Form **990**

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Return of Organization Exempt From Income Tax

Under section 501(c), 527, or 4947(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code (except private foundations)

▶ Do not enter social security numbers on this form as it may be made public.

▶ **Go to www.irs.gov/Form990 for instructions and the latest information.**

OMB No. 1545-0047

2021

Open to Public Inspection

A For the 2021 calendar year, or tax year beginning 07-01-2021 , and ending 06-30-2022

B Check if applicable:
- ☐ Address change
- ☐ Name change
- ☐ Initial return
- ☐ Final return/terminated
- ☐ Amended return
- ☐ Application pending

C Name of organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Doing business as

Number and street (or P.O. box if mail is not delivered to street address) | Room/suite
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD STE 900

City or town, state or province, country, and ZIP or foreign postal code
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

D Employer identification number
52-1744337

E Telephone number
(703) 682-9320

G Gross receipts $ 55,698,663

F Name and address of principal officer:
SCOTT G BULLOCK
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD STE 900
ARLINGTON,VA 22203

H(a) Is this a group return for subordinates? ☐ Yes ☑ No

H(b) Are all subordinates included? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If "No," attach a list. See instructions.

H(c) Group exemption number ▶

I Tax-exempt status: ☑ 501(c)(3) ☐ 501(c) ( ) ◀ (insert no.) ☐ 4947(a)(1) or ☐ 527

J Website: ▶ WWW.IJ.ORG

K Form of organization: ☑ Corporation ☐ Trust ☐ Association ☐ Other ▶

L Year of formation: 1991

M State of legal domicile: DC

Part I Summary

1 Briefly describe the organization's mission or most significant activities:
TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF AMERICANS.

2 Check this box ▶ ☐ if the organization discontinued its operations or disposed of more than 25% of its net assets.

3	Number of voting members of the governing body (Part VI, line 1a)	**3**	8
4	Number of independent voting members of the governing body (Part VI, line 1b)	**4**	6
5	Total number of individuals employed in calendar year 2021 (Part V, line 2a)	**5**	217
6	Total number of volunteers (estimate if necessary)	**6**	30
7a	Total unrelated business revenue from Part VIII, column (C), line 12	**7a**	0
b	Net unrelated business taxable income from Form 990-T, Part I, line 11	**7b**	0

		Prior Year	Current Year
8	Contributions and grants (Part VIII, line 1h)	31,138,106	34,956,143
9	Program service revenue (Part VIII, line 2g)	3,318,224	389,016
10	Investment income (Part VIII, column (A), lines 3, 4, and 7d)	3,397,998	3,633,268
11	Other revenue (Part VIII, column (A), lines 5, 6d, 8c, 9c, 10c, and 11e)	25,606	6,044
12	Total revenue—add lines 8 through 11 (must equal Part VIII, column (A), line 12)	37,879,934	38,984,471
13	Grants and similar amounts paid (Part IX, column (A), lines 1–3)	136,879	80,250
14	Benefits paid to or for members (Part IX, column (A), line 4)	0	0
15	Salaries, other compensation, employee benefits (Part IX, column (A), lines 5–10)	21,639,891	24,066,153
16a	Professional fundraising fees (Part IX, column (A), line 11e)	0	0
b	Total fundraising expenses (Part IX, column (D), line 25) ▶2,462,947		
17	Other expenses (Part IX, column (A), lines 11a–11d, 11f–24e)	7,416,871	9,087,386
18	Total expenses. Add lines 13–17 (must equal Part IX, column (A), line 25)	29,193,641	33,233,789
19	Revenue less expenses. Subtract line 18 from line 12	8,686,293	5,750,682

		Beginning of Current Year	End of Year
20	Total assets (Part X, line 16)	122,859,049	118,219,089
21	Total liabilities (Part X, line 26)	6,297,135	6,401,849
22	Net assets or fund balances. Subtract line 21 from line 20	116,561,914	111,817,240

Part II Signature Block

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have examined this return, including accompanying schedules and statements, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, it is true, correct, and complete. Declaration of preparer (other than officer) is based on all information of which preparer has any knowledge.

Sign Here

Signature of officer — Date: 2022-11-29

SCOTT G BULLOCK PRESIDENT
Type or print name and title

Paid Preparer Use Only

Print/Type preparer's name	Preparer's signature	Date	Check ☐ if self-employed	PTIN
		2022-11-18		P00957510

Firm's name ▶ COHNREZNICK LLP — Firm's EIN ▶ 22-1478099

Firm's address ▶ 7501 WISCONSIN AVENUE SUITE 400E
BETHESDA, MD 20814 — Phone no. (301) 652-9100

May the IRS discuss this return with the preparer shown above? (see instructions) ☑ **Yes** ☐ **No**

Part III Statement of Program Service Accomplishments

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part III . . . . . ☑

1 Briefly describe the organization's mission:

THROUGH STRATEGIC LITIGATION, TRAINING, COMMUNICATION, ACTIVISM AND RESEARCH, THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE (IJ) ADVANCES A RULE OF LAW UNDER WHICH INDIVIDUALS CAN CONTROL THEIR DESTINIES AS FREE AND RESPONSIBLE MEMBERS OF SOCIETY. IJ LITIGATES TO SECURE ECONOMIC LIBERTY, EDUCATIONAL CHOICE, PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS, FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND OTHER VITAL INDIVIDUAL LIBERTIES, AND TO RESTORE CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS ON THE POWER OF GOVERNMENT. IN ADDITION, IJ TRAINS LAW STUDENTS, LAWYERS AND POLICY ACTIVISTS IN THE TACTICS OF PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION. THROUGH THESE ACTIVITIES, IJ CHALLENGES THE IDEOLOGY OF THE WELFARE STATE AND ILLUSTRATES AND EXTENDS THE BENEFITS OF FREEDOM TO THOSE WHOSE FULL ENJOYMENT OF LIBERTY IS DENIED BY GOVERNMENT.

2 Did the organization undertake any significant program services during the year which were not listed on the prior Form 990 or 990-EZ? . . . . . ☐ Yes ☑ No

If "Yes," describe these new services on Schedule O.

3 Did the organization cease conducting, or make significant changes in how it conducts, any program services? . . . . . ☐ Yes ☑ No

If "Yes," describe these changes on Schedule O.

4 Describe the organization's program service accomplishments for each of its three largest program services, as measured by expenses. Section 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations are required to report the amount of grants and allocations to others, the total expenses, and revenue, if any, for each program service reported.

4a (Code:) (Expenses $ 26,793,418 including grants of $ 80,250) (Revenue $ 395,060)

TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF AMERICANS THROUGH LITIGATION, TO EDUCATE THE PUBLIC ABOUT ISSUES VITAL TO LIBERTY THROUGH MEDIA, ACTIVISM, AND OUTREACH, TO APPLY SOCIAL SCIENCE AND POLICY RESEARCH METHODS TO THOSE ISSUES THAT THE ORGANIZATION LITIGATES, AND TO TRAIN LAWYERS AND LAW STUDENTS.

4b (Code:) (Expenses $ including grants of $) (Revenue $)

4c (Code:) (Expenses $ including grants of $) (Revenue $)

4d Other program services (Describe in Schedule O.)
(Expenses $ including grants of $) (Revenue $)

4e **Total program service expenses** ▶ 26,793,418

Part IV Checklist of Required Schedules

			Yes	No
1	Is the organization described in section 501(c)(3) or 4947(a)(1) (other than a private foundation)? *If "Yes," complete Schedule A*	1	Yes	
2	Is the organization required to complete *Schedule B, Schedule of Contributors*? See instructions.	2	Yes	
3	Did the organization engage in direct or indirect political campaign activities on behalf of or in opposition to candidates for public office? *If "Yes," complete Schedule C, Part I*	3		No
4	**Section 501(c)(3) organizations.** Did the organization engage in lobbying activities, or have a section 501(h) election in effect during the tax year? *If "Yes," complete Schedule C, Part II*	4	Yes	
5	Is the organization a section 501(c)(4), 501(c)(5), or 501(c)(6) organization that receives membership dues, assessments, or similar amounts as defined in Rev. Proc. 98-19? *If "Yes," complete Schedule C, Part III*	5		No
6	Did the organization maintain any donor advised funds or any similar funds or accounts for which donors have the right to provide advice on the distribution or investment of amounts in such funds or accounts? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D,* Part I	6		No
7	Did the organization receive or hold a conservation easement, including easements to preserve open space, the environment, historic land areas, or historic structures? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part II*	7		No
8	Did the organization maintain collections of works of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D,* Part III	8		No
9	Did the organization report an amount in Part X, line 21 for escrow or custodial account liability; serve as a custodian for amounts not listed in Part X; or provide credit counseling, debt management, credit repair, or debt negotiation services? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part IV*	9		No
10	Did the organization, directly or through a related organization, hold assets in temporarily restricted endowments, permanent endowments, or quasi endowments? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part V*	10	Yes	
11	If the organization's answer to any of the following questions is "Yes," then complete Schedule D, Parts VI, VII, VIII, IX, or X, as applicable.			
a	Did the organization report an amount for land, buildings, and equipment in Part X, line 10? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D,* Part VI.	11a	Yes	
b	Did the organization report an amount for investments—other securities in Part X, line 12 that is 5% or more of its total assets reported in Part X, line 16? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part VII*	11b		No
c	Did the organization report an amount for investments—program related in Part X, line 13 that is 5% or more of its total assets reported in Part X, line 16? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part VIII*	11c		No
d	Did the organization report an amount for other assets in Part X, line 15 that is 5% or more of its total assets reported in Part X, line 16? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part IX*	11d		No
e	Did the organization report an amount for other liabilities in Part X, line 25? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part X*	11e	Yes	
f	Did the organization's separate or consolidated financial statements for the tax year include a footnote that addresses the organization's liability for uncertain tax positions under FIN 48 (ASC 740)? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part X*	11f	Yes	
12a	Did the organization obtain separate, independent audited financial statements for the tax year? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Parts XI and XII*	12a	Yes	
b	Was the organization included in consolidated, independent audited financial statements for the tax year? *If "Yes," and if the organization answered "No" to line 12a, then completing Schedule D, Parts XI and XII is optional*	12b		No
13	Is the organization a school described in section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii)? *If "Yes," complete Schedule E*	13		No
14a	Did the organization maintain an office, employees, or agents outside of the United States?	14a		No
b	Did the organization have aggregate revenues or expenses of more than $10,000 from grantmaking, fundraising, business, investment, and program service activities outside the United States, or aggregate foreign investments valued at $100,000 or more? *If "Yes," complete Schedule F, Parts I and IV*	14b	Yes	
15	Did the organization report on Part IX, column (A), line 3, more than $5,000 of grants or other assistance to or for any foreign organization? *If "Yes," complete Schedule F, Parts II and IV*	15		No
16	Did the organization report on Part IX, column (A), line 3, more than $5,000 of aggregate grants or other assistance to or for foreign individuals? *If "Yes," complete Schedule F, Parts III and IV*	16		No
17	Did the organization report a total of more than $15,000 of expenses for professional fundraising services on Part IX, column (A), lines 6 and 11e? *If "Yes," complete Schedule G, Part I.* See instructions.	17		No
18	Did the organization report more than $15,000 total of fundraising event gross income and contributions on Part VIII, lines 1c and 8a? *If "Yes," complete Schedule G, Part II*	18		No
19	Did the organization report more than $15,000 of gross income from gaming activities on Part VIII, line 9a? *If "Yes," complete Schedule G, Part III*	19		No
20a	Did the organization operate one or more hospital facilities? *If "Yes," complete Schedule H*	20a		No
b	If "Yes" to line 20a, did the organization attach a copy of its audited financial statements to this return?	20b		
21	Did the organization report more than $5,000 of grants or other assistance to any domestic organization or domestic government on Part IX, column (A), line 1? *If "Yes," complete Schedule I, Parts I and II*	21	Yes	

Part IV Checklist of Required Schedules *(continued)*

			Yes	No
22	Did the organization report more than $5,000 of grants or other assistance to or for domestic individuals on Part IX, column (A), line 2? *If "Yes," complete Schedule I, Parts I and III*	22		No
23	Did the organization answer "Yes" to Part VII, Section A, line 3, 4, or 5, about compensation of the organization's current and former officers, directors, trustees, key employees, and highest compensated employees? *If "Yes," complete Schedule J*	23	Yes	
24a	Did the organization have a tax-exempt bond issue with an outstanding principal amount of more than $100,000 as of the last day of the year, that was issued after December 31, 2002? *If "Yes," answer lines 24b through 24d and complete Schedule K. If "No," go to line 25a*	24a		No
b	Did the organization invest any proceeds of tax-exempt bonds beyond a temporary period exception?	24b		
c	Did the organization maintain an escrow account other than a refunding escrow at any time during the year to defease any tax-exempt bonds?	24c		
d	Did the organization act as an "on behalf of" issuer for bonds outstanding at any time during the year?	24d		
25a	**Section 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), and 501(c)(29) organizations.** Did the organization engage in an excess benefit transaction with a disqualified person during the year? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L,* Part I	25a		No
b	Is the organization aware that it engaged in an excess benefit transaction with a disqualified person in a prior year, and that the transaction has not been reported on any of the organization's prior Forms 990 or 990-EZ? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L,* Part I	25b		No
26	Did the organization report any amount on Part X, line 5 or 22 for receivables from or payables to any current or former officer, director, trustee, key employee, creator or founder, substantial contributor, or 35% controlled entity or family member of any of these persons? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part II*	26		No
27	Did the organization provide a grant or other assistance to any current or former officer, director, trustee, key employee, creator or founder, substantial contributor, or employee thereof, a grant selection committee member, or to a 35% controlled entity (including an employee thereof) or family member of any of these persons? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L,* Part III	27		No
28	Was the organization a party to a business transaction with one of the following parties (see the Schedule L, Part IV instructions for applicable filing thresholds, conditions, and exceptions):			
a	A current or former officer, director, trustee, key employee, creator or founder, or substantial contributor? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part IV*	28a		No
b	A family member of any individual described in line 28a? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part IV*	28b		No
c	A 35% controlled entity of one or more individuals and/or organizations described in line 28a or 28b? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part IV*	28c		No
29	Did the organization receive more than $25,000 in non-cash contributions? *If "Yes," complete Schedule M*	29	Yes	
30	Did the organization receive contributions of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets, or qualified conservation contributions? *If "Yes," complete Schedule M*	30		No
31	Did the organization liquidate, terminate, or dissolve and cease operations? *If "Yes," complete Schedule N, Part I*	31		No
32	Did the organization sell, exchange, dispose of, or transfer more than 25% of its net assets? *If "Yes," complete Schedule N, Part II*	32		No
33	Did the organization own 100% of an entity disregarded as separate from the organization under Regulations sections 301.7701-2 and 301.7701-3? *If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Part I*	33		No
34	Was the organization related to any tax-exempt or taxable entity? *If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Part II, III, or IV, and Part V, line 1*	34		No
35a	Did the organization have a controlled entity within the meaning of section 512(b)(13)?	35a		No
b	If 'Yes' to line 35a, did the organization receive any payment from or engage in any transaction with a controlled entity within the meaning of section 512(b)(13)? *If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Part V, line 2*	35b		
36	**Section 501(c)(3) organizations.** Did the organization make any transfers to an exempt non-charitable related organization? *If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Part V, line 2*	36		No
37	Did the organization conduct more than 5% of its activities through an entity that is not a related organization and that is treated as a partnership for federal income tax purposes? *If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Part VI*	37		No
38	Did the organization complete Schedule O and provide explanations on Schedule O for Part VI, lines 11b and 19? **Note.** All Form 990 filers are required to complete Schedule O.	38	Yes	

Part V Statements Regarding Other IRS Filings and Tax Compliance

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part V ☐

				Yes	No
1a	Enter the number reported in box 3 of Form 1096. Enter -0- if not applicable	1a	95		
b	Enter the number of Forms W-2G included on line 1a. Enter -0- if not applicable	1b	0		
c	Did the organization comply with backup withholding rules for reportable payments to vendors and reportable gaming (gambling) winnings to prize winners?	1c		Yes	

Part V Statements Regarding Other IRS Filings and Tax Compliance *(continued)*

2a	Enter the number of employees reported on Form W-3, Transmittal of Wage and Tax Statements, filed for the calendar year ending with or within the year covered by this return **2a** 217				
b	If at least one is reported on line 2a, did the organization file all required federal employment tax returns? **Note.** If the sum of lines 1a and 2a is greater than 250, you may be required to e-file. See instructions.	**2b**	Yes		
3a	Did the organization have unrelated business gross income of $1,000 or more during the year?	**3a**		No	
b	If "Yes," has it filed a Form 990-T for this year? *If "No" to line 3b, provide an explanation in Schedule O*	**3b**			
4a	At any time during the calendar year, did the organization have an interest in, or a signature or other authority over, a financial account in a foreign country (such as a bank account, securities account, or other financial account)?	**4a**	Yes		
b	If "Yes," enter the name of the foreign country: ▶CJ See instructions for filing requirements for FinCEN Form 114, Report of Foreign Bank and Financial Accounts (FBAR).				
5a	Was the organization a party to a prohibited tax shelter transaction at any time during the tax year?	**5a**		No	
b	Did any taxable party notify the organization that it was or is a party to a prohibited tax shelter transaction?	**5b**		No	
c	If "Yes," to line 5a or 5b, did the organization file Form 8886-T?	**5c**			
6a	Does the organization have annual gross receipts that are normally greater than $100,000, and did the organization solicit any contributions that were not tax deductible as charitable contributions?	**6a**		No	
b	If "Yes," did the organization include with every solicitation an express statement that such contributions or gifts were not tax deductible?	**6b**			
7	**Organizations that may receive deductible contributions under section 170(c).**				
a	Did the organization receive a payment in excess of $75 made partly as a contribution and partly for goods and services provided to the payor?	**7a**		No	
b	If "Yes," did the organization notify the donor of the value of the goods or services provided?	**7b**			
c	Did the organization sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of tangible personal property for which it was required to file Form 8282?	**7c**	Yes		
d	If "Yes," indicate the number of Forms 8282 filed during the year **7d** 6				
e	Did the organization receive any funds, directly or indirectly, to pay premiums on a personal benefit contract?	**7e**		No	
f	Did the organization, during the year, pay premiums, directly or indirectly, on a personal benefit contract?	**7f**		No	
g	If the organization received a contribution of qualified intellectual property, did the organization file Form 8899 as required?	**7g**			
h	If the organization received a contribution of cars, boats, airplanes, or other vehicles, did the organization file a Form 1098-C?	**7h**	Yes		
8	**Sponsoring organizations maintaining donor advised funds.** Did a donor advised fund maintained by the sponsoring organization have excess business holdings at any time during the year?	**8**			
9	**Sponsoring organizations maintaining donor advised funds.**				
a	Did the sponsoring organization make any taxable distributions under section 4966?	**9a**			
b	Did the sponsoring organization make a distribution to a donor, donor advisor, or related person?	**9b**			
10	**Section 501(c)(7) organizations.** Enter:				
a	Initiation fees and capital contributions included on Part VIII, line 12 **10a**				
b	Gross receipts, included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 12, for public use of club facilities **10b**				
11	**Section 501(c)(12) organizations.** Enter:				
a	Gross income from members or shareholders **11a**				
b	Gross income from other sources. (Do not net amounts due or paid to other sources against amounts due or received from them.) **11b**				
12a	**Section 4947(a)(1) non-exempt charitable trusts.** Is the organization filing Form 990 in lieu of Form 1041?	**12a**			
b	If "Yes," enter the amount of tax-exempt interest received or accrued during the year. **12b**				
13	**Section 501(c)(29) qualified nonprofit health insurance issuers.**				
a	Is the organization licensed to issue qualified health plans in more than one state? **Note.** See the instructions for additional information the organization must report on Schedule O.	**13a**			
b	Enter the amount of reserves the organization is required to maintain by the states in which the organization is licensed to issue qualified health plans **13b**				
c	Enter the amount of reserves on hand **13c**				
14a	Did the organization receive any payments for indoor tanning services during the tax year?	**14a**		No	
b	If "Yes," has it filed a Form 720 to report these payments? *If "No," provide an explanation in Schedule O*	**14b**			
15	Is the organization subject to the section 4960 tax on payment(s) of more than $1,000,000 in remuneration or excess parachute payment(s) during the year? If "Yes," see instructions and file Form 4720, Schedule N.	**15**		No	
16	Is the organization an educational institution subject to the section 4968 excise tax on net investment income? If "Yes," complete Form 4720, Schedule O.	**16**		No	
17	**Section 501(c)(21) organizations.** Did the trust, any disqualified person, or mine operator engage in any activities that would result in the imposition of an excise tax under section 4951, 4952, or 4953? If "Yes," complete Form 6069.	**17**			

Part VI **Governance, Management, and Disclosure.** *For each "Yes" response to lines 2 through 7b below, and for a "No" response to lines 8a, 8b, or 10b below, describe the circumstances, processes, or changes in Schedule O. See instructions.*

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part VI . . . . . ☑

Section A. Governing Body and Management

				Yes	No
1a	Enter the number of voting members of the governing body at the end of the tax year. If there are material differences in voting rights among members of the governing body, or if the governing body delegated broad authority to an executive committee or similar committee, explain in Schedule O.	**1a**	8		
b	Enter the number of voting members included in line 1a, above, who are independent	**1b**	6		
2	Did any officer, director, trustee, or key employee have a family relationship or a business relationship with any other officer, director, trustee, or key employee?				No
3	Did the organization delegate control over management duties customarily performed by or under the direct supervision of officers, directors or trustees, or key employees to a management company or other person?				No
4	Did the organization make any significant changes to its governing documents since the prior Form 990 was filed?				No
5	Did the organization become aware during the year of a significant diversion of the organization's assets?				No
6	Did the organization have members or stockholders?				No
7a	Did the organization have members, stockholders, or other persons who had the power to elect or appoint one or more members of the governing body?				No
b	Are any governance decisions of the organization reserved to (or subject to approval by) members, stockholders, or persons other than the governing body?				No
8	Did the organization contemporaneously document the meetings held or written actions undertaken during the year by the following:				
a	The governing body?	**8a**		Yes	
b	Each committee with authority to act on behalf of the governing body?	**8b**		Yes	
9	Is there any officer, director, trustee, or key employee listed in Part VII, Section A, who cannot be reached at the organization's mailing address? *If "Yes," provide the names and addresses in Schedule O*	**9**			No

Section B. Policies (*This Section B requests information about policies not required by the Internal Revenue Code.*)

			Yes	No
10a	Did the organization have local chapters, branches, or affiliates?	**10a**	Yes	
b	If "Yes," did the organization have written policies and procedures governing the activities of such chapters, affiliates, and branches to ensure their operations are consistent with the organization's exempt purposes?	**10b**	Yes	
11a	Has the organization provided a complete copy of this Form 990 to all members of its governing body before filing the form?	**11a**	Yes	
b	Describe on Schedule O the process, if any, used by the organization to review this Form 990.			
12a	Did the organization have a written conflict of interest policy? *If "No," go to line 13*	**12a**	Yes	
b	Were officers, directors, or trustees, and key employees required to disclose annually interests that could give rise to conflicts?	**12b**	Yes	
c	Did the organization regularly and consistently monitor and enforce compliance with the policy? *If "Yes," describe on Schedule O how this was done*	**12c**	Yes	
13	Did the organization have a written whistleblower policy?	**13**	Yes	
14	Did the organization have a written document retention and destruction policy?	**14**	Yes	
15	Did the process for determining compensation of the following persons include a review and approval by independent persons, comparability data, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision?			
a	The organization's CEO, Executive Director, or top management official	**15a**	Yes	
b	Other officers or key employees of the organization	**15b**	Yes	
	If "Yes" to line 15a or 15b, describe the process on Schedule O. See instructions.			
16a	Did the organization invest in, contribute assets to, or participate in a joint venture or similar arrangement with a taxable entity during the year?	**16a**		No
b	If "Yes," did the organization follow a written policy or procedure requiring the organization to evaluate its participation in joint venture arrangements under applicable federal tax law, and take steps to safeguard the organization's exempt status with respect to such arrangements?	**16b**		

Section C. Disclosure

17 List the states with which a copy of this Form 990 is required to be filed ▶ AL, AR, CA, FL, GA, HI, IL, KS, KY, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, UT, VA, WV, WI

18 Section 6104 requires an organization to make its Form 1023 (1024 or 1024-A, if applicable), 990, and 990-T (section 501(c)(3)s only) available for public inspection. Indicate how you made these available. Check all that apply.

☑ Own website ☐ Another's website ☑ Upon request ☐ Other (explain in Schedule O)

19 Describe in Schedule O whether (and if so, how) the organization made its governing documents, conflict of interest policy, and financial statements available to the public during the tax year.

20 State the name, address, and telephone number of the person who possesses the organization's books and records: ▶ DANIEL KNEPPER 901 NORTH GLEBE RD STE 900 ARLINGTON, VA 22203 (703) 682-9320

Part VII Compensation of Officers, Directors,Trustees, Key Employees, Highest Compensated Employees, and Independent Contractors

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part VII . . . . . ☐

Section A. Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, and Highest Compensated Employees

1a Complete this table for all persons required to be listed. Report compensation for the calendar year ending with or within the organization's tax year.

- List all of the organization's **current** officers, directors, trustees (whether individuals or organizations), regardless of amount of compensation. Enter -0- in columns (D), (E), and (F) if no compensation was paid.
- List all of the organization's **current** key employees, if any. See the instructions for definition of "key employee."
- List the organization's five **current** highest compensated employees (other than an officer, director, trustee or key employee) who received reportable compensation (box 5 of Form W-2, Form 1099-MISC, and/or box 1 of Form 1099-NEC) of more than $100,000 from the organization and any related organizations.
- List all of the organization's **former** officers, key employees, or highest compensated employees who received more than $100,000 of reportable compensation from the organization and any related organizations.
- List all of the organization's **former directors or trustees** that received, in the capacity as a former director or trustee of the organization, more than $10,000 of reportable compensation from the organization and any related organizations.

See the instructions for the order in which to list the persons above.

☐ Check this box if neither the organization nor any related organization compensated any current officer, director, or trustee.

(A) Name and title	(B) Average hours per week (list any hours for related organizations below dotted line)	(C) Position (do not check more than one box, unless person is both an officer and a director/trustee)						(D) Reportable compensation from the organization (W-2/1099-MISC/1099-NEC)	(E) Reportable compensation from related organizations (W-2/1099-MISC/1099-NEC)	(F) Estimated amount of other compensation from the organization and related organizations
		Individual trustee or director	Institutional Trustee	Officer	Key employee	Highest compensated employee	Former			
(1) SCOTT G BULLOCK PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL	40.00	X		X				575,860	0	35,786
(2) WILLIAM MELLOR CHAIRMAN & FOUNDING GENERAL COUNSEL	40.00	X		X				41,582	0	4,204
(3) ARTHUR DANTCHIK DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(4) BOB GELFOND DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(5) KENNETH N LEVY DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(6) ROBERT A LEVY DIRECTOR (UNTIL DEC/2021)	1.00	X						0	0	0
(7) JIM LINTOTT DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(8) STEPHEN MODZELEWSKI DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(9) MARY E STIEFEL DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(10) DANIEL KNEPPER MANAGING VP-CFO/SECRETARY	40.00			X				420,601	0	41,699
(11) DANA BERLINER SENIOR VP AND LITIGATION DIRECTOR	40.00				X			504,293	0	41,441
(12) JOHN KRAMER VP FOR COMMUNICATIONS	40.00				X			375,385	0	47,643
(13) DEBORAH SIMPSON CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER	40.00				X			323,351	0	42,686
(14) BETH STEVENS VP FOR DEVELOPMENT	40.00				X			295,587	0	42,278
(15) ROBERT MCNAMARA SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		297,125	0	50,504
(16) JEFFREY ROWES SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		237,746	0	59,544
(17) ROBERT GALL MANAGING VP AND SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		308,016	0	54,701

Part VII **Section A. Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, and Highest Compensated Employees** *(continued)*

(A) Name and title	(B) Average hours per week (list any hours for related organizations below dotted line)	(C) Position (do not check more than one box, unless person is both an officer and a director/trustee)						(D) Reportable compensation from the organization (W-2/1099-MISC/1099-NEC)	(E) Reportable compensation from related organizations (W-2/1099-MISC/1099-NEC)	(F) Estimated amount of other compensation from the organization and related organizations
		Individual trustee or director	Institutional Trustee	Officer	Key employee	Highest compensated employee	Former			
(18) MELANIE HILDRETH VP FOR EXTERNAL RELATIONS (UNTIL JAN/2022)	40.00					X		239,243	0	47,590
(19) ROBERT JOHNSON SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		232,340	0	32,293
1b Sub-Total										
c Total from continuation sheets to Part VII, Section A										
d Total (add lines 1b and 1c)								3,851,129	0	500,369

2 Total number of individuals (including but not limited to those listed above) who received more than $100,000 of reportable compensation from the organization ▶ 6 3

			Yes	No
3	Did the organization list any **former** officer, director or trustee, key employee, or highest compensated employee on line 1a? *If "Yes," complete Schedule J for such individual*	**3**		No
4	For any individual listed on line 1a, is the sum of reportable compensation and other compensation from the organization and related organizations greater than $150,000? *If "Yes," complete Schedule J for such individual*	**4**	Yes	
5	Did any person listed on line 1a receive or accrue compensation from any unrelated organization or individual for services rendered to the organization? *If "Yes," complete Schedule J for such person*	**5**		No

Section B. Independent Contractors

1 Complete this table for your five highest compensated independent contractors that received more than $100,000 of compensation from the organization. Report compensation for the calendar year ending with or within the organization's tax year.

(A) Name and business address	(B) Description of services	(C) Compensation
COMMUNITY IT INNOVATORS INC 1101 14TH STREET NW SUITE 830 WASHINGTON, DC 20005	IT CONTRACTORS	219,374
CAPSICUM GROUP LLC 50 S 16TH STREET SUITE 2525 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19102	FORENSICS LITIGATION SERVICES	200,378
PRODUCTION SOLUTIONS INC 1953 GALLOWS RD SUITE 600 VIENNA, VA 22182	PRINTING AND MAILING SHOP	198,016
OCEAN SOLUTIONS LLC 20130 LAKEVIEW CENTER PLAZA SUITE ASHBURN, VA 20147	IT CONTRACTORS	179,509
DOYLE PRINTING & OFFSET CO 5206 46TH AVENUE HYATTSVILLE, MD 20781	PRINTING AND MAILING SHOP	173,172

2 Total number of independent contractors (including but not limited to those listed above) who received more than $100,000 of compensation from the organization ▶ 8

Part VIII Statement of Revenue

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part VIII . . . . . ☐

	(A) Total revenue	(B) Related or exempt function revenue	(C) Unrelated business revenue	(D) Revenue excluded from tax under sections 512 - 514
Contributions, Gifts, Grants, and OtherAmt Similar Amounts				
1a Federated campaigns . . **1a**				
b Membership dues . . **1b**				
c Fundraising events . . **1c**				
d Related organizations **1d**				
e Government grants (contributions) **1e**				
f All other contributions, gifts, grants, and similar amounts not included above **1f**	34,956,143			
g Noncash contributions included in lines 1a - 1f:$ **1g** 2,576,070				
h Total. Add lines 1a-1f . . . . . ▶	34,956,143			
Program Service Revenue	Business Code			
2a ATTORNEY FEES	541100	382,534	382,534	
b HONORARIA	900099	6,482	6,482	
c				
d				
e				
f All other program service revenue.				
g Total. Add lines 2a–2f. . . . . ▶	389,016			
3 Investment income (including dividends, interest, and other similar amounts)	2,085,326			2,085,326
4 Income from investment of tax-exempt bond proceeds ▶				
5 Royalties . . . . . ▶				
	(i) Real	(ii) Personal		
6a Gross rents **6a**				
b Less: rental expenses **6b**				
c Rental income or (loss) **6c**				
d Net rental income or (loss)				
	(i) Securities	(ii) Other ▶		
7a Gross amount from sales of assets other than inventory **7a**	18,262,134			
b Less: cost or other basis and sales expenses **7b**	16,713,423	769		
c Gain or (loss) **7c**	1,548,711	-769		
d Net gain or (loss) . . . . . ▶	1,547,942			1,547,942
8a Gross income from fundraising events (not including $ _____ of contributions reported on line 1c). See Part IV, line 18 . . . . **8a**				
b Less: direct expenses **8b**				
c Net income or (loss) from fundraising events . . ▶				
9a Gross income from gaming activities. See Part IV, line 19 . . . **9a**				
b Less: direct expenses **9b**				
c Net income or (loss) from gaming activities . . ▶				
10a Gross sales of inventory, less returns and allowances . . **10a**				
b Less: cost of goods sold . . **10b**				
c Net income or (loss) from sales of inventory . . ▶				
Other Revenue Miscellaneous Revenue	Business Code			
11a OTHER INCOME	541110	6,044	6,044	
b				
c				
d All other revenue				
e Total. Add lines 11a–11d . . . . . ▶		6,044		
12 Total revenue. See instructions . . . . ▶		38,984,471	395,060	0	3,633,268

Part IX Statement of Functional Expenses

Section 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations must complete all columns. All other organizations must complete column (A).

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part IX . . . . . ☐

Do not include amounts reported on lines 6b, 7b, 8b, 9b, and 10b of Part VIII.	(A) Total expenses	(B) Program service expenses	(C) Management and general expenses	(D) Fundraising expenses
1 Grants and other assistance to domestic organizations and domestic governments. See Part IV, line 21	80,250	80,250		
2 Grants and other assistance to domestic individuals. See Part IV, line 22				
3 Grants and other assistance to foreign organizations, foreign governments, and foreign individuals. See Part IV, lines 15 and 16.				
4 Benefits paid to or for members				
5 Compensation of current officers, directors, trustees, and key employees	2,978,201	2,487,073	286,213	204,915
6 Compensation not included above, to disqualified persons (as defined under section 4958(f)(1)) and persons described in section 4958(c)(3)(B)				
7 Other salaries and wages	16,681,886	13,930,913	1,603,174	1,147,799
8 Pension plan accruals and contributions (include section 401(k) and 403(b) employer contributions)	1,530,731	1,278,302	147,107	105,322
9 Other employee benefits	1,650,552	1,378,364	158,622	113,566
10 Payroll taxes	1,224,783	1,022,807	117,705	84,271
11 Fees for services (non-employees):				
a Management				
b Legal	90,562	69,763	20,204	595
c Accounting	62,020		62,020	
d Lobbying	174,557	174,557		
e Professional fundraising services. See Part IV, line 17				
f Investment management fees	11,036			11,036
g Other (If line 11g amount exceeds 10% of line 25, column (A) amount, list line 11g expenses on Schedule O)	1,300,420	1,076,406	122,608	101,406
12 Advertising and promotion	113,503	102,656	770	10,077
13 Office expenses	1,030,946	541,072	116,204	373,670
14 Information technology	813,515	129,935	653,688	29,892
15 Royalties				
16 Occupancy	2,467,553	2,064,259	236,121	167,173
17 Travel	706,836	695,953	3,142	7,741
18 Payments of travel or entertainment expenses for any federal, state, or local public officials				
19 Conferences, conventions, and meetings	273,437	272,070	1,367	
20 Interest	7,446		7,446	
21 Payments to affiliates				
22 Depreciation, depletion, and amortization	911,441	761,137	87,592	62,712
23 Insurance	164,288	82,647	81,641	
24 Other expenses. Itemize expenses not covered above (List miscellaneous expenses in line 24e. If line 24e amount exceeds 10% of line 25, column (A) amount, list line 24e expenses on Schedule O.)				
a RESEARCH TOOLS	454,615	403,652	20,621	30,342
b OTHER EXPENSES	439,760	176,172	251,158	12,430
c FILING AND COURT FEES	65,451	65,430	21	
d				
e All other expenses				
25 **Total functional expenses.** Add lines 1 through 24e	33,233,789	26,793,418	3,977,424	2,462,947
26 **Joint costs.** Complete this line only if the organization reported in column (B) joint costs from a combined educational campaign and fundraising solicitation. Check here ▶ ☐ if following SOP 98-2 (ASC 958-720).				

Part X Balance Sheet

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part IX . . . . . ☐

				(A) Beginning of year		(B) End of year
Assets	1	Cash–non-interest-bearing		3,839,769	1	2,518,446
	2	Savings and temporary cash investments			2	
	3	Pledges and grants receivable, net		1,673,364	3	1,191,533
	4	Accounts receivable, net		131,182	4	56,892
	5	Loans and other receivables from any current or former officer, director, trustee, key employee, creator or founder, substantial contributor, or 35% controlled entity or family member of any of these persons			5	
	6	Loans and other receivables from other disqualified persons (as defined under section 4958(f)(1)), and persons described in section 4958(c)(3)(B)			6	
	7	Notes and loans receivable, net			7	
	8	Inventories for sale or use			8	
	9	Prepaid expenses and deferred charges		518,257	9	467,777
	10a	Land, buildings, and equipment: cost or other basis. Complete Part VI of Schedule D	10a 8,518,130			
	b	Less: accumulated depreciation	10b 5,398,421	3,806,609	10c	3,119,709
	11	Investments—publicly traded securities		106,203,216	11	107,040,970
	12	Investments—other securities. See Part IV, line 11		6,550,531	12	3,667,641
	13	Investments—program-related. See Part IV, line 11			13	
	14	Intangible assets			14	
	15	Other assets. See Part IV, line 11		136,121	15	156,121
	16	**Total assets.** Add lines 1 through 15 (must equal line 33)		122,859,049	16	118,219,089
Liabilities	17	Accounts payable and accrued expenses		2,400,462	17	2,846,719
	18	Grants payable			18	
	19	Deferred revenue		538,000	19	476,537
	20	Tax-exempt bond liabilities			20	
	21	Escrow or custodial account liability. Complete Part IV of Schedule D			21	
	22	Loans and other payables to any current or former officer, director, trustee, key employee, creator or founder, substantial contributor, or 35% controlled entity or family member of any of these persons			22	
	23	Secured mortgages and notes payable to unrelated third parties			23	
	24	Unsecured notes and loans payable to unrelated third parties			24	
	25	Other liabilities (including federal income tax, payables to related third parties, and other liabilities not included on lines 17 - 24). Complete Part X of Schedule D		3,358,673	25	3,078,593
	26	**Total liabilities.** Add lines 17 through 25		6,297,135	26	6,401,849
Net Assets or Fund Balances		**Organizations that follow FASB ASC 958, check here ▶ ☑ and complete lines 27, 28, 32, and 33.**				
	27	Net assets without donor restrictions		112,418,697	27	108,550,958
	28	Net assets with donor restrictions		4,143,217	28	3,266,282
		Organizations that do not follow FASB ASC 958, check here ▶ ☐ and complete lines 29 through 33.				
	29	Capital stock or trust principal, or current funds			29	
	30	Paid-in or capital surplus, or land, building or equipment fund			30	
	31	Retained earnings, endowment, accumulated income, or other funds			31	
	32	Total net assets or fund balances		116,561,914	32	111,817,240
	33	Total liabilities and net assets/fund balances		122,859,049	33	118,219,089

Part XI Reconcilliation of Net Assets

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part XI . . . . . ☐

1	Total revenue (must equal Part VIII, column (A), line 12)	1	38,984,471
2	Total expenses (must equal Part IX, column (A), line 25)	2	33,233,789
3	Revenue less expenses. Subtract line 2 from line 1	3	5,750,682
4	Net assets or fund balances at beginning of year (must equal Part X, line 32, column (A))	4	116,561,914
5	Net unrealized gains (losses) on investments	5	-10,495,356
6	Donated services and use of facilities	6	
7	Investment expenses	7	
8	Prior period adjustments	8	
9	Other changes in net assets or fund balances (explain in Schedule O)	9	0
10	Net assets or fund balances at end of year. Combine lines 3 through 9 (must equal Part X, line 32, column	10	111,817,240

Part XII Financial Statements and Reporting

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part XII . . . . . ☑

			Yes	No
1	Accounting method used to prepare the Form 990: ☐ Cash ☑ Accrual ☐ Other _____ If the organization changed its method of accounting from a prior year or checked "Other," explain on Schedule O.			
2a	Were the organization's financial statements compiled or reviewed by an independent accountant?	2a		No
	If 'Yes,' check a box below to indicate whether the financial statements for the year were compiled or reviewed on a separate basis, consolidated basis, or both: ☐ Separate basis ☐ Consolidated basis ☐ Both consolidated and separate basis			
b	Were the organization's financial statements audited by an independent accountant?	2b	Yes	
	If 'Yes,' check a box below to indicate whether the financial statements for the year were audited on a separate basis, consolidated basis, or both: ☑ Separate basis ☐ Consolidated basis ☐ Both consolidated and separate basis			
c	If "Yes," to line 2a or 2b, does the organization have a committee that assumes responsibility for oversight of the audit, review, or compilation of its financial statements and selection of an independent accountant?	2c	Yes	
	If the organization changed either its oversight process or selection process during the tax year, explain in Schedule O.			
3a	As a result of a federal award, was the organization required to undergo an audit or audits as set forth in the Single Audit Act and OMB Circular A-133?	3a		No
b	If "Yes," did the organization undergo the required audit or audits? If the organization did not undergo the required audit or audits, explain why in Schedule O and describe any steps taken to undergo such audits.	3b		

Additional Data

Return to Form

Software ID:

Software Version:

Form 990, Special Condition Description:

Special Condition Description

SCHEDULE A (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Public Charity Status and Public Support

Complete if the organization is a section 501(c)(3) organization or a section 4947(a)(1) nonexempt charitable trust.

▶ **Attach to Form 990 or Form 990-EZ.**

▶ **Go to *www.irs.gov/Form990* for instructions and the latest information.**

OMB No. 1545-0047

2021

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I Reason for Public Charity Status (All organizations must complete this part.) See instructions.

The organization is not a private foundation because it is: (For lines 1 through 12, check only one box.)

1 ☐ A church, convention of churches, or association of churches described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(i).**

2 ☐ A school described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii).** (Attach Schedule E (Form 990).)

3 ☐ A hospital or a cooperative hospital service organization described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(iii).**

4 ☐ A medical research organization operated in conjunction with a hospital described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(iii).** Enter the hospital's name, city, and state:

5 ☐ An organization operated for the benefit of a college or university owned or operated by a governmental unit described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(iv).** (Complete Part II.)

6 ☐ A federal, state, or local government or governmental unit described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(v).**

7 ☑ An organization that normally receives a substantial part of its support from a governmental unit or from the general public described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(vi).** (Complete Part II.)

8 ☐ A community trust described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(vi)**. (Complete Part II.)

9 ☐ An agricultural research organization described in **170(b)(1)(A)(ix)** operated in conjunction with a land-grant college or university or a non-land grant college of agriculture. See instructions. Enter the name, city, and state of the college or university:

10 ☐ An organization that normally receives: (1) more than 33 1/3% of its support from contributions, membership fees, and gross receipts from activities related to its exempt functions—subject to certain exceptions, and (2) no more than 33 1/3% of its support from gross investment income and unrelated business taxable income (less section 511 tax) from businesses acquired by the organization after June 30, 1975. See **section 509(a)(2).** (Complete Part III.)

11 ☐ An organization organized and operated exclusively to test for public safety. See **section 509(a)(4).**

12 ☐ An organization organized and operated exclusively for the benefit of, to perform the functions of, or to carry out the purposes of one or more publicly supported organizations described in **section 509(a)(1)** or **section 509(a)(2).** See **section 509(a)(3).** Check the box on lines 12a through 12d that describes the type of supporting organization and complete lines 12e, 12f, and 12g.

a ☐ **Type I.** A supporting organization operated, supervised, or controlled by its supported organization(s), typically by giving the supported organization(s) the power to regularly appoint or elect a majority of the directors or trustees of the supporting organization. **You must complete Part IV, Sections A and B.**

b ☐ **Type II.** A supporting organization supervised or controlled in connection with its supported organization(s), by having control or management of the supporting organization vested in the same persons that control or manage the supported organization(s). **You must complete Part IV, Sections A and C.**

c ☐ **Type III functionally integrated.** A supporting organization operated in connection with, and functionally integrated with, its supported organization(s) (see instructions). **You must complete Part IV, Sections A, D, and E.**

d ☐ **Type III non-functionally integrated.** A supporting organization operated in connection with its supported organization(s) that is not functionally integrated. The organization generally must satisfy a distribution requirement and an attentiveness requirement (see instructions). **You must complete Part IV, Sections A and D, and Part V.**

e ☐ Check this box if the organization received a written determination from the IRS that it is a Type I, Type II, Type III functionally integrated, or Type III non-functionally integrated supporting organization.

f Enter the number of supported organizations . . . . . _____

g Provide the following information about the supported organization(s).

(i) Name of supported organization	(ii) EIN	(iii) Type of organization (described on lines 1- 10 above (see instructions))	(iv) Is the organization listed in your governing document? Yes	(iv) No	(v) Amount of monetary support (see instructions)	(vi) Amount of other support (see instructions)
Total						

Part II **Support Schedule for Organizations Described in Sections 170(b)(1)(A)(iv) and 170(b)(1)(A)(vi)** (Complete only if you checked the box on line 5, 7, or 8 of Part I or if the organization failed to qualify under Part III. If the organization failed to qualify under the tests listed below, please complete Part III.)

Section A. Public Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in) ▶	(a) 2017	(b) 2018	(c) 2019	(d) 2020	(e) 2021	(f) Total
1 Gifts, grants, contributions, and membership fees received. (Do not include any "unusual grant.") . .	23,793,166	21,267,811	27,138,233	31,138,106	34,956,143	138,293,459
2 Tax revenues levied for the organization's benefit and either paid to or expended on its behalf						
3 The value of services or facilities furnished by a governmental unit to the organization without charge..						
4 **Total.** Add lines 1 through 3	23,793,166	21,267,811	27,138,233	31,138,106	34,956,143	138,293,459
5 The portion of total contributions by each person (other than a governmental unit or publicly supported organization) included on line 1 that exceeds 2% of the amount shown on line 11, column (f) . .						12,232,532
6 **Public support.** Subtract line 5 from line 4.						126,060,927

Section B. Total Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in) ▶	(a) 2017	(b) 2018	(c) 2019	(d) 2020	(e) 2021	(f) Total
7 Amounts from line 4. .	23,793,166	21,267,811	27,138,233	31,138,106	34,956,143	138,293,459
8 Gross income from interest, dividends, payments received on securities loans, rents, royalties and income from similar sources . . .	1,103,004	1,577,636	1,622,922	1,473,498	2,085,326	7,862,386
9 Net income from unrelated business activities, whether or not the business is regularly carried on. .						
10 Other income. Do not include gain or loss from the sale of capital assets (Explain in Part VI.). .						
11 **Total support.** Add lines 7 through 10						146,155,845

12 Gross receipts from related activities, etc. (see instructions)	12	5,992,468

13 **First 5 years.** If the Form 990 is for the organization's first, second, third, fourth, or fifth tax year as a section 501(c)(3) organization, check this box and **stop here** . . . . . ▶ ☐

Section C. Computation of Public Support Percentage

14 Public support percentage for 2021 (line 6, column (f) divided by line 11, column (f))	14	86.250 %
15 Public support percentage for 2020 Schedule A, Part II, line 14	15	85.250 %

16a **33 1/3% support test—2021.** If the organization did not check the box on line 13, and line 14 is 33 1/3% or more, check this box and **stop here.** The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization . . . . . ▶ ☑

b **33 1/3% support test—2020.** If the organization did not check a box on line 13 or 16a, and line 15 is 33 1/3% or more, check this box and **stop here.** The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization . . . . . ▶ ☐

17a **10%-facts-and-circumstances test—2021.** If the organization did not check a box on line 13, 16a, or 16b, and line 14 is 10% or more, and if the organization meets the "facts-and-circumstances" test, check this box and **stop here.** Explain in Part VI how the organization meets the "facts-and-circumstances" test. The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization . . . . . ▶ ☐

b **10%-facts-and-circumstances test—2020.** If the organization did not check a box on line 13, 16a, 16b, or 17a, and line 15 is 10% or more, and if the organization meets the "facts-and-circumstances" test, check this box and **stop here.** Explain in Part VI how the organization meets the "facts-and-circumstances" test. The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization . . . . . ▶ ☐

18 **Private foundation.** If the organization did not check a box on line 13, 16a, 16b, 17a, or 17b, check this box and see instructions . . . . . ▶ ☐

Part III Support Schedule for Organizations Described in Section 509(a)(2)

(Complete only if you checked the box on line 10 of Part I or if the organization failed to qualify under Part II. If the organization fails to qualify under the tests listed below, please complete Part II.)

Section A. Public Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in) ▶	(a) 2017	(b) 2018	(c) 2019	(d) 2020	(e) 2021	(f) Total
1 Gifts, grants, contributions, and membership fees received. (Do not include any "unusual grants.") .						
2 Gross receipts from admissions, merchandise sold or services performed, or facilities furnished in any activity that is related to the organization's tax-exempt purpose						
3 Gross receipts from activities that are not an unrelated trade or business under section 513						
4 Tax revenues levied for the organization's benefit and either paid to or expended on its behalf . . .						
5 The value of services or facilities furnished by a governmental unit to the organization without charge						
6 **Total.** Add lines 1 through 5						
7a Amounts included on lines 1, 2, and 3 received from disqualified persons						
b Amounts included on lines 2 and 3 received from other than disqualified persons that exceed the greater of $5,000 or 1% of the amount on line 13 for the year.						
c Add lines 7a and 7b. .						
8 **Public support.** (Subtract line 7c from line 6.)						

Section B. Total Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in) ▶	(a) 2017	(b) 2018	(c) 2019	(d) 2020	(e) 2021	(f) Total
9 Amounts from line 6. . .						
10a Gross income from interest, dividends, payments received on securities loans, rents, royalties and income from similar sources . .						
b Unrelated business taxable income (less section 511 taxes) from businesses acquired after June 30, 1975.						
c Add lines 10a and 10b.						
11 Net income from unrelated business activities not included on line 10b, whether or not the business is regularly carried on.						
12 Other income. Do not include gain or loss from the sale of capital assets (Explain in Part VI.) . .						
13 **Total support.** (Add lines 9, 10c, 11, and 12.). .						

14 **First 5 years.** If the Form 990 is for the organization's first, second, third, fourth, or fifth tax year as a section 501(c)(3) organization, check this box and **stop here**. . . . . ▶☐

Section C. Computation of Public Support Percentage

15	Public support percentage for 2021 (line 8, column (f) divided by line 13, column (f))	15	
16	Public support percentage from 2020 Schedule A, Part III, line 15	16	

Section D. Computation of Investment Income Percentage

17	Investment income percentage for **2021** (line 10c, column (f) divided by line 13, column (f))	17	
18	Investment income percentage from **2020** Schedule A, Part III, line 17	18	

19a **33 1/3% support tests—2021.** If the organization did not check the box on line 14, and line 15 is more than 33 1/3%, and line 17 is not more than 33 1/3%, check this box and **stop here.** The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization . . . . . ▶☐

b **33 1/3% support tests—2020.** If the organization did not check a box on line 14 or line 19a, and line 16 is more than 33 1/3% and line 18 is not more than 33 1/3%, check this box and **stop here.** The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization . . . . ▶☐

20 **Private foundation.** If the organization did not check a box on line 14, 19a, or 19b, check this box and see instructions . . . . ▶☐

Part IV Supporting Organizations

(Complete only if you checked a box on line 12 of Part I. If you checked box 12a, of Part I, complete Sections A and B. If you checked box 12b, of Part I, complete Sections A and C. If you checked box 12c, of Part I, complete Sections A, D, and E. If you checked box 12d, of Part I, complete Sections A and D, and complete Part V.)

Section A. All Supporting Organizations

			Yes	No
1	Are all of the organization's supported organizations listed by name in the organization's governing documents? *If "No," describe in* ***Part VI*** *how the supported organizations are designated. If designated by class or purpose, describe the designation. If historic and continuing relationship, explain.*	1		
2	Did the organization have any supported organization that does not have an IRS determination of status under section 509(a)(1) or (2)? *If "Yes," explain in* ***Part VI*** *how the organization determined that the supported organization was described in section 509(a)(1) or (2).*	2		
3a	Did the organization have a supported organization described in section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6)? *If "Yes," answer lines 3b and 3c below.*	3a		
b	Did the organization confirm that each supported organization qualified under section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6) and satisfied the public support tests under section 509(a)(2)? *If "Yes," describe in* ***Part VI*** *when and how the organization made the determination.*	3b		
c	Did the organization ensure that all support to such organizations was used exclusively for section 170(c)(2)(B) purposes? *If "Yes," explain in* ***Part VI*** *what controls the organization put in place to ensure such use.*	3c		
4a	Was any supported organization not organized in the United States ("foreign supported organization")? *If "Yes" and if you checked box 12a or 12b in Part I, answer lines 4b and 4c below.*	4a		
b	Did the organization have ultimate control and discretion in deciding whether to make grants to the foreign supported organization? *If "Yes," describe in* ***Part VI*** *how the organization had such control and discretion despite being controlled or supervised by or in connection with its supported organizations.*	4b		
c	Did the organization support any foreign supported organization that does not have an IRS determination under sections 501(c)(3) and 509(a)(1) or (2)? *If "Yes," explain in* ***Part VI*** *what controls the organization used to ensure that all support to the foreign supported organization was used exclusively for section 170(c)(2)(B) purposes.*	4c		
5a	Did the organization add, substitute, or remove any supported organizations during the tax year? *If "Yes," answer lines 5b and 5c below (if applicable). Also, provide detail in* ***Part VI,*** *including (i) the names and EIN numbers of the supported organizations added, substituted, or removed; (ii) the reasons for each such action; (iii) the authority under the organization's organizing document authorizing such action; and (iv) how the action was accomplished (such as by amendment to the organizing document).*	5a		
b	**Type I or Type II only.** Was any added or substituted supported organization part of a class already designated in the organization's organizing document?	5b		
c	**Substitutions only.** Was the substitution the result of an event beyond the organization's control?	5c		
6	Did the organization provide support (whether in the form of grants or the provision of services or facilities) to anyone other than (i) its supported organizations, (ii) individuals that are part of the charitable class benefited by one or more of its supported organizations, or (iii) other supporting organizations that also support or benefit one or more of the filing organization's supported organizations? *If "Yes," provide detail in* ***Part VI.***	6		
7	Did the organization provide a grant, loan, compensation, or other similar payment to a substantial contributor (defined in section 4958(c)(3)(C)), a family member of a substantial contributor, or a 35% controlled entity with regard to a substantial contributor? *If "Yes," complete Part I of Schedule L (Form 990) .*	7		
8	Did the organization make a loan to a disqualified person (as defined in section 4958) not described on line 7? *If "Yes," complete Part I of Schedule L (Form 990).*	8		
9a	Was the organization controlled directly or indirectly at any time during the tax year by one or more disqualified persons, as defined in section 4946 (other than foundation managers and organizations described in section 509(a)(1) or (2))? *If "Yes," provide detail in* ***Part VI.***	9a		
b	Did one or more disqualified persons (as defined on line 9a) hold a controlling interest in any entity in which the supporting organization had an interest? *If "Yes," provide detail in* ***Part VI.***	9b		
c	Did a disqualified person (as defined on line 9a) have an ownership interest in, or derive any personal benefit from, assets in which the supporting organization also had an interest? *If "Yes," provide detail in* ***Part VI.***	9c		
10a	Was the organization subject to the excess business holdings rules of section 4943 because of section 4943(f) (regarding certain Type II supporting organizations, and all Type III non-functionally integrated supporting organizations)? *If "Yes," answer line 10b below.*	10a		
b	Did the organization have any excess business holdings in the tax year? *(Use Schedule C, Form 4720, to determine whether the organization had excess business holdings).*	10b		

Part IV Supporting Organizations (continued)

			Yes	No
11	Has the organization accepted a gift or contribution from any of the following persons?			
a	A person who directly or indirectly controls, either alone or together with persons described on lines 11b and 11c below, the governing body of a supported organization?	**11a**		
b	A family member of a person described on 11a above?	**11b**		
c	A 35% controlled entity of a person described on line 11a or 11b above? *If "Yes" to 11a, 11b, or 11c, provide detail in* ***Part VI****.*	**11c**		

Section B. Type I Supporting Organizations

			Yes	No
1	Did the officers, directors, trustees, or membership of one or more supported organizations have the power to regularly appoint or elect at least a majority of the organization's directors or trustees at all times during the tax year? *If "No," describe in* ***Part VI*** *how the supported organization(s) effectively operated, supervised, or controlled the organization's activities. If the organization had more than one supported organization, describe how the powers to appoint and/or remove directors or trustees were allocated among the supported organizations and what conditions or restrictions, if any, applied to such powers during the tax year.*	**1**		
2	Did the organization operate for the benefit of any supported organization other than the supported organization(s) that operated, supervised, or controlled the supporting organization? *If "Yes," explain in* ***Part VI*** *how providing such benefit carried out the purposes of the supported organization(s) that operated, supervised or controlled the supporting organization.*	**2**		

Section C. Type II Supporting Organizations

			Yes	No
1	Were a majority of the organization's directors or trustees during the tax year also a majority of the directors or trustees of each of the organization's supported organization(s)? *If "No," describe in* ***Part VI*** *how control or management of the supporting organization was vested in the same persons that controlled or managed the supported organization(s).*	**1**		

Section D. All Type III Supporting Organizations

			Yes	No
1	Did the organization provide to each of its supported organizations, by the last day of the fifth month of the organization's tax year, (i) a written notice describing the type and amount of support provided during the prior tax year, (ii) a copy of the Form 990 that was most recently filed as of the date of notification, and (iii) copies of the organization's governing documents in effect on the date of notification, to the extent not previously provided?	**1**		
2	Were any of the organization's officers, directors, or trustees either (i) appointed or elected by the supported organization(s) or (ii) serving on the governing body of a supported organization? *If "No," explain in* ***Part VI*** *how the organization maintained a close and continuous working relationship with the supported organization(s).*	**2**		
3	By reason of the relationship described in line 2 above, did the organization's supported organizations have a significant voice in the organization's investment policies and in directing the use of the organization's income or assets at all times during the tax year? *If "Yes," describe in* ***Part VI*** *the role the organization's supported organizations played in this regard.*	**3**		

Section E. Type III Functionally-Integrated Supporting Organizations

1 Check the box next to the method that the organization used to satisfy the Integral Part Test during the year **(see instructions)**:

- **a** ☐ The organization satisfied the Activities Test. Complete **line 2** below.
- **b** ☐ The organization is the parent of each of its supported organizations. Complete **line 3** below.
- **c** ☐ The organization supported a governmental entity. Describe in **Part VI** how you supported a government entity (see instructions)

2 Activities Test. **Answer lines 2a and 2b below.**

			Yes	No
a	Did substantially all of the organization's activities during the tax year directly further the exempt purposes of the supported organization(s) to which the organization was responsive? *If "Yes," then in* ***Part VI identify those supported organizations and explain*** *how these activities directly furthered their exempt purposes, how the organization was responsive to those supported organizations, and how the organization determined that these activities constituted substantially all of its activities.*	**2a**		
b	Did the activities described on line 2a, above constitute activities that, but for the organization's involvement, one or more of the organization's supported organization(s) would have been engaged in? *If "Yes," explain in* ***Part VI*** *the reasons for the organization's position that its supported organization(s) would have engaged in these activities but for the organization's involvement.*	**2b**		

3 Parent of Supported Organizations. **Answer lines 3a and 3b below.**

a	Did the organization have the power to regularly appoint or elect a majority of the officers, directors, or trustees of each of the supported organizations? *If "Yes" or "No", provide details in* ***Part VI.***	**3a**		
b	Did the organization exercise a substantial degree of direction over the policies, programs and activities of each of its supported organizations? *If "Yes," describe in* ***Part VI.*** *the role played by the organization in this regard.*	**3b**		

Part V Type III Non-Functionally Integrated 509(a)(3) Supporting Organizations

1 ☐ Check here if the organization satisfied the Integral Part Test as a qualifying trust on Nov. 20, 1970 *(explain in **Part VI**)*. **See instructions.** All other Type III non-functionally integrated supporting organizations must complete Sections A through E.

Section A - Adjusted Net Income

			(A) Prior Year	(B) Current Year (optional)
1	Net short-term capital gain	1		
2	Recoveries of prior-year distributions	2		
3	Other gross income (see instructions)	3		
4	Add lines 1 through 3	4		
5	Depreciation and depletion	5		
6	Portion of operating expenses paid or incurred for production or collection of gross income or for management, conservation, or maintenance of property held for production of income (see instructions)	6		
7	Other expenses (see instructions)	7		
8	**Adjusted Net Income** (subtract lines 5, 6 and 7 from line 4)	8		

Section B - Minimum Asset Amount

			(A) Prior Year	(B) Current Year (optional)
1	Aggregate fair market value of all non-exempt-use assets (see instructions for short tax year or assets held for part of year):	1		
a	Average monthly value of securities	1a		
b	Average monthly cash balances	1b		
c	Fair market value of other non-exempt-use assets	1c		
d	**Total** (add lines 1a, 1b, and 1c)	1d		
e	**Discount** claimed for blockage or other factors (*explain in detail in **Part VI***):			
2	Acquisition indebtedness applicable to non-exempt use assets	2		
3	Subtract line 2 from line 1d	3		
4	Cash deemed held for exempt use. Enter 0.015 of line 3 (for greater amount, see instructions).	4		
5	Net value of non-exempt-use assets (subtract line 4 from line 3)	5		
6	Multiply line 5 by 0.035	6		
7	Recoveries of prior-year distributions	7		
8	**Minimum Asset Amount** (add line 7 to line 6)	8		

Section C - Distributable Amount

			Current Year
1	Adjusted net income for prior year (from Section A, line 8, Column A)	1	
2	Enter 85% of line 1	2	
3	Minimum asset amount for prior year (from Section B, line 8, Column A)	3	
4	Enter greater of line 2 or line 3	4	
5	Income tax imposed in prior year	5	
6	**Distributable Amount.** Subtract line 5 from line 4, unless subject to emergency temporary reduction (see instructions)	6	

7 ☐ Check here if the current year is the organization's first as a non-functionally-integrated Type III supporting organization (see instructions)

Part V **Type III Non-Functionally Integrated 509(a)(3) Supporting Organizations** (continued)

Section D - Distributions		**Current Year**
1 Amounts paid to supported organizations to accomplish exempt purposes	**1**	
2 Amounts paid to perform activity that directly furthers exempt purposes of supported organizations, in excess of income from activity	**2**	
3 Administrative expenses paid to accomplish exempt purposes of supported organizations	**3**	
4 Amounts paid to acquire exempt-use assets	**4**	
5 Qualified set-aside amounts (*prior IRS approval required - provide details in* ***Part VI***)	**5**	
6 Other distributions (*describe in* ***Part VI***). See instructions	**6**	
7 **Total annual distributions.** Add lines 1 through 6.	**7**	
8 Distributions to attentive supported organizations to which the organization is responsive (*provide details in* ***Part VI***). See instructions	**8**	
9 Distributable amount for 2021 from Section C, line 6	**9**	
10 Line 8 amount divided by Line 9 amount	**10**	

Section E - Distribution Allocations (see instructions)	**(i) Excess Distributions**	**(ii) Underdistributions Pre-2021**	**(iii) Distributable Amount for 2021**
1 Distributable amount for 2021 from Section C, line 6			
2 Underdistributions, if any, for years prior to 2021 (reasonable cause required-- *explain in* ***Part VI***). See instructions.			
3 Excess distributions carryover, if any, to 2021:			
a From 2016.			
b From 2017.			
c From 2018.			
d From 2019.			
e From 2020.			
f **Total** of lines 3a through e			
g Applied to underdistributions of prior years			
h Applied to 2021 distributable amount			
i Carryover from 2016 not applied (see instructions)			
j Remainder. Subtract lines 3g, 3h, and 3i from line 3f.			
4 Distributions for 2021 from Section D, line 7: $			
a Applied to underdistributions of prior years			
b Applied to 2021 distributable amount			
c Remainder. Subtract lines 4a and 4b from line 4.			
5 Remaining underdistributions for years prior to 2021, if any. Subtract lines 3g and 4a from line 2. If the amount is greater than zero, *explain in* ***Part VI***. See instructions.			
6 Remaining underdistributions for 2021. Subtract lines 3h and 4b from line 1. If the amount is greater than zero, *explain in* ***Part VI***. See instructions.			
7 **Excess distributions carryover to 2022.** Add lines 3j and 4c.			
8 Breakdown of line 7:			
a Excess from 2017.			
b Excess from 2018.			
c Excess from 2019.			
d Excess from 2020.			
e Excess from 2021.			

Part VI **Supplemental Information.** Provide the explanations required by Part II, line 10; Part II, line 17a or 17b; Part III, line 12; Part IV, Section A, lines 1, 2, 3b, 3c, 4b, 4c, 5a, 6, 9a, 9b, 9c, 11a, 11b, and 11c; Part IV, Section B, lines 1 and 2; Part IV, Section C, line 1; Part IV, Section D, lines 2 and 3; Part IV, Section E, lines 1c, 2a, 2b, 3a and 3b; Part V, line 1; Part V, Section B, line 1e; Part V Section D, lines 5, 6, and 8; and Part V, Section E, lines 2, 5, and 6. Also complete this part for any additional information. (See instructions).

Facts And Circumstances Test

Return Reference	Explanation

Additional Data

Return to Form

Software ID:

Software Version:

SCHEDULE C (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Political Campaign and Lobbying Activities

For Organizations Exempt From Income Tax Under section 501(c) and section 527

▶**Complete if the organization is described below.** ▶**Attach to Form 990 or Form 990-EZ.**
▶**Go to *www.irs.gov/Form990* for instructions and the latest information.**

OMB No. 1545-0047

2021

Open to Public Inspection

If the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, Line 3, or Form 990-EZ, Part V, line 46 (Political Campaign Activities), then

- Section 501(c)(3) organizations: Complete Parts I-A and B. Do not complete Part I-C.
- Section 501(c) (other than section 501(c)(3)) organizations: Complete Parts I-A and C below. Do not complete Part I-B.
- Section 527 organizations: Complete Part I-A only.

If the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, Line 4, or Form 990-EZ, Part VI, line 47 (Lobbying Activities), then

- Section 501(c)(3) organizations that have filed Form 5768 (election under section 501(h)): Complete Part II-A. Do not complete Part II-B.
- Section 501(c)(3) organizations that have NOT filed Form 5768 (election under section 501(h)): Complete Part II-B. Do not complete Part II-A.

If the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, Line 5 (Proxy Tax) (see separate instructions) or Form 990-EZ, Part V, line 35c (Proxy Tax) (see separate instructions), then

- Section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6) organizations: Complete Part III.

Name of the organization	**Employer identification number**
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE	52-1744337

Part I-A Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c) or is a section 527 organization.

1 Provide a description of the organization's direct and indirect political campaign activities in Part IV. See instructions for definition of "political campaign activities."

2 Political campaign activity expenditures. See instructions ▶ $

3 Volunteer hours for political campaign activities. See instructions

Part I-B Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c)(3).

1 Enter the amount of any excise tax incurred by the organization under section 4955 $

2 Enter the amount of any excise tax incurred by organization managers under section 4955 $

3 If the organization incurred a section 4955 tax, did it file Form 4720 for this year? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4a Was a correction made? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b If "Yes," describe in Part IV.

Part I-C Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c), except section 501(c)(3).

1 Enter the amount directly expended by the filing organization for section 527 exempt function activities $

2 Enter the amount of the filing organization's funds contributed to other organizations for section 527 exempt function activities ▶ $

3 Total exempt function expenditures. Add lines 1 and 2. Enter here and on Form 1120-POL, line 17b ▶ $

4 Did the filing organization file **Form 1120-POL** for this year? ☐ Yes ☐ No

5 Enter the names, addresses and employer identification number (EIN) of all section 527 political organizations to which the filing organization made payments. For each organization listed, enter the amount paid from the filing organization's funds. Also enter the amount of political contributions received that were promptly and directly delivered to a separate political organization, such as a separate segregated fund or a political action committee (PAC). If additional space is needed, provide information in Part IV.

	(a) Name	**(b)** Address	**(c)** EIN	**(d)** Amount paid from filing organization's funds. If none, enter -0-.	**(e)** Amount of political contributions received and promptly and directly delivered to a separate political organization. If none, enter -0-.
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					

Part II-A **Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c)(3) and filed Form 5768 (election under section 501(h)).**

A Check ▶ ☐ if the filing organization belongs to an affiliated group (and list in Part IV each affiliated group member's name, address, EIN, expenses, and share of excess lobbying expenditures).

B Check ▶ ☐ if the filing organization checked box A and "limited control" provisions apply.

Limits on Lobbying Expenditures (The term "expenditures" means amounts paid or incurred.)	(a) Filing organization's totals	(b) Affiliated group totals
1a Total lobbying expenditures to influence public opinion (grass roots lobbying)	10,821	
b Total lobbying expenditures to influence a legislative body (direct lobbying)	377,342	
c Total lobbying expenditures (add lines 1a and 1b)	388,163	
d Other exempt purpose expenditures	32,845,626	
e Total exempt purpose expenditures (add lines 1c and 1d)	33,233,789	
f Lobbying nontaxable amount. Enter the amount from the following table in both columns.	1,000,000	

If the amount on line 1e, column (a) or (b) is:	The lobbying nontaxable amount is:
Not over $500,000	20% of the amount on line 1e.
Over $500,000 but not over $1,000,000	$100,000 plus 15% of the excess over $500,000.
Over $1,000,000 but not over $1,500,000	$175,000 plus 10% of the excess over $1,000,000.
Over $1,500,000 but not over $17,000,000	$225,000 plus 5% of the excess over $1,500,000.
Over $17,000,000	$1,000,000.

g Grassroots nontaxable amount (enter 25% of line 1f)	250,000	
h Subtract line 1g from line 1a. If zero or less, enter -0-.	0	
i Subtract line 1f from line 1c. If zero or less, enter -0-.	0	

j If there is an amount other than zero on either line 1h or line 1i, did the organization file Form 4720 reporting section 4911 tax for this year? ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

4-Year Averaging Period Under Section 501(h)
(Some organizations that made a section 501(h) election do not have to complete all of the five columns below. See the separate instructions for lines 2a through 2f.)

Lobbying Expenditures During 4-Year Averaging Period

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in)	(a) 2018	(b) 2019	(c) 2020	(d) 2021	(e) Total
2a Lobbying nontaxable amount	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
b Lobbying ceiling amount (150% of line 2a, column(e))					6,000,000
c Total lobbying expenditures	323,049	309,769	350,878	388,163	1,371,859
d Grassroots nontaxable amount	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	1,000,000
e Grassroots ceiling amount (150% of line 2d, column (e))					1,500,000
f Grassroots lobbying expenditures	33,382	42,160	26,028	10,821	112,391

Part II-B Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c)(3) and has NOT filed Form 5768 (election under section 501(h)).

For each "Yes" response on lines 1a through 1i below, provide in Part IV a detailed description of the lobbying activity.		(a) Yes	(a) No	(b) Amount
1	During the year, did the filing organization attempt to influence foreign, national, state or local legislation, including any attempt to influence public opinion on a legislative matter or referendum, through the use of:			
a	Volunteers?			
b	Paid staff or management (include compensation in expenses reported on lines 1c through 1i)?			
c	Media advertisements?			
d	Mailings to members, legislators, or the public?			
e	Publications, or published or broadcast statements?			
f	Grants to other organizations for lobbying purposes?			
g	Direct contact with legislators, their staffs, government officials, or a legislative body?			
h	Rallies, demonstrations, seminars, conventions, speeches, lectures, or any similar means?			
i	Other activities?			
j	Total. Add lines 1c through 1i			
2a	Did the activities in line 1 cause the organization to be not described in section 501(c)(3)?			
b	If "Yes," enter the amount of any tax incurred under section 4912			
c	If "Yes," enter the amount of any tax incurred by organization managers under section 4912			
d	If the filing organization incurred a section 4912 tax, did it file Form 4720 for this year?			

Part III-A Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c)(4), section 501(c)(5), or section 501(c)(6).

			Yes	No
1	Were substantially all (90% or more) dues received nondeductible by members?	1		
2	Did the organization make only in-house lobbying expenditures of $2,000 or less?	2		
3	Did the organization agree to carry over lobbying and political expenditures from the prior year?	3		

Part III-B Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c)(4), section 501(c)(5), or section 501(c)(6) and if either (a) BOTH Part III-A, lines 1 and 2, are answered "No" OR (b) Part III-A, line 3, is answered "Yes."

1	Dues, assessments and similar amounts from members	1	
2	Section 162(e) nondeductible lobbying and political expenditures **(do not include amounts of political expenses for which the section 527(f) tax was paid).**		
a	Current year	2a	
b	Carryover from last year	2b	
c	Total	2c	
3	Aggregate amount reported in section 6033(e)(1)(A) notices of nondeductible section 162(e) dues	3	
4	If notices were sent and the amount on line 2c exceeds the amount on line 3, what portion of the excess does the organization agree to carryover to the reasonable estimate of nondeductible lobbying and political expenditure next year?	4	
5	Taxable amount of lobbying and political expenditures. See Instructions	5	

Part IV Supplemental Information

Provide the descriptions required for Part I-A, line 1; Part I-B, line 4; Part I-C, line 5; Part II-A (affiliated group list); Part II-A, lines 1 and 2 (see instructions), and Part II-B, line 1. Also, complete this part for any additional information.

Return Reference	Explanation	

Additional Data

Return to Form

Software ID:

Software Version:

SCHEDULE D (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Supplemental Financial Statements

▶ **Complete if the organization answered "Yes," on Form 990, Part IV, line 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11a, 11b, 11c, 11d, 11e, 11f, 12a, or 12b.**
▶ **Attach to Form 990.**
▶ **Go to *www.irs.gov/Form990* for instructions and the latest information.**

OMB No. 1545-0047

2021

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I Organizations Maintaining Donor Advised Funds or Other Similar Funds or Accounts.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 6.

		(a) Donor advised funds	(b) Funds and other accounts
1	Total number at end of year		
2	Aggregate value of contributions to (during year)		
3	Aggregate value of grants from (during year)		
4	Aggregate value at end of year		

5 Did the organization inform all donors and donor advisors in writing that the assets held in donor advised funds are the organization's property, subject to the organization's exclusive legal control? ☐ Yes ☐ No

6 Did the organization inform all grantees, donors, and donor advisors in writing that grant funds can be used only for charitable purposes and not for the benefit of the donor or donor advisor, or for any other purpose conferring impermissible private benefit? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Part II Conservation Easements.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 7.

1 Purpose(s) of conservation easements held by the organization (check all that apply).

☐ Preservation of land for public use (e.g., recreation or education)
☐ Preservation of an historically important land area
☐ Protection of natural habitat
☐ Preservation of a certified historic structure
☐ Preservation of open space

2 Complete lines 2a through 2d if the organization held a qualified conservation contribution in the form of a conservation easement on the last day of the tax year.

		Held at the End of the Year
a	Total number of conservation easements	2a	
b	Total acreage restricted by conservation easements	2b	
c	Number of conservation easements on a certified historic structure included in (a)	2c	
d	Number of conservation easements included in (c) acquired after 7/25/06, and not on a historic structure listed in the National Register	2d	

3 Number of conservation easements modified, transferred, released, extinguished, or terminated by the organization during the tax year ▶ _____

4 Number of states where property subject to conservation easement is located ▶ _____

5 Does the organization have a written policy regarding the periodic monitoring, inspection, handling of violations, and enforcement of the conservation easements it holds? ☐ Yes ☐ No

6 Staff and volunteer hours devoted to monitoring, inspecting, handling of violations, and enforcing conservation easements during the year ▶ _____

7 Amount of expenses incurred in monitoring, inspecting, handling of violations, and enforcing conservation easements during the year ▶ $ _____

8 Does each conservation easement reported on line 2(d) above satisfy the requirements of section 170(h)(4)(B)(i) and section 170(h)(4)(B)(ii)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

9 In Part XIII, describe how the organization reports conservation easements in its revenue and expense statement, and balance sheet, and include, if applicable, the text of the footnote to the organization's financial statements that describes the organization's accounting for conservation easements.

Part III Organizations Maintaining Collections of Art, Historical Treasures, or Other Similar Assets.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 8.

1a If the organization elected, as permitted under FASB ASC 958, not to report in its revenue statement and balance sheet works of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets held for public exhibition, education, or research in furtherance of public service, provide, in Part XIII, the text of the footnote to its financial statements that describes these items.

b If the organization elected, as permitted under FASB ASC 958, to report in its revenue statement and balance sheet works of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets held for public exhibition, education, or research in furtherance of public service, provide the following amounts relating to these items:

(i) Revenue included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 1 ▶ $ _____

(ii) Assets included in Form 990, Part X ▶ $ _____

2 If the organization received or held works of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets for financial gain, provide the following amounts required to be reported under FASB ASC 958 relating to these items:

a Revenue included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 1 ▶ $ _____

b Assets included in Form 990, Part X ▶ $ _____

Part III Organizations Maintaining Collections of Art, Historical Treasures, or Other Similar Assets *(continued)*

3 Using the organization's acquisition, accession, and other records, check any of the following that are a significant use of its collection items (check all that apply):

- **a** ☐ Public exhibition
- **b** ☐ Scholarly research
- **c** ☐ Preservation for future generations
- **d** ☐ Loan or exchange programs
- **e** ☐ Other .....

4 Provide a description of the organization's collections and explain how they further the organization's exempt purpose in Part XIII.

5 During the year, did the organization solicit or receive donations of art, historical treasures or other similar assets to be sold to raise funds rather than to be maintained as part of the organization's collection?. . . ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

Part IV Escrow and Custodial Arrangements.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 9, or reported an amount on Form 990, Part X, line 21.

1a Is the organization an agent, trustee, custodian or other intermediary for contributions or other assets not included on Form 990, Part X? . . . . . ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

b If "Yes," explain the arrangement in Part XIII and complete the following table:

		Amount
c	Beginning balance	**1c**
d	Additions during the year	**1d**
e	Distributions during the year	**1e**
f	Ending balance	**1f**

2a Did the organization include an amount on Form 990, Part X, line 21, for escrow or custodial account liability? . . . ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

b If "Yes," explain the arrangement in Part XIII. Check here if the explanation has been provided in Part XIII . . . . ☐

Part V Endowment Funds.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 10.

	(a) Current year	(b) Prior year	(c) Two years back	(d) Three years back	(e) Four years back
1a Beginning of year balance	136,098	116,692	115,680	111,025	105,874
b Contributions . . .					
c Net investment earnings, gains, and losses	-16,902	21,151	3,484	7,282	7,496
d Grants or scholarships . . .					
e Other expenditures for facilities and programs . . .	3,597	1,745	2,472	2,627	2,345
f Administrative expenses					
g End of year balance	115,599	136,098	116,692	115,680	111,025

2 Provide the estimated percentage of the current year end balance (line 1g, column (a)) held as:

- **a** Board designated or quasi-endowment ▶ 0 %
- **b** Permanent endowment ▶ 100.000 %
- **c** Term endowment ▶ 0 %

The percentages on lines 2a, 2b, and 2c should equal 100%.

3a Are there endowment funds not in the possession of the organization that are held and administered for the organization by:

	Yes	No
(i) Unrelated organizations . . . . . **3a(i)**	Yes	
(ii) Related organizations . . . . . **3a(ii)**		No

b If "Yes" on 3a(ii), are the related organizations listed as required on Schedule R? **3b**

4 Describe in Part XIII the intended uses of the organization's endowment funds.

Part VI Land, Buildings, and Equipment.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 11a. See Form 990, Part X, line 10.

Description of property	(a) Cost or other basis (investment)	(b) Cost or other basis (other)	(c) Accumulated depreciation	(d) Book value
1a Land				
b Buildings				
c Leasehold improvements		5,080,678	2,894,352	2,186,326
d Equipment		3,419,442	2,504,069	915,373
e Other		18,010		18,010
Total. Add lines 1a through 1e. *(Column (d) must equal Form 990, Part X, column (B), line 10(c).)* . . ▶				3,119,709

Part VII Investments - Other Securities.
Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 11b.See Form 990, Part X, line 12.

(a) Description of security or category (including name of security)	(b) Book value	(c) Method of valuation: Cost or end-of-year market value
(1) Financial derivatives		
(2) Closely-held equity interests		
(3)Other		
(A)		
(B)		
(C)		
(D)		
(E)		
(F)		
(G)		
(H)		
Total. *(Column (b) must equal Form 990, Part X, col. (B) line 12.)* ▶		

Part VIII Investments - Program Related.
Complete if the organization answered 'Yes' on Form 990, Part IV, line 11c. See Form 990, Part X, line 13.

(a) Description of investment	(b) Book value	(c) Method of valuation: Cost or end-of-year market value
(1)		
(2)		
(3)		
(4)		
(5)		
(6)		
(7)		
(8)		
(9)		
Total. *(Column (b) must equal Form 990, Part X, col.(B) line 13.)* ▶		

Part IX Other Assets.
Complete if the organization answered 'Yes' on Form 990, Part IV, line 11d. See Form 990, Part X, line 15.

(a) Description	(b) Book value
(1)	
(2)	
(3)	
(4)	
(5)	
(6)	
(7)	
(8)	
(9)	
Total. *(Column (b) must equal Form 990, Part X, col.(B) line 15.)* ▶	

Part X Other Liabilities.
Complete if the organization answered 'Yes' on Form 990, Part IV, line 11e or 11f.
See Form 990, Part X, line 25.

1. (a) Description of liability	(b) Book value
(1) Federal income taxes	
(4)	
(5)	
(6)	
(7)	
(8)	
(9)	
Total. *(Column (b) must equal Form 990, Part X, col.(B) line 25.)* ▶	3,078,593

2. Liability for uncertain tax positions. In Part XIII, provide the text of the footnote to the organization's financial statements that reports the organization's liability for uncertain tax positions under FIN 48 (ASC 740). Check here if the text of the footnote has been provided in Part XIII ☑

Part XI Reconciliation of Revenue per Audited Financial Statements With Revenue per Return.

Complete if the organization answered 'Yes' on Form 990, Part IV, line 12a.

1	Total revenue, gains, and other support per audited financial statements			1	28,582,241
2	Amounts included on line 1 but not on Form 990, Part VIII, line 12:				
a	Net unrealized gains (losses) on investments	2a	-10,495,356		
b	Donated services and use of facilities	2b	92,357		
c	Recoveries of prior year grants	2c			
d	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	2d			
e	Add lines **2a** through **2d**			2e	-10,402,999
3	Subtract line **2e** from line **1**			3	38,985,240
4	Amounts included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 12, but not on line **1**:				
a	Investment expenses not included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 7b	4a			
b	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	4b	-769		
c	Add lines **4a** and **4b**			4c	-769
5	Total revenue. Add lines **3** and **4c.** (This must equal Form 990, Part I, line 12.)			5	38,984,471

Part XII Reconciliation of Expenses per Audited Financial Statements With Expenses per Return.

Complete if the organization answered 'Yes' on Form 990, Part IV, line 12a.

1	Total expenses and losses per audited financial statements			1	33,326,915
2	Amounts included on line 1 but not on Form 990, Part IX, line 25:				
a	Donated services and use of facilities	2a	92,357		
b	Prior year adjustments	2b			
c	Other losses	2c			
d	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	2d	769		
e	Add lines **2a** through **2d**			2e	93,126
3	Subtract line **2e** from line **1**			3	33,233,789
4	Amounts included on Form 990, Part IX, line 25, but not on line **1:**				
a	Investment expenses not included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 7b	4a			
b	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	4b			
c	Add lines **4a** and **4b**			4c	0
5	Total expenses. Add lines **3** and **4c.** (This must equal Form 990, Part I, line 18.)			5	33,233,789

Part XIII Supplemental Information

Provide the descriptions required for Part II, lines 3, 5, and 9; Part III, lines 1a and 4; Part IV, lines 1b and 2b; Part V, line 4; Part X, line 2; Part XI, lines 2d and 4b; and Part XII, lines 2d and 4b. Also complete this part to provide any additional information.

Return Reference	Explanation
PART V, LINE 4:	ENDOWMENT FUNDS ARE MAINTAINED TO PROVIDE A PERMANENT SOURCE OF INCOME TO SUPPORT THE INSTITUTE'S OVERALL MISSION. ENDOWMENT ASSETS ARE HELD IN PERPETUITY AS DONOR-RESTRICTED GIFTS, WHILE INCOME GENERATED BY THE ENDOWMENTS IS UTILIZED BY THE INSTITUTE FOR ITS GENERAL CHARITABLE PURPOSE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TERMS OF THE GIFT INSTRUMENT.
PART X, LINE 2:	MANAGEMENT HAS DETERMINED THERE ARE NO UNCERTAIN TAX POSITIONS THAT ARE MATERIAL TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2022 AND 2021. THE INSTITUTE RECOGNIZES INTEREST EXPENSE AND PENALTIES ON INCOME TAXES RELATED TO UNCERTAIN TAX POSITIONS IN MANAGEMENT EXPENSES IN THE STATEMENTS OF ACTIVITIES AND CHANGE IN NET ASSETS. THERE IS NO PROVISION IN THESE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR PENALTIES AND INTEREST RELATED TO INCOME TAXES ON UNCERTAIN TAX POSITIONS FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2022 AND 2021. TAX YEARS PRIOR TO 2018 ARE NO LONGER SUBJECT TO EXAMINATION BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE ("IRS") OR THE TAX JURISDICTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.
PART XI, LINE 4B - OTHER ADJUSTMENTS:	LOSS ON DISPOSAL OF FIXED ASSETS -769.
PART XII, LINE 2D - OTHER ADJUSTMENTS:	LOSS ON DISPOSAL OF FIXED ASSETS 769.

Additional Data

Return to Form

Software ID:

Software Version:

SCHEDULE F (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Statement of Activities Outside the United States

▶ **Complete if the organization answered "Yes" to Form 990, Part IV, line 14b, 15, or 16.**

▶ **Attach to Form 990.**

▶ **Go to *www.irs.gov/Form990* for instructions and the latest information.**

OMB No. 1545-0047

2021

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I **General Information on Activities Outside the United States.** Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 14b.

1 **For grantmakers.** Does the organization maintain records to substantiate the amount of its grants and other assistance, the grantees' eligibility for the grants or assistance, and the selection criteria used to award the grants or assistance? . . . . . ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

2 **For grantmakers.** Describe in Part V the organization's procedures for monitoring the use of its grants and other assistance outside the United States.

3 Activites per Region. (The following Part I, line 3 table can be duplicated if additional space is needed.)

	(a) Region	**(b)** Number of offices in the region	**(c)** Number of employees, agents, and independent contractors in the region	**(d)** Activities conducted in region (by type) (such as, fundraising, program services, investments, grants to recipients located in the region)	**(e)** If activity listed in (d) is a program service, describe specific type of service(s) in the region	**(f)** Total expenditures for and investments in the region
(1)	CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	0	0	INVESTMENTS		3,667,641
(2)						
(3)						
(4)						
(5)						
(6)						
(7)						
(8)						
(9)						
(10)						
(11)						
(12)						
(13)						
(14)						
(15)						
(16)						
(17)						
3a	Sub-total	0	0			3,667,641
b	Total from continuation sheets to Part I . . .	0	0			0
c	**Totals** (add lines 3a and 3b)	0	0			3,667,641

Part II **Grants and Other Assistance to Organizations or Entities Outside the United States.** Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 15, for any recipient who received more than $5,000. Part II can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

1	**(a)** Name of organization	**(b)** IRS code section and EIN (if applicable)	**(c)** Region	**(d)** Purpose of grant	**(e)** Amount of cash grant	**(f)** Manner of cash disbursement	**(g)** Amount of noncash assistance	**(h)** Description of noncash assistance	**(i)** Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)
(1)									
(2)									
(3)									
(4)									
(5)									
(6)									
(7)									
(8)									
(9)									
(10)									
(11)									
(12)									
(13)									
(14)									
(15)									
(16)									

2 Enter total number of recipient organizations listed above that are recognized as charities by the foreign country, recognized as tax-exempt by the IRS, or for which the grantee or counsel has provided a section 501(c)(3) equivalency letter . . . . . ▶

3 Enter total number of other organizations or entities . . . . . ▶

Part III **Grants and Other Assistance to Individuals Outside the United States.** Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 16. Part III can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

	(a) Type of grant or assistance	**(b)** Region	**(c)** Number of recipients	**(d)** Amount of cash grant	**(e)** Manner of cash disbursement	**(f)** Amount of noncash assistance	**(g)** Description of noncash assistance	**(h)** Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)
(1)								
(2)								
(3)								
(4)								
(5)								
(6)								
(7)								
(8)								
(9)								
(10)								
(11)								
(12)								
(13)								
(14)								
(15)								
(16)								
(17)								
(18)								

Part IV Foreign Forms

1	Was the organization a U.S. transferor of property to a foreign corporation during the tax year? *If "Yes," the organization may be required to file Form 926, Return by a U.S. Transferor of Property to a Foreign Corporation (see Instructions for Form 926)*	☐ Yes	☑ No
2	Did the organization have an interest in a foreign trust during the tax year? *If "Yes," the organization may be required to separately file Form 3520, Annual Return to Report Transactions with Foreign Trusts and Receipt of Certain Foreign Gifts, and/or Form 3520-A, Annual Information Return of Foreign Trust With a U.S. Owner (see Instructions for Forms 3520 and 3520-A; don't file with Form 990)*	☐ Yes	☑ No
3	Did the organization have an ownership interest in a foreign corporation during the tax year? *If "Yes," the organization may be required to file Form 5471, Information Return of U.S. Persons with Respect to Certain Foreign Corporations. (see Instructions for Form 5471)*	☐ Yes	☑ No
4	Was the organization a direct or indirect shareholder of a passive foreign investment company or a qualified electing fund during the tax year? *If "Yes," the organization may be required to file Form 8621, Information Return by a Shareholder of a Passive Foreign Investment Company or Qualified Electing Fund. (see Instructions for Form 8621)* .	☐ Yes	☑ No
5	Did the organization have an ownership interest in a foreign partnership during the tax year? *If "Yes," the organization may be required to file Form 8865, Return of U.S. Persons with Respect to Certain Foreign Partnerships (see Instructions for Form 8865)*	☐ Yes	☑ No
6	Did the organization have any operations in or related to any boycotting countries during the tax year? *If "Yes," the organization may be required to separately file Form 5713, International Boycott Report (see Instructions for Form 5713; don't file with Form 990).*	☐ Yes	☑ No

Part V **Supplemental Information**

Provide the information required by Part I, line 2 (monitoring of funds); Part I, line 3, column (f) (accounting method; amounts of investments vs. expenditures per region); Part II, line 1 (accounting method); Part III (accounting method); and Part III, column (c) (estimated number of recipients), as applicable. Also complete this part to provide any additional information. See instructions.

ReturnReference	Explanation
PART III ACCOUNTING METHOD:	

Additional Data

Software ID:

Software Version:

Note: To capture the full content of this document, please select landscape mode (11" x 8.5") when printing.

Schedule I (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Grants and Other Assistance to Organizations, Governments and Individuals in the United States

Complete if the organization answered "Yes," on Form 990, Part IV, line 21 or 22.

▶ **Attach to Form 990.**

▶ **Go to *www.irs.gov/Form990* for the latest information.**

OMB No. 1545-0047

2021

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I General Information on Grants and Assistance

1 Does the organization maintain records to substantiate the amount of the grants or assistance, the grantees' eligibility for the grants or assistance, and the selection criteria used to award the grants or assistance? . . . . . ☑ Yes ☐ No

2 Describe in Part IV the organization's procedures for monitoring the use of grant funds in the United States.

Part II Grants and Other Assistance to Domestic Organizations and Domestic Governments.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 21, for any recipient that received more than $5,000. Part II can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

(a) Name and address of organization or government	(b) EIN	(c) IRC section (if applicable)	(d) Amount of cash grant	(e) Amount of non-cash assistance	(f) Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)	(g) Description of noncash assistance	(h) Purpose of grant or assistance
(1) STATE POLICY NETWORK 1655 NORTH FORT MYER DRIVE 360 ARLINGTON,VA 22209	57-0952531	501(C)(3)	20,000	0	FMV		2022 SPN CONFERENCE SPONSORSHIP
(2) AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL (ALEC) 2900 CRYSTAL DRIVE 6TH FLOOR ARLINGTON,VA 22202	52-0140979	501(C)(3)	34,000	0	FMV		2021 & 2022 MEMBERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS
(3) SISTA AFYA COMMUNITY MENTAL WELLNESS 503 E 61ST STREET CHICAGO,IL 60637	81-5443360		8,000	0	FMV		CASH PRIZE GIVEN TO THE 1ST PLACE AND PUBLIC VOTE 2021 SOUTH SIDE PITCH FINALIST.
(4) PIGGYBACK NETWORK 10357 S LEAVITT CHICAGO,IL 60643	85-3346285		7,000	0	FMV		CASH PRIZE GIVEN TO THE 2ND PLACE 2021 SOUTH SIDE PITCH FINALIST

2 Enter total number of section 501(c)(3) and government organizations listed in the line 1 table . . . . . ▶ 2

3 Enter total number of other organizations listed in the line 1 table . . . . . ▶ 2

Part III **Grants and Other Assistance to Domestic Individuals.** Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 22. Part III can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

	(a) Type of grant or assistance	**(b)** Number of recipients	**(c)** Amount of cash grant	**(d)** Amount of noncash assistance	**(e)** Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)	**(f)** Description of noncash assistance
(1)						
(2)						
(3)						
(4)						
(5)						
(6)						
(7)						

Part IV **Supplemental Information.** Provide the information required in Part I, line 2; Part III, column (b); and any other additional information.

Return Reference	Explanation
PART I, LINE 2:	THE GRANTS DESCRIBED ABOVE ARE CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROVIDE OUTREACH AND TO EDUCATE ON THOSE ISSUES THAT THE ORGANIZATION LITIGATES. SOUTH SIDE PITCH FINALISTS ARE SELECTED THROUGH A COMPETITIVE PROCESS, AND GRANT AMOUNTS ARE FOR GENERAL OPERATIONS.

Additional Data

Return to Form

Software ID:

Software Version:

Schedule J (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Compensation Information

For certain Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, and Highest Compensated Employees

▶ **Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 23.**
▶ **Attach to Form 990.**
▶ **Go to *www.irs.gov/Form990* for instructions and the latest information.**

OMB No. 1545-0047

2021

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I Questions Regarding Compensation

			Yes	No
1a	Check the appropiate box(es) if the organization provided any of the following to or for a person listed on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a. Complete Part III to provide any relevant information regarding these items.			
	☐ First-class or charter travel	☐ Housing allowance or residence for personal use		
	☐ Travel for companions	☐ Payments for business use of personal residence		
	☐ Tax idemnification and gross-up payments	☐ Health or social club dues or initiation fees		
	☐ Discretionary spending account	☐ Personal services (e.g., maid, chauffeur, chef)		
b	If any of the boxes on Line 1a are checked, did the organization follow a written policy regarding payment or reimbursement or provision of all of the expenses described above? If "No," complete Part III to explain	**1b**		
2	Did the organization require substantiation prior to reimbursing or allowing expenses incurred by all directors, trustees, officers, including the CEO/Executive Director, regarding the items checked on Line 1a?	**2**		
3	Indicate which, if any, of the following the filing organization used to establish the compensation of the organization's CEO/Executive Director. Check all that apply. Do not check any boxes for methods used by a related organization to establish compensation of the CEO/Executive Director, but explain in Part III.			
	☑ Compensation committee	☐ Written employment contract		
	☑ Independent compensation consultant	☑ Compensation survey or study		
	☑ Form 990 of other organizations	☑ Approval by the board or compensation committee		
4	During the year, did any person listed on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, with respect to the filing organization or a related organization:			
a	Receive a severance payment or change-of-control payment?	**4a**		No
b	Participate in, or receive payment from, a supplemental nonqualified retirement plan?	**4b**		No
c	Participate in, or receive payment from, an equity-based compensation arrangement?	**4c**		No
	If "Yes" to any of lines 4a-c, list the persons and provide the applicable amounts for each item in Part III.			
	Only 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), and 501(c)(29) organizations must complete lines 5-9.			
5	For persons listed on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, did the organization pay or accrue any compensation contingent on the revenues of:			
a	The organization?	**5a**		No
b	Any related organization?	**5b**		No
	If "Yes," on line 5a or 5b, describe in Part III.			
6	For persons listed on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, did the organization pay or accrue any compensation contingent on the net earnings of:			
a	The organization?	**6a**		No
b	Any related organization?	**6b**		No
	If "Yes," on line 6a or 6b, describe in Part III.			
7	For persons listed on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, did the organization provide any nonfixed payments not described in lines 5 and 6? If "Yes," describe in Part III	**7**	Yes	
8	Were any amounts reported on Form 990, Part VII, paid or accured pursuant to a contract that was subject to the initial contract exception described in Regulations section 53.4958-4(a)(3)? If "Yes," describe in Part III	**8**		No
9	If "Yes" on line 8, did the organization also follow the rebuttable presumption procedure described in Regulations section 53.4958-6(c)?	**9**		

Part II **Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, and Highest Compensated Employees.** Use duplicate copies if additional space is needed.

For each individual whose compensation must be reported on Schedule J, report compensation from the organization on row (i) and from related organizations, described in the instructions, on row (ii). Do not list any individuals that are not listed on Form 990, Part VII.

Note. The sum of columns (B)(i)-(iii) for each listed individual must equal the total amount of Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, applicable column (D) and (E) amounts for that individual.

(A) Name and Title		**(B)** Breakdown of W-2, 1099-MISC compensation, and/or 1099-NEC			**(C)** Retirement and other deferred compensation	**(D)** Nontaxable benefits	**(E)** Total of columns (B)(i)-(D)	**(F)** Compensation in column (B) reported as deferred on prior Form 990
		(i) Base compensation	**(ii)** Bonus & incentive compensation	**(iii)** Other reportable compensation				
1SCOTT G BULLOCK PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL	**(i)**	495,726	80,000	134	35,750	36	611,646	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2DANA BERLINER SENIOR VP AND LITIGATION DIRECTOR	**(i)**	434,221	70,000	72	39,900	1,541	545,734	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3DANIEL KNEPPER MANAGING VP-CFO/SECRETARY	**(i)**	365,554	55,000	47	39,900	1,799	462,300	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4JOHN KRAMER VP FOR COMMUNICATIONS	**(i)**	335,251	40,000	134	39,900	7,743	423,028	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5DEBORAH SIMPSON CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER	**(i)**	323,222	0	129	39,900	2,786	366,037	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6ROBERT GALL MANAGING VP AND SENIOR ATTORNEY	**(i)**	272,969	35,000	47	39,183	15,518	362,717	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7ROBERT MCNAMARA SENIOR ATTORNEY	**(i)**	273,591	23,500	34	38,500	12,004	347,629	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8BETH STEVENS VP FOR DEVELOPMENT	**(i)**	273,509	22,000	78	38,992	3,286	337,865	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9JEFFREY ROWES SENIOR ATTORNEY	**(i)**	215,668	22,000	78	35,602	23,942	297,290	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10MELANIE HILDRETH VP FOR EXTERNAL RELATIONS (UNTIL JAN	**(i)**	217,209	22,000	34	34,554	13,036	286,833	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11ROBERT JOHNSON SENIOR ATTORNEY	**(i)**	225,309	7,000	31	27,257	5,036	264,633	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part III Supplemental Information

Provide the information, explanation, or descriptions required for Part I, lines 1a, 1b, 3, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b, 7, and 8, and for Part II. Also complete this part for any additional information.

Return Reference	Explanation
PART I, LINE 7	THE COMPENSATION COMMITTEE DETERMINES, ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, THE BONUSES TO BE AWARDED TO SIX SENIOR IJ EMPLOYEES: (I) PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL, (II) SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR LITIGATION, (III) CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER, (IV) MANAGING VP AND SENIOR ATTORNEY, (V) VICE PRESIDENT FOR COMMUNICATIONS, AND (VI) THE MANAGING VP-CFO/SECRETARY AND TREASURER. FOR ALL OTHERS, BONUSES ARE DETERMINED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE INSTITUTE ON AN ANNUAL BASIS. ALL BONUSES ARE BASED ON A BOARD APPROVED BUDGET.

Additional Data

Return to Form

Software ID:

Software Version:

SCHEDULE M (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Noncash Contributions

▶**Complete if the organizations answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, lines 29 or 30.**
▶ **Attach to Form 990.**
▶**Go to *www.irs.gov/Form990* for the latest information.**

OMB No. 1545-0047

2021

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I Types of Property

	(a) Check if applicable	(b) Number of contributions or items contributed	(c) Noncash contribution amounts reported on Form 990, Part VIII, line 1g	(d) Method of determining noncash contribution amounts
1 Art—Works of art				
2 Art—Historical treasures				
3 Art—Fractional interests				
4 Books and publications				
5 Clothing and household goods				
6 Cars and other vehicles	X	4	1,261	FMV
7 Boats and planes				
8 Intellectual property				
9 Securities—Publicly traded	X	83	2,353,534	FMV
10 Securities—Closely held stock				
11 Securities—Partnership, LLC, or trust interests				
12 Securities—Miscellaneous				
13 Qualified conservation contribution—Historic structures				
14 Qualified conservation contribution—Other				
15 Real estate—Residential				
16 Real estate—Commercial				
17 Real estate—Other				
18 Collectibles				
19 Food inventory				
20 Drugs and medical supplies				
21 Taxidermy				
22 Historical artifacts				
23 Scientific specimens				
24 Archeological artifacts				
25 Other ▶ (CRYPTOCURRENCY)	X	31	221,275	FMV
26 Other ▶ ( )				
27 Other ▶ ( )				
28 Other ▶ ( )				

			Yes	No
29	Number of Forms 8283 received by the organization during the tax year for contributions for which the organization completed Form 8283, Part IV, Donee Acknowledgement	29		
30a	During the year, did the organization receive by contribution any property reported in Part I, lines 1 through 28, that it must hold for at least three years from the date of the initial contribution, and which isn't required to be used for exempt purposes for the entire holding period?	30a		No
b	If "Yes," describe the arrangement in Part II.			
31	Does the organization have a gift acceptance policy that requires the review of any nonstandard contributions?	31	Yes	
32a	Does the organization hire or use third parties or related organizations to solicit, process, or sell noncash contributions?	32a	Yes	
b	If "Yes," describe in Part II.			
33	If the organization didn't report an amount in column (c) for a type of property for which column (a) is checked, describe in Part II.			

Part II **Supplemental Information.** Provide the information required by Part I, lines 30b, 32b, and 33, and whether the organization is reporting in Part I, column (b), the number of contributions, the number of items received, or a combination of both. Also complete this part for any additional information.

Return Reference	Explanation
PART I, COLUMN (B):	THE CONTRIBUTIONS REPORTED IN COLUMN B OF PART I ABOVE REPRESENT THE NUMBER OF CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED.
PART I, LINE 32B:	THE INSTITUTE UTILIZES A BROKERAGE FIRM TO SELL DONATED SECURITIES AND OTHER INVESTMENT VEHICLES.

Additional Data

Return to Form

Software ID:

Software Version:

SCHEDULE O
(Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Supplemental Information to Form 990 or 990-EZ

Complete to provide information for responses to specific questions on Form 990 or 990-EZ or to provide any additional information.
▶ **Attach to Form 990 or 990-EZ.**
▶ **Go to *www.irs.gov/Form990* for the latest information.**

OMB No. 1545-0047

2021

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Return Reference	Explanation
FORM 990, PART VI, SECTION B, LINE 11B	THE FORM 990 WAS REVIEWED BY THE INSTITUTE'S AUDIT COMMITTEE IN CONSULTATION WITH THE INSTITUTE'S INDEPENDENT AUDITORS, AS NECESSARY. AFTER REVIEW BY THE AUDIT COMMITTEE, THE FORM 990 WAS DISTRIBUTED TO THE FULL BOARD OF DIRECTORS.
FORM 990, PART VI, SECTION B, LINE 12C	ON AN ANNUAL BASIS BOTH THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND EVERY EMPLOYEE REVIEW THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY AND MUST DISCLOSE ANY CONFLICTS WITH THE INSTITUTE. THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS REVIEWS THE POLICY AT OR AROUND ITS FINAL MEETING OF THE FISCAL YEAR AND EACH MEMBER PROVIDES WRITTEN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. EVERY EMPLOYEE RECEIVES AN ELECTRONIC COPY OF THE POLICY. ANY CONFLICTS OR POTENTIAL CONFLICTS ARE RESOLVED BY THE PRESIDENT OR OTHERWISE REPORTED BY THE PRESIDENT AND REVIEWED AND RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, LESS ANY MEMBER THAT MAY HAVE A CONFLICT OR POTENTIAL CONFLICT.
FORM 990, PART VI, SECTION B, LINE 15	AT THE FALL BOARD MEETING, THE BOARD DETERMINES THE COMPENSATION OF SIX EMPLOYEES: THE PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL, THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR LITIGATION, THE CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER, THE MANAGING VICE PRESIDENT AND SENIOR ATTORNEY, THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR COMMUNICATIONS, AND THE MANAGING VICE PRESIDENT-CFO/SECRETARY AND TREASURER. IJ PROVIDES THE BOARD'S COMPENSATION COMMITTEE WITH PRESENT AND PAST COMPENSATION AMOUNTS FOR THESE POSITIONS, AS WELL AS COMPARABLE DATA FROM THE MOST RECENTLY AVAILABLE FORM 990 FOR SIMILARLY SITUATED NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. IJ ALSO ANNUALLY ENGAGES AN OUTSIDE VENDOR TO PROVIDE AN INDEPENDENT COMPENSATION SURVEY. THE COMPENSATION COMMITTEE MAKES A RECOMMENDATION ON COMPENSATION TO THE FULL BOARD (EXCEPT FOR THE PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL, WHO IS RECUSED), AND THE FULL BOARD THEN VOTES TO DETERMINE COMPENSATION, WHICH DECISION IS CONTEMPORANEOUSLY RECORDED AND COMMUNICATED TO THE CFO BY THE CHAIRMAN AND PLACED IN THE APPLICABLE CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYMENT FILES. DURING THE SUMMER BOARD MEETING, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZES FORECASTED COMPENSATION INCREASES FOR OTHER OFFICERS AND KEY EMPLOYEES THROUGH ITS APPROVAL OF THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR'S BUDGET.
FORM 990, PART VI, SECTION C, LINE 19	IJ'S 990 AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS ARE AVAILABLE ON ITS AND OTHER WEBSITES. IJ'S 990, FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, AND OTHER IRS DOCUMENTATION, GOVERNING DOCUMENTS AND CERTAIN OTHER POLICIES ARE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC UPON REQUEST.
FORM 990, PART XII, LINE 2C:	THE INSTITUTE HAS AN AUDIT COMMITTEE THAT ASSUMES RESPONSIBILITY FOR OVERSIGHT OF THE AUDIT OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND SELECTION OF AN INDEPENDENT AUDITOR. THE PROCESS HAS NOT CHANGED SINCE THE PRIOR YEAR.
CASES IN LITIGATION	BAKER V. CITY OF MCKINNEY, TEXAS IN SUMMER 2020, THE MCKINNEY, TEXAS, SWAT TEAM USED TEAR GAS GRENADES, EXPLOSIVES, AND AN ARMORED VEHICLE TO BOMBARD VICKI BAKER'S HOME TO PURSUE A FUGITIVE WHO HAD HIDDEN INSIDE. THE CITY THEN REFUSED TO PAY ANY OF THE MORE THAN $50,000 IN DAMAGE THEY CAUSED. YET WHEN THE GOVERNMENT DELIBERATELY DESTROYS AN INNOCENT OWNER'S PROPERTY IN SERVICE OF THE PUBLIC GOOD - IN THIS CASE, PUBLIC SAFETY - IT MUST COMPENSATE THAT OWNER. UNFORTUNATELY, SOME LOWER COURTS IN RECENT YEARS HAVE HELD THAT THE CONSTITUTION DOES NOT REQUIRE THE GOVERNMENT TO REIMBURSE OWNERS FOR PROPERTY DAMAGED BY POLICE ACTIONS. IJ FILED SUIT IN MARCH 2021 ON VICKI'S BEHALF. IN APRIL 2022, FOR THE FIRST TIME EVER, A FEDERAL COURT RULED THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES COMPENSATION WHEN POLICE INTENTIONALLY DESTROY AN INNOCENT PERSON'S PROPERTY. THANKS TO THAT VICTORY, A JURY AWARDED VICKI $59,656.59 IN DAMAGES THAT JUNE. DAVID AND AMY CARSON V. COMMISSIONER OF THE MAINE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION CARSON V. MAKIN WAS IJ'S VEHICLE TO CLOSE A LOOPHOLE IN OUR 2020 U.S. SUPREME COURT VICTORY IN ESPINOZA V. MONTANA, IN WHICH THE COURT DECLARED STATES COULD NOT EXCLUDE SCHOOLS FROM PARTICIPATING IN AN EDUCATIONAL CHOICE PROGRAM DUE TO THEIR RELIGIOUS STATUS. MAINE HAD BEEN PROVIDING TUITION FUNDS TO FAMILIES IN AREAS WITHOUT PUBLIC SCHOOLS SO THAT THE FAMILIES COULD ATTEND THE PRIVATE SCHOOL OF THEIR CHOICE, EXCEPT RELIGIOUS PRIVATE SCHOOLS. SEIZING ON A GREY AREA IN THE ESPINOZA OPINION, THE STATE OF MAINE INSISTED ITS TUITIONING PROGRAM DIDN'T REJECT RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS BECAUSE OF THEIR RELIGIOUS STATUS, BUT BECAUSE PUBLIC FUNDS COULD BE PUT TO RELIGIOUS USE, A SUPPOSEDLY ACCEPTABLE FORM OF DISCRIMINATION. IJ AND OUR CLIENTS ARGUED OTHERWISE: A STATE MUST REMAIN NEUTRAL WITH REGARD TO RELIGION. AFTER ORAL ARGUMENT IN DECEMBER 2021, THE JUSTICES RELEASED THEIR DECISION ON JUNE 21, 2022. IN A 6-3 VICTORY, THE JUSTICES HELD THAT MAINE'S REFUSAL TO LET FAMILIES SPEND EDUCATION BENEFITS AT SCHOOLS THAT OFFER RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION VIOLATED THE CONSTITUTION. LARA V. STATE OF NEVADA, ET AL. FORMER MARINE STEPHEN LARA WAS DRIVING FROM TEXAS TO VISIT HIS DAUGHTERS IN CALIFORNIA IN THE WINTER OF 2021 WHEN THE NEVADA HIGHWAY PATROL (NHP) PULLED HIM OVER ON A FLIMSY PRETEXT AND SEIZED HIS LIFE SAVINGS, DESPITE HAVING NO EVIDENCE OF ANY CRIME. THEY HANDED HIS MONEY OVER TO THE U.S. DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION, IN THE ANTICIPATION THAT THE AGENCY WOULD KICK BACK A PORTION TO THE HIGHWAY PATROL. SO STEPHEN TEAMED UP WITH IJ. ONE DAY AFTER FILING THE LAWSUIT, AND ONLY HOURS AFTER A TOP WASHINGTON POST STORY ON THE CASE, THE DEA AGREED TO RETURN STEPHEN'S MONEY. BUT STEPHEN'S CASE IS NOT OVER. WE ALSO SUED THE NHP IN NEVADA STATE COURT TO HOLD THE GOVERNMENT TO ACCOUNT AND TO STOP THE NHP FROM VIOLATING NEVADA LAW IN EXCHANGE FOR LUCRATIVE KICKBACKS FROM THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. PCHS, ET AL. V. GRAFILO, ET AL. IN 2017, BOB SMITH, OWNER OF THE PACIFIC COAST HORSESHOEING SCHOOL, RECEIVED A NOTICE FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THREATENING TO SHUT HIM DOWN FOR VIOLATING STATE LAW BY ADMITTING STUDENTS WHO HAD NOT GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL. CALIFORNIA'S LAW VIOLATED THE FIRST AMENDMENT, SO BOB, A POTENTIAL STUDENT, AND IJ CHALLENGED IT IN COURT. IN JUNE 2020, THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 9TH CIRCUIT RULED THAT CALIFORNIA RESTRICTED SPEECH BY PLACING CONDITIONS ON TEACHING HORSESHOEING AND SENT THE CASE BACK TO THE DISTRICT COURT,

Return Reference	Explanation
	WHERE THE STATE WOULD HAVE BEEN REQUIRED TO PROVE THAT ITS LAW COULD SURVIVE FIRST AMENDMENT SCRUTINY. THEN, IN SEPTEMBER 2021, THE CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY REPEALED THE LAW, FREEING BOB AND OTHERS LIKE HIM TO CONTINUE TEACHING STUDENTS WHO WANT TO LEARN. TAYLOR ET AL. V. NOCCO PASCO, FLORIDA'S PRETEXTUAL CODE ENFORCEMENT USES THE THREAT OF FINES TO ACCOMPLISH THINGS GOVERNMENT COULD NOT LAWFULLY DO BY OTHER MEANS. USING A CRUDE COMPUTER ALGORITHM, THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE CREATES A LIST OF PEOPLE THEY THINK ARE LIKELY TO COMMIT CRIMES. THEN, DEPUTIES ROUTINELY SHOW UP UNANNOUNCED AT THEIR HOMES TO INTERROGATE THEM ABOUT THEIR FRIENDS AND FAMILY. TO INTIMIDATE THEIR TARGETS INTO SUBMISSION, COUNTY DEPUTIES AGGRESSIVELY ISSUE CITATIONS FOR INNOCUOUS OFFENSES LIKE MISSING HOUSE NUMBERS. IN THE WORDS OF A FORMER PASCO COUNTY DEPUTY, THEY WERE UNDER ORDERS TO "[M]AKE THEIR LIVES MISERABLE UNTIL THEY MOVE OR SUE." SO, IN MARCH 2021, THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT IJ DID. THIS CASE WILL SEND A MESSAGE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ACROSS THE COUNTRY THAT FINES AND FEES SHOULD BE USED ONLY TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC, NOT TO FORCE UNDESIRABLE RESIDENTS OUT OF TOWN. IN AUGUST 2021, A JUDGE DENIED THE SHERIFF'S MOTION TO DISMISS, MEANING OUR CLIENTS WILL HAVE THEIR DAY IN COURT. SHAW, ET AL. V. METRO. GOV'T OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, IS THE CENTER OF COUNTRY MUSIC. YET, INCREDIBLY, THE CITY BANNED MUSICIANS FROM MAKING MUSIC IN THEIR OWN HOMES. NASHVILLE OUTLAWED HOME-BASED BUSINESSES THAT SERVE CLIENTS, PREVENTING LOCAL MUSICIANS, HAIR STYLISTS, AND OTHER BUDDING ENTREPRENEURS FROM BUILDING THEIR OWN AMERICAN DREAM. NASHVILLE RESIDENTS, LIKE IJ CLIENTS LIJ SHAW AND PAT RAYNOR, FACE STEEP FINES IF ANY CUSTOMERS PHYSICALLY COME TO THEIR HOMES TO DO BUSINESS. AT THE SAME TIME, NASHVILLE ALLOWS OTHER TYPES OF HOME-BASED BUSINESSES. IJ AND THE BEACON CENTER OF TENNESSEE TEAMED UP TO VINDICATE THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO USE YOUR OWN HOME TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING. IN OCTOBER 2019, A NASHVILLE COURT DISMISSED THE SUIT. WE APPEALED THAT RULING TO THE STATE SUPREME COURT, WHICH HEARD ORAL ARGUMENTS IN JANUARY 2022. WE NOW AWAIT THE COURT'S RULING. AZAEL SEPULVEDA V. CITY OF PASADENA, TEXAS, ET AL. AZAEL SEPULVEDA, ALSO KNOWN AS OZ, HAS RUN A CAR REPAIR SHOP FOR NINE YEARS. IN SUMMER 2021, HE BOUGHT A STOREFRONT IN HIS HOMETOWN OF PASADENA, TEXAS. BUT THE CITY DEMANDED HE BUILD 23 PARKING SPACES, SOMETHING HIS ONE-MAN SHOP DIDN'T NEED AND COULDN'T AFFORD. IJ AND OZ FILED A LAWSUIT ASKING TEXAS STATE COURTS TO STRIKE DOWN PASADENA'S AUTO-SHOP PARKING REQUIREMENTS. IJ SECURED AN EARLY INJUNCTION THAT PREVENTED THE CITY FROM ENFORCING ITS LAW WHILE THE CASE WAS PENDING. IN MAY 2022, THE CITY APPROVED A CONFIDENTIAL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT THAT PAVES THE WAY FOR OZ TO OPEN HIS SHOP. KING V. CITY OF LAKEWAY, TEXAS, ET AL. BIANCA KING IS A SINGLE MOTHER TO TWO SMALL CHILDREN. SHE WATCHES A FEW OF HER NEIGHBORS' CHILDREN AT HER HOME, WHICH BACKS UP TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD GOLF COURSE IN LAKEWAY, TEXAS. THE SIGHT AND SOUND OF CHILDREN IN HER PRIVATE BACKYARD LED SEVERAL GOLFERS, INCLUDING THE FORMER TOWN MAYOR, TO COMPLAIN ABOUT BIANCA'S BUSINESS AT A PERMIT HEARING. LAKEWAY REQUIRES HOME BUSINESSES TO MEET VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE CRITERIA, AND THE TOWN DENIED BIANCA A PERMIT FOR HER HOME DAY CARE. BUT BIANCA IS PROVIDING A VALUABLE SERVICE, AND THE TEXAS CONSTITUTION PROHIBITS OVERLY OPPRESSIVE LAWS THAT BURDEN A PERSON'S ECONOMIC OR PROPERTY RIGHTS. SO, BIANCA AND IJ HAVE ASKED THE TEXAS STATE COURTS TO REVERSE LAKEWAY'S DENIAL OF HER PERMIT AND TO RULE THAT LAKEWAY CANNOT PREVENT HARMLESS HOME BUSINESSES LIKE BIANCA'S DAY CARE. OPTERNATIVE, INC. V. SOUTH CAROLINA BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS TECHNOLOGY ALLOWS CONSUMERS TO TAKE A ROUTINE VISION TEST IN THE COMFORT OF THEIR OWN HOME USING THEIR PERSONAL COMPUTER AND SMARTPHONE. AN OPHTHALMOLOGIST REVIEWS THE RESULTS AND WRITES A PRESCRIPTION. DEVELOPED BY HEALTHCARE STARTUP VISIBLY (FORMERLY OPTERNATIVE), THESE TESTS ARE INEXPENSIVE AND ENABLE MORE PEOPLE TO GET EYEGLASS PRESCRIPTIONS MORE QUICKLY AND EASILY THAN EVER BEFORE. BUT OPTOMETRISTS HAVE GONE TO EXTRAORDINARY LENGTHS TO PROTECT THEMSELVES FROM ONLINE COMPETITORS LIKE VISIBLY. IN SOUTH CAROLINA, THE GOVERNMENT MADE IT A CRIME FOR ANY OPTOMETRIST TO DISPENSE AN EYEGLASS PRESCRIPTION USING VISIBLY'S TECHNOLOGY. IJ FILED SUIT IN OCTOBER 2016 TO STAMP OUT THIS BLATANT ECONOMIC PROTECTIONISM AND PROTECT BOTH THE RIGHTS OF ENTREPRENEURS TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING AND THE RIGHTS OF DOCTORS AND PATIENTS TO BENEFIT FROM MODERN TECHNOLOGY. DESPITE AN INITIAL SETBACK, IN MAY 2021, THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS REVERSED A LOWER COURT DECISION DISMISSING OUR CASE, ALLOWING OUR CASE TO PROCEED.
LADD, ET AL. V. REAL ESTATE COMMISSION OF PENNSYLVANIA	SALLY LADD IS AN ENTREPRENEUR WHO MANAGED VARIOUS VACATION PROPERTIES IN PENNSYLVANIA'S POCONO MOUNTAINS. THOUGH NOT A REAL ESTATE BROKER, SALLY RECEIVED A CALL FROM THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE INFORMING HER THAT SHE WAS UNDER INVESTIGATION FOR THE UNLICENSED PRACTICE OF REAL ESTATE. TO CONTINUE, SHE WOULD HAVE TO SPEND THREE YEARS WORKING FOR AN ESTABLISHED BROKER, PASS TWO EXAMS, AND SET UP HER OWN BRICK-AND-MORTAR OFFICE. SALLY TEAMED UP WITH IJ IN JULY 2017 TO CHALLENGE THIS HEAVY-HANDED LICENSING SCHEME. IN MAY 2020, THE PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT HELD THAT SALLY'S LAWSUIT AGAINST THE PENNSYLVANIA REAL ESTATE COMMISSION COULD MOVE FORWARD, VINDICATING THE RIGHT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING ENSHRINED IN THE PENNSYLVANIA CONSTITUTION. THE DECISION PROVIDED A DEFINITIVE RULING OUTLINING AND APPLYING THE PROTECTIONS OF THE STATE CONSTITUTION WHEN CHALLENGING ECONOMIC LIBERTY RESTRICTIONS IN COURT. THE DECISION WILL AFFECT ALL PENNSYLVANIANS AND MOST DUE PROCESS AND EQUAL PROTECTION CHALLENGES IN PENNSYLVANIA STATE COURT. SALLY'S CASE WAS SENT BACK TO THE PENNSYLVANIA COMMONWEALTH COURT, WHERE WE CONTINUE TO FIGHT FOR SALLY AND ALL PENNSYLVANIANS. WISCONSIN COTTAGE FOODS ASSOCIATION V. WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, ET AL. WISCONSIN BANS THE SALE OF MANY HOMEMADE FOODS. THOSE WHO WOULD SELL A PIECE OF FUDGE MADE IN THEIR HOME KITCHEN RISK $1,000 IN FINES OR SIX MONTHS IN JAIL. WISCONSIN EVEN BANNED THE SALE OF HOME-BAKED GOODS UNTIL THREE WISCONSIN BAKERS JOINED FORCES WITH IJ TO SUCCESSFULLY CHALLENGE THE STATE'S BAN. MANY HOME-PREPARED FOODS ARE SHELF-STABLE, MEANING THEY CAN BE SAFELY LEFT AT ROOM TEMPERATURE AND THEN EATEN. BUT WISCONSIN IS INTERPRETING THAT COURT ORDER IN A WRONGLY RESTRICTIVE WAY TO STILL BAN MANY SAFE FOODS, LIKE COFFEE BEANS AND CANDY. SO, IN FEBRUARY 2021, SEVEN WISCONSINITES AND THE WISCONSIN COTTAGE FOODS ASSOCIATION JOINED WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE IN A LAWSUIT TO ENFORCE THAT EARLIER WIN. IN JUNE, THE COURT REJECTED WISCONSIN'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE CASE. RUSSINKO, ET AL. V. NEW JERSEY DEP'T OF HEALTH, ET AL. HOME BAKERS HEATHER RUSSINKO, LIZ CIBOTARIU, AND MARTHA RABELLO TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO CONTEST THE NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH'S REQUIREMENT THAT THEY BE LICENSED AS A "RETAIL FOOD ESTABLISHMENT" TO SELL THEIR HOMEMADE GOODS. THIS ENTAILS USING A COMMERCIAL-GRADE KITCHEN SEPARATE FROM ONE'S HOME KITCHEN, PAYING FEES, AND ABIDING BY HUNDREDS OF PAGES OF REGULATIONS. BANNING THE SALE OF HOME-BAKED GOODS DIRECTLY TO CONSUMERS GIVES COMMERCIAL BAKERS UNDUE PROTECTION FROM COMPETITION. THE COURT SERVED IJ AND THE HOME BAKERS A FIRST-ROUND VICTORY IN

Return Reference	Explanation
	APRIL 2018 WHEN IT DENIED THE NEW JERSEY HEALTH DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST TO DISMISS THE LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE STATE'S BAN. MOTIVATED BY PRESSURE FROM THE LAWSUIT, THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT USED THE RULEMAKING PROCESS IN OCTOBER 2021 TO DO AWAY WITH THE STATE'S TOTAL BAN AND ALLOW HEATHER, LIZ, MARTHA, AND OTHER NEW JERSEY BAKERS TO SELL THEIR HOMEMADE BAKED GOODS. ELIJAH AND ASHLEY DURHAM, ET AL. V. CITY OF TARPON SPRINGS, ET AL. AFTER ELIJAH DURHAM LOST HIS JOB AS A CHEF DURING THE PANDEMIC, HE DECIDED TO TAKE HIS CULINARY TALENTS TO THE STREETS BY OPENING A BURGER FOOD TRUCK WITH HIS WIFE, ASHLEY. THEY THOUGHT THEIR TIMING COULD NOT BE BETTER. THANKS IN LARGE PART TO IJ'S EFFORTS IN 2020, FLORIDA MADE IT ILLEGAL FOR CITIES TO BAN FOOD TRUCKS. BUT THE CITY OF TARPON SPRINGS PASSED A NEW ORDINANCE THAT ONLY ALLOWED FOOD TRUCKS OPERATED BY BRICK-AND-MORTAR RESTAURANTS IN THE DOWNTOWN AREA WHERE ALL THE RESTAURANTS, CRAFT BREWERIES, AND CUSTOMERS ARE LOCATED. ALL OTHER FOOD TRUCKS WERE RELEGATED TO A SMALL STRIP OF LAND BY THE HIGHWAY, AN UNSUITABLE LOCATION FOR A BUSINESS THAT RELIES ON FOOT TRAFFIC. THE CITY PASSED THIS ORDINANCE AT THE BEHEST OF LOCAL BRICK-AND-MORTAR RESTAURANT OWNERS TO LIMIT COMPETITION, SO ELIJAH AND ASHLEY PARTNERED WITH IJ IN MAY 2021 TO CHALLENGE THE PROTECTIONIST LAW. UNFORTUNATELY, ELIJAH AND ASHLEY WERE FORCED TO CLOSE THEIR FOOD TRUCK IN JANUARY 2022 DUE TO FINANCIAL SETBACKS, AND WE DISMISSED THE SUIT. DIAZ, ET AL. V. CITY OF FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA, ET AL. IN FEBRUARY 2019, A FLORIDA CIRCUIT COURT ISSUED A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION STATING THAT THE CITY OF FORT PIERCE CANNOT ENFORCE ITS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BAN ON FOOD TRUCKS OPERATING WITHIN 500 FEET OF ANOTHER ESTABLISHMENT THAT SELLS FOOD. FORT PIERCE'S LAW WAS CREATED IN 2014 FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF PROTECTING RESTAURANT OWNERS FROM COMPETITION. FOOD TRUCK OWNERS BENNY DIAZ AND BRIAN PEFFER JOINED WITH IJ IN DECEMBER 2018 TO CHALLENGE THE BAN. IN FEBRUARY 2019, A JUDGE GRANTED A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION ALLOWING FOOD TRUCK VENDORS TO OPERATE IN THE CITY DURING THE LITIGATION. SHORTLY AFTER, THE CITY REPEALED THE BAN. IN SEPTEMBER 2021, WE ACHIEVED FINAL VICTORY WHEN A JUDGE ENTERED A CONSENT DECREE THAT WILL ENSURE FORT PIERCE CANNOT BRING BACK ITS UNCONSTITUTIONAL ORDINANCE. IJ RECEIVED FROM THE CITY OF FORT PIERCE $2,533 IN COSTS. SURFVIVE, ET AL. V. CITY OF SOUTH PADRE ISLAND IN SOUTH PADRE ISLAND, TEXAS, THE CITY GOVERNMENT CAPS FOOD TRUCK PERMITS AT 12 AND REQUIRES FOOD TRUCKS TO GET A RESTAURANT OWNER'S APPROVAL ON THEIR APPLICATION. THIS MEANS LESS CHOICE AND HIGHER PRICES FOR SOUTH PADRE ISLAND RESIDENTS AND VISITORS, AND IT VIOLATES THE TEXAS CONSTITUTION, WHICH FORBIDS LAWS THAT SERVE ONLY TO PROTECT BUSINESSES FROM COMPETITION. IJ TEAMED UP WITH SURFVIVE - A LOCAL NONPROFIT'S FOOD TRUCK - AND FOOD TRUCK OWNERS ANUBIS AND RAMSES AVALOS TO CHALLENGE SOUTH PADRE ISLAND'S LAW. IN DECEMBER 2020, A DISTRICT COURT JUDGE STRUCK DOWN SOUTH PADRE'S ANTI-COMPETITIVE FOOD TRUCK PERMIT CAP. ASTONISHINGLY, THE ISLAND CHOSE TO DEFY THE ORDER BEFORE IT EVEN FILED AN APPEAL. THEN, AFTER THE CITY DID APPEAL, IN JUNE 2022, TEXAS' 13TH COURT OF APPEALS REVERSED THE TRIAL COURT DECISION, HELD THAT THE LAW WAS A REASONABLE WAY TO PROMOTE THE ECONOMY, AND SAID THE GOVERNMENT WAS IMMUNE FROM SUIT BECAUSE THE CLAIMS WERE NOT VIABLE. IJ WILL APPEAL TO THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT. ALEXIS BAILLY VINEYARD AND THE NEXT CHAPTER WINERY V. DOHMANT A LITTLE-KNOWN MINNESOTA LAW REQUIRES WINERIES IN THE STATE MAKE THEIR WINE PRIMARILY USING GRAPES GROWN IN MINNESOTA, EVEN THOUGH FEW TYPES OF GRAPES CAN GROW IN MINNESOTA'S CLIMATE. THIS LAW HURTS THE ECONOMIC VIABILITY OF MINNESOTA VINEYARDS AND HINDERS THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE THAT BINDS AMERICA TOGETHER. IJ JOINED FORCES WITH TWO MINNESOTA WINERIES, ALEXIS BAILLY VINEYARD AND NEXT CHAPTER WINERY, TO CHALLENGE THIS LAW. IN APRIL 2018, A FEDERAL JUDGE DISMISSED THE SUIT ON PROCEDURAL GROUNDS, BUT IN JULY 2019, THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 8TH CIRCUIT REVERSED THIS DECISION AND SENT THE CASE BACK TO TRIAL COURT. IN SEPTEMBER 2020, IJ SECURED A VICTORY FOR OUR CLIENTS AND MINNESOTANS WHEN A FEDERAL JUDGE STRUCK DOWN THE PROTECTIONIST LAW. N'DA AND DIGNITY NON-EMERGENCY MEDICAL TRANSPORTATION, INC., V. HYBL, ET AL. MARC N'DA RUNS A HOME HEALTH AGENCY, AND WHEN HE SAW HIS PATIENTS GETTING BAD SERVICE FROM NON-EMERGENCY MEDICAL TRANSPORTATION COMPANIES, HE DECIDED TO START HIS OWN COMPANY TO PROVIDE BETTER SERVICE. TO DO SO, HE NEEDS A "CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY" FROM THE GOVERNMENT. SUCH LAWS PROTECT ESTABLISHED BUSINESSES BY SHUTTING OUT NEW COMPETITION, RAISING PRICES, AND LOWERING SERVICE. AMONG OTHER REQUIREMENTS, MARC MUST GET PERMISSION FROM HIS COMPETITORS BEFORE HE CAN BEGIN OPERATING. NOT SURPRISINGLY, THOSE COMPETITORS SAID "NO." MARC TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO PROTECT HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING. THOUGH NEBRASKA PASSED A LAW REPEALING SOME CON REQUIREMENTS IN AUGUST 2020, IT DID NOT REPEAL THE ONE PREVENTING MARC'S BUSINESS. MARC'S CASE CONTINUES AS IJ ARGUES THE CON LAW IN HIS PROFESSION VIOLATES THREE PROVISIONS OF THE STATE CONSTITUTION. SINGLETON AND SINGLETON VISION CENTER V. NORTH CAROLINA DEP'T OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL. NORTH CAROLINA MAKES IT ILLEGAL FOR DOCTORS TO OFFER NEW HEALTH CARE SERVICES, BUILD NEW FACILITIES OR BUY NEW EQUIPMENT WITHOUT OBTAINING A CERTIFICATE OF NEED FROM A BOARD DOMINATED BY REGULATORS AND INDUSTRY INSIDERS. IF THE BOARD DETERMINES THAT THERE ARE ALREADY "ENOUGH" PROVIDERS IN A COMMUNITY, DOCTORS ARE FORBIDDEN FROM OFFERING SERVICES TO PATIENTS WHO NEED THEM. IN APRIL 2020, IJ JOINED UP WITH DR. JAY SINGLETON, AN OPHTHALMOLOGIST FROM NEW BERN, TO FILE A CHALLENGE TO NORTH CAROLINA'S CON LAW. DR. SINGLETON OWNS A STATE-OF-THE-ART OUTPATIENT OPERATING FACILITY BUT CANNOT START THE CON APPLICATION PROCESS TO PERFORM SURGERIES THERE BECAUSE A FORMULA PUT IN PLACE BY STATE REGULATORS HAS ALREADY DETERMINED THAT HIS COMMUNITY DOES NOT "NEED" ANOTHER SURGERY CENTER. IN JUNE 2022, THE NORTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS HELD THAT THE STATE'S ANTI-COMPETITIVE LAW IS CONSTITUTIONAL, AFFIRMING A LOWER COURT'S DECISION AND DISMISSING SUIT. IJ IS APPEALING THE DECISION TO THE STATE SUPREME COURT.
TIWARI, ET AL. V. MEIER, ET AL.	DIPENDRA TIWARI AND KISHOR SAPKOTAARE ARE NEPALI IMMIGRANTS WHO WANT TO START A HOME HEALTH AGENCY THAT CATERS TO THE LARGE NEPALI-SPEAKING POPULATION IN LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY. THEIR FUTURE COMPETITOR - A $2 BILLION HEALTH CARE CONGLOMERATE - ARGUED THAT THEIR NEW AGENCY WAS UNNEEDED, AND THE STATE OF KENTUCKY REFUSED TO ISSUE DIPENDRA AND KISHOR'S BUSINESS A CERTIFICATE OF NEED THAT WOULD ALLOW THEM TO OPERATE. THE CONSTITUTION PROTECTS THE RIGHT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING FREE FROM UNREASONABLE GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE, AND IT IS UNREASONABLE FOR KENTUCKY TO PICK WINNERS AND LOSERS IN THE MARKETPLACE. SO DIPENDRA, KISHOR, AND IJ CHALLENGED KENTUCKY'S CON REQUIREMENT FOR HOME HEALTH AGENCIES IN FEDERAL COURT. UNFORTUNATELY, THE SIXTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS UPHELD IN FEBRUARY 2022 THE SUMMARY-JUDGMENT LOSS WE RECEIVED IN A LOWER COURT. WE ARE PREPARING TO ASK THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO TAKE THE CASE. ABDALLAH BATAYNEH ET AL. V. COLORADO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION ET AL. IJ AND OUR CLIENT ABDALLAH BATAYNEH FILED A LAWSUIT AGAINST COLORADO'S MONOPOLISTIC SCHEME THAT PREVENTED HIM FROM LAUNCHING A SHUTTLE SERVICE BUSINESS. ABDALLAH WORKS

Return Reference	Explanation
	AT A HOT SPRINGS RESORT AND HEARD NUMEROUS COMPLAINTS THAT EXISTING SERVICES WERE TOO EXPENSIVE AND HAD POOR CUSTOMER SERVICE, SO HE DECIDED TO CREATE HIS OWN COMPANY THAT WOULD PROVIDE BETTER SERVICE. UNFORTUNATELY, COLORADO LAW ALLOWS POWERFUL INDUSTRY INSIDERS TO DENY NEW COMPETITION BY REQUIRING NEW WOULD-BE BUSINESSES TO OBTAIN PERMISSION FROM EXISTING MONOPOLIES. EXISTING SHUTTLE COMPANIES USED THIS LAW TO THWART ABDALLAH IN STARTING HIS BUSINESS BY ARGUING THAT HIS SERVICES WERE NOT "NEEDED." THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO PICK WINNERS AND LOSERS, AND EXISTING COMPANIES SHOULD NOT HAVE THE POWER TO DENY COMPETITION. ABDALLAH PARTNERED WITH IJ IN MARCH 2021 TO SUE THE STATE REGULATORY AGENCY. A COURT DISMISSED THE SUIT IN NOVEMBER 2021, AND WE HAVE APPEALED THE DISMISSAL. OKECH V. THOMPSON IN MARCH 2022, IJ ACHIEVED ONE OF OUR FASTEST VICTORIES YET WHEN WE SUED ON BEHALF OF TEDY OKECH, CHARLOTTE AMOUSSOU, AND SONIA EKEMON, THREE AFRICAN-STYLE HAIR BRAIDERS IN IDAHO CHALLENGING THE STATE'S REQUIREMENT THAT THEY RECEIVE A COSMETOLOGY LICENSE TO BRAID HAIR, A LICENSE THAT ENTAILS 1,600 HOURS OF TRAINING AT A COST OF UP TO $20,000 AND TEACHES ALMOST NOTHING ON BRAIDING. RECOGNIZING THE IRRATIONALITY OF THE REQUIREMENT, THE IDAHO LEGISLATURE QUICKLY PASSED A NEW BILL EXEMPTING BRAIDERS FROM COSMETOLOGY LICENSING, AND THE GOVERNOR SIGNED IT INTO LAW LATER THAT MONTH. IJ AND OUR CLIENTS FILED A STIPULATED DISMISSAL OF OUR LAWSUIT. SHAZIA ITTIQ AND SEEMA PANJWANI V. OKLAHOMA STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY AND BARBERING, ET AL. SHAZIA ITTIQ AND SEEMA PANJWANI ARE EYEBROW THREADERS IN OKLAHOMA WHO ARE SUBJECTED TO ONEROUS AND IRRELEVANT REGULATIONS BY THE OKLAHOMA BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY. THE BOARD REQUIRES THREADERS TO COMPLETE AT LEAST 600 HOURS OF COSMETOLOGY SCHOOLING, NOT A MINUTE OF WHICH ADDRESSES THREADING. THEY ALSO MUST PASS TWO EXAMS THAT ONLY TEST PRACTICES THREADERS NEVER USE. SHAZIA AND SEEMA HAVE PRACTICED THREADING SINCE THEY WERE TEENAGERS AND SPENT YEARS DEVELOPING THEIR BUSINESSES FROM THE GROUND UP. BOTH PARTNERED WITH IJ IN FEBRUARY 2021. IN RESPONSE TO THE LAWSUIT, THE STATE PASSED A TEMPORARY MEASURE CREATING LESS BURDENSOME THREADING LICENSES, AND THE LEGISLATURE IS CONSIDERING A DRAFT BILL TO MAKE THE MEASURE PERMANENT. WE WILL CONTINUE LITIGATING THIS CASE UNTIL THE LEGISLATURE MAKES THE EXEMPTION PERMANENT TO ENSURE THAT THREADERS MAY PRACTICE THEIR CRAFT WITHOUT IRRELEVANT LICENSING REQUIREMENTS. N'DAKPRI, ET AL. V. LOUISIANA STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY, ET AL. IJ REPRESENTS THREE NATURAL HAIR BRAIDERS - ASHLEY N'DAKPRI, LYNN SCHOFIELD, AND MICHELLE ROBERTSON - WHO WANT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING BUT FACE ENORMOUS AND IRRATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING HURDLES. ALTHOUGH HAIR BRAIDING IS NOT A THREAT TO PUBLIC SAFETY, THE LOUISIANA STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY REQUIRES ANYONE SEEKING A BRAIDING LICENSE TO COMPLETE 500 HOURS OF UNNECESSARY AND IRRELEVANT TRAINING. THIS RUNS AFOUL OF THE LOUISIANA CONSTITUTION, WHICH DOES NOT ALLOW THE GOVERNMENT TO LICENSE SOMETHING AS SAFE AND COMMON AS BRAIDING HAIR. IN OCTOBER 2019, A JUDGE IN BATON ROUGE DENIED THE BOARD'S MOTION TO DISMISS. WE ARE NOW PREPARING FOR TRIAL AT THE DISTRICT COURT. SANCHEZ V. OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION IJ JOINED WITH ALTAGRACIA YLUMINADA "ILUMI" SANCHEZ IN APRIL 2018 TO FIGHT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION'S REGULATIONS REQUIRING MANY OF THE CITY'S DAY CARE PROVIDERS TO GO TO COLLEGE OR LOSE THEIR JOBS. THESE REGULATIONS WOULD HAVE CAREER-ENDING CONSEQUENCES FOR ILUMI, WHO RUNS A DAY CARE IN HER HOME IN NORTHEAST D.C. AND HAS WORKED WITH CHILDREN FOR OVER 20 YEARS. TO COMPLY WITH THE NEW REGULATIONS AND RETURN TO SCHOOL FOR A DEGREE IRRELEVANT TO CHILDCARE IS TOO MUCH OF A STRAIN ON ILUMI'S TIME AND MONEY. FOR PARENTS, THE REGULATIONS WOULD RAISE PRICES AND LOWER OPTIONS. IN JANUARY 2021, THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DISMISSED THE LAWSUIT, AND WE APPEALED THE DECISION TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE D.C. CIRCUIT, WHERE WE AWAIT A DECISION. GARRETT AND HELD V. TEXAS STATE BOARD OF PHARMACY, ET AL. IN 45 STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DOCTORS CAN DISPENSE MEDICINE DIRECTLY TO THEIR PATIENTS, SAVING PATIENTS TIME AND MONEY AND MAKING IT MORE LIKELY THEY WILL FILL THEIR PRESCRIPTIONS. TEXAS, HOWEVER, LARGELY BANS DOCTORS FROM DISPENSING MEDICATION AND ONLY ALLOWS IT IN CERTAIN RURAL AREAS. THE BAN SERVES ONLY TO PROTECT THE PROFITS OF PHARMACIES, SO IJ IS REPRESENTING TEXAS DOCTORS IN A LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THIS BAN ON DOCTOR DISPENSING. IN DECEMBER 2020, A DISTRICT COURT UPHELD THE STATE'S BAN, AND WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF APPEALING THAT DECISION. JACKSON, ET AL. V. RAFFENSPERGER MARY JACKSON, A CERTIFIED LACTATION COUNSELOR, AND REACHING OUR SISTERS EVERYWHERE - A NONPROFIT DEDICATED TO PROVIDING BREASTFEEDING SUPPORT TO MINORITY COMMUNITIES - JOINED WITH IJ IN JUNE 2018 TO CHALLENGE GEORGIA'S MANDATE THAT LACTATION CONSULTANTS BE CERTIFIED BY A PRIVATE ORGANIZATION, REQUIRING TWO YEARS OF COLLEGE COURSES AND MORE THAN 300 HOURS OF SUPERVISED CLINICAL WORK. IMPOSING THIS REQUIREMENT WILL REDUCE THE NUMBER OF LACTATION CONSULTANTS, ESPECIALLY OUTSIDE OF MAJOR CITIES. IJ'S CLIENTS HAVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE, AND THERE IS NO PROOF THAT THIS CERTIFICATION IMPROVES CARE. IN A MAJOR VICTORY FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM IN THE PEACH STATE, THE GEORGIA SUPREME COURT RULED IN MAY 2020 THAT IJ'S CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE TO THE STATE'S NEW LACTATION CONSULTANT LICENSE WILL GO FORWARD. REVERSING A TRIAL COURT DECISION THAT HAD DISMISSED THE CASE IN 2019, THE GEORGIA SUPREME COURT UNANIMOUSLY AFFIRMED THAT THE GEORGIA CONSTITUTION PROTECTS A RIGHT TO WORK IN ONE'S CHOSEN PROFESSION FREE FROM UNREASONABLE GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE. THANKS TO THAT VICTORY, THE FULTON COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT RULED GEORGIA'S REQUIREMENT UNCONSTITUTIONAL IN MARCH 2022. THE GOVERNMENT APPEALED, SO WE FIGHT ON. HAY, ET AL. V. ASOTIN COUNTY, WASHINGTON, ET AL. WHEN KATHY HAY SAW HER NEIGHBORS IN ASOTIN COUNTY, WASHINGTON, STRUGGLING TO PUT FOOD ON THE TABLE, SHE BUILT A "LITTLE FREE PANTRY" ON HER PROPERTY SO THAT HER NEIGHBORS COULD TAKE AND DONATE FOOD. IN FEBRUARY 2020, THE ASOTIN COUNTY HEALTH DISTRICT CLOSED HER PANTRY AND ORDERED HER TO COMPLY WITH A LONG LIST OF DEMANDS BEFORE SHE COULD REOPEN IT. LATER, AS THE COVID PANDEMIC RAGED AND PEOPLE ACROSS AMERICA WERE CONVERTING THEIR LITTLE LENDING LIBRARIES INTO PANTRIES, THE COUNTY SENT KATHY AN INVOICE FOR $2,800 AND A LETTER DEMANDING SHE PAY FOR THE ILLEGAL ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS AGAINST HER. KATHY, NEIGHBORS WHO USED HER PANTRY, AND IJ FILED A CONSTITUTIONAL LAWSUIT IN FEDERAL COURT TO STRIKE DOWN THE POLICIES THAT PREVENT KATHY FROM SHARING FOOD WITH THOSE IN NEED. IN RESPONSE TO THE LAWSUIT, THE COUNTY WAIVED THE INVOICE AND AGREED TO ALLOW KATHY AND OTHERS TO SHARE SHELF-STABLE FOODS AND UNCUT PRODUCE WITHOUT GOVERNMENT RESTRICTIONS.
GURROLA AND HERRERA V. DUNCAN ET AL.	DARIO GURROLA LEARNED HOW TO FIGHT FIRES IN CALIFORNIA'S WELL-KNOWN INMATE FIREFIGHTING PROGRAM. WHEN HE TURNED HIS LIFE AROUND, HE THOUGHT HE COULD TURN THE SKILLS HE LEARNED WHILE INCARCERATED INTO A CAREER SERVING THE PUBLIC AS A FIREFIGHTER. BUT CALIFORNIA, DESPITE USING THOUSANDS OF INMATES TO FIGHT ITS WILDFIRES, PERMANENTLY BANS THOSE SAME PEOPLE FROM RECEIVING THE EMT CERTIFICATION

Return Reference	Explanation
	NEEDED TO BECOME A CAREER FIREFIGHTER IF THEY HAVE MORE THAN ONE FELONY ON THEIR RECORD. SO, ALTHOUGH HE HAS ALL THE NECESSARY SKILLS AND TRAINING, DARIO CAN ONLY WORK AS A VOLUNTEER OR SEASONAL FIREFIGHTER. DARIO AND IJ ARE CHALLENGING THIS UNJUST RESTRICTION TO VINDICATE THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING. AND, IN SEPTEMBER 2020, IJ PARTNERED WITH A NEW PLAINTIFF, FERNANDO HERRERA, WHO IS SIMILARLY PREVENTED FROM BECOMING A CERTIFIED FIRST RESPONDER BECAUSE OF HIS RECORD. SINCE THEN, CALIFORNIA PARTIALLY REFORMED THE LAW, ALLOWING SOME FORMER INMATES TO RECEIVE EMT CERTIFICATION. IN JUNE 2022, 9TH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS UPHELD A LOWER COURT'S DISMISSAL OF THE CASE. WE WILL PETITION FOR REHEARING. CAREY V. LAND RUDY CAREY HAD A LONG BATTLE WITH ADDICTION AND SPENT TIME IN PRISON BEFORE TURNING HIS LIFE AROUND. HIS FIRST-HAND EXPERIENCE MAKES HIM WELL-SUITED TO GUIDE OTHERS THROUGH RECOVERY, AND HE WORKED SUCCESSFULLY FOR FIVE YEARS AS A COUNSELOR AT A FREDERICKSBURG, VIRGINIA, TREATMENT FACILITY - UNTIL HE DISCOVERED HIS CAREER WAS ILLEGAL. THE STATE BANS PEOPLE WITH CONVICTIONS FOR ANY OF 176 "BARRIER CRIMES" (RANGING FROM RECKLESS BOAT DRIVING TO BURGLARY) FROM BEING EMPLOYED IN A "DIRECT CARE" POSITION. IN SEPTEMBER, IJ TEAMED UP WITH RUDY IN FEDERAL COURT TO VINDICATE A SIMPLE TRUTH: VIRGINIA SHOULD JUDGE WHO PEOPLE ARE TODAY, NOT WHO THEY WERE TWO DECADES AGO. IN JANUARY 2022, A DISTRICT COURT DISMISSED THE CASE, RULING THAT RUDY HAS NO RIGHT TO SUE UNTIL HE HAS BEEN DENIED A PARDON. IN MAY, THE COURT DENIED OUR MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND DIRECTED THE GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA TO PRIORITIZE RUDY'S PARDON APPLICATION. IN RE ARM & RAGE LLC JOE ARMSTRONG OWNS WJBE, KNOXVILLE'S ONLY RADIO STATION FOCUSED ON THE BLACK COMMUNITY. BUT THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION (FCC) IS THREATENING TO SHUT IT DOWN; NOT FOR ANYTHING WJBE DID, BUT BECAUSE JOE WAS CONVICTED OF MAKING A FALSE STATEMENT ON HIS 2008 PERSONAL TAX RETURN, FOUR YEARS BEFORE HE EVEN BOUGHT THE STATION. THE U.S. CONSTITUTION PROTECTS AMERICANS FROM THIS TYPE OF IRRATIONAL GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE. IJ WILL DEFEND JOE AT AN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING AND, IF NECESSARY, FIGHT FOR HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN COURT. FULL CIRCLE OF LIVING AND DYING, ET AL. V. SANCHEZ, ET AL. AKHILA MURPHY AND DONNA PEIZER ARE END-OF-LIFE DOULAS, HELPING PLAN HOME FUNERALS AND PROVIDING EMOTIONAL AND PRACTICAL SUPPORT TO THE DYING PERSON AND FAMILY. IN DECEMBER 2019, THE CALIFORNIA CEMETERY AND FUNERAL BUREAU RULED THAT AKHILA AND DONNA'S BUSINESS IS AN UNLICENSED FUNERAL AGENCY, MEANING AKHILA AND DONNA MUST BECOME LICENSED FUNERAL DIRECTORS AND BUILD A FUNERAL HOME. THIS DECISION PROTECTS FUNERAL HOMES FROM COMPETITION WHILE LIMITING OPTIONS FOR GRIEVING FAMILIES. SO, AKHILA AND DONNA JOINED WITH IJ TO FILE A LAWSUIT IN FEDERAL COURT TO DEFEND THEIR FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH AND THEIR 14TH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING. WE ARGUED A MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BEFORE A DISTRICT COURT IN FEBRUARY 2022 AND ARE AWAITING A DECISION. MILLS AND SOUTHWEST ENGINEERING CONCEPTS, LLC V. ARIZONA BOARD OF TECHNICAL REGISTRATION, ET AL. FOR 12 YEARS, GREG MILLS HAS RUN AN ARIZONA ENGINEERING FIRM. LIKE 80% OF AMERICAN ENGINEERS, HE DOES NOT HAVE AN ENGINEER'S LICENSE, WHICH IS NOT LEGALLY REQUIRED FOR THE PROJECTS THAT HE WORKS ON. BUT IN MAY 2019, THE ARIZONA BOARD OF TECHNICAL REGISTRATION THREATENED TO SHUT DOWN GREG'S COMPANY AND FINE HIM BECAUSE HE DOES NOT HAVE A STATE-ISSUED LICENSE, WHICH THE BOARD'S RULES SAY HE WOULD NOT NEED IF HE WORKED AT A MANUFACTURING COMPANY. GREG PARTNERED WITH IJ SO THAT HE AND OTHER ARIZONA ENGINEERS CAN DO THE WORK THEY ARE QUALIFIED TO DO WITHOUT UNCONSTITUTIONAL INTERFERENCE FROM THE BOARD. IN MAY 2020, THE MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT RULED THAT GREG COULD NOT SUE TO PROTECT HIS RIGHTS UNTIL THE BOARD FINISHED ITS ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS AGAINST HIM. WE APPEALED THIS RULING AND NOW AWAIT A DECISION FROM THE STATE SUPREME COURT. HIGHT V. U.S. DEP'T OF HOMELAND SECURITY CAPTAIN MATTHEW HIGHT HAS BEEN A MERCHANT MARINER FOR MORE THAN 20 YEARS. HE DECIDED TO WORK TOWARD GETTING HIS LICENSE TO PILOT COMMERCIAL VESSELS ON THE SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND LAKE ONTARIO. CAPTAIN HIGHT WAS REQUIRED BY THE COAST GUARD TO TRAIN WITH THE SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY PILOTS' ASSOCIATION, A FOR-PROFIT BUSINESS. AFTER DISAGREEMENTS OVER THE FINANCIAL PRACTICES OF THE ASSOCIATION'S LEADERSHIP, THE ASSOCIATION SUDDENLY INFORMED THE COAST GUARD THAT IT RECOMMENDED AGAINST GRANTING CAPTAIN HIGHT A LICENSE. WITH NO MEANINGFUL WAY TO CONTEST THE RECOMMENDATION WITH THE COAST GUARD, HIGHT TEAMED UP WITH IJ, AND IN MARCH 2021, A FEDERAL COURT ORDERED THE COAST GUARD TO LET HIM TAKE THE EXAM HE NEEDS TO BECOME A REGISTERED PILOT, WHICH HE PASSED. AFTER A LONG DELAY, THE COAST GUARD DENIED HIS APPLICATION, SO WE ARE BACK IN COURT SO CAPTAIN HIGHT CAN SET SAIL. BEN AND HANK BRINKMANN, AND MATTITUCK 12500 LLC., V. TOWN OF SOUTHOLD, NEW YORK THE FAMILY OWNERS OF BRINKMANN'S HARDWARE THOUGHT THEY HAD FOUND THE PERFECT LOCATION FOR A NEW STORE IN SOUTHOLD, NEW YORK. BUT EVEN THOUGH THEY FOLLOWED ALL THE RULES, THE TOWN OF SOUTHOLD IS TRYING TO USE EMINENT DOMAIN TO TAKE THEIR PROPERTY FOR A "PARK" (BY WHICH THE TOWN MEANS THAT IT WILL LEAVE THE LAND AS AN UNIMPROVED LOT). IT IS AN EXTREME AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL TACTIC TO PREVENT AN ENTIRELY LEGAL BUSINESS FROM SERVING THE COMMUNITY. THE TOWN, WHERE THEY PURCHASED A COMMERCIAL-ZONED LOT, HAS DONE EVERYTHING POSSIBLE TO STOP THE BRINKMANNS: IT SLOW-PLAYED THE PERMITTING PROCESS, IMPOSED EXORBITANT FEES, AND THEN ENACTED A TARGETED MORATORIUM ON BUILDING PERMITS ALONG A ONE MILE STRETCH OF ROAD WITH THE BRINKMANNS' PROPERTY IN THE CENTER. THE BRINKMANNS HAVE TEAMED UP WITH IJ IN FEDERAL COURT TO END THE TOWN'S ATTEMPTS TO THWART THEIR BUSINESS. BROWN AND ROLIN V. TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, ET AL. WHEN TRAVELERS GO ONLINE TO FIND OUT WHETHER IT IS LEGAL TO FLY WITH CASH, THE GOVERNMENT TELLS THEM THAT THERE ARE NO RESTRICTIONS ON TRAVELING WITH ANY AMOUNT OF MONEY ON DOMESTIC FLIGHTS. WHAT IT DOES NOT TELL FLYERS IS THAT, UPON SEEING CASH, TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION (TSA) SCREENERS WILL DETAIN THEM AND TURN THEM OVER TO LAW ENFORCEMENT, WHO WILL TAKE THEIR MONEY WITHOUT ANY CAUSE FOR SUSPICION AND WITHOUT FILING ANY CRIMINAL CHARGES. THAT IS WHAT HAPPENED TO IJ CLIENT TERRY ROLIN AND HIS DAUGHTER REBECCA BROWN, WHO HAD TERRY'S LIFE SAVINGS OF $82,000 SEIZED AT THE PITTSBURGH AIRPORT BY THE TSA AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCY (DEA) WHEN REBECCA WAS TRYING TO TAKE THE MONEY HOME WITH HER TO BOSTON TO DEPOSIT INTO A NEW JOINT BANK ACCOUNT. TO END THESE UNCONSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES, IJ HAS FILED A FOURTH AMENDMENT CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT ON BEHALF OF TERRY, REBECCA, AND OTHER TRAVELERS. IN MARCH 2021, IJ WON A FIRST-ROUND VICTORY WHEN A FEDERAL JUDGE REJECTED THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE CASE. U.S. V. $28,180 (KERMIT WARREN) KERMIT WARREN IS A HARDWORKING GRANDFATHER IN NEW ORLEANS. HE MANAGED TO SAVE ALMOST $30,000 AND TOOK HIS SAVINGS TO OHIO TO BUY A USED TRUCK FOR HIS BUSINESS. BUT DEA AGENTS TOOK ALL OF KERMIT'S MONEY, DESPITE NOT CHARGING HIM WITH ANY CRIME. IN APRIL 2021, IJ TEAMED UP WITH KERMIT TO GET HIS MONEY BACK. WEEKS LATER, PROSECUTORS AGREED TO RETURN KERMIT'S LIFE SAVINGS AND DISMISS THE CASE WITH PREJUDICE, EFFECTIVELY CLEARING HIS NAME. KERMIT'S CASE HIGHLIGHTS THE FUNDAMENTAL INJUSTICE OF TSA'S AND DEA'S

Return Reference	Explanation
	"SEE CASH, SEIZE CASH" POLICY, WHICH WE CONTINUE TO LITIGATE AGAINST IN A SEPARATE CLASS ACTION SUIT. U.S. V. $8,040 (CRISTAL STARLING) CRISTAL STARLING RUNS A MOBILE FOOD CART IN ROCHESTER, NEW YORK, TO PROVIDE FOR HERSELF AND HER GRANDNEPHEW. BUT IN THE FALL OF 2020, THE LOCAL POLICE RAIDED HER APARTMENT AND SEIZED $8,040. POLICE ACCUSED CRISTAL'S THEN-BOYFRIEND OF DEALING DRUGS, BUT HE WAS ACQUITTED BY A JURY. THAT DIDN'T STOP LAW ENFORCEMENT FROM TRYING TO KEEP HER MONEY PERMANENTLY THROUGH CIVIL FORFEITURE. UNABLE TO HIRE A LAWYER, CRISTAL FOUGHT FOR HER MONEY ON HER OWN, BUT MISSED THE DEADLINE TO FILE ONE REQUIRED PIECE OF PAPER. IN A NON-FORFEITURE CASE, THE COURT WOULD HAVE LET CRISTAL CONTINUE HER CASE. IJ HAS JOINED WITH CRISTAL TO APPEAL A LOWER COURT'S DECISION THAT CRISTAL CANNOT CONTINUE CHALLENGING THE FORFEITURE.
EMPYREAL ENTERPRISES, LLC V. USA, ET AL.	EMPYREAL LOGISTICS TRANSPORTS PROCEEDS FROM CASH-INTENSIVE BUSINESSES, INCLUDING STATE-LICENSED CANNABIS BUSINESSES, TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS. EMPYREAL WORKS ONLY WITH STATE-LEGAL BUSINESSES, AND NEITHER THEY NOR THEIR CLIENTS HAVE BEEN ACCUSED OF ANY CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR OR WRONGDOING. SHERIFF'S DEPUTIES STOPPED AND SEARCHED EMPYREAL'S VEHICLES AT LEAST FIVE TIMES AND THEN HANDED THE FUNDS OVER TO FEDERAL AGENCIES TO TAKE THROUGH FEDERAL FORFEITURE PROCEDURES THAT COULD KICK BACK 80% OF THE FUNDS TO THE LOCAL POLICE. THESE FORFEITURES AREN'T ALLOWED UNDER STATE OR FEDERAL LAW, SO EMPYREAL TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FIGHT BACK. IN APRIL 2022, THE GOVERNMENT AGREED TO RETURN THE MONEY AND WE VOLUNTARILY DISMISSED THE CASE. SHAHEED, ET AL. V. CITY OF WILMINGTON, DELAWARE, ET AL. WILMINGTON, DELAWARE, ISSUES A LOT OF PARKING TICKETS AND THEN ALLOWS PRIVATE COMPANIES TO TOW ANY CAR WITH MORE THAN $200 IN OUTSTANDING FINES. RATHER THAN PAY MONEY TO THOSE COMPANIES FOR THEIR SERVICES, THE CITY CONTRACTUALLY EMPOWERS THE TOWING COMPANIES TO KEEP AND SCRAP CARS. THE TOW COMPANIES GET TO KEEP THE FULL VALUE OF THE CARS - THE VALUE DOES NOT EVEN OFFSET THE OWNER'S OUTSTANDING TICKETS. WILMINGTON'S ENTIRE SYSTEM IS FUNDAMENTALLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL FOR BEING WOEFULLY DEFICIENT OF DUE PROCESS AND REPEATEDLY DEMANDING GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONATE FINES. IN SEPTEMBER 2021, TWO WILMINGTON RESIDENTS TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO END THIS SCHEME. INGRAM, ET AL. V. WAYNE COUNTY FOR DECADES, RESIDENTS OF DETROIT AND WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN, HAVE LIVED UNDER CONSTANT THREAT OF HAVING THEIR CARS TAKEN AWAY AND RANSOMED BACK TO THEM FOR $1,000 OR MORE. THE PERPETRATORS ARE POLICE AND PROSECUTORS WHO USE CIVIL FORFEITURE TO SEIZE HUNDREDS OF CARS EACH YEAR. DETROITERS MELISA INGRAM AND ROBERT REEVES BOTH LOST THEIR CARS WHEN WAYNE COUNTY SEIZED THEM BASED ON OTHER PEOPLE'S ALLEGED MISBEHAVIOR. SO THEY HAVE PARTNERED WITH IJ IN A MAJOR FEDERAL CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF WAYNE COUNTY'S FORFEITURE PROGRAM. WE ARE ALSO FIGHTING FOR THE RETURN OF OUR CLIENT STEPHANIE WILSON'S CAR. AN APPEALS COURT OVERTURNED OUR WIN IN STEPHANIE'S FORFEITURE CASE IN A LOWER COURT, AND WE ARE NOW SEEKING REVIEW OF THAT JUDGMENT BY THE MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT. OUR GOAL WITH THIS CASE IS TO ENFORCE THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS AND THE RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM UNREASONABLE SEIZURES AND EXCESSIVE FINES AND THUS DISMANTLING MUCH OF DETROIT'S CAR FORFEITURE SYSTEM. STATE OF ARIZONA V. JERRY JOHNSON IJ FILED A LAWSUIT ON BEHALF OF JERRY JOHNSON AFTER OFFICERS INTERROGATED HIM AT THE PHOENIX AIRPORT AND SEIZED THE ALMOST $40,000 HE WAS CARRYING. JERRY HAD COMMITTED NO CRIME AND WAS ON HIS WAY TO BUY A TRUCK FOR HIS SMALL TRUCKING BUSINESS. BUT THE OFFICERS BASELESSLY ACCUSED HIM OF LAUNDERING MONEY. STATE PROSECUTORS THEN USED CIVIL FORFEITURE TO TAKE JERRY'S MONEY. JERRY HAD TO PROVE THE MONEY WAS HIS, BUT THE COURT FOUND THAT JERRY WAS MORE LIKELY TO BE TRANSPORTING THE PROCEEDS OF DRUG TRAFFICKING THAN TRAVELING WITH THE MONEY ON A LEGITIMATE BUSINESS TRIP. THIS EFFECTIVELY REQUIRED JERRY TO PROVE HIS INNOCENCE. THE COURT ORDERED THE FORFEITURE OF JERRY'S MONEY AND NOW THE STATE RETAINS IT. IT VIOLATES DUE PROCESS TO REQUIRE SOMEONE TO PROVE THEIR INNOCENCE TO SECURE THE RETURN OF THEIR PROPERTY, SO JERRY PARTNERED WITH IJ TO APPEAL THE COURT'S DECISION. IN MAY 2022, THE ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS RULED THAT JERRY MAY CONTEST THE CIVIL FORFEITURE OF HIS MONEY. JERRY'S CASE ALSO MOTIVATED THE ARIZONA LEGISLATURE TO STRENGTHEN DUE PROCESS PROTECTIONS FOR PROPERTY OWNERS FACING CIVIL FORFEITURE. SPARGER-WITHERS V. TAYLOR, ET AL. UNLIKE EVERY OTHER STATE IN THE NATION, INDIANA OUTSOURCES CIVIL FORFEITURE SUITS TO PRIVATE LAWYERS ON A CONTINGENCY-FEE BASIS. THE MORE PROPERTY THE STATE FORFEITS, THE MORE MONEY THE LAWYERS POCKET. HUNDREDS OF THESE FOR-PROFIT CIVIL FORFEITURE CASES ARE FILED EACH YEAR. IN FALL 2021, IJ PUSHED BACK WITH A FEDERAL CLASS-ACTION LAWSUIT AGAINST ONE OF THE STATE'S MOST PROLIFIC CONTINGENCY-FEE PROSECUTORS. THE CLAIM IS AS SIMPLE AS IT IS IMPORTANT: UNDER BASIC DUE-PROCESS PRINCIPLES, PROSECUTORS CANNOT HAVE A PERSONAL FINANCIAL STAKE IN THE CASES THEY PROSECUTE. SUCH A SYSTEM DELEGITIMIZES THE JUSTICE SYSTEM AND SKEWS PROSECUTORIAL INCENTIVES. IT'S PAST TIME TO PUT AN END TO FOR-PROFIT PROSECUTIONS. WOODS, ET AL. V. HARRIS COUNTY, ET AL.; STATE OF TEXAS V. $41,680 POLICE IN TEXAS'S MOST POPULOUS COUNTY ROUTINELY ASK DRIVERS IF THEY HAVE CASH IN THE CAR, ONLY TO SEIZE THE CASH, ACCUSE IT OF A CRIME, AND DRIVE AWAY WITH IT IN THEIR PATROL CAR. AMEAL WOODS AND JORDAN DAVIS GOT TRAPPED BY HARRIS COUNTY'S FORFEITURE RACKET AND WANT THEIR LIFE SAVINGS BACK AFTER POLICE SEIZED $41,680 MEANT FOR BUYING A USED VEHICLE AND HELD IT WITHOUT NOTICE FOR TWO YEARS. HARRIS COUNTY HAS AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL FINANCIAL INCENTIVE TO SEIZE AND FORFEIT CASH AND OTHER PROPERTY WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE AND TO DO SO EXCESSIVELY, SWEEPING IN INNOCENT PEOPLE AND PROPERTY. THAT IS WHY AMEAL AND JORDAN HAVE TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FILE A MAJOR CLASS-ACTION LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF HARRIS COUNTY'S CIVIL FORFEITURE PROGRAM. PLATT V. MOORE, ET AL. ARIZONA'S FORFEITURE LAWS ARE SO COMPLICATED THAT EVEN LAWYERS OFTEN STRUGGLE TO UNDERSTAND THEM - LET ALONE THE AVERAGE PERSON. TWO VICTIMS OF THIS MAZE ARE TERRY AND RIA PLATT, AN ELDERLY COUPLE WHO HAD THEIR CAR SEIZED AFTER POLICE PULLED OVER THEIR SON, WHO DID NOT OWN THE CAR, FOR A WINDOW TINT VIOLATION. THE POLICE FOUND CASH AND A SMALL AMOUNT OF PERSONAL USE MARIJUANA, BOTH OF WHICH THE SON SAID WERE HIS. PROSECUTORS TRIED TO IGNORE THE LAW AND FORFEIT THE CAR. WHEN THE PLATTS TRIED TO GET THEIR CAR BACK, THE GOVERNMENT DENIED THEM THEIR DAY IN COURT USING A LOOPHOLE IN ARIZONA'S "UNCONTESTED" FORFEITURE SYSTEM. SHORTLY AFTER IJ GOT INVOLVED, THE PROSECUTORS RETURNED THE CAR, AND THE CASE MOTIVATED SOME REFORMS OF ARIZONA FORFEITURE LAW. BUT ARIZONA STILL ALLOWS "UNCONTESTED FORFEITURES." IN FALL 2021, A FEDERAL APPELLATE COURT REINSTATED THE PLATTS' LONG-RUNNING CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE AGAINST FORFEITURE ABUSE IN ARIZONA. TERRY ABBOTT V. STATE OF INDIANA IN 2015, POLICE SEIZED ABOUT $9,000 FROM TERRY ABBOTT. HE ORIGINALLY HIRED AN ATTORNEY TO DEFEND AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT'S FORFEITURE LAWSUIT. BUT HE COULD NOT AFFORD THE MOUNTING LEGAL FEES, SO HE CONTINUED WITHOUT COUNSEL. HE ASKED FOR THE HELP OF A COURT-APPOINTED ATTORNEY, BUT THE TRIAL COURT REJECTED HIS REQUEST AND DECIDED THE GOVERNMENT

Return Reference	Explanation
	SHOULD GET TO KEEP HIS MONEY. ON APPEAL, THE COURT OF APPEALS HELD THAT THE TRIAL COURT HAD JUMPED THE GUN AND THE GOVERNMENT MUST PROVE ITS CASE AT TRIAL. THE COURT OF APPEALS ALSO HELD THAT MR. ABBOTT SHOULD BE ABLE TO USE SOME OF THE SEIZED FUNDS TO HIRE DEFENSE COUNSEL. INDIANA ASKED THE STATE SUPREME COURT TO TAKE ON THE CASE, WHERE IJ ARGUED FOR OUR CLIENT'S RIGHT TO USE HIS FORFEITED FUNDS IN HIS DEFENSE. UNFORTUNATELY, THE COURT HELD IN MARCH 2022 THAT FORFEITURE VICTIMS HAVE A RIGHT TO TRIAL BUT CANNOT USE FORFEITED FUNDS TO HIRE AN ATTORNEY. RICHARDSON, ET AL. V. $20,771.00, ET AL. IN JULY 2020, IJ INTERVENED ON BEHALF OF TRAVIS GREEN, A SOUTH CAROLINA MAN FROM WHOM OFFICIALS AND PROSECUTORS SEIZED AND ATTEMPTED TO PERMANENTLY TAKE MONEY. INITIALLY, AFTER HEARING ARGUMENTS FROM BOTH SIDES, A JUDGE RULED THAT THE STATUTES PROSECUTORS TRIED TO USE TO FORFEIT TRAVIS' MONEY VIOLATED DUE PROCESS RIGHTS AND AN INDIVIDUAL'S RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM EXCESSIVE FINES. THE PROSECUTORS APPEALED THE DECISION TO THE STATE SUPREME COURT, AND IJ PARTNERED WITH TRAVIS TO DEFEND HIS VICTORY AND PROPERTY RIGHTS FOR SOUTH CAROLINIANS. WE AWAIT A DECISION. PAUL SNITKO, ET AL. V. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL. USING CIVIL FORFEITURE, THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SOUGHT TO PERMANENTLY TAKE THE CONTENTS OF HUNDREDS OF SAFE DEPOSIT BOXES, INCLUDING OVER $85 MILLION IN CASH AND PRECIOUS METALS, JEWELRY, AND OTHER VALUABLES WORTH MILLIONS MORE. BUT THE BOXES' OWNERS WERE NOT ACCUSED OF ANY CRIME. IN MAY 2021, SEVERAL OF THOSE OWNERS JOINED WITH IJ TO STOP THE GOVERNMENT'S FORFEITURE PLANS IN THEIR TRACKS. AFTER GRANTING PRELIMINARY RELIEF HOLDING THAT THE GOVERNMENT VIOLATED THE FOURTH AMENDMENT AND THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE BY TRYING TO FORFEIT SEIZED PROPERTY WITHOUT GIVING A REASON WHY, THE COURT IN OCTOBER 2021 CERTIFIED THE CASE AS A CLASS ACTION. NOW, IJ AND THE BOX OWNERS ARE FIGHTING FOR A JUDGMENT THAT THE GOVERNMENT NEVER SHOULD HAVE OPENED ANY OF THESE SECURITY DEPOSIT BOXES IN THE FIRST PLACE.
RAINWATERS AND HOLLINGSWORTH V. TENNESSEE WILDLIFE RESOURCES AGENCY, ET AL.	TERRY RAINWATERS AND HUNTER HOLLINGSWORTH OWN RURAL PROPERTIES IN TENNESSEE, WHICH THEY USE FOR HUNTING AND OTHER ACTIVITIES. THEIR PROPERTIES ARE THEIR SANCTUARIES, BUT OFFICERS FROM THE TENNESSEE WILDLIFE RESOURCES AGENCY (TWRA) ROUTINELY ENTER PRIVATE LAND ON A WHIM TO SEARCH FOR POTENTIAL HUNTING VIOLATIONS WITHOUT A WARRANT. THEY TRESPASS, TAKE PHOTOS AND VIDEOS, AND EVEN INSTALL CAMERAS TO RECORD 24/7. THE TENNESSEE CONSTITUTION PROHIBITS STATE OFFICIALS FROM BARGING IN WHENEVER THEY WISH. TERRY AND HUNTER TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO SUE TWRA IN TENNESSEE STATE COURT TO VINDICATE THE RIGHT OF ALL TENNESSEANS TO BE FREE FROM UNCONSTITUTIONAL SEARCHES. IN MARCH 2022, A THREE-JUDGE TRIAL COURT PANEL DECLARED THE WARRANTLESS ENTRY STATUTE "UNCONSTITUTIONAL, UNLAWFUL, AND UNENFORCEABLE." THE STATE HAS APPEALED, SO WE WILL CONTINUE THE FIGHT. BENNETT V. MERTZ, ET AL. JEREMY BENNETT OWNS A TAXIDERMY AND DEER PROCESSING BUSINESS IN OHIO, RIGHT NEXT TO HIS HOME. FOR YEARS, THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES (ODNR) HAS CONDUCTED INTRUSIVE, WARRANTLESS INSPECTIONS OF HIS AND OTHER SHOPS SEARCHING FOR GAME VIOLATIONS, EVEN THREATENING HIM WITH JAIL WHEN HE ASKED THEM TO COME BACK LATER. THE FOURTH AMENDMENT GENERALLY FORBIDS WARRANTLESS SEARCHES OF PRIVATE BUSINESSES, SO JEREMY AND IJ FILED A FEDERAL SUIT AGAINST ODNR TO END ITS UNCONSTITUTIONAL SEARCHES. IN EARLY 2022, ODNR AMENDED ITS WARRANTLESS INSPECTION REGULATION TO END INVOLUNTARY WARRANTLESS INSPECTIONS, AND WE DISMISSED THE CASE IN JUNE 2022. PUNXSUTAWNEY HUNTING CLUB, INC., ET AL. V. PENNSYLVANIA GAME COMMISSION, ET AL. LIKE MANY STATES, PENNSYLVANIA GRANTS ITS WILDLIFE OFFICERS VIRTUALLY UNLIMITED POWER TO ENTER PRIVATE LAND WHENEVER THEY PLEASE TO SNOOP AROUND FOR POTENTIAL HUNTING VIOLATIONS. KNOWING THAT, WILDLIFE OFFICERS HAVE REPEATEDLY ENTERED HUNTING CLUBS' PROPERTIES WITHOUT CONSENT OR WARRANTS TO SPY ON MEMBERS AND INTERROGATE THEM ABOUT THEIR COMPLIANCE WITH HUNTING LAWS. IN 2007, THE STATE SUPREME COURT SAID THAT WAS LEGAL. BUT THE PENNSYLVANIA CONSTITUTION HAS UNIQUE TEXT PROTECTING PRIVATE LAND FROM WARRANTLESS SEARCHES, AND THE TIME HAS COME FOR THE COURT TO HONOR THAT TEXT. THE PUNXSUTAWNEY AND PITCH PINE HUNTING CLUBS, REPRESENTED BY IJ, ARE SUING IN STATE COURT TO RESTORE ALL PENNSYLVANIANS' RIGHT TO BE SECURE ON THEIR LAND. QUINONEZ V. 5 UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AND UNITED STATES POSTAL INSPECTION SERVICE OFFICIALS IN THE SPRING OF 2020, LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENTS WORKING FOR THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE BASELESSLY SEIZED A SET OF FOUR ORDINARY BOXES CONTAINING THOUSANDS OF COVID-19 FACE MASKS WITH POLITICAL SLOGANS. THE MASKS BELONGED TO RENE QUINONEZ, WHO OPERATES OAKLAND-BASED MOVEMENT INK LLC. BLACK LIVES MATTER ORGANIZERS HIRED RENE TO PRINT AS MANY FACE MASKS AS POSSIBLE TO DISTRIBUTE TO PROTESTORS. HE WORKED NEARLY NONSTOP TO PRINT AND SHIP THE MASKS. BUT THEY DIDN'T ARRIVE IN TIME BECAUSE OFFICIALS SEIZED THE PLAIN BROWN BOXES WITHOUT A WARRANT, CLAIMING THEY LOOKED LIKE OTHER BOXES FROM OTHER CITIES THAT HAD CONTAINED DRUGS. RENE'S BUSINESS TOOK SERIOUS DAMAGE. IN JUNE 2022, RENE AND MOVEMENT INK PARTNERED WITH IJ TO FILE A FEDERAL LAWSUIT TO VINDICATE HIS FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS. CATHERINE H. BARBER MEMORIAL SHELTER, INC. V. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE TOWN OF NORTH WILKESBORO ET AL. IN NORTH WILKESBORO, NORTH CAROLINA, THE CATHERINE H. BARBER MEMORIAL SHELTER WORKS CLOSELY WITH LOCAL SOCIAL SERVICES TO TEMPORARILY SHELTER THOSE IN NEED. AFTER OPERATING FOR 30 YEARS, THE SHELTER SOUGHT A LARGER, MORE PERMANENT SPACE, SO IT APPLIED FOR A PERMIT. BUT THE TOWN BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT DENIED THE APPLICATION BECAUSE IT WOULD NOT BE "HARMONIOUS" WITH ITS NEIGHBORS. IT IS ILLEGAL FOR THE GOVERNMENT TO USE ITS ZONING POWER TO PENALIZE OR ARBITRARILY RESTRICT THE PROPERTY RIGHTS OF CERTAIN KINDS OF PEOPLE OR CERTAIN TYPES OF PLACES. FOR THESE REASONS, THE BARBER SHELTER PARTNERED WITH IJ IN OCTOBER 2020 TO CHALLENGE THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL RESTRICTION ON PRIVATE PROPERTY AND DEFEND THE SHELTER'S RIGHT TO OFFER PRIVATE CHARITY ON PRIVATE PROPERTY. IN DECEMBER 2021, A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RESOUNDINGLY SIDED WITH THE SHELTER RULING THE TOWN HAD VIOLATED THE CONSTITUTION IN DENYING THE PERMIT. THE BARBER SHELTER IS NOW HARD AT WORK RENOVATING THE PROPERTY. IJ RECEIVED FROM THE TOWN OF NORTH WILKESBORO $180,000 IN ATTORNEYS' FEES. TINY HOUSE HAND UP, INC. V. CITY OF CALHOUN, GEORGIA, ET AL. CINDY TUCKER RUNS TINY HOUSE HAND UP, OR THHU, TO FILL A NICHE FOR SMALLER, LESS COSTLY HOMES. THEY'RE READY TO BUILD A COMMUNITY OF SOUTHERN-STYLE COTTAGES WITH 540 TO 600 SQUARE FEET OF LIVING SPACE EACH IN CALHOUN, GEORGIA, BUT THE CITY DEMANDS HOUSES HAVE OVER 1,000 SQUARE FEET. GEORGIA'S CONSTITUTION REQUIRES ZONING LAWS TO BE SUBSTANTIALLY RELATED TO PUBLIC HEALTH, SAFETY, MORALITY, OR GENERAL WELFARE. CALHOUN'S BAN ON SMALLER HOMES IS NOT RELATED TO ANYTHING OTHER THAN EXCLUDING PEOPLE WITH LOWER INCOMES AND FORCING PEOPLE TO LIVE IN HOMES THAT ARE LARGER THAN THEY WANT. SO, CINDY AND THHU HAVE TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FIGHT FOR THEIR RIGHT TO BUILD MODESTLY SIZED HOMES. IN OCTOBER 2021, WE FILED A PETITION ASKING THE COURT TO FIND THAT THE CITY'S BAN VIOLATES THE GEORGIA CONSTITUTION. JOSEPH CORSINI V. CITY OF NEW YORK THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS

Return Reference	Explanation
	(DOB) IMPOSES FINES FOR VIOLATIONS TO ENSURE THE SAFETY OF THE CITY AND ITS INHABITANTS. TOO OFTEN THOUGH, IT PENALIZES PROPERTY OWNERS OVER TRIVIAL ISSUES AND LEAVES THEM OWING THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS, AS IT DID WITH JOE CORSINI. JOE IS A PIGEON KEEPER - A COMMON HOBBY IN THE CITY. HE DECIDED TO BUILD A SMALL PIGEON COOP ON THE ROOF OF HIS HOME BUT DID NOT REALIZE HE NEEDED TO OBTAIN A BUILDING PERMIT. HE SOON RECEIVED $3,000 IN FINES AND AN ORDER THAT HE BRING HIS COOP INTO COMPLIANCE BY OBTAINING A PERMIT. WHILE ENGAGING WITH THE DOB, HE AMASSED APPROXIMATELY $11,000 IN FINES. EVENTUALLY, HE CONCEDED AND TOOK DOWN THE COOP. BUT THIS PROCESS DID NOT SIT WELL WITH JOE, AND HE TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FIGHT BACK. PENALIZING A HOMEOWNER WITH FINES THAT CAN RANGE UP TO $25,000 PER VIOLATION AND FAILING TO PROVIDE A RECOURSE TO APPEAL SIMPLY RAISES MONEY FOR THE GOVERNMENT AND DEPRIVES PROPERTY OWNERS OF DUE PROCESS. JOE IS FIGHTING TO CHANGE THIS SYSTEM AND ENSURE THAT HOMEOWNERS ARE TREATED WITH DIGNITY AND DUE PROCESS. IN JANUARY 2022, A DISTRICT COURT DISMISSED THE SUIT ON STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS GROUNDS. WE FILED AN AMENDED COMPLAINT. AMANDA ROOT ET AL. V. CITY OF SIERRA VISTA AMANDA ROOT HAS CALLED SIERRA VISTA, IN SOUTHEAST ARIZONA, HOME FOR MORE THAN 20 YEARS. IN THE LATE '90S, AMANDA ACQUIRED A SMALL LOT IN THE THEN CLOUD 9 MOBILE HOME PARK. SADLY, IN 2016, AMANDA'S MOBILE HOME BURNED TO THE GROUND, LEAVING HER TEMPORARILY HOMELESS. BUT IN 2017, AMANDA WAS GIVEN A PARK TRAILER TO PUT ON HER PROPERTY AND LIVE IN. THEN IN JULY 2020 - DURING THE MIDDLE OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC - THE CITY TRIED TO KICK AMANDA AND HER NEIGHBORS OUT OF THEIR HOMES AND OFF THEIR PROPERTY. THE CITY GAVE THEM JUST 30 DAYS TO LEAVE. THERE WAS NO HEARING OR APPEAL OFFERED. THE CITY SAYS THAT AMANDA LIVES IN AN "RV" INSTEAD OF A "MANUFACTURED HOME." TO BE CLEAR, IT IS PERFECTLY LEGAL TO LIVE IN AN RV IN SIERRA VISTA. THE CITY JUST SAYS AMANDA CANNOT HAVE AN RV ON THE PROPERTY SHE OWNS BECAUSE OF THE TECHNICALITIES OF THE CITY'S ZONING LAWS. NO ONE SHOULD BE MADE HOMELESS IN THE NAME OF ZONING, SO AMANDA AND HER NEIGHBORS TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO SUE THE CITY AND PROTECT THEIR RV HOMES. A JUDGE DISMISSED THE LAWSUIT IN SEPTEMBER 2021, AND WE HAVE APPEALED. BRITTANY COLEMAN V. TOWN OF BROOKSIDE SINCE 2018, THE TINY TOWN OF BROOKSIDE, ALABAMA, HAS BEEN A REVENUE-GENERATING FIEFDOM. HUNDREDS OF RESIDENTS - MOST INNOCENT OF ANY WRONGDOING - WERE PULLED OVER AND THE POLICE SEIZED AND TOWED THEIR CARS. TO GET THEIR CARS BACK, THEY WERE FORCED TO PAY HUNDREDS OR EVEN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS FOR TOWING FEES, COURT COSTS, AND TRUMPED-UP TICKETS. TOWN OFFICIALS OPENLY DISCUSSED THEIR DESIRE TO EXTRACT REVENUE FROM THEIR CONSTITUENTS. IJ FILED A SWEEPING CLASS ACTION AGAINST THE TOWN IN APRIL 2022. WHILE A FEW LOCAL ATTORNEYS HAVE CHALLENGED THE TOWN'S ACTIONS, IJ'S CASE IS THE ONLY COMPREHENSIVE, CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT TO END THIS REGIME OF SYSTEMIC ABUSE.
ZENAIDA "SANDY" MARTINEZ V. CITY OF LANTANA, FLORIDA, ET AL.	THE CITY OF LANTANA, FLORIDA, FINED SANDY MARTINEZ MORE THAN $165,000 FOR MINOR PROPERTY CODE VIOLATIONS - INCLUDING A $100,000 FINE FOR PARKING HER CARS IN HER DRIVEWAY IN SUCH A WAY THAT THE TIRES ON ONE SIDE OF THE CAR WERE ON THE EDGE OF THE LAWN INSTEAD OF ON THE PAVED DRIVEWAY. THE CITY ALSO FINED HER FOR A STORM-DAMAGED FENCE AND CRACKS IN HER DRIVEWAY. THE FINES ADD UP TO MORE THAN HALF THE VALUE OF HER HOME. EVEN AFTER SANDY MOVED HER CAR, THE CITY CONTINUED TO ASSESS DAILY FINES BECAUSE, SUPPOSEDLY, SHE DID NOT INFORM SOMEONE SHE HAD MOVED HER CAR'S WHEELS SO THAT THEY WERE NO LONGER ON ANY GRASS IN HER FRONT YARD. BUT THE GOVERNMENT CANNOT LOCK YOU INTO A LIFETIME OF DEBT AND CRIPPLE YOU FINANCIALLY BECAUSE YOUR DRIVEWAY IS TOO NARROW AND YOUR FENCE FELL IN A HURRICANE. BY TRYING TO IMPOSE RUINOUS FINES ON SANDY FOR SUCH MINOR INFRACTIONS, LANTANA IS VIOLATING SANDY'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO BE FREE FROM EXCESSIVE FINES. TO FIGHT BACK, SHE TEAMED UP WITH IJ IN FEBRUARY 2021 TO FILE A LAWSUIT IN FLORIDA STATE COURT TO HOLD THE CITY ACCOUNTABLE FOR THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR. THAT JULY, A COURT REJECTED LANTANA'S ATTEMPT TO DISMISS THE LAWSUIT. ERICA BREWER AND ZACHARY MALLORY V. TOWN OF EAGLE ET AL.; ANNALYSE AND JOSEPH VICTOR V. TOWN OF EAGLE ET AL. IJ REPRESENTS ANNALYSE AND JOSEPH VICTOR IN ONE LAWSUIT AND ERICA BREWER AND ZACH MALLORY IN ANOTHER AGAINST THE TOWN OF EAGLE, WISCONSIN. THE TOWN IMPOSED $87,900 IN FINES AND FEES ON ANNALYSE AND JOSEPH VICTOR FOR A VARIETY OF VIOLATIONS RELATED TO A FEW TRUCKS THAT WERE PARKED ON THEIR NEARLY 10 ACRES OF RURAL PROPERTY. SIMILARLY, THE TOWN TARGETED ERICA AND ZACH AFTER ERICA SPOKE IN SUPPORT OF A NEIGHBOR AT A TOWN MEETING. SOON, THE TOWN THREATENED THEM WITH $20,000 IN FINES AND FEES FOR VIOLATIONS LIKE AN UNPERMITTED FLOWER PLANTER, TALL GRASS, AND THE LOCATION OF A BARN THAT WAS ON THE PROPERTY WHEN THEY PURCHASED THE LAND. LOCAL GOVERNMENTS CANNOT LEVY DISPROPORTIONATE FINES TO RAISE MONEY OR TARGET PEOPLE AS RETALIATION, SO WE ARE FIGHTING IN COURT TO STOP THIS ABUSE. IN AUGUST 2021, A COURT GRANTED OUR REQUEST FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION PROTECTING ERICA AND ZACH FROM CONTINUED HARASSMENT BY THE TOWN WHILE THEY SEEK TO VINDICATE THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. IN MAY 2021, A COURT DENIED OUR MOTION TO VACATE THE FINES AGAINST THE VICTORS AND WE HAVE APPEALED. BEAN, ET AL. V. SEATTLE, ET AL. SEATTLE TREATS ITS RENTAL TENANTS AS SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS BY FORCING THEM TO ALLOW GOVERNMENT-MANDATED INSPECTORS INTO THEIR HOMES WITHOUT GETTING A WARRANT. RENTERS MATTHEW BENTLEY, WESLEY WILLIAMS, AND JOSEPH BRIERE FOUND THAT OUT FIRSTHAND WHEN THE CITY INFORMED THEIR LANDLORD THAT THEIR HOME NEEDED TO BE INSPECTED BY A GOVERNMENT-MANDATED HOUSING INSPECTOR. BENTLEY, WILLIAMS, AND BRIERE VALUE THEIR PRIVACY AND INFORMED THE CITY THAT THEY DID NOT WANT THEIR HOME INSPECTED. THEIR LANDLORDS AGREED AND TOLD THE CITY THEIR TENANTS REFUSED TO ALLOW AN INSPECTOR. THE CITY RESPONDED BY THREATENING FINES UPWARDS OF $500 PER DAY IF THE LANDLORDS DID NOT COERCE THEIR TENANTS TO ALLOW THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL INSPECTION. ALL THREE RESIDENTS, THEIR LANDLORDS, AND A GROUP OF OTHER RENTERS PARTNERED WITH IJ IN DECEMBER 2018 TO FILE A CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT AGAINST SEATTLE ASKING THE COURTS TO SHUT DOWN SEATTLE'S WARRANTLESS INSPECTIONS PROGRAM. UNFORTUNATELY, THE TRIAL COURT DISMISSED THE CASE, AND IN JULY OF 2021 THE WASHINGTON COURT OF APPEALS UPHELD THAT DISMISSAL. IN DECEMBER 2021, THE WASHINGTON SUPREME COURT DENIED REVIEW, DIMINISHING THE PRIVACY RIGHTS OF TENANTS ACROSS WASHINGTON. AMANDA WINK, ET AL. V. CITY OF ORANGE CITY, ET AL. ORANGE CITY, IOWA, ALSO HAS A RENTAL INSPECTION LAW THAT FORCES LANDLORDS AND TENANTS TO OPEN THEIR PROPERTIES AND HOMES TO SUBMIT TO INTRUSIVE INSPECTIONS. THIS ORDINANCE ALLOWS THE GOVERNMENT TO ENTER THE MOST INTIMATE CONFINES OF TENANTS' HOMES, EVEN WHEN LANDLORDS AND TENANTS OBJECT. ORDINARILY, WHEN A PERSON DOES NOT WANT THE GOVERNMENT TO ENTER THEIR HOME, THEY CAN REQUEST A WARRANT SUPPORTED BY SOME EVIDENCE THAT A VIOLATION OF THE LAW HAS OCCURRED. BUT IN ORANGE CITY, THE GOVERNMENT CAN GO TO COURT AND READILY OBTAIN AN "ADMINISTRATIVE" WARRANT, WHICH DOES NOT REQUIRE ANY EVIDENCE THAT ANYTHING IS WRONG WITH THE HOME. THE U.S. AND IOWA CONSTITUTIONS GUARANTEE STRONG PROPERTY RIGHTS AND THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY IN THE HOME, MEANING THAT THE GOVERNMENT NEEDS VOLUNTARY CONSENT OR PROBABLE CAUSE TO ENTER

Return Reference	Explanation
	YOUR HOME. ORANGE CITY'S INSPECTION SCHEME DEFIES THESE CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES, SO IN MAY 2021, WE TEAMED UP WITH ORANGE CITY TENANTS AMANDA WINK, BRYAN SINGER, AND ERIKA NORDYKE, AND THEIR LANDLORDS, TO FILE A LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE GOVERNMENT'S USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE WARRANTS. IN FALL 2021, A JUDGE DENIED THE CITY'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE SUIT. DOROTHY RIVERA ET AL. V. BOROUGH OF POTTSTOWN AND KEITH A. PLACE POTTSTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA, HAS A SIMILAR RENTAL INSPECTION LAW THAT FORCES LANDLORDS AND TENANTS TO OPEN THEIR PROPERTIES AND HOMES TO SUBMIT TO INTRUSIVE INSPECTIONS SEARCHING FOR HOUSING CODE VIOLATIONS EVEN IF A LANDLORD OR TENANT OBJECTS. THE FOURTH AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION AND ARTICLE I, SECTION 8 OF THE PENNSYLVANIA CONSTITUTION GUARANTEE PROPERTY RIGHTS AND THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY IN THE HOME. THAT IS WHY IJ TEAMED UP WITH A POTTSTOWN LANDLORD AND HIS TENANTS TO CHALLENGE THE GOVERNMENT'S USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE WARRANTS TO SEARCH HOMES WITHOUT VOLUNTARY CONSENT OR A WARRANT BASED UPON TRADITIONAL PROBABLE CAUSE. IN MAY 2020, THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA VACATED AND REMANDED A LOWER COURT'S RULING IN FAVOR OF POTTSTOWN AND ORDERED THE TOWN TO PRODUCE RECORDS RELATING TO THE RENTAL ORDINANCE. LOZANO, ET AL. V. ZION IN ZION, ILLINOIS, THE CITY REQUIRES LANDLORDS TO FORCE TENANTS TO OPEN THE DOORS OF THEIR HOMES TO CITY INSPECTORS WITHOUT A WARRANT. IF A TENANT REFUSES TO CONSENT TO AN INSPECTION, THE CITY THREATENS THEIR LANDLORD WITH RUINOUS FINES. THE CITY REFUSES TO ACQUIRE SEARCH WARRANTS IN RESPONSE TO TENANT OBJECTIONS. YOUR HOME IS YOUR CASTLE, WHETHER YOU RENT OR OWN, SO IN SEPTEMBER 2019, JOSEFINA LOZANO AND THREE OF HER TENANTS JOINED WITH IJ TO FILE A FEDERAL LAWSUIT TO SHUT DOWN ZION'S WARRANTLESS INSPECTION PROGRAM. THE CITY AMENDED THE ORDINANCE IN APRIL 2022 IN RESPONSE TO THE LAWSUIT SO THAT IT WILL NO LONGER PUNISH TENANTS OR LANDLORDS WHO REFUSE WARRANTLESS INSPECTIONS. DAVID AND PEGGY SCHROEDER V. CITY OF WILMINGTON, ET AL. AFTER RETIRING, DAVID AND PEG SCHROEDER BOUGHT A TOWNHOME IN WILMINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA, TO STAY AT WHEN THEY VISITED FAMILY. TO AFFORD THE TOWNHOME, THEY PLANNED ALSO TO OFFER IT AS A VACATION RENTAL WHEN THEY WERE NOT LIVING THERE. BUT AFTER $75,000 IN RENOVATIONS, THE CITY PASSED A ZONING ORDINANCE THAT CREATED A HARD CAP ON HOW MANY PROPERTIES WERE ALLOWED TO ENGAGE IN VACATION RENTALS. ANY PROPERTY THAT FELL WITHIN 400 FEET OF ANOTHER VACATION RENTAL WOULD BE PROHIBITED FROM OPERATING AS A VACATION RENTAL. TO DECIDE WHICH PROPERTY OWNERS WOULD RETAIN THEIR RIGHT TO OFFER VACATION RENTALS, THE CITY DEVISED A RANDOMIZED LOTTERY PROCESS THAT THE SCHROEDERS LOST. THEN THE CITY GAVE PROPERTIES THAT DID NOT WIN THE LOTTERY ONE YEAR TO RECOUP THEIR LOSSES. THIS, ACCORDING TO THE CITY, WOULD ABSOLVE THE CITY OF HAVING TO PAY THE SCHROEDERS "JUST COMPENSATION." BUT IF THE CITY WANTS TO TAKE THE SCHROEDERS' PROPERTY RIGHTS, IT HAS TO PAY THEM. IJ PARTNERED WITH DAVID AND PEG TO SUE THE CITY, ARGUING THAT THE STATE CONSTITUTION PROTECTS THEIR RIGHT TO RENT, AND IT PROHIBITS THE CITY FROM GRANTING EXCLUSIVE PRIVILEGES AND CREATING RENTAL MONOPOLIES THAT PROHIBIT EVERYONE ELSE FROM RENTING. IN SEPTEMBER 2020, A SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE RULED THE CITY'S ORDINANCE VIOLATED A STATEWIDE LAW, AND IN APRIL 2022, AN APPEALS COURT AFFIRMED THAT RULING.
MEADE AND SOOKRAM V. BONIN AND ETOH MONITORING, LLC	THE U.S. CONSTITUTION REQUIRES JUDGES TO BE OBJECTIVE WHEN DECIDING WHETHER TO DEPRIVE A PERSON OF HER LIBERTY OR PROPERTY. WHEN JUDGES HAVE A PERSONAL, POLITICAL, OR FINANCIAL INTEREST IN A CASE, THEY VIOLATE THE 14TH AMENDMENT'S GUARANTEE OF DUE PROCESS. HAKEEM MEADE, MARSHALL SOOKRAM, AND TOO MANY OTHERS IN NEW ORLEANS WERE ORDERED TO SUBMIT TO ANKLE MONITORING BY A JUDGE WHO HAD PERSONAL, POLITICAL, AND FINANCIAL TIES TO THE COMPANY THAT PROVIDED AND CHARGED FOR THIS SERVICE. NOW, HAKEEM AND MARSHALL ARE FIGHTING TO ENSURE THAT ANKLE MONITORING DECISIONS IN ORLEANS PARISH AND ELSEWHERE ARE MADE WITHOUT BIAS OR THE APPEARANCE OF BIAS. IN MAY 2020, THEY TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FILE A CIVIL RIGHTS CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT SEEKING AN ORDER DECLARING THAT JUDICIAL DECISIONS INFLUENCED BY A JUDGE'S TIES TO A PRIVATE PARTY VIOLATE THE CONSTITUTION AND REQUIRING THE COMPANY TO DISGORGE THE FEES IT HAS COLLECTED FROM DEFENDANTS APPEARING BEFORE THE JUDGE AND CANCEL ANY REMAINING FEES. IN SEPTEMBER 2021, A JUDGE DISMISSED THE LAWSUIT, AND IJ APPEALED TO THE FIFTH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. HOHENBERG AND HANSON V. SHELBY COUNTY, TENNESSEE, ET AL. WHEN A COURT PROCEEDING MAY RESULT IN A PERSON LOSING THEIR HOME, THE U.S. CONSTITUTION DEMANDS A FAIR PROCESS WITH RIGOROUS SAFEGUARDS. FOR DEFENDANTS IN MEMPHIS' ENVIRONMENTAL COURT, THE PROCESS IS ANYTHING BUT FAIR. SARAH HOHENBERG AND JOSEPH HANSON BOTH ENDED UP IN ENVIRONMENTAL COURT AFTER TREES FELL ON THEIR HOUSES. BOTH ENDED UP LOSING THEIR HOMES AFTER A YEARS-LONG PROCESS IN A COURT WHERE WITNESSES ARE NOT SWORN IN, EVIDENCE IS NOT AUTHENTICATED, AND PROCEEDINGS ARE NOT RECORDED, MAKING DECISIONS ALL BUT IMPOSSIBLE TO APPEAL. SARAH AND JOSEPH HAVE PARTNERED WITH IJ IN A LAWSUIT TO ENSURE THAT THE ENVIRONMENTAL COURT, AND SIMILAR HOUSING COURTS ACROSS THE COUNTRY, PROVIDE THE DUE PROCESS THAT THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES AND THAT THE COURT BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR MAKING BOTH OF THEM HOMELESS. MORALES V. CITY OF INDIO, ET AL. LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN INDIO, CALIFORNIA, TEAMED UP WITH A PRIVATE LAW FIRM TO CHARGE PROPERTY OWNERS THE COSTS OF THEIR OWN PROSECUTIONS. UNDER THIS OUTRAGEOUS SCHEME, THE LAW FIRM PROVIDED INDIO AND SEVERAL OTHER CALIFORNIA CITIES WITH "COST-NEUTRAL" CODE ENFORCEMENT SERVICES. THIS MEANS THAT EVERY TICKET THE CITY ISSUED FOR VIOLATIONS SUCH AS UN-MOWED GRASS OR "SUN-DAMAGED" ADDRESS NUMBERS WAS MONEY IN THE BANK FOR THE CITY AND THE LAW FIRM, WHICH THEN BILLED PROPERTY OWNERS THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS FOR "PROSECUTION FEES." IF OWNERS DARED TO CONTEST THE FEES, THEIR LEGAL BILLS SIMPLY GREW LARGER. IJ FILED A CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT AGAINST THE CITY IN FEBRUARY 2018 TO PUT A STOP TO THIS EGREGIOUS FORM OF POLICING FOR PROFIT. AND THAT DECEMBER, WE WON A RESOUNDING VICTORY WHEN THE CITY OF INDIO AGREED TO RETURN THE MONEY OF EVERYONE WHO WAS VICTIMIZED BY THE CITY'S SCHEME. BUT THEN, AFTER THE CASE HAD SETTLED AND SUBSTANTIVELY CONCLUDED, A TRIAL JUDGE NONETHELESS GRANTED SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE PRIVATE LAW FIRM THAT HAD ISSUED THESE FEES - EVEN THOUGH THE ACTUAL GOVERNMENT DEFENDANTS HAD LONG SINCE FIRED THE FIRM AND IT WAS NOT A PARTY TO THE CASE. IJ HAS APPEALED THAT RULING TO ESTABLISH THAT FORMER GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS DO NOT HAVE STANDING TO OBJECT TO SETTLEMENTS ENTERED INTO BY THEIR ERSTWHILE EMPLOYERS. NWAORIE V. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION ANTHONIA NWAORIE IS A REGISTERED NURSE AND AN AMERICAN CITIZEN WHO WAS ON HER WAY TO NIGERIA IN OCTOBER 2017 WITH $41,377 SHE HAD SAVED TO OPEN A MEDICAL CLINIC. BUT AT HOUSTON'S GEORGE BUSH INTERCONTINENTAL AIRPORT, U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION (CBP) AGENTS DISCOVERED HER MONEY AND TOOK EVERY PENNY - EVEN THOUGH SHE OBTAINED THE MONEY LEGALLY AND PLANNED TO USE IT LEGALLY. CBP STATED IT WOULD RETURN HER MONEY ONLY IF SHE SIGNED AN AGREEMENT WAIVING HER RIGHT TO INTEREST ON THE SEIZED PROPERTY AND HER RIGHTS TO SUE CBP OVER ANYTHING RELATED TO THE CONFISCATION OF HER MONEY. ANTHONIA TEAMED UP WITH IJ

Return Reference	Explanation
	TO FILE A FEDERAL CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT AGAINST CBP, AND WITHIN JUST ONE MONTH, SHE RECEIVED HER MONEY BACK. YET, IJ FORGED AHEAD WITH THE LAWSUIT TO END CBP'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND UNLAWFUL BEHAVIOR. IN AUGUST 2019, A DISTRICT COURT DISMISSED THE CASE, BUT WE HAVE APPEALED THE DISMISSAL TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 5TH CIRCUIT AND ARE AWAITING A DECISION. BRUCKER V. CITY OF DORAVILLE EACH YEAR, THE CITY OF DORAVILLE, GEORGIA, BUDGETS BETWEEN 17 AND 30% OF ITS OVERALL ANTICIPATED REVENUE TO COME FROM FINES AND FEES ISSUED BY ITS POLICE OFFICERS AND CODE INSPECTORS. BY PUTTING FINE REVENUE INTO ITS ANNUAL BUDGET, DORAVILLE CREATES A PERVERSE INCENTIVE FOR POLICE, PROSECUTORS, AND EVEN ITS MUNICIPAL COURT TO POLICE FOR PROFIT. DORAVILLE HOMEOWNER HILDA BRUCKER WAS FINED AND SENTENCED TO SIX MONTHS OF PROBATION FOR HAVING CRACKS IN HER DRIVEWAY. HILDA'S NEIGHBOR JEFF THORNTON WAS FINED $1,000 FOR HAVING A STACK OF FIREWOOD IN HIS BACKYARD. IN MAY 2018, HILDA, JEFF, AND TWO OTHERS PARTNERED WITH IJ TO STOP DORAVILLE'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL RELIANCE ON FINES AND FEES INCOME. IJ SECURED A FIRST-ROUND VICTORY IN APRIL 2019 AND A SECOND WIN THAT JULY. BUT IN DECEMBER 2020, A FEDERAL JUDGE RULED AGAINST OUR CLIENTS, UPHOLDING THE TOWN'S FINES AND FEES. UNFORTUNATELY, IN JUNE 2022 THE 11TH CIRCUIT AFFIRMED THAT RULING. VALANCOURT BOOKS, LLC V. CLAGGETT, ET AL. VALANCOURT IS A SMALL PUBLISHING COMPANY OPERATED OUT OF THE RICHMOND, VIRGINIA, HOME OF JAMES JENKINS, WHO REVIVES AND POPULARIZES RARE, NEGLECTED, AND OUT-OF-PRINT FICTION. VALANCOURT HAS PUBLISHED MORE THAN 300 BOOKS, ALL OF WHICH IT HAS PERMISSION TO REPRINT. BUT IN JUNE 2018, JAMES RECEIVED AN EMAIL FROM THE U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE DEMANDING THAT HE PROVIDE IT WITH COPIES OF EVERY SINGLE BOOK IN VALANCOURT'S CATALOG, AND THREATENING HIM WITH FINES THAT COULD REACH HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IF HE FAILED TO COMPLY. A LITTLE-KNOWN PROVISION OF FEDERAL LAW MAKES IT ILLEGAL TO PUBLISH A NEW BOOK WITHOUT PROVIDING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WITH TWO FREE COPIES. VALANCOURT BOOKS JOINED WITH IJ IN AUGUST 2018 TO FILE A FEDERAL LAWSUIT AGAINST THE COPYRIGHT OFFICE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, CLAIMING THAT THE BOOK-DEPOSIT MANDATE IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE IT VIOLATES THE TAKINGS CLAUSE OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT AND OPERATES AS A PENALTY ON PEOPLE WHO PUBLISH PHYSICAL BOOKS WITHOUT TURNING OVER A COPY. IN JULY 2021, A DISTRICT COURT UPHELD THE LAW. WE HAVE APPEALED TO THE D.C. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. HOMELESS CHARITY, ET AL. V. AKRON BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS AKRON, OHIO, HAS A SOARING HOMELESS POPULATION. SAGE LEWIS STEPPED UP TO PROVIDE REAL SUPPORT TO THOSE IN NEED BY ALLOWING A FEW HOMELESS MEN AND WOMEN TO PITCH THEIR TENTS IN THE BACK LOT OF HIS BUILDING. THIS INFORMAL ARRANGEMENT EVOLVED INTO A COMMUNITY DESIGNED TO HELP HOMELESS MEN AND WOMEN TRANSITION BACK TO INDEPENDENCE. BUT WHILE AKRON OFFICIALS DO NOT OFFER ADEQUATE SOLUTIONS TO THE CITY'S HOMELESS PROBLEM, THEY ARE ALL TOO QUICK TO USE ZONING LAWS TO SHUT DOWN SAGE'S CHARITY. IJ JOINED WITH SAGE IN OCTOBER 2018 TO VINDICATE THE RIGHT TO CARRY ON THIS WORK BY KEEPING VULNERABLE PEOPLE OFF THE STREETS. IN MAY 2022, A STATE APPELLATE COURT UPHELD THE ZONING BOARD'S REFUSAL TO ALLOW SAGE TO OPERATE HIS SHELTER ON PRIVATE PROPERTY. WE PLAN TO APPEAL TO THE STATE SUPREME COURT. CITY OF NORCO V. MUGAR THREE YEARS AGO, NORCO, CALIFORNIA, RESIDENT RON MUGAR RECEIVED A NOTICE INDICATING THAT HE HAD VIOLATED THE CITY'S HOUSING CODE. HE ADMITTEDLY ALLOWED HIS HOME AND BACKYARD TO BECOME CLUTTERED WITH HOBBY MACHINERY. BUT INSTEAD OF FINING HIM OR ASKING HIM TO BRING HIS PROPERTY UP TO CODE, THE CITY'S PRIVATE, FOR-PROFIT PROSECUTORS DECLARED THEY WERE GOING TO TAKE OVER OWNERSHIP OF HIS HOUSE USING A LEGAL PROCESS KNOWN AS "RECEIVERSHIP." TRADITIONALLY, RECEIVERSHIPS ALLOW A CITY TO TAKE TEMPORARY OWNERSHIP OF A PROPERTY TO FIX AN IMMINENT DANGER TO A COMMUNITY. UNFORTUNATELY, RECEIVERSHIPS ARE NOW BEING USED IN CALIFORNIA TO ADDRESS EVEN MINOR CODE VIOLATIONS. RON BROUGHT HIS HOME AND YARD UP TO CODE AND FOUGHT THE RECEIVERSHIP IN COURT - AND WON. BUT JUST WHEN RON THOUGHT HE COULD RELAX, HE RECEIVED A BILL FROM THE CITY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE FOR THE $60,798 IT SPENT LOSING RON'S CASE. RON IS EFFECTIVELY BEING PUNISHED FOR SUCCESSFULLY DEFENDING HIS PROPERTY RIGHTS AGAINST GOVERNMENT OVERREACH. IJ JOINED RON IN APRIL 2019 TO VINDICATE HIS RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS AND TO PROTECT ALL CALIFORNIA PROPERTY OWNERS FROM FALLING VICTIM TO ABUSIVE CODE ENFORCEMENT SCHEMES. UNFORTUNATELY, IN MARCH 2021, THE CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT REFUSED TO HEAR HIS APPEAL.
DAVIS, ET AL. V. CITY OF CHICAGO	IN APRIL 2019, IJ FILED A CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT CHALLENGING CHICAGO'S MASSIVE AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL VEHICLE IMPOUND PROGRAM. IN A CITY THAT RUNS A CHRONIC BUDGET DEFICIT OF MORE THAN $100 MILLION, IMPOUNDING VEHICLES HAS BECOME AN EASY AND SIGNIFICANT SOURCE OF CASH. THE LEAD PLAINTIFFS IN OUR CLASS ACTION ARE INNOCENT OWNERS JEROME DAVIS AND VERONICA WALKER-DAVIS. THE CITY IMPOUNDED THEIR CAR AFTER AN AUTO-SHOP EMPLOYEE TOOK IT FOR A JOY RIDE WHILE IT WAS IN THE SHOP FOR REPAIRS. AFTER FIGHTING THE CITY FOR NEARLY A YEAR AND BEING CHARGED THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN FINES AND FEES, THE DAVISES ARRIVED TO PICK UP THEIR VEHICLE - ONLY TO FIND THAT CITY HAD ALREADY DESTROYED IT. IN JUNE 2020, THE MAYOR OF CHICAGO PROPOSED REFORMS TO THE IMPOUND PROGRAM THAT WOULD FIX SOME OF THE GLARING CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS. THEN, IN AUGUST 2020, A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE REJECTED THE CITY'S REQUEST TO DISMISS SEVERAL CLAIMS IN THE CASE, SO THE CASE CONTINUES. FICKEN V. CITY OF DUNEDIN, FLORIDA, ET AL. IJ JOINED WITH JIM FICKEN OF DUNEDIN, FLORIDA, TO CHALLENGE THE CITY'S ATTEMPT TO FORECLOSE HIS HOME SIMPLY BECAUSE HIS GRASS WAS TOO LONG. WHILE JIM WAS OUT OF TOWN TENDING TO HIS LATE MOTHER'S ESTATE, CITY CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS FINED HIM FOR HIS LONG GRASS, TO THE TUNE OF $500 PER DAY. BY THE TIME HE GOT BACK AND BECAME AWARE THAT HE WAS BEING FINED, THE FINES HAD ALREADY ACCRUED TO NEARLY $30,000. THE CITY TOLD JIM HE HAD 15 DAYS TO PAY, OR THEY WOULD GET THEIR MONEY BY FORECLOSING ON HIS HOME. UNFORTUNATELY, A DISTRICT COURT JUDGE RULED AGAINST JIM BY UPHOLDING THE CITY'S OUTRAGEOUS FINE. THE DECISION TEES UP SEVERAL IMPORTANT ISSUES FOR REVIEW BY THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 11TH CIRCUIT, WHERE WE CURRENTLY ARE LITIGATING THE CASE. BRUMIT V. CITY OF GRANITE CITY CITY OFFICIALS IN GRANITE CITY, ILLINOIS, ARE TRYING TO KICK ANDY SIMPSON AND DEBI BRUMIT (ALONG WITH DEBI'S GRANDCHILDREN) OUT OF THEIR HOME AS PUNISHMENT FOR A CRIME EVERYONE AGREES THEY DID NOT COMMIT. WHY? BECAUSE DEBI'S DAUGHTER (WHO DOES NOT LIVE WITH HER) STOLE A VAN ELSEWHERE IN TOWN. GRANITE CITY HAS WHAT IT CALLS A "CRIME-FREE" HOUSING ORDINANCE THAT AMOUNTS TO A COMPULSORY EVICTION LAW. UNDER THE LAW, IF ANY MEMBER OF YOUR "HOUSEHOLD OR EVEN A GUEST COMMITS A CRIME ANYWHERE IN THE CITY THEN YOUR LANDLORD IS REQUIRED TO EVICT YOU. BUT DEBI AND ANDY'S LANDLORD DOES NOT WANT TO EVICT THEM. THAT IS WHY DEBI AND ANDY TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO SUE GRANITE CITY TO AFFIRM THAT AMERICANS CANNOT BE RENDERED HOMELESS AS PUNISHMENT FOR OTHER PEOPLE'S CRIMES. IN OCTOBER 2019, A FEDERAL JUDGE AGREED, ENTERING A RESTRAINING ORDER THAT HAS KEPT DEBI AND ANDY SAFELY IN THEIR HOME WHILE THE LAWSUIT HAS PROCEEDED THROUGH DISCOVERY AND SUMMARY JUDGMENT BRIEFING. SUN VALLEY

Return Reference	Explanation
	ORCHARDS, INC. V. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ET AL. THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FINED SUN VALLEY ORCHARDS, A FOURTH-GENERATION FAMILY FARM IN SOUTHERN NEW JERSEY, OVER $550,000, THE BULK OF WHICH WAS BECAUSE OF A SINGLE PAPERWORK VIOLATION. THE TWO BROTHERS WHO OWN THE ORCHARD SPENT THE NEXT FIVE YEARS TRYING TO FIGHT THE AGENCY'S DECISION IN THE AGENCY'S IN-HOUSE ADMINISTRATIVE COURTS. IN EVERY HEARING, THE AGENCY SERVED AS PROSECUTOR, JUDGE, AND JURY, AND THE AGENCY WON EVERY TIME. IN SEPTEMBER 2021, THE BROTHERS JOINED WITH IJ TO FIGHT FOR THEIR RIGHT, AND THE RIGHT OF ALL AMERICANS, TO HAVE PROCEEDINGS BY THE GOVERNMENT TO IMPOSE SIGNIFICANT MONETARY PENALTIES HEARD BY A REAL COURT. TIMBS V. STATE OF INDIANA IJ CLIENT TYSON TIMBS'S JOURNEY BEGAN WHEN LAW ENFORCEMENT USED FORFEITURE TO SEIZE HIS VEHICLE AFTER HE WAS CONVICTED OF SELLING $225 WORTH OF DRUGS. AFTER THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HELD IN 2019 THAT THE CONSTITUTION'S BAN ON EXCESSIVE FINES AND FEES APPLIES TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AS WELL AS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, THE COURT SENT TYSON'S CASE BACK TO THE INDIANA SUPREME COURT, WHICH IN TURN SENT THE CASE BACK TO THE TRIAL COURT, WHICH RULED FOR TYSON. THE INDIANA ATTORNEY GENERAL APPEALED THE DECISION, PLACING TYSON'S CASE BEFORE THE INDIANA SUPREME COURT FOR A THIRD TIME. IN JUNE 2021, THE INDIANA SUPREME COURT ONCE AGAIN RULED IN OUR CLIENT'S FAVOR, STATING THAT FORFEITING HIS CAR VIOLATED THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT'S EXCESSIVE FINES CLAUSE. TYSON CAN KEEP HIS CAR AND ALL AMERICANS NOW HAVE GREATER PROTECTION FOR THEIR PROPERTY. SOUROVELIS V. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA IN A CASE SPANNING MORE THAN EIGHT YEARS, IJ SUCCESSFULLY DISMANTLED THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA'S DRACONIAN CIVIL FORFEITURE PROGRAM. UNTIL IJ SUED, PHILADELPHIA ROUTINELY SEIZED HOMES, CARS, AND CASH WITHOUT NOTICE. IT FORCED OWNERS TO NAVIGATE THE NOTORIOUS "COURTROOM 478," WHERE SO-CALLED "HEARINGS" WERE RUN ENTIRELY BY PROSECUTORS, WITHOUT ANY JUDGES OR COURT-APPOINTED LAWYERS TO DEFEND PROPERTY OWNERS. MISSING EVEN A SINGLE "HEARING" MEANT THAT PROSECUTORS COULD PERMANENTLY TAKE AN OWNER'S PROPERTY, SELL IT, AND USE THE PROCEEDS FOR ANY LAW-ENFORCEMENT PURPOSE THEY WISHED, CREATING A PERVERSE INCENTIVE TO SEIZE PROPERTY. IJ SECURED TWO SWEEPING CONSENT DECREES THAT CURB THE FINANCIAL INCENTIVES UNDER WHICH LAW ENFORCEMENT KEEPS AND USES FORFEITURE REVENUE; FUNDAMENTALLY REFORM PROCEDURES FOR SEIZING AND FORFEITING PROPERTY; AND ESTABLISH A $3 MILLION FUND TO COMPENSATE THOSE WHOSE PROPERTY WAS WRONGLY CONFISCATED. IN 2021, CHECKS FROM THE FUND WERE DELIVERED TO VICTIMS, FINALLY MAKING WHOLE THOUSANDS OF PHILADELPHIANS. EL-SHABAZZ, ET AL. V. CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL. SUNG CHO OWNS A LAUNDROMAT IN MANHATTAN AND, JUST BEFORE CHRISTMAS 2013, HE FOUND HIMSELF TARGETED BY THE CITY'S NO-FAULT EVICTION MACHINE. UNDERCOVER COPS HAD COME TO HIS LAUNDROMAT MONTHS BEFORE AND ASKED CUSTOMERS AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC IF THEY WANTED TO BUY STOLEN ELECTRONICS. TWO TOOK THE BAIT. NEITHER WAS EMPLOYED IN ANY WAY BY SUNG'S BUSINESS. ATTORNEYS FOR THE CITY THREATENED THE LAUNDROMAT WITH EVICTION SIMPLY BECAUSE IT WAS THE PLACE WHERE THE ALLEGED OFFENSES OCCURRED. THE CITY OFFERED TO DROP THE ACTION IF SUNG AGREED TO WARRANTLESS SEARCHES, GAVE POLICE UNLIMITED ACCESS TO HIS SECURITY CAMERAS, AND CONSENTED TO FINES AND SANCTIONS FOR ALLEGED CRIMINAL OFFENSES AT THE BUSINESS WITHOUT THE OPPORTUNITY TO GO BEFORE A JUDGE. IJ CHALLENGED THESE COERCIVE AGREEMENTS IN COURT, AND IN OCTOBER 2020, A FEDERAL COURT APPROVED AN ORDER BARRING THE CITY FROM ENFORCING THESE SETTLEMENTS AND PROVIDING RELIEF TO THOUSANDS OF NEW YORKERS. IJ RECEIVED FROM THE CITY OF NEW YORK $200,000 IN ATTORNEYS' FEES. COLUMBUS CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT ET AL. VS. OHIO ET AL. IN JANUARY 2022, A GROUP REPRESENTING FIVE PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS FILED A LEGAL CHALLENGE TO STRIKE DOWN TWO OF OHIO'S EIGHT PRIVATE SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAMS. THIS CASE INVOLVES A FLURRY OF ALLEGATIONS, LIKE THAT THE PROGRAMS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY DIVERT MONEY FROM THE STATE'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS. THE MOST UNIQUE CLAIM IS AN ACCUSATION THAT OHIO'S VOUCHER PROGRAMS RESULT IN SEGREGATED PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SINCE AN ALLEGEDLY DISPROPORTIONATE PERCENTAGE OF NON-MINORITY STUDENTS USE THE PROGRAM, THE PERCENTAGE OF MINORITY STUDENTS IN SOME PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS HAS INCREASED. THEIR COMPLAINT DISREGARDS THE INTERESTS OF THOUSANDS OF HARDWORKING FAMILIES (LIKE OUR CLIENTS) OF ALL RACES WHO FOR YEARS HAVE DEPENDED ON THIS PROGRAM TO ACCESS SCHOOLS THEY WOULD OTHERWISE BE UNABLE TO AFFORD. IN JANUARY 2022, IJ TEAMED UP WITH FIVE OHIO FAMILIES TO DEFEND THE OPPORTUNITIES OHIO'S CHOICE PROGRAMS OFFER. BEAVER ET AL. V. MOORE ET AL. IN MARCH 2021, WEST VIRGINIA ENACTED THE HOPE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM: WEST VIRGINIA'S FIRST SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAM AND ONE OF THE MOST EXPANSIVE EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNT PROGRAMS IN THE NATION. FAMILIES MAY USE A STUDENT'S HOPE SCHOLARSHIP FOR PRIVATE SCHOOL TUITION AND A WIDE ARRAY OF OTHER EDUCATION EXPENSES, SUCH AS ONLINE LEARNING, AFTER-SCHOOL OR SUMMER LEARNING PROGRAMS, EDUCATIONAL THERAPIES, AND TRAVEL COSTS. THE HOPE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM DOES NOT USE ANY FUNDS MEANT FOR WEST VIRGINIA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS, BUT IN JANUARY 2022, THE GROUP PUBLIC SCHOOLS PUBLIC FUNDS CHALLENGED THE PROGRAM'S CONSTITUTIONALITY. IJ HELPED TWO PARENTS INTERVENE TO COUNTER THE LAWSUIT. UNFORTUNATELY, IN JULY 2022, THE TRIAL COURT JUDGE ENJOINED THE PROGRAM, UPENDING THOUSANDS OF FAMILIES' SCHOOL YEAR PLANS. IJ APPEALED AND REQUESTED A STAY OF THE INJUNCTION, AND WE EXPECT THE STATE SUPREME COURT WILL ULTIMATELY DECIDE THE PROGRAM'S FATE.
METRO. GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY, ET AL., V. TENNESSEE	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, ET AL. IN MAY 2019, TENNESSEE ENACTED THE TENNESSEE EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNT PILOT PROGRAM ACT, WHICH PROVIDES SCHOLARSHIPS WORTH UP TO $7,300 TO FAMILIES FROM SHELBY COUNTY AND METRO NASHVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS. IJ IS INTERVENING ON BEHALF OF TWO PARENTS TO DEFEND THE PROGRAM FROM A LAWSUIT CHALLENGING ITS CONSTITUTIONALITY. IJ AND OUR CLIENTS APPEALED OUR LOSS AT CHANCERY COURT TO THE TENNESSEE SUPREME COURT, AND WE RE-ARGUED THE APPEAL IN FEBRUARY 2022 AFTER THE UNEXPECTED DEATH OF A JUSTICE. IN MAY 2022, THE JUSTICES RULED IN OUR FAVOR AND DIRECTED THE LOWER COURT TO REOPEN THE CASE AND CONSIDER THE REMAINING CLAIMS THAT WERE NOT ANALYZED IN THE INITIAL RULING AGAINST IJ. KELLY, ET AL., V. STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, ET AL. PASSED INTO LAW IN 2013, THE OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM (OSP) PROVIDES SCHOLARSHIPS TO OVER 12,000 K-12 STUDENTS IN NORTH CAROLINA WHO USE THE PROGRAM TO ATTEND 451 PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS. THE OSP IS NOW IN THE CROSSHAIRS OF A CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE FOR THE SECOND TIME. ALONG WITH A COALITION OF NORTH CAROLINA PARENTS, IJ IS ONCE MORE FIGHTING TO SECURE THE OPPORTUNITIES THE OSP HAS BROUGHT. BEFORE LITIGATING ON THE MERITS OF THE ARGUMENT, WE ARE FIGHTING ON APPEAL TO ENSURE THIS CASE IS HEARD IN ITS PROPER FORUM: A THREE-JUDGE PANEL. AFTER ORAL ARGUMENT IN JUNE 2022, WE'RE WAITING FOR A DECISION FROM THE N.C. COURT OF APPEALS REGARDING WHICH TRIBUNAL - A SINGLE JUDGE OR A PANEL - WE'LL BE LITIGATING THE MERITS BEFORE. MICHAEL AND NANCY VALENTE ET AL. V. VERMONT AGENCY OF EDUCATION ET AL. SINCE 1869, VERMONT HAS GIVEN PARENTS A CHOICE: IF THEIR LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT DOES NOT PROVIDE INSTRUCTION FOR THEIR CHILD'S GRADE-LEVEL, THEN THE STATE GIVES

Return Reference	Explanation
	PARENTS A STIPEND TO SPEND AT ANY SCHOOL, PUBLIC OR PRIVATE, EXCEPT PRIVATE RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS. DESPITE IJ'S VICTORY IN ESPINOZA V. MONTANA IN JUNE 2020, WHICH CONFIRMED THAT THE CONSTITUTION OUTLAWS RELIGIOUS STATUS-BASED DISCRIMINATION, VERMONT CONTINUED TO EXCLUDE PRIVATE RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS FROM ITS TUITIONING PROGRAM. THUS, THREE VERMONT FAMILIES TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FILE A LAWSUIT. LITIGATION IN VERMONT WAS STAYED PENDING THE OUTCOME OF CARSON V. MAKIN - WHICH ADDRESSED THE SAME LEGAL ISSUE - AT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. OUR VICTORY IN CARSON MEANS VERMONT OFFICIALS NOW MUST WRESTLE WITH WHETHER TO CONFORM TO THE COURT'S DECISION OR ELSE ATTEMPT TO ARGUE THAT CARSON SOMEHOW DOESN'T APPLY. EITHER WAY, IJ WILL BE THERE TO ENSURE CARSON RIGHTLY PUTS THE NAIL IN THE COFFIN OF VERMONT'S POLICY. DENNIS AND CATHERINE GRIFFIN V. NEW HAMPSHIRE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION DENNIS AND CATHY GRIFFIN LIVE IN THE SMALL TOWN OF CROYDON, NEW HAMPSHIRE, AND ARE RAISING THEIR GRANDSON CLAYTON. BECAUSE CROYDON IS SO SMALL, IT DOES NOT OPERATE A MIDDLE SCHOOL AND INSTEAD PAYS STUDENTS' TUITION AT NEARBY PRIVATE OR PUBLIC SCHOOLS. BUT THE GRIFFINS WERE NOT ELIGIBLE FOR THAT ASSISTANCE BECAUSE THEY SELECTED A RELIGIOUS SCHOOL, TO WHICH THE STATE PROHIBITS TUITIONING TOWNS FROM PAYING TUITION. IJ HELPED THE GRIFFINS SUE IN SEPTEMBER 2020 BECAUSE SUCH DISCRIMINATION IS BOTH UNFAIR AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL. IN JULY 2021, THE GRIFFINS AND IJ CONCLUDED OUR LAWSUIT WITH A LEGISLATIVE VICTORY WHEN GOV. CHRIS SUNUNU SIGNED A BILL EXPANDING THE STATE'S TUITIONING PROGRAM TO INCLUDE RELIGIOUS PRIVATE SCHOOLS. COUNCIL FOR BETTER EDUCATION, INC., ET AL. V. KENTUCKY FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION CABINET, ET AL. IN JUNE 2021, IJ INTERVENED IN A KENTUCKY LAWSUIT IN ORDER TO PROTECT THE STATE'S NEW EDUCATIONAL CHOICE PROGRAM, THE EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY ACCOUNT PROGRAM. THE PROGRAM GIVES THOUSANDS OF LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES IN KENTUCKY INCREASED EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM AND IS FUNDED ENTIRELY BY PRIVATE DONATIONS. BUT A GROUP REPRESENTING KENTUCKY PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS FILED A LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE PROGRAM'S CONSTITUTIONALITY. IN OCTOBER 2021, A TRIAL COURT JUDGE RULED THE PROGRAM UNCONSTITUTIONAL ON TWO GROUNDS. IN FEBRUARY 2022, THE KENTUCKY SUPREME COURT ACCEPTED OUR APPEAL, BYPASSING THE INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS IN ORDER TO REACH A QUICKER RESOLUTION FOR FAMILIES EAGER FOR MUCH-NEEDED RESOURCES. AFTER THE BRIEFING SCHEDULE CONCLUDES IN EARLY FALL 2022, THE STATE SUPREME COURT WILL CHOOSE WHETHER TO HEAR ORAL ARGUMENT OR DECIDE THE CASE IMMEDIATELY. FLORENCY, ET AL. V. STATE OF NEVADA, ET AL. IN 2015, NEVADA ESTABLISHED THE NEVADA EDUCATIONAL CHOICE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM, A NEED-BASED PROGRAM FUNDED BY PRIVATE DONATIONS INCENTIVIZED BY TAX CREDITS. TO ACCOMMODATE THE STATE'S GROWING POPULATION, THE LAW INCREASED THE NUMBER OF TAX CREDITS AVAILABLE BY 10% ANNUALLY. IN 2019, THE STATE REPEALED THIS "ESCALATOR PROVISION" WITHOUT A SUPERMAJORITY VOTE REQUIRED UNDER THE STATE'S CONSTITUTION, SO IJ FILED SUIT. IN MAY 2020, A JUDGE UPHELD THE 2019 CHANGE. WE APPEALED THIS DECISION TO THE NEVADA SUPREME COURT, BUT THE COURT UPHELD THE REDUCTION IN OCTOBER 2021. THE COURT'S DECISION BROKE FROM NATIONAL CONSENSUS THAT IJ HELPED ESTABLISH ON HOW EDUCATIONAL CHOICE FUNDING WORKS, SO WE FILED A PETITION FOR REHEARING. UNFORTUNATELY, ON DECEMBER 23, 2021, THE NEVADA SUPREME COURT ANNOUNCED IT WOULD NOT RECONSIDER, CONCLUDING THIS CASE WITH AN UNFORTUNATE LOSS FOR NEVADA CHILDREN AND FAMILIES. DEL CASTILLO V. FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH IN 2014, HEATHER DEL CASTILLO STARTED A BUSINESS PROVIDING PERSONALIZED HEALTH COACHING. SHE NEVER CLAIMED TO BE A LICENSED NUTRITIONIST OR DIETITIAN, BUT THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ORDERED HER TO CEASE PROVIDING NUTRITIONAL ADVICE AND DEMANDED THAT SHE PAY OVER $750 IN FINES. HEATHER COULD NOT AFFORD TO SPEND YEARS AND THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS GETTING THE DEGREE TO BECOME A LICENSED DIETICIAN, SO SHE SHUT HER BUSINESS DOWN. THESE SORTS OF OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING LAWS PROTECT THE ECONOMIC INTERESTS OF LICENSE HOLDERS BY CENSORING WHAT OTHERS CAN SAY AND HEAR. HEATHER AND IJ FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUIT CHALLENGING FLORIDA'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON GIVING DIETARY ADVICE. UNFORTUNATELY, IN JULY 2019, A FEDERAL DISTRICT UPHELD THE LICENSING REQUIREMENT ON THE BASIS THAT HEATHER'S ADVICE WAS "CONDUCT NOT "SPEECH AND THEREFORE EXEMPT FROM FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTIONS. WE APPEALED THE DECISION TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 11TH CIRCUIT, WHICH UPHELD THE LOWER COURT'S DECISION IN FEBRUARY 2022, AND ARE ASKING THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO TAKE THE CASE. ELIZABETH BROKAMP V. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; ELIZABETH BROKAMP V. JAMES, ET AL. IN DECEMBER 2020, IJ FILED A CASE ON BEHALF OF ELIZABETH BROKAMP, A PROFESSIONAL COUNSELOR LOCATED AND LICENSED IN VIRGINIA. D.C. LAW DOES NOT ALLOW ELIZABETH TO PROVIDE TELETHERAPY TO CLIENTS LOCATED IN D.C., EVEN THOUGH ELIZABETH COULD MEET IN PERSON WITH THOSE SAME CLIENTS AT AN OFFICE ACROSS THE RIVER IN VIRGINIA. AS A RESULT, SINCE MOVING HER PRACTICE ONLINE DURING THE PANDEMIC, ELIZABETH HAS BEEN FORCED TO TURN AWAY NEW CLIENTS FROM THE DISTRICT. IN APRIL 2021, IJ FILED ANOTHER SUIT ON BEHALF OF ELIZABETH, THIS TIME CHALLENGING A SIMILAR RESTRICTION IN NEW YORK. D.C.'S AND NEW YORK'S RESTRICTIONS ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE TELETHERAPY IS SPEECH AND THE GOVERNMENT CANNOT REQUIRE A LICENSE TO TALK. WE ARGUE THAT THE TECHNOLOGY THAT ALLOWS OUR CLIENT TO HELP PATIENTS ACROSS STATE LINES SHOULD NOT BE SUBJECT TO RESTRICTIONS THAT VIOLATE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS. IN MARCH 2022, A JUDGE DENIED D.C'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE SUIT. IN NEW YORK, A JUDGE GRANTED THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS IN LATE 2021, AND WE HAVE APPEALED. 360 VIRTUAL DRONE SERVICES LLC AND MICHAEL JONES V. RITTER, ET AL. IN MARCH 2021, IJ SUED ON BEHALF OF MICHAEL JONES AFTER THE NORTH CAROLINA BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR ENGINEERS AND SURVEYORS THREATENED HIM WITH CIVIL AND CRIMINAL CONSEQUENCES. MICHAEL USES A DRONE TO TAKE PHOTOS OF LAND AND CREATE MAPS FOR CUSTOMERS TO MONITOR PROPERTY. MICHAEL DOES NOT PRACTICE SURVEYING, A MORE FORMAL PROFESSION THAT MARKS THE LEGAL BOUNDARIES OF PROPERTY. EVEN SO, THE BOARD ACCUSED HIM OF PROVIDING UNLICENSED SURVEYING SERVICES, AND, IN RESPONSE TO THE BOARD'S THREATS, MICHAEL SHUT DOWN HIS BUSINESS. THE STATE'S LICENSING LAWS STIFLE INNOVATION, AND THEY ALSO UNCONSTITUTIONALLY RESTRICT FREE SPEECH BY REQUIRING THE GOVERNMENT'S PERMISSION TO CREATE AND DISSEMINATE IMAGES AND DATA. MICHAEL PARTNERED WITH IJ TO SUE THE BOARD IN FEDERAL COURT TO DISASSEMBLE THE STATE'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL RESTRICTIONS AND OPEN THE DOOR FOR OTHER ENTREPRENEURS TO CREATIVELY USE TECHNOLOGY TO PROVIDE CHEAPER, MORE CONVENIENT SERVICES.
WAYNE NUTT V. NORTH CAROLINA BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR ENGINEERS AND	WAYNE NUTT PRACTICED ENGINEERING FOR FOUR DECADES. BECAUSE HE WORKED FOR BIG MANUFACTURERS THROUGHOUT HIS WHOLE CAREER, HE WAS EXEMPT FROM NORTH CAROLINA'S LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR ENGINEERS. NOW THAT WAYNE IS RETIRED, HE NO LONGER WANTS TO PRACTICE ENGINEERING. HE ONLY WANTS TO TALK ABOUT IT. HE HAS FOUND HIMSELF DEPLOYING HIS HARD-WON EXPERTISE TO TESTIFY AT TOWN COUNCIL MEETINGS AND WRITE LETTERS TO GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS. HE ALSO WANTS TO TESTIFY IN OTHER LAWSUITS RELATED TO HIS AREA OF EXPERTISE - HYDRAULICS. THE TROUBLE IS THAT ALL OF THIS IS A CRIME ACCORDING TO

Return Reference	Explanation
SURVEYORS	THE NORTH CAROLINA BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR ENGINEERS AND SURVEYORS. IN THE GOVERNMENT'S VIEW, ONLY LICENSED ENGINEERS CAN TALK ABOUT ENGINEERING, EVEN IF THOSE SAME UNLICENSED ENGINEERS CAN DO ACTUAL ENGINEERING. WAYNE CAN EITHER GET A LICENSE OR STOP TALKING. BUT WAYNE DOES NOT WANT TO BECOME A LICENSED ENGINEER BECAUSE, AT 77, HE IS NOT LOOKING TO START A BRAND-NEW CAREER. SO HE TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FILE A FEDERAL LAWSUIT TO STRIKE DOWN THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL RESTRICTION ON PROFESSIONAL SPEECH. REGULUS BOOKS, LLC, V. CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE AND DIVERS; HART V. COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA, AND ALBEMARLE COUNTY, VIRGINIA, HAVE DECIDED TO REQUIRE A BUSINESS LICENSE TO WRITE NOVELS, AND THEY HAVE ASSESSED THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN BACK TAXES AGAINST SOME OF THEIR HARDWORKING FREELANCE WRITERS, WHILE EXEMPTING NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES, RADIO, AND TELEVISION. CHARLOTTESVILLE'S MONEY-GRAB IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL, SO BESTSELLING NOVELISTS CORBAN ADDISON AND JOHN HART TEAMED UP WITH IJ IN JULY 2019 TO FILE LAWSUITS AGAINST THE CITY AND COUNTY ASKING FOR REFUNDS OF THEIR BUSINESS LICENSE TAXES AND CHALLENGING THE TAXES' CONSTITUTIONALITY UNDER THE FIRST AND 14TH AMENDMENTS. IN JUNE 2022, THE VIRGINIA SUPREME COURT UPHELD A LOWER COURT'S DECISION THAT DISMANTLED THE TAX LEVIED BY THE CITY. AS A RESULT, CORBAN WILL RECEIVE A TAX REFUND AND WILL NO LONGER BE SUBJECT TO THE BUSINESS LICENSE TAX. THIS VICTORY WILL ALSO HELP OUR LAWSUIT AGAINST THE COUNTY. GRAY V. MAINE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY JOSHUA GRAY IS A PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR IN MASSACHUSETTS WHO WISHES TO EXPAND HIS BUSINESS INTO MAINE. HE ALSO WRITES ABOUT WHAT HE SEES AS ABUSIVE POLICE PRACTICES. BUT WHEN GRAY USED FACEBOOK TO CRITICIZE THE CONDUCT EMPLOYEES OF THE MAINE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY IN A FATAL SHOOTING, THAT VERY SAME DEPARTMENT DENIED HIS APPLICATION FOR A PROFESSIONAL INVESTIGATOR'S LICENSE, SAYING HE LACKS THE "GOOD MORAL CHARACTER" REQUIRED FOR LICENSURE. GRAY CHALLENGED THE DENIAL OF HIS LICENSE ALL THE WAY TO THE MAINE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT, WHICH IN APRIL 2021 UPHELD THE DEPARTMENT'S DECISION. THEN HE JOINED WITH IJ TO ASK THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO REVIEW THE CASE, BUT UNFORTUNATELY THE COURT DECLINED. WILLIAM FAMBROUGH V. EAST CLEVELAND ET AL. IN 2021, WILLIAM FAMBROUGH USED HIS VAN - OUTFITTED AS A SOUND TRUCK WITH A CANDIDATE POSTER - TO CAMPAIGN FOR A CHALLENGER TO THE INCUMBENT MAYOR OF EAST CLEVELAND. RATHER THAN RESPECT WILLIAM'S FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS, THE CITY GOVERNMENT RETALIATED AGAINST HIM. POLICE OFFICERS REPEATEDLY SHOWED UP AT WILLIAM'S HOME, FINED HIM AND TOWED HIS VAN. AND THEY CITED WILLIAM FOR "NOISE POLLUTION," DESPITE HIS OBTAINING A PERMIT TO BROADCAST CAMPAIGN MESSAGES FROM HIS VAN. WILLIAM AND IJ ARE FIGHTING BACK WITH A LAWSUIT AGAINST EAST CLEVELAND SO THAT OTHER CITIES DO NOT USE THEIR CODES OR ORDINANCES AS PRETEXTS TO VIOLATE THEIR RESIDENTS' FREE SPEECH RIGHTS. SMITH V. GALLAHER IN MAY 2022, IJ WON A FREE SPEECH VICTORY ON BEHALF OF KELLY GALLAHER, A MOUNT PLEASANT, WISCONSIN, COMMUNITY ACTIVIST WHO WAS SLAPPED WITH A FRIVOLOUS DEFAMATION SUIT BY THE MOUNT PLEASANT VILLAGE ATTORNEY. THE FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTS KELLY'S RIGHT TO PUBLICLY CRITICIZE GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WITHOUT SUFFERING CRUSHING FINANCIAL DAMAGES OVER A SIMPLE DIFFERENCE OF OPINION. RECOGNIZING THAT, A JUDGE GRANTED OUR MOTION TO DISMISS THE CASE. HINES V. TEXAS STATE BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS, ET AL. DR. RON HINES IS A RETIRED AND PHYSICALLY DISABLED LICENSED VETERINARIAN IN TEXAS. FROM 2002 TO 2012, HE GAVE PET OWNERS AROUND THE COUNTRY VETERINARY ADVICE ONLINE, MOSTLY TO THOSE WHO LACKED ACCESS TO VETERINARIANS AND OFTEN FOR FREE. THE TEXAS STATE BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS SHUT RON DOWN, SUSPENDED HIS LICENSE, AND FINED HIM. RON AND IJ FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUIT TO VINDICATE HIS FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH, BUT AN APPEALS COURT RULED THAT RON'S SPEECH WASN'T PROTECTED BECAUSE HE WAS SPEAKING AS PART OF A LICENSED OCCUPATION. SINCE THEN, THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HAS ADOPTED IJ'S ARGUMENTS ON THIS TYPE OF SPEECH AND AFFIRMED THAT THE FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTS IT, SO RON AND IJ FILED A NEW LAWSUIT TO VINDICATE HIS RIGHT TO GIVE VETERINARY ADVICE TO PET OWNERS. IN DECEMBER 2020, THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 5TH CIRCUIT HELD THAT RESTRICTING DR. HINES' ONLINE PET ADVICE IMPLICATED HIS FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS. THE APPELLATE DECISION WILL PROTECT SPEAKERS THROUGHOUT TEXAS. THE CASE CONTINUES IN THE DISTRICT COURT, WHICH RULED IN DECEMBER 2021 THAT TEXAS MUST SATISFY THE CONSTITUTION'S MOST DEMANDING FREE SPEECH STANDARD. CATO INSTITUTE V. SEC SINCE THE 1970S, THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION HAS REFUSED TO SETTLE ANY ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS UNLESS THE DEFENDANT AGREES TO A GAG ORDER. FACED WITH THE POTENTIALLY STAGGERING COST OF CHALLENGING THE SEC'S PROSECUTION, MANY DEFENDANTS AGREE TO SETTLE. THIS PREVENTS THOSE WHO BELIEVE THEY ARE INNOCENT FROM CRITICIZING THE SEC'S ACTIONS AGAINST THEM, EFFECTIVELY MEANING A GOVERNMENT AGENCY IS DECIDING WHO CAN CRITICIZE THAT AGENCY. THE CATO INSTITUTE, A D.C.-BASED THINK TANK, WANTS TO PUBLISH A BOOK WRITTEN BY SOMEONE WHO BELIEVES HE IS THE VICTIM OF ABUSE BY THE SEC AND TO HOST A PANEL DISCUSSION WITH OTHER SUCH INDIVIDUALS. CATO TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO CHALLENGE THE SEC'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL INFRINGEMENT ON FREE SPEECH. IN FEBRUARY 2020, A FEDERAL JUDGE IN D.C. DISMISSED THE LAWSUIT, HOLDING THAT CATO COULD NOT CHALLENGE THE SEC'S POLICY BECAUSE IT DOES NOT REGULATE CATO DIRECTLY. AFTER IJ APPEALED THIS RULING, THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE D.C. CIRCUIT UPHELD THE DISMISSAL OF OUR CASE. SYLVIA GONZALEZ V. CITY OF CASTLE HILLS, TEXAS SYLVIA GONZALEZ, A RETIRED RESIDENT OF CASTLE HILLS, TEXAS, RAN FOR LOCAL OFFICE IN 2019 AND DEFEATED A WELL-CONNECTED AND POWERFUL INCUMBENT AFTER KNOCKING ON MORE THAN 500 DOORS AND TALKING WITH HUNDREDS OF RESIDENTS. SYLVIA HELPED ORGANIZE A NON-BINDING PETITION CALLING FOR THE REMOVAL OF THE CASTLE HILLS CITY MANAGER. INCENSED BY THE CRITICISM, CITY OFFICIALS RETALIATED WITH A CAMPAIGN OF HARASSMENT THAT CULMINATED IN SYLVIA BEING ARRESTED AND SPENDING A DAY IN JAIL, ACCUSED OF STEALING HER OWN PETITION. IN SEPTEMBER 2020, SYLVIA TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO HOLD ACCOUNTABLE THE CITY OFFICIALS WHO VIOLATED HER CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. CITY OFFICIALS CLAIMED THEY COULD NOT BE SUED BECAUSE OF QUALIFIED IMMUNITY. IN MARCH 2021, A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT JUDGE DENIED THE OFFICIALS IMMUNITY, RULING THAT THROWING SOMEONE IN JAIL FOR EXERCISING THEIR RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH IS A CLEARLY ESTABLISHED VIOLATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT. CITY OFFICIALS APPEALED THE RULING. ERMA WILSON V. MIDLAND COUNTY FORMER ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY RALPH PETTY OF MIDLAND, TEXAS, SPENT HIS DAYS PROSECUTING CRIMINAL CASES AND HIS NIGHTS ACTING AS A LAW CLERK ON THE VERY CASES HE WAS PROSECUTING. IJ CLIENT ERMA WILSON CANNOT PURSUE HER DREAM OF BECOMING A NURSE BECAUSE OF A FELONY DRUG CONVICTION FOLLOWING A TAINTED TRIAL PROSECUTED BY PETTY - WHO AS A CLERK ALSO DRAFTED THE FINAL JUDGMENT AND SENTENCING ORDER AGAINST HER. FOR 20 YEARS, PETTY ACTED ON BOTH SIDES OF THE BENCH IN MORE THAN 300 CASES. SUCH A PLAIN CONFLICT OF INTEREST VIOLATES THE RIGHT TO A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL COURT OF LAW. SO, IN APRIL 2022, ERMA JOINED WITH IJ TO FILE A LAWSUIT AGAINST PETTY, OTHER RESPONSIBLE OFFICIALS, AND MIDLAND COUNTY ITSELF. A VICTORY IN THIS CASE WILL PUT OTHER PROSECUTORS AND JUDGES ON NOTICE ABOUT THE LIMITS OF THEIR

Return Reference	Explanation
	IMMUNITY. CENTRAL SPECIALTIES INC. V. LARGE IN 2017, A COUNTY TRAFFIC ENGINEER IN MINNESOTA CREATED A NEW WEIGHT LIMIT FOR TRUCKS TRAVELING ON THE HIGHWAY. THEN, AN HOUR LATER, HE PRETENDED TO BE A TRAFFIC COP BY PULLING OVER TWO TRUCKS, DETAINING THE DRIVERS FOR HOURS, AND CALLING STATE TROOPERS TO COME GIVE THE DRIVERS TICKETS. DESPITE TRAFFIC STOPS BEING COMPLETELY OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THE ENGINEER'S JOB, THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT COURT GRANTED HIM QUALIFIED IMMUNITY FOR THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL STOPS. THIS DECISION RUNS IN THE FACE OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S PRECEDENT ON QUALIFIED IMMUNITY AND THIS NATION'S HISTORICAL PRACTICES. SO, IJ AND OWNER OF THE TRUCKS, CENTRAL SPECIALTIES, INC. (CSI), HAVE TEAMED UP TO ASK THE HIGH COURT TO WEIGH IN AND STOP THIS EXPANSION OF QUALIFIED IMMUNITY FOR ROGUE GOVERNMENT AGENTS.
ROSALES V. BRADSHAW	IN 2018, MARIO ROSALES WAS DRIVING HOME WHEN HE PASSED AN OFF-DUTY CHAVES COUNTY, NEW MEXICO SHERIFF'S DEPUTY. IN A FIT OF ROAD RAGE, THE DEPUTY FOLLOWED MARIO HOME, BLOCKED HIM IN THE DRIVEWAY, AND ULTIMATELY POINTED A GUN AT HIM. THE DEPUTY LOST HIS JOB AND WAS CONVICTED OF AGGRAVATED ASSAULT, BUT WHEN MARIO SUED HIM, A FEDERAL COURT DISMISSED HIS SUIT BECAUSE OF QUALIFIED IMMUNITY. GOVERNMENT AGENTS ARE NOT ENTITLED TO IMMUNITY FOR ACTIONS OUTSIDE THE SCOPE OF THEIR JOB, AND POINTING A GUN AT A NON-THREATENING PERSON IS CLEARLY ESTABLISHED AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL. MARIO HAS JOINED WITH IJ TO APPEAL THIS DECISION TO THE 10TH CIRCUIT AND HOLD THE OFFICER ACCOUNTABLE. POLLREIS V. MARZOLF IN DECEMBER 2021, IJ FILED A CERT PETITION ASKING THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO TAKE UP AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ARREST CASE ON BEHALF OF TWO BOYS WHO WERE HANDCUFFED AND HELD AT GUNPOINT WHILE WALKING HOME FROM THEIR GRANDMOTHER'S HOUSE IN 2018. A DISTRICT COURT FOUND THAT THE OFFICER WAS NOT ENTITLED TO QUALIFIED IMMUNITY FOR VIOLATING THE BOYS' FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS, BUT THE 8TH CIRCUIT HELD THAT QUALIFIED IMMUNITY SHIELDS THE OFFICER BECAUSE THE BOYS HAD NEVER BEEN "ARRESTED" AT ALL. THIS CONTINUES A GROWING TREND OF FEDERAL COURTS CONSIDERING HIGHLY INTRUSIVE, SOMETIMES VIOLENT LAW ENFORCEMENT CONDUCT AS CONSTITUTIONALLY PERMISSIBLE ENCOUNTERS. IN JANUARY 2022, THE HIGH COURT DENIED THE BOYS' PETITION. THE CASE CONTINUES THROUGH IJ'S SEPARATE APPEAL TO THE 8TH CIRCUIT ON BEHALF OF THE BOYS' MOTHER, CASSI POLLREIS, WHO AN OFFICER THREATENED WITH A TASER. DESPITE DENYING THE OFFICER QUALIFIED IMMUNITY ON THE BOYS' CLAIMS, THE DISTRICT COURT GRANTED IMMUNITY ON CASSI'S. BUT POLICE CANNOT DRAW WEAPONS ON BYSTANDERS WHO POSE NO THREAT. BROWNBACK V. KING IN 2014, JAMES KING, AN INNOCENT COLLEGE STUDENT, WAS MISTAKEN FOR A PETTY THIEF BY PLAINCLOTHES OFFICERS ACTING AS PART OF A JOINT FEDERAL-STATE TASK FORCE. WHEN THEY TOOK HIS WALLET, JAMES THOUGHT HE WAS BEING MUGGED AND TRIED TO FLEE. THE OFFICERS TACKLED HIM, BRUTALLY BEAT HIM, AND CHOKED HIM UNCONSCIOUS. WHEN THE OFFICERS RESPONSIBLE REALIZED THEIR MISTAKE, THEY CHARGED JAMES WITH SEVERAL VIOLENT FELONIES. EVENTUALLY, JAMES WAS FULLY ACQUITTED ON ALL CHARGES BY A JURY. BUT THE PROCESS OF CLEARING HIS NAME COST JAMES YEARS OF HIS LIFE AND HIS FAMILY'S ENTIRE SAVINGS. IN 2016, HE FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUIT AGAINST THE TASK FORCE MEMBERS. BUT GOVERNMENT IMMUNITY DOCTRINES MADE JAMES' OPTIONS EXTREMELY LIMITED AND PRACTICALLY IMPOSSIBLE. HE TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO VINDICATE HIS RIGHTS AND ENSURE THAT OTHER AMERICANS COULD HOLD THE GOVERNMENT TO ACCOUNT WHEN IT VIOLATES THE CONSTITUTION. IN FEBRUARY 2021, THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ISSUED ITS DECISION REJECTING THE GOVERNMENT'S REQUEST TO CREATE A NEW KIND OF IMMUNITY FOR THE OFFICERS. THE DECISION WAS MIXED IN THAT IT DIDN'T CATEGORICALLY RULE FOR POLICE VICTIMS EITHER. INSTEAD, IT SENT THE CASE BACK TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 6TH CIRCUIT TO RESOLVE AN ISSUE ABOUT WHETHER POLICE VICTIMS CAN BRING A NUMBER OF DIFFERENT CLAIMS IN A SINGLE SUIT. THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION HAS CREATED THE OPPORTUNITY FOR IJ TO ARGUE THE CASE BASED SOLELY ON ITS MERITS RATHER THAN DEFENDING IT FROM THE GOVERNMENT'S CLAIMS THAT IT SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED AT ALL. OLIVA V. NIVAR IN JANUARY 2021, IJ FILED A PETITION FOR CERT AT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ON BEHALF OF JOSE OLIVA, A VETERAN WHO WAS VIOLENTLY ATTACKED BY VA SECURITY OFFICERS ON HIS WAY TO A ROUTINE DENTAL APPOINTMENT. THE TRIAL COURT DENIED THE OFFICERS' CLAIM FOR QUALIFIED IMMUNITY. BUT ON APPEAL, THE 5TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HELD THAT JOSE STILL CANNOT SUE THEM BECAUSE THEY WORK FOR THE FEDERAL - RATHER THAN A STATE - GOVERNMENT. IN DOING SO, THE 5TH CIRCUIT FURTHER RESTRICTED AN ALREADY NARROW AVENUE TO SUE FEDERAL WORKERS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS UNDER THE BIVENS DOCTRINE, EFFECTIVELY MAKING FEDERAL POLICE FULLY IMMUNE FROM LIABILITY IN THE STATES WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION. IN MAY 2021, THE SUPREME COURT REJECTED THE PETITION AND IN AUGUST DENIED A PETITION FOR REHEARING. MOHAMUD V. WEYKER; BYRD V. LAMB IN AUGUST 2021, IJ FILED TWO PETITIONS ASKING THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO TAKE UP PARALLEL CASES CHALLENGING BLANKET IMMUNITY FOR FEDERAL OFFICIALS. IN MOHAMUD V. WEYKER, A SOMALI REFUGEE WAS FRAMED BY A MINNESOTA POLICE OFFICER IN ATTEMPT TO SALVAGE A FABRICATED INVESTIGATION. THE OFFICER'S LIES SENT HER TO FEDERAL DETENTION FOR TWO YEARS. ACCORDING TO THE 8TH CIRCUIT, THE OFFICER'S ROLE ON A JOINT FEDERAL-STATE TASK FORCE MEANS SHE CAN NEVER BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR DERAILING A TEENAGER'S FUTURE. IN BYRD V. LAMB, A TEXAS MECHANIC WAS ATTACKED BY A ROGUE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AGENT. THE AGENT CAUSED KEVIN BYRD TO BE ARRESTED, THREATENED TO KILL HIM, AND EVEN TRIED TO SHOOT HIM. THE 5TH CIRCUIT RULED THAT FEDERAL AGENTS CANNOT BE SUED FOR CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS. UNFORTUNATELY, THE HIGH COURT DENIED BOTH PETITIONS IN JUNE 2022. FOR NOW, A FEDERAL BADGE MEANS A GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL CAN VIOLATE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WITH IMPUNITY IN TEN STATES ACROSS THE HEARTLAND OF AMERICA. AMICUS BRIEFS FILED FY 22 (JULY 1, 2021 - JUNE 30, 2022) FOUNDATION FOR INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IN EDUCATION, ET AL. V. VICTIM RIGHTS LAW CENTER, ET AL. ARIYAN, INC., ET AL. V. SWERAGE & WATER BOARD OF NEW ORLEANS, ET AL CARLY GRAFF, ET AL. V. ABERDEEN ENTERPRIZES, II, INC., ET AL. J.W.; LORI WASHINGTON, A/N/F J.W. V. ELVIN PALEY IN RE Z.L.S. SIGN-ON AMICUS JENNIFER SCHROEDER, ET AL. V. MINNESOTA SECRETARY OF STATE STEVE SIMON CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS V. REAGAN NATIONAL ADVERTISING OF AUSTIN, LLC. L.B. V. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TRAVIS TUGGLE V. U.S.A. SONJIA MACK V. BRIAN WILLIAMS, ET AL. FREEDOM FROM RELIGION FOUNDATION, INC., ET AL. V. WAYNE MACK DIJON SHARPE V. WINTERVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT, ET AL. TENNESSEANS FOR SENSIBLE ELECTION LAWS V. HERBERT H. SLATERY III, ET AL. BRIAN TINGLEY V. ROBERT W. FERGUSON, ET AL. DYLAN BRANDT V. LESLIE RUTLEDGE THE WASHINGTON FOOD INDUSTRY ASSOC., ET AL. V. THE CITY OF SEATTLE XIAOXING XI, ET AL. V. FBI SPECIAL AGENT ANDREW HAUGEN, ET AL. UPSOLVE, INC., ET AL. V. LETITIA JAMES TEXAS DEPT. OF STATE HEALTH SERVICES, ET AL. V. CROWN DIST. LLC, ET AL. PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN V. TRAVIS MICHAEL JOHNSON JACQUELINE CRAIG, ET AL. V. WILLIAM D. MARTIN D. BART ROCKETT V. THE HONORABLE ERIC EIGHMY DRAKE SNELL, ET AL. V. TIM WALZ, GOVERNOR OF MINNESOTA, ET AL. FRANCISCO DUARTE V. CITY OF STOCKTON, ET AL. MICHELE LEUTHAUSER V. UNITED STATES, ET AL. ROXANNE TORRES V. JANICE MADRID, ET AL. LONG LAKE TOWNSHIP V. TODD MAXON AND HEATHER MAXON DENVER HOMELESS OUT LOUD, ET AL. V. DENVER, COLORADO, ET AL. WAYNE

Return Reference	Explanation
	TORCIVIA V. SUFFOLK COUNTY, NEW YORK, ET AL. OHIO POWER COMPANY V. MICHAEL BURNS, ET AL.

Additional Data

Return to Form

Software ID:

Software Version: