



Restricting Abortion: North Dakota¹

In far too many places throughout this country, it has become extremely difficult for women to safely and legally end a pregnancy. In too many states, politicians have enacted laws that single out the provision of abortion services for restrictions that are more burdensome than those imposed on medically comparable procedures, do not significantly advance women's health or the safety of abortion services, and make abortion services more difficult to access. It's time for politicians to stop interfering with women's personal decision-making. We need a federal law that puts women's health, safety, and rights first. The Women's Health Protection Act does just that.

In North Dakota, the following restrictions are among those that would be unlawful under the Women's Health Protection Act once enacted:

- BAN on abortion after 20 weeks of pregnancy (an unconstitutional pre-viability ban) with unconstitutionally narrow exceptions for when the life or health of a woman is endangered.²
- REQUIREMENT that abortion providers have admitting privileges at a local hospital, a medically unnecessary requirement that is designed to prevent qualified, experienced physicians from providing care to their patients.³
- "Right now, in North Dakota, it feels different than it ever has. This session has put abortion on everyone's radar. People are stopping me on the street, in coffee shops. People are finally outraged."
- Tammi Kromenaker, Director of Red River Women's Clinic, the last remaining clinic in North Dakota, on North Dakota's 2013 legislative session
- BAN on abortions based on sex selection, allowing the state to police women's reasons for ending a pregnancy and perpetuating negative stereotypes about Asian American communities that may result in the denial of health care.⁴
- RESTRICTION on medication abortion that could prohibit physicians from providing individualized, patient-specific care based on their best medical judgment.⁵
- BAN on abortion after viability without constitutionally adequate exceptions for the woman's life or health.⁶
- REQUIREMENT that all abortion procedures performed after twelve weeks be provided only at a licensed hospital, although
 the procedures can be performed safely in clinics.⁷
- BAN on abortion at six weeks of pregnancy with only narrow health exceptions, effectively outlawing abortion before many women know they are pregnant.8
- BAN on the use of telemedicine to provide medication abortion, reducing the potential for access to safe, nonsurgical abortion services, and eliminating an important way to expand access to many low-income and rural women.⁹

1634 Eye Street, NW Suite 600 Washington, DC 20006 Tel. 202 628 0286

(Endnotes)

- ¹ The restrictions highlighted herein are examples of the types of restrictions that the **Women's Health Protection Act** seeks to invalidate. This fact sheet is not intended as a comprehensive guide to abortion restrictions in North Dakota.
- ² N.D. CENT. CODE § 14-02.1-05.3.
- ³ N.D. CENT. CODE § 14-02.1-04(1).
- ⁴ N.D. CENT. CODE § 14-02.1-04.1.; Replacing Myths with Facts: Sex-Selective Abortion Laws in the United States, NATIONAL ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN WOMEN'S FORUM (June 2014), available at http://napawf.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Replacing-Myths-with-facts-final.pdf; Race and Sex Selective Abortion Bans: Wolves in Sheep's Clothing, NATIONAL ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN WOMEN'S FORUM (July 2013), available at http://napawf.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/PRENDAIssueBrief_11.26-FINAL.pdf.
- ⁵ N.D. CENT. CODE § 14-02.1-03.5. This law was temporarily blocked before it could take effect in 2011, but on October 28, 2014, the North Dakota state Supreme Court upheld the law and allowed it to go into effect immediately. MKB Mgmt. Corp. v. Burdick, No. 20130259 (N.D. Oct. 28, 2014).
- ⁶ N.D. CENT. CODE § 14-02.1-04(3).
- ⁷ N.D. CENT. CODE § 14-02.1-04, *invalidated by* Akron v. Akron Center for Reproductive Health, Inc., 462 U.S. 416, 438-39 (internal citations omitted) (1983) (state may not require that second-trimester abortions be performed in hospitals); Planned Parenthood v. Ashcroft, 462 U.S. 476, 481-82. (1983) (same holding). This holding of *Akron* is unaffected by the Supreme Court's subsequent decision in Planned Parenthood of Se. Pa. v. Casey, 505 U.S. 833, 877 (1992), because the *Akron* Court applied a standard virtually identical to the "undue burden" standard later adopted in *Casey*.
- 8 N.D. CENT. CODE § 14-02.1-05.2, invalidated by M.K.B. Mgmt. Corp. v. Burdick, 16 F. Supp. 3d 1059, (D.N.D. 2014) (issuing permanent injunction); aff'd sub nom. M.K.B. Mgmt. Corp. v. Stenehjem, 795 F.3d 768 (8th Cir. 2015), cert denied, 136 S.Ct. 981 (2016).
- ⁹ N.D. CENT. CODE § 14-02.1-03.5(5).