



Written by [Michael Tennant](#) on May 19, 2025

Massachusetts' Assault on Pregnancy Centers Under Scrutiny as Judge Allows Lawsuit to Proceed

Massachusetts officials and a pro-abortion activist group [failed](#) to convince a federal judge to dismiss a lawsuit charging them with violating the Constitution by conducting a coordinated smear campaign against pro-life [Pregnancy Resource Centers](#) (PRCs).

The judge based his decision in part on the fact that the plaintiff's lawyers recently obtained a trove of documents from the Massachusetts Department of Public Health that bolster its case.



AP Images
Maura Healey

Projection Room

Last June, Massachusetts Governor Maura Healey, a Democrat, [announced](#) that her administration would be spending \$1 million on “a first-in-the-nation public education campaign highlighting the dangers and potential harm of anti-abortion centers, also called ‘crisis pregnancy centers.’”

Said Healey:

In Massachusetts, we are committed to protecting and expanding access to safe and legal abortion. That includes protecting patients from the deceptive and dangerous tactics that anti-abortion centers often use to stop people from accessing comprehensive reproductive services.

In short, Healey wants as many future Bay Staters snuffed out in the womb as possible, as evidenced by her omission of a key word from the once-standard “pro-choice” plea for “safe, legal, and rare” abortion. (Healey has been on the warpath against PRCs since [2022](#), when she was state attorney general.) To that end, she is prepared to do whatever it takes to ensure that no woman is talked out of killing her unborn child.

In her announcement, Healey stated that the taxpayer-funded anti-PRC campaign “was created by the Department of Public Health (DPH) in collaboration with the Reproductive Equity Now [REN] Foundation,” a pro-abortion nonprofit. She also quoted the foundation’s president, Rebecca Hart Holder, who called PRCs “deceptive” and “predatory.”

The state’s attacks on PRCs took a variety of forms, from billboards to bus advertisements to [social-media spots](#) to a state [website](#) titled “Avoid Anti-Abortion Centers,” which warns that PRCs “may mislead you about your options if you’re pregnant and can put your health at risk.”

Under the heading “Have you been harmed by an anti-abortion center?”, the website includes a link to the state’s “How to file a civil rights complaint” page, which it suggests visitors use if they “have concerns about [their] experience” at a PRC.



Written by [Michael Tennant](#) on May 19, 2025

Meanwhile, [far-left DPH Commissioner Robbie Goldstein](#) threatened legal action against PRCs, [claiming](#) they spread “misinformation and disinformation” — which means they must be telling the truth — and constitute “a public health threat.”

Clause and Effect

In August, Massachusetts PRC Your Options Medical (YOM) [filed a federal lawsuit](#) against Healey, Goldstein, and Holder, alleging constitutional violations. The American Center for Law and Justice (ACLJ) — which, along with the Massachusetts Liberty Legal Center (MLLC), is representing YOM — argued that REN, while a private organization, can be found guilty of violating the Constitution since it is acting on the state’s behalf.

The suit contends that the defendants “unconstitutionally coerced the speech of YOM by their threats.” Their “conduct,” wrote ACLJ, “violated YOM’s constitutional rights by actively seeking complaints against PRCs in a targeted campaign of harassment, threats, and unequal enforcement based on political and religious viewpoints.”

Noting that “more than 90 percent of the entities targeted by the government and the pro-abortion agents are religious,” the plaintiff also alleges a First Amendment claim of religious discrimination.

Finally, the lawsuit claims the defendants have violated the Constitution’s equal-protection clause by “seeking to selectively enforce regulations against YOM, applying an unequal standard on YOM and imposing unjustified investigations” while giving abortion providers a free pass.

Record Collectors

Interested parties have, of course, been attempting to pry documents related to the anti-PRC campaign from the state’s clutches for quite some time.

Last July, the [Massachusetts Family Institute \(MFI\)](#) submitted a public-records request to the state agencies involved in the campaign and to Healey’s office. According to MFI:

Although the governor is legally exempt from revealing records to the public, Governor Healey [has proclaimed](#) that she intends to voluntarily follow the public records law and “provide more transparency to the Governor’s Office than ever before” — that is apparently, unless the records relate to the Governor’s attempt to silence all opposition to abortion in Massachusetts.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, our request was denied out of hand. The only explanation we received was that complying with our request for documents would “unreasonably hinder the Governor in effectively performing her duties.” But unless the Governor’s “duties” include weaponizing the State against religious charities that oppose her views on abortion, this rationale doesn’t hold water.

MLLC filed a public-records request with DPH about a year ago. It recently received over 8,000 pages’ worth of documents in response. Stated [ACLJ](#):

These records confirm much of what we’ve alleged: a calculated effort by government officials, working hand-in-hand with pro-abortion activists, to silence and discredit Christian ministries that offer real alternatives to abortion.



Written by [Michael Tennant](#) on May 19, 2025

Hearing Impaired

Crucially, these documents were turned over *before* the judge in the case held a hearing to consider the defendants' two separate motions to dismiss. Much to their dismay, the judge not only rejected their motions but also allowed the plaintiff to amend its complaint to include the new evidence contained in the DPH documents. The truth, therefore, is about to become part of the official record.

Not for nothing did ACLJ declare:

This case remains one of the most important pro-life and free speech battles in the country. The outcome could set national precedent on whether state governments can team up with abortion activists to suppress the voices of those who offer women hope, help, and life.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.