

Angela Colmenero, President Trump's latest federal judicial nominee for the Southern District of Texas, has spent nearly two decades advocating for the extreme far-right agendas of Texas Governor Greg Abbott and Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton. Colmenero used her leadership roles in both offices to advocate for some of the most restrictive bans on gender-affirming medical care for young people in the country. She also supported efforts to make it harder for Texans to have their votes fairly counted and challenged updates to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which would have helped an estimated 500,000 immigrants. If confirmed to a lifetime seat on the federal bench, Colmenero's demonstrated commitment to furthering far-right ideologies will drive her decision making, undermining the Constitution, fairness, and equal justice for all. Colmenero's record, actions, and many documented biases against marginalized communities across Texas confirm that she is unfit and unqualified to serve as a federal judge for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas.

Undermines Voting Rights and Access

Colmenero has repeatedly defended laws that make it harder for everyday people, especially Black and Latino voters, to exercise their fundamental right to vote. She served as lead counsel in *Veasey v. Abbott*, where she defended a Texas photo-ID voting law that courts found disproportionately burdened Black and Latino voters in violation of the Voting Rights Act. After courts found evidence of discriminatory intent, Colmenero continued to defend this law, guiding the Texas legislature through workarounds to "cure" the law's discriminatory effects. Colmenero also served as trial counsel for Texas in multiple cases, defending Texas's 2011 and 2013 congressional and state legislative redistricting maps against Voting Rights Act challenges. The court found discriminatory intent in several of these districts. Lastly, Colmenero served as trial counsel in Texas's failed attempts to obtain Section 5 preclearance for its 2011 redistricting plans, which the court ultimately denied after finding the plans were drawn specifically to disadvantage minority voters.

Stands Against Immigrants

Colmenero served as trial counsel in *Texas v. United States*, where she represented Texas and a group of other states that challenged the Obama administration's DAPA (Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents) program and the expansion of DACA (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals). These changes would have extended protections for millions of undocumented immigrants, making it easier for families to stay together and delay deportation. Colmenero had a heavy hand in this case; she helped develop evidence, prepared expert reports, and prepped counsel to present arguments against these programs. Texas is a diverse state, and Colmenero will undoubtedly be asked to preside over cases that involve undocumented immigrants, where she will need to act fairly and impartially. Her heavy involvement in such politicized cases against immigrants raises questions around her ability to stay fair and impartial as a judge presiding over the same communities she has actively worked against.

Refuses to Allow Access to Reproductive Care

Colmenero has repeatedly made efforts to defend Texas's abortion ban. Under her leadership, the Texas Office of the AG defended the state's position in *Zurawski v. State of Texas*, the landmark challenge to Texas's near total abortion ban and its medical exception provisions, that eventually reached the Texas Supreme Court. The case involved Amanda Zurawski, who was denied an abortion at 18 weeks pregnant, experienced septic shock twice, and then was left with a permanently closed fallopian tube from scar tissue. The state maintained the position that a narrow exception structure was best, rather than allowing broader medical access. Colmenero led during a time when Texas had several overlapping abortion bans, making it nearly impossible to gain access to reproductive care within the state. These bans put pregnant people at risk and are weaponized to deny lifesaving care. As in Zurawski's case, the effects of these bans are not hypothetical: they can and often do cause life-altering consequences to the health of the pregnant person.

Attacks Trans Rights and Endangers Trans Youth

Under Colmenero's leadership as an interim Texas attorney general, her office filed an appeal to undo Travis County District Court judge's ruling to stop Texas from enforcing SB 14, a state law that prohibited necessary and lifesaving gender affirming care for young people. The bill would have severed access to care for adolescents who were already receiving treatment and revoked the medical licenses of doctors providing the best standard of care to their trans patients. The Texas Supreme Court allowed the law to remain in effect while an appeal was pending, making it much more difficult for an already targeted population to receive the support and care they might seek from medical institutions.

In press releases greenlit by Colmenero's office, the OAG emphasized false and dangerous anti-trans rhetoric. Government institutions should not be sharing such dangerous rhetoric as studies continue to confirm that gender-affirming medical care significantly lowers the odds of depression and suicidality in transgender youths – critical for a population that already faces high levels of self-harm and suicide and mental health disparities. Additionally, Colmenero reviewed and approved the Texas State Preservation Board's controversial restroom policy, which required all public restrooms overseen by the board to be designated as only "men's," "women's" or "family care" and that individuals use the restroom corresponding to their biological sex. Such policies prohibit transgender individuals from using restrooms that align with who they are. This policy extended to bathrooms at the Texas State Capitol and was part of broader Texas attacks on transgender individuals. Colmenero's direct role in creating and greenlighting harmful policies like this one renders her unfit to now potentially rule on such policies as a judge.

Texans deserve a federal judge who is committed to making decisions that are aligned with the law, not personal ideology. Colmenero's track record has shown relentless efforts to make democracy less functional, less safe, and less rights-expansive; she will continue this commitment if elevated to the bench.