

Federal Court Ruling in Rutgers Vaccine Mandate Challenge Is Likely the Tip of the Iceberg

What You Should Know

In the age of COVID-19 circa 2021, many business institutions and organizations are struggling to strike a balance between individual rights and public safety. A recent ruling by the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey in a case involving Rutgers University serves to reinforce the message that mandatory vaccination policies should be drafted with great care, and that decision-makers and their in-house legal teams are well-advised to anticipate and prepare for potential legal challenges and protracted battles in the courtroom.

In the matter *Children's Health Defense Inc. et al. v. Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey et al.*, Rutgers' student Adriana Pinto and other plaintiffs filed suit in federal court against Rutgers University in response to the university's decision to mandate COVID-19 vaccinations for students attending school in the fall of 2021.

Rutgers' mandatory vaccine policy requires that all students be vaccinated regardless of whether they are attending in-person classes. The policy states that only students enrolled in the university's fully online degree program, or those claiming health or religious reasons, may be granted an exemption from the vaccine policy.

The suit alleges that Rutgers' vaccination policy is "both illegal and unconstitutional" and that it coerces students to accept "an experimental COVID-19 vaccine" as a precondition for returning to campus, thereby violating Ms. Pinto's basic constitutional right to refuse unwanted medical treatment. More specifically, the plaintiffs argue that the university's policy is unconstitutional because it mandates vaccination for all students regardless of whether those students will be physically present on campus or will be attending school virtually.

Ms. Pinto was suspended from accessing her student account and from attending an online course she had registered for after refusing to be vaccinated against COVID-19. With the support of the non-profit anti-vaccination organization Children's Health Defense Inc., Ms. Pinto challenged her suspension by filing a complaint against Rutgers in federal court and seeking urgent relief in the form of a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) to stop Rutgers from suspending her and from requiring that she be vaccinated.

How the Court Ruled

In denying the plaintiffs' TRO request, U.S. District Judge Zahid N. Quraishi evaluated the four standard criteria for granting a TRO, and found:

Judge Quraishi's denial of the request for urgent relief is not the end of this case, which will proceed through discovery and then to trial as any other lawsuit would. It should also be noted that this case is not an anomaly, as mandatory vaccine policies have generated a flurry of additional lawsuits brought by other individuals, including healthcare workers, through the country.

Next Steps

In light of the predictable reaction to mandatory vaccination policies, it is advisable for any employer contemplating the implementation of mandatory vaccination policies to consider the following steps prior to initiating such a policy:

The bottom line is that a business or institution's decision to implement a mandatory vaccine policy may impact substantial areas of its business, including negative media attention and perhaps uninformed criticism by those who may not be aware of the legal implications of making vaccinations mandatory.

Please contact the authors of this Alert, **James A. Robertson** and **Ghatul Abdul**, for additional information or to discuss your specific circumstances. Mr. Robertson is Chair of the firm's **Healthcare Department**, of which Ms. Abdul is a member.


James A. Robertson

Chair, **Healthcare Department**
jrobertson@greenbaumlaw.com
973.577.1784

Ghatul Abdul

Member, **Healthcare Department**
gabdul@greenbaumlaw.com
973.577.1856

Related Attorneys



James A. Robertson

Partner
973.577.1784
Email