

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CRIMINAL DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
)	Case No. 2017-CF2-001356
v.)	
)	Judge Lynn Leibovitz
TROY NEVES)	
WILLIAM BOGIN)	
MAKENNA CLARK)	
TRACI DUNLAP)	
JARED FARLEY)	
MICHAEL LOADENTHAL)	
ROSA RONCALES,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

**MEMORANDUM OF THE REPORTERS COMMITTEE FOR FREEDOM OF THE
PRESS AND 10 NEWS MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS AS *AMICI CURIAE***

Bruce. D. Brown (D.C. Bar # 457317)
Counsel of Record
Gregg P. Leslie (D.C. Bar # 426092)
Caitlin Vogus (D.C. Bar # 988826)
REPORTERS COMMITTEE FOR
FREEDOM OF THE PRESS
1156 15th Street NW, Suite 1250
Washington, DC 20005-1779
(202) 795-9302
bbrown@rcfp.org

October 6, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

STATEMENT OF IDENTITY AND INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE* 1

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 1

ARGUMENT 3

 I. The public has a strong interest in learning about the Inauguration Day protests, which the Court must consider in determining whether the government has demonstrated good cause for the protective order..... 3

 II. The government’s broad and general assertions are insufficient to demonstrate the good cause required to support the protective order..... 5

 A. The government’s unsupported claim that dissemination of discovery materials would risk “juror taint” ignores the effectiveness of a thorough voir dire in eliminating bias... 6

 B. The government’s invocation of “privacy interests” does not establish good cause for a broad protective order that bars dissemination of all discovery materials. 11

CONCLUSION..... 13

APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF *AMICI* 15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>ACLU v. Alvarez</i> , 679 F.3d 583 (7th Cir. 2012)	12
<i>Bacon v. McKeithen</i> , No. 5:14-cv-37-RS-CJK, 2014 WL 12479640 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 28, 2014)..	12
<i>Casey v. Moore</i> , 386 F.3d 896 (9th Cir. 1984)	7, 8, 10
<i>Cowles Pub. Co. v. State Patrol</i> , 748 P.2d 597 (Wash. 1988).....	12
<i>Franks v. City of New York</i> , No. 13-CV-623 JBW VMS, 2013 WL 6002946 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 12, 2013).....	11
<i>Garrison v. Louisiana</i> , 379 U.S. 64 (1964)	12
<i>In re Charlotte Observer</i> , 882 F.2d 850 (4th Cir. 1989).....	10
<i>Irvin v. Dowd</i> , 366 U.S. 717 (1961).....	7
<i>Khaalis v. United States</i> , 408 A.2d 313 (D.C. 1979).....	9
<i>McDonough v. Fernandez-Rundle</i> , 862 F.3d 1314 (11th Cir. 2017).....	12
<i>Pansy v. Borough of Stroudsburg</i> , 23 F.3d 772 (3d Cir. 1994)	5
<i>Patton v. Yount</i> , 467 U.S. 1025 (1984).....	7
<i>Reynolds v. United States</i> , 98 U.S. 145 (1878).....	6
<i>Rideau v. Louisiana</i> , 373 U.S. 723 (1963).....	7
<i>Rowland v. United States</i> , 840 A.2d 664 (D.C. 2004).....	5
<i>SEC v. TheStreet.com</i> , 273 F.3d 222 (2d Cir. 2001).....	5
<i>Skilling v. United States</i> , 561 U.S. 358 (2010)	6
<i>United States v. Bulger</i> , 283 F.R.D. 46 (D. Mass. 2012).....	11
<i>United States v. Chapin</i> , 515 F.2d 1274 (D.C. Cir. 1975)	8
<i>United States v. Edwards</i> , 430 A.2d 1321 (D.C. 1981).....	9
<i>United States v. Haldeman</i> , 559 F.2d 31 (D.C. Cir. 1976).....	9
<i>United States v. Wecht</i> , 484 F.3d 194 (3d Cir. 2007)	5

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Doug Moore, <i>As Arrests Are Made, Protesters Question the Tactics Used by St. Louis Police</i> , St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 19, 2017, https://perma.cc/8MG5-3VZ2	3
---	---

Patrick Wilson, <i>Some Virginia State Police Troopers Concealed Their Uniform Name Strips at Confederate Rally, Leading to Questions</i> , Richmond Times-Dispatch, Sept. 20, 2017, https://perma.cc/P92U-KF6A	3
Phil McCausland, Emmanuelle Saliba, Erik Ortiz, & Corky Siemaszko, <i>More Than 200 Arrested in D.C. Protests on Inauguration</i> , NBC News, Jan. 21, 2017, https://perma.cc/88Q2-JJMT	4
<i>Photos from Anti-Trump Protests on Inauguration Day in Washington, D.C.</i> , Rolling Stone, Jan. 21, 2017, https://perma.cc/QM8G-9FJF	10
<i>Protesters and police clash in downtown D.C. on Inauguration Day</i> , Wash. Post, Jan. 20, 2017, http://wapo.st/2hpfgFB	10
<i>Protesters clash with police at inauguration – video</i> , Guardian, Jan. 20, 2017, http://bit.ly/2k7JYq7	10
<i>Protests Turn Violent Near Inauguration Parade in D.C.</i> , Fox 5 DC, Jan. 20, 2017, https://perma.cc/X3YC-LQ6X	4
Robert Faturechi, <i>Can Police Prevent the Next Charlottesville</i> , ProPublica, Aug. 18, 2017, https://perma.cc/5NY7-VDGX	3
Wesley Lowery & Christina Pazzanese, <i>Boston ‘Free Speech’ Rally Ends Early Amid Flood of Counterprotesters; 27 People Arrested</i> , Wash. Post, Aug. 19, 2017, https://perma.cc/4VSZ-XFPF	3
WTOP Staff, <i>Photos: Inauguration protests in DC</i> , WTOP, Jan. 20, 2017, http://bit.ly/2xu5iMk	10
Zoe Tillman, <i>New Videos of Trump Inauguration Day Protests Show Chaos and Mayhem</i> , BuzzFeed, Jul. 18, 2017, https://perma.cc/4RAW-P96S	4

RULES

Fed. R. Crim. P. 16	5, 11
Fed. R. Civ. P. 26.....	5
Super. Ct. Crim. R. 16	2, 4, 5, 11

STATEMENT OF IDENTITY AND INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*

Amici curiae are the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, American Society of News Editors, Association of Alternative Newsmedia, BuzzFeed, National Press Photographers Association, Online News Association, PEN America, Radio Television Digital News Association, Reporters Without Borders, Society of Professional Journalists, and The Washington Post. A supplemental statement of identity and interest of *amici* is included below as Appendix A.

Amici file this brief in support of Defendants' Opposition to Government's Motion for a Protective Order Regarding Materials Produced During Discovery and Motion to Vacate the Protective Order Imposed. As representatives and members of the media, *amici* have a strong interest in safeguarding the ability of the public and the press to access court documents in criminal cases. *Amici* or the journalists on whose behalf *amici* advocate regularly report on criminal trials and the events that lead to arrests and criminal charges. Accordingly, *amici* frequently rely on court records that shed light on newsworthy events to report on matters of public concern. Broad protective orders that prohibit public disclosure of discovery materials in criminal cases without a sufficient showing of good cause, such as the protective order entered in this case, hinder journalists' ability to gather facts and report the news.

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The protective order entered in this case restricts public dissemination of virtually all discovery materials in a criminal prosecution that is the subject of widespread public discussion and concern without a good cause basis for doing so. *Amici* agree with Defendants that the protective order currently in place should be vacated and that the government's request for a protective order should be denied. *Amici* write to emphasize a few points.

First, this case, which stems from protests of the presidential inauguration held on January 20, 2017 (the “Inauguration Day protests”), is of national interest and importance. The American public has a powerful interest in obtaining information to understand the events of the Inauguration Day protests, including the actions of protesters and the response of law enforcement. The Court must consider this interest in determining whether the government has demonstrated “good cause” for the protective order.

Second, the government’s broad claim that a protective order is necessary to avoid juror taint is insufficient to show good cause for the protective order. Not only is this claim too vague to satisfy the test of good cause under Superior Court Rule of Criminal Procedure 16, the government ignores the traditional tools used by courts to filter out jury bias, namely a thorough *voir dire*.

Finally, the government’s concern over privacy for police officers also cannot demonstrate good cause to support the sweeping protective order entered in this case. The government fails to identify with the requisite specificity what personal information about officers might be revealed without a protective order. Additionally, the government’s argument is undermined by the fact that officers have little, if any, privacy interest in information documenting their performance of their official duties.

The protective order sought by the government and imposed by this Court restricts the ability of reporters and news organizations—both in Washington, D.C., and around the country—to keep the public informed about political protests and law enforcement responses to such demonstrations. Because it is not supported by good cause, it should be vacated and the government’s motion denied.

ARGUMENT

I. The public has a strong interest in learning about the Inauguration Day protests, which the Court must consider in determining whether the government has demonstrated good cause for the protective order.

Going back at least as far as the Sons of Liberty's 1773 demonstration in defiance of the Tea Act in Boston, protests have been the subject of great public attention and news coverage. Even after the Inauguration, conflicts between protesters, counter-protesters, and police are more than ever the subject of national discussion. As such, information furthering understanding of such conflicts is of great public interest. *See, e.g.,* Wesley Lowery & Christina Pazzanese, *Boston 'Free Speech' Rally Ends Early Amid Flood of Counterprotesters; 27 People Arrested*, Wash. Post, Aug. 19, 2017, <https://perma.cc/4VSZ-XFPF> (describing the interplay between protesters, counter-protesters, and police officers during a rally in Boston); Robert Faturechi, *Can Police Prevent the Next Charlottesville*, ProPublica, Aug. 18, 2017, <https://perma.cc/5NY7-VDGX> (describing protest in Charlottesville, lessons learned by local police, and crowd control methods that could be used by police at future demonstrations). Video footage, photographs, and other documentation of protests are the source materials that allow news media organizations to report about protests, which in some instances have involved violence and even the loss of life, and inform this important public debate. *See, e.g.,* Patrick Wilson, *Some Virginia State Police Troopers Concealed Their Uniform Name Strips at Confederate Rally, Leading to Questions*, Richmond Times-Dispatch, Sept. 20, 2017, <https://perma.cc/P92U-KF6A>; Doug Moore, *As Arrests Are Made, Protesters Question the Tactics Used by St. Louis Police*, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Sept. 19, 2017, <https://perma.cc/8MG5-3VZ2>.

Just as with other protests, the public has an interest in learning about the Inauguration Day protests that took place in Washington, D.C. *See, e.g.,* *Protests Turn Violent Near*

Inauguration Parade in D.C., Fox 5 DC, Jan. 20, 2017, <https://perma.cc/X3YC-LQ6X>; Phil McCausland, Emmanuelle Saliba, Erik Ortiz, & Corky Siemaszko, *More Than 200 Arrested in D.C. Protests on Inauguration*, NBC News, Jan. 21, 2017, <https://perma.cc/88Q2-JJMT>. In reporting on the protests, journalists have relied on the same types of materials that are covered by the protective order. For example, in July, a journalist published a news article about the Inauguration Day protests based at least partly on police video footage. Zoe Tillman, *New Videos of Trump Inauguration Day Protests Show Chaos and Mayhem*, BuzzFeed, Jul. 18, 2017, <https://perma.cc/4RAW-P96S> (featuring footage highlighting various aspects of the protests and the police response including a clip showing protesters lobbing projectiles at police and another clip showing police spraying a crowd of protesters with what looks like pepper spray). The videos are accompanied by reporting that provides context about the Inauguration Day protests and discussion of what the footage adds to the public’s understanding of events. *Id.*

In short, the public has a powerful interest in understanding the Inauguration Day protests, and the news media’s ability to report on these events accurately and thoroughly is enhanced by access to videos, photographs, and other materials that document the protests. By limiting dissemination of evidence produced by the government in discovery, which includes videos from police body cameras and other law enforcement sources, videos from nearby businesses, photographs, recordings of police radio communications, and other documents, the protective order inhibits public knowledge about the Inauguration Day protests.

In determining whether good cause exists to justify the protective order in this case, the Court should consider the public’s interest in access to the discovery materials. *See* Super. Ct. Crim. R. 16(d)(1) (permitting the Court “for good cause” to enter a protective order denying, restricting, or deferring discovery). Courts in the District of Columbia have not issued any

published decisions defining the factors necessary to show good cause under Rule 16. However, D.C. courts construe the good cause standard under Rule 16 consistently with federal courts' interpretations of the same standard under Rule 16 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and with Rule 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *See Rowland v. United States*, 840 A.2d 664, 678 n.16 (D.C. 2004) (“We construe Rule 16 consistently with the federal rule from which it is derived.”). Federal courts have concluded that “[t]he good cause determination must . . . balance the public’s interest in the information against the injuries that disclosure would cause.” *United States v. Wecht*, 484 F.3d 194, 211 (3d Cir. 2007) (citing *Pansy v. Borough of Stroudsburg*, 23 F.3d 772, 787–91 (3d Cir. 1994); *see also SEC v. TheStreet.com*, 273 F.3d 222, 234 (2d Cir. 2001) (affirming district court decision to modify protective order to unseal portions of deposition in a civil case because “the interest of the general public” outweighed the privacy rights at stake). Here, the public interest in information about the Inauguration Day protest is considerable. Accordingly, the Court should weigh this interest against the government’s arguments in favor of a protective order barring any dissemination by the parties of government-produced discovery materials in determining whether good cause exists.

II. The government’s broad and general assertions are insufficient to demonstrate the good cause required to support the protective order.

The government’s motion for a protective order appears to be based on two theories: without such an order there would be a “possibility of juror taint” and without such an order there would be risk that private information about defendants or police officers might become public. Gov’t Mot. for a Protective Order Regarding Materials Produced During Discovery at 6, 7 (“Gov’t Mot.”). These general assertions, however, are insufficient to establish good cause as is required under Rule 16(d).

- A. The government’s unsupported claim that dissemination of discovery materials would risk “juror taint” ignores the effectiveness of a thorough voir dire in eliminating bias.

The government argues that public dissemination of discovery materials “raises the possibility of juror taint.” Gov’t Mot. at 6. In connection with this claim, the government notes that certain footage produced in discovery in this case has been posted on the internet “in a manner that is editorialized, arguably inflammatory, and less than complete.” *Id.* As an example, the government points to a video taken on a police body camera and posted to YouTube that shows police cordoning off a group of protesters. *Id.* at 6 n.1. The government states that this video omitted footage from the same body camera of protesters assaulting police officers and charging a police line. *Id.*

It is well-established that mere exposure to information about a case is insufficient to establish a threat of juror bias. The U.S. Supreme Court recognized in *Reynolds v. United States* that the criminal justice system both anticipates and tolerates jurors who have been exposed to pretrial publicity, as it is an inevitable consequence of an informed citizenry. 98 U.S. 145, 155–56 (1878) (“[E]very case of public interest is almost, as a matter of necessity, brought to the attention of all the intelligent people in the vicinity, and scarcely any one can be found among those best fitted for jurors who has not read or heard of it, and who has not some impression or some opinion in respect to its merits.”). As the Court affirmed more recently, “Prominence does not necessarily produce prejudice, and juror *impartiality* does not require *ignorance*.” *Skilling v. United States*, 561 U.S. 358, 360 (2010).

For pretrial publicity to reach the point of causing serious risk of juror taint, it must be so inflammatory that any juror exposed to it could not be expected to render an impartial verdict. *See id.* at 382–83 (noting that publicity must be “the kind of vivid, unforgettable information”

that is “particularly likely to produce prejudice”). Perhaps not surprisingly, then, courts have tended to find pretrial publicity to be sufficiently prejudicial in cases involving particularly heinous crimes that captivated a community and dominated local news coverage, especially when news reports have highlighted a defendant’s confession of guilt. *See, e.g., Irvin v. Dowd*, 366 U.S. 717, 720, 725–26 (1961) (coverage of murder case featured multiple articles stating defendant had confessed to six murders); *Rideau v. Louisiana*, 373 U.S. 723, 726 (1963) (“[I]t was a denial of due process of law to refuse the request for a change of venue, after the people of Calcasieu Parish had been exposed repeatedly and in depth to the spectacle of Rideau personally confessing in detail to the crimes with which he was later to be charged.”).

In contrast, courts have held that even widespread, adverse publicity does not so inevitably taint a prospective jury as to make seating an impartial jury impossible. For example, in *Patton v. Yount*, a Luthersburg, Pa., a high-school student was murdered and a man convicted in part based on an improperly obtained confession. 467 U.S. 1025, 1026–27 (1984). The teen’s murder and the man’s confession were the focus of extensive media coverage throughout a first trial. *Id.* at 1032. At a later retrial, however, the court allowed for “extensive voir dire” before seating a jury. *Id.* at 1027. During the process it was revealed that a sizable majority of jurors “admitted they would carry an opinion into the jury box” and eight of the 14 jurors and alternates seated even “admitted that at some time they had formed an opinion as to Yount’s guilt.” *Id.* at 1029–30. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court found that “the voir dire testimony and record of publicity do not reveal the kind of ‘wave of public passion’ that would have made a fair trial unlikely by the jury that was empaneled as a whole.” *Id.* at 1040. Similarly, in *Casey v. Moore*, a Wenatchee, Wash., man stood trial for killing his wife. 386 F.3d 896, 901 (9th Cir. 1984). The defendant twice moved for a change of venue, arguing that he could not obtain a fair trial

because of intense news coverage and “small-town gossip.” *Id.* at 902. Both motions were denied, even after *voir dire* revealed that approximately 40 percent of the jury pool had “formed some opinion about the case.” *Id.* The Ninth Circuit affirmed denial of the change-of-venue motions, stating that the defendant “has not demonstrated that prejudice could be presumed or that actual prejudice existed as a result of pretrial publicity” *Id.* at 921.

Courts have also found that pretrial publicity is unlikely to taint a jury pool in a place like the District of Columbia, “where the community in which the trial is scheduled is large and inundated with other news” *United States v. Chapin*, 515 F.2d 1274, 1289 (D.C. Cir. 1975). In *Chapin*, an attorney for the Nixon Administration was convicted of making “false material declarations” to a grand jury investigating so-called “dirty tricks”—ethically dubious political activities aimed at the administration’s enemies. *Id.* at 1277. A jury convicted the defendant in April 1974, just two months after publicity of the Watergate break-in and scandal had reached its height, according to the D.C. Circuit. *Id.* at 1289. The defendant appealed, arguing that the district court erred in denying his motion for a change of venue. *Id.* at 1277. The United States Court of Appeals for the District of the Columbia Circuit held, however, that the district court did not err, rejecting the defendant’s argument that pretrial publicity was so great that it was unlikely that an unbiased jury could have been empaneled. *Id.* at 1287–89.

Indeed, courts in the District of Columbia have held numerous trials of criminal defendants accused of high-profile crimes subject to extensive press attention. Nevertheless, these courts have effectively assembled impartial juries, as the D.C. Court of Appeals discussed in *United States v. Edwards*:

The District of Columbia, the capital of the nation, is a major metropolitan center with a surfeit of events commanding media attention. Events occur, are reported, and pass with amazing rapidity. Trials relating to events of national and

international news attention have been conducted without undue difficulty in obtaining a jury free from taint caused by such news attention.

430 A.2d 1321, 1346 (D.C. 1981).

Several high-profile cases further illustrate this point. In *Khaalis v. United States*, defendants were convicted on charges stemming from their violent seizure of three buildings, including the District Building that housed the offices of the Mayor and City Council. 408 A.2d 313, 319 (D.C. 1979). During the takeover of the District Building, a radio reporter was fatally shot, and then-councilman Marion Barry was shot and injured. *Id.* at 326. Even though a majority of the potential jurors in the case followed news coverage of the seizures on a routine basis, the D.C. Court of Appeals rejected defendants' claim on appeal that this rose to the level of prejudicial publicity that deprived them of their Sixth Amendment rights to a fair trial. *Id.* at 335 (concluding that during its "thorough voir dire" the Court was able to empanel a jury "without unduly exposing the jury array to publicity . . . to the ultimate prejudice of appellants"). Similarly, in *United States v. Haldeman*, "extensive voir dire . . . with its detailed inquiry into the sources and intensity of the veniremen's exposure to Watergate publicity" was sufficient to overcome the contention of Watergate defendants that the jury was prejudiced against them. 559 F.2d 31, 69 (D.C. Cir. 1976).

Here, the government does not argue that pretrial publicity would be more extensive than is typical for a trial of public interest, let alone utterly corrupting. *See generally* Gov't Mot. It also does not suggest that the discovery materials covered under the protective order contain information analogous to a confession that could bias potential jurors with regard to a question of fact in the case. Rather, the government offers as its lone example of potentially prejudicial discovery material a clip posted on YouTube showing police on Inauguration Day corralling protesters that allegedly omits earlier actions of protesters that prompted the police response.

Gov't Mot. at 6. Although the government suggests that this video is misleading, it does not explain why it is so inflammatory or so memorable that the public dissemination of it or similar videos would prevent the seating of an impartial jury.

The government also does not explain how dissemination of videos or photographs produced in discovery that show events that took place in public during the Inauguration Day protests would increase the risk of tainting potential jurors, when there are hundreds of hours of video and innumerable pictures of the day's events that were recorded and made available by journalists and members of the public alike. *See, e.g., Protesters clash with police at inauguration – video*, Guardian, Jan. 20, 2017, <http://bit.ly/2k7JYq7>; *Protesters and police clash in downtown D.C. on Inauguration Day*, Wash. Post, Jan. 20, 2017, <http://wapo.st/2hpfqFB>; *See Photos from Anti-Trump Protests on Inauguration Day in Washington, D.C.*, Rolling Stone, Jan. 21, 2017, <https://perma.cc/QM8G-9FJF>; WTOP Staff, *Photos: Inauguration protests in DC*, WTOP, Jan. 20, 2017, <http://bit.ly/2xu5iMk>. Indeed, the YouTube video cited by the government itself shows numerous individuals, including some who identify themselves as members of the press, filming or photographing the same events depicted in the video.

Moreover, even when there is a genuine possibility of juror taint, courts should employ thorough *voir dire* to screen out potentially biased jurors and preserve the impartiality of the jury. *See In re Charlotte Observer*, 882 F.2d 850, 855–56 (4th Cir. 1989) (observing that “[i]ncreasingly the courts are expressing confidence that voir dire can serve in almost all cases as a reliable protection against juror bias however induced”). As part of the *voir dire* process, courts may also allow litigants to use special questionnaires to filter prospective jurors, *Casey*, 386 F.3d at 902; allow litigants to ask searching and direct questions to jurors about their level of exposure to pretrial publicity and whether they nonetheless can be fair, *Skilling* at 373–74; and

increase the number of peremptory challenges available to the parties, *id.* at 373. The government does not even attempt to explain why one or more of these remedies would be insufficient to ensure an impartial jury in this case.

- B. The government’s invocation of “privacy interests” does not establish good cause for a broad protective order that bars dissemination of all discovery materials.

The government’s motion argues that certain discovery materials, including body camera footage of arrest processing and arrest paperwork “contain relevant, but personal information about defendants, and even officers.” Gov’t Mot. at 7. While courts have held that privacy concerns can provide good cause to support protective orders, a particularized showing is nevertheless required under Rule 16(d) when such an order is challenged. *United States v. Bulger*, 283 F.R.D. 46, 55–56 (D. Mass. 2012) (recognizing that a party seeking continued enforcement of a protective order under Rule 16 must demonstrate cognizable privacy rights with particularity for specific items produced in discovery).

Here, the government suggests that body camera footage and arrest paperwork produced by the government in discovery might contain personal information about officers, without explaining what information may be revealed or the level of privacy interest, if any, an officer may have in that information. To the extent that these materials reveal events that occurred in public or non-undercover officers’ names, faces, or badge numbers, which are in full view of members of the public on a daily basis, they are insufficient to justify the protective order. *See Franks v. City of New York*, No. 13-CV-623 JBW VMS, 2013 WL 6002946, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 12, 2013) (“Defendant offers no explanation for why the requested photographs are protected by the law enforcement and official information privileges, when the officers are publicly visible during the course of their duties.”).

In addition, *amici* agree with Defendants that officers have little, if any, privacy interest in the performance of their official duties. Def. Opp’n at 14–15; *see ACLU v. Alvarez*, 679 F.3d 583, 605–06 (7th Cir. 2012) (recognizing that police officer’s privacy interests are not implicated by recordings of officers performing their duties in public places and speaking at a volume audible to bystanders); *McDonough v. Fernandez-Rundle*, 862 F.3d 1314, 1320 (11th Cir. 2017) (holding that police chief had no expectation of privacy in meeting between two members of the public and two police officials in chief’s office to discuss allegations of police misconduct); *Bacon v. McKeithen*, No. 5:14-cv-37-RS-CJK, 2014 WL 12479640, at *3 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 28, 2014) (stating that “there is little societal expectation of privacy for police officers acting in the line of duty in public places; an expectation of privacy in these circumstances would undercut societal expectations of police accountability”); *Cowles Pub. Co. v. State Patrol*, 748 P.2d 597, 605 (Wash. 1988) (concluding that “a law enforcement officer’s actions while performing his public duties or improper off duty actions in public which bear upon his ability to perform his public office” are not a matter of “personal privacy” in tort law). As the U.S. Supreme Court has recognized, there is a “paramount public interest in a free flow of information to the people concerning public officials, their servants.” *Garrison v. Louisiana*, 379 U.S. 64, 77 (1964). Accordingly, there is no good cause that justifies the protective order prohibiting dissemination of discovery materials that show or relate to officers’ performance of their official duties.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and those set forth in Defendant's opposition, *amici curiae* respectfully urge this Court to deny the government's request for a protective order and vacate the protective order currently in place.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Bruce D. Brown

Bruce D. Brown (D.C. Bar # 457317)

Counsel of Record

Gregg P. Leslie (D.C. Bar # 426092)

Caitlin Vogus (D.C. Bar # 988826)

REPORTERS COMMITTEE FOR

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

1156 15th St. NW, Suite 1250

Washington, DC 20005

(202) 795-9300

bbrown@rcfp.org

October 6, 2017

Of Counsel listed on next page

Of Counsel:

Kevin M. Goldberg
Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, PLC
1300 N. 17th St., 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22209
Counsel for American Society of News Editors
Counsel for Association of Alternative Newsmedia

Allison Lucas
General Counsel and EVP Legal
Nabiha Syed
Assistant General Counsel
BuzzFeed
111 East 18th Street, 13th Floor
New York, NY 10003

Mickey H. Osterreicher
1100 M&T Center, 3 Fountain Plaza,
Buffalo, NY 14203
Counsel for National Press Photographers Association

Laura R. Handman
Alison Schary
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006
Thomas R. Burke
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
Suite 800
500 Montgomery Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
Counsel for Online News Association

Katherine Glenn Bass
588 Broadway, Suite 303A
New York, NY 10012

Kathleen A. Kirby
Wiley Rein LLP
1776 K St., NW
Washington, DC 20006
Counsel for Radio Television Digital News Association

Bruce W. Sanford
Mark I. Bailen
Baker & Hostetler LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave., NW
Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20036
Counsel for Society of Professional Journalists

Jay Kennedy
James A. McLaughlin
Kalea S. Clark
The Washington Post
One Franklin Square
Washington, D.C. 20071
Tel: (202) 334-6000
Fax: (202) 334-5075

APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF *AMICI*

The Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press is an unincorporated association of reporters and editors that works to defend the First Amendment rights and freedom of information interests of the news media. The Reporters Committee has provided assistance and research in First Amendment and Freedom of Information Act litigation since 1970.

With some 500 members, **American Society of News Editors** (“ASNE”) is an organization that includes directing editors of daily newspapers throughout the Americas. ASNE changed its name in April 2009 to American Society of News Editors and approved broadening its membership to editors of online news providers and academic leaders. Founded in 1922 as American Society of Newspaper Editors, ASNE is active in a number of areas of interest to top editors with priorities on improving freedom of information, diversity, readership and the credibility of newspapers.

Association of Alternative Newsmedia (“AAN”) is a not-for-profit trade association for 130 alternative newspapers in North America, including weekly papers like The Village Voice and Washington City Paper. AAN newspapers and their websites provide an editorial alternative to the mainstream press. AAN members have a total weekly circulation of seven million and a reach of over 25 million readers.

BuzzFeed is a social news and entertainment company that provides shareable breaking news, original reporting, entertainment, and video across the social web to its global audience of more than 200 million.

The National Press Photographers Association (“NPPA”) is a 501(c)(6) non-profit organization dedicated to the advancement of visual journalism in its creation, editing and distribution. NPPA’s approximately 7,000 members include television and still photographers,

editors, students and representatives of businesses that serve the visual journalism industry. Since its founding in 1946, the NPPA has vigorously promoted the constitutional rights of journalists as well as freedom of the press in all its forms, especially as it relates to visual journalism. The submission of this brief was duly authorized by Mickey H. Osterreicher, its General Counsel.

Online News Association (“ONA”) is the world’s largest association of online journalists. ONA’s mission is to inspire innovation and excellence among journalists to better serve the public. ONA’s more than 2,000 members include news writers, producers, designers, editors, bloggers, technologists, photographers, academics, students and others who produce news for the Internet or other digital delivery systems. ONA hosts the annual Online News Association conference and administers the Online Journalism Awards. ONA is dedicated to advancing the interests of digital journalists and the public generally by encouraging editorial integrity and independence, journalistic excellence and freedom of expression and access.

PEN American Center (“PEN America”) is a non-profit association of writers that includes novelists, journalists, editors, poets, essayists, playwrights, publishers, translators, agents, and other professionals. PEN America stands at the intersection of literature and human rights to protect open expression in the United States and worldwide. We champion the freedom to write, recognizing the power of the word to transform the world. Our mission is to unite writers and their allies to celebrate creative expression and defend the liberties that make it possible, working to ensure that people everywhere have the freedom to create literature, to convey information and ideas, to express their views, and to make it possible for everyone to access the views, ideas, and literatures of others. PEN America has approximately 5,000 members and is affiliated with PEN International, the global writers’ organization with over 100 Centers in Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, and the Americas.

Radio Television Digital News Association (“RTDNA”) is the world’s largest and only professional organization devoted exclusively to electronic journalism. RTDNA is made up of news directors, news associates, educators and students in radio, television, cable and electronic media in more than 30 countries. RTDNA is committed to encouraging excellence in the electronic journalism industry and upholding First Amendment freedoms.

Reporters Without Borders has been fighting censorship and supporting and protecting journalists since 1985. Activities are carried out on five continents through its network of over 150 correspondents, its national sections, and its close collaboration with local and regional press freedom groups. Reporters Without Borders currently has 10 offices and sections worldwide.

Society of Professional Journalists (“SPJ”) is dedicated to improving and protecting journalism. It is the nation’s largest and most broad-based journalism organization, dedicated to encouraging the free practice of journalism and stimulating high standards of ethical behavior. Founded in 1909 as Sigma Delta Chi, SPJ promotes the free flow of information vital to a well-informed citizenry, works to inspire and educate the next generation of journalists and protects First Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech and press.

WP Company LLC publishes **The Washington Post**, the leading daily newspaper in the nation’s capital, as well as the website www.washingtonpost.com, which reaches more than 65 million unique visitors per month.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the motion was electronically filed on October 6, 2017, and served on counsel for the Government via electronic mail on October 6, 2017, as stated below:

Jennifer Kerkhoff, Esq.
Office of the United States Attorney
for the District of Columbia 555 Fourth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530
Jennifer.kerkhoff@usdoj.gov

I also certify that on October 6, 2017, copies of the foregoing were served via email on the following:

ablitzlaw@aol.com; arh@hunterandjohnson.com; adgieobryant@aol.com;
alan@asolomonlaw.com; athomas@ahthomaslaw.com; apantonelli@verizon.net
friedmana@butzel.com; a.clarke@aclarkelaw.com; Wilcox_Ann@yahoo.com;
anna@annascannonlaw.com; attycade@aol.com; aprilldowns@aol.com;
Ashley.Jones@georgetown.edu; aralaw@icloud.com; baruch.weiss@apks.com;
berncr@aol.com; slam13@aol.com; hardenpinckney@gmail.com; becatty@aol.com;
brett.marston@aporter.com; baruch.weiss@apks.com; brucecooperlaw@gmail.com;
by@yamashitalaw.com; bbookhard@bookhardlw.com; njarvis35@aol.com;
cweletz@hotmail.com; clenonlegal@hotmail.com; chantal_jeanbaptiste@yahoo.com;
cfiebig@gibsondunn.com; murdterlaw@hotmail.com; cmwlaw@cs.com; cherlynf@aol.com;
copaigbeogu@hotmail.com; cgowen@gowenrhoades.com; cjm@scrofanolaw.com;
powellfirm@msn.com; colin.ram@skadden.com; donald.salzman@skadden.com;
colleen_archer@msn.com; cjs97@hotmail.com; vaughanlawdc@gmail.com;
themoorelawoffices.cnm@gmail.com; catacaloslaw@gmail.com; quillin.d@erols.com;
davidsidbury@com;cast.net; info@notguiltyindc.com; david@pricebenowitz.com;
djcbatch@aol.com; richterlawdc@gmail.com; dondworsky@gmail.com; attybeas@aol.com;
dorsey301@verizon.net; skip@egainlaw.com; ehaldane@msn.com; amato@amatoatlaw.com;
elizabeth@weller-law.com; elliotqueenlaw@gmail.com; scialpilaw@gmail.com;
evans0714@aol.com; ferrisbond@bondandnorman.com; fdantuono@msn.com;
fdiverson@gmail.com; michellestevenslaw@gmail.com; givey@leftwichlaw.com;
gehilllawoff@aol.com; gregg_baron@yahoo.com; gmarshall@bradley.com;
esullivan@bradley.com; frankiezyx@aol.com; hhsesq@aol.com; henry@escotolaw.com;
phillips@phillipsfirmdc.com; howard950@aol.com; ianwilliamslaw@verizon.net;
kunnirickallaw@gmail.com; jsgilmorelaw@yahoo.com; info@jacquelinewilliamsesq.com;
jamescolt@hotmail.com; gr8falls@aol.com; jheine@cov.com; alazerow@cov.com;
jreed038@gmail.com; Jason.Downs@MurphyFalcon.com; Jfw@jfwlaw.net;
ason@clarkdefense.com; jpm@scrofanolaw.com; jenifer@jwickslaw.com;
jfeldman@houlonberman.com; rfinci@houlonberman.com; jerryraysmith@verizon.net;
jslaight@att.net; jschwartz@shulmanrogers.com; jrdnbdty@verizon.net;
copacino@law.georgetown.edu; johnlmachado@gmail.com; johnlrpoinindexter@gmail.com;

jsample229@aol.com; jtharvey3@com;cast.net; jonnorrislaw@gmail.com;
jcook@dcwhitecollar.com; swu@dcwhitecollar.com; jml@vinelaw.com; lanyilaw@gmail.com;
jsheldon@sfhdefense.com; jonathanzuckerlaw@gmail.com; jonwillmott@yahoo.com;
jas@scrofanolaw.com; joseph.mccoy.law@gmail.com; sarco600@msn.com;
jcaleblaw@gmail.com; Joe.Fay@FayKaplanLaw.com; jsheketoff@jonesday.com;
juneperrone@yahoo.com; justin@okezielaw.com; kanita@kcwilliamslaw.com;
karenlminor@aol.com; neptunelaw@gmail.com; ken.auerbach@yahoo.com;
kevin.irving@mac.com; koliver202@aol.com; kcrobertson@juno.com; kralaw1@msn.com;
phillips.gppc@gmail.com; kristin.robinson@bryancave.com; dschwartz@bryancave.com;
mark.srere@bryancave.com; mcgonigallaw@verizon.net; Immanitta@rrbmdk.com;
lwade@wc.com; cberg@wc.com; zwarren@wc.com; willild1@verizon.net;
lauckland1@aol.com; lsmith@peaklg.com; bboss@cozen.com; egurskis@cozen.com;
lindahoustonlaw@aol.com; lsapirstein@gmail.com; malechlaw@aol.com;
lloyd@coburngreenbaum.com; louis_kamara@yahoo.com; khanlaw@hotmail.com;
msweet@wileyrein.com; mglaw@com;cast.net; kristin.robinson@bryancave.com;
dschwartz@bryancave.com; mark.srere@bryancave.com; mlking@kinglaw.org;
m.mtrose@com;cast.net; hertzmr@smaclaw.com; mrism26@gmail.com;
matthew.jones@wilmerhale.com; Lauren.Moore@wilmerhale.com;
mcgennis@mcgenniswilliams.com; mbarfield@dclawstudents.org;
dschertler@schertlerlaw.com; msatin@milchev.com; maddenlaw@gmail.com;
joJon@Fellnerlaw.com; michael@brucklaw.com; serranomas@gmail.com;
mitchellbaer@msn.com; mooses_cook@yahoo.com; nmdepalma@venable.com;
sarosenthal@venable.com; zahara@oz-legal.com; nlotze@lotzemosley.com;
noah@theclementsfirm.com; patrice.sulton@sultonlaw.com; plinehan@steptoe.com;
pauls411x@yahoo.com; peggy@coburngreenbaum.com; pcooper@petercooperlaw.com;
quo@judkinsfirm.com; rcicurel@pdsdc.org; jfowler@pdsdc.org; rcotton@zuckerman.com;
modonnell@zuckerman.com; ralph_29104@msn.com; randyemcdonald@gmail.com;
rregunathan@yahoo.com; rblochlegal@gmail.com; rebecca@legrandpllc.com; rh000@aol.com;
rgallena@orrick.com; wjacobson@orrick.com; rf@rfeitellaw.com; rmeyer@willkie.com;
raustin@hwglaw.com; thiswese@hwglaw.com; attorneyrufusmckinneylaw@gmail.com;
russelljhairston@yahoo.com; attorney@saboulaw.com; scmoore@smkslaw.com;
sbogash@mac.com; s.kopeccki@aol.com; sbernstein@kaiserdillon.com;
jdillon@kaiserdillon.com; murphylawdc@gmail.com; seanfarrelly@farrellypc.com;
sschr83309@aol.com; slburka@aol.com; sweathers@verizon.net; sheridan@slengland.com;
sjones@schertlerlaw.com; donorato@schertlerlaw.com; slj@hunterandjohnson.com;
sfbrennwald@cs.com; ogilvie@oz-legal.com; spolin2@earthlink.net; skiersh@aol.com;
stuart.johnson.esq@gmail.com; sdellis1@verizon.net; susan@boreckilaw.com;
patel@brucklaw.com; myattorney@maddoxlevine.com; tammysjacques@yahoo.com;
mskleiman@aol.com; ladylawyeresq@yahoo.com; lawyer@thomasakey.com;
tomengle@burkaengle.com; ttheslep@aol.com; tlester@tlesterlaw.com; tbaldwin@cjapanel.org;
tonydclaw@gmail.com; veroniceholt@msn.com; wjya@syalaw.com; wole@falodunlaw.com

/s/ Bruce D. Brown
Bruce D. Brown