	Case 3:21-cv-01644-MMC Docum	ent 21-1 Filed 03/24/21 Page 1 of 22
2 3 4	KATIE TOWNSEND (SBN 254321) Counsel of Record GABE ROTTMAN* MAILYN FIDLER* ktownsend@rcfp.org REPORTERS COMMITTEE FOR FREEDOM OF THE PRESS 1156 15 th Street NW, Suite 1020 Washington, D.C. 20005 Telephone: (202) 795-9300 Facsimile: (202) 795-9310 * Of counsel Counsel for Amici Curiae Additional counsel listed on signatur	
11		
12 13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
15	TWITTER, INC.	Case No. 3:21-CV-01644
16	Plaintiff,	
17		
18	v.	BRIEF OF THE REPORTERS COMMITTEE FOR FREEDOM OF
19	KEN PAXTON,	THE PRESS, CENTER FOR
20	in his official capacity as Attorney General of Texas,	DEMOCRACY AND TECHNOLOGY, ELECTRONIC
21	Defendant.	FRONTIER FOUNDATION, MEDIA LAW RESOURCE CENTER, INC.,
22 23	Derenuant.	AND PEN AMERICA AS AMICI
23 24		CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF
25		
26		
27		Judge: Maxine Chesney
28		
		ents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u> .

	Case 3:21-cv-01644-MMC Document 21-1 Filed 03/24/21 Page 2 of 22
1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	TABLE OF AUTHORITIESiii
3	INTEREST OF THE AMICI CURIAE
4	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT
5	DISCUSSION6
7	I. The <i>Tornillo</i> rule is a crucial protection for the free flow of information
8	II. The DTPA poses a significant risk of censorship if used to investigate or enforce the government's conception of viewpoint neutrality online11
9	CONCLUSION16
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
	VET
	R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u> .

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

2 Cases

1

2

Α

A

3	Ark. Writers' Project, Inc. v. Ragland, 481 U.S. 221 (1987)15
4	Autohaus, Inc. v. Aguilar, 794 S.W.2d 459 (Tex. App. 1990)14
5	Bantam Books, Inc. v. Sullivan, 372 U.S. 58 (1963)15
6	Bullfrog Films, Inc. v. Wick, 847 F.2d 502 (9th Cir. 1988)
7	Columbia Broad. Sys., Inc. v. Democratic Nat'l Comm., 412 U.S. 94 (1973)5
8	<i>Connick v. Myers</i> , 461 U.S. 138 (1983)
9 10	<i>e-ventures Worldwide, LLC v. Google, Inc.</i> , No. 2:14-cv-646, 2017 WL 2210029 (M.D. Fla. Feb. 8, 2017)
11	Hurley v. Irish-Am. Gay, Lesbian & Bisexual Grp. of Bos., 515 U.S. 557 (1995).9, 10
12	<i>Jian Zhang v. Baidu.com Inc.</i> , 10 F. Supp. 3d 433 (S.D.N.Y. 2014)5, 8, 9, 10
12	<i>La'Tiejira v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 272 F. Supp. 3d 981 (S.D. Tex. 2017)
	Langdon v. Google, Inc., 474 F. Supp. 2d 622 (D. Del. 2007)10
14	Miami Herald Publ'g Co. v. Tornillo, 418 U.S. 241 (1974)passim
15	Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co. v. Minn. Comm'r of Revenue, 460 U.S. 575 (1983)
16	
17	Murphy v. Twitter, Inc., 274 Cal. Rptr. 3d 360 (Cal. Ct. App. 2021)
18	<i>N.A.A.C.P. v. Button</i> , 371 U.S. 415 (1963)10
19	<i>N.Y. Times Co. v. Sullivan</i> , 376 U.S. 254 (1964)10
20	<i>N.Y. Times Co. v. United States</i> , 403 U.S. 713 (1971)7
21	<i>Packingham v. North Carolina</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1730 (2017)
22	Prager Univ. v. Google LLC, 951 F.3d 991 (9th Cir. 2020)14
23	<i>Reed v. Town of Gilbert</i> , 576 U.S. 155 (2015)9
	<i>Reno v. ACLU</i> , 521 U.S. 844 (1997)8
24 25	<i>Search King, Inc. v. Google Tech., Inc.</i> , No. CIV-02-1457, 2003 WL 21464568 (W.D. Okla. May 27, 2003)
26	<i>Snyder v. Phelps</i> , 562 U.S. 443 (2011)
27	<i>Turner Broad. Sys., Inc. v. FCC</i> , 512 U.S. 622 (1994)
28	

1	Va. State Bd. of Pharmacy v. Va. Citizens Consumer Council, Inc., 425 U.S. 748 (1976)
2	(1970)
3	Statutes
4	15 U.S.C. § 1125
5	15 U.S.C. § 45
6	47 U.S.C. § 230
7	Other Authorities
8	Anthony Lewis, <i>Nixon and a Right of Reply</i> , N.Y. Times, Mar. 24, 1974, https://perma.cc/2W2J-AJ657
9	Exec. Order No. 13,925, 85 Fed. Reg. 34,079 (May 28, 2020)
10	Leah Nylen et al., Trump Pressures Head of Consumer Agency to Bend on Social
11	Media Crackdown, Politico (Aug. 21, 2020), https://perma.cc/7FLH-WDYP13
12	Lucas A. Powe, Jr., The Fourth Estate and the Constitution (1992)6, 7
13	News Release, AG Paxton Issues Civil Investigative Demands to Five Leading Tech Companies Regarding Discriminatory and Biased Policies and Practices (Jan. 13,
14	2021), https://perma.cc/YWJ2-3DFQ12
15	News Release, First Assistant AG Jeff Mateer to FTC: Big Tech Companies Must Comply with State Deceptive Trade Practices Law (June 12, 2019),
16	https://perma.cc/D83P-QF68
17	Office of the Att'y Gen., Consumer Prot. Div., Civil Investigative Demand (Jan. 13, 2021). https://www.ac/
18 19	2021), https://perma.cc/ 4FNL-Z47B
20	Zechariah Chafee, Government and Mass Communications (1947)
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	VET
	R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u> .

26

27

INTEREST OF THE AMICI CURIAE

2 The Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press (the "Reporters 3 Committee") is an unincorporated non-profit association. The Reporters Committee 4 5 was founded by leading journalists and media lawyers in 1970 when the nation's 6 news media faced an unprecedented wave of government subpoenas forcing reporters 7 to name confidential sources. Today, its attorneys provide pro bono legal 8 9 representation, amicus curiae support, and other legal resources to protect First 10 Amendment freedoms and the newsgathering rights of journalists. 11 Center for Democracy & Technology ("CDT") is a non-profit public interest 12 13 organization. For more than 25 years, CDT has represented the public's interest in an 14 open, decentralized internet and worked to ensure that the constitutional and 15 democratic values of free expression and privacy are protected in the digital age. 16 17 CDT regularly advocates in support of the First Amendment and protections for 18 online speech before legislatures, regulatory agencies, and courts. 19 The Electronic Frontier Foundation ("EFF") is a non-profit, member-supported 20 21 civil liberties organization working to protect digital rights. Founded in 1990 and 22 based in San Francisco, California, EFF has more than 37,000 active donors and 23 dues-paying members. EFF represents the interests of technology users in both court 24 25

cases and broader policy debates surrounding the application of law in the digital age.

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>

DOCKET A L A R M



Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.