

February 20, 2025

The Honorable Supreme Court met pursuant to adjournment.

The following order was passed:

## STATE OF GEORGIA v. SISTERSONG WOMEN OF COLOR REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE COLLECTIVE ET AL.

The trial court in the above-styled case concluded that the plaintiffs have standing to raise all of the claims they have brought, relying in large part on Feminist Women's Health Center v. Burgess, 282 Ga. 433 (2007). See Trial Court Order 3 n.4 ("All plaintiffs possess individual or organizational standing to sue on their own behalf," citing Burgess). On January 28, 2025, this Court decided Wasserman v. Franklin County, S23G1029. Wasserman overruled Burgess. See Wasserman, Slip Op. 59 ("[W]e overrule [Burgess's] decision's adoption of the federal doctrine of third-party standing and the handful of later decisions to the extent they hold that a plaintiff may rely on the federal doctrine of third-party standing to maintain an action in Georgia courts."). See also Slip Op. 60 (explaining that going forward in Georgia courts: "Now that the federal doctrine of third-party standing is no longer a part of Georgia's law of constitutional standing, a plaintiff may not maintain an action in Georgia courts by asserting only the rights of a third party and meeting the elements of the federal test. Instead,

at a minimum, a plaintiff must assert her own rights to maintain an action in Georgia courts.").1

Accordingly, we vacate the trial court's order and the case is remanded for the trial court to reconsider the issue of the plaintiffs' standing to assert each of their claims in light of *Wasserman*.

This Court's October 7, 2024 order granting in part the State's petition for supersedeas remains in effect.

All the Justices concur, except Ellington, J., who dissents. Peterson, P. J., disqualified, and Pinson, J., not participating.

## SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Clerk's Office, Atlanta

I certify that the above is a true extract from the minutes of the Supreme Court of Georgia.

Witness my signature and the seal of said court hereto affixed the day and year last above written.

Think I Bame, Clerk

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The trial court also held that the plaintiffs "possess associational standing to sue on behalf of their patients and/or members." Order, 3 n.4. That holding should also be re-examined in light of *Wasserman*. See *Wasserman*, Op. 59-60 n.14.