

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF IOWA  
Supreme Court No. 24–1019  
Johnson County No. LACV085047

---

ELIZABETH BRIGHT,

*Plaintiff–Appellant,*

vs.

STATE OF IOWA,

*Defendant–Appellee.*

---

Appeal from the Iowa District Court  
For Johnson County  
The Honorable Kevin McKeever, District Judge

---

**BRIEF FOR APPELLEE**

---

BRENNA BIRD  
Attorney General of Iowa  
ERIC H. WESSAN  
*Solicitor General*  
WILLIAM C. ADMUSSEN  
*Assistant Solicitor General*  
CHRISTOPHER J. DEIST  
*Assistant Attorney General*  
1305 E. Walnut Street  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
(515) 281-7240  
william.admussen@ag.iowa.gov

POPE S. YAMADA  
CAROLYN RUSSELL WALLACE  
Phelan Tucker Law L.L.P  
321 E. Market Street  
Iowa City, IA 52245  
(319) 354-1104  
yamada@phelantuckerlaw.com  
wallace@phelantuckerlaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	3
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES.....	6
ROUTING STATEMENT.....	7
NATURE OF THE CASE.....	8
STATEMENT OF THE FACTS .....	9
ARGUMENT .....	12
I. The district court correctly held that the Fraud in Assisted Reproduction Act does not apply retrospectively. ....	12
A. Preservation and Standard of Review.....	12
B. The Act creates criminal and civil liability for misrepresentations related to assisted reproduction services..	13
C. The Act does not apply retrospectively because it does not expressly say so.....	15
CONCLUSION .....	22
REQUEST FOR NON-ORAL SUBMISSION .....	23
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	24
CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE .....	24

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Burke v. Barron</i> , 8 Iowa 132 (1859) .....	17
<i>City of Waterloo v. Bainbridge</i> , 749 N.W.2d 245 (Iowa 2008) .....	20, 21
<i>Dindinger v. Allsteel, Inc.</i> , 860 N.W.2d 557 (Iowa 2015) .....	20, 21
<i>Hedlund v. State</i> , 991 N.W.2d 752 (Iowa 2023) .....	15, 16, 22
<i>Hrbek v. State</i> , 958 N.W.2d 779 (Iowa 2021) .....	16
<i>Iowa Comprehensive Petroleum Underground Storage Tank Fund Bd. v. Shell Oil Co.</i> , 606 N.W.2d 370 (Iowa 2000) .....	21
<i>Landgraf v. USI Film Prod.</i> , 511 U.S. 244 (1994) .....	15, 16, 22
<i>Nahas v. Polk Cnty.</i> , 991 N.W.2d 770 (Iowa 2023) .....	12, 17, 22
<i>Shumate v. Drake Univ.</i> , 846 N.W.2d 503 (Iowa 2014) .....	13
<i>State ex rel. Shaver v. Iowa Tel. Co.</i> , 154 N.W. 678 (Iowa 1915) .....	17
<i>State v. Macke</i> , 933 N.W.2d 226 (Iowa 2019) .....	17, 22

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<b>Statutes and Constitutional Provisions</b>	
1975 Iowa Acts ch. 239, § 17 (codified at Iowa Code § 147.137) .....	22
2021 Iowa Acts ch. 183, § 26 .....	18
815 ILCS 540/5 (2024).....	19
Fraud in Assisted Reproduction Act, 2022 Iowa Acts ch. 1123, § 3 (codified at Iowa Code § 714I.3).....	8, 13, 18
Fraud in Assisted Reproduction Act, 2022 Iowa Acts ch. 1123, § 8 (codified at Iowa Code § 802.2E) .....	19
Iowa Code § 147.137.....	14
Iowa Code § 4.4(1) .....	19
Iowa Code § 4.5.....	7, 8, 12, 16
Iowa Code § 709.4A .....	14
Iowa Code § 709.4A(1).....	14
Iowa Code § 709.4A(3).....	14
Iowa Code § 709.4A(3)(a) .....	18
Iowa Code § 714I.3 .....	13
Iowa Code § 714I.3(1).....	13
Iowa Code § 714I.3(2)(a).....	14
Iowa Code § 714I.4 .....	11, 14
Iowa Code § 714I.4(1).....	11, 18
Iowa Code § 714I.4(1)(a)(1) .....	11, 20
Iowa Code § 714I.4(1)(a)(1)(a).....	15

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	<u>Page(s)</u>
Iowa Code § 714I.4(1)(a)(1)(b) .....	15, 20
Iowa Code § 714I.4(2) .....	15
Iowa Code § 714I.4(3) .....	15
Iowa Code § 714I.4(6) .....	11, 15, 19
Iowa Code § 802.2E .....	14
Iowa Const. art. I, § 21 .....	18, 19
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
Antonin Scalia & Bryan A. Garner, <i>Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts</i> (2012).....	15, 16, 18
Kara W. Swanson, <i>The Birth of the Sperm Bank</i> , 71 <i>The Annals of Iowa</i> 241 (2012) .....	9
<b>Rules</b>	
Iowa R. App. P. 6.1101(2)(c) .....	7

## **STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES**

1. Does the Fraud in Assisted Reproduction Act apply retrospectively?

## ROUTING STATEMENT

It is appropriate for this Court to retain the case. Plaintiff asserts that a recently enacted statute, the Fraud in Assisted Reproduction Act (“the Act”), Iowa Code § 714I, applies retrospectively to conduct occurring approximately 70 years ago. Appellant’s Br. 5. The law is well settled: a statute applies retrospectively only if the statute expressly says so. *See* Iowa Code § 4.5. The Act does not say that it applies retrospectively, so Plaintiff’s claims fail. But because this Court has not specifically addressed whether the Act applies retrospectively, this case presents an issue of first impression and thus meets the criteria for retention. *See* Iowa R. App. P. 6.1101(2)(c).

In making its routing decision, the Court should be aware of two other pending appeals that raise the same issue and were resolved by the district court in materially identical orders: *Miller v. State*, No. 24-1017, and *Stoughton v. State*, No. 24-1018.

## NATURE OF THE CASE

This case asks a question of statutory interpretation: does the Fraud in Assisted Reproduction Act apply retrospectively?

Plaintiff Elizabeth Bright sued the State in 2024. D0002, Petition (02/08/2024). She alleges that in the 1950s, a University of Iowa Health Care physician violated the Act by misrepresenting the source of human reproductive material used in assisted reproduction treatments her mother received. D0002 at ¶¶ 18. The Act, which was passed in 2022, prohibits fraud related to assisted reproduction services. 2022 Iowa Acts ch. 1123, § 3 (codified at Iowa Code § 714I.3). Because the petition was based on conduct that occurred about 70 years before the Act was enacted, and the Act does not say that it applies retrospectively, the State moved to dismiss the petition. D0006, MTD Br. (03/06/2024).

The district court granted the State's motion to dismiss. D0020, MTD Order at 7 (05/30/2024). It reasoned that “[a] statute is presumed to be prospective in its operation unless expressly made retroactive,” Iowa Code § 4.5, and the Act “contains no express language indicating legislative intent for retrospective application.” D0020 at 4, 6. The court rejected Plaintiff's arguments based on the Legislature's purported intent, stressing that express retrospective language “must be found in the text of the statute.” D0020 at 6 (citation omitted).

This appeal followed. D0021, Notice of Appeal (06/19/2024).

## STATEMENT OF THE FACTS<sup>1</sup>

In the 1950s, Barbara Steinkraus and her husband Warren struggled to conceive a child. D0002 at ¶ 10. At some point—the petition does not say when—Barbara Steinkraus sought fertility treatment from what is now University of Iowa Health Care in Iowa City. D0002 at ¶¶ 11. She was purportedly seen by Dr. John Randall, the head of the Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology. D0002 at ¶ 12–13.

The petition does not identify the couple’s specific fertility issue, nor what type of fertility treatment was provided. D0002 at ¶ 14 (“[I]t is believed that Dr. Randall assisted Barbara Steinkraus with fertility treatment.”). That is perhaps because in the 1950s, fertility treatment was in its early stages and so “doctors and patients kept [fertility] treatment secret to avoid public condemnation and controversy.” Kara W. Swanson, *The Birth of the Sperm Bank*, 71 *The Annals of Iowa* 241, 247–48 (2012). That secrecy was especially true for artificial insemination using donor sperm, which at the time “was virtually the only effective technique medicine had to offer infertile men.” *Id.* at 245, 247–48. Coupled with the fact that over 70 years have passed, it is unsurprising that there are no allegations about medical records of Barbara Steinkraus’s visits.

---

<sup>1</sup> The State accepts the well-pleaded factual allegations as true only for purposes of this appeal but it does not accept Plaintiff’s legal conclusions. *See, e.g., Shumate v. Drake Univ.*, 846 N.W.2d 503, 507 (Iowa 2014).

In 1958, Barbara Steinkraus gave birth to Plaintiff Elizabeth (Steinkraus) Bright. D0002 at ¶ 14. Dr. Randall passed away in 1959. D0002 at ¶ 13. Barbara Steinkraus passed away in 2011, and her husband in 1990. D0002 at ¶¶ 15.

Recently, Plaintiff took a DNA test through Ancestry.com. D0002 at ¶ 16. She alleges that this test revealed that Dr. Randall is her biological father. D0002 at ¶ 16. Based on the test, Plaintiff alleges that Dr. Randall's sperm was used in her mother's assisted reproduction procedure. D0002 at ¶ 18.

So Plaintiff sued the State. D0002 at ¶¶ 6–7. She alleges that the State violated the Fraud in Assisted Reproduction Act (1) by “providing false information” to Barbara Steinkraus regarding the identity of the donor material used in her assisted reproduction procedure and (2) by using reproductive material that differed from what Barbara Steinkraus consented to in writing. D0002 at ¶¶ 18. Plaintiff does not allege any details of what her mother understood about the identity of the donor whose sperm was used in the procedure (e.g., whether it was from an anonymous donor). Nor does she allege what Barbara Steinkraus allegedly consented to in writing.

The State moved to dismiss the petition because the Act, enacted in 2022, does not contain language saying that it applies retrospectively. D0006. In response, Plaintiff argued that portions of the Act allowing an

action to be commenced at any time by the patient, her spouse, or her children is retrospective language. D0014, Resistance to MTD Br. at 8 (04/01/2024) (citing Iowa Code §§ 714I.4(6), 714I.4(1)(a)(1)).

The district court concluded that the Act does not apply retrospectively because it “contains no express language indicating legislative intent for retrospective application.” D0020 at 6. It explained that no part of the law that Plaintiff cited addressed retrospectivity. Allowing an action to be brought at any time merely “suggest[s] legislative intent for chapter 714I to apply prospectively without time limits.” D0020 at 5. And the subsection about proper plaintiffs “only addresses who has capacity to sue and nothing more.” D0020 at 5. Plaintiff now appeals the district court’s dismissal of her petition. D0021.

## ARGUMENT

The district court correctly held that the Fraud in Assisted Reproduction Act does not apply retrospectively to conduct that allegedly occurred close to 70 years before the Act's enactment. "A statute is presumed to be prospective in its operation unless expressly made retrospective." Iowa Code § 4.5. If a statute does not contain an "express statement making the statutory immunity provisions retrospective, . . . the law can only be applied prospectively to conduct occurring after the effective date of the statute." *Nahas v. Polk Cnty.*, 991 N.W.2d 770, 779 (Iowa 2023).

Here, the Act does not contain an express statement saying that it applies retrospectively. If it did, the language would be clear and obvious because the Act creates both criminal and civil liability for the same conduct. Nor do any of the portions of the Act that Plaintiff invokes relate to a retrospective application. This Court should affirm the district court's dismissal of Plaintiff's petition.

**I. The district court correctly held that the Fraud in Assisted Reproduction Act does not apply retrospectively.**

**A. Preservation and Standard of Review.**

The sole issue here is whether the Fraud in Assisted Reproduction Act applies retrospectively. Plaintiff preserved this issue for appeal by making the argument in her resistance to the State's motion to dismiss.

D0014 at 5–13. The district court disagreed and granted the State’s motion to dismiss. D0020 at 4–6.

This Court “review[s] a district court’s ruling on a motion to dismiss for the correction of errors at law.” *Shumate v. Drake Univ.*, 846 N.W.2d 503, 507 (Iowa 2014) (citation omitted). In doing so, it “accept[s] as true the petition’s well-pleaded factual allegations, but not its legal conclusions.” *Id.* This Court “will affirm a district court ruling that granted a motion to dismiss when the petition’s allegations, taken as true, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.” *Id.*

**B. The Act creates criminal and civil liability for misrepresentations related to assisted reproduction services.**

The Legislature passed the Fraud in Assisted Reproduction Act in 2022. 2022 Iowa Acts ch. 1123 (codified at Iowa Code § 714I (2022)). The Act created two types of “[p]rohibited practices and acts” relating to assisted reproduction. Iowa Code § 714I.3.

First, it prohibits healthcare professionals from engaging in conduct that the person knows or reasonably should have known “provides false information to a patient related to an assisted reproduction procedure or treatment.” *Id.* § 714I.3(1). That includes information about the human reproductive material (e.g., sperm or egg) used in an assisted-reproduction procedure, as well as the medical history of the donor of the material. *Id.*

Second, the Act prohibits healthcare professionals from intentionally using human reproductive material in a way that differs from the express written consent of the patient or donor. *Id.* § 714I.3(2)(a). That changed Iowa healthcare law. Before the Act, healthcare providers were not required to obtain written consent. *See* Iowa Code § 147.137 (creating “a presumption that informed consent was given” if a written consent meets certain requirements, but not requiring that informed consent be written).

The Act also established new criminal and civil consequences for engaging in the “[p]rohibited practices and acts” described in section 714I.3. *Id.* §§ 709.4A, 714I.4.

On the criminal side, a healthcare professional commits fourth-degree sexual abuse if he or she violates section 714I.3(2) by using human reproductive material in a manner that differs from what the patient consented to in writing. *Id.* § 709.4A(1). A healthcare professional also commits fourth-degree sexual abuse if he or she uses his or her own human reproductive material in a procedure without the patient’s consent. *Id.* § 709.4A(3) (stating that this is a class “D” felony). Prosecutions for those crimes are not subject to a statute of limitations, and “may be commenced at any time after the commission of the offense.” *Id.* § 802.2E.

On the civil side, the Act created a private right of action. *Id.* § 714I.4. Aside from the patient and her spouse, the patient’s child can

bring a cause of action if the child was born “as the result of being conceived through assisted reproduction” that violates the Act, or if “the patient’s spouse is deceased or is otherwise unable to bring such cause of action.” *Id.* § 714I.4(1)(a)(1)(a)–(b). Donors whose human reproductive material was used in violation of the Act can sue, too. *Id.* § 714I.4(2). Like the criminal provisions, civil suits brought under the Act are “not subject to a statute of limitations and may be commenced at any time.” *Id.* § 714I.4(6).

Finally, if a healthcare professional uses his or her own human reproductive material in an assisted-reproduction procedure in violation of section 714I.3(2), and a child who is biologically related to the healthcare professional is born as a result, the healthcare professional must provide financial support to the child. *Id.* § 714I.4(3).

**C. The Act does not apply retrospectively because it does not expressly say so.**

This Court “presume[s] that statutes operate only prospectively.” *Hedlund v. State*, 991 N.W.2d 752, 758 (Iowa 2023). That “presumption against retroactive legislation is deeply rooted in our jurisprudence, and embodies a legal doctrine centuries older than our Republic.” *Landgraf v. USI Film Prod.*, 511 U.S. 244, 265 (1994). After all, “a legislature makes law for the future, not for the past.” *Hedlund*, 991 N.W.2d at 758 (quoting Antonin Scalia & Bryan A. Garner, *Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts* 261 (2012)). So “[e]ven when [statutes] do

not say so (and they rarely do), [they] will not be interpreted to apply to past events.” Scalia & Garner, *Reading Law* at 261; *see also Landgraf*, 511 U.S. at 268 (“[A] requirement that Congress first make its intention clear helps ensure that Congress itself has determined that the benefits of retroactivity outweigh the potential for disruption or unfairness.”).

The Legislature has “built this presumption into every law that it enacts.” *Hedlund*, 991 N.W.2d at 758. Iowa Code section 4.5 states: “A statute is presumed to be prospective in its operation unless expressly made retrospective.”

To determine whether a statute applies retrospectively, this Court has formulated a three-part test, which it recently revised in *Hrbek v. State*, 958 N.W.2d 779, 782 (Iowa 2021). *See Hedlund*, 991 N.W.2d at 757–58 (explaining the history of this “revised” test). *First*, the Court asks “whether the statute’s application is in fact retrospective.” *Id.* at 757 (quotation marks omitted). *Second*, “[i]f the application is indeed retrospective, then the court next must determine whether the statute should be applied retrospectively.” *Id.* “For this determination, [courts] engage in statutory interpretation to determine whether the legislature ‘expressly made [the statute] retrospective.’” *Id.* (quoting Iowa Code § 4.5). If no express language indicates a retrospective application, then the Court stops its inquiry. *Id.* at 758–59. *Third*, if there is express retrospective language, “then the court determines whether any substantive law bars the statute’s retrospective application.” *Id.* at 757.

Here, because the Act does not contain express language providing a retrospective application, only the first and second steps are relevant.

For the first step, Plaintiff agrees that she is seeking to apply the Act retrospectively. D0020 at 4; Appellant’s Br. 13–14. A statute is applied retrospectively when it “attaches new legal consequences to events completed before its enactment,” *Nahas*, 991 N.W.2d at 777 (citation omitted), and that is exactly what Plaintiff seeks to do by applying a recently enacted statute to conduct that occurred almost 70 years ago.

This case turns on the second step: whether the Act contains express language stating that it applies retrospectively. *See Nahas*, 991 N.W.2d at 779. The express language must be clear and unequivocal, and there must not be any doubt that the Legislature intended a retrospective application. *See Burke v. Barron*, 8 Iowa 132, 135 (1859) (“Courts will give to statutes a prospective effect only, unless the language is so clear and imperative as not to admit of a doubt.”); *State ex rel. Shaver v. Iowa Tel. Co.*, 154 N.W. 678, 683–84 (Iowa 1915) (applying statutes retrospectively only in “clear cases unequivocally evidencing the legislative intent to that effect”); *accord State v. Macke*, 933 N.W.2d 226, 233 (Iowa 2019) (requiring a “clear indication”).

The district court correctly concluded that there is no express language in the Act providing that it applies retrospectively. D0020 at 4–6. The Legislature “rarely” includes express language applying a statute

retrospectively. Scalia & Garner, *Reading Law* at 261. When it does, its language is crystal clear. *See, e.g.*, 2021 Iowa Acts ch. 183, § 26 (“The following applies retroactively to January 1, 2021 . . .”).

For the Act, one would expect that retrospective language would be especially obvious because it creates both criminal and civil liability for the same conduct. *See* Iowa Code § 709.4A(3)(a) (making it a felony for a healthcare professional to use his “own human reproductive material for assisted reproduction in violation of section 714I.3, subsection 2”); *id.* § 714I.4(1) (creating a private right of action for violations of section 714I.3, subsection 2). Indeed, section 714I is primarily a criminal statute, as it appears in Title XVI of the Iowa Code, which is titled “Criminal Law and Procedure.” To avoid violating the Ex Post Facto Clause, the Legislature would need to conspicuously state and define any retrospective effect for the new civil causes of action. *See* Iowa Const. art. I, § 21.

But the Act contains no express language stating that it applies retrospectively. *See* 2022 Iowa Acts ch. 1123. It does not mention an effective date, nor does it refer to retroactivity or a retrospective application. This contrasts with other States’ statutes, which include express retrospective language in similar fertility fraud statutes. Illinois’s statute, for example, states that “this Act shall be retroactive and apply to any treatment by a health care provider occurring prior to

the effective date of this Act.” 815 ILCS 540/5 (2024). Iowa’s statute does not.

None of the language Plaintiff cites expressly states that the Act should apply retrospectively. She first points to the lack of a statute of limitations on these new causes of action. Iowa Code § 714I.4(6) (“[A]n action brought pursuant to this section is not subject to a statute of limitations and may be commenced at any time.”); Appellant’s Br. 16. But as the district court recognized, the lack of statute of limitations merely “suggest[s] legislative intent for chapter 714I to apply prospectively without time limits” and “do[es] not indicate that [its provisions] apply to fraud that occurred before [the Act] was enacted.” D0020 at 5. In short, this section specifying when a plaintiff can bring an action in the future says nothing about whether the Act applies to conduct in the past.

If Plaintiff was right that the lack of a statute of limitations is an express statement of retrospective application, then the criminal provision of the Act would apply retrospectively as well, for it similarly lacks a statute of limitations. *See* Fraud in Assisted Reproduction Act, 2022 Iowa Acts ch. 1123, § 8 (codified at Iowa Code § 802.2E) (“An information or indictment for sexual abuse in the fourth degree may be commenced at any time after the commission of the offense.”). That cannot be the case, because it would violate the Ex Post Facto Clause. Iowa Const. art. I, § 21; *see also* Iowa Code § 4.4(1) (presumption that statutes do not violate the Iowa Constitution).

Plaintiff next relies on the fact the Act allows children of a deceased patient to sue “if the patient’s spouse is deceased or is otherwise unable to bring such cause of action.” Iowa Code § 714I.4(1)(a)(1)(b); Appellant’s Br. 16–17. But as the district court noted, this “only addresses who has capacity to sue and nothing more.” D0020 at 5. Defining who can sue says nothing about when the conduct they are suing about must have occurred. Plaintiff thus fails to demonstrate that the Act includes express retrospective language.

Shifting away from the Act’s text, Plaintiff briefly discusses two cases in which this Court has found that a statute applies retrospectively. Appellant’s Br. 15. Each is distinguishable.

*City of Waterloo v. Bainbridge* held that a statute shortening the time a city had to wait before obtaining title to an abandoned building applied retrospectively. 749 N.W.2d 245, 250–51 (Iowa 2008). The Court relied on the fact that the statute was “not a substantive statute,” *id.* at 251, and thus fell under an exception to the presumption that statutes apply only prospectively, *id.* at 249–51. Indeed, this Court has noted that “the law[] in *Bainbridge* . . . w[as] not retroactive at all because [it] only set standards for conduct occurring *after* [its] enactment—i.e., a city could seek title to abandoned land.” *Dindinger v. Allsteel, Inc.*, 860 N.W.2d 557, 565 n.3 (Iowa 2015).

But here the Act affects the scope of permissible conduct by creating new causes of action, new rights or obligations, and is thus a substantive

law. *See id.* at 563 (“When a statute creates new rights or obligations, it is substantive rather than procedural or remedial.”); D0020 at 4 (noting Plaintiff’s agreement that retrospective application of the Act “would apply new obligations to practitioners and facilities when providing fertility services and impose new consequences if those obligations were not met”). *Bainbridge’s* retrospective application of a procedural statute therefore does not apply here. The normal presumption against retrospective application still applies.

*Shell Oil* is similarly inapplicable because it involved a remedial statute, not a substantive one. *See Iowa Comprehensive Petroleum Underground Storage Tank Fund Bd. v. Shell Oil Co.*, 606 N.W.2d 370, 375 (Iowa 2000) (stating that “[a] remedial statute is not always applied retroactively,” and applying the relevant three-part test). Indeed, the statute at issue in *Shell Oil* contained an express statement of retrospective intent: this Court found that the statute’s statement that it applied to “*past* and existing petroleum leaks” unambiguously “revealed an intent for the act to apply retroactively.” *Id.* at 375, 376 (emphasis altered) (citation omitted). The Act here, by contrast, is not a remedial statute and does not include similar language referring to past conduct.

Finally, unable to find any textual support for her argument, Plaintiff turns to what she believes to be the “purpose and policies” behind the Act. Appellant’s Br. 18. But “only the text of the statute itself” can establish that a statute applies retrospectively, not Plaintiff’s

description of the general purpose of the statute. *Landgraf*, 511 U.S. at 287 (Scalia, J., concurring in the judgment) (collecting cases requiring “express words” for a retrospective effect); *accord Macke*, 933 N.W.2d at 233 (“The clear indication of intent for retroactive application must be found in the text of the statute; legislative history is no substitute.”).

Even so, it would be odd if the Legislature intended the Act, creating a new written-consent requirement, to apply retrospectively to conduct that occurred almost 20 years before the State’s first law referencing written consent appeared. *See* 1975 Iowa Acts ch. 239, § 17 (codified at Iowa Code § 147.137) (creating a new presumption of informed consent if there is written consent, but not requiring written consent).

Because “there is no express statement making the [Act] retrospective, . . . the law can only be applied prospectively to conduct occurring after the effective date of the statute.” *Nahas*, 991 N.W.2d at 779. This Court “thus need not move to the third step” of the *Hedlund* test and should affirm the district court. *Hedlund*, 991 N.W.2d at 758.

## CONCLUSION

The judgment below should be affirmed.

## REQUEST FOR NON-ORAL SUBMISSION

The State agrees with Plaintiff that oral argument is unnecessary and therefore does not request it. If the Court grants Plaintiff oral argument, the State requests equal time.

Respectfully submitted,

BRENNA BIRD  
Attorney General of Iowa

ERIC WESSAN  
Solicitor General

/s/ William C. Admussen  
WILLIAM C. ADMUSSEN  
*Assistant Solicitor General*  
CHRISTOPHER J. DEIST  
*Assistant Attorney General*  
1305 E. Walnut Street  
Des Moines, Iowa 50319  
(515) 281-7240  
william.admussen@ag.iowa.gov

/s/ Pope S. Yamada  
POPE S. YAMADA  
CAROLYN RUSSELL WALLACE  
Phelan Tucker Law L.L.P  
321 E. Market Street  
Iowa City, IA 52245  
(319) 354-1104  
yamada@phelantuckerlaw.com  
wallace@phelantuckerlaw.com

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

This brief complies with the typeface requirements and type-volume limitation of Iowa Rs. App. P. 6.903(1)(g) and 6.903(1)(i)(1) because this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Century Schoolbook in size 14 and contains 3,600 words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Iowa R. App. P. 6.903(1)(i)(1).

*/s/William C. Admussen*  
WILLIAM C. ADMUSSEN  
*Assistant Solicitor General*

## CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 16th day of September, 2024, I, or a person acting on my behalf, filed this brief and served it on counsel of record to this appeal via EDMS.

*/s/William C. Admussen*  
WILLIAM C. ADMUSSEN  
*Assistant Solicitor General*