

No. 17-1024

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

ANN WALDRON DAWSON, JEFFREY ALAN GRUNOW,
WAYNE ERXLEBEN, SHIRLEY ERXLEBEN,
LAURA GRACE STERENBERG, GARY KIEVIT,
AND MARY KIEVIT,

Petitioners,

v.

CITY OF GRAND HAVEN,

Respondent.

**On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The Michigan Court Of Appeals**

**BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO PETITION
FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

ROBERT A. LUSK
Counsel for Respondent
LUSK ALBERTSON PLC
409 E. Jefferson, Fifth Floor
Detroit, Michigan 48226-4300
(248) 988-5662
RLusk@LuskAlbertson.com

COCKLE LEGAL BRIEFS (800) 225-6964
WWW.COCKLELEGALBRIEFS.COM

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Did the Michigan Court of Appeals Properly Apply Government Speech Analysis in Concluding that the Dewey Hill monument feature pole constitutes government speech?
2. Is the proposition that Respondent created a Limited Public Forum Unsupported by Law?
3. Is Resolution 15-013 Consistent with the Equal Protection Clause of the U.S. Constitution?
4. Is the Michigan Court of Appeals' Opinion Consistent with the Jurisprudence of this Court?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	1
ARGUMENT	5
I. MICHIGAN PROPERLY HELD THAT THE DEWEY HILL MONUMENT FEATURE POLE IS CONTROLLED BY THE GOVERNMENT SPEECH DOCTRINE ELUCIDATED IN <i>SUMMUM</i>	5
A. <i>SUMMUM</i> AND ITS PROGENY ARE CONTROLLING IN THIS CASE	5
B. PETITIONERS' ARGUMENTS AGAINST A FINDING OF GOVERNMENT SPEECH IN THIS CASE ARE UNAVAILING.....	16
II. PETITIONERS' ARGUMENT THAT THE DEWEY HILL MONUMENT FEATURE POLE IS A LIMITED PUBLIC FORUM IS UNSUPPORTED BY LAW	24
III. RESOLUTION 15-013 IS CONSISTENT WITH EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE U.S. AND MICHIGAN CONSTITUTIONS....	31
IV. THE LOWER COURTS PROPERLY APPLIED THE APPLICABLE CONSTITUTIONAL JURISPRUDENCE IN THIS CASE.....	36
CONCLUSION.....	37

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Bannon v. Sch. Dist. of Palm Beach Cty.</i> , 387 F.3d 1208 (11th Cir. 2004).....	35
<i>Capitol Square Review and Advisory Bd. v. Pinette</i> , 515 U.S. 753, 115 S.Ct. 2440, 132 L.Ed.2d 650 (1995).....	16, 17
<i>Cornelius v. NAACP Legal Defense & Ed. Fund, Inc.</i> , 473 U.S. 788, 105 S.Ct. 3439, 87 L.Ed.2d 567 (1985).....	18
<i>Fox v. Michigan Employment Sec. Comm'n</i> , 379 Mich. 579, 153 N.W.2d 644 (1967)	32
<i>Freedom from Religion Found., Inc. v. City of Warren</i> , 873 F.Supp.2d 850 (E.D. Mich. 2012)	26, 27
<i>Golden v. Rossford Exempted Vill. Sch. Dist.</i> , 445 F.Supp.2d 820 (N.D. Ohio 2006)	35
<i>Good News Club v. Milford Cent. Sch.</i> , 533 U.S. 98, 121 S.Ct. 2093, 150 L.Ed.2d 151 (2001)	28, 34
<i>Harville v. State Plumbing & Heating, Inc.</i> , 218 Mich.App. 302, 553 N.W.2d 377 (1996).....	32
<i>In re Contempt of Dudzinski</i> , 257 Mich.App. 96, 667 N.W.2d 68 (2003)	32
<i>J.S. v. Holly Area Schs.</i> , 749 F.Supp.2d 614 (E.D. Mich. 2010).....	30
<i>Kincaid v. Gibson</i> , 236 F.3d 342 (6th Cir. 2001)	24, 25
<i>Lamb's Chapel v. Ctr. Moriches Union Free Sch. Dist.</i> , 508 U.S. 384, 113 S.Ct. 2141, 124 L.Ed.2d 352 (1993).....	26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>Mech v. Sch. Bd. of Palm Beach Cty, Fla.</i> , 806 F.3d 1070 (11th Cir. 2015).....	12
<i>Perry Ed. Ass’n v. Perry Local Educators’ Ass’n</i> , 460 U.S. 37, 103 S.Ct. 948, 74 L.Ed.2d 794 (1983).....	25, 26
<i>Pleasant Grove City v. Sumnum</i> , 555 U.S. 460, 129 S.Ct. 1125, 172 L.Ed.2d 853 (2009)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Reed v. Town of Gilbert</i> , 576 U.S. ___, 135 S.Ct. 2218, 192 L.Ed.2d 236 (2015)	34
<i>Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of Univ. of Va.</i> , 515 U.S. 819, 115 S.Ct. 2510, 132 L.Ed.2d 700 (1995).....	25, 31, 34
<i>Satawa v. Macomb Cty. Rd. Comm’n</i> , 689 F.3d 506 (6th Cir. 2012).....	22
<i>Sloan v. Lemon</i> , 413 U.S. 825, 93 S.Ct. 2982, 37 L.Ed.2d 939 (1973)	35
<i>Southeastern Promotions, Ltd. v. Conrad</i> , 420 U.S. 546, 95 S.Ct. 1239, 43 L.Ed.2d 448 (1975)	22
<i>Thomas v. Chicago Park Dist.</i> , 534 U.S. 316, 122 S.Ct. 775, 151 L.Ed.2d 783 (2002)	22
<i>United States v. Kokinda</i> , 497 U.S. 720, 110 S.Ct. 3115, 111 L.Ed.2d 571 (1990)	24
<i>United Veterans Mem’l & Patriotic Ass’n v. City of New Rochelle</i> , 72 F.Supp.3d 468 (S.D.N.Y. 2014)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Van Orden v. Perry</i> , 545 U.S. 677, 125 S.Ct. 2854, 162 L.Ed.2d 607 (2005)	21

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.