Heartbeat INTERNATIONAL

Claims & Truths

The People of the State of California v. Heartbeat International, Inc. and RealOptions

California Attorney General Rob Bonta has accused Heartbeat International and RealOptions of misleading women about Abortion Pill Reversal (APR). Yet after six weeks of trial, testimony from 25 witnesses, and nearly 200 exhibits, **the State identified no woman harmed by APR and no consumer complaint against APR, Heartbeat International, or RealOptions.**

1. THE STATE IDENTIFIED NO WOMAN HARMED BY ABORTION PILL REVERSAL (APR)

Perhaps the most important fact from the entire case: California identified zero women who claimed they were harmed by APR or by the information provided by Heartbeat International, RealOptions, or a pregnancy help organization. There was no consumer complaint from a woman that prompted this lawsuit. The State also did not identify a woman who suffered a financial loss because of the challenged communications.

TALKING POINT

After years of investigation and six weeks of trial, California could not point to a single woman harmed by the free help it is seeking to restrict. Yet three women testified in favor of APR, sharing their personal reversal stories and gratitude for timely support.

2. THE STATE'S OWN EXPERT COULD NOT SAY APR DOES NOT WORK

Dr. Mitchell Creinin, the Attorney General's principal expert witness, is a paid consultant for mifepristone manufacturer Danco Laboratories and a leading critic of APR. He was questioned directly about the safety and effectiveness of the protocol. Under oath, Dr. Creinin could not say that APR does not work or that it is unsafe. His position ultimately came down to: "We just don't know."

That distinction matters. Heartbeat presented a considerable body of medical evidence, all supporting APR as safe and effective. California has repeatedly characterized APR as ineffective and unsafe, yet one of its principal experts could not make either assertion under oath.

TALKING POINT

Scientific disagreement is not proof of deception. The State's own expert, Dr. Creinin, could not testify that APR does not work or that it is unsafe.

3. ACOG'S POSITION ON APR WAS PROVIDED BY ITS GOVERNMENT RELATIONS TEAM

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) is frequently cited as authoritative evidence that APR does not work. That position has affected how APR information is surfaced online, with search engines, AI platforms, and companies like Google labeling or limiting it as "misinformation." But testimony at trial revealed important context about that position.

ACOG representative Dr. Christopher Zahn testified that ACOG was not aware of good-quality or even fair-quality evidence establishing that APR does not work. He also acknowledged that ACOG had not formally evaluated APR's efficacy or safety through its established clinical-guidance process. Instead, the guidance regarding APR was provided by ACOG's government relations team and is not a graded clinical recommendation.

Follow the case and access court updates: hbi.life/ca-lawsuit

©2026 by Heartbeat International®, Inc.

SCAN FOR MORE CLAIMS & TRUTHS >>

TALKING POINT

ACOG's opposition to APR came through government relations, not its formal clinical-guidance process, yet it has been used to label APR "misinformation" and suppress it in search and AI results.

4. CALIFORNIA IS SEEKING POTENTIALLY DEVASTATING FINANCIAL PENALTIES

The Attorney General alleges at least 5,131 violations of each of two California statutes by Heartbeat International. By applying maximum penalties cumulatively, the State's theory could expose Heartbeat to more than $20 million in penalties.

This is against a religiously motivated nonprofit organization that provides APR information to women for free, does not sell the medication, and does not receive referral fees.

TALKING POINT

California is seeking more than $20 million in potential penalties against a nonprofit for providing free information, without identifying a woman harmed, a consumer complaint, or a financial loss.

5. THE CASE CONCERNS WHETHER WOMEN MAY RECEIVE INFORMATION ABOUT CONTINUING A PREGNANCY

Women contact the Abortion Pill Rescue® Network after taking mifepristone because they want to continue their pregnancies, a decision protected under California constitutional law.

In July 2026, a federal court granted Mayday Health a preliminary injunction protecting its ability to advertise abortion pills, even though abortion is generally illegal in South Dakota. If speech promoting an illegal procedure may be protected, then surely Heartbeat must be free to share information about APR, a legal medical intervention for women seeking to continue their pregnancies. The U.S. Supreme Court's March ruling in *Chiles v. Salazar* also reinforced that states may not evade First Amendment scrutiny simply because speech occurs in a professional or healthcare setting.

This case reaches beyond a dispute about medical terminology. It raises fundamental questions about women's right to information, charitable speech, scientific debate, and whether the government can impose financially devastating penalties on organizations offering a legal alternative to abortion.

TALKING POINT

The Mayday Health ruling reinforces that organizations should be free to share information, including information that supports a woman's decision to continue her pregnancy.

Bottom Line:

The trial against Heartbeat International and RealOptions revealed no identified harmed woman or consumer complaint, and the State's expert could not say APR does not work. Still, California seeks penalties exceeding $20 million and restrictions on Heartbeat's APR communications.

This case raises a question extending far beyond Heartbeat: **Can the government use laws meant to protect consumers as a way to silence organizations whose mission or message it disagrees with?** Heartbeat remains confident in its services, committed to serving women, and grateful for our partners' prayers and support.

Follow the case and access court updates: hbi.life/ca-lawsuit