

---

**Case No. 20-1776 (L)**

---

**In the United States Court of Appeals  
for the Fourth Circuit**

PEOPLE FOR THE ETHICAL TREATMENT OF ANIMALS, INC.; CENTER  
FOR FOOD SAFETY; ANIMAL LEGAL DEFENSE FUND; FARM  
SANCTUARY; FOOD & WATER WATCH; GOVERNMENT  
ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT; FARM FORWARD; and AMERICAN  
SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS,  
*Plaintiffs-Appellees, Cross-Appellants*

v.

NORTH CAROLINA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, INC.,  
*Intervenor-Defendant-Appellant, Cross-Appellee,*

and

JOSH STEIN, in his official capacity as Attorney General of North Carolina, and  
DR. KEVIN GUSKIEWICZ, in his official capacity as Chancellor of the  
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill,  
*Defendants-Appellants, Cross-Appellees.*

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Middle District of North Carolina

---

**OPENING AND RESPONSE BRIEF OF APPELLEES**

---

David S. Muraskin  
Public Justice, P.C.  
1620 L St. NW, Suite 630  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 861-5245  
dmuraskin@publicjustice.net  
*Counsel for Plaintiffs-Appellees, Cross-Appellants*  
*(additional counsel listed on inside cover)*

---

Daniel K. Bryson  
N.C. Bar Number: 15781  
Jeremy Williams  
N.C. Bar Number: 48162  
Whitfield Bryson  
900 W. Morgan Street  
Raleigh, NC 27603  
(919) 600-5000  
dan@whitfieldbryson.com  
jeremy@whitfieldbryson.com  
*Counsel for Plaintiffs-Appellees,  
Cross-Appellants*

Gabriel Walters  
PETA Foundation  
1563 16th St. NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 483-7382  
gabew@peta.org  
*Counsel for People for the Ethical  
Treatment of Animals, Inc.*

Matthew Strugar  
3435 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2910  
Los Angeles, CA 90010  
(323) 696-2299  
matthew@matthewstrugar.com  
*Counsel for People for the Ethical  
Treatment of Animals, Inc.*

Cristina Stella  
Kelsey Eberly  
Animal Legal Defense Fund  
525 East Cotati Avenue  
Cotati, CA 94931  
(707) 795-7533  
cstella@aldf.org  
keberly@aldf.org  
*Counsel for Animal Legal Defense  
Fund*

**CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Plaintiffs-Appellees, Cross-Appellants (“Plaintiffs”) do not issue stock and have no parent corporations.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                                                                                                            |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>I. JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT.</b>                                                                                                                                        | 1  |
| <b>II. ISSUES PRESENTED.</b>                                                                                                                                               | 1  |
| <b>III. INTRODUCTION.</b>                                                                                                                                                  | 2  |
| <b>IV. STATEMENT OF THE CASE.</b>                                                                                                                                          | 5  |
| <b>A. Section 99A-2’s plain text directly regulates speech.</b>                                                                                                            | 5  |
| <b>B. The law directly regulates Plaintiffs’ speech.</b>                                                                                                                   | 8  |
| <b>C. The law’s legislative history makes clear it is aimed at public advocacy.</b>                                                                                        | 10 |
| <b>D. The district court correctly recognized the law restricts speech and rejected Defendants’ efforts to limit the First Amendment.</b>                                  | 13 |
| <b>V. STANDARD OF REVIEW.</b>                                                                                                                                              | 16 |
| <b>VI. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.</b>                                                                                                                                            | 16 |
| <b>VII. ARGUMENT.</b>                                                                                                                                                      | 20 |
| <b>A. Section § 99A-2 targets protected First Amendment activities.</b>                                                                                                    | 20 |
| <b>B. That some of the regulated speech occurs on private property does not remove the First Amendment’s protections.</b>                                                  | 24 |
| <i>i. Defendants’ authority does not identify any instance in which regulations of speech are free from First Amendment review.</i>                                        | 28 |
| <b>C. Defendants wrongly characterize § 99A-2 as a “generally applicable law,” but even if they were correct, that would not free the law from First Amendment review.</b> | 34 |
| <i>i. Section 99A-2 is not a “generally applicable law.”</i>                                                                                                               | 34 |
| <i>ii. Even “generally applicable laws” that restrict speech are subject to the First Amendment.</i>                                                                       | 37 |
| <b>D. Food Lion is entirely consistent with the binding precedent on which Plaintiffs rely.</b>                                                                            | 38 |

..

|                                                                                                                                                           |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>E. The challenged provisions are subject to strict scrutiny that Defendants do not even seek to satisfy, but also fail intermediate scrutiny. ....</b> | <b>43</b> |
| <i>i. Section 99A-2 is content based, and Defendants concede they cannot defend such a law. ....</i>                                                      | <i>44</i> |
| <i>a. Defendants' counterarguments fail. ....</i>                                                                                                         | <i>47</i> |
| <i>ii. The law also fails intermediate scrutiny. ....</i>                                                                                                 | <i>50</i> |
| <i>a. The law fails as it lacks evidence supporting its restrictions on speech. ....</i>                                                                  | <i>51</i> |
| <i>b. The law is over- and under-inclusive, and therefore not tailored. ....</i>                                                                          | <i>54</i> |
| <i>c. The law does not further a significant governmental interest. ....</i>                                                                              | <i>56</i> |
| <b>F. Because the challenged provisions fail every application of First Amendment scrutiny they should be held facially invalid. ....</b>                 | <b>58</b> |
| <b>G. The challenged provisions are also unconstitutionally overbroad, providing an independent basis to hold them facially invalid. ....</b>             | <b>61</b> |
| <b>VIII. CONCLUSION. ....</b>                                                                                                                             | <b>64</b> |
| <b>IX. REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT. ....</b>                                                                                                                | <b>64</b> |
| <b>X. ADDENDUM OF STATUTORY TEXT. ....</b>                                                                                                                | <b>67</b> |

...

# 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.