



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 18, 2022

The Honorable Matt Krause
Chair, House Committee on General
Investigating
Texas House of Representatives
Post Office Box 2910
Austin, Texas 78768-2910

Opinion No. KP-0401

Re: Whether certain medical procedures performed on children constitute child abuse (RQ-0426-KP)

Dear Representative Krause:

You ask whether the performance of certain medical and chemical procedures on children—several of which have the effect of sterilization—constitute child abuse.¹ You specifically ask about procedures falling under the broader category of “gender reassignment surgeries.” Request Letter at 1. You state that such procedures typically are performed to “transition individuals with gender dysphoria to their desired gender,” and you identify the following specific “sex-change procedures”:

- (1) sterilization through castration, vasectomy, hysterectomy, oophorectomy, metoidioplasty, orchiectomy, penectomy, phalloplasty, and vaginoplasty; (2) mastectomies; and (3) removing from children otherwise healthy or non-diseased body part or tissue.

Id. at 1 (footnotes omitted). Additionally, you ask whether “providing, administering, prescribing, or dispensing drugs to children that induce transient or permanent infertility” constitutes child abuse. *See id.* at 1–2. You include the following categories of drugs: (1) puberty-suppression or puberty-blocking drugs; (2) supraphysiologic doses of testosterone to females; and (3) supraphysiologic doses of estrogen to males. *See id.*

¹*See* Letter from Honorable Matt Krause, Chair, House Comm. on Gen. Investigating, to Honorable Ken Paxton, Tex. Att’y Gen. at 1 (Aug. 23, 2021), <https://www2.texasattorneygeneral.gov/opinions/opinions/51paxton/rq/2021/pdf/RQ0426KP.pdf> (“Request Letter”); *see also* Letter from Honorable Jaime Masters, Comm’r, Tex. Dept. of Family & Protective Servs., to Honorable Greg Abbott, Governor, State of Tex. at 1 (Aug. 11, 2021), https://gov.texas.gov/uploads/files/press/Response_to_August_6_2021_OOG_Letter_08.11.2021.pdf (on file with the Op. Comm.) (hereinafter “Commissioner’s Letter”).

You qualify your question with the following statement: “Some children have a medically verifiable genetic disorder of sex development or do not have the normal sex chromosome structure for male or female as determined by a physician through genetic testing that require procedures similar to those described in this request.” *Id.* at 2. In other words, in rare circumstances, some of the procedures you list are borne out of medical necessity. For example, a minor male with testicular cancer may need an orchiectomy. This opinion does not address or apply to medically necessary procedures.

I. Executive Summary

Based on the analysis herein, each of the “sex change” procedures and treatments enumerated above, when performed on children, can legally constitute child abuse under several provisions of chapter 261 of the Texas Family Code.

- These procedures and treatments can cause “mental or emotional injury to a child that results in an observable and material impairment in the child’s growth, development, or psychological functioning.” TEX. FAM. CODE § 261.001(1)(A).
- These procedures and treatments can “caus[e] or permit[] the child to be in a situation in which the child sustains a mental or emotional injury that results in an observable and material impairment in the child’s growth, development, or psychological functioning.” *Id.* § 261.001(1)(B).
- These procedures and treatments can cause a “physical injury that results in substantial harm to the child.” *Id.* § 261.001(1)(C).
- These procedures and treatments often involve a “failure to make a reasonable effort to prevent an action by another person that results in physical injury that results in substantial harm to the child[,]” particularly by parents, counselors, and physicians. *Id.* § 261.001(1)(D).

In addition to analysis under the Family Code, we discuss below the fundamental right to procreation, issues of physical and emotional harm associated with these procedures and treatments, consent laws in Texas and throughout the country, and existing child abuse standards. Each of the procedures and treatments you ask about can constitute child abuse when performed on minor children.

II. Nature and context of the question presented

Forming the basis for your request, you contend that the “sex change” procedures and treatments you ask about are typically performed to transition individuals with gender dysphoria to their desired gender. *See* Request Letter at 1. The novel trend of providing these elective sex changes to minors often has the effect of permanently sterilizing those minor children. While you refer to these procedures as “sex changes,” it is important to note that it remains medically impossible to truly change the sex of an individual because this is determined biologically at

conception. No doctor can replace a fully functioning male sex organ with a fully functioning female sex organ (or vice versa). In reality, these “sex change” procedures seek to destroy a fully functioning sex organ in order to cosmetically create the illusion of a sex change.

Beyond the obvious harm of permanently sterilizing a child, these procedures and treatments can cause side effects and harms beyond permanent infertility, including serious mental health effects, venous thrombosis/thromboembolism, increased risk of cardiovascular disease, weight gain, decreased libido, hypertriglyceridemia, elevated blood pressure, decreased glucose tolerance, gallbladder disease, benign pituitary prolactinoma, lowered and elevated triglycerides, increased homocysteine levels, hepatotoxicity, polycythemia, sleep apnea, insulin resistance, chronic pelvic pain, and increased cancer and stroke risk.²

While the spike in these procedures is a relatively recent development,³ sterilization of minors and other vulnerable populations without clear consent is not a new phenomenon and has an unsettling history. Historically weaponized against minorities, sterilization procedures have harmed many vulnerable populations, such as African Americans, female minors, the disabled, and others.⁴ These violations have been found to infringe upon the fundamental human right to procreate. Any discussion of sterilization procedures in the context of minor children must, accordingly, consider the fundamental right that is at stake: the right to procreate. Given the uniquely vulnerable nature of children, and the clear dangers of sterilization demonstrated throughout history, it is important to emphasize the crux of the question you present today—whether facilitating (parents/counselors) or conducting (doctors) medical procedures and treatments that could permanently deprive minor children of their constitutional right to procreate, or impair their ability to procreate, before those children have the legal capacity to consent to those procedures and treatments, constitutes child abuse.

The medical evidence does not demonstrate that children and adolescents benefit from engaging in these irreversible sterilization procedures. The prevalence of gender dysphoria in children and adolescents has never been estimated, and there is no scientific consensus that these sterilizing procedures and treatments even serve to benefit minor children dealing with gender dysphoria. As stated by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, “There is not enough high-quality evidence to determine whether gender reassignment surgery improves health outcomes for Medicare beneficiaries with gender dysphoria and whether patients most likely to benefit from these types of surgical intervention can be identified prospectively.”⁵ Also, “several studies show a higher rate of regret at being sterilized among younger women than among those

²See Timothy Cavanaugh, M.D., *Cross-Sex Hormone Therapy*, FENWAY HEALTH (2015), <https://www.lgbtqiahealtheducation.org/wp-content/uploads/Cross-Sex-Hormone-Therapy1.pdf>.

³SOCIETY FOR EVIDENCE BASED GENDER MEDICINE, <https://segm.org/> (demonstrating a spike in referrals to Gender Identify Development Services around the mid-2010s).

⁴Alexandra Stern, Ph.D., *Forced sterilization policies in the US targeted minorities and those with disabilities – and lasted into the 21st Century*, (Sept. 23, 2020), <https://ihpi.umich.edu/news/forced-sterilization-policies-us-targeted-minorities-and-those-disabilities-and-lasting-21st>.

⁵Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Decision Memo for Gender Dysphoria and Gender Reassignment Surgery (CAG-00446N) (Aug. 30, 2016), <http://www.lb7.uscourts.gov/documents/17-264URL1DecisionMemo.pdf>.

who were sterilized at a later age.” 43 FED. REG. at 52,151, 52,152. This further indicates that minor children are not sufficiently mature to make informed decisions in this context.

There is no evidence that long-term mental health outcomes are improved or that rates of suicide are reduced by hormonal or surgical intervention. “Childhood-onset gender dysphoria has been shown to have a high rate of natural resolution, with 61-98% of children reidentifying with their biological sex during puberty. No studies to date have evaluated the natural course and rate of gender dysphoria resolution among the novel cohort presenting with adolescent-onset gender dysphoria.”⁶ One of the few relevant studies monitored transitioned individuals for 30 years. It found high rates of post-transition suicide and significantly elevated all-cause mortality, including increased death rates from cardiovascular disease and cancer, although causality could not be established.⁷ The lack of evidence in this field is why the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services rejected a nationwide coverage mandate for adult gender transition surgeries during the Obama Administration. Similarly, the World Professional Association for Transgender Health states that with respect to irreversible procedures, genital surgery should not be carried out until patients reach the legal age of majority to give consent for medical procedures in a given country.⁸

Generally, the age of majority is eighteen in Texas. TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 129.001. With respect to consent to sterilization procedures, Medicaid sets the age threshold even higher, at twenty-one years old. Children and adolescents are promised relief and asked to “consent” to life-altering, irreversible treatment—and to do so in the midst of reported psychological distress, when they cannot weigh long-term risks the way adults do, and when they are considered by the State in most regards to be without legal capacity to consent, contract, vote, or otherwise. Legal and ethics scholars have suggested that it is particularly unethical to radically intervene in the normal physical development of a child to “affirm” a “gender identity” that is at odds with bodily sex.⁹

State and federal governments have “wide discretion to pass legislation in areas where there is medical and scientific uncertainty.” *Gonzales v. Carhart*, 550 U.S. 124, 163 (2007). Thus, states routinely regulate the medical profession and routinely update their regulations as new trends arise and new evidence becomes available. In the opioid context, for instance, states responded to an epidemic caused largely by pharmaceutical companies and medical professionals. Dismissing as “opioidphobic” any concern that “raising pain treatment to a ‘patients’ rights’ issue could lead to overreliance on opioids,” these experts created new pain standards and assured doctors that

⁶SOCIETY FOR EVIDENCE BASED GENDER MEDICINE, <https://segm.org/>.

⁷See Cecilia Dhejne, et al., *Long-term Follow-up of Transsexual Persons Undergoing Sex Reassignment Surgery: Cohort Study in Sweden*, 6 PLOS ONE, Issue 2, 5 (Feb. 22, 2011) (19 times the expected norm overall (Table 2), and 40 times the norm for biological females (Table s1)), <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0016885>.

⁸WORLD PROFESSIONAL ASS’N FOR TRANSGENDER HEALTH, *Standards of Care for the Health of Transsexual, Transgender, and Gender-Nonconforming People* at 59 (7th ed. 2012), available at https://www.wpath.org/media/cms/Documents/SOC%20v7/SOC%20V7_English2012.pdf?t=1613669341.

⁹Ryan T. Anderson & Robert P. George, Physical Interventions on the Bodies of Children to “Affirm” their “Gender Identity” Violate Sound Medical Ethics and Should Be Prohibited, PUBLIC DISCOURSE: THE JOURNAL OF THE WITHERSPOON INSTITUTE (Dec. 8, 2019), <https://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2019/12/58839/>.

prescribing more opioids was largely risk free.¹⁰ *Id.* As we know now, the results were—indeed, *are*—nothing short of tragic.¹¹ There is always the potential for novel medical determinations to promote purported remedies that may not improve patient outcomes and can even result in tragic harms. The same potential for harm exists for minors who have engaged in the type of procedures or treatments above.

The State’s power is arguably at its zenith when it comes to protecting children. In the Supreme Court’s words, that is due to “the peculiar vulnerability of children.” *Bellotti v. Baird*, 443 U.S. 622, 634 (1979); *see also Ginsberg v. New York*, 390 U.S. 629, 640 (1968) (“The State also has an independent interest in the well-being of its youth.”). The Supreme Court has explained that children’s “inability to make critical decisions in an informed, mature manner” makes legislation to protect them particularly appropriate. *Bellotti*, 443 U.S. at 634. The procedures that you ask about impose significant and irreversible effects on children, and we therefore address them with extreme caution, mindful of the State’s duty to protect its children. *See generally T.L. v. Cook Children’s Med. Ctr.*, 607 S.W.3d 9, 42 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2020), *cert. denied*, 141 S. Ct. 1069 (2021) (“Children, by definition, are not assumed to have the capacity to take care of themselves. They are assumed to be subject to the control of their parents, and if parental control falters, the State must play its part as *parens patriae*. In this respect, the [child]’s liberty interest may, in appropriate circumstances, be subordinated to the State’s *parens patriae* interest in preserving and promoting the welfare of the child.”) (citation omitted).

III. To the extent that these procedures and treatments could result in sterilization, they would deprive the child of the fundamental right to procreate, which supports a finding of child abuse under the Family Code.

A. The procedures you describe can and do cause sterilization.

The surgical and chemical procedures you ask about can and do cause sterilization.¹² Similarly, the treatments you ask about often involve puberty-blocking medications. Such medications suppress the body’s production of estrogen or testosterone to prevent puberty and are being used in this context to pause the sexual development of a person that occurs during puberty. The use of these chemical procedures for this purpose is not approved by the federal Food and Drug Administration and is considered an “off-label” use of the medications. These chemical procedures prevent a person’s body from developing the capability to procreate. There is insufficient medical evidence available to demonstrate that discontinuing the medication resumes a normal puberty process. *See generally Hennessy-Waller v. Snyder*, 529 F. Supp. 3d 1031, 1042 (D. Ariz. 2021), citing *Bell v. Tavistock and Portman NHS Foundation Trust*, 2020 EWHC 3274,

¹⁰*See* David W. Baker, *The Joint Commission’s Pain Standards: Origins and Evolution* 4 (May 5, 2017) (footnotes omitted), <https://perma.cc/RZ42-YNRC> (“[N]o large national studies were conducted to examine whether the standards improved pain assessment or control.”).

¹¹*See generally* U.S. HEALTH & HUMAN SERVS., WHAT IS THE U.S. OPIOID EPIDEMIC?, <https://www.hhs.gov/opioids/about-the-epidemic/index.html>.

¹²*See* Philip J. Cheng, *Fertility Concerns of the Transgender Patient*, *TRANSL ANDROL UROL.* 2019;9(3):209-218 (explaining that hysterectomy, oophorectomy, and orchiectomy “results in permanent sterility”), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6626312/>.

¶ 134 (Dec. 1, 2020) (referring to *Bell's* conclusion that a clinic's practice of prescribing puberty-suppressing medication to individuals under age 18 with gender dysphoria and determining such treatment was experimental). Thus, because the procedures you inquire about can and do result in sterilization, they implicate a minor child's constitutional right to procreate.

B. The United States Constitution protects a fundamental right to procreation.

The United States Supreme Court recognizes that the right to procreate is a fundamental right under the Fourteenth Amendment. *See Skinner v. Oklahoma*, 316 U.S. 535, 541 (1942). Almost a century ago, the Court explained the unique concerns sterilization poses respecting this fundamental right:

The power to sterilize, if exercised, may have subtle, far reaching and devastating effects. In evil or reckless hands it can cause races or types which are inimical to the dominant group to wither and disappear. There is no redemption for the individual whom the law touches. Any experiment which the State conducts is to his irreparable injury. He is forever deprived of a basic liberty.

Id. To the extent the procedures you describe cause permanent damage to reproductive organs and functions of a child before that child has the legal capacity to consent, they unlawfully violate the child's constitutional right to procreate. *See generally* 43 FED. REG. at 52,146–52,152 (discussing ripeness for coercion and regret rates among minor children).

C. Because children are legally incompetent to consent to sterilization, procedures and treatments that result in a child's sterilization are unauthorized and infringe on the child's fundamental right to procreate.

Under Texas law, a minor is a person under eighteen years of age that has never been married and never declared an adult by a court. *See* TEX. CIV. PRAC. & REM. CODE § 129.001; TEX. FAM. CODE §§ 1.104, 101.003 (including a minor on active duty in the military, one who does not live with a parent or guardian and who manages their own financial affairs, among others). State law recognizes seven instances in which a minor can consent to certain types of medical treatment on their own. *See id.* § 32.003. None of the express provisions relating to a minor's ability to consent to medical treatment addresses consent to the procedures used for "gender-affirming" treatment. *See generally id.*

The lack of authority of a minor to consent to an irreversible sterilization procedure is consistent with other law. The federal Medicaid program does not allow for parental consent, has established a minimum age of 21 for consent to sterilization procedures, and imposes detailed requirements for obtaining that consent. 42 C.F.R. §§ 441.253(a); 441.258 ("Consent form requirements"). Federal Medicaid funds may not be used for any sterilization without complying with the consent requirements, meaning a doctor may not be reimbursed for sterilization procedures performed on minors. *Id.* § 441.256(a).

The higher age limit for sterilization procedures was implemented due to a number of special concerns, including historical instances of forced sterilization. *See* 43 FED. REG. 52146, 52148. “[M]inors and other incompetents have been sterilized with federal funds and . . . an indefinite number of poor people have been improperly coerced into accepting a sterilization operation under the threat that various federally supported welfare benefits would be withdrawn unless they submitted to irreversible sterilization.” *Relf v. Weinberger*, 372 F. Supp. 1196, 1199 (D.D.C. 1974), *vacated*, 565 F.2d 722 (D.C. Cir. 1977). In addition, the 21-year minimum age-of-consent rule accounted for concerns that minors were more susceptible to coercion than those over 21 and that younger women had higher rates of regret for sterilization than those who were sterilized at a later age. 43 FED. REG. at 52,151 (pointing to comments suggesting that “persons under 21 are more susceptible to coercion than those over 21 and are more likely to lack the maturity to make an informed decision” and acknowledging “these considerations favor protecting such individuals by limiting their access to the procedure”); *see id.* at 52,151–52,152 (pointing to “several studies [that] show a higher rate of regret at being sterilized among younger women than among those who were sterilized at a later age”).

Regarding parental consent, Texas law generally recognizes a parent’s right to consent to a child’s medical care. TEX. FAM. CODE § 151.001(a)(6) (“A parent of a child has the following rights and duties: . . . (6) the right to consent to the child’s . . . medical and dental care, and psychiatric, psychological, and surgical treatment . . .”). But this general right to consent to certain medically necessary procedures does not extend to elective (not medically necessary) procedures and treatments that infringe upon a minor child’s constitutional right to procreate. Indeed, courts have analyzed the imposition of unnecessary medical procedures upon children in similar circumstances in the past to determine whether doing so constitutes child abuse.

One such situation that the law has addressed is often referred to as “Munchausen by proxy” or “factitious disorder imposed on another”:

[A] psychological disorder that is characterized by the intentional feigning, exaggeration, or induction of the symptoms of a disease or injury in oneself or another and that is accompanied by the seeking of excessive medical care from various doctors and medical facilities typically resulting in multiple diagnostic tests, treatments, procedures, and hospitalizations. Unlike the malingerer, who consciously induces symptoms to obtain something of value, the patient with a factitious disorder consciously produces symptoms for unconscious reasons, without identifiable gain.¹³

In situations such as this, an individual intentionally seeks to procure—often by deceptive means, such as exaggeration—unnecessary medical procedures or treatments either for themselves or others, usually their children. In Texas, courts have found that these “Munchausen by proxy” situations can constitute child abuse. *See generally Williamson v. State*, 356 S.W.3d 1, 19–21 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2010, pet. ref’d) (recognizing that an unnecessary medical procedure

¹³*Factitious disorder*, MERRIAM-WEBSTER.COM DICTIONARY, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/factitious%20disorder>.

may cause serious bodily injury, supporting a charge of injury to a child under section 22.04 of the Penal Code).¹⁴

In the context of elective sex change procedures for minors, the Legislature has not provided any avenue for parental consent, and no judicial avenue exists for the child to proceed with these procedures and treatments without parental consent. By comparison, Texas law respecting abortion requires parental consent and, in extenuating circumstances, permits non-parental consent for a minor to obtain an abortion. TEX. OCC. CODE § 164.052(19) (requiring written consent of a child's parent before a physician may perform an abortion on an unemancipated minor); TEX. FAM. CODE § 33.003 (authorizing judicial approval of a minor's abortion without parental consent in limited circumstances). But the Texas Legislature has not decided to make those same allowances for consent to sterilization, and thus a parent cannot consent to sterilization procedures or treatments that result in the permanent deprivation of a minor child's constitutional right to procreate.¹⁵ Thus, no avenue exists for a child to consent to or obtain consent for an elective procedure or treatment that causes sterilization.

IV. The procedures and treatments you describe can constitute child abuse under the Family Code.

Having established the legal and cultural context of this opinion request, we now consider whether these procedures and treatments qualify as child abuse under the Family Code. *See* Request Letter at 1. Where, as a factual matter, one of these procedures or treatments cannot result in sterilization, a court would have to go through the process of evaluating, on a case-by-case basis, whether that procedure violates any of the provisions of the Family Code—and whether the procedure or treatment poses a similar threat or likelihood of substantial physical and emotional harm. Thus, where a factual scenario involving non-medically necessary, gender-based procedures or treatments on a minor causes or threatens to cause harm or irreparable harm¹⁶ to the child—comparable to instances of Munchausen syndrome by proxy or criminal injury to a child—or demonstrates a lack of consent, etc., a court could find such procedures to constitute child abuse under section 261.001.

A. The Texas Legislature defines child abuse broadly.

Family Code chapter 261 provides for the reporting and investigation of abuse or neglect of a child. *See* TEX. FAM. CODE §§ 261.001–.505; *see also* TEX. PENAL CODE § 22.04 (providing for the offense of injury to a child). Section 261.001 defines abuse through a broad and nonexclusive list of acts and omissions. TEX. FAM. CODE § 261.001(1); *see also In re Interest of*

¹⁴*See also* Tex. Dep't of Fam. & Protective Servs., Tex. Practice Guide for Child Protective Servs. Att'ys, § 7, at 15 (2018), https://www.dfps.state.tx.us/Child_Protection/Attorneys_Guide/default.asp.

¹⁵Federal Medicaid programs will not reimburse for these types of procedures on minors, regardless of whether the child or parent consents, because of the numerous concerns outlined in the Federal Register provisions discussed above. *See* 43 FED. REG. at 52,146–52,159.

¹⁶For example, a non-medically necessary procedure or treatment that seeks to alter a minor female's breasts in such a way that would or could prevent that minor female from having the ability to breastfeed her eventual children likely causes irreparable harm and could form the basis for a finding of child abuse.

S.M.R., 434 S.W.3d 576, 583 (Tex. 2014). Of course, this broad definition of abuse would apply to and include criminal acts against children, such as “female genital mutilation”¹⁷ or “injury to a child.”¹⁸

Your questions implicate several components of section 261.001(1). Subsection 261.001(1)(A) identifies “mental or emotional injury to a child that results in an observable and material impairment in the child’s growth, development, or psychological functioning.” Subsection 261.001(1)(B) provides that “causing or permitting the child to be in a situation in which the child sustains a mental or emotional injury that results in an observable and material impairment in the child’s growth, development, or psychological functioning” is abuse. Subsection 261.001(1)(C) includes as abuse a “physical injury that results in substantial harm to the child, or the genuine threat of substantial harm from physical injury to the child.” And subsection 261.001(1)(D) includes “failure to make a reasonable effort to prevent an action by another person that results in physical injury that results in substantial harm to the child.”

Offering some clarity to the scope of “abuse” under subsection 261.001(1), the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (“Department”) adopted rules giving meaning to the key terms and phrases used in the definition. The Department acknowledges that emotional abuse is a subset of abuse that includes “[m]ental or emotional injury to a child that results in an observable and material impairment in the child’s growth, development, or psychological functioning.” 40 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 707.453(a) (Tex. Dept. of Fam. & Protective Servs., What is Emotional Abuse?). The Department’s rules provide that “[m]ental or emotional injury” means

[t]hat a child of any age experiences significant or serious negative effects on intellectual or psychological development or functioning. . . . and exhibits behaviors indicative of observable and material impairment mean[ing] discernable and substantial damage or deterioration to a child’s emotional, social, and cognitive development.

Id. § 707.453(b)(1)–(2).

With respect to physical injuries, the Department further clarified the meaning of the phrase “[p]hysical injury that results in substantial harm to the child,” explaining that it means in relevant part a

¹⁷A person commits an offense if the person: (1) knowingly circumcises, excises, or infibulates any part of the labia majora or labia minora or clitoris of another person who is younger than 18 years of age; (2) is a parent or legal guardian of another person who is younger than 18 years of age and knowingly consents to or permits an act described by Subdivision (1) to be performed on that person; or (3) knowingly transports or facilitates the transportation of another person who is younger than 18 years of age within this state or from this state for the purpose of having an act described by Subdivision (1) performed on that person. TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 167.001.

¹⁸A person commits an offense if he intentionally, knowingly, recklessly, or with criminal negligence, by act or intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly by omission, causes to a child, elderly individual, or disabled individual: (1) serious bodily injury; (2) serious mental deficiency, impairment, or injury; or (3) bodily injury. TEX. PENAL CODE § 22.04.

real and significant physical injury or damage to a child that includes but is not limited to . . . [a]ny of the following, if caused by an action of the alleged perpetrator directed toward the alleged victim: . . . *impairment of or injury to any bodily organ or function; . . .*

Id. § 707.455(b)(2)(A) (emphasis added). The Department’s rules also define a “[g]enuine threat of substantial harm from physical injury” to include the

declaring or exhibiting the intent or determination to inflict real and significant physical injury or damage to a child. The declaration or exhibition does not require actual physical contact or injury.

Id. § 707.455(b)(1) (emphasis added).

Subsection 261.001(1) and these rules define “abuse” broadly to include mental or emotional injury in addition to a physical injury. To the extent the specific procedures about which you ask may cause mental or emotional injury or physical injury within these provisions, they constitute abuse.

Further, the Legislature has explicitly defined “female genital mutilation” and made such act a state jail felony. *See* TEX. HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 167.001(a)–(b). While the Legislature has not elsewhere defined the phrase “genital mutilation”, nor specifically for males of any age,¹⁹ the Legislature’s criminalization of a particular type of genital mutilation supports an argument that analogous procedures that include genital mutilation—potentially including gender reassignment surgeries—could constitute “abuse” under the Family Code’s broad and non-exhaustive examples of child abuse or neglect.²⁰ *See* TEX. FAM. CODE § 261.001(1)(A)–(M); *see generally* Commissioner’s Letter at 1 (concluding that genital “mutilation may cause a genuine threat of substantial harm from physical injury to the child”). Thus, many of the procedures and treatments you ask about can constitute “female genital mutilation,” a standalone criminal act. But even where these procedures and treatments may not constitute “female genital mutilation” under Texas law, a court could still find that these procedures and treatments constitute child abuse under section 261.001 of the Family Code.

B. Each of these procedures and treatments can constitute abuse under Texas Family Code § 261.001(1)(A), (B), (C), or (D).

The Texas Family Code is clear—causing or permitting substantial harm to the child or the child’s growth and development is child abuse. Courts have held that an unnecessary surgical

¹⁹Your letter does not mention nor request an analysis under federal law. However, under federal law, there are at least two definitions of female genital mutilation, 8 U.S.C § 1374 and 18 U.S.C. § 116. For purposes of this opinion, we have not considered federal statutes, nor have we undertaken any analysis under state or federal constitutions beyond that included here.

²⁰The Eighty-seventh Legislature considered multiple bills that would have amended Family Code subsection 261.001(1) to expressly include in the definition of abuse the performing of surgery or other medical procedures on a child for the purpose of gender transitioning or gender reassignment. Those bills did not pass. *See, e.g.,* Tex. H.B. 22, 87th Leg., 3d C.S. (2021).

procedure that removes a healthy body part from a child can constitute a real and significant injury or damage to the child. *See generally Williamson v. State*, 356 S.W.3d 1, 19–21 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 2010, pet. ref'd) (recognizing that an unnecessary medical procedure may cause serious bodily injury, supporting a charge of injury to a child under section 22.04 of the Penal Code). The *Williamson* case involved a “victim of medical child abuse, sometimes referred to as Munchausen Syndrome by Proxy.” *Id.* at 5. Munchausen syndrome by proxy is “where an alleged perpetrator . . . attempts to gain medical procedures and issues for [their] child for secondary gain for themselves [A]s a result, the children are subjected to multiple diagnostic tests, therapeutic procedures, sometimes operative procedures, in order to treat things that aren’t really there.” *Williamson*, 356 S.W.3d at 11. In the *Williamson* case, the abuse was perpetrated on the child when he was five and six years old by his mother. *Id.* The evidence showed that two surgeries performed on the child “were not medically necessary and that [his mother] knowingly and intentionally caused the unnecessary procedures to be performed by fabricating, exaggerating, and inducing the symptoms leading to the surgeries.” *Id.*

Similarly, in *Austin v. State*, a court of appeals upheld the conviction for felony injury of a child of a mother suffering from Munchausen syndrome by proxy who injected her son with insulin. *See* 222 S.W.3d 801, 804 (Tex. App.—Austin 2007, pet. ref'd); *see also In re McCabe*, 580 S.E.2d 69, 73 (N.C. Ct. App. 2003) (concluding that abuse through Munchausen syndrome by proxy was abuse under state statute defining abuse in a similar manner as chapter 261); *Matter of Aaron S.*, 625 N.Y.S.2d 786, 793 (Fam. Ct. 1993), *aff’d sub nom. Matter of Suffolk Cnty. Dep’t of Soc. Servs on Behalf of Aaron S.*, 626 N.Y.S.2d 227 (App. Div. 1995) (finding that a mother neglected her son by subjecting him to a continuous course of medical treatment for condition which he did not have and that he was a neglected child under state statute governing abuse of a child). In guidance documents published for its child protective services attorneys, the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services explains that “Munchausen by proxy syndrome is relatively rare, but when it occurs, it is frequently a basis for a finding of child abuse.”²¹ Whether motivated by Munchausen syndrome by proxy or otherwise, it is clear that unnecessary medical treatment inflicted on a child by a parent can constitute child abuse under the Family Code.

By definition, procedures and treatments resulting in sterilization cause “physical injury that results in substantial harm to the child, or the genuine threat of substantial harm from physical injury to the child” by surgically altering key physical body parts of the child in ways that render entire body parts, organs, and the entire reproductive system of the child physically incapable of functioning. Thus, such procedures and treatments can constitute child abuse under section 261.001(1)(C). Even where the procedure or treatment does not involve the physical removal or alteration of a child’s reproductive organs (*i.e.* puberty blockers), these procedures and treatments can cause “mental or emotional injury to a child that results in an observable and material impairment in the child’s growth, development, or psychological functioning” by subjecting a child to the mental and emotional injury associated with lifelong sterilization—an impairment to

²¹TEX. DEP’T OF FAM. & PROTECTIVE SERVS., TEX. PRACTICE GUIDE FOR CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVS. ATT’YS, § 7, at 15 (2018), https://www.dfps.state.tx.us/Child_Protection/Attorneys_Guide/default.asp (citing *Reid v. State*, 964 S.W.2d 723 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 1998, pet. ref’d) (mem. op.) (expert testimony admitted regarding general acceptance of Munchausen diagnosis as a form of child abuse)).

one's growth and development. Therefore, a court could find these procedures and treatments to be child abuse under section 261.001(1)(A). Further, attempts by a parent to consent to these procedures and treatments on behalf of their child may, if successful, "cause or permit the child to be in a situation in which the child sustains a mental or emotional injury that results in an observable and material impairment in the child's growth, development, or psychological functioning[,]" and could be child abuse under section 261.001(1)(B). Additionally, the failure to stop a doctor or another parent from conducting these treatments and procedures on a minor child can constitute a "failure to make a reasonable effort to prevent an action by another person that results in physical injury that results in substantial harm to the child[,]" and this "failure to make a reasonable effort to prevent" can also constitute child abuse under section 261.001(1)(D). Any person that conducts or facilitates these procedures or treatments could be engaged in child abuse, whether that be parents, doctors, counselors, etc.

It is important to note that anyone who has "a reasonable cause to believe that a child's physical or mental health or welfare has been adversely affected by abuse or neglect by any person shall immediately make a report" as described in the Family Code. TEX. FAM. CODE § 261.101(a). Further, "[i]f a professional has reasonable cause to believe that a child has been abused or neglected or may be abused or neglected, or that a child is a victim of an offense under Section 21.11, Penal Code, and the professional has reasonable cause to believe that the child has been abused as defined by Section 261.001, the professional shall make a report not later than the 48th hour after the hour the professional first has reasonable cause to believe that the child has been or may be abused or neglected or is a victim of an offense under Section 21.11, Penal Code." TEX. FAM. CODE § 261.101(b). The term includes teachers, nurses, doctors, day-care employees, employees of a clinic or health care facility that provides reproductive services, juvenile probation officers, and juvenile detention or correctional officers. *Id.* A failure to report under these circumstances is a criminal offense. TEX. FAM. CODE § 261.109(a).

S U M M A R Y

Each of the “sex change” procedures and treatments enumerated above, when performed on children, can legally constitute child abuse under several provisions of chapter 261 of the Texas Family Code.

When considering questions of child abuse, a court would likely consider the fundamental right to procreation, issues of physical and emotional harm associated with these procedures and treatments, consent laws in Texas and throughout the country, and existing child abuse standards.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ken Paxton". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

KEN PAXTON
Attorney General of Texas

BRENT E. WEBSTER
First Assistant Attorney General

LESLEY FRENCH
Chief of Staff

MURTAZA F. SUTARWALLA
Deputy Attorney General for Legal Counsel

AARON REITZ
Deputy Attorney General for Legal Strategy

RALPH M. MOLINA
Special Counsel to the First Assistant Attorney General

VIRGINIA K. HOELSCHER
Chair, Opinion Committee

CHARLOTTE M. HARPER
Assistant Attorney General, Opinion Committee