

Subject: Concerns regarding misinformation on Equality Act guidance and ‘single-sex services’

[Remember to add any edits to this template to avoid filtering of mass emails]

You can check who your MP is and find their contact details here:

<https://members.parliament.uk/FindYourMP>

Dear [MP name],

I am writing as your constituent in [your town/ward], regarding a recent email campaign and booklet “ONE YEAR LATER” circulated by Sex Matters, which presents a misleading account of the law following the Supreme Court judgment in *For Women Scotland Ltd v Scottish Ministers*.

The materials repeatedly claim that the law is now “clear” and that ‘single-sex services’ must be based solely on “biological sex”. They further suggest that organisations continuing trans-inclusive policies are acting unlawfully. This is not an accurate reflection of the legal position.

While the Supreme Court considered the interpretation of certain terms in the Equality Act 2010, it did not remove or override protections for people with the protected characteristic of gender reassignment. Those protections remain fully in force.

This has since been reinforced by the High Court in *Good Law Project Ltd v Equality and Human Rights Commission*, which upheld the lawfulness of the EHRC’s interim guidance. [The Court made clear that:](#)

- Statutory provisions set a floor, not a ceiling, meaning they are a minimum standard, not a blanket rule
- Employers and service providers must still comply with the Equality Act in full
- Decisions about inclusion or exclusion must be proportionate and based on the specific circumstances

The campaign’s claim that organisations are “refusing to follow the law” is therefore a mischaracterisation. They are instead attempting to comply with a complex legal framework that requires balancing rights. They also go on to suggest that current policies stem from “guidance from trans lobby groups”. This is also incorrect. At the time, organisations and government departments relied upon trans-inclusive guidance issued by the Equality and Human Rights Commission.

I am also deeply concerned by the way the booklet frames trans people. Throughout, it repeatedly misgenders trans women and presents them as a

potential threat in women's spaces. For example, one passage claims that allowing access means "men can come in, strip off and stare at women naked". This presents a protected group as inherently predatory, without any evidence, and contributes to unjustifiable fear.

Concerns have [been formally raised with the Equality and Human Rights Commission regarding Sex Matters' wider body of work](#). These include repeated use of language portraying trans people, particularly trans women, as linked to sexual deviance or risk, they assert that "transgender identification" can, in some cases, be associated with "autogynephilia", "exhibitionism", or even "interest in non-consensual sexual activity", and suggest that requests from trans women could represent "the masturbatory fantasy of a man who enjoys breaching women's boundaries". They also persistently misgender trans people across publications and media engagement.

They are also under investigation by the Charity Commission, after multiple complaints were raised about their conduct.

Their conduct, including the way beliefs are expressed, remains subject to the Equality Act's prohibitions on harassment and discrimination. Repeatedly depicting a protected group as dangerous or predatory, while denying their identity, raises serious concerns. This was outlined clearly in *Forstater v CGD Europe*, *For Women Scotland Ltd v Scottish Ministers*, and multiple employment tribunals.

Given that Sex Matters is actively lobbying policymakers and public bodies, the accuracy and tone of its materials matter. Misrepresenting the law while simultaneously promoting harmful stereotypes risks influencing decisions in ways that could lead to unlawful discrimination and a more hostile environment for trans people, and may lead to expensive litigation against potentially unlawful exclusionary policies.

[Optional: Any personal connection to this issue or relevant experience]

Parliamentary engagement on equality law should be based on accurate and balanced legal analysis. I therefore urge you to treat these claims made in this campaign with caution, and to ensure that any consideration of these issues raised reflects the full legal position, including the continuing requirement for proportionality and the protection of all groups under the Equality Act 2010.

I would welcome your confirmation that you will take these concerns into account.

Yours sincerely,

[Your name]

[Your address or postcode]

