CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS
DR. MICHAEL N	MOATES	STATE OF TEXAS, NORTH CAROLINA, NEVADA, AND VIRGINIA
(b) County of Residence of	of First Listed Plaintiff TARRANT	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant TARRANT
` '	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)	(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, .	Address, and Telephone Number)	Attomeys (If Known)
(c) Attorneya primi nome, i	numess, and recomme manuery	
II. BASIS OF JURISD	NCTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
		(For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for Defendant)
U.S. Government Plaintiff	X3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	PTF DEF Citizen of This State 1 lucorporated or Principal Place 4 4 of Business In This State
2 U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 5 of Business In Another State
		Citizen or Subject of a 3 5 Foreign Nation 6 6
IV. NATURE OF SUIT	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.
CONTRACT	TORIS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY BANKRUPTCY OTHER STATUTES.
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/	of Property 21 USC 881 423 Withdrawal 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 28 USC 157 3729(a)) INTELIBECTUAL 400 State Reapportionment
150 Recovery of Overpayment	320 Assault, Libel & Pharmaceutical Slander Personal Injury	PROPERTY RIGHTS 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking
& Enforcement of Judgmen	330 Federal Employers' Product Liability	830 Patent 450 Commerce
152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability 368 Asbestos Personal	490 7 - 5-400 -
Student Loans (Excludes Veterans)	340 Marine Injury Product 345 Marine Product Liability	New Drug Application Corrupt Organizations
153 Recovery of Overpayment		RTY LABOR 880 Defend Trade Secrets 480 Consumer Credit
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	350 Motor Vehicle 370 Other Fraud 355 Motor Vehicle 371 Truth in Lending	710 Fair Labor Standards Act of 2016 (15 USC 1681 or 1692) Act 485 Telephone Consumer
190 Other Contract	Product Liability 380 Other Personal	720 Labor/Management SOCIAL SECURITY Protection Act
195 Contract Product Liability	360 Other Personal Property Damage	Relations 861 HIA (1395ff) 490 Cable/Sat TV
196 Franchise	Injury 385 Property Damage 362 Personal Injury - Product Liability	
	Medical Malpractice	Leave Act 864 SSID Title XVI 890 Other Statutory Actions
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO	
210 Land Condemnation	440 Other Civil Rights Habeas Corpust	791 Employee Retirement 893 Environmental Matters Income Security Act FEDERAL TAX SUITS 895 Freedom of Information
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	441 Voting 463 Alien Detainee 442 Employment 510 Motions to Vacat	
240 Torts to Land	443 Housing/ Sentence	or Defendant) 896 Arbitration
245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations 530 General	871 IRS—Third Party 899 Administrative Procedure 26 USC 7609 Act/Review or Appeal of
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 535 Death Penalty Employment Other:	462 Naturalization Application Application Agency Decision
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities 2 540 Mandamus & Oth	her 465 Other Immigration X 950 Constitutionality of
	Other 550 Civil Rights	Actions State Statutes
	448 Education 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee -	
	Conditions of	
V ODICIN	Confinement	
	emoved from [3 Remanded from [4 Reinstated or 5 Transferred from 6 Multidistrict 8 Multidistrict
Proceeding Su	nte Court Appellate Court	Reopened Another District Litigation - Litigation - Company of the
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON US CONSTITUTION	are filing (Do not clie jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
, i, oncomor nom	Dist assembani or cause.	Y TO ENJOY LICENSURE AND PRACTICE PROFESSION
VII. REQUESTED IN	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTIO	
COMPLAINT:	UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.	JURY DEMAND: ▼Yes No
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S)	
IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE	DOCKET NUMBER
DATE	the commence of the commence o	TTORNEY OF RECORD
Jul 25, 2023		TES, EDD, PRO SE
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	TOP CHIEF TOPS	
A OR OFFICE OSE ONLI	ADDI VINIC IED	HIDGE MAG HIDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

Northern District of Texas

Normern	District of Texas
DR. MICHAEL MOATES)))
Plaintiff(s) v. STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA STATE OF TEXAS STATE OF NEVADA STATE OF VIRGINIA)) Civil Action No.))
Defendant(s))
SUMMONS	IN A CIVIL ACTION
To: (Defendant's name and address) Office of the Attorney G 100 North Carson Stree Carson City, NV 89701	
A lawsuit has been filed against you.	
are the United States or a United States agency, or an or P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or me whose name and address are: DR. MICHAEL MOATE	WILL ACCEPT SERVICE VIA EMAIL)
If you fail to respond, judgment by default will You also must file your answer or motion with the cour	be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint.
	CLERK OF COURT
Date:	Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Pursuant to Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff Michael Moates, EdD, Pro Se, hereby moves this court for a Preliminary Injunction against the Defendants States of North Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and Nevada (collectively states) and in support thereof, states as follows:

INTRODUCTION

The Plaintiff is challenging the mandatory certification requirement imposed by the states as an unconstitutional violation of the First Amendment rights of behavior analysts to freedom of speech and association.

ARGUMENT

I. Likelihood of Success on the Merits

Plaintiff contends that the mandatory BACB certification requirement violates the First Amendment, which safeguards an individual's right to associate and not to associate as an aspect of "freedom of speech." The requirement compels behavior analysts to join and financially support the BACB in violation of their freedom of association and speech, regardless of whether they agree with or wish to support its views, goals, or methods.

Additionally, Plaintiff alleges the certification requirement violates the Sherman Antitrust Act, which prohibits activities that restrict competition and monopolize trade. The

BACB's monopoly over certification for behavior analysts restricts competition, controls prices, and suppresses innovation in the field.

II. Threat of Irreparable Harm

The Plaintiff faces immediate and irreparable harm without preliminary injunctive relief.

The BACB's certification requirement currently limits the Plaintiff's and similarly situated behavior analysts' right to practice their profession. This requirement results in a loss of livelihood, professional reputation, and potentially, clientele - harm that cannot be compensated by damages alone.

An essential aspect of obtaining a preliminary injunction is demonstrating that there would be irreparable harm without it. In this case, the harm is not only to the plaintiff and other behavior analysts but also to the consumers of their services.

The enforcement of the new law requiring BACB certification in North Carolina would result in the immediate cessation of services for hundreds, potentially thousands, of clients. This sudden stop in services would significantly impact clients, including those exhibiting high-risk behaviors such as self-injurious behaviors, sexual behaviors, aggression towards others, and more.

These individuals, often among the most vulnerable in our society, rely on the continuity of therapeutic services provided by behavior analysts for their well-being and progress.

The immediate discontinuation of these services poses a serious risk to their safety and health and impedes their ability to live fulfilling and productive lives.

The harm to these consumers is not merely economic but includes the deterioration of their mental health, loss of progress, and potential escalation of harmful behaviors.

Courts have recognized that such harms qualify as irreparable injury warranting preliminary injunctive relief because of their irreversible nature. See, e.g., Rodriguez v. DeBuono, 175 F.3d 227, 234–35 (2d Cir.1999) (finding irreparable harm in the context of mental health services).

Further, this immediate cessation of services undermines the fundamental purpose of state regulation – to protect consumers. The Supreme Court of North Carolina, in North Carolina State Board of Dental Examiners v. FTC, highlighted the necessity of state regulation to be driven by public welfare and not by a protectionist agenda for select market participants.

Therefore, enforcing the law mandating BACB certification in North Carolina violates constitutional and antitrust laws. It brings immediate and severe harm to consumers, the people the regulations aim to protect. For these reasons, the court must grant the preliminary injunction to prevent the grave and irreparable harm that would otherwise result from the enforcement of this new law.

III. Balance of Harms

The harm Plaintiff will suffer without the injunction significantly outweighs any potential harm to Defendants. The BACB will continue to operate and may certify willing behavior analysts. In contrast, without an injunction, the Plaintiff and others will be prevented from practicing their profession, and current patients will find an immediate cessation of services.

IV. Public Interest

The granting of a preliminary injunction serves the public interest. It would ensure respect for constitutional rights, uphold antitrust laws, encourage competition in the professional sector, and protect the public from potential monopolistic practices that could increase costs or limit access to services.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, Plaintiff, Dr. Michael Moates, respectfully requests that the Court grant this Motion for Preliminary Injunction, enjoin the enforcement of the BACB certification requirement, and issue a declaratory statement that the mandatory certification requirement by the BACB is unconstitutional and violates the First Amendment rights of behavior analysts. We ask that this injunction be a nationwide injunction that blocks the enforcement of a BACB certification requirement to be licensed, regardless of if a

statutory requirement or an administrative rule. In the alternative, we request a preliminary injunction to block the enforcement of any law requiring BACB certification.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Michael Moates, EdD, Pro Se

4501 Nautilus Circle #710

Fort Worth, Texas

254-966-2837

mike@cpmht.com