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

2023

Open to Public Inspection

A For the 2023 calendar year, or tax year beginning 07-01-2023 , and ending 06-30-2024

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) 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD STE 900

Room/suite

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 $ 64,594,368

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 2023 (Part V, line 2a)	**5**	216
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)	33,988,094	44,568,286
9	Program service revenue (Part VIII, line 2g)	1,300,429	617,784
10	Investment income (Part VIII, column (A), lines 3, 4, and 7d)	3,422,745	4,670,707
11	Other revenue (Part VIII, column (A), lines 5, 6d, 8c, 9c, 10c, and 11e)	42,115	69,685
12	Total revenue—add lines 8 through 11 (must equal Part VIII, column (A), line 12)	38,753,383	49,926,462
13	Grants and similar amounts paid (Part IX, column (A), lines 1–3)	103,348	1,395,438
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)	27,543,992	30,276,445
16a	Professional fundraising fees (Part IX, column (A), line 11e)	0	0
b	Total fundraising expenses (Part IX, column (D), line 25) 3,299,815		
17	Other expenses (Part IX, column (A), lines 11a–11d, 11f–24e)	10,085,729	12,592,425
18	Total expenses. Add lines 13–17 (must equal Part IX, column (A), line 25)	37,733,069	44,264,308
19	Revenue less expenses. Subtract line 18 from line 12	1,020,314	5,662,154

		Beginning of Current Year	End of Year
20	Total assets (Part X, line 16)	144,590,449	163,719,094
21	Total liabilities (Part X, line 26)	30,168,526	36,460,638
22	Net assets or fund balances. Subtract line 21 from line 20	114,421,923	127,258,456

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
SCOTT G BULLOCK PRESIDENT
Type or print name and title

2024-12-03
Date

Paid Preparer Use Only

Print/Type preparer's name	Preparer's signature	Date	Check ☐ if self-employed	PTIN
		2024-12-03		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 $ 36,933,473 including grants of $ 1,395,438) (Revenue $ 687,469)

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** 36,933,473

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		No
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	Yes	
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	136		
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**	216		
b	If at least one is reported on line 2a, did the organization file all required federal employment tax returns?			**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**	No
b	If "Yes," enter the name of the foreign country: _____ 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**	5		
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, or any disqualified or other person 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?		**2**		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?		**3**		No
4	Did the organization make any significant changes to its governing documents since the prior Form 990 was filed?		**4**		No
5	Did the organization become aware during the year of a significant diversion of the organization's assets?		**5**		No
6	Did the organization have members or stockholders?		**6**		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?		**7a**		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?		**7b**		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, box 6 of 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 CHIEF COUNSEL	40.00	X		X				756,875	0	55,584
(2) WILLIAM MELLOR CHAIRMAN AND FOUNDING GEN. COUNSEL	40.00	X		X				45,974	0	17,841
(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) JIM LINTOTT DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(7) STEPHEN MODZELEWSKI DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(8) ANDREW D PRINS DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(9) MARY E STIEFEL OUTGOING DIRECTOR (UNTIL 12/31/23)	1.00	X						0	0	0
(10) DANIEL KNEPPER CFO AND GEN. COUNSEL/SEC. AND TREAS.	40.00			X				533,334	0	56,096
(11) BETH STEVENS VP FOR DEVELOPMENT	40.00				X			344,694	0	60,013
(12) DANA BERLINER SENIOR VP AND LITIGATION DIRECTOR	40.00				X			636,741	0	44,885
(13) DEBORAH SIMPSON CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER	40.00				X			441,674	0	68,116
(14) JOHN KRAMER VP FOR STRATEGIC RELATIONS	40.00					X		447,359	0	74,251
(15) MICHAEL BINDAS SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		261,652	0	66,193
(16) ROBERT GALL MANAGING VP AND SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		386,307	0	65,196
(17) ROBERT JOHNSON SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		286,273	0	58,438

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) ROBERT MCNAMARA DEPUTY LITIGATION DIRECTOR	40.00					X		350,986	0	64,967

1b Sub-Total			
c Total from continuation sheets to Part VII, Section A			
d Total (add lines 1b and 1c)	4,491,869	0	631,580

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 8 6

			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
DANA POINT BEACH RESORT ONE MONARCH BEACH RESORT DANA POINT, CA 92629	EVENT SERVICES	588,554
OCEAN SOLUTIONS LLC 20130 LAKEVIEW CENTER PLAZA SUITE ASHBURN, VA 20147	IT CONTRACTORS	554,845
DOYLE PRINTING & OFFSET CO INCORPORATED 5206 46TH AVENUE HYATTSVILLE, MD 20781	PRINTING/MAILING SHOP	320,618
S WATTS GROUP INC 608 MORROW ST SUITE 100 AUSTIN, TX 78752	GENERAL CONTRACTOR - CONSTRUCTION	294,619
GERSON LEHRMAN GROUP INC 60 E 42ND ST 3RD FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10165	EXPERT WITNESS	213,120

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 1 2

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	44,568,286		
g Noncash contributions included in lines 1a - 1f:$	1g	4,690,334		
h **Total.** Add lines 1a-1f				44,568,286
Program Service Revenue	Business Code				
2a ATTORNEY FEES	541100	614,834	614,834		
b HONORARIA	900099	2,950	2,950		
c					
d					
e					
f All other program service revenue.					
g **Total.** Add lines 2a–2f.	617,784				
3 Investment income (including dividends, interest, and other similar amounts)		3,454,447			3,454,447
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	15,884,166				
b Less: cost or other basis and sales expenses 7b	14,666,779	1,127			
c Gain or (loss) 7c	1,217,387	-1,127			
d Net gain or (loss)		1,216,260			1,216,260
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	Business Code				
11a					
b					
OtherRevenueMiscAmt c					
d All other revenue		69,685	69,685		
e **Total.** Add lines 11a–11d		69,685			
12 **Total revenue.** See instructions		49,926,462	687,469	0	4,670,707

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	1,395,438	1,395,438		
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	3,136,724	2,571,008	312,816	252,900
6 Compensation not included above, to disqualified persons (as defined under section 4958(f)(1)) and persons described in section 4958(c)(3)(B)	267,300	219,092	26,657	21,551
7 Other salaries and wages	21,350,004	17,499,480	2,129,171	1,721,353
8 Pension plan accruals and contributions (include section 401(k) and 403(b) employer contributions)	2,023,879	1,658,868	201,835	163,176
9 Other employee benefits	1,958,057	1,605,028	195,276	157,753
10 Payroll taxes	1,540,481	1,262,652	153,627	124,202
11 Fees for services (non-employees):				
a Management				
b Legal	151,855	93,484	57,310	1,061
c Accounting	89,824		89,824	
d Lobbying	452,845	452,845		
e Professional fundraising services. See Part IV, line 17				
f Investment management fees	12,379			12,379
g Other (If line 11g amount exceeds 10% of line 25, column (A) amount, list line 11g expenses on Schedule O)	1,834,927	1,667,507	67,798	99,622
12 Advertising and promotion	80,700	75,991	775	3,934
13 Office expenses	973,846	568,834	246,829	158,183
14 Information technology	1,156,625	900,483	135,007	121,135
15 Royalties				
16 Occupancy	2,994,562	2,853,929	-139,733	280,366
17 Travel	1,219,697	1,148,468	45,910	25,319
18 Payments of travel or entertainment expenses for any federal, state, or local public officials				
19 Conferences, conventions, and meetings	988,682	983,979	4,703	
20 Interest	1,297		1,297	
21 Payments to affiliates				
22 Depreciation, depletion, and amortization	1,366,427	1,119,988	136,270	110,169
23 Insurance	188,944	90,304	98,640	
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	577,369	519,751	24,893	32,725
b OTHER OPERATIONS	406,942	150,846	242,115	13,981
c COURT FEES	95,504	95,498	0	6
d				
e All other expenses				
25 **Total functional expenses.** Add lines 1 through 24e	44,264,308	36,933,473	4,031,020	3,299,815
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		2,337,527	1	3,759,935
	2	Savings and temporary cash investments			2	
	3	Pledges and grants receivable, net		1,435,000	3	247,500
	4	Accounts receivable, net		1,085,748	4	38,103
	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		393,256	9	178,979
	10a	Land, buildings, and equipment: cost or other basis. Complete Part VI of Schedule D	10a 14,338,030			
	b	Less: accumulated depreciation	10b 6,733,549	3,081,363	10c	7,604,481
	11	Investments—publicly traded securities		112,802,470	11	128,445,112
	12	Investments—other securities. See Part IV, line 11			12	
	13	Investments—program-related. See Part IV, line 11			13	
	14	Intangible assets		23,342,659	14	23,384,682
	15	Other assets. See Part IV, line 11		112,426	15	60,302
	16	**Total assets.** Add lines 1 through 15 (must equal line 33)		144,590,449	16	163,719,094
Liabilities	17	Accounts payable and accrued expenses		3,592,161	17	3,546,984
	18	Grants payable			18	
	19	Deferred revenue		249,108	19	7,397
	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		26,327,257	25	32,906,257
	26	**Total liabilities.** Add lines 17 through 25		30,168,526	26	36,460,638
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		111,051,904	27	124,381,742
	28	Net assets with donor restrictions		3,370,019	28	2,876,714
		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		114,421,923	32	127,258,456
	33	Total liabilities and net assets/fund balances		144,590,449	33	163,719,094

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	49,926,462
2	Total expenses (must equal Part IX, column (A), line 25)	2	44,264,308
3	Revenue less expenses. Subtract line 2 from line 1	3	5,662,154
4	Net assets or fund balances at beginning of year (must equal Part X, line 32, column (A))	4	114,421,923
5	Net unrealized gains (losses) on investments	5	7,174,379
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	127,258,456

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 Uniform Guidance, 2 C.F.R. Part 200, Subpart F?	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

2023

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) 2018	(b) 2019	(c) 2020	(d) 2021	(e) 2022	(f) Total
1 Gifts, grants, contributions, and membership fees received. (Do not include any "unusual grant.") . .	27,138,233	31,138,106	34,956,143	33,988,094	44,568,286	171,788,862
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	27,138,233	31,138,106	34,956,143	33,988,094	44,568,286	171,788,862
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) . .						14,908,798
6 **Public support.** Subtract line 5 from line 4.						156,880,064

Section B. Total Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in) ▶	(a) 2018	(b) 2019	(c) 2020	(d) 2021	(e) 2022	(f) Total
7 Amounts from line 4. .	27,138,233	31,138,106	34,956,143	33,988,094	44,568,286	171,788,862
8 Gross income from interest, dividends, payments received on securities loans, rents, royalties and income from similar sources . . .	1,622,922	1,473,498	2,085,326	2,575,952	3,454,447	11,212,145
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.). .	42,235	25,606	6,044	42,115	69,685	185,685
11 **Total support.** Add lines 7 through 10						183,186,692

12 Gross receipts from related activities, etc. (see instructions) **12** 6,080,326

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 2023 (line 6, column (f) divided by line 11, column (f))	**14**	85.640 %
15 Public support percentage for 2022 Schedule A, Part II, line 14	**15**	84.930 %

16a **33 1/3% support test—2023.** 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—2022.** 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—2023.** 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—2022.** 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) 2019	(b) 2020	(c) 2021	(d) 2022	(e) 2023	(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) 2019	(b) 2020	(c) 2021	(d) 2022	(e) 2023	(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 2023 (line 8, column (f) divided by line 13, column (f))	15	
16	Public support percentage from 2022 Schedule A, Part III, line 15	16	

Section D. Computation of Investment Income Percentage

17	Investment income percentage for **2023** (line 10c, column (f) divided by line 13, column (f))	17	
18	Investment income percentage from **2022** Schedule A, Part III, line 17	18	

19a **33 1/3% support tests-2023.** 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—2022.** 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 2023 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-2023**	**(iii) Distributable Amount for 2023**
1 Distributable amount for 2023 from Section C, line 6			
2 Underdistributions, if any, for years prior to 2023 (reasonable cause required-- *explain in* ***Part VI***). See instructions.			
3 Excess distributions carryover, if any, to 2023:			
a From 2018.			
b From 2019.			
c From 2020.			
d From 2021.			
e From 2022.			
f **Total** of lines 3a through e			
g Applied to underdistributions of prior years			
h Applied to 2023 distributable amount			
i Carryover from 2018 not applied (see instructions)			
j Remainder. Subtract lines 3g, 3h, and 3i from line 3f.			
4 Distributions for 2023 from Section D, line 7: $			
a Applied to underdistributions of prior years			
b Applied to 2023 distributable amount			
c Remainder. Subtract lines 4a and 4b from line 4.			
5 Remaining underdistributions for years prior to 2023, 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 2023. 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 2024.** Add lines 3j and 4c.			
8 Breakdown of line 7:			
a Excess from 2019.			
b Excess from 2020.			
c Excess from 2021.			
d Excess from 2022.			
e Excess from 2023.			

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
SCHEDULE A, PART II, LINE 10, EXPLANATION OF OTHER INCOME:	OTHER INCOME - 2019 AMOUNT: $ 42,235. 2020 AMOUNT: $ 25,606. 2021 AMOUNT: $ 6,044. 2022 AMOUNT: $ 42,115. 2023 AMOUNT: $ 69,685.

Additional Data

Return to Form

Software ID:

Software Version:

Schedule B

(Form 990)
Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Schedule of Contributors

▶ **Attach to Form 990, 990-EZ, or 990-PF.**
▶ **Go to *www.irs.gov/Form990* for the latest information.**

OMB No. 1545-0047

2023

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Organization type (check one):

Filers of:	**Section:**
Form 990 or 990-EZ	☐ 501(c)( ) (enter number) organization
	☐ 4947(a)(1) nonexempt charitable trust **not** treated as a private foundation
	☐ 527 political organization
Form 990-PF	☐ 501(c)(3) exempt private foundation
	☐ 4947(a)(1) nonexempt charitable trust treated as a private foundation
	☐ 501(c)(3) taxable private foundation

Check if your organization is covered by the **General Rule** or a **Special Rule.**
Note: Only a section 501(c)(7), (8), or (10) organization can check boxes for both the General Rule and a Special Rule. See instructions.

General Rule

☐ For an organization filing Form 990, 990-EZ, or 990-PF that received, during the year, contributions totaling $5,000 or more (in money or other property) from any one contributor. Complete Parts I and II. See instructions for determining a contributor's total contributions.

Special Rules

☐ For an organization described in section 501(c)(3) filing Form 990 or 990-EZ that met the 33$^{1}/_{3}$% support test of the regulations under sections 509(a)(1) and 170(b)(1)(A)(vi), that checked Schedule A (Form 990 or 990-EZ), Part II, line 13, 16a, or 16b, and that received from any one contributor, during the year, total contributions of the greater of **(1)** $5,000 or **(2)** 2% of the amount on (i) Form 990, Part VIII, line 1h, or (ii) Form 990-EZ, line 1. Complete Parts I and II.

☐ For an organization described in section 501(c)(7), (8), or (10) filing Form 990 or 990-EZ that received from any one contributor, during the year, total contributions of more than $1,000 *exclusively* for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals. Complete Parts I, II, and III.

☐ For an organization described in section 501(c)(7), (8), or (10) filing Form 990 or 990-EZ that received from any one contributor, during the year, contributions *exclusively* for religious, charitable, etc., purposes, but no such contributions totaled more than $1,000. If this box is checked, enter here the total contributions that were received during the year for an *exclusively* religious, charitable, etc., purpose. Don't complete any of the parts unless the **General Rule** applies to this organization because it received *nonexclusively* religious, charitable, etc., contributions totaling $5,000 or more during the year . . . . . ▶ $ _____

Caution: An organization that isn't covered by the General Rule and/or the Special Rules doesn't file Schedule B (Form 990, 990-EZ, or 990-PF), but it **must** answer "No" on Part IV, line 2, of its Form 990; or check the box on line H of its Form 990-EZ or on its Form 990PF, Part I, line 2, to certify that it doesn't meet the filing requirements of Schedule B (Form 990, 990-EZ, or 990-PF).

Name of organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I **Contributors** (see instructions). Use duplicate copies of Part I if additional space is needed.

Contributors

(a) No.	(b) Name, address, and ZIP + 4	(c) Total contributions	(d) Type of contribution
RESTRICTED		$ RESTRICTED	☐ Person ☐ Payroll ☐ Noncash (Complete Part II for noncash contributions.)
(a) No.	(b) Name, address, and ZIP + 4	(c) Total contributions	(d) Type of contribution
		$	☐ Person ☐ Payroll ☐ Noncash (Complete Part II for noncash contributions.)
(a) No.	(b) Name, address, and ZIP + 4	(c) Total contributions	(d) Type of contribution
		$	☐ Person ☐ Payroll ☐ Noncash (Complete Part II for noncash contributions.)
(a) No.	(b) Name, address, and ZIP + 4	(c) Total contributions	(d) Type of contribution
		$	☐ Person ☐ Payroll ☐ Noncash (Complete Part II for noncash contributions.)
(a) No.	(b) Name, address, and ZIP + 4	(c) Total contributions	(d) Type of contribution
		$	☐ Person ☐ Payroll ☐ Noncash (Complete Part II for noncash contributions.)
(a) No.	(b) Name, address, and ZIP + 4	(c) Total contributions	(d) Type of contribution
		$	☐ Person ☐ Payroll ☐ Noncash (Complete Part II for noncash contributions.)

Name of organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part II **Noncash Property** (see instructions). Use duplicate copies of Part II if additional space is needed.

(a) No. from Part I	(b) Description of noncash property given	(c) FMV (or estimate) (See instructions)	(d) Date received
		$	
(a) No. from Part I	(b) Description of noncash property given	(c) FMV (or estimate) (See instructions)	(d) Date received
		$	
(a) No. from Part I	(b) Description of noncash property given	(c) FMV (or estimate) (See instructions)	(d) Date received
		$	
(a) No. from Part I	(b) Description of noncash property given	(c) FMV (or estimate) (See instructions)	(d) Date received
		$	
(a) No. from Part I	(b) Description of noncash property given	(c) FMV (or estimate) (See instructions)	(d) Date received
		$	
(a) No. from Part I	(b) Description of noncash property given	(c) FMV (or estimate) (See instructions)	(d) Date received
		$	

Name of organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part III ***Exclusively*** **religious, charitable, etc., contributions to organizations described in section 501(c)(7), (8), or (10) that total more than $1,000 for the year from any one contributor. Complete columns (a) through (e) and the following line entry. For organizations completing Part III, enter the total of *exclusively* religious, charitable, etc., contributions of $1,000 or less for the year. (Enter this information once. See instructions.)** ▶ **$** _____

Use duplicate copies of Part III if additional space is needed.

(a) No. from Part I	(b) Purpose of gift	(c) Use of gift	(d) Description of how gift is held
	(e) Transfer of gift Transferee's name, address, and ZIP 4		Relationship of transferor to transferee

(a) No. from Part I	(b) Purpose of gift	(c) Use of gift	(d) Description of how gift is held
	(e) Transfer of gift Transferee's name, address, and ZIP 4		Relationship of transferor to transferee

(a) No. from Part I	(b) Purpose of gift	(c) Use of gift	(d) Description of how gift is held
	(e) Transfer of gift Transferee's name, address, and ZIP 4		Relationship of transferor to transferee

(a) No. from Part I	(b) Purpose of gift	(c) Use of gift	(d) Description of how gift is held
	(e) Transfer of gift Transferee's name, address, and ZIP 4		Relationship of transferor to transferee

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

2022

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)	160,558	
b Total lobbying expenditures to influence a legislative body (direct lobbying)	647,321	
c Total lobbying expenditures (add lines 1a and 1b)	807,879	
d Other exempt purpose expenditures	43,456,429	
e Total exempt purpose expenditures (add lines 1c and 1d)	44,264,308	
f Lobbying nontaxable amount. Enter the amount from the following table in both columns.	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	

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.

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) 2019	(b) 2020	(c) 2021	(d) 2022	(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	350,878	388,163	588,514	807,879	2,135,434
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	26,028	10,821	107,741	160,558	305,148

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

2022

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 July 25, 2006, 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	117,893	115,599	136,098	116,692	115,680
b Contributions . . .					
c Net investment earnings, gains, and losses	8,876	7,287	-16,902	21,151	3,484
d Grants or scholarships . . .					
e Other expenditures for facilities and programs . . .	4,650	4,993	3,597	1,745	2,472
f Administrative expenses					
g End of year balance	122,119	117,893	115,599	136,098	116,692

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

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

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		9,621,282	4,145,355	5,475,927
d Equipment		4,634,041	2,588,194	2,045,847
e Other		82,707		82,707
Total. Add lines 1a through 1e. *(Column (d) must equal Form 990, Part X, column (B), line 10(c).)* . . ▶				7,604,481

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	
CHARITABLE GIFT ANNUITIES	732,518
LEASE LIABILITY	32,168,350
OTHERS	5,389
Total. *(Column (b) must equal Form 990, Part X, col.(B) line 25.)* ▶	32,906,257

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	57,219,803
2	Amounts included on line 1 but not on Form 990, Part VIII, line 12:				
a	Net unrealized gains (losses) on investments	2a	7,174,379		
b	Donated services and use of facilities	2b	117,835		
c	Recoveries of prior year grants	2c			
d	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	2d			
e	Add lines **2a** through **2d**			2e	7,292,214
3	Subtract line **2e** from line **1**			3	49,927,589
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	-1,127		
c	Add lines **4a** and **4b**			4c	-1,127
5	Total revenue. Add lines **3** and **4c.** (This must equal Form 990, Part I, line 12.)			5	49,926,462

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	44,383,270
2	Amounts included on line 1 but not on Form 990, Part IX, line 25:				
a	Donated services and use of facilities	2a	117,835		
b	Prior year adjustments	2b			
c	Other losses	2c			
d	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	2d	1,127		
e	Add lines **2a** through **2d**			2e	118,962
3	Subtract line **2e** from line **1**			3	44,264,308
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	44,264,308

Part XIII Supplemental Information

Provide the descriptions required for Part II, lines 3, 5, and 9; Part III, lines 1a and 4; Part lV, 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 YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2024 AND 2023. THE INSTITUTE RECOGNIZES INTEREST EXPENSE AND PENALTIES ON INCOME TAXES RELATED TO UNCERTAIN TAX POSITIONS IN MANAGEMENT EXPENSES IN THE STATEMENT 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 YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2024 AND 2023. TAX YEARS PRIOR TO 2020 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 -1,127.
PART XII, LINE 2D - OTHER ADJUSTMENTS:	LOSS ON DISPOSAL OF FIXED ASSETS 1,127.

Additional Data

Return to Form

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

2023

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) EDCHOICE INC 111 MONUMENT CIRCLE SUITE 2650 INDIANAPOLIS,IN 46204	35-1978359	501(C)(3)	1,283,542	0			TO HELP FUND THE WORK OF EDCHOICE LEGAL ADVOCATES THROUGH A JOINT PROJECT CALLED THE PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATIONAL CHOICE.
(2) AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL (ALEC) 2900 CRYSTAL DRIVE 6TH FLOOR ARLINGTON,VA 22202	52-0140979	501(C)(3)	22,000	0			2024 MEMBERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS AND ECONOMIC LIBERTY ACADEMY SPONSORSHIP
(3) STATE POLICY NETWORK 1655 NORTH FORT MYER DRIVE 360 ARLINGTON,VA 22209	57-0952531	501(C)(3)	20,000	0			2024 SPN CONFERENCE SPONSORSHIP
(4) R CITY KITCHEN GROUP 841 W 103RD ST CHICAGO,IL 60643	92-1076829		13,000	0			CASH PRIZE GIVEN TO THE 1ST PLACE 2023 SOUTH SIDE PITCH FINALIST.
(5) THE FEDERALIST SOCIETY FOR LAW AND PUBLIC POLICY 1776 I STREET NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON,DC 20006	36-3235550	501(C)(3)	10,000	0			2024 STUDENT SYMPOSIUM AND TEXAS YOUNG LAWYERS CONFERENCE SPONSORSHIPS
(6) UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSON FOUNDATION 1848 UNIVERSITY AVE MADISON,WI 53726	39-0743975	501(C)(3)	10,000	0			2024 MAYORS INNOVATION PROJECT WINTER POLICY MEETING SPONSORSHIP
(7) JUSTUS JUNKIE INC 11214 S LONGWOOD DRIVE CHICAGO,IL 60643	83-1605608		9,000	0			CASH PRIZE GIVEN TO THE 2ND PLACE 2023 SOUTH SIDE PITCH FINALIST.

2 Enter total number of section 501(c)(3) and government organizations listed in the line 1 table . . . . . ▶ 5

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 TO THE ORGANIZATIONS DESCRIBED ABOVE ARE CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROVIDE OUTREACH AND TO EDUCATE ON THOSE ISSUES THAT THE INSTITUTE 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

2023

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				
1 SCOTT G BULLOCK PRESIDENT AND CHIEF COUNSEL	(i)	575,762	180,000	1,113	42,700	12,884	812,459	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 DANA BERLINER SENIOR VP AND LITIGATION DIRECTOR	(i)	503,553	132,000	1,188	42,700	2,185	681,626	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 DANIEL KNEPPER CFO AND GEN. COUNSEL/SEC. AND TREAS.	(i)	432,946	100,000	388	41,550	14,546	589,430	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 JOHN KRAMER VP FOR STRATEGIC RELATIONS	(i)	371,246	75,000	1,113	42,700	31,551	521,610	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5 DEBORAH SIMPSON CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER	(i)	370,556	70,000	1,118	42,700	25,416	509,790	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 ROBERT GALL MANAGING VP AND SENIOR ATTORNEY	(i)	315,712	70,000	595	42,700	22,496	451,503	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7 ROBERT MCNAMARA DEPUTY LITIGATION DIRECTOR	(i)	318,207	32,500	279	42,700	22,267	415,953	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8 BETH STEVENS VP FOR DEVELOPMENT	(i)	302,931	40,500	1,263	42,700	17,313	404,707	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9 ROBERT JOHNSON SENIOR ATTORNEY	(i)	260,479	25,500	294	39,279	19,159	344,711	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 MICHAEL BINDAS SENIOR ATTORNEY	(i)	235,476	25,500	676	27,846	38,347	327,845	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/CHIEF COUNSEL, (II) SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND LITIGATION DIRECTOR, (III) CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER, (IV) MANAGING VP AND SENIOR ATTORNEY, (V) VICE PRESIDENT FOR STRATEGIC RELATIONS, AND(VI) CFO AND GENERAL COUNSEL/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 L (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Transactions with Interested Persons

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, lines 25a, 25b, 26, 27, 28a, 28b, or 28c, or Form 990-EZ, Part V, line 38a or 40b.
Attach to Form 990 or Form 990-EZ.
Go to www.irs.gov/Form990 for instructions and the latest information.

OMB No. 1545-0047

2023

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I Excess Benefit Transactions (section 501(c)(3), section 501(c)(4), and section 501(c)(29) organizations only).

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 25a or 25b, or Form 990-EZ, Part V, line 40b.

1	**(a)** Name of disqualified person	**(b)** Relationship between disqualified person and organization	**(c)** Description of transaction	**(d)** Corrected? Yes	No

2 Enter the amount of tax incurred by the organization managers or disqualified persons during the year under section 4958.

3 Enter the amount of tax, if any, on line 2, above, reimbursed by the organization . . . . . $ . . $

Part II Loans to and/or From Interested Persons.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990-EZ, Part V, line 38a, or Form 990, Part IV, line 26; or if the organization reported an amount on Form 990, Part X, line 5, 6, or 22

(a) Name of interested person	**(b)** Relationship with organization	**(c)** Purpose of loan	**(d)** Loan to or from the organization? To	From	**(e)** Original principal amount	**(f)** Balance due	**(g)** In default? Yes	No	**(h)** Approved by board or committee? Yes	No	**(i)** Written agreement? Yes	No
Total . . . . . $												

Part III Grants or Assistance Benefiting Interested Persons.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 27.

(a) Name of interested person	**(b)** Relationship between interested person and the organization	**(c)** Amount of assistance	**(d)** Type of assistance	**(e)** Purpose of assistance

Part IV Business Transactions Involving Interested Persons.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 28a, 28b, or 28c.

(a) Name of interested person	(b) Relationship between interested person and the organization	(c) Amount of transaction	(d) Description of transaction	(e) Sharing of organization's revenues?	
				Yes	No
(1) LISA KNEPPER	CFO'S SPOUSE	231,755	COMPENSATION AS THE INSTITUTE'S SENIOR DIRECTOR OF STRATEGIC RESEARCH		No

Part V Supplemental Information

Provide additional information for responses to questions on Schedule L (see instructions).

Return Reference	Explanation

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

2023

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	2	808	FMV
7	Boats and planes				
8	Intellectual property				
9	Securities—Publicly traded	X	89	4,596,933	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	21	92,593	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	0	
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

2023

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/CHIEF COUNSEL, THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR LITIGATION, THE CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER, THE MANAGING VICE PRESIDENT AND SENIOR ATTORNEY, THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STRATEGIC RELATIONS, AND THE CFO AND GENERAL COUNSEL/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/CHIEF 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 IX, LINE 16(C):	THE ALLOCATION OF FIVE RENOVATED LEASED SPACES, INCLUDING SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS OF PERSONNEL IN LEASE- AND RENOVATION-RELATED ROLES, RESULTED IN THE INSTITUTE SHOWING A NEGATIVE EXPENSE FOR MANAGEMENT-RELATED OCCUPANCY FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2024.
CASES IN LITIGATION:	DEVILLIER, ET AL. V. TEXAS RICHIE DEVILLIER IS A FARMER WHO HAS LIVED ON HIS FAMILY'S LAND IN WINNIE, TEXAS, FOR GENERATIONS. FOR AS LONG AS ANYONE COULD REMEMBER, THE DEVILLIERS' LAND NEVER FLOODED - THAT IS, BEFORE THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION RENOVATED A NEARBY HIGHWAY TO CONTROL STORMWATER. SINCE THEN, THE DEVILLIER FAMILY FARM AND MANY OF THE SURROUNDING PROPERTIES HAVE BEEN INUNDATED AFTER MAJOR STORMS. THE EFFECTS WERE DEVASTATING. AND EVEN THOUGH THE CONSTITUTION GUARANTEES JUST COMPENSATION FOR TAKINGS, SHOCKINGLY, THE 5TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS SIDED WITH TEXAS, HOLDING THAT PROPERTY OWNERS WHOSE LAND IS TAKEN BY THE STATE FOR FLOOD CONTROL DON'T HAVE ANY FEDERAL REMEDY AT ALL. THAT RULING WAS WRONG, AND IT CONFLICTED WITH RULINGS OF BOTH THE SUPREME COURT AND OTHER COURTS NATIONWIDE, WHICH IS WHY IJ ASKED THE SUPREME COURT TO REVIEW AND HOLD THAT STATES CANNOT IGNORE THE CONSTITUTION. THE SUPREME COURT UNANIMOUSLY RULED THAT THE DEVILLIERS' CLAIMS CAN GO FORWARD AND THAT TEXAS CANNOT EVADE THE TAKINGS CLAUSE'S REQUIREMENTS SIMPLY BY VIRTUE OF BEING A STATE. THE CASE IS BACK TO THE TRIAL COURT, WHERE IT WILL BE TAKEN OVER BY ITS ORIGINAL COUNSEL. GONZALEZ V. CITY OF CASTLE HILLS 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 THEN 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'S 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. 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, AND THE 5TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HELD THAT SYLVIA COULD NOT MAKE OUT A FIRST AMENDMENT CLAIM. IJ FILED A PETITION FOR CERTIORARI WITH THE SUPREME COURT ON BEHALF OF SYLVIA. THE COURT GRANTED THE PETITION AND REVERSED THE 5TH CIRCUIT, OPENING THE COURTHOUSE DOORS FOR THOSE AMERICANS WHO HAVE BEEN ARRESTED FOR CRITICIZING THE GOVERNMENT. BAILEY V. ILES IT'S NOT A CRIME TO MAKE A JOKE ON THE INTERNET. BUT WHEN WAYLON BAILEY POSTED AN INNOCUOUS JOKE ON FACEBOOK COMPARING THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC TO A ZOMBIE APOCALYPSE, HE LEARNED THE HARD WAY OVERZEALOUS LOCAL OFFICIALS DON'T ALWAYS HONOR THAT CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE. THOUGH THE POST WAS CLEARLY SATIRICAL, THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE STORMED WAYLON'S HOUSE WITH GUNS DRAWN, ARRESTED HIM, AND TOOK HIM TO JAIL. IN AUGUST 2023, THE 5TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HELD THAT WAYLON'S SPEECH WAS CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED AND THAT THE OFFICERS WERE NOT ENTITLED TO QUALIFIED IMMUNITY. A JURY ULTIMATELY AWARDED WAYLON $205,000 IN DAMAGES, AND IN MARCH 2024 IJ RECEIVED $72,733.77 IN ATTORNEYS' FEES. RAINWATERS, ET AL. 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.

Return Reference	Explanation
	THEIR PROPERTIES ARE THEIR SANCTUARIES, BUT OFFICERS FROM THE TENNESSEE WILDLIFE RESOURCES AGENCY ("TWRA") WOULD ROUTINELY ENTER PRIVATE LAND ON A WHIM TO SEARCH FOR POTENTIAL HUNTING VIOLATIONS WITHOUT A WARRANT. THEY TRESPASSED, TOOK PHOTOS AND VIDEOS, AND EVEN INSTALLED 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 APPEALED, AND, IN MAY 2024, THE TENNESSEE COURT OF APPEALS DECISION AFFIRMED THE DISTRICT COURT'S DECISION. 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 THE 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 - THUS PROTECTING 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 FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING. IN JANUARY 2023, THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA RULED THAT SEVERAL OF THE REGULATIONS VIOLATED AKHILA'S AND DONNA'S FIRST AMENDMENT AND ECONOMIC LIBERTY RIGHTS. THE RULING PROTECTS THOSE WHO WANT TO SPEAK AND BRING VALUABLE SERVICES TO THE PUBLIC. THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA ALSO AGREED TO PAY US $525,000 IN ATTORNEYS' FEES IN MAY 2024. OPTERNATIVE, INC. V. SOUTH CAROLINA BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS, ET AL. 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 OPHTHALMOLOGIST 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 AUGUST 2022, THE SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT AFFIRMED A COURT OF APPEALS RULING THAT VISIBLY HAS STANDING TO CHALLENGE THE LAW BANNING THE USE OF ITS TECHNOLOGY IN THE STATE, ALLOWING OUR CASE TO PROCEED IN THE TRIAL COURT. AFTER SIGNIFICANT DELAYS, A NEW DISTRICT COURT JUDGE GRANTED THE DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN A ONE-SENTENCE ORDER IN JUNE 2024, WHICH WE WILL APPEAL. 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" (CON) 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. THE CASE WENT TO TRIAL IN JANUARY 2023, AND ALTHOUGH IT WENT WELL, THE TRIAL COURT ISSUED A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE GOVERNMENT IN OCTOBER 2023. WE HAVE APPEALED DIRECTLY TO THE NEBRASKA SUPREME COURT. 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 THE SUIT. THE SUPREME COURT OF NORTH CAROLINA AGREED TO TAKE THE CASE AND HEARD ORAL ARGUMENT IN APRIL 2024.
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. TRIAL WAS HELD IN THIS CASE IN JULY 2023, AND THE JUDGE GRANTED THE BOARD'S MOTION FOR A DIRECTED VERDICT. WE APPEALED THE TRIAL COURT'S DECISION TO LOUISIANA'S FIRST CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEAL, WHICH AFFIRMED ON JUNE 21, 2024. WE WILL BE APPEALING THIS DECISION TO THE LOUISIANA SUPREME COURT. DAVIS V. OKLAHOMA STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY AND BARBERING, ET AL. BRANDY DAVIS' LIVELIHOOD WAS STRIPPED AWAY FROM HER IN JANUARY 2022. A PROFESSIONAL, LICENSED EYELASH-EXTENSION SPECIALIST IN TEXAS, BRANDY HAD A THRIVING BUSINESS IN THE LONE STAR STATE. BUT WHEN SHE MOVED TO OKLAHOMA, HER STATE LICENSE, PRIVATE CERTIFICATE, AND EXPERTISE MEANT NOTHING TO THE OKLAHOMA STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY AND BARBERING, WHICH FORBIDS HER FROM PRACTICING EYELASH EXTENSIONS WITHOUT A COSMETOLOGY OR ESTHETICIAN LICENSE. BUT BRANDY JUST WANTS TO DO EYELASH EXTENSIONS, NOT OTHER COSMETOLOGY PRACTICES. OKLAHOMANS HAVE A RIGHT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING AND ENJOY THE GAINS OF THEIR INDUSTRY WITHOUT FACING OVERBEARING LICENSING DEMANDS. THAT IS WHY BRANDY TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FILE A LAWSUIT TO ENFORCE HER CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO EARN A LIVING IN HER TRADE. LESS THAN TWO WEEKS AFTER FILING SUIT, REFORM EFFORTS BEGAN IN BOTH THE BOARD AND THE STATE LEGISLATURE. WE ANTICIPATE THAT THE NEW RULES WILL ALLOW BRANDY TO OBTAIN HER EYELASH-EXTENSION LICENSE IN NOVEMBER 2024. 360 VIRTUAL DRONE SERVICES LLC AND MICHAEL JONES V.

Return Reference	Explanation
	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 ENFORCEMENT. 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. 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. IN MARCH 2023, A DISTRICT COURT JUDGE UPHELD THE RESTRICTION THAT PREVENTS MICHAEL FROM CREATING MAPS WITH HIS DRONES. WE APPEALED TO THE 4TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, AND IN A MAY 2024 DECISION, THE FOURTH CIRCUIT AFFIRMED. WE WILL BE PETITIONING THE SUPREME COURT FOR CERTIORARI. CROWNHOLM, ET AL. V. MOORE, ET AL. RYAN CROWNHOLM IS THE FOUNDER OF A BUSINESS CALLED MYSITEPLAN.COM. RYAN USES PUBLICLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION FROM THE INTERNET TO MAKE A DIGITAL DRAWING THAT SHOWS THE CUSTOMER'S LOT LINES AND THE BUILDINGS, DRIVEWAYS, FENCES, ETC. ON THE PROPERTY. BUT THE CALIFORNIA BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS, LAND SURVEYORS, AND GEOLOGISTS CLAIMED THAT RYAN WAS ILLEGALLY PRACTICING LAND SURVEYING WITHOUT A LICENSE. IF ALL IT TAKES TO BE ILLEGALLY PRACTICING LAND SURVEYING IS TO DEPICT PROPERTY LINES AND SOME FEATURES OF A PROPERTY WITHIN THOSE LINES, ANYONE WHO HAS EVER DRAWN AN INFORMAL MAP IS A CRIMINAL. THE SUPREME COURT HAS MADE CLEAR THAT THE CREATION AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION ARE SPEECH WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT. NOW, WITH BOTH THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND IJ BY HIS SIDE, RYAN IS FIGHTING BACK IN FEDERAL COURT TO SAVE HIS BUSINESS AND PROTECT THE RIGHT OF ALL ENTREPRENEURS TO PROVIDE USEFUL INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC. IN DECEMBER 2022, THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT DENIED RYAN'S MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, AND, SOON AFTER, THE COURT DISMISSED THE CASE. IJ APPEALED TO THE 9TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, WHICH AFFIRMED IN MARCH 2024. WE WILL SEEK CERTIORARI FROM THE SUPREME COURT. HIGHT V. U.S. DEP'T OF HOMELAND SECURITY, ET AL. 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 CAPTAIN HIGHT QUESTIONED THE FINANCIAL PRACTICES OF THE ASSOCIATION'S LEADERSHIP, THE ASSOCIATION SUDDENLY INFORMED THE COAST GUARD THAT IT RECOMMENDED AGAINST GRANTING CAPTAIN HIGHT A LICENSE. THE COAST GUARD THEN REFUSED TO ALLOW HIGHT TO TAKE THE EXAM TO BECOME A REGISTERED PILOT. WITH NO MEANINGFUL WAY TO CONTEST THE RECOMMENDATION WITH THE COAST GUARD, CAPTAIN 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 THEN DENIED CAPTAIN HIGHT'S APPLICATION, SO WE ARE BACK IN COURT TO HOLD THE GOVERNMENT TO ACCOUNT FOR ITS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BEHAVIOR. IN SEPTEMBER 2023, THE DISTRICT COURT GRANTED THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT. WE APPEALED THAT JUDGMENT TO THE D.C. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, WHERE BRIEFING CONCLUDED ON JUNE 3, 2024. BROKAMP V. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; 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. ACROSS THE POTOMAC RIVER, WASHINGTON, 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 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, AND SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTIONS ARE PENDING. IN NEW YORK, A JUDGE GRANTED THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS IN LATE 2021, AND THE 2ND U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AFFIRMED THE DISTRICT COURT'S DECISION; THE SUPREME COURT DENIED REVIEW IN MARCH 2024. RICHWINE, ET AL. V. MATUSZAK, ET AL. LAUREN RICHWINE WANTS TO PROVIDE FAMILIES INDIVIDUALIZED ADVICE ABOUT HOW TO PREPARE FOR DEATH, HOW TO PLAN A FUNERAL, AND THE DIFFERENT OPTIONS THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO THEM - IN OTHER WORDS, SHE WANTS TO SPEAK WITH ADULTS ABOUT END-OF-LIFE MATTERS. BUT INDIANA DEMANDED THAT SHE STOP, CLAIMING THAT SUCH SPEECH REQUIRES FUNERAL-DIRECTOR AND FUNERAL-HOME LICENSES. THIS FLIES IN THE FACE OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT, AND IN DECEMBER 2023 THE TRIAL COURT AGREED, GRANTING LAUREN A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT'S ACTIONS. THE GOVERNMENT HAS APPEALED TO THE 7TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.
WAYNE NUTT V. RITTER, ET AL.	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 WOULD BE A CRIME, ACCORDING TO 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. ACCORDING TO THE GOVERNMENT, WAYNE COULD EITHER GET A LICENSE OR STOP TALKING. BUT WAYNE DID NOT WANT TO BECOME A LICENSED ENGINEER BECAUSE, IN HIS LATER 70S, HE WAS 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 HIS SPEECH. THE COURT GRANTED OUR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, HOLDING THAT THE BOARD'S ATTEMPTS TO SILENCE WAYNE'S TRUTHFUL DESCRIPTION OF HIS EXPERTISE AND EXPRESSIONS OF HIS OPINIONS VIOLATED THE FIRST AMENDMENT. THE BOARD DECLINED TO APPEAL, AND THE JUDGMENT AGAINST IT BECAME FINAL IN MID-JANUARY 2024. THE ONLY THING REMAINING IN THE CASE IS OUR PENDING MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES. BATAYNEH ET AL. V. COLORADO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION ET AL. IJ AND OUR CLIENT ABDALLAH BATAYNEH FILED A LAWSUIT AGAINST COLORADO'S

Return Reference	Explanation
	MONOPOLISTIC SCHEME THAT PREVENTED HIM FROM LAUNCHING A SHUTTLE SERVICE BUSINESS. ABDALLAH WORKS 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 KEEP WOULD-BE COMPETITORS OUT OF BUSINESS. ABDALLAH PARTNERED WITH IJ IN MARCH 2021 TO SUE THE STATE REGULATORY AGENCY. IN MARCH 2023, THE COLORADO COURT OF APPEALS DISMISSED ABDALLAH'S CASE. THE COLORADO SUPREME COURT DENIED REVIEW OF THE CASE IN DECEMBER 2023, ALLOWING THE ANTICOMPETITIVE LAW TO REMAIN IN PLACE. 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 THE 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'S 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 APPEALED TO THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT, BUT THAT APPEAL WAS DENIED ON NOVEMBER 3, 2023. PROCTOR, ET AL. V. CITY OF JACKSONVILLE, ET AL. NICOLE GONZALEZ OWNS PROPERTY IN JACKSONVILLE, NORTH CAROLINA, WHERE SHE'D LIKE TO HOST A FOOD TRUCK ALONGSIDE HER GENERAL GOODS STORE THERE. ANTHONY PROCTOR ("TONY") AND OCTAVIUS RAYMOND ("RAY") ARE BOTH MARINE VETERANS AND FOOD TRUCK ENTREPRENEURS WHO WANT TO PARTNER WITH PROPERTY OWNERS LIKE NICOLE TO SET UP AND SELL THEIR FOOD TO HUNGRY RESIDENTS. BUT CITY ORDINANCES SQUASH FOOD TRUCK FREEDOM WITH PROXIMITY AND SIGNAGE RESTRICTIONS, PLUS A HIGH PERMIT FEE. THAT'S WHY NICOLE, TONY, AND RAY HAVE TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FIGHT THE CITY'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL ECONOMIC PROTECTIONISM. PEOPLE HAVE THE RIGHT TO USE THEIR PRIVATE PROPERTY AND EARN THEIR HONEST LIVING WITHOUT THE GOVERNMENT'S SUPPRESSING THEIR TRUTHFUL AND ACCURATE SPEECH OR CHARGING THEM EXCESSIVE AND UNREASONABLE PERMIT FEES. WE ALSO CHALLENGED AN EXORBITANT PERMIT FEE UNDER STATE LAW. THE TRIAL COURT DISMISSED OUR COMPLAINT, AND WE HAVE APPEALED. WISCONSIN COTTAGE FOOD ASSOCIATION, ET AL. V. WISCONSIN DEP'T OF AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION, ET AL. WISCONSIN BANS THE SALE OF MANY HOMEMADE FOODS, INCLUDING COMMON AND SHELF-STABLE FOODS LIKE CANDIES, CHOCOLATES, GRANOLA, AND ROASTED COFFEE BEANS. FOR THOSE WHO WOULD DARE SELL, SAY, A PIECE OF FUDGE MADE IN THEIR HOME KITCHEN, THE PUNISHMENT COULD BE UP TO $1,000 IN FINES OR SIX MONTHS IN JAIL. WISCONSIN'S BAN HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH SAFETY. SO, IN FEBRUARY 2021, SEVEN WISCONSINITES AND THE WISCONSIN COTTAGE FOOD ASSOCIATION JOINED WITH IJ IN A LAWSUIT TO ALLOW THE SALE OF HOME-PREPARED, SAFE, NON-BAKED FOODS. IN DECEMBER 2022, A TRIAL COURT DECISION ALLOWED HOME BAKERS IN WISCONSIN TO SELL SHELF-STABLE FOODS DIRECTLY TO CONSUMERS. BUT AN APPELLATE COURT IN MAY 2023 RULED TO TEMPORARILY ALLOW THE STATE TO ENFORCE THE BAN ON THE SALE OF CERTAIN HOMEMADE FOODS WHILE THE CASE PROCEEDS ON APPEAL. 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 2021, 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. THE DISTRICT COURT DISMISSED THE CASE AS "UNRIPE AND THEN DENIED OUR MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION IN AUGUST 2022, HOLDING THAT THE POSSIBILITY OF A PARDON PREVENTS RUDY FROM CHALLENGING THE LAW. THANKS IN NO SMALL PART TO IJ'S EFFORTS, IN SEPTEMBER 2023, RUDY RECEIVED A PARDON FROM THE GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA IN SEPTEMBER 2023, ALLOWING HIM TO RETURN TO THE JOB HE LOVES. BROWN V. SMITH AS OUR CASE ON BEHALF OF RUDY CAREY ENDED WITH THE GOVERNOR'S PARDON, WE RENEWED OUR CHALLENGE TO VIRGINIA'S LIFETIME BAN ON PEOPLE WITH "BARRIER CRIME" CONVICTIONS ON BEHALF OF MELISSA BROWN. LIKE RUDY, SHE STRUGGLED WITH ADDICTION IN THE 1990S, COMMITTED CRIMES TO FUEL IT, AND NOW WANTS TO USE HER EXPERIENCE TO GUIDE OTHERS INTO RECOVERY. BUT UNLIKE RUDY, HER DECADES-OLD CONVICTION - ROBBERY - RENDERS HER INELIGIBLE FROM BEING HIRED AS A SUBSTANCE ABUSE COUNSELOR, EVEN WITH A GOVERNOR'S PARDON. THIS LAWSUIT SEEKS ONCE AND FOR ALL TO END THIS IRRATIONAL RESTRICTION. CARMEN'S CORNER STORE, ET AL. V. U.S. DEP'T OF AGRICULTURE, ET AL. RETAILERS ACROSS THE COUNTRY - BUT PARTICULARLY IN IMPOVERISHED AREAS - RELY ON THEIR ABILITY TO ACCEPT SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (SNAP) BENEFITS AS PART OF THEIR BUSINESS. BUT THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE PERMANENTLY BANS RETAILERS WHO HAVE EVER BEEN CONVICTED OF ANY CRIME RELATING TO ALCOHOL, DRUGS, OR FIREARMS FROM ACCEPTING SNAP BENEFITS. THIS MEANT THAT ALTIMONT MARK WILKS, WHO WAS SEEKING A FRESH START AFTER A DRUG-DEALING CONVICTION DECADES AGO, COULDN'T ACCEPT SNAP BENEFITS AT HIS CORNER GROCERY STORES. IJ TEAMED UP WITH ALTIMONT TO FIGHT AGAINST THE USDA'S PERMANENT BAN. AND IN DECEMBER 2023, THE AGENCY ENTERED INTO A SETTLEMENT ALLOWING ALTIMONT TO REAPPLY TO BECOME A CERTIFIED SNAP RETAILER, AND TO STOP PERMANENTLY PUNISHING INDIVIDUALS WITH CERTAIN DRUG OFFENSES. IN RE:ARM & RAGE LLC JOE ARMSTRONG OWNS WJBE, KNOXVILLE'S ONLY RADIO STATION FOCUSED ON THE BLACK COMMUNITY. BUT THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION THREATENED 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 DEFENDED JOE AT AN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING, AND IN SEPTEMBER 2023, THE ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE RULED COMPLETELY IN OUR FAVOR. WHILE CERTAIN DISCOVERY ORDERS REMAIN PENDING ON APPEAL (FILED BY THE FCC WITH AN EYE TO SEPARATE PROCEEDINGS), JOE HAS WON ON THE SUBSTANCE AND WJBE GETS TO STAY ON THE AIR.
THORNTON V.	IN BULLHEAD CITY, ARIZONA, YOUR KINDNESS MIGHT COST YOU YOUR FREEDOM. IT NEARLY DID FOR NORMA

Return Reference	Explanation
CITY OF BULLHEAD CITY	THORNTON, A 78-YEAR-OLD GRANDMOTHER WHO WAS ARRESTED AND CRIMINALLY CHARGED FOR FEEDING THOSE IN NEED IN BULLHEAD CITY. UNDER A NEW ORDINANCE, THE CITY DEEMED IT A CRIMINAL MISDEMEANOR - PUNISHABLE BY FINES AND EVEN IMPRISONMENT - TO SHARE PREPARED FOOD IN A PUBLIC PARK FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES. HOMELESSNESS IS A COMPLICATED AND SERIOUS PROBLEM, BUT CRIMINALIZING ACTS OF CHARITY ISN'T THE SOLUTION. WHAT'S MORE, IT'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL. THAT'S WHY NORMA JOINED IJ IN A FEDERAL LAWSUIT AGAINST BULLHEAD CITY TO STRIKE DOWN THIS ORDINANCE AND ALLOW NORMA, AND OTHERS LIKE HER, TO USE CHARITY TO HELP THOSE IN NEED. 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, AND IN AUGUST 2022, THE HIGH COURT VACATED THE DISMISSAL, ALLOWING OUR CLIENTS TO CONTINUE THEIR LAWSUIT. BUT ON REMAND, THE CHANCERY COURT OF DAVIDSON COUNTY RULED THAT THE CITY'S DISCRIMINATION WAS CONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE OF DEFERENCE TO THE GOVERNMENT, BUT NEVER ACTUALLY ADDRESSED WHETHER OUR CLIENTS WERE SIMILARLY SITUATED TO THE PRIVILEGED HOME-BASED BUSINESSES - A DETERMINATION THAT WE WILL ONCE AGAIN APPEAL. BRINKMANN, ET AL. V. TOWN OF SOUTHOLD 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 "PASSIVE 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 UNCONSTITUTIONAL ATTEMPTS TO USE EMINENT DOMAIN TO STOP A COMPLETELY LEGAL USE OF PROPERTY TO BUILD A BUSINESS. A LOSS IN THE TRIAL COURT WAS AFFIRMED BY THE 2ND U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS IN A 2-1 DECISION. WE PETITIONED THE SUPREME COURT FOR CERTIORARI IN EARLY JUNE 2024. JONES, ET AL. V. PORT FREEPORT, ET AL. THE PORT IN FREEPORT, TEXAS, USED EMINENT DOMAIN TO CONDEMN SEVERAL PROPERTIES IN A HISTORICALLY BLACK NEIGHBORHOOD - EVEN THOUGH ITS CEO HAS ADMITTED AT DEPOSITION THAT THE PORT HAS NO SPECIFIC PLANS FOR THE PROPERTY BESIDES LEASING IT TO THIRD PARTIES FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT. THIS IS PRECISELY THE KIND OF TAKING THAT TEXAS OUTLAWED IN 2009 (IN THE WAKE OF THE WIDELY CRITICIZED KELO DECISION), SO IJ HAS TAKEN ON THIS CASE TO OPPOSE THE CONDEMNATION. THE DISTRICT COURT GRANTED SUMMARY JUDGMENT TO THE PORT, AND WE HAVE APPEALED. FISHER, ET AL. V. CITY OF OCEAN SPRINGS OCEAN SPRINGS, MISSISSIPPI, DESIGNATED AS "SLUM OR BLIGHTED" MORE THAN 200 PROPERTIES IN A HISTORIC BLACK NEIGHBORHOOD - A DESIGNATION THAT NEVER EXPIRES, AND CARRIES WITH IT THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN. BUT EVEN THOUGH THE GOVERNMENT'S DESIGNATION NEVER EXPIRES, MISSISSIPPI PROPERTY OWNERS RECEIVE NO HEARING NOTICE AND NO OPPORTUNITY TO BE HEARD, AND HAVE ONLY 10 DAYS TO CHALLENGE THE DESIGNATION; AFTER THAT, THEY ARE EFFECTIVELY PRECLUDED FROM DEFENDING THEMSELVES AGAINST EMINENT DOMAIN IN THE FUTURE. THIS TERRIBLE SYSTEM VIOLATES DUE PROCESS, AND IN OCTOBER 2023, WE FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUIT CHALLENGING BOTH THE CITY'S ACTIONS AND THE MISSISSIPPI LAWS THAT ALLOW THEM AS VIOLATING THE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT. WE REPRESENT HOMEOWNERS, A SMALL BUSINESS OWNER, AND THE NEIGHBORHOOD'S BAPTIST CHURCH. AZAEL SEPULVEDA V. CITY OF PASADENA, ET AL. AZAEL SEPULVEDA, ALSO KNOWN AS OZ, HAS RUN A CAR REPAIR SHOP FOR TEN 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. SINCE THAT TIME, CITY OFFICIALS HAVE DRAGGED THEIR FEET ON ALLOWING HIM TO OPEN HIS NEW SHOP. SO, IN MARCH 2023, OZ WENT BACK TO COURT TO ENFORCE THE AGREEMENT. THE DEFENDANTS FILED A PLEA TO THE JURISDICTION, ARGUING THAT THEY WERE IMMUNE FROM SUIT AND OUR CASE WAS NOT RIPE. THE TRIAL COURT DENIED THEIR PLEA, BUT THEY TOOK AN INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL, WHICH STAYS THE TRIAL COURT PROCEEDINGS. BAKER V. CITY OF MCKINNEY 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 IT HAD 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 IN JUNE 2022. BUT THE CITY APPEALED, AND IN OCTOBER 2023 THE 5TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ISSUED AN OPINION REVERSING THE DISTRICT COURT AND HOLDING THAT THE TAKINGS CLAUSE DOES NOT APPLY IN CASES OF "PUBLIC NECESSITY." WE PETITIONED FOR REHEARING, AND THE PETITION WAS DENIED BY AN 11-6 VOTE, WITH A DISSENT BY TWO JUDGES. WE FILED A PETITION FOR CERTIORARI ON JUNE 28, 2024. PENA V. CITY OF LOS ANGELES OUR CLIENT, CARLOS PENA, RAN A SUCCESSFUL PRINT SHOP IN LOS ANGELES FOR YEARS. HIS HARD WORK WAS UPENDED SUDDENLY WHEN A FUGITIVE RAN INTO THE SHOP AND BARRICADED HIMSELF INSIDE. A LOS ANGELES SWAT TEAM SURROUNDED THE STORE AND EVENTUALLY ASSAULTED IT WITH TEAR GAS, CAUSING NEARLY $60,000 IN DAMAGE. AS IN BAKER V. CITY OF MCKINNEY (OUR TEXAS SWAT CASE), THE CITY HAS REFUSED TO PAY FOR THE DAMAGE, IN VIOLATION OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT'S TAKINGS CLAUSE. NEVERTHELESS, THE DISTRICT COURT GRANTED SUMMARY JUDGMENT TO THE CITY, A DECISION THAT WE HAVE APPEALED TO THE 9TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. SLAYBAUGH V. RUTHERFORD COUNTY, ET AL. IN JANUARY 2022, MOLLIE SLAYBAUGH LET HER ADULT SON SPEND THE NIGHT AT HER SMYRNA, TENNESSEE, HOME. SHE HAD NO IDEA THAT HE

Return Reference	Explanation
	WAS WANTED FOR THE MURDER OF A POLICE OFFICER, AND WAS SHOCKED WHEN SHE NOTICED A LARGE POLICE PRESENCE OUTSIDE HER HOME THAT EVENING. SHE OFFERED TO HELP THE POLICE EXTRICATE HER SON SAFELY, BUT THE POLICE TOLD HER TO LEAVE AND EVENTUALLY ASSAULTED THE HOME WITH DOZENS OF TEAR GAS CANNISTERS, DESTROYING DRYWALL, TEXTILES, AND ESSENTIALLY EVERYTHING IN THE HOME. THE DISTRICT COURT THREW OUT HER CASE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT, ON THE BASIS THAT "POLICE POWER" ACTIONS ARE NOT SUBJECT TO THE FIFTH AMENDMENT'S TAKINGS CLAUSE. WE TOOK THIS CASE UP ON APPEAL TO THE 6TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, BECAUSE THE FIFTH AMENDMENT REQUIRES JUST COMPENSATION WHEN THE GOVERNMENT DESTROYS PRIVATE PROPERTY FOR A PUBLIC GOOD.
HADLEY V. CITY OF SOUTH BEND, ET AL.	OUR CLIENT, AMY HADLEY, HAD HER HOME IN SOUTH BEND, INDIANA, BLASTED WITH TEAR-GAS GRENADES AND RANSACKED BY POLICE WHO WERE SEARCHING FOR A DANGEROUS FUGITIVE. BUT THE POLICE HAD MADE A MAJOR MISTAKE IN THEIR INVESTIGATION AND HAD THE WRONG HOUSE. AMY AND HER FAMILY HAD NO CONNECTION TO THE FUGITIVE. THEY WERE VICTIMS OF A DESTRUCTIVE, COSTLY RAID AND WERE LEFT TO SHOULDER THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN PROPERTY DAMAGE. IN DECEMBER 2023, WE LAUNCHED A CASE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT ENTITIES WHO CONTRIBUTED TO THE DESTRUCTION, CLAIMING THAT THEY TOOK AMY'S PROPERTY WITHOUT JUST COMPENSATION, AS REQUIRED BY THE INDIANA AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS. IN RE: SANDERSVILLE RAILROAD COMPANY'S PETITION FOR APPROVAL TO ACQUIRE REAL ESTATE BY CONDEMNATION TO BRING RAIL SERVICE TO ONE PRIVATELY HELD ROCK QUARRY, THE SANDERSVILLE RAILROAD COMPANY WANTS TO DRIVE A TRACK STRAIGHT THROUGH THE HEART OF SEVERAL PARCELS OF PROPERTY IN THE SMALL TOWN OF SPARTA, GEORGIA - INCLUDING PARCELS THAT HAVE BEEN IN THE GARRETT AND SMITH FAMILIES FOR GENERATIONS. UNDER GEORGIA LAW, PRIVATE RAILROAD COMPANIES CAN USE THE POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN ONLY FOR A PUBLIC USE - BUT GRABBING LAND THAT BELONGS TO OTHERS TO BUILD A TRACK TO SERVICE PRIVATE INTERESTS IS NOT A PUBLIC USE. THAT'S WHY THE GARRETTS AND THE SMITHS HAVE JOINED WITH IJ TO STAND UP TO SANDERSVILLE RAILROAD'S ATTEMPT TO WIELD THE STATE'S POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN TO TAKE THEIR GENERATIONAL LAND. THEY ARE ASKING THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION TO DENY SANDERSVILLE RAILROAD'S REQUEST FOR AUTHORITY TO TAKE THEIR LAND TO BUILD THE TRACK BECAUSE IT IS NOT A PUBLIC USE. AN AGENCY HEARING OFFICER RECOMMENDED RULING IN FAVOR OF THE RAILROAD, AND OUR CLIENTS HAVE SOUGHT REVIEW BEFORE THE FULL PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION. 8307 MANCHESTER LLC, ET AL. V. CITY OF BRENTWOOD SINCE 2018, BRENTWOOD, MISSOURI, HAS PLANNED TO REDEVELOP A COMMERCIAL AREA IT CALLS THE MANCHESTER CORRIDOR. DESPERATE TO REDEVELOP THE AREA TO INCREASE ITS ECONOMIC OUTPUT, THE CITY HAS USED SHIFTING JUSTIFICATIONS TO DESIGNATE THE AREA AS "BLIGHTED." WE REPRESENT SEVERAL SMALL BUSINESSES CHALLENGING THE BLIGHT DESIGNATION. NOT ONLY DOES IT NOT MEET THE STATUTORY STANDARD, BUT BLIGHT IS ALSO A PRETEXT FOR THE REAL MOTIVATION, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (AN IMPROPER JUSTIFICATION UNDER MISSOURI'S POST-KELO LAW). THOMAS, ET AL. V. COUNTY OF HUMBOLDT, ET AL. HUMBOLDT COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, IMPOSES A DAILY CIVIL PENALTY OF UP TO $10,000 PER VIOLATION, FOR UP TO 90 DAYS, FOR ANY CODE VIOLATION IT SAYS IS RELATED TO CANNABIS. SHOCKINGLY, HUMBOLDT WILL FINE NEW HOMEBUYERS MILLIONS OF DOLLARS BECAUSE BEFORE THEY BOUGHT THE PLACE, THE PRIOR PROPERTY OWNER ALLEGEDLY GREW MARIJUANA ILLEGALLY. WHILE THESE INNOCENT OWNERS HAVE ALL OF TEN DAYS TO WEIGH THEIR OPTIONS UNDER THE THREAT OF MILLIONS IN FINES, THE COUNTY TYPICALLY OFFERS A COMPLIANCE AGREEMENT, UNDER WHICH OWNERS WAIVE THEIR RIGHTS IN EXCHANGE FOR A SINGLE DAY'S WORTH OF FINES. THESE TACTICS HAVE PUT HUNDREDS OF INNOCENT PROPERTY OWNERS UNDER IMMENSE PRESSURE AND LEGAL UNCERTAINTY. THEY NEVER GREW CANNABIS - BUT THEY ALSO CAN'T GET THEIR DAY IN COURT - THEY FACE CRIPPLING FINES, AND THEY CAN'T DEVELOP THEIR LAND. THIS STATE OF AFFAIRS IS UNJUST AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL. THAT'S WHY FOUR HUMBOLDT RESIDENTS HAVE JOINED WITH IJ TO FILE A PUTATIVE CLASS ACTION AGAINST THE COUNTY. IN MAY 2023, A FEDERAL JUDGE GRANTED THE COUNTY'S MOTION TO DISMISS; IJ HAS APPEALED THE DECISION. 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 THE CITY HAD ALREADY DESTROYED IT. IN JUNE 2020, THE MAYOR OF CHICAGO PROPOSED REFORMS TO THE IMPOUND PROGRAM THAT WOULD FIX SOME (THOUGH NOT ALL) 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. BUT THE JUDGE ALSO DENIED CLASS CERTIFICATION, SO THE INDIVIDUAL CLAIMS NOW PROCEED BY THEMSELVES. RIVERA, ET AL. V. BOROUGH OF POTTSTOWN, ET AL. POTTSTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA, HAS A 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 U.S. CONSTITUTION AND 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 JANUARY 2024, THE TRIAL COURT GRANTED SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN OUR FAVOR, BUT IT DID NOT GIVE US ALL OF THE RELIEF WE REQUESTED, SO WE HAVE APPEALED TO THE PENNSYLVANIA COMMONWEALTH COURT. SINGER, ET AL. V. ORANGE CITY, ET AL. ORANGE CITY, IOWA, ALSO FORCES LANDLORDS AND TENANTS TO OPEN THEIR PROPERTIES AND HOMES TO SUBMIT TO INTRUSIVE INSPECTIONS. THE 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 YOUR HOME. ORANGE CITY'S INSPECTION SCHEME DEFIES THESE CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES, SO IJ 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. ON AUGUST 31, 2023, THE DISTRICT COURT STRUCK DOWN ORANGE CITY'S SUSPICIONLESS RENTAL INSPECTION PROGRAM UNDER THE IOWA CONSTITUTION. THIS IS THE FIRST TIME THAT A COURT, ON A FULL RECORD,

Return Reference	Explanation
	HAS HELD THAT THE GOVERNMENT CANNOT FORCE ITS WAY INTO RENTERS' HOMES WITHOUT "SOME PLAUSIBLE BASIS FOR BELIEVING THAT A VIOLATION IS LIKELY TO BE FOUND." THE CITY HAS SINCE APPEALED OUR WIN TO THE IOWA SUPREME COURT. BRUMIT, ET AL. V. GRANITE CITY CITY OFFICIALS IN GRANITE CITY, ILLINOIS, TRIED 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 DID NOT LIVE WITH HER) STOLE A VAN ELSEWHERE IN TOWN. GRANITE CITY HAD WHAT IT CALLS A "CRIME-FREE" HOUSING ORDINANCE THAT AMOUNTED TO A COMPULSORY EVICTION LAW. UNDER THE LAW, IF ANY MEMBER OF YOUR HOUSEHOLD OR EVEN A GUEST COMMITTED A CRIME ANYWHERE IN THE CITY, THEN YOUR LANDLORD WAS REQUIRED TO EVICT YOU. BUT DEBI AND ANDY'S LANDLORD DID 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 ENTERED A RESTRAINING ORDER THAT KEPT DEBI AND ANDY SAFELY IN THEIR HOME WHILE THE LAWSUIT PROCEEDED THROUGH DISCOVERY AND SUMMARY JUDGMENT BRIEFING. THE CITY REFORMED THEIR ORDINANCE IN THE FACE OF IJ'S PRESSURE, AND DUE TO THESE REFORMS (AND DEBI AND ANDY'S EVENTUAL MOVE OUT OF STATE) THE 7TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ULTIMATELY FOUND THAT THE CASE WAS MOOT BECAUSE DEBI AND ANDY WEREN'T ACTUALLY EVICTED.
HOHENBERG, ET AL. V. SHELBY COUNTY, ET AL.	WHEN A COURT PROCEEDING MAY RESULT IN A PERSON'S 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, PROVIDES THE DUE PROCESS THAT THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES AND IS HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR MAKING BOTH OF THEM HOMELESS. AFTER A VICTORY IN THE 6TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS IN MAY 2023, RECOGNIZING THAT FEDERAL COURTS HAVE AUTHORITY TO HEAR CHALLENGES AGAINST LOCAL GOVERNMENTS WHEN THEY CREATE JUDICIAL SYSTEMS THAT VIOLATE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS, SARAH AND JOSEPH WILL CARRY ON THEIR FIGHT; THE CASE IS NOW REMANDED TO THE DISTRICT COURT FOR FURTHER DISCOVERY AND BRIEFING. ADAMS V. CITY OF SEATTLE SEATTLE, LIKE MANY CITIES, IS EXPERIENCING A HOUSING SHORTAGE. THEIR ATTEMPT TO ADDRESS IT ONLY MAKES MATTERS WORSE. IN 2019, THE CITY CREATED THE MANDATORY HOUSING AFFORDABILITY (MHA) PROGRAM, WHICH PLACES UNIQUE BURDENS ON ANYONE BUILDING IN CERTAIN ZONES THROUGHOUT THE CITY. LONGTIME CENTRAL DISTRICT HOMEOWNER ANITA ADAMS WANTS TO BUILD A MODEST ADDITION TO HOUSE HER TWO ADULT CHILDREN. BUT BEFORE SHE CAN GET A BUILDING PERMIT, THE CITY DEMANDS THAT SHE EITHER BUILD ADDITIONAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS OR PAY NEARLY $77,000 INTO THE MHA PROGRAM. THOSE FEES MAKE ANITA'S PLANS IMPOSSIBLE - AND LEAVE THE CITY WITH FEWER AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS. ACROSS THE CITY, ANYONE WISHING TO CONSTRUCT A HOME MUST FACE INCOMPREHENSIBLY HIGH FEES OR BURDENSOME AND INTRUSIVE NEW HOUSING MANDATES LEVIED IN THE NAME OF "AFFORDABLE HOUSING." ANITA HAS PARTNERED WITH IJ TO CHALLENGE SEATTLE'S COUNTERPRODUCTIVE AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL MHA PROGRAM. ON JUNE 28, 2024, THE DISTRICT COURT RULED AGAINST US, AND WE WILL BE SEEKING FURTHER REVIEW. DECKER, ET AL. V. CITY OF MERIDIAN, ET AL. CHASIDY DECKER, A NATIVE OF THE TREASURE VALLEY IN IDAHO, HAD A SAVVY SOLUTION TO OWNING A HOME AFTER BEING PRICED OUT OF THE GENERAL BOISE REAL ESTATE MARKET: SHE BOUGHT A BEAUTIFUL 252-SQUARE FOOT TINY HOUSE ON WHEELS AND FOUND A LOCAL MERIDIAN HOMEOWNER WHO WOULD LET HER PARK IT ON HIS PROPERTY FOR $600 PER MONTH. BUT THE DAY AFTER CHASIDY MOVED IN, THE CITY THREATENED BOTH CHASIDY AND THE HOMEOWNER WITH CRIMINAL PROSECUTION AND FINES OF $1,000 PER DAY UNLESS SHE MOVED OUT OF HER TINY HOUSE. CITIES LIKE MERIDIAN SHOULD PROMOTE RATHER THAN DISCOURAGE THEIR RESIDENTS' PRIVATE EFFORTS TO FIND AFFORDABLE HOUSING DURING A HOUSING CRISIS. BUT MERIDIAN'S BAN ON TINY HOMES ON WHEELS IS NOT JUST BAD POLICY - IT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL. WITH IJ, CHASIDY FILED A CONSTITUTIONAL LAWSUIT AGAINST MERIDIAN'S IRRATIONAL BAN ON LIVING IN TINY HOMES. IN NOVEMBER 2022, A STATE DISTRICT COURT ALLOWED CHASIDY'S CASE TO MOVE FORWARD. A BENCH TRIAL WAS HELD IN APRIL 2024, AND WE AWAIT A DECISION FROM THE COURT. TINY HOUSE HAND UP, INC. V. CITY OF CALHOUN, 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 HOLD THAT THE CITY'S BAN VIOLATES THE GEORGIA CONSTITUTION. DUNCKEL, ET AL. V. CITY OF WINSTON-SALEM, ET AL. KIMBERLY DUNCKEL AND HER FAMILY FOUNDED FAIRYTALE FARM ANIMAL SANCTUARY TO GIVE NEGLECTED AND SPECIAL-NEEDS FARM ANIMALS A "HAPPILY EVER AFTER." BUT IN EARLY 2023, THE CITY TOLD KIMBERLY THE SANCTUARY COULD NOT CONTINUE TO SERVE THE COMMUNITY. AFTER A BACKLASH, THE CITY BACKED DOWN, BUT IT STILL PLACED HARSH LIMITS ON THE SANCTUARY, INCLUDING A BAN ON EVENTS AND CAPPING HOW MANY VOLUNTEERS CAN WORK AT A TIME. THE CITY WILL NOT EVEN ALLOW LOCAL GIRL SCOUT TROOPS TO VISIT. TOO OFTEN, ZONING CODES STRIP PEOPLE OF THEIR PROPERTY RIGHTS, MAKING THEIR OWNERSHIP LITTLE MORE THAN A NAME ON A DEED. KIMBERLY TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO PROTECT PROPERTY RIGHTS AND THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS TO PURSUE THEIR CHOSEN OCCUPATION, INCLUDING AT NONPROFITS LIKE THE SANCTUARY. THE DISTRICT COURT JUDGE DENIED THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS IN SEPTEMBER 2023, AND THE CASE REMAINS ONGOING. QUAKENBUSH, ET AL. V. BROOKS TOWNSHIP, ET AL. PETER AND ANNICA QUAKENBUSH WANT TO OPERATE A CONSERVATION BURIAL GROUND AND NATURE PRESERVE ON THEIR FORESTED, 20-ACRE PROPERTY IN BROOKS TOWNSHIP, MICHIGAN. BUT DESPITE THE ISSUANCE OF AN APPROVAL FROM THE LOCAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT, THE TOWNSHIP - BOTHERED BY THE QUAKENBUSHES' UNCONVENTIONAL FORM OF CEMETERY - RESPONDED BY BANNING ALL CEMETERIES WITHIN ITS BOUNDARIES. IN JANUARY 2024, IJ RESPONDED IN TURN BY SUING ON THE QUAKENBUSHES' BEHALF, BRINGING A SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS CLAIM AND A CLAIM UNDER MICHIGAN'S CONSTITUTION, WHICH DOES NOT ALLOW MICHIGAN MUNICIPALITIES TO USE ZONING TO BAN ORDINARY BUSINESSES. KING, ET AL. V. HANSON, ET AL. THE OREGON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE RECENTLY INTERPRETED ITS REGULATIONS OF CONFINED ANIMAL FEEDING OPERATIONS (CAFOS) TO APPLY TO ALL DAIRY FARMERS - REGARDLESS OF SIZE. YET PUBLICLY AVAILABLE INFORMATION BETRAYS THAT

Return Reference	Explanation
	THIS BURDENSOME REQUIREMENT (WHICH IS ENTIRELY UNNECESSARY FOR SMALLER OPERATIONS) WAS MOTIVATED BY PROTECTIONISM, IMPLEMENTED AT THE BEHEST OF LARGE DAIRY OPERATIONS CONCERNED ABOUT COMPETITION FROM SMALLER DAIRIES. IJ FILED SUIT ON BEHALF OF FOUR SMALL DAIRY FARMERS IN FEDERAL COURT IN JANUARY 2024, ALLEGING THAT THE STATE'S CAFO REQUIREMENTS VIOLATE EQUAL PROTECTION AND DUE PROCESS. SHAHEED, ET AL. V. CITY OF WILMINGTON, 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 NOVEMBER 2022, A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT RULED AGAINST THE CITY'S ATTEMPT TO DISMISS THE CASE, ALLOWING IJ'S SUIT TO CONTINUE. MEADE, ET AL. V. 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 FOURTEENTH 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, THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT DISMISSED THE LAWSUIT, AND IJ ARGUED OUR APPEAL TO THE 5TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS IN AUGUST 2022. WE CONTINUE TO AWAIT A DECISION.
VALANCOURT BOOKS, LLC V. CLAGGETT, ET AL.	VALANCOURT IS A SMALL PUBLISHING COMPANY OPERATING 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, BUT THE D.C. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS REVERSED ON AUGUST 29, 2023, AGREEING WITH OUR TAKINGS CLAUSE ARGUMENTS AND HOLDING THAT THE GOVERNMENT VIOLATED THE FIFTH AMENDMENT BY DEMANDING THAT VALANCOURT TURN OVER BOOKS FREE OF CHARGE. (BECAUSE THIS GRANTS US COMPLETE RELIEF, THE COURT DID NOT REACH OUR FIRST AMENDMENT CLAIM.) WE CONTINUE TO LITIGATE THE SCOPE OF THE APPROPRIATE REMEDY ON REMAND IN THE DISTRICT COURT. TAYLOR, ET AL. V. NOCCO USING A CRUDE COMPUTER ALGORITHM, THE PASCO COUNTY, FLORIDA, SHERIFF'S OFFICE CREATES A LIST OF PEOPLE THEY THINK ARE LIKELY TO COMMIT CRIMES. THEN, DEPUTIES ROUTINELY SHOW UP UNANNOUNCED AT THE HOMES OF THOSE IDENTIFIED TO INTERROGATE THEM AND, ESPECIALLY, THEIR FAMILY AND FRIENDS. TO INTIMIDATE THEIR TARGETS AND FAMILY MEMBERS 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. THE CASE AIMS TO END BOTH PRETEXTUAL CODE ENFORCEMENT AND HARASSMENT OF PEOPLE THAT POLICE THINK MIGHT COMMIT CRIMES IN THE FUTURE. 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. THE CLASS RELATED TO INDIO HAS BEEN FULLY PAID; A FINAL CLASS APPROVAL HEARING IN OUR RELATED CLASS ACTION REGARDING COACHELLA HAS NOT YET BEEN HELD. SUN VALLEY ORCHARDS, LLC V. U.S. DEP'T 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. THE DISTRICT COURT DISMISSED THE COMPLAINT, AND WE HAVE APPEALED TO THE 3RD U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. C.S. LAWN & LANDSCAPE, INC. V. U.S. DEP'T OF LABOR, ET AL. WHEN THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (DOL) DECIDED TO FINE CHUCK SAINE TENS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS, CHUCK DID NOT GET TO MAKE HIS CASE TO A JURY OF HIS PEERS - OR EVEN A REAL FEDERAL JUDGE. INSTEAD, THE AGENCY'S OWN EMPLOYEES SERVED AS PROSECUTOR, JUDGE, AND JURY. CHUCK'S ADMINISTRATIVE ODYSSEY BEGAN IN 2015, WHEN DOL INVESTIGATORS FIRST SHOWED UP AT HIS BUSINESS, AND ENDED IN 2022, WHEN DOL'S IN-HOUSE AGENCY JUDGES IMPOSED ALMOST $55,000 IN LIABILITY. NOW, CHUCK HAS JOINED WITH IJ TO FILE A CHALLENGE IN THE U.S. DISTRICT

Return Reference	Explanation
	COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. UNDER THE CONSTITUTION, CHUCK SHOULD HAVE BEEN ENTITLED TO MAKE HIS DEFENSE IN A REAL FEDERAL COURT, WITH A REAL FEDERAL JUDGE, AND TO MAKE HIS DEFENSE BEFORE A JURY OF HIS PEERS. IF THE GOVERNMENT WANTS TO TAKE YOUR PROPERTY, YOU SHOULD GET YOUR DAY IN COURT - NOT YOUR DAY BEFORE A BUREAUCRAT. PROCRAFT MASONRY, LLC V. U.S. DEP'T OF JUSTICE, ET AL. PROCRAFT MASONRY IS A SMALL BUSINESS IN TULSA OWNED BY MARRIED COUPLE DANNY AND DIANA BARBEE. FOR MINOR PAPERWORK ERRORS, THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY (DHS) IMPOSED $31,000 IN FINES - AN AMOUNT THAT WOULD CRIPPLE THE BUSINESS. INSTEAD OF SUING THE BARBEES IN A REGULAR COURT, WHERE THEY COULD PRESENT THEIR EVIDENCE TO A JURY, DHS BROUGHT ITS CHARGES TO DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES. THAT VIOLATES THE SEVENTH AMENDMENT (RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL) AND ARTICLE III (REQUIRING THAT CASES BE TRIED BY FEDERAL JUDGES WHO ARE PART OF THE JUDICIARY, NOT THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH). SO, IN SEPTEMBER 2023, IJ JOINED UP WITH PROCRAFT TO CHALLENGE DHS'S USE OF THESE AGENCY COURTS. CORSINI V. CITY OF NEW YORK THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS (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, BUT THAT COMPLAINT WAS DISMISSED AND THE DECISION WAS UPHELD BY THE 2ND U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. KATERGARIS V. CITY OF NEW YORK SERAFIM KATERGARIS BOUGHT A HOME IN HARLEM IN 2014. A TITLE REPORT CONFIRMED THE PROPERTY WAS FREE AND CLEAR OF ANY ENCUMBRANCES. BUT SEVEN YEARS LATER, WHEN HE WENT TO SELL THE PROPERTY, HE LEARNED THAT THE NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS (DOB) HAD FINED HIM $1,000 WAY BACK IN 2014 - ALL BECAUSE A PRIOR OWNER ALLEGEDLY FAILED TO FILE PAPERWORK IN 2013 CERTIFYING THAT THE HOME'S BOILER WAS INSPECTED THAT YEAR. NOT ONLY DID SERAFIM NOT OWN THE HOUSE AT THE TIME, BUT THE OWNER FROM WHOM HE PURCHASED THE PROPERTY HAD REMOVED THE BOILER BEFORE SERAFIM BOUGHT THE PLACE, SO, THERE WAS NO BOILER FOR SERAFIM TO INSPECT. THE FAILURE TO CERTIFY A BOILER INSPECTION IS ONE OF DOB'S MANY UNREVIEWABLE FINES. SERAFIM HAS TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO SUE THE CITY IN FEDERAL COURT AND TAKE A STAND ON BEHALF OF ALL NEW YORKERS. HE HAS ASKED THE COURT TO DECLARE THAT UNREVIEWABLE FINES ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND ORDER DOB TO AFFORD PEOPLE THEIR RIGHT TO BE HEARD AS DUE PROCESS REQUIRES. THE DISTRICT COURT DISMISSED THE CASE ON STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS GROUNDS IN JUNE 2024, AND WE WILL APPEAL.
COLEMAN, ET AL. V. TOWN OF BROOKSIDE, ET AL.	SINCE 2018, THE TINY TOWN OF BROOKSIDE, ALABAMA, HAS BEEN A REVENUE-GENERATING FIEFDOM. HUNDREDS OF RESIDENTS - MANY 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. IN MARCH 2023, A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT REJECTED BROOKSIDE'S EFFORTS TO DISMISS THE CASE, AND THE CASE REMAINS ONGOING. 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 HOMES. A JUDGE DISMISSED THE LAWSUIT IN SEPTEMBER 2021, AND THE APPEALS COURT RULED THAT THE HOMEOWNERS COULD NOT EVEN APPEAL THAT DECISION. BUT IN JANUARY 2023, THE ARIZONA SUPREME COURT OVERTURNED THE APPEALS COURT DECISION AND ASKED THE JUDGES TO RECONSIDER THE CASE CONSIDERING ANOTHER RECENT VICTORY BY IJ. THE CASE NOW IS ENTERING DISCOVERY. MARTINEZ V. CITY OF LANTANA, 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 AT THE CITY 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. BUT IN JUNE 2023, THAT SAME COURT GRANTED THE CITY'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT. WE HAVE APPEALED THAT DECISION TO FLORIDA'S FOURTH DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS. LONG LAKE TOWNSHIP V. MAXON, ET AL. TODD AND HEATHER MAXON LIVE ON A FIVE-ACRE PROPERTY IN RURAL LONG LAKE TOWNSHIP, IN NORTHERN MICHIGAN. LONG LAKE USED A DRONE TO REPEATEDLY SURVEIL THEIR HOME WITHOUT A WARRANT FOR OVER TWO YEARS - TAKING INTRUSIVE, HIGH-RESOLUTION PHOTOGRAPHS AND VIDEOS OF THEIR HOME AND BACKYARD THAT COULD NOT BE CAPTURED WITHOUT A DRONE. THEN, THE GOVERNMENT TRIED

Return Reference	Explanation
	TO USE THOSE PHOTOS AND VIDEOS AS EVIDENCE IN A ZONING ENFORCEMENT LAWSUIT MEANT TO PUNISH THE COUPLE FOR ALLEGED CODE VIOLATIONS ON THEIR PROPERTY. SHOCKINGLY, THE MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS RULED THE FOURTH AMENDMENT'S PROTECTION AGAINST WARRANTLESS SEARCHES DID NOT APPLY HERE. THE MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT NOT ONLY AGREED TO HEAR THE MAXONS' CASE, BUT FEATURED IT IN A "ROAD SHOW" HEARING DESIGNED TO MAXIMIZE PUBLIC OUTREACH. UNFORTUNATELY, THE COURT ISSUED A LARGELY DISENGAGED DECISION HOLDING THAT THE EXCLUSIONARY RULE DOES NOT APPLY TO CIVIL, ZONING-ENFORCEMENT CASES AND THUS THE COURT NEED NOT REACH THE BROADER ISSUE OF WHETHER OVERHEAD SURVEILLANCE OF PRIVATE BACKYARDS WITH A DRONE IS A "SEARCH" REQUIRING A WARRANT. BECAUSE THE DECISION PURPORTS TO BE LIMITED TO THE FACTS OF THIS PARTICULAR CASE, WE OPTED NOT TO SEEK CERTIORARI FROM THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. LOVAGLIO, ET AL. V. BASTON, ET AL. IN ALL FIFTY STATES, NEWBORN BABIES HAVE BLOOD DRAWN FROM A HEEL PINPRICK TO SCREEN FOR DISEASES. BUT UNLIKE OTHER STATES, NEW JERSEY KEEPS THE BLOOD FOR 23 YEARS AFTER BIRTH - WITHOUT EVER TELLING PARENTS THAT THEIR CHILD'S BLOOD REMAINS ON FILE. NOR DOES IT ASK PARENTS FOR PERMISSION TO TAKE OR KEEP THEIR CHILD'S BLOOD. NO LAWS PREVENT THE STATE FROM SELLING THE BLOOD TO THIRD PARTIES, PROVIDING IT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT, OR DOING WHATEVER IT DEEMS FIT WITH IT. THIS DRAWN-OUT RETENTION OF THE BLOOD AFTER TESTING VIOLATES THE FOURTH AMENDMENT, SO IJ FILED SUIT AGAINST THE STATE ON BEHALF OF THREE NEW JERSEY PARENTS AND THEIR CHILDREN. IN JUNE 2024, THE GOVERNMENT ANNOUNCED THAT IT WOULD MAKE VARIOUS CHANGES TO ITS RETENTION POLICY THAT DO NOT RESOLVE THE CONSTITUTIONAL FLAWS WITH THE PROGRAM, AND THE CASE CONTINUES. 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. WE ARE NOW BEFORE THE STATE SUPREME COURT, SEEKING TO OVERTURN THE 2007 PRECEDENT. HIGHLANDER V. VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES, ET AL. THE 30 ACRES JOSH HIGHLANDER (AN AVID HUNTER) OWNS OUTSIDE RICHMOND, VIRGINIA, IS PRIVATE LAND. AFTER AN INCIDENT WHERE HIS FAMILY NOTICED SOMEONE WEARING A CAMOUFLAGE LEAFY JACKET IN THEIR WOODS, JOSH SOON DISCOVERED THAT A CAMERA HE USED TO MONITOR GAME ON HIS PROPERTY WAS MISSING. HE CALLED POLICE TO REPORT THE THEFT, WHO SAID THE CAMERA WAS IN THE POSSESSION OF THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES (DWR). IN THE WEEKS FOLLOWING, JOSH DID NOT RECEIVE A WARRANT NOR WAS HE GIVEN ANY HUNTING CITATIONS. VIRGINIA IS ONE OF MANY STATES WHERE GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS CONDUCT WARRANTLESS SEARCHES OF "OPEN FIELDS" UNDER A CENTURY-OLD U.S. SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT, LEAVING MOST PRIVATE PROPERTY IN THE NATION UNPROTECTED BY THE FOURTH AMENDMENT'S PROHIBITION AGAINST UNREASONABLE SEARCHES AND SEIZURES. BUT THE DWR DID MORE THAN TRESPASS ON JOSH'S PROPERTY AND OBSERVE HIS FAMILY. IT TOOK JOSH'S CAMERA TO SPY ON HIM. NOW, JOSH AND IJ ARE SUING IN STATE COURT TO GET HIS CAMERA BACK, TO PROTECT HIS HOME, AND TO RESTORE THE RIGHT OF ALL VIRGINIANS TO BE SECURE ON THEIR LAND. THE TRIAL COURT HELD NOT ONLY THAT THESE SEARCHES DON'T VIOLATE THE VIRGINIA CONSTITUTION, BUT THAT VIRGINIANS CANNOT EVEN SUE IN COURT TO ENFORCE THESE RIGHTS AT ALL. IJ HAS APPEALED THIS DECISION TO THE VIRGINIA COURT OF APPEALS (VIRGINIA'S INTERMEDIATE APPELLATE COURT). MANUEL V. LOUISIANA DEP'T OF WILDLIFE AND FISHERIES, ET AL. OUR LATEST CASE CHALLENGING THE OPEN-FIELDS DOCTRINE THAT ALLOWS OFFICIALS TO CONDUCT WARRANTLESS SEARCHES OF PRIVATE LAND IS ON BEHALF OF TOM MANUEL, A FORESTER AND WILDLIFE BIOLOGIST WITH 240 ACRES OF TIMBERLAND IN RURAL LOUISIANA. IN DECEMBER 2023, STATE GAME WARDENS TWICE ENTERED HIS PROPERTY WITHOUT A WARRANT, HIS PERMISSION, OR ANY SUSPICION OF WRONGDOING. WE SUED ON TOM'S BEHALF, ARGUING THAT LOUISIANA'S CONSTITUTION - WHICH PROTECTS ALL "PROPERTY" FROM UNREASONABLE SEARCHES AND INVASIONS OF PRIVACY - MEANS THAT STATE OFFICIALS MAY NOT CONDUCT WARRANTLESS INTRUSIONS ONTO PRIVATE LAND IN THE STATE.
QUINONEZ, ET AL. V. DOES 1 THROUGH 5, UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE, ET AL.	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 A SERIOUS HIT. IN JUNE 2022, RENE AND MOVEMENT INK PARTNERED WITH IJ TO FILE A FEDERAL LAWSUIT TO VINDICATE HIS FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS. IN JUNE 2023, A FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGE PARTIALLY GRANTED AND PARTIALLY DENIED THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTIONS TO DISMISS. THE CASE REMAINS ONGOING. BROWN, ET AL. 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 THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION 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. LARA V. 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 DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION (DEA), 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

Return Reference	Explanation
	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. THE TRIAL COURT DENIED THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS IN JANUARY 2024, AND THE CASE CONTINUES. 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. THE 6TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ULTIMATELY RULED IN OUR FAVOR, HOLDING THAT THE GOVERNMENT MUST PROVIDE A HEARING BEFORE A NEUTRAL DECISIONMAKER WITHIN 14 DAYS OF A VEHICLE SEIZURE; THE REMAINING ISSUES ARE STILL BEING LITIGATED IN DISTRICT COURT. WE ARE ALSO FIGHTING FOR THE RETURN OF OUR CLIENT STEPHANIE WILSON'S CAR IN STATE COURT. AN APPEALS COURT OVERTURNED OUR WIN IN STEPHANIE'S FORFEITURE CASE IN A LOWER COURT, AND THE MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT ACCEPTED REVIEW OF THE MID-LEVEL COURT DECISION THAT REVERSED OUR WIN. 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, THUS DISMANTLING MUCH OF DETROIT'S CAR FORFEITURE SYSTEM. REEVES V. COUNTY OF WAYNE, ET AL. IN 2019, ROBERT REEVES' CAR WAS SEIZED BY POLICE IN DETROIT USING CIVIL FORFEITURE. HE PARTNERED WITH IJ IN 2020 TO FILE THE FEDERAL CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT TO PUT AN END TO WAYNE COUNTY'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL PRACTICE OF SEIZING CARS FROM INNOCENT MOTORISTS, DESCRIBED ABOVE. WITHIN TWO WEEKS OF OUR FILING THE SUIT, WAYNE COUNTY PROSECUTORS BEGAN TO WAGE A WAR OF RETRIBUTION AGAINST ROBERT. THEY FILED TWO FELONY CHARGES AGAINST ROBERT AND THEN ATTEMPTED TO LEVERAGE THOSE CHARGES TO DERAIL HIS FEDERAL CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT. WHEN A JUDGE DISMISSED THAT, THEY DIDN'T GIVE UP. INSTEAD, THEY FILED A SECOND SET OF IDENTICAL CHARGES, WHICH WERE ONCE AGAIN DISMISSED FOR LACK OF EVIDENCE. TO ENSURE THAT NO ONE ELSE IS THREATENED WITH JAIL TIME FOR DARING TO HOLD GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS ACCOUNTABLE, ROBERT JOINED IJ TO FILE A SECOND LAWSUIT AGAINST WAYNE COUNTY FOR THEIR HARASSMENT AGAINST HIM. THE CASE IS NOW BEFORE THE MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS, AS BOTH SIDES ARE APPEALING THE DISTRICT COURT'S DECISION PARTIALLY GRANTING THE COUNTY'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT. WOODS, ET AL. V. HARRIS COUNTY, ET AL.; TEXAS V. $41,680 POLICE IN TEXAS' MOST POPULOUS COUNTY ROUTINELY ASK DRIVERS IF THEY HAVE CASH IN THE CAR - ONLY TO SEIZE THE CASH, ACCUSE DRIVERS OF A CRIME, AND DRIVE AWAY WITH THE CASH 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. MEANWHILE, A TEXAS TRIAL COURT ALLOWED THE GOVERNMENT TO KEEP AMEAL AND JORDAN'S MONEY, AND WE HAVE APPEALED. 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. A DISTRICT COURT DECISION ISSUED IN SEPTEMBER 2022 SAID THE SEARCH AND SEIZURE WAS CONSTITUTIONAL, BUT IN JANUARY 2024, THE 9TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS EMPHATICALLY REVERSED. IT DESCRIBED THE GOVERNMENT'S CONDUCT AS "EGREGIOUS AND "OUTRAGEOUS AND COMPARED THE FBI'S ACTIONS TO THE BRITISH WRITS OF ASSISTANCE AT THE TIME OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. WE WILL BE SEEKING ATTORNEYS' FEES. MARTIN V. FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION, ET AL. LINDA MARTIN AND HER HUSBAND, REGGIE, WERE CAUGHT UP IN THE SAME DOJ RAID OF SAFE DEPOSIT BOXES DESCRIBED ABOVE. AFTER THE FBI SEIZED THE MONEY THE COUPLE WAS SAVING TO BUY A HOUSE, THEY AND HUNDREDS OF OTHER BOX RENTERS RECEIVED FORFEITURE NOTICES TELLING THEM THE GOVERNMENT WANTED TO TAKE THEIR PROPERTY FOREVER, EVEN THOUGH THEY WERE NOT NAMED IN THE INDICTMENT AGAINST THE SAFE DEPOSIT BOX COMPANY. LINDA'S FORM DID NOT SAY WHAT THE FBI THOUGHT LINDA HAD DONE WRONG, AND SHE HAS NOT BEEN CHARGED WITH ANY CRIME. LINDA DID NOT REALIZE THAT BY SELECTING THE FIRST OPTION ON THE CONFUSING FORM, "FILE A PETITION FOR REMISSION," SHE WAS LEAVING IT COMPLETELY IN THE HANDS OF THE FBI WHETHER TO RETURN ANY OF HER SAVINGS. SO, LINDA TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FILE A NATIONWIDE CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE FBI'S FORFEITURE NOTICES. IF THE GOVERNMENT WANTS TO FORFEIT SOMEONE'S PROPERTY, IT SHOULD TELL THEM WHAT IT THINKS THEY DID WRONG. THE TRIAL COURT GRANTED THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS IN APRIL 2024, AND WE HAVE APPEALED TO THE D.C. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.
MELLEIN V. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL.	IN STILL ANOTHER FOLLOW-UP CASE TO THE SAME DOJ RAID OF SAFE DEPOSIT BOXES IN THE TWO PRECEDING CASES, IJ IS SUING ON BEHALF OF DON MELLEIN, A RETIRED CIVIL SERVANT WHO INVESTED IN PRECIOUS METALS AND COINS TO SAVE FOR HIS RETIREMENT. HIS BOX WAS ONE OF THE HUNDREDS SEIZED BY THE FBI IN MARCH 2021; AND ALTHOUGH THE FBI PROMISED TO "PRESERVE THE PROPERTY" FOR SAFE KEEPING UNTIL IT COULD BE RETURNED TO ITS RIGHTFUL OWNERS, 63 OF DON'S COINS - WORTH OVER $100,000 - REMAIN MISSING TO THIS DAY. THE FBI HAS REFUSED TO COMPENSATE DON FOR HIS LOSS. IJ'S LAWSUIT SEEKS TO HOLD THE FBI RESPONSIBLE FOR ITS FAILURE TO UPHOLD ITS PROMISE TO KEEP RIGHTFUL OWNERS' PROPERTY SAFE. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V. $8,040 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 AS BEST SHE COULD, BUT SHE 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 JOINED WITH CRISTAL TO APPEAL A LOWER COURT'S DECISION THAT CRISTAL CANNOT CONTINUE CHALLENGING THE FORFEITURE. IN AUGUST 2023, THE SECOND CIRCUIT AGREED WITH US THAT THE DISTRICT COURT

Return Reference	Explanation
	ERRED BY GRANTING DEFAULT JUDGMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT. IN RESPONSE, THE GOVERNMENT HAS ABANDONED ANY ATTEMPT TO FORFEIT THE PROPERTY AND HAS FINALLY RETURNED CRISTAL'S MONEY. THE PARTIES ARE NOW FIGHTING OVER CRISTAL'S RIGHT TO INTEREST AND ATTORNEYS' FEES. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V. MOORE IN 2021, DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION AGENTS SEIZED $8,500 IN CASH FROM BRIAN MOORE AT ATLANTA'S AIRPORT WHILE HE WAS WAITING TO BOARD A FLIGHT. BRIAN LITIGATED TO GET THE MONEY BACK AND, AFTER ABOUT A YEAR OF LITIGATION, THE GOVERNMENT EVENTUALLY MOVED TO DISMISS THE CASE AGAINST HIS MONEY WITH PREJUDICE. THE COURT ENTERED THE DISMISSAL ORDER AND DIRECTED THE GOVERNMENT TO RETURN THE MONEY, BUT THEN REFUSED TO ACKNOWLEDGE BRIAN'S VICTORY. AFTER THE COURT DISMISSED THE CASE, BRIAN ASKED FOR THE $15,200 IN FEES THAT HIS ATTORNEYS HAD ACCRUED WHILE DEFENDING HIS PROPERTY FROM FORFEITURE. YET THE COURT RULED THAT BRIAN DID NOT REALLY WIN THE CASE - DESPITE GETTING HIS MONEY BACK AND GETTING THE ENTIRE CASE DISMISSED - BECAUSE THE GOVERNMENT HAD VOLUNTARILY ASKED FOR THE DISMISSAL. NOW, BRIAN HAS TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO APPEAL HIS CASE TO THE 11TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. IT COSTS MONEY TO DEFEND YOUR PROPERTY AGAINST CIVIL FORFEITURE, AND THOSE WHO SUCCESSFULLY FIGHT THE GOVERNMENT'S ATTEMPT TO TAKE THEIR PROPERTY DESERVE TO BE MADE WHOLE. IF THEY ARE NOT COMPENSATED FOR THE COST OF SUCCESSFULLY LITIGATING THEIR CASE, EVEN MORE PROPERTY OWNERS WILL SIMPLY GIVE UP RATHER THAN CONTEST THIS GOVERNMENT ABUSE. 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. IN SEPTEMBER 2022, A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT ALLOWED THE LAWSUIT TO PROCEED AND CERTIFIED THE CASE AS A CLASS ACTION. IN FEBRUARY 2024, HOWEVER, THE DISTRICT COURT GRANTED SUMMARY JUDGMENT TO THE DEFENDANTS. WE HAVE APPEALED. INDIANA V. $2,435 IN UNITED STATES CURRENCY, ET AL. MOST STATES, INCLUDING INDIANA, HAVE CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS SECURING THE RIGHT TO JURY TRIALS IN CIVIL CASES. IN SEPTEMBER 2022, THE INDIANA COURT OF APPEALS HELD THAT THIS PROTECTION IN THE INDIANA CONSTITUTION DOESN'T APPLY WHEN THE GOVERNMENT BRINGS CIVIL FORFEITURE ACTIONS. THIS RULING DEPRIVES INDIVIDUALS STATEWIDE OF VITAL CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION IN THE PROCESS. IN NOVEMBER 2022, IJ PETITIONED THE INDIANA SUPREME COURT TO TAKE THE CASE AND CONFIRM WHAT SHOULD ALREADY BE OBVIOUS: WHEN THE GOVERNMENT SUES TO FORFEIT YOUR PROPERTY, YOU'RE ENTITLED TO MAKE YOUR CASE TO A JURY. ON OCTOBER 31, 2023, THE INDIANA SUPREME COURT AGREED: "THE INDIANA CONSTITUTION GUARANTEES THE SAME RIGHT TO A JURY TRIAL IN A CIVIL CASE AS EXISTED AT COMMON LAW WHEN THE CURRENT CONSTITUTION WAS ADOPTED IN 1851. THE QUESTION HERE IS WHETHER THIS JURY-TRIAL RIGHT APPLIES IN AN ACTION SEEKING TO CONFISCATE MONEY UNDER INDIANA'S CIVIL FORFEITURE STATUTE. OUR HISTORICAL SURVEY LEADS US TO CONCLUDE THAT IT DOES. WE THUS AFFIRM THE TRIAL COURT AND REMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY." PLATT V. MOORE, ET AL. ARIZONA'S FORFEITURE LAWS ARE SO COMPLICATED THAT THEY'RE A CHALLENGE EVEN FOR LAWYERS. OFTEN, ORDINARY NON-LAWYERS DON'T STAND A CHANCE. 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 SPURRED SOME REFORMS OF ARIZONA FORFEITURE LAW. BUT ARIZONA STILL ALLOWS "UNCONTESTED FORFEITURES." A FEDERAL APPELLATE COURT REINSTATED THE PLATTS' LONG-RUNNING CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE AGAINST FORFEITURE ABUSE IN ARIZONA, BUT IN JUNE 2023, THE STATE SUPERIOR COURT RULED AGAINST IJ'S ARGUMENT THAT THE PLATTS' CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED - A DECISION THAT WE HAVE APPEALED. COLUMBUS CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, ET AL. V. 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. NOT ONLY IS THIS EMPIRICALLY FALSE, BUT IT 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. HOWES V. EDELBLUT, ET AL. IN JUNE 2021, NEW HAMPSHIRE ENACTED THE EDUCATION FREEDOM ACCOUNT (EFA) PROGRAM, PROVIDING GRANITE STATE FAMILIES WITH EDUCATIONAL CHOICE. BUT WHILE PARENTS COUNT ON THE PROGRAM TO HELP THEM EDUCATE THEIR CHILDREN, OPPONENTS THINK THOSE PARENTS - EVEN PARENTS WHO CANNOT AFFORD OTHER OPTIONS - SHOULD BE ABLE TO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS ONLY. TO THAT END, THE HEAD OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE FILED A LAWSUIT AGAINST THE PROGRAM. IF THE EFA PROGRAM'S OPPONENTS SUCCEED, THEY WILL DEPRIVE LOW-INCOME FAMILIES OF THE OPPORTUNITY TO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO SCHOOLS THAT BETTER MEET THEIR NEEDS. IJ DEFENDED THE PROGRAM ON BEHALF OF THREE PARENTS WHOSE CHILDREN ARE ELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE EFAS UNDER THE PROGRAM. IN NOVEMBER 2023, THE NEW HAMPSHIRE SUPERIOR COURT GRANTED OUR MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS. ALEXANDER, ET AL. V. ACTING COMMISSIONER HEIDI TESHNER, ET AL. AS A SPARSELY POPULATED STATE, ALASKA FACES UNIQUE CHALLENGES IN ENSURING THAT ALL CHILDREN CAN RECEIVE AN EDUCATION. TO ADDRESS THIS CONCERN, THE STATE CREATED "CORRESPONDENCE PROGRAMS," IN WHICH A STUDENT'S PUBLIC SCHOOL USES THE POST OFFICE OR FLOAT PLANES TO DELIVER LESSONS TO STUDENTS ACROSS THE STATE AND THEN PICKS UP AND GRADES ASSIGNMENTS. IN JANUARY 2023, A LAWSUIT WAS FILED CHALLENGING THE CORRESPONDENCE PROGRAM. A GROUP OF ALASKA FAMILIES WHO BENEFIT FROM THE PROGRAM TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO DEFEND IT AGAINST THIS LAWSUIT, BECAUSE ALL PARENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO DIRECT THEIR CHILD'S EDUCATION. ON JUNE 28, 2024, THE ALASKA SUPREME COURT REVERSED THE LOWER COURT'S HOLDING THAT THE PROGRAM VIOLATED THE STATE CONSTITUTION, ALLOWING THE PROGRAM TO CONTINUE.

Return Reference	Explanation
HELLMAN, ET AL. V. MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF ELEMENTARY AND	SECONDARY EDUCATION IN MASSACHUSETTS, ALL STUDENTS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS ARE ENTITLED TO SPECIAL EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES. BUT STATE REGULATORS DO NOT ALLOW STUDENTS WHOSE PARENTS HAVE PLACED THEM IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS TO RECEIVE THESE BENEFITS; INSTEAD, THOSE STUDENTS MUST RECEIVE THOSE SERVICES AT PUBLIC SCHOOL OR SOME OTHER "NEUTRAL" LOCATION. PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS RECEIVE THEIR SERVICES AT THEIR SCHOOL, AND PRIVATE SCHOOL STUDENTS WHO ARE ASSIGNED TO A PRIVATE SCHOOL BY THE SCHOOL SYSTEM ALSO RECEIVE THEIR SERVICES AT THEIR OWN SCHOOL. ONLY STUDENTS WHOSE PARENTS CHOSE THEIR SCHOOL MUST LEAVE SCHOOL MULTIPLE TIMES PER WEEK TO GET SERVICES. IN MAY 2024, WE FILED A LAWSUIT ON BEHALF OF TWO FAMILIES CHALLENGING THIS RESTRICTION TO ENSURE THAT ALL STUDENTS IN MASSACHUSETTS ARE TREATED EQUALLY. METRO. GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY, ET AL. V. TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, ET AL.; MCEWEN, 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 TWO LAWSUITS CHALLENGING ITS CONSTITUTIONALITY, ONE BROUGHT BY TWO TENNESSEE COUNTIES AND ANOTHER BROUGHT BY PARENTS WHO OPPOSE THE PROGRAM. IJ AND OUR CLIENTS APPEALED OUR LOSS AT CHANCERY COURT TO THE TENNESSEE SUPREME COURT, AND 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. IN NOVEMBER 2022, THE CHANCERY COURT FOR DAVIDSON COUNTY DISMISSED ALL LEGAL CLAIMS RAISED IN TWO LAWSUITS CHALLENGING THE PROGRAM. THE COUNTY PLAINTIFFS ABANDONED THEIR LAWSUIT SHORTLY THEREAFTER, BUT THE INTERMEDIATE APPELLATE COURT HELD IN JANUARY 2024 THAT THE INDIVIDUAL PLAINTIFFS HAVE STANDING AND RIPE CLAIMS. AS A RESULT, THE MCEWEN CASE REMAINS ONGOING. LABRESH, ET AL. V. COX, ET AL. THE UTAH FITS ALL SCHOLARSHIP BILL, WHICH WENT INTO EFFECT IN MAY 2023, PROVIDES FAMILIES WITH $8,000 SCHOLARSHIP ACCOUNTS THAT CAN BE USED FOR PRIVATE SCHOOL TUITION, THERAPIES, AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS, RELEVANT TECHNOLOGY, CURRICULA, TRANSPORTATION, TESTING, AND OTHER SIMILAR EDUCATIONAL EXPENSES. ON MAY 29, 2024, THE UTAH EDUCATION ASSOCIATION FILED A LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE PROGRAM UNDER THE UTAH CONSTITUTION, ARGUING THAT IT VIOLATES THE STATE'S EDUCATION CLAUSE, IMPERMISSIBLY USES INCOME TAX REVENUE, AND UNCONSTITUTIONALLY DELEGATES AUTHORITY. WE HAVE MOVED TO INTERVENE AND ARE PREPARING TO DEFEND THE PROGRAM. FAULKENBERRY, ET AL. V. ARKANSAS DEP'T OF EDUCATION, ET AL. IN MARCH 2023, ARKANSAS ENACTED THE LEARNS ACT, A LARGE PACKAGE OF EDUCATIONAL REFORMS THAT INCLUDES THE NEW ARKANSAS CHILDREN'S EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM ACCOUNT (EFA) PROGRAM, WHICH PROVIDES $6,600 ANNUALLY TO ELIGIBLE STUDENTS AND WHICH WILL BECOME UNIVERSAL FOR THE 2025-26 ACADEMIC YEAR. ON JUNE 7, 2024, FOUR PLAINTIFFS WITH CHILDREN IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS FILED A LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE EFA PROGRAM, ARGUING THAT THE ARKANSAS CONSTITUTION PROHIBITS USING STATE FUNDS FOR NON-PUBLIC-SCHOOL EDUCATION. WE FILED A MOTION TO INTERVENE ON JUNE 18, 2024, ON BEHALF OF THREE MOTHERS WHO EITHER USE THE EFA PROGRAM NOW TO PAY FOR THEIR CHILDREN'S EDUCATION OR WANT TO USE IT NEXT YEAR WHEN THEY BECOME ELIGIBLE. 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 PROFESSIONAL-ENGINEER 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, AND IN A UNANIMOUS DECISION, THE ARIZONA SUPREME COURT RULED THAT GREG CAN SUE THE BOARD TO PROTECT HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO CALL HIMSELF AN ENGINEER AND CONTINUE HIS ENGINEERING CAREER. BUT THE MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT ONCE AGAIN DISMISSED THE COMPLAINT IN MID-2023, AND WE HAVE APPEALED TO THE ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS. 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 5TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HELD THAT RESTRICTING DR. HINES' ONLINE PET ADVICE IMPLICATED HIS FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS. THE APPELLATE DECISION WILL PROTECT SPEAKERS THROUGHOUT TEXAS. ON AUGUST 15, 2023, HOWEVER, THE DISTRICT COURT ON REMAND ACKNOWLEDGED THAT RON'S ADVICE IS PROTECTED BY THE FIRST AMENDMENT, BUT THEN APPLIED A WEAK FORM OF REVIEW AND ALLOWED TEXAS TO PROHIBIT IT. WE HAVE APPEALED ONCE AGAIN TO THE 5TH CIRCUIT. CRAMER V. BOROUGH OF NAZARETH THE BOROUGH OF NAZARETH, PENNSYLVANIA, BANS PUTTING A "FOR SALE" SIGN IN A CAR WINDOW - EVEN IF IT'S PARKED IN YOUR OWN DRIVEWAY OR OTHERWISE LEGALLY PARKED, AND EVEN THOUGH THE BOROUGH HAS NO PROBLEM WITH OTHER ADVERTISING OR POLITICAL SIGNS ON PARKED CARS. THIS PROHIBITION LED TO A CITATION AND CRIMINAL CONVICTION FOR OUR CLIENT, WILLIAM CRAMER. BUT THE FIRST AMENDMENT DOES NOT ALLOW THE GOVERNMENT TO PROHIBIT THIS VENERABLE FORM OF LOW-COST, PERSONAL COMMERCIAL SPEECH, SO IJ HAS JOINED WITH WILL TO SUE THE BOROUGH AND STOP ENFORCEMENT OF ITS UNCONSTITUTIONAL REGULATION. CROCROFT, ET AL. V. GRAHAM, ET AL. IN 2022, MISSISSIPPI LEGALIZED MEDICAL MARIJUANA. BUT EVEN THOUGH MEDICAL MARIJUANA IS NOW A FULLY LEGAL PRODUCT UNDER MISSISSIPPI STATE LAW, THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH PROHIBITS ADVERTISING IT. WE SUED ON BEHALF OF CLARENCE COCROFT TO CHALLENGE THIS RESTRICTION ON HIS FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO ADVERTISE HIS LEGAL MEDICAL MARIJUANA DISPENSARY. THE DISTRICT COURT GRANTED THE STATE'S MOTION TO DISMISS, AND WE ARE APPEALING THAT DECISION TO THE 5TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS. MOX V. OLSON LEDA MOX IS AN EXPERT IN HORSES, HORSE TRAINING, AND HORSE MASSAGE, WITH A DEGREE IN EQUINE SCIENCE. SHE HAS TAUGHT HORSE MASSAGE AT HER MINNESOTA FARM FOR YEARS, BUT MINNESOTA IS NOW REQUIRING HER TO COMPLY WITH THE STATE'S

Return Reference	Explanation
	POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION ACT - A LAW WHICH IMPOSES SUCH SUBSTANTIAL BURDENS (FEES, RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS, CURRICULUM REVIEW, ETC.) THAT LEDA WOULD RATHER QUIT TEACHING ENTIRELY THAN COMPLY. WE SUED ON LEDA'S BEHALF TO VINDICATE HER FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND THE RIGHTS OF OTHER VOCATIONAL TEACHERS IN MINNESOTA. BLACK POLASKI V. STEIN THE FIRST AMENDMENT'S PROTECTION FOR FREE SPEECH ISN'T LIMITED TO POLITICAL ADVOCACY OR EXPRESSIONS OF PERSONAL OPINION - IT EXTENDS TO SPEECH ON ALL TOPICS, INCLUDING LEGAL ADVICE. THIS MEANS THAT IT SHOULD PROTECT THE SPEECH OF THOSE LIKE THE NORTH CAROLINA JUSTICE FOR ALL PROJECT (JFAP), WHICH SEEKS TO EXPAND ACCESS TO LEGAL ADVICE FOR LOW-INCOME NORTH CAROLINIANS. BUT UNAUTHORIZED-PRACTICE-OF-LAW RESTRICTIONS IN NORTH CAROLINA (LIKE MANY OTHER STATES) UNREASONABLY HINDER THIS SPEECH, EVEN WHEN IT'S SOMETHING AS SIMPLE AS NAVIGATING A LESS-THAN-CLEAR COURT-CREATED FORM. IN JANUARY 2024, WE SUED TO PROTECT THE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF THOSE LIKE MORAG BLACK POLASKI AND SHAWANA ALMENDAREZ, TWO STATE-CERTIFIED PARALEGALS WORKING WITH JFAP, WHO WOULD LIKE TO ASSIST PEOPLE IN FILLING OUT COURT FORMS FOR ISSUES LIKE EVICTIONS, UNCONTESTED DIVORCES, AND RESTRAINING ORDERS.
UPSOLVE, INC., ET AL. V. JAMES	UPSOLVE BEGAN BY OFFERING A FREE APP TO WALK PEOPLE THROUGH CHAPTER 7 BANKRUPTCY - AN AWARD-WINNING INNOVATION THAT HAS NOW HELPED RELIEVE HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN DEBT. UPSOLVE'S NEXT PROJECT, THE AMERICAN JUSTICE MOVEMENT, WAS DESIGNED TO TRAIN VOLUNTEERS, LIKE REVEREND JOHN UDO-OKON, TO GIVE BASIC LEGAL ADVICE PEOPLE NEED TO DEFEND THEMSELVES AGAINST DEBT-COLLECTION SUITS THAT PLAGUE SO MANY NEW YORKERS. THE SORT OF ADVICE CONTEMPLATED BY UPSOLVE'S NEW PROJECT IS A CRIME AND COULD JAIL REVEREND JOHN FOR UP TO FOUR YEARS FOR ENGAGING IN THE "UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE OF LAW." THAT IS WHY REVEREND JOHN AND UPSOLVE HAVE JOINED WITH IJ TO CHALLENGE NEW YORK'S PROHIBITION ON LEGAL ADVICE FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT LAWYERS UNDER THE FIRST AMENDMENT. IT CANNOT BE A CRIME SIMPLY TO GIVE SOMEONE ADVICE. IN MAY 2022, THE DISTRICT COURT AGREED WITH US AND GRANTED THE PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION. THE GOVERNMENT HAS APPEALED, AND IJ HAS DIRECTLY TAKEN OVER THE CASE FOR APPEAL AND ANY FURTHER PROCEEDINGS AFTERWARD. FINK V. KIRCHMEYER, ET AL. CALIFORNIA'S ANTI-SPAM LAW ALLOWS SPAM RECIPIENTS TO SUE SPAMMERS. OUR CLIENT, JAY FINK, IS AN ENTREPRENEUR WHO GOES THROUGH A CLIENT'S JUNK OR SPAM FOLDER, READS THE EMAILS, AND THEN GENERATES A LIST THAT THE CLIENT CAN TAKE TO A LAWYER TO TRY AND SUE SPAMMERS. NINETY-NINE PERCENT OF WHAT JAY DOES IS READ EMAILS, THINK THOUGHTS ABOUT THEM, AND THEN COMMUNICATE THOSE THOUGHTS - ALL ACTIVITIES PROTECTED BY THE FIRST AMENDMENT. EVEN SO, CALIFORNIA HAS TOLD HIM HE IS BREAKING THE LAW BY BEING AN UNLICENSED PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR. AND JAY CANNOT GET A LICENSE WITHOUT THREE YEARS OF IRRELEVANT TRAINING. WE SUED ON HIS BEHALF IN NOVEMBER 2023, AND THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT GRANTED AN UNHEARD-OF PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, HOLDING THAT THE LAW FAILED TO PASS THE RATIONAL-BASIS TEST. KNOTT, ET AL. V. FRERICHS, ET AL. EVERY STATE HAS A SYSTEM TO HOLD ONTO UNCLAIMED PROPERTY - SUCH AS UNCASHED CHECKS AND ABANDONED BANK ACCOUNTS - UNTIL CLAIMED BY THE OWNER. BUT OWNERS OFTEN FIND IT DIFFICULT TO FIND THEIR FUNDS, LET ALONE ASSEMBLE THE PAPERWORK TO RECOVER THEM. OUR CLIENT, ENTREPRENEUR DAVID KNOTT, IS AN EXPERT AT NAVIGATING THESE SYSTEMS, AND HE HAS A SUCCESSFUL SMALL BUSINESS HELPING OWNERS FIND AND RECOVER THESE UNCLAIMED FUNDS FOR A SMALL FEE. BUT ILLINOIS IS DEMANDING THAT FOR THIS WORK, DAVID BECOME A LICENSED PRIVATE DETECTIVE - A BURDENSOME LICENSE THAT HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH DAVID'S DAY-TO-DAY WORK. WE HAVE SUED ON BEHALF OF DAVID TO VINDICATE HIS FREE-SPEECH AND PETITION RIGHTS UNDER THE FIRST AMENDMENT. YOUNG, ET AL. V. TOWN OF CONWAY LEAVITT'S COUNTRY BAKERY HAS BEEN A PILLAR OF THE TOWN OF CONWAY, NEW HAMPSHIRE, FOR OVER 45 YEARS. THE BAKERY'S OWNER, SEAN YOUNG, ALLOWED A GROUP OF LOCAL HIGH SCHOOL ART STUDENTS TO PAINT OVER THE BLANK FACADE ABOVE THE BAKERY'S FRONT DOOR. THE RESULT WAS A WHIMSICAL DEPICTION OF A SUNNY NEW ENGLAND MOUNTAIN LANDSCAPE MADE ENTIRELY OF BAKED GOODS. BUT THE TOWN'S ZONING OFFICIALS INSIST THE MURAL MUST COME DOWN - CLAIMING THAT THE MURAL IS NO MURAL AT ALL, BUT RATHER, A SIGN LARGER THAN WHAT THE TOWN'S SIGN CODE ALLOWS. GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS DON'T GET TO TELL PEOPLE, INCLUDING ENTREPRENEURS AND BUSINESSES, WHAT THEY CAN AND CAN'T PAINT. TO PROTECT HIS RIGHTS, SEAN HAS TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FILE A FEDERAL LAWSUIT CHALLENGING CONWAY'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL SIGN CODE. PRZYBOCKI, ET AL. V. U.S. DEP'T OF AGRICULTURE, ET AL. MICHELLE PRZYBOCKI AND ENTREPRENEUR KETAN VAKIL SUFFER FROM DIGESTIVE ISSUES. WHEN KETAN SAW HOW DIFFICULT IT WAS TO DETERMINE WHICH FOODS WERE LOW FODMAP (AN ACRONYM FOR DIFFICULT-TO-DIGEST SUGARS), HE STARTED A BUSINESS TO PROVIDE LOW-FODMAP FOODS TO INDIVIDUALS WITH DIGESTIVE ISSUES. BUT THEN THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE INFORMED HIM THAT A FEDERAL LAW BANNED PROVIDING THIS INFORMATION ON FOOD LABELS - NOT BECAUSE SUCH LABELING WOULD BE FALSE, BUT MERELY BECAUSE IT IS NOT INCLUDED ON THE GOVERNMENT'S LIST OF PREAPPROVED "NUTRIENT CONTENT CLAIMS." MICHELLE AND KETAN HAVE JOINED WITH IJ TO FILE A FIRST AMENDMENT LAWSUIT IN FEDERAL COURT CHALLENGING THE USDA'S CENSORSHIP OF LOW-FODMAP LABELS. VICTORY WILL MEAN THAT TENS OF MILLIONS OF AMERICANS WILL FINALLY BE ABLE TO IDENTIFY WHICH FOODS WILL HELP THEM AVOID DEBILITATING PAIN, AND IT WILL REMIND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT THAT CENSORSHIP HURTS CONSUMERS AND IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL. PETERSEN V. CITY OF NEWTON, ET AL. NOAH PETERSEN WENT TO A CITY COUNCIL MEETING IN NEWTON, IOWA, TO CALMLY VOICE HIS CONCERNS ABOUT THE LOCAL POLICE DEPARTMENT DURING THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD. BUT THE MAYOR DID NOT LIKE NOAH'S SPEECH, SO HE HAD THE POLICE CHIEF ARREST NOAH, REMOVE HIM IN HANDCUFFS, AND CHARGE HIM WITH A CRIME. AFTER THE STATE COURT DISMISSED THE CRIMINAL CHARGES, WE FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUIT AGAINST NEWTON, THE MAYOR, AND THE POLICE CHIEF (UNDER THE FIRST, FOURTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS) FOR RETALIATING AGAINST NOAH FOR EXERCISING HIS FREE SPEECH RIGHTS. BENOIR, ET AL. V. TOWN OF PARKSLEY, ET AL. THE TOWN GOVERNMENT OF PARKSLEY, VIRGINIA, AND COUNCILMEMBER HENRY NICHOLSON HAVE ENGAGED IN A SERIES OF UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS AGAINST THESLET BENOIR AND CLEMENE BASTIEN FOR DARING TO OPEN A FOOD TRUCK ON THEIR OWN PROPERTY NEXT TO THEIR OWN STORE. THE TOWN SOUGHT TO PROTECT LOCAL RESTAURANTS FROM COMPETITION, PARTICULARLY COMPETITION FROM OUTSIDERS. COUNCILMEMBER NICHOLSON YELLED AT THESLET AND CLEMENE TO "GO BACK TO [THEIR] OWN COUNTRY" (THEY ARE BOTH HAITIAN IMMIGRANTS), AND PHYSICALLY CUT THEIR FOOD TRUCK'S WATER LINE, CAUSING SUBSTANTIAL DAMAGE AND FOOD SPOILAGE. THE TOWN ALSO WITHDREW ITS PREVIOUS PERMISSION TO OPERATE. WHEN IJ SENT A LETTER ASKING THE TOWN COUNCIL TO REPEAL THE BAN, THE TOWN'S ATTORNEY RESPONDED BY SENDING A LETTER TO THESLET AND CLEMENE THREATENING TO INCARCERATE THEM FOR OPERATING THEIR FOOD TRUCK IN THE PAST, EVEN THOUGH THEY HAD THE TOWN'S PERMISSION. IN JANUARY 2024, IJ FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUIT ON BEHALF OF THESLET, CLEMENE, AND THEIR FOOD TRUCK BUSINESS AGAINST PARKSLEY AND COUNCILMEMBER NICHOLSON FOR THEIR VIOLATIONS OF THE FIRST, FOURTH, AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS.

Return Reference	Explanation
	HERBEL V. CITY OF MARION, ET AL. CITY COUNCIL MEMBER RUTH HERBEL AND THE MARION COUNTY RECORD REGULARLY CRITICIZED THE MAYOR, POLICE CHIEF, AND OTHER ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS IN MARION, KANSAS. RATHER THAN ENGAGE WITH THIS CRITICISM, THE MAYOR AND POLICE CHIEF WORKED TOGETHER TO CONCOCT AN EXCUSE FOR SEARCHING HER HOME AND SEIZING EVERY PHONE AND COMPUTER, EVEN THOUGH THAT LEFT HER WITH NO WAY OF CONTACTING FAMILY OR DOCTORS. IN MARCH 2024, WE FILED A LAWSUIT ON RUTH'S BEHALF ALLEGING THAT THE MAYOR AND SEVERAL OF HIS ALLIES ENGAGED IN A CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE RUTH'S RIGHTS, RETALIATING AGAINST HER FOR HER POLITICAL SPEECH. BREWER, ET AL. V. TOWN OF EAGLE, ET AL. IJ REPRESENTED ERICA BREWER AND ZACH MALLORY IN A FIRST AMENDMENT LAWSUIT AGAINST THE TOWN OF EAGLE, WISCONSIN. THE TOWN TARGETED ERICA AND ZACH FOR CODE ENFORCEMENT 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. WE PARTNERED WITH ERICA AND ZACH TO BRING A FIRST AMENDMENT RETALIATION LAWSUIT AGAINST THE TOWN. IN AUGUST 2021, A COURT GRANTED OUR REQUEST FOR A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION PROTECTING ERICA AND ZACH FROM RETALIATION WHILE THEY SOUGHT TO VINDICATE THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. THE PARTIES ULTIMATELY REACHED A PRODUCTIVE SETTLEMENT THAT RESOLVED THE LEGAL ISSUES IN THE CASE WHILE PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF EVERY PROPERTY OWNER IN THE TOWN. TAYLOR V. LEBLANC PERCY TAYLOR WAS DETAINED 17 MONTHS PAST HIS RELEASE DATE, DESPITE RELENTLESSLY ADVOCATING FOR HIS RELEASE. HE SUED HIS JAILERS FOR VIOLATING HIS DUE PROCESS RIGHTS, AND EVEN THOUGH THE 5TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HELD THAT THERE IS A CLEARLY ESTABLISHED CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO BE RELEASED ON TIME, IT FOUND THAT PERCY HADN'T SHOWN THAT THE HEAD JAILER'S ACTIONS WERE OBJECTIVELY UNREASONABLE IN LIGHT OF THIS CLEARLY ESTABLISHED LAW. WE TOOK ON THIS CASE TO FIGHT THE IMPOSITION OF THIS UNPRECEDENTED "OBJECTIVELY UNREASONABLE" STEP TO TRADITIONAL TWO-STEP QUALIFIED-IMMUNITY ANALYSIS, AND THE 5TH CIRCUIT BACKED DOWN IN THE FACE OF OUR BRIEFING. HOWEVER, THE COURT NONETHELESS HELD THAT PERCY'S LATE RELEASE WAS PROPER FOR SEPARATE REASONS, AND WE WILL FILE AN EN BANC PETITION TO ASK THE FULL COURT TO RECONSIDER.
PULLIAM V. COUNTY OF FORT BEND, ET AL.	THIS FEDERAL LAWSUIT SEEKS TO VINDICATE THE FREE-SPEECH RIGHTS OF JUSTIN PULLIAM, A CITIZEN JOURNALIST IN FORT BEND, TEXAS, WHO WAS EXCLUDED FROM A POLICE PRESS CONFERENCE AND ARRESTED FOR FILMING A POLICE ENCOUNTER WITH A MENTALLY ILL MAN. AS PART OF HIS PROJECT TO INSTILL MORE ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY INTO THE ACTIONS OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS, JUSTIN TRACKS CALLS ON A SCANNER AND DRIVES TO THE SCENE TO DOCUMENT LAW ENFORCEMENT RESPONSES. THE FORT BEND COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE BEGAN TO SINGLE JUSTIN OUT AND INTIMIDATE HIM, AND AUTHORITIES ARE NOW PROSECUTING HIM FOR INTERFERING WITH POLICE DUTIES, EVEN THOUGH HE DID NOT INTERFERE WITH THE OFFICERS IN ANY WAY. NOW, JUSTIN AND IJ ARE FIGHTING BACK AGAINST THE FORT BEND DEPUTIES' UNLAWFUL BEHAVIOR. HE HAS FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUIT TO PROTECT HIS FIRST AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND TO ENSURE THE CONSTITUTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WHO VIOLATE THEM. FAMBROUGH V. CITY OF 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, OHIO. 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. GIBSON V. GOLDSTON DURING DIVORCE PROCEEDINGS BETWEEN MATTHEW GIBSON AND HIS EX-WIFE, THE JUDGE IN THE CASE, RALEIGH COUNTY, WEST VIRGINIA, FAMILY-COURT JUDGE LOUISE GOLDSTON, PERSONALLY FORCED HER WAY INTO MATTHEW'S HOME TO SEARCH FOR ITEMS THAT WERE IN DISPUTE. GOLDSTON WAS ULTIMATELY CENSURED AND FINED BY THE WEST VIRGINIA HIGH COURT FOR VIOLATING THE STATE'S CODE OF JUDICIAL CONDUCT. WHEN MATTHEW SUED FOR THESE EGREGIOUS VIOLATIONS OF HIS PRIVACY AND FREE SPEECH RIGHTS, GOLDSTON ARGUED THAT SHE WAS NOT LIABLE BY INVOKING A COURT-MADE DOCTRINE CALLED JUDICIAL IMMUNITY. BUT JUDICIAL IMMUNITY IS RESERVED FOR JUDICIAL ACTIONS, AND SEARCHING SOMEONE'S HOME IS NOT A JUDICIAL ACT. THE TRIAL COURT CORRECTLY RECOGNIZED THIS PRINCIPLE AND DENIED GOLDSTON JUDICIAL IMMUNITY FOR HER ACTIONS. THE 4TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AFFIRMED THIS DECISION IN OCTOBER 2023, HOLDING THAT "[J]UDICIAL IMMUNITY PROTECTS ONLY JUDICIAL ACTS." 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'S OPTIONS EXTREMELY LIMITED. 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 6TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS TO RESOLVE AN ISSUE ABOUT WHETHER POLICE VICTIMS CAN BRING SEVERAL DIFFERENT CLAIMS IN A SINGLE SUIT. UNFORTUNATELY, THE 6TH CIRCUIT CITED OUTDATED CASE LAW TO APPLY IMMUNITY AND LET THE GOVERNMENT OFF THE HOOK, AND THE U.S. SUPREME COURT DID NOT GRANT CERTIORARI ON THIS ISSUE. WE ARE NOW TRYING TO PURSUE ANOTHER PROCEDURAL APPROACH TO AFFORD JAMES RELIEF, WHICH REMAINS PENDING IN THE DISTRICT COURT. ROSALES V. BRADSHAW, ET AL. 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 HIS 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. IN JULY 2023, THE 10TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AGREED AND REVERSED THE GRANT OF IMMUNITY TO THE OFFICER. ROSALES V. LEWIS, ET AL. NOW LIVING IN LOUISIANA, IN JUNE 2022, MARIO ROSALES FROM THE CASE DESCRIBED ABOVE AND HIS GIRLFRIEND, GRACIE, WERE DRIVING HOME

Return Reference	Explanation
	FROM WORK. THEY WEREN'T DOING ANYTHING SUSPICIOUS, AND MARIO WAS FOLLOWING THE TRAFFIC LAWS. DESPITE THAT, A POLICE VEHICLE FOLLOWED AND IMMEDIATELY PULLED MARIO OVER. WHEN MARIO AND GRACIE ASKED WHY THEY HAD BEEN PULLED OVER, THE OFFICERS ANSWERED THAT MARIO FAILED TO USE HIS TURN SIGNAL - BUT MULTIPLE RECORDINGS OF THE INCIDENT CLEARLY SHOW THAT MARIO USED HIS BLINKER. OVER 20 MINUTES AFTER PULLING OVER MARIO AND GRACIE, THE OFFICERS LET THEM GO. THE CONSTITUTION PROTECTS AGAINST THIS STOP-FIRST-JUSTIFY-LATER FORM OF POLICING. THAT IS WHY MARIO AND GRACIE HAVE SUED THE POLICE OFFICERS AND THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, LOUISIANA - TO ENFORCE THE CONSTITUTIONAL BOUNDARIES THAT ARE SUPPOSED TO PROTECT MOTORISTS FROM BOGUS TRAFFIC STOPS THAT TURN INTO FREE-FOR-ALL FISHING EXPEDITIONS FOR CRIMES. S.B. V. JEFFERSON PARISH SCHOOL BOARD, ET AL. UNLIKE EVERY OTHER CIRCUIT COURT IN THE COUNTRY, THE 5TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HAS HELD THAT PUBLIC SCHOOL EMPLOYEES ARE PER SE IMMUNIZED FROM CLAIMS OF EXCESSIVE CORPORAL PUNISHMENT UNDER SECTION 1983. ON BEHALF OF A MOTHER OF A CHILD WITH NONVERBAL AUTISM WHO WAS PHYSICALLY ABUSED MULTIPLE TIMES, WE ASKED THE SUPREME COURT TO REVERSE THAT RULE, AND TO HOLD THAT SUCH CLAIMS SHOULD BE ASSESSED UNDER THE FOURTH AMENDMENT. UNFORTUNATELY, OUR PETITION WAS DENIED. 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 U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HELD THAT QUALIFIED IMMUNITY SHIELDS THE OFFICER BECAUSE THE BOYS HAD NEVER BEEN "ARRESTED" AT ALL. AND BOTH THE DISTRICT COURT AND THE 8TH CIRCUIT FOUND THAT THE OFFICER WAS IMMUNE FOR VIOLATIONS OF THE MOTHER'S RIGHTS, DESPITE THREATENING HER WITH A TASER. THE SUPREME COURT DENIED CERTIORARI FOR BOTH CASES. SCHOTT V. BABB, ET AL. ALEK SCHOTT WAS DRIVING HOME FROM A WORK TRIP WHEN A BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS, SHERIFF'S DEPUTY PULLED HIM OVER. THE DEPUTY CALLED A DRUG DOG TO SEARCH HIS TRUCK, AND THE DOG ALLEGEDLY ALERTED TO THE PRESENCE OF DRUGS. POLICE PROCEEDED TO TEAR APART ALEK'S TRUCK, BUT THEY FOUND NOTHING BECAUSE THERE WAS NOTHING TO FIND. FROM THE VERY BEGINNING, THE TRAFFIC STOP WAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL; FOOTAGE FROM ALEK'S OWN DASHCAM SHOWS HE NEVER DRIFTED LANES. THE FOURTH AMENDMENT PROHIBITS STOP-FIRST, JUSTIFY-LATER POLICING. IN ALEK'S CASE, THE DEPUTY USED AN UNJUSTIFIED TRAFFIC STOP TO PROBE INTO CRIMES ALEK HADN'T COMMITTED. ALEK IS PARTNERING WITH IJ TO SUE THE DEPUTIES AND BEXAR COUNTY FOR VIOLATING HIS FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS BECAUSE IF WE THE PEOPLE MUST FOLLOW THE LAW, GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS MUST FOLLOW THE CONSTITUTION. ON MAY 13, 2024, THE COURT AWARDED IJ $17,100 IN ATTORNEYS' FEES AS A SANCTION FOR THE DEFENDANTS' CONDUCT DURING DISCOVERY.
WILSON V. MIDLAND COUNTY, ET AL.	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. THE DISTRICT COURT DISMISSED THE CASE, AND IN APRIL 2023 A PANEL OF THE 5TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS RELUCTANTLY AFFIRMED, FINDING IT WAS BOUND TO DO SO BY CIRCUIT PRECEDENT. IJ FILED A PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC TO OVERTURN THAT PRECEDENT, WHICH THE 5TH CIRCUIT GRANTED IN FEBRUARY 2024 AND HEARD IN MAY 2024. MOHAMUD V. WEYKER IN AUGUST 2021, IJ FILED A PETITION ASKING THE SUPREME COURT TO TAKE UP A CASE CHALLENGING BLANKET IMMUNITY FOR FEDERAL OFFICIALS. A SOMALI REFUGEE NAMED HAMDI MOHAMUD WAS FRAMED BY A MINNESOTA POLICE OFFICER IN AN ATTEMPT TO SALVAGE A FABRICATED INVESTIGATION. THE OFFICER'S LIES SENT HAMDI TO FEDERAL DETENTION FOR TWO YEARS. ACCORDING TO THE 8TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS, THE OFFICER'S ROLE ON A JOINT FEDERAL-STATE TASK FORCE MEANS SHE CANNOT BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE AS A FEDERAL OFFICER FOR DERAILING A TEENAGER'S FUTURE. UNFORTUNATELY, THE HIGH COURT DENIED HAMDI'S PETITION IN JUNE 2022. EVEN SO, THE 8TH CIRCUIT HELD THAT, IF HAMDI COULD SHOW THE OFFICER WAS ACTING AS A STATE OFFICER WHEN SHE VIOLATED THE CONSTITUTION, HAMDI'S CASE COULD MOVE FORWARD. WITH NEWLY DISCOVERED DOCUMENTS, HAMDI RETURNED TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT TO PROVE THE OFFICER WAS ACTING AS A STATE OFFICER, EVEN WHILE SHE ACTED AS A FEDERAL OFFICER. THE DISTRICT COURT HAS ONCE AGAIN DISMISSED THE CASE, IGNORING THIS NEW INFORMATION, AND WE HAVE ONCE AGAIN APPEALED TO THE 8TH CIRCUIT. IJ WILL CONTINUE THIS FIGHT UNTIL JUSTICE IS SECURED FOR THOSE WHOSE RIGHTS ARE VIOLATED BY FEDERAL OFFICERS AND STATE OFFICIALS. MURPHY V. SCHMITT MASON MURPHY WAS WALKING TO A STORE ON A RURAL MISSOURI ROAD WHEN A POLICE OFFICER STOPPED HIM AND DEMANDED HIS IDENTIFICATION. WHEN MASON REFUSED AND ASKED FOR THE REASON HE WAS BEING DETAINED, THE OFFICER CALLED OTHER POLICE OFFICERS TO BRAINSTORM SOME BASIS ON WHICH TO CHARGE HIM - ALL OF WHICH WAS CAPTURED ON VIDEOTAPE. WHEN MASON SUED FOR VIOLATION OF HIS RIGHTS AGAINST SUCH A PRETEXTUAL STOP, HIS CASE WAS DISMISSED BECAUSE HE WAS WALKING ON THE WRONG SIDE OF THE STREET, AND THUS, THE COURT CONCLUDED, THERE WAS PROBABLE CAUSE TO ARREST HIM. IJ TOOK OVER THE CASE AT THE CERTIORARI STAGE, ASKING THE SUPREME COURT TO OVERTURN THE 8TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND HOLD THAT OFFICERS CAN BE HELD LIABLE WHEN THERE IS OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE OF PRETEXT LIKE THAT PRESENTED IN MASON'S CASE.
AMICUS BRIEFS FILED FY24 (JULY 1, 2023 - JUNE 30, 2024)	ANDRE V. CLAYTON COUNTY BENNING V. OLIVER, ET AL. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF FAIRFAX COUNTY V. LEACH-LEWIS BROWN V. POUNCY CHIAVERINI, ET AL. V. CITY OF NAPOLEON, ET AL. CHRIS GRAHAM, ET AL. V. DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF HAMPDEN COUNTY DAVIS V. CALIFORNIA EDISON, ET AL. V. SOUTH CAROLINA DEP'T OF EDUCATION, ET AL. FBI V. FIKRE FLORENCE OWNER 1, LLC V. DUKE ENERGY KENTUCKY, INC. HILE V. MICHIGAN JW V. PALEY CERT PET LOCKE V. COUNTY OF HUBBARD MAID V. MONTANA MICHIGAN V. ARMSTRONG MONROE V. CONNOR NEWELL-DAVIS, ET AL. V. PHILLIPS, ET AL. NO ON E, ET AL. V. DAVID CHIU, ET AL. O'CONNOR V. EUBANKS SEC V. JARKESY, ET AL. SHARPE V. WINTERVILLE POLICE DEP'T, ET AL. SMITH, ET AL. V. GEORGIA TANVIR, ET AL. V. SAJJAD, ET AL. TEXAS DEP'T OF INSURANCE V. STONEWATER ROOFING, LTD. CO. THE COMMONS OF LAKE HOUSTON, LTD. V. CITY OF HOUSTON TIKTOK INC. V. GARLAND UNITED STATES V. HENDLER UNITED STATES V. NIKSICH UNITED STATES V. JACKSON VETERANS GUARDIAN V. MATTHEW PLATKIN VILLARREAL V. ALANIZ WATSON MEMORIAL SPIRITUAL TEMPLE OF CHRIST V. KORBAN YAMHILL COUNTY, ET AL. V. REAL PROPERTY, ET AL.

Additional Data

Return to Form

Software ID:

Software Version: