solicitor general, embodies a right-wing conservative crusader mentality. Deeply unfit for a lifetime judgeship, LaCour, like all of Trump's nominees, consistently demonstrates a disregard for the U.S. Constitution, instead opting to advance a far-right political agenda. Though relatively young, he has amassed a record that reflects hostility toward voting rights, reproductive freedom, civil rights, environmental safeguards, LGBTQ+ equality, and protections for workers and consumers. Repeatedly, he has pursued arguments that elevate corporate and political power at the expense of ordinary people, particularly Black, immigrant, and historically marginalized communities.

If confirmed to a lifetime seat on the federal bench, LaCour would bring with him a dangerous record that threatens to cement a judiciary hostile to equal justice.

VOTING RIGHTS

LaCour has relentlessly attacked voting rights, particularly those of Black Alabamians. LaCour recently filed a brief in *Louisiana v. Callais* arguing that race-based remedies to combat racially discriminatory maps were “flawed as a constitutional matter.” But this isn’t LaCour’s first time displaying his disdain for equality in voting. Just two years after graduating law school, he filed a brief in *Shelby County v. Holder* urging the Supreme Court to gut the preclearance formula in the Voting Rights Act, falsely claiming that it now “serves no purpose.” Later, in *Alabama v. Alabama NAACP*, he argued that states should be immune from private lawsuits under the Voting Rights Act — a radical position that would render the law nearly unenforceable. During the COVID-19 pandemic, LaCour defended Alabama’s burdensome absentee voting requirements, which disproportionately harmed elderly, disabled, and Black voters. The Supreme Court, in a narrow 5–4 ruling, sided with him, forcing voters to risk their health to cast a ballot.

Most recently, in *Allen v. Milligan*, LaCour defended Alabama’s racially discriminatory congressional map, which dilutes the voting power of people of color. The Supreme Court rejected his arguments, affirming a lower court’s finding that the plan likely violated Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. He also defended Alabama’s SB 1, an extreme voter suppression law that criminalizes ordinary voter assistance, making it a felony, on par with robbery, to simply help a neighbor with an absentee ballot application.

LaCour’s record demonstrates that he views voting rights not as a cornerstone of democracy, but as an obstacle to be chipped away so that voters of color are routinely denied equal access to the ballot box. His record demonstrates that, if confirmed, he would use the power of the bench to further undermine voting rights, the Fifteenth Amendment, and our nation’s democracy.

EDMUND LACOUR



CIVIL RIGHTS

LaCour has opposed some of the most fundamental civil rights protections in modern America. He joined Rep. Mo Brooks in suing to force a citizenship question onto the census, an effort widely seen as an attempt to suppress immigrant participation and skew representation. He filed briefs against the Equal Rights Amendment, resisting the effort to enshrine gender equality in the Constitution.

LaCour also attempted to shield Alabama officials from accountability by defending a scheme that delayed access to federal courts through burdensome administrative hurdles. The Supreme Court rejected his argument, making clear that states cannot “in effect immunize[] state officials” from §1983 civil rights claims.

LaCour’s anti-civil rights advocacy is dedicated to rolling back long-fought-for protections. As a federal judge, his outlook on equal protection under law, government official accountability, and economic justice to combat poverty would further entrench inequality in our legal system and, in turn, our communities.

REPRODUCTIVE FREEDOM & LGBTQ+ RIGHTS

LaCour has been one of the nation’s most aggressive state officials in attacking reproductive freedom. He defended Alabama’s near-total abortion ban, which is one of the most draconian bans in the nation. In doing so, he called Roe v. Wade “unworkable” and “illegitimate,” and urged the Supreme Court to overturn decades of precedent. During the pandemic, he argued that delaying abortion procedures was not an undue burden, even when it endangered patients’ health and stripped them of autonomy.

In addition, LaCour defended SB 184, Alabama’s sweeping ban on gender-affirming care for transgender minors. The law makes it a felony for doctors to prescribe puberty blockers, hormone therapy, or perform gender-affirming surgeries, and even requires school personnel to out transgender students to their parents.

LaCour’s record demonstrates a deep hostility toward both reproductive autonomy and LGBTQ+ equality. On the bench, he would be a reliable vote to further strip away personal freedoms.

WORKER’S RIGHTS

LaCour has repeatedly fought against protections for workers and consumers. He represented the International Franchise Association when it challenged Seattle’s \$15 minimum wage law. He opposed expanded overtime protections for mortgage loan officers, a position unanimously rejected by the Supreme Court. And he defended Alabama’s effort to block Birmingham from raising its minimum wage, undermining the ability of working families to earn a living wage.

LaCour’s legal work shows that he consistently sides with corporate interests over working people. As a judge, workers could expect little protection in his courtroom.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

LaCour's record in criminal justice reflects a disinterest in recognizing defendants' rights and constitutional safeguards. He argued that a prison warden was entitled to qualified immunity after allegedly ordering that life support be withdrawn from an injured, responsive inmate — a claim the Eleventh Circuit rejected. He filed briefs supporting executions even in cases involving severe pain, intellectual disability, or youth. He also opposed reforms to reduce reliance on cash bail, siding with the bail bond industry over fairer pretrial practices.

In Culley v. Marshall, LaCour defended Alabama's civil forfeiture scheme, which allows police to seize vehicles from innocent owners, keep them for months or years, and profit from the proceeds of sales— without any prompt opportunity for owners to contest the seizure. By defending this system, LaCour backed a practice that undermines due process and entrenches abusive policing incentives.

LaCour's approach to criminal justice prioritizes punishment and state power over constitutional rights. His presence on the bench would potentially encourage harshness and weaken protections for the accused.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

LaCour fought efforts to confront the climate crisis and protect public health. He supported the Trump administration's rollback of the Endangered Species Act, weakening safeguards for vulnerable species and ecosystems. He also sued to block California from setting stronger fuel efficiency standards, undermining a critical tool in the fight against climate change.

LaCour's record shows disregard for environmental protections and climate action. On the federal bench, he would likely side with polluters over communities, putting people's lives at risk.

GUN SAFETY

LaCour has consistently opposed common-sense gun safety laws. He challenged California's concealed carry restrictions, fees on gun sales used to fund enforcement, and New York City's handgun transport ban. He also filed briefs opposing Maryland's prohibition on carrying handguns outside the home.

LaCour's hostility to basic gun safety measures makes clear that he would expand gun rights at the expense of public safety. On the bench, he would work to dismantle even modest regulations designed to save lives.