

**THE CIRCUIT COURT OF ST. LOUIS COUNTY
TWENTY-FIRST JUDICIAL CIRCUIT OF MISSOURI**

THE STATE OF MISSOURI ex rel. ERIC
S. SCHMITT;

JOHANNA BEAUDEAN;
BENIGNA BLEVINS;
CRYSTAL DOMAGALSKI;
RICK HORTON;
AMBER HORTON;
JULIE KELLER;
MEGHAN KING;
STEPHEN LAROCQUE;
AMBER MUELLER;
RICHARD MUELLER;
CHRIS NAEGEL;
LINDSEY NAEGEL;
SHAUNA POGGIO;
DAN SANDWEG;
STACEY SANDWEG;
CINDY SCARATO;
NAOMI SHULDBERG;
MICHELLE SWAIN;
DEREK WATSON; and
RACHEL WOOD,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ROCKWOOD R-VI SCHOOL DISTRICT;

Defendant.

No. _____

PETITION

1. School districts do not have the authority to impose, at their whim, public health orders for their schoolchildren. That is doubly true when the public health order, in this case, facemasks, creates a barrier to education that far outweighs any speculative benefit.

2. Instead, school districts only have the power to issue those health rules that the General Assembly provides them—and the General Assembly did not give school districts the authority to condition in-person attendance on compliance with an arbitrary mask mandate.

3. That makes sense. The theory that mandatory masking in schools prevents the spread of COVID-19 by preventing the transmission of its causative agent, the SARS-CoV-2 virus, has no empirical or rational basis; and rejects basic principles of sound public health decision-making, medical science, and statistical analysis.

4. Indeed, far from providing any benefit, masking students imposes positive harms—physical, emotional, and developmental—on schoolchildren.

5. Since school districts lack the power to impose mask mandates, like the one at issue here, decisions about masking of children to prevent the spread of COVID-19 are reserved to parents, not to school districts. That follows from the fundamental truth that “[t]he child is not the mere creature of the state; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right, coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations.” *Pierce v. Soc’y of the Sisters of the Holy Name of Jesus & Mary*, 268 U.S. 510, 535 (1925).

6. Missouri Attorney General Eric S. Schmitt seeks to protect the welfare of Missouri’s children and the liberty and constitutional rights of the people of Missouri.

7. Attorney General Schmitt brings this action to prevent unlawful, unconstitutional, arbitrary, capricious, and unreasonable conduct by the Defendant.

8. Plaintiffs are parents with children who attend schools in Defendant District. They bring this action to protect their children against the District’s unlawful mask mandate and to vindicate their rights as taxpayers.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9. This Court has jurisdiction under Mo. Const. art V, § 14(a), § 527.010, RSMo, *et seq.*, § 536.150, RSMo, § 536.050, RSMo, and other applicable law.

10. Venue is proper in this Court under §§ 508.010.2(2) and 508.050, RSMo.

PARTIES

11. Plaintiff State of Missouri is a sovereign State of the United States of America.

12. Eric S. Schmitt is the 43rd Attorney General of the State of Missouri. Attorney General Schmitt is authorized to “institute, in the name of and on behalf of the state, all civil suits and other proceedings at law or in equity requisite or necessary to protect the rights and interests of the State, and enforce any and all rights, interests or claims against any and all persons, firms or corporations in whatever court or jurisdiction such action may be necessary; and he may also appear and interplead, answer or defend, in any proceeding or tribunal in which the state’s interests are involved.” § 27.060, RSMo.

13. Attorney General Schmitt sues to vindicate Missouri’s sovereign interest in controlling the exercise of sovereign power over individuals and entities within its borders; Missouri’s sovereign interest in ensuring the enforcement of Missouri law within Missouri’s borders; and Missouri’s quasi-sovereign and *parens patriae* interest in the freedom, health, and physical, psychological, educational, and economic well-being of a significant segment of its populace. This interest includes, but is not limited to, preventing the spread of the COVID-19 virus within the State as well as protecting the health and welfare of the State’s residents from arbitrary, capricious, unreasonable, unlawful, and ultimately harmful public health policies.

14. Attorney General Schmitt sues to vindicate Missouri’s sovereign interest in ensuring that its political subdivisions do not exercise authority vested in them under State law in a fashion that violates the Missouri Constitution or Missouri law.

15. Attorney General Schmitt sues to vindicate Missouri’s interest in ensuring that the children of the State receive an appropriate education.

16. Plaintiffs Johanna Beaudean, Benigna Blevins, Crystal Domagalski, Rick Horton, Amber Horton, Julie Keller, Meghan King, Stephen Larocque, Amber Mueller, Richard Mueller, Chris Naegel, Lindsey Naegel, Shauna Poggio, Dan Sandweg, Stacey Sandweg, Cindy Scarato, Naomi Shuldberg, Michelle Swain, Derek Watson, and Rachel Wood are parents with children who attend schools in the District. They sue to vindicate their interests, as parents, in preventing their children from being subject to an unlawful and arbitrary mandate.

17. Together, Johanna Beaudean, Benigna Blevins, Crystal Domagalski, Rick Horton, Amber Horton, Julie Keller, Meghan King, Stephen Larocque, Amber Mueller, Richard Mueller, Chris Naegel, Lindsey Naegel, Shauna Poggio, Dan Sandweg, Stacey Sandweg, Cindy Scarato, Naomi Shuldberg, Michelle Swain, Derek Watson, and Rachel Wood are the “Private Plaintiffs.” The Private Plaintiffs, along with the State of Missouri, are the “Plaintiffs.”

18. The Private Plaintiffs also sue as taxpayers:

- a. The Private Plaintiffs are taxpayers of the district.
- b. On information and belief, the District is expending public funds to implement and to enforce the illegal Mask Mandate. This includes, but is not limited to, expending funds to disseminate information about the Mask Mandate, to enforce the Mask Mandate (including by setting up virtual learning to enforce related quarantine rules), and to drum-up public support for the Mask Mandate.

19. Defendant Rockwood R-VI School District is responsible for providing a free, public education to the children within its district. It is a public school district and is a political subdivision of the State of Missouri.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

20. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations in all preceding paragraphs by reference.

I. The District's mask mandate

21. As of August 20, 2021, the District had implemented a mask mandate. This mask mandate required masks inside all District schools and buildings for students, staff, and visitors.

Exhibit F.

22. On information and belief, the Rockwood School Board did not vote on or approve the original Mask Mandate.

23. On December 16, 2021, the District's school board voted to change the original Mask Mandate. It voted to make masks mandatory in a District school when the school has a positivity and/or exclusion rate of 4% or more (students and staff). See Exhibit A at 7, December 16, 2021 Rockwood Safe Together Plan; Exhibit B, December 16, 2021 Voting Record; Exhibit C, December 16, 2021 School Board Signature. When the 4% threshold was met, the policy required masking for two weeks and required one-week extensions until the positivity and/or exclusion rate drops below 4%. Ex. A at 7.

24. This policy was set to become effective on January 18, 2022. Ex. B.

25. On January 11, 2022, the Rockwood School District Board of Education passed a new mandate that mandated masks for all students, regardless of a school's positivity and/or exclusion rate until February 3, 2022. Exhibit D, January 11, 2022 Rockwood Safe Together Plan ("current Mask Mandate"); Exhibit E, January 11, 2022 Vote.

26. The current Mask Mandate is currently in force.

27. The current Mask Mandate:

- a. requires students wear a mask, but does not require any particular mask type;

- b. requires students to wear a mask while on school property, including when indoors and receiving in person instruction;
 - c. has very few and incredibly limited exceptions and does not exempt vaccinated or previously infected students;
28. On information and belief, when the District instituted its original Mask Mandate prior to the beginning of school, a statewide emergency declaration under Chapter 44 was in effect relating to COVID-19 and Missouri's recovery efforts.
29. The School Board did not vote for and/or approve of the original Mask Mandate within 30 days after its issuance.

II. Public Health Decision-Making

30. Public health decision-making requires considering a number of factors, some of which are quantitative (*e.g.*, disease severity, characteristics of the virus), some of which are qualitative (*e.g.*, a community's trust in public health officials and anticipated reactions), and some that blend these factors.

31. Public health decision-making recognizes that many public health decisions are made in the absence of complete information, and understands that decisions must be continuously updated in light of new information.

32. Public health decision-making understands that public health decisions consider not just the effect of a decision on the transmission of a disease but also the social and economic effects a decision may have on the public at large.

33. In short, rational public health decision-making is a holistic process that requires consideration of innumerable factors, many of which defy ready quantification.

III. SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19 characteristics

34. SARS-CoV-2 is a virus that causes COVID-19, which is an influenza-like illness.

Like the flu, COVID-19 is a respiratory illness spread primarily through droplets and small, aerosolized particles.

35. COVID-19, as a global pandemic, has affected the entire State of Missouri.

36. The extent of transmission of COVID-19 ebbs and flows based on a number of factors, including seasonality and the presence of new variants of SARS-CoV-2. On information and belief, omicron is the dominant SARS-CoV-2 variant in Missouri.

37. Doctors report that the omicron variant of SARS-CoV-2 appears to be mild and much less virulent than prior variants and the original virus. For example, Dr. Anthony Fauci (director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases) recently commented that “all indications point to a lesser severity of omicron versus delta.” Kevin Breuninger, *Fauci Says All Indications Suggest that Omicron is Less Severe Than Delta, But Warns Against Complacency*, CNBC (Dec. 29, 2021), <https://cnb.cx/3ru9F4J>.

38. Regardless of variant, COVID-19 is not a serious health risk for the vast majority of the population—and especially for children and young adults. Rather, the risk of serious negative health outcomes from COVID-19 goes up with age. Thus, children—especially healthy children—do not face a significant risk of serious illness or death if they catch COVID-19.

39. It is likely that the vast majority of people in Missouri have some form of immunity to COVID-19 either due to vaccination or prior infection. Current evidence indicates that natural immunity (*i.e.*, immunity from prior infection), is durable and protects against reinfection and severe health outcomes. Current evidence suggests that vaccine-mediated immunity, while inferior to natural immunity, provides protection against severe, negative health outcomes for at least a season.

40. Furthermore, there is no evidence that children drive the spread of COVID-19.

Bearing that out is evidence that schools are not sources of COVID-19 transmission/outbreaks in a community, but rather transmission of COVID-19 in school reflects patterns of community transmission.

IV. Masks fail to provide adequate protection and offer a false sense of security.

41. Doctors appear to agree that it is time to “retire the cloth mask.” Former commissioner of the FDA, Dr. Scott Gottlieb, has said, “Cloth masks aren’t going to provide a lot of protection, that’s the bottom line. This is an airborne illness. We now understand that, and a cloth mask is not going to protect you from a virus that spreads through airborne transmission.” Full Transcript: Dr. Scott Gottlieb on ‘Face the Nation,’ January 2, 2022, CBS NEWS (Jan. 2, 2022), <https://cbsn.ws/3558jWB>. Indeed even masking advocates admit that “[c]loth masks are little more than facial decorations. There’s no place for them in light of Omicron.” Kristen Rogers, *Why You Should Upgrade Your Mask As the Omicron Variant Spreads*, CNN HEALTH (Dec. 24, 2021), <https://cnn.it/3GL4h3s>.

42. That is consistent with the data. Cloth and surgical masks are not effective at preventing the spread of COVID-19. Many studies show no distinguishable difference between places with mask mandates and those without them. And studies claiming that masks are effective at preventing the spread of COVID-19 are generally of poor quality and are unreliable. Indeed, mask wearing may even be counterproductive in preventing the spread of disease.

43. Furthermore, there are documented harms associated with long-term wearing of masks. Studies, for example, have found that children who wear masks in schools suffer physical discomfort (*e.g.*, headaches), mental and emotional pain (*e.g.*, less happiness or irritability), and are less capable at school. Masks could also impair the educational and emotional development of children.

44. In short, mask mandates—especially for school children—represent a reversal of a

long-held consensus on the merits of community masking, and rests on assumptions and premises that reject the fundamental tenets of modern medicine, statistical analysis, and public health decision-making. They do so while failing a cost-benefit analysis and imposing real, tangible harm.

COUNT ONE – DECLARATION THAT THE CURRENT MASK MANDATE IS VOID

45. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

46. The District is a political subdivision within the meaning of § 67.265.1, RSMo.

47. The original Mask Mandate was an “order” within the meaning of § 67.265.1, RSMo.

48. The current Mask Mandate is an “order” within the meaning of § 67.265.1, RSMo.

49. On information and belief, the District issued its original Mask Mandate in July or August 2021, when there was an emergency order declared pursuant to chapter 44, RSMo.

50. The original Mask Mandate was an order that “directly or indirectly close[d], partially close[d], or place[d] restrictions on the opening of or access to any one or more business organizations, churches, schools, or other places of public or private gathering or assembly, including any order, ordinance, rule, or regulation of general applicability or that prohibits or otherwise limits attendance at any public or private gathering ...” § 67.265.1(1), RSMo. The current Mask Mandate does the same now.

51. Specifically, the original Mask Mandate placed restrictions on access to “schools, or other places of public or private gathering or assembly,” § 67.265.1(1), RSMo, because it limited school access only to masked individuals or to individuals who fall under an exception to the mask requirement. The same is true about the current Mask Mandate.

52. On information and belief, students who refused to comply with the original Mask Mandate would have been excluded from school property, faced discipline, and may have been sent home. The same is true about the current Mask Mandate.

53. On information and belief, students who refused to comply with the original Mask Mandate would not be allowed in school. The same is true about the current Mask Mandate.

54. As a result, the original Mask Mandate was subject to § 67.265.1(1), RSMo, and expired after thirty days absent authorization by the school board. On information and belief, there was no such authorization within the requisite thirty days.

55. Therefore, the original Mask Mandate expired. Because the current Mask Mandate is an extension of the original Mask Mandate, the current Mask Mandate is an expired and prohibited order.

56. In the alternative, the current Mask Mandate (implemented January 11, 2022) is a prohibited order that was void *ab initio*.

57. On August 20, 2021, the District had in place a mask requirement substantively similar to the current Mask Mandate. That mandate, like this one, was subject to § 67.265.1(1), RSMo, because it was a health order that limited students' ability to access school buildings and was issued and related to a statewide emergency involving COVID-19.

58. The School Board never lawfully extended the original Mask Mandate. Pursuant to § 67.265.1(1), RSMo, that mandate could "not remain in effect for longer than thirty calendar days in a one hundred eighty-day-period, including the cumulative duration of similar orders issued concurrently, consecutively, or successively." Because it did not expire and was not approved within the requisite thirty days, the prior mask mandate became a prohibited order. § 67.265.5, RSMo.

59. As a result, that prior mask mandate, and similar masking orders, cannot remain in effect 150 days from the date the District either terminates the prior mask requirement or allows it to expire. *See* § 67.265.1(1), .5, RSMo.

60. Because the current Mask Mandate is similar to the prior mask mandate, in that it is substantively similar to the prior masking requirement, and was issued within 150 days of the termination of the prior masking order, it is a prohibited order. That is, given the similarity between the original Mask Mandate and the current Mask Mandate, the current Mask Mandate at issue here is a “order” per § 67.265 that has “the effect, directly or indirectly” of the original Mask Mandate.

61. In the alternative, the Rockwood School Board terminated the original Mask Mandate on December 16, 2021, under § 67.265.2. The original Mask Mandate then became a prohibited order under § 67.265.5.

62. Because the current Mask Mandate is an order that has the “effect, directly or indirectly” of the original mask mandate, it is a prohibited order under § 67.265.5.

COUNT TWO – CURRENT MASK MANDATE IS UNLAWFUL

63. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

64. Plaintiffs challenge the invalidity of the current Mask Mandate, and seek a declaration that it is unlawful and *ultra vires*.

65. By law, “[i]t shall be the general duty and responsibility of the department of health and senior services to safeguard the health of the people in the state and all its subdivisions.” § 192.020.1, RSMo.

66. DHSS has not delegated, and indeed could not delegate, that authority to school districts.

67. The local health authority has not issued an order requiring schoolchildren to wear masks.

68. The local health authority cannot issue an order requiring schoolchildren to wear masks.

69. Neither the Missouri Constitution nor the General Assembly has granted the School District a general police power to enact law for the public welfare.

70. Neither the General Assembly, DHSS, nor the School Board has delegated to the superintendent a general power to issue public health orders like the Mask Mandate.

71. Neither the General Assembly, DHSS, nor the School Board could delegate to the superintendent a general power to issue public health orders like the Mask Mandate.

72. In fact, Missouri statutes require DHSS to set health policy in schools. This indicates that only DHSS may provide appropriate measures to safeguard the public health. *See* § 167.181, RSMo (DHSS promulgates mandatory vaccination requirements for schoolchildren); § 167.182, RSMo (DHSS develops informational brochure on HPV).

73. Missouri law thus does not authorize Defendant to impose a Mask Mandate.

74. The District does not have authority to impose a Mask Mandate for public health reasons.

75. For those reasons, the current Mask Mandate is an unlawful order and Missouri's schoolchildren should not be subject to it.

**COUNT THREE – THE CURRENT MASK MANDATE IS UNREASONABLE,
ARBITRARY, AND CAPRICIOUS**

76. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

77. Plaintiffs challenge the validity of the current Mask Mandate, and seek a declaration that that it is unreasonable, arbitrary, and capricious.

78. School Districts are “agencies” within the definition under the Missouri Administrative Procedure Act. *See P.L.S. ex rel. Shelton v. Koster*, 360 S.W.3d 805, 818 (Mo. Ct. App. 2011). School Districts may not exercise their power in an “unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious or unlawful manner.” *Magenheim v. Bd. of Educ. of Sch. Dist. of Riverview Gardens*, 347 S.W.2d 409, 417 (Mo. App. 1961).

79. The current Mask Mandate requires all elementary schoolchildren (defined as all children who are of the age to attend K-12 school) attending schools in the District to wear a mask with few exceptions when they are at school. That decision is arbitrary and capricious.

80. Government action is arbitrary, capricious, and unreasonable when it is based on *post hoc* rationalization, when it fails to consider an important part of the problem it is addressing, and when it fails to consider less restrictive alternatives before infringing on citizens’ liberty. *See, e.g., Dep’t of Homeland Sec. v. Regents of the Univ. of Cal.*, 140 S. Ct. 1891, 1905, 1909 (2020); *Michigan v. EPA*, 135 S. Ct. 2699, 2706 (2015). “[A]n agency which completely fails to consider an important aspect or factor of the issue before it may also be found to have acted arbitrarily and capriciously.” *Barry Serv. Agency Co. v. Manning*, 891 S.W.2d 882, 892 (Mo. App. W.D. 1995) (quoting *Motor Vehicle Mfrs. Ass’n of U.S., Inc. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 463 U.S. 29, 43 (1983)). In addition, agencies must consider whether there are less restrictive policies that would achieve their goals. *See Regents of the Univ. of Calif.*, 140 S. Ct. at 1912 (quoting *State Farm Mut. Auto.*, 463 U.S. at 51).

81. On information and belief, the District failed to consider fully the potential social and economic consequences of the current Mask Mandate, including the effect of the mandate on schools and the community.

82. On information and belief, the District failed to fully consider key characteristics of COVID-19, including severity of disease among different age and risk groups, availability and effectiveness of control measures and treatment options, and the fact that many people have immunity either because of vaccination or prior infection.

83. On information and belief, the District failed to consider the fact that the Omicron variant is less likely to cause severe illness and death.

84. On information and belief, the District failed to grapple with a large swath of relevant science, data, statistics, studies, or alternatives. That includes failing to grapple with the weakness of the evidence supporting community masking as a mitigation measure, and the significant evidence showing that masking does very little or nothing to prevent the spread of COVID-19.

85. On information and belief, the District failed to consider the harms masking imposes on schoolchildren.

86. The factors listed above are not an exhaustive list. Ultimately, the current Mask Mandate represents an irrational analysis of the costs and benefits of mandating community masking. For those reasons, and more, the current Mask Mandate is unreasonable, arbitrary, and capricious.

COUNT FOUR – VIOLATION OF MISSOURI CONSTITUTION, ART. IX, § 1(a)

87. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations in all preceding paragraphs.

88. Article IX, § 1(a) of the Missouri Constitution provides schoolchildren a right to a free public education.

89. Since the current Mask Mandate arbitrarily prohibits schoolchildren from attending class in-person in the District, serves no legitimate public health purpose, and is unlawful, it violates the rights of schoolchildren in the District to a free public education.

90. To the extent the District provides virtual learning, virtual learning is no substitute for in-person instruction and cannot remedy the constitutional violation.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court:

- a. Declare that the current Mask Mandate is unconstitutional, unlawful, and/or *ultra vires*;
- b. Declare that the current Mask Mandate is arbitrary, capricious, unreasonable, and invalid;
- c. Declare that the District's original Mask Mandate was subject to § 67.265, RSMo, expired thirty days after issuance, is a prohibited order, and that the District cannot issue any order that has the effect, directly or indirectly, of implementing the original Mask Mandate or any similar mandate for at least 150 days from the final judgment;
- d. Enjoin the District and its officers, employees, and agents from enforcing the current Mask Mandate or any similar order that has the effect, directly or indirectly, of implementing the current Mask Mandate;
- e. Grant relief by injunction, certiorari, mandamus, prohibition, or other appropriate action against the District and its officers, employees, and agents, providing that the current Mask Mandate is unlawful, arbitrary, capricious, unreasonable, and invalid;
- f. Enter a final judgment in Plaintiff's favor on all Counts in this Petition; and
- g. Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper under the circumstances.

Dated: January 21, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

ERIC S. SCHMITT
Attorney General of Missouri

/s/ James S. Atkins

James S. Atkins, MO Bar #61214
Michael E. Talent, MO Bar #73339
Todd A. Scott, MO Bar #56614
Missouri Attorney General's Office
Post Office Box 899
Jefferson City, MO 65102
Tel: 573-751-7890
Fax: 573-751-0774
Jay.Atkins@ago.mo.gov
Counsel for Plaintiff State of Missouri

/s/ Mark C. Milton

Mark C. Milton, MO Bar #63101
Milton Law Group
12026 Manchester Road
St. Louis, MO 63131
Tel: 314-394-3370
Mark.milton@miltonlawgroup.com
Counsel for Private Plaintiffs