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• Dov Fox, 2010
• Jake Gardener, 2011
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• Matthew Hengreness, 2012
• Adam Hockensmith, 2012
• Jennifer Jones, 2011
• Patrick Kabat, 2010
• Margot Kaminski, 2010
• Valerie Kaur, 2012
• Noorain Khan
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• Nadia Lambek, 2010
• Matthew Maddox
• Alexandra Orme, 2010
• Lisa Larrimore Ouellette, 2011
• Lauren Pardee, 2010
• Sohail Ramirez, 2010
• Doug Rand, 2010
• Michael Seringhaus, 2010
• Kristin E. Shaffer, 2011
• Nabiha Syed, 2010
• Chris Suarez, 2011
• Marisa B. Van Saanen, 2010
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**ISP Student Fellows**

• Sam Adelsberg, 2013
• Giselle Barcia, 2013
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• Jeremy Kutner, 2012
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• Jeff Love, 2012
• Max Mishkin, 2014
• Eric Parrie, 2013
• Daniel Pastor, 2013
• Robert Quigley, 2014
• David Robinson, 2012
• Jane Rosen, 2013
• David Ryan, 2013
• James Shih, 2013
• Jonathan Soleimani, 2013
• Nyfees Syed, 2014
• Xiying Tang, 2012
• Ivy Wang, 2013  
• Qian Julie Wang, 2012  
• Albert Wong, 2015  
• Alyssa Work, 2013

Undergraduate Student Fellows

• Bobby Dresser, YC 2014  
• Adi Kamdar, YC 2012  
• Aseem Mehta, YC 2014  
• Joel Sircus, YC 2014  
• Cynthia Weaver, YC 2012

Yale University Affiliates

• Jason Eiseman  
• Bonnie Kaplan  
• Limor Peer  
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• Tina Weiner

Affiliated Fellows

• Marvin Ammori, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, College of Law  
• Anita Allen-Castellitto, Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School  
• Shyam Balganesh, Assistant Professor of Law, University of Pennsylvania Law School  
• Stuart Benjamin, Professor of Law, Duke Law School  
• Yochai Benkler, Professor, Harvard Law School  
• Daniel Benoliel, Professor, University of Haifa School of Law  
• Molly Beutz Land, Associate Professor of Law, New York Law School  
• Rebekka Bonner  
• James Boyle, Professor of Law, Duke Law School  
• Herbert Burkert, Professor of Information Law, University of St. Gallen. President, Legal Advisory Board (LAB), European Commission  
• Anupam Chander, UC Davis School of Law
- Danielle Citron, Associate Professor of Law, University of Maryland Law School
- Susan Crawford, Professor, University of Michigan Law School
- Eun Chang Choi
- Laura DeNardis, Associate Professor, School of Communications at American University
- Niva Elkin-Koren, Lecturer, Faculty of Law, University of Haifa
- Jeanne Fromer, Associate Professor of Law, Fordham Law School
- Michael Froomkin, Professor of Law, University of Miami School of Law
- Christine Greenhow
- David Singh Grewal, Harvard Society of Fellows, Harvard University
- James Grimmelmann, New York Law School
- Andreas Grünwald, Assistant to Professor Bernd Holznagel at the Institute for Information, Telecommunications and Media Law, University of Münster, Germany
- Robert A. Heverly, Assistant Professor at Albany Law School of Union University
- David Johnson, Distinguished Visitor, New York Law School
- Dan Klau, Adjunct Professor, University of Connecticut Law School & Attorney, Pepe & Hazard, LLP
- Douglas Lichtman, Professor of Law, UCLA Law
- Christopher Mason, Assistant Professor of Computational Genomics Department of Physiology and Biophysics and the Institute for Computational Biomedicine Weill Cornell Medical College
- Ernest Miller
- Caio Mario da Silva Pereira Neto, Getulio Vargas Foundation (FGV) School of Law
- Beth Noveck, Associate Professor of Law, New York Law
School

- **Frank Pasquale**, Loftus Professor of Law, Seton Hall Law School; Associate Director of the Gibbons Institute of Law, Science, and Technology, Seton Hall University
- **Guy Pessach**, Lecturer, Faculty of Law, Hebrew University of Jerusalem
- **Arti Rai**, Professor of Law, Duke Law School
- **Nagla Rizk**, Professor of Economics, American University in Cairo
- **Kermit Roosevelt**, Professor, University of Pennsylvania School of Law
- **David Schulz**, Lecturer, Columbia Law School and Partner, Levine, Sullivan, Koch & Schulz, LLP
- **Lea Shaver**, Associate Professor, Hofstra Law School
- **Daniel J. Solove**, George Washington University Law School
- **Victoria Stodden**
- **Madhavi Sunder**, UC Davis School of Law
- **David Thaw**
- **Stefaan Verhulst**, Markle Foundation
- **Kim Weatherall**, University of Queensland, Australia
- **Tal Zarsky**, Lecturer, Faculty of Law, University of Haifa
- **Michael Zimmer**, Assistant Professor, School of Information Studies, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
SCHOLARSHIP AND ACADEMIC PRESENTATIONS
Highlights of Fellow Activities

Bryan Choi – Resident Fellow

Articles and Publications

During the spring semester, Bryan Choi successfully placed his article, "The Anonymous Internet," for publication in the Maryland Law Review. He has also been drafting a whitepaper on digital advertising and behavioral tracking, and he has authored several blog posts analyzing recent Supreme Court decisions in the areas of privacy law and patent law.

Organizational Work

In October 2011, Choi organized and moderated a panel on patents and innovation which included speakers from the Patent Trade Office.

In February 2012, Choi organized and moderated a panel on human Gene Patents and the high-profile Supreme Court case, Association for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, involving a challenge against patents claiming isolated DNA molecules associated with breast and ovarian cancer. The panelists included Chris Hansen, the lead attorney for the plaintiff; Richard Marsh, the general counsel for Myriad Genetics, Rochelle Dreyfuss, the Pauline Newman Professor of Law at NYU; and Dr. Allen Bale, the Director of the DNA Diagnostic Lab and Professor of Genetics at the Yale School of Medicine. The video is available at http://www.law.yale.edu/intellectuallife/genepatents.htm

Conferences and Speaking Engagements

In June 2012, Choi attended the Privacy Law Scholars Conference, hosted by George Washington University Law School. He was asked by the conference organizers to lead a paper workshop on digital identity and privacy.
Adam Cohen – Resident Fellow

Papers

*The Media that Need Citizens: The First Amendment and the Fifth Estate*, 85 S.Cal. L. Rev. 1, November 2011; http://lawweb.usc.edu/why/students/orgs/lawreview/A.CohenFifthEstate.cfm

Anjali Dalal – Resident Fellow

Media Publications


Presentations:

Digital Copyright 101 at General Assembly May 9, 2012
Joanna Erdmann - Resident Fellow


*Harm reduction, human rights, and access to information on safer abortion* (published)


Margot Kaminski - Executive Director

Publications

“Anti-mask Laws and Doe”, a forthcoming article comparing state anti-mask laws to the Doe anonymous online speech standard, presented at the Privacy Law Scholars Conference in June 2012.


“Flash Rob or Protest Movement: The First Amendment and regulating online calls to action”, to be published as a chapter in the forthcoming PUBLIC INTEREST AND PRIVATE RIGHTS IN SOCIAL MEDIA, through Chandos Publishing at Oxford.


Popular Media Publications


Time to Realize that the Obama Administration Doesn’t Even Have the Authority to Commit the US to ACTA or TPP, Techdirt, May 16, 2012, http://www.techdirt.com/articles/20120508/17174518835/time-to-realize-that-obama-administration-doesnt-even-have-authority-to-commit-us-to-acta-tpp.shtml


Kaminski quoted in *War is peace, IP negotiations are transparent*, Ars Technica [http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2012/03/obama-admin-war-is-peace-tpp-negotiations-are-transparent/](http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2012/03/obama-admin-war-is-peace-tpp-negotiations-are-transparent/).


Jennifer Keighley – Resident Fellow

**Articles and Publications**


**Briefs**

Brief for Amicus Curiae Scholars from The Information Society Project at Yale Law School in Support of Defendants-Appellants, Evergreen Association v. New York, No. 11-2735 (2d Cir. 2011) (written with Cilla Smith)

**Reading Groups:**
Participated in leading Liberty, Equality, and Compelling Speech: Problems in Reproductive and Reproductive Rights in Europe

**Speaking Engagements:**

Popular Media Publications
Abortion, the First Amendment, and the Fourth Circuit’s "Kangaroo Court." It Balkinization July 6, 2012

Christina Mulligan – Resident Fellow

Academic Publications


- Downloaded over 1,000 times on SSRN since March 6, 2012.

Popular Media Publications


Court Brief

**Speaking Engagements and Workshops**


*Mimesis and Copyright*, Quinnipiac University, Jan. 20, 2012.


*Discussing the Effects of Cambridge University Press v. Patton*, Collaborative Learning Center, Yale University, Nov. 8, 2011.

David Robinson – Student Fellow

**Academic Publications**

Co-authored with Harlan Yu *Apertura de Datos: Primeras Lecciones Para el Diseño de Políticas* published in a book of policy advice published by ECLAC, the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

**Popular Media Publications**
*Inside Views: To Stem Infringement, Block Money – Not Information* Intellectual Property Watch October 18, 2011,

*A Possible Constitutional Caveat to SOPA* Freedom to Tinker November 15, 2011

*US Chamber Urges More IP Protection As Job Booster; Tech Supporters Disagree* Intellectual Property Watch, July 9, 2011, contributor

Podcast:
David Robinson on Rogue Websites and Domain Seizures, Surprisingly Free, October 11, 2011;

**Genevieve Scott – Resident Policy Fellow**

Summer 2012, Genevieve Scott drafted an amicus brief in a case involving GPS tracking by the government of its own employees

And with Cilla Smith, a brief defending the privacy rights of women to use in vitro fertilization in Costa Rica
Wendy Seltzer - Resident Fellow

Publications:


Presentations:

Privacy, Option Value, Feedback, Privacy Law Scholars Conference, June 7-8, 2012

Keynote, Defending the Open Net, ORGcon, London, March 24, 2012

Openness in the Smartphone Ecosystem, Whittier Law Review Symposium, Nov 4, 2011

Android's Openness (keynote) and Leveraging Openness, Android Open (O'Reilly), San Francisco, Nov. 2011
CONFERENCES
Global Censorship Conference

Yale Law School

featuring panels including:
The Means of Change, Familiar and New
Old and New Forms of Censorship
Technical Architectures of Censorship
Case Studies of Censorship
Technical Methods of Circumventing Censorship
Legal Solutions to Censorship
New Controversies in Censorship

Friday, March 30 - Sunday, April 1, 2012

Brought to you by Thomson Reuters and the Abrams Institute for Freedom of Expression
Censorship has long been a means to silence “harmful speech.” What governments consider to be “harmful” has varied across time and regime. However, whether it's the passage of the Alien and Sedition Acts or the more overt uses of force such as in Tiananmen Square, governments have shown time and time again that they are capable of deploying whatever means necessary to eliminate so called “harmful speech.”

The ubiquity of the Internet has added an additional layer of complexity to issues of government censorship. It is both an unrivaled tool for speech and an incredible tool for monitoring and surveillance. This conference will consider how censorship has changed in a networked world, exploring how networks have altered the practices of both governments and their citizens. Panels will include discussions of how governments can and do censor and how speakers can command technical and legal tools to preserve their ability to speak. The conference will conclude with a discussion of new controversies in censorship, including laws designed to prevent online bullying and intellectual property infringement.

**FRIDAY MARCH 30, 2012**

3:15-4:45 **The Means of Change, Familiar and New**  
*co-sponsored by the Orville H. Schell, Jr. Center for International Human Rights*

In the popular story of the political upheavals in the Middle East and North Africa, information technology stands out as the new factor that was critical to rapid mass mobilization for demanding change. The media have been credited with making popular demands for
change contagious. Enthusiasts for the potential of technology to foster progressive change have labeled these apparently sudden developments a Facebook revolution. Governments responded by seeking to curtail the use of mobile phones and the Internet. What role has technology played in igniting, sustaining and shaping recent political changes in the Arab world?

- Anupam Chander, Professor of Law, University of California, Davis and Director, California International Law Center
- Rebecca MacKinnon, Bernard L. Schwartz Senior Fellow, New America Foundation
- John Pollock, journalist

5:00-6:30  **Keynote Lecture**
*(co-sponsored by the Orville H. Schell, Jr. Center for International Human Rights)*

- Irwin Cotler, Canadian Parliament, former Attorney General of Canada

**SATURDAY MARCH 31, 2012**

10:00 - 11:30  **Panel One: Old and New Forms of Censorship**

Years ago, activists met in person to plan protests and quietly shared subversive texts. Now, events can be planned over social networking sites, and arguments for change are posted online. How have governments responded to these changes? How have activist practices and governments’ reactions changed the way we conceptualize censorship?

- Jack Balkin, Yale Law School
- Yochai Benkler, Harvard Law School
- Navid Hassanpour, Yale Political Science Department
- Rebecca MacKinnon, Bernard L. Schwartz Senior Fellow, New America Foundation
11:45 – 1:15  **Panel 2: Technical Architectures of Censorship**

There are a number of choke points across the Internet and a number of different censorship mechanisms that can be deployed at various points across the network. Censorship can be executed at the router level, the Internet Service Provider (ISP) level, the Internet Content Provider (ICP) level, or the device level. Additionally, countries can employ a number of different technologies at each level. This panel will explore the many technical options for censorship and the strategic value of different choices.

- Laura DeNardis, Associate Professor of Communication at American University, and Affiliated Fellow, Information Society Project at Yale Law School
- Nagla Rizk, American University in Cairo
- Hal Roberts, Fellow at Berkman Center for Internet & Technology
- Ashkan Soltani, Independent Researcher and Consultant on Privacy and Security

2:15 – 3:45  **Panel 3: Case Studies of Censorship**

In the wake of censorship both domestically and abroad, many questions emerged about how the censorship was executed, what effects it had, if and how activists were able to route around the it, and how, if it all, it was eventually stopped. This panel will explore recent instances of censorship in the United States, Egypt, Syria, Brazil, and India and the common themes and important differences that emerged.

- Sherwin Siy, Deputy Legal Director and the Kahle/Austin Promise Fellow at Public Knowledge
- Lina Attalah, Journalist, Managing Editor of Al-Masry Al-Youm
- Anas Qtiesh, Blogger, Editor of Global Voices
• Carlos Affonso Pereira de Souza, Vice-Coordinator of the Center for Technology & Society (CTS) at the Fundação Getulio Vargas (FGV) Law School
• Rishabh Dara, Researcher at Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad

4:00- 5:30  **Panel Four: Technical Methods of circumventing Censorship**

New technology may provide governments with new tools to censor, but it also creates opportunities for speakers and “hactivists” everywhere. How can individuals evade identification online and access blocked content? Can activists circumvent attempts to shut down the internet during periods of political unrest? What new methods are being developed to preserve free speech online?

• Roger Dingledine, The Tor Project
• Peter Fein, Telecomix
• Alex Halderman, University of Michigan, Dept. of Computer Science
• Sascha Meinrath, Open Technology Initiative Director, New America Foundation
• Wendy Seltzer, Senior Fellow, Information Society Project at Yale Law School

**SUNDAY, APRIL 1, 2012**

9:30 – 11:00  **Panel 5: Legal Solutions to Censorship**

Given the way censorship technologies have slowly crept into acceptable use because of concerns like piracy, child pornography, or national security, there is much debate about the role and capacity of law in combatting these new, digital forms of government censorship, domestically and internationally. This panel will discuss if and how legal solutions to censorship can be deployed most effectively.
11:15 – 12:45  **Panel Six: New Controversies in Censorship**

Does new technology change the appropriate scope of free expression rights? Can policing intellectual property infringement burden free speech interests? Does surveillance ever have a censoring effect? This panel will wrestle with whether a variety of government activities constitutes inappropriate censorship or necessary actions to protect the public interest.

- Derek Bambauer, Brooklyn Law School
- Jim Dempsey, Vice President of Public Policy at the Center for Democracy and Technology
- Molly Land, New York Law School
- Linda Lye, ACLU Northern California
- Jillian York, Director for International Freedom of Expression at the Electronic Frontier Foundation
- Mark MacCarthy, Vice President for Public Policy, Software and Information Industry Association; Adjunct Professor, Communication, Culture and Technology Program, Georgetown University
- Preston Padden, Senior Fellow at the Silicon Flatirons Center and an Adjunct Professor at the University Of Colorado’s Law School and Interdisciplinary Telecommunications Program
- David Post, Temple University, Beasley School of Law
- Christopher Soghoian, Graduate Fellow, Center for Applied Cybersecurity Research, Indiana University
Constitutional Interpretation and Change: A Conference on Jack Balkin’s Living Originalism

April 27-28, 2012

Register at
www.constitutionalinterpretation.eventbrite.com
Yale Law School
Room 127

A Discussion Between Legal Scholars and Journalists:

Bruce Ackerman
Akhil Amar
Emily Bazelon
Jack Balkin
Joan Biskupic
Sujit Choudhry
Justin Driver
Garrett Epps
Barry Friedman
Linda Greenhouse
Michael Greve
Sanford Levinson
Adam Liptak
Dahlia Lithwick
Michael McConnell
Robert Post
Jeffrey Rosen

Pre-Registration is Required
Register at:
www.constitutionalinterpretation.eventbrite.com
Deadline: April 20, 2012

Sponsored by the Oscar M. Ruebhausen Fund, Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities and by the Information Society Project at Yale Law School
Living Originalism offers a theory of constitutional interpretation that is both faithful to the Constitution’s original meaning and consistent with a living Constitution; it argues that the best versions of originalism and living constitutionalism are compatible rather than opposed. The book also explains how legitimate constitutional change occurs in the American constitutional system through the efforts of the political branches, political parties, social movements, and the institutions of civil society.

A distinctive feature of this conference is its focus on journalism as a conduit of American constitutional culture and on journalists as important players in the construction of public opinion about the Constitution. The conference includes panels of both constitutional scholars and journalists who cover constitutional issues.

Living Originalism argues that the Constitution changes over time because of continuous debates in public life about what the Constitution means. Journalists play a key role in discussing and explaining constitutional controversies before the public, including debates about constitutional interpretation. Because their work shapes and educates public opinion, journalists are an indispensable element of the long-term processes of constitutional change. The Internet and digital media, which blend traditional legal experts, journalists, commentators, and the general public, have, if anything, enhanced these features of American constitutional culture.
Friday, April 27, 2012

9:00am  Introduction

9:15am  Panel One: Living Originalism: A Contradiction in Terms?

- Justin Driver (Texas, New Republic): Does Originalism Have What Liberals Want?
- Jeffrey Rosen (GW, New Republic): Substance versus Method in Constitutional Interpretation
- Moderator/Discussant: Robert Post (Dean, Yale Law School)

11:15am  Panel Two: Journalism and Constitutional Interpretation

Living Originalism argues that the standard case of constitutional interpretation is interpretation by citizens, not by courts, and that all Americans have the duty to interpret the Constitution for themselves. It also argues that the distinction between originalism and living constitutionalism is a false choice.

How do or should journalists think about constitutional interpretation (as opposed to judges and courts)? How do they explain competing theories of constitutional interpretation to the public? How do they interpret the Constitution themselves? Who do they talk to about constitutional interpretation? What do they read?

- Joan Biskupic (Reuters News)
- Linda Greenhouse (Yale, NY Times)
- Charlie Savage (NY Times)
- Dahlia Lithwick (Slate)
- Moderator/Provocateur: Garrett Epps, (University of Baltimore, American Prospect)
2:00pm  **Panel Three: Constitutional Construction**

- Bruce Ackerman (Yale): Deconstructing Constitutional Construction
- Reva Siegel (Yale): Sex Equality and Constitutional Change: What Movement/Party Conflict Explains and Originalism Does Not
- Michael McConnell (Stanford): Originalism and Precedent
- Barry Friedman (NYU) and Sara Aronchick Solow (Clerk 3rd Cir.): How to Read the Constitution
- Moderator/Discussant: Sanford Levinson (Texas)

4:00pm  **Panel Four: Journalism and Constitutional Change**

Living Originalism argues that constitutional change outside the amendment process enjoys democratic legitimacy because social and political mobilizations, political parties, civil society organizations, and litigation campaigns, reshaping the boundaries of what is considered reasonable or plausible, move arguments from "off the wall" to "on the wall," and influence constitutional culture.

Journalism and media are important aspects of civil society. What role do journalists and the profession of journalism play in processes of constitutional change?

- Emily Bazelon (Yale, Slate)
- Barry Friedman (NYU)
- Reihan Salam (National Review Online, The Daily)
- Jeffrey Rosen (GW, New Republic)
- Moderator/Provocateur: Steven Teles (Johns Hopkins)

**Saturday, April 28th**

9:15am  **Panel Five: Comparative and Historical Perspectives on Living Originalism**
• Sujit Choudhry (NYU): “Our Law” and Comparative Constitutional Law: Living Originalism and Dialogical Engagement
• Kim Scheppele (Princeton): Jack Balkin is an American
• Akhil Amar (Yale): The Yale School of Constitutional Theory
• Michael Greve (American Enterprise Institute): What was Orginalism?
• Moderator/Discussant: Linda Greenhouse (Yale, NY Times)

11:15am  **Panel Six: Journalism and the Constitution outside the Courts**

Living Originalism argues that "living constitutionalism" is an elaborate interaction between constitutional arguments made within the courts and constitutional arguments made outside of them; it also argues that much constitutional change is driven by political and cultural forces beyond the judiciary.

How do journalists engage (or affect) the public in understanding the Constitution outside of the courts? This includes not only the work of Congress and the President, but state courts, political parties, NGOs, social movements, and public opinion. What is the difference between covering the courts and covering the Constitution?

• Emily Bazelon (Yale, Slate)
• Linda Greenhouse (Yale, NY Times)
• Adam Liptak (NY Times)
• Charlie Savage (NY Times)
• Moderator/Provocateur: Reva Siegel (Yale)

1:00 pm  **Lunch: Author's Question Time**

A panel of journalists asks the author difficult questions over lunch

• Jack Balkin
Questioners/Interrogators:

- Irin Carmon (Salon)
- Adam Liptak (NY Times)
- Armando Llorens (Daily Kos)
- Reihan Salam (National Review Online, The Daily)
Open Video Conference:

The Information Society Project helped to support the New York Law School Open Video Conference. ISP Fellow and Law & Media Program Director Nick Bramble led two seminars with Marvin Ammori titled: “Making the Map: A visual Representation of the Web Video Landscape.”

Description of Workshop: Our goal in this multi-part workshop is to make a comprehensive infographic with the help of a graphic artist. The graphic will illustrate how different layers of the open video ecosystem, from devices and bandwidth, to software and standards, and filmmaking and distribution, fit together—and what kinds of legal, competitive, or creative constraints are in place at each layer. As we draw this map, we will speak with a range of video makers, distributors, investors, and developers to address the following questions:

Who makes video? Who licenses video, and on what terms? Who aggregates and distributes video? How are different kinds of video encoded? How does video travel across the Internet and other kinds of networks? What roles do backbone providers and content delivery networks play in the process of transmitting video on the Internet? How much control do ISPs have over users’ ability to access video? Who is capable of exercising political control over video? And what can you do with video once it gets to a device?

The goal of these sessions is to map out the layers of people and technologies and licensing arrangements that video passes through on its way from the camera (or the computer) to the end user. In creating this map and refining our understanding of the economics and the infrastructure of the open video ecosystem, we will develop a better sense of how to interact with a variety of public and private design levers important to the future of open video.
**SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>W220</th>
<th>W320</th>
<th>WA010</th>
<th>WA300</th>
<th>W302</th>
<th>Faculty Commons</th>
<th>W303</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00—9:30</td>
<td>Registration &amp; Coffee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30—10:00</td>
<td>Keynote: Jillian York, Director of International Freedom of Expression (EFF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00—10:30</td>
<td>Lightning Talk: Jonathan McIntosh, Rebellious Pixels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30—12:00</td>
<td>Alternative Copyright Education</td>
<td>Making a Remix Maker</td>
<td>Designing Storyworlds</td>
<td>Visual Privacy/Visual Anonymity</td>
<td>Open Media Developers plenary</td>
<td>Using Open Source In Commercial Context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00—1:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30—2:15</td>
<td>Catered lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30—4:00</td>
<td>Defensive Patent License</td>
<td>New Currencies and Compensation Models</td>
<td>Technologies for Anonymization: SecureSmartCam</td>
<td>Connected Documentary</td>
<td>Video Archives: Life After Production</td>
<td>Fun with WebGL, the Audio API, and more</td>
<td>The Missing Link: Flash to HTML5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00—5:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45—6:15</td>
<td>A thought-provoking talk by Cindy Gallop: Make Love, Not Porn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30—8:00</td>
<td>Screening: Life in a Day (popcorn &amp; drinks)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>W220</td>
<td>W320</td>
<td>WA010</td>
<td>W300</td>
<td>W302</td>
<td>Faculty Commons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30—10:30</td>
<td>Registration &amp; Coffee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30—11:00</td>
<td>Keynote: Gigi Sohn, President &amp; Co-Founder, Public Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brewster Kahle and Tracey Jacqueh present the 9/11 Archive at Archive.org</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30—1:00</td>
<td>Intro to popcorn.js and pitch session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the Web Safe for Expression?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designing a Next-Generation TV Interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making the Map: bandwidth, backbone peering, cloud &amp; device</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scalable HTML5 players skill share</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards for HTTP adaptive streaming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00—2:00</td>
<td>Catered lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00—3:30</td>
<td>Popcorn.js plugin sprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robolawyers for the Open Web: DMCA automation and more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobile Content Neutrality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making the Map: logical, software &amp; standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Database Driven Narratives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards for Browser Video Playback Metrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30—5:00</td>
<td>The Rebecca Black Story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Making the Map: content &amp; distribution layer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral History Best Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Video Editors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00—5:30</td>
<td>Keynote: Marvin Ammori, Legal Fellow, New America Foundation Open Technology Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30—7:30</td>
<td>Showcase and beer — share your work from the weekend and relax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Innovate/Activate 2.0

The Information Society Project (ISP) supported the second Innovate/Activate conference at University of California, Berkeley.

Margot Kaminski, Executive Director of the ISP presented on the U.S Trade Representatives’ I.P. Policy.

Description: The Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) has been creating bad international IP law for years, as part of U.S. trade policy. Laws created by USTR stop the worldwide distribution of lifesaving medicines, and threaten civil liberties, both online and off. For example, USTR was the driving force behind the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement (ACTA), which is now being widely rejected in Europe. This panel will discuss USTR's latest round of bad international law.

Christina Mulligan, ISP Fellow, presented on Software Patents.

Description: Ever since the takedown of SOPA and PIPA, policy makers and others have been paying increased attention to technology policy. During the same time, the problems surrounding software patents -- thicket that hinder innovation and trolls who threaten suits, for example -- have grown. So what can we take from the SOPA fight to address these growing problems and bring the fight to software patents?

Nick Bramble, ISP Fellow and Law and Media Director, presented on Tech Policy Advocacy in Administrative Rulemaking.

Description: Outside of Washington, advocates frequently focus their intellectual property and technology policymaking efforts on various legislative and judicial arenas. Often overlooked, however, are important opportunities to shape IP and technology policy in rulemakings at federal administrative agencies like the USPTO, the Copyright Office, the FCC, and the FTC. We’ll highlight success stories from policy advocates who have navigated the complex landscape of federal rulemakings and returned to tell the tale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 AM</td>
<td>Registration / Breakfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 AM</td>
<td>Opening Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>Workshop Keynote - The Proactive Agenda: What Does It Look Like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 AM</td>
<td>Workshop Breakout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banatao Auditerium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 PM</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM</td>
<td>Lunch Keynote - Trademark Bullies, Transnational Boundaries, and Anti-Brand Activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Lunch Keynote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15 PM</td>
<td>Unconference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 PM</td>
<td>Conference Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Breakout Rooms**
- Room 250
- Room 254
- Room 240
- Room 630

**Workshop Sessions**
- Keeping It Global: Transnational Awareness and Organizing
- Checking the Gender Box: How Gender Matters in Tech Activism
- OER From the Core: Changing Institutional and Governmental IP Policies
- Workshop: Using Emerging Technologies / Platforms to Run a Campaign

**Other Sessions**
- USTR: WTF?
- Funding Online Activism
- How Online Activists Can / Should Protect Themselves from IP Threats
- Copyright Exceptions and Limitations for Education, Libraries, and Research
- Robolawyerling for the Open Interwebz
- The Taxonomy of the Perfect Test Case
Data Journalism Panel:
New Tools and New Challenges for Accessing Information

9:30 am - 3:30 pm
Friday, March 9
Room 122
Yale Law School

Register to attend:
www.datajournalism030912.eventbrite.com

Panel 1: Data Journalism Forms and Practices
Reginald Chua, Editor, Data and Innovation, Thomson Reuters
Amanda Cox, Graphics Editor, New York Times
Simon Ferrari, Video Game Designer and Doctoral Researcher in Digital Media, Georgia Institute of Technology
Katharine Jarmul, Lead Developer, Loud3r
Dafna Linzer, Senior Investigative Reporter, ProPublica

Panel 2: The Influence of Data on News Work
C.W. Anderson, Assistant Professor of Media Culture, College of Staten Island (CUNY)
Brian Boyer, News Applications Editor, Chicago Tribune
Hannah Fairfield, Graphics Director, Washington Post
Matt Stiles, Data Journalist, NPR
ACTIVITIES AND SPECIAL EVENTS
**Speaker Series**

**Speakers:**

**November 10**
Alexis Madrigal, Senior Editor at the Atlantic

“Journalism and Advocacy”

**December 8**
Brian Stelter, reporter at the New York Times

“Social Media and the Newsroom”

**January 27**
Susan Buckley, Partner at Cahill, Gordon & Reindell, LLP

"The Espionage Act and The Press: From The Pentagon Papers to Wikileaks."

**February 16**
Timothy B. Lee, a journalist at Ars Technica and an adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute

“How the Internet Is Transforming Journalism”

**April 4**
Irin Carmon, staff writer at Salon.com, where she focuses on reproductive rights, women, and politics.

A discussion on national controversies in reproductive rights and how they have been driven and shaped by the Internet, from progressive online news to social media
Thomson Reuters ISP Speaker Series
The Thomson Reuters ISP Speaker Series on Information Law and Information Policy hosts leading experts in the field of information law, speaking about their latest paper or projects. The series occurs weekly.

Fall 2011 Speaker Series

September 16

Wendy Seltzer, *Software Patents and/or Software Development*

September 26

Susan Freiwald, *Is Big Brother Tracking You: Location Data and Fourth Amendment Privacy*

September 30

Cherian George, *Singapore’s Suspended Spring: Media Control and Authoritarian Consolidation*

October 11

Daniel Solove, *Nothing to Hide: The False Tradeoff Between Privacy and Security*

October 21

Woody Hartzog, *The Case for Online Obscurity*

October 28

Damian Schofield, *Why Doesn’t it Look Like it Does on Television? The Presentation of Forensic Evidence Using Digital Technologies*
November 4
Christina Raasch, *The Option to Be Open and How It Increases Social Welfare*

November 11
Madhavi Sunder, *Technologies of Enlightenment: Upending Authority, from Common Sense to Google*

November 18
Sonia Katyal, *Contrabrand: Art, Advertising and Property in the Age of Corporate Identity*

December 2
Adrian Johns, *The Intellectual Property Defense Industry and the Crisis of Information*

December 9
Jeffrey Alexander, *Barack Obama and the Performance of Politics: The Campaigner and the President.*

Spring 2012 Speaker Series

February 3
Patricia Aufderheide, *Reclaiming Fair Use: How to Put Balance Back in Copyright*

February 10
Jason Mazzone, *Copyfraud and Other Abuses of Intellectual Property Law*

February 24
Adam Kolber, *Smooth and Bumpy Laws*
March 1
**Andrew Bridges**, *Copyright Law as Sausage: How It's Made and What's in It*

March 23
**Jennifer Keighley**, *Can You Handle the Truth? Compelled Commercial Speech and the First Amendment*

April 5
**Lina Srivastava**, *The Design of Narrative Platforms for Social Change*

April 20
**Dov Fox**, *Compelling Interest Specification and the State's Interest in Potential Life*

April 23
**Laura Handman**, *Destination Defamation: the Rise and Fall (?) of Libel Tourism*
YALE INFORMATION SOCIETY
PROJECT “IDEAS LUNCHES”

THOMSON REUTERS IDEAS LUNCHES

The ISP facilitates a series of “ideas lunches” that meet weekly. The ideas lunches consist of an informal gathering of students, fellows, and guest speakers to forge new ideas related to emerging issues in media law and technology. During this year (2011-2012), informal guest speakers led animated discourses on a wide range of subjects, including:

**Barton Beebe**, Professor, New York University Law School, on “Aesthetic Progress in Copyright”

**Prof. Anupam Chander**, Professor, University of California, Davis, on “IP and the Silicon Valley”

**John Collins**, Google, on “Cloud Computing”

**Betsy Cooper**, ISP Student Fellow, on “Robot Judges”

**Joanna Erdman**, ISP Fellow, on “Access to Safer-use Information”

**J. Alex Halderman**, Assistant Professor of Computer Science, University of Michigan, on “Internet Censorship”

**Eitan Hirsch**, Assistant Professor, Political Science, Yale University, on “Political Strategy and Databases”

**Paul Allen Levy**, Public Citizen, on “Trademark and Free Expression”

**Prof. R. John Williams**, Assistant Professor of English, Yale University, on “The History of the Book”

**Prof. Jed Rubinfeld** on “The Anonymity of the Streets”

**Tom Glaisyer**, Knight Media Policy Fellow at New America, on “Democracy and Media Models”
Prof. Ian Ayres on “Information Escrows”

Colin Agur, ISP Visiting Fellow, on the history of wiretapping

Prof. Christine Jolls on “Privacy and Prior Consent”

Dr. Nagla Rizk and journalist Lina Attalah on Egyptian FOI law

Irin Carmon of Salon on “Online Activism and New Media”

Becky Bolin on “Internet gambling”

Kate Fink on "Journalistic Sources in the Age of Digital News: a Study of Data-Driven Sourcing and its Effects on News Work Practices and Production."

Wendy Seltzer on “Privacy Options”

Anjali Dalal and Nick Bramble on the history and future of municipal broadband as a viable alternative to traditional broadband access models.

Christina Mulligan on “Tech Reg and Freedom of the Press Clause”

Margot Kaminski, Genevieve Scott on “Location Tracking”

Seeta Gangadharan on “Surveillance”

Cilla Smith and Jen Keighley on “Reproductive Rights”
ABRAMS INSTITUTE
FOR FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Speakers:

January 27
Susan Buckley

“The Espionage Act and the Press: From the Pentagon Papers to Wikileaks”

April 5
Lina Srivastava

“The Design of Narrative Platforms for Social Change”

April 23
Laura Handman

“Destination Defamation: the Rise and Fall (?) of Libel Tourism”

Events:

February 28
Interrogation After 9/11, Censorship, and Journalism

March 21
Page One Screening

March 30 – April 1
Global Censorship Conference
PROGRAM FOR THE STUDY OF REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE

Events:

April 12
A discussion on pro-choice and reproductive rights

April 13
Conference on First Amendment Issues in Regulating Reproduction

April 19
A discussion of whether Katniss from the Hunger Games is a feminist hero

Clinical:

Briefs:
Brief of Amici Curiae in Support of the Respondent United States v. Jones

Brief for Amicus Curiae in Support of Defendants-Appellants Evergreen Ass’n v. City of New York

Brief for Amicus Curie in support of the Petition Associate for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics

Journal Articles:
A symposium that brought together pro-choice litigators, academics, and city attorneys to examine First Amendment limitations on the state's ability to compel speech about reproductive health services. Compelled speech laws range from city ordinances that compel anti-choice crisis pregnancy centers to post signs disclosing what services they provide and whether they have medical professionals on staff, to laws requiring abortion providers to give patients information sometimes false -- designed to encourage them to carry their pregnancies to term, to laws that require abortion providers to perform, display, and describe the results of an ultrasound of the fetus.

10:00 - 11:45 am Panel 1
Compelled Ideological Speech or Truthful Dissuasion: The Case of Mandatory Physician Speech and Transvaginal Ultrasounds

Panelists:
Andy Beck, Staff Attorney, Reproductive Freedom Project, ACLU
Julie Rikelman, Litigation Director, Center for Reproductive Rights

Moderator:
Priscilla Smith, Senior Fellow, Program for the Study of Reproductive Justice in the ISP at Yale Law School
12:30 - 2:15pm Panel 2
Compelled Ideological Speech or Fraud Prevention: The Case of Mandatory Disclosures by Crisis Pregnancy Centers

Panelists:
- Erin Bernstein, Deputy City Attorney, City and County of San Francisco
- Suzanne Sangree, Chief Solicitor, City of Baltimore Law Department
- Stephanie Toti, Senior Staff Attorney, Center for Reproductive Rights

Moderator:
- Jennifer Keighley, Resident Fellow, Program for the Study of Reproductive Justice in the ISP at Yale Law School
FIRST AMENDMENT ISSUES in Regulating Reproduction

April 13, 2012
10 am - 2:30 pm
Room 129
Yale Law School
Lunch is provided

10:00 - 11:45am Panel 1
Compelled Ideological Speech or Truthful Dissuasion: The Case of Mandatory Physician Speech and Transvaginal Ultrasounds
Panelists:
Andy Beck, Staff Attorney, Reproductive Freedom Project, ACLU
Julie Rikelman, Litigation Director, Center for Reproductive Rights
Moderator:
Pricilla Smith, Senior Fellow, Program for the Study of Reproductive Justice in the ISP at Yale Law School

12:30 - 2:15pm Panel 2
Compelled Ideological Speech or Fraud Prevention: The Case of Mandatory Disclosures by Crisis Pregnancy Centers
Panelists:
Erin Bernstein, Deputy City Attorney, City and County of San Francisco
Suzanne Sangree, Chief Solicitor, City of Baltimore Law Department
Stephanie Toto, Senior Staff Attorney, Center for Reproductive Rights
Moderator:
Jennifer Keighley, Resident Fellow, Program for the Study of Reproductive Justice in the ISP at Yale Law School
What does antitrust law mean under the Obama Administration?

The AT&T/T-Mobile merger, spectrum, and competition in mobile wireless infrastructure

Thursday, December 1, 2011
2:30 - 4:30 p.m.

Yale Law School • Room 124

Panelists:
Susan Crawford, Cardozo Law School
Harold Feld, Public Knowledge
Harold Furchtgott-Roth, former FCC Commissioner
Jonathan Akin, Brooklyn Law School

Moderator:
Nicholas Bramble, Yale Law School
Gene Patents: Advancing Medicine or Capturing Humanity?

12:00 - 2:00 pm
Tuesday, February 14
Room 129
Yale Law School

Lunch will be served

Panelists:
Chris Hansen, Staff Attorney, ACLU
Richard Marsh, General Counsel, Myriad Genetics
Rochelle Dreyfuss, Pauline Newman Professor of Law, NYU
Dr. Allen Bale, Director of the DNA Diagnostic Lab and Professor of Genetics, Yale School of Medicine

Moderator:
Bryan Choi, Thomson Reuters ISP Fellow, Yale Law School
The Media Freedom and Information Access Clinic
and Information Society Project at Yale Law School

Present:

**FOIA Boot Camp**

Interested in:

- Government Transparency?
- Researching Administrative Law?
- Boosting your clinic case with more evidence?
- Supporting the role of the press in a healthy democracy?
- Finding out what records the government is holding on "you"?

**Speakers Include:**

- Harry Hammitt
  Federal FOIA Expert
  Editor, Access Reports
- Colleen Murphy
  Executive Director and General Counsel of the CT
  Freedom of Information Commission (FOIC)

**Monday, Feb. 6, 2012**

6:10 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

Room 122

Dinner Provided
Get Scanned, Get Canned: Deception Detection and Neuroscience Technology Outside the Courtroom

2:00 - 4:00 pm  
Friday, February 24  
Room 120  
Yale Law School

Panelists:  
Owen D. Jones, New York Alumni Chancellor’s Professor of Law and Professor of Biological Sciences at Vanderbilt University  
Adam Kolber, Professor of Law, Brooklyn Law School, Visiting Fellow, NYU School of Law  
John Meixner, JD/PhD Candidate, Northwestern University

Moderator:  
Bradley Moore, ISP Visiting Fellow, Yale Law School
Interrogation After 9/11, Censorship, and Journalism

4 - 6 pm
Tuesday, February 28
Room 120
Yale Law School

Panelists:
Daniel Freedman, Director of Strategy and Policy Analysis of The Soufan Group; co-author of “The Black Banners: The Inside Story of 9/11 and the War Against al Qaeda”
Ali Soufan, former FBI Supervisory Agent; co-author of “The Black Banners: The Inside Story of 9/11 and the War Against al Qaeda”
Andrew Weissmann, General Counsel, FBI
Charles Savage, Washington correspondent, New York Times

Moderator:
Nicholas Bramble, Director of the Law and Media Program at the Information Society Project, Yale Law School
Asha Rangappa, Associate Dean, Yale Law School
PRESENTS

MOVIE NIGHT

Magnolia Films’

PAGE ONE:
INSIDE THE NEW YORK TIMES

Directed by
Andrew Rossi
YC’95

Produced and
Written by
Kate Novack and
Andrew Rossi

WEDNESDAY
MARCH 21, 2012
6:10 PM
ROOM 127

YALE LAW SCHOOL
The Information Society Project
Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act

Monday, April 9
12:30 - 2:00 pm
YLS Room 120
Lunch is provided

PANEL:
What’s the future of children’s online privacy?

Panelists:

Emily Bazelon, Senior Editor at Slate, Senior Research Scholar in Law, Lecturer in Law, and Truman Capote Fellow for Creative Writing and Law at Yale Law School

Danah Boyd, Assistant Professor at Media, Culture, and Communication at New York University, Visiting Researcher at Harvard Law School and Fellow at Harvard’s Berkman Center. Co-author of Hanging Out, Messing Around, and Geeking Out: Kids Living and Learning with New Media

Elizabeth K. Englander, Professor of Psychology at Bridgewater State University (MA)

Mary Engle, Associate Director for Advertising Practices, Federal Trade Commission (FTC)
Spying on Students: NYPD Monitoring of Muslim Students Associations

Thursday, 12 April 2012
Noon - LUNCH
Room 120
Yale Law School

Please join us for a lunch panel discussion on the legal, ethical, and practical implications of the recent disclosure of NYPD monitoring of Muslim Students Associations including that at Yale, with:

Moderator:
Hope Metcalf, Associate Research Scholar in Law; Director, Arthur Liman Program; and Clinical Lecturer in Law at YLS.

Panelists:
Boher Azmy, Professor at Seton Hall Law School and current Legal Director of the Center for Constitutional Rights.

Jack Balkin, Knight Professor of Constitutional Law and the First Amendment at Yale Law School. Founder and director of the Information Society Project.

Nusrat Choudhury, Staff Attorney in the ACLU’s National Security Project.

Dean Esserman, Chief of Police of New Haven and Clinical Visiting Lecturer in Law at Yale Law School.

Vegetarian (non-pizza) lunch will be served. Open to the Yale Community.

Sponsored by the Muslim Law Students Association and the Information Society Project at Yale Law School
Summary of Visual Law Project Year Two - 2011-2012

During the academic year, five students and two teaching fellows filmed and edited *The Worst of the Worst*, a one-hour documentary film on Northern Correctional Institute, the super maximum security prison in Connecticut. The group met weekly to learn the building blocks of film production and visual advocacy and put these skills to work during more than twenty days of filming on location with former inmates, correctional officers, family members, and Department of Correction officials. In addition to interviewing, filming, producing, and editing, students wrote legal memos and met with a number of noted lawyers and filmmakers during the Fall semester. The group released a trailer for the film in April and is currently working with a team of professional animators and composers to prepare a full-length version for distribution in Fall 2012.


Partnerships and Outreach:
The Visual Law Project worked with the Human Rights and Detention Clinic to develop the topic for this year's film. The Project led a panel discussion on visual advocacy for the 2012 Reblaw Conference at Yale and participated in discussion about solitary confinement and Supermax prison with the Liman Colloquium. We distributed our two previous films, *Stigma* and *Alienation*, on our Web site and continued to work with the Digital Media Center for the Arts, who provided technical support and trainings.

Vision:
In preparation for our third year, we are exploring collaboration with a prominent human rights organization and continued guidance from Yale Law School faculty and clinics to produce our next film. We will also lead a second team devoted to distribution and advocacy supporting *The Worst of the Worst*. 
Harvard-MIT-Yale-Columbia Cyberscholar Working Group

The “Harvard-MIT-Yale-Columbia Cyberscholar Working Group” is a forum for fellows and affiliates of the Comparative Media Studies Program at MIT, Yale Law School Information Society Project, and the Berkman Center for Internet & Society at Harvard University to discuss their ongoing research.

**Nov 10 Berkman Center, Harvard**

Empower Public Sphere with ICTs--A Chinese Perspective  
Jia Wang

**Dec 7 at Yale Law School**

Murray Turoff and the Evolution of Computer Mediated Communication  
Ramesh Subramanian

**Feb 1, 2012 at Berkman Center, Harvard**

Transparency with(out) Accountability: The Effects of the Internet on the Administrative State  
Jennifer Shkabatur

**Feb 28, 2012 at MIT**

Digital commons: How does governance shape collaborative communities (in term of scale of participation and complexity of collaboration)?  
Mayo Fuster Morell

The Hacker as Media Metaphor: Policy Effects of the Media Portrayals of Hackers and Hacktivists  
Molly Sauter
MARCH 27, 2012 AT COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

"The Future Criminal Investigation in the Digital Age"
Harris Chen

"Traditional Knowledge – Culture Expression and Access to Knowledge: The Open Questions"
Shlomit Yanisky-Ravid

"Comparing Management-Based Regulation and Prescriptive Legislation: How to Improve Information Security through Regulation"
David Thaw

"Analyzing Russian Social Media"
John Kelly

MAY 2, 2012 YALE LAW SCHOOL

"Incitement to Riot in the age of Flash Mobs"
Margot Kaminski

"Innovation in Online Gambling"
Rebecca Bolin

“Beyond ‘digital literacy’ there is Cybercy: what does this new concept index?”
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CLINICAL ACTIVITIES
Yale Law School has long focused on the intersection of law, media and journalism. The Media Freedom and Information Access Practicum is a team of student practitioners dedicated to increasing government transparency and supporting both traditional and emerging forms of newsgathering through impact litigation and policy work.

**News:**
In its short life, MFIA has garnered an impressive string of victories for journalists and on behalf of the public interest at both the state and federal levels. Among its several successes:


- MFIA won a unanimous decision from the Connecticut Freedom of Information Commission requiring the release of police mug shots and declaring void a police policy restricting access to such material.

- The Clinic has filed several amicus briefs on hotly contested access issues. These have included arguments supporting the right of public access to administrative hearings, the importance of public access to information related to the operation of state prisons, and in support of anonymous speech online.

- The Clinic hosted the FOIA Boot Camp where several speakers gave a crash course on filing and working with Freedom of Information Access briefs.
MFIA Clinic Press Release:

Tomorrow, April 5, 2012, the Media Freedom and Information Access Clinic (MFIA) will be in the First Circuit arguing an exciting case about the public’s right of access to court proceedings and judicial documents. MFIA is representing Jim Edwards, an award-winning journalist for Bnet.com. Edwards requests that the First Circuit unseal numerous judicial documents in a criminal case—documents to which the public has a qualified right of access under both the First Amendment and the common law.

The release of these documents is necessary for the public to understand the surprising outcome of this criminal case. Two defendants were convicted of multiple counts of mail fraud in connection with an advertising kickback scheme; despite recommended sentences of several years in jail, both walked away with probation. These dramatically reduced sentences can be attributed to what the defendants argued in sentencing memoranda and other documents filed with the court—documents which have been sealed and which the public has no way of accessing at present.

To help the public understand what happened in this case, Jim Edwards asked the District Court of Massachusetts, on three separate occasions, to unseal the documents. Sixteen months later, the district judge responded with a two-sentence order refusing to unseal the documents on the grounds that they were “personal.” This judge’s actions, and the judicial secrecy of this case in general, undermine the public’s well-established right to enter courtrooms and access judicial documents. In many circumstances, this right provides the only public oversight mechanism for our judicial system.
Now on appeal in the First Circuit, Edwards repeats his request that the court unseal the documents at issue. Edwards and the MFIA team also seek to remind judges that, under Supreme Court precedent, sealing documents is an exceptional measure requiring particularized, on-the-record findings as to why a private party’s interest in secrecy outweighs the public’s presumptive right of access. Jeremy Kutner, a MFIA Student Director, will be arguing on behalf of Jim Edwards.
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INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

Amici include Yale Law School Information Society Project scholars, the New America Foundation, and Professor Monroe Price, a First Amendment and media scholar.2

The Information Society Project at Yale Law School (ISP) is an intellectual center addressing the implications of new information technologies for law and society. Marvin Ammori, a Visiting Scholar at Stanford Law School and an Affiliated Fellow of the Yale ISP, publishes in First Amendment and Internet policy. Nicholas Bramble, a Lecturer in Law at Yale Law School and Director of the Law and Media Program at the Yale Law School ISP, has written articles on First Amendment law and information policy.

---

1 No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no person or entity other than amici and their counsel made any monetary contribution toward the preparation or submission of this brief. Counsel for the respondents, on June 28, 2011, June 29, 2011, and July 1, 2011, and counsel for the petitioners, on July 8, 2011, have filed in this Court consent to the filing of amicus curiae briefs in support of either party or of neither party in fulfillment of S. Ct. Rule 37.3. This brief was written by Nicholas Bramble, Lecturer in Law at Yale Law School and Director of the Law and Media Program at the Information Society Project at Yale Law School, under the supervision of the undersigned Senior Fellow of the ISP, Friscilla Smith. Portions of this brief are derived from a brief written by Marvin Ammori and submitted to the Court in FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc., 556 U.S. ___, 129 S. Ct. 1800 (2009).

2 The amici participate in this case in their personal capacity; titles are used only for purposes of identification.
The New America Foundation is a nonprofit, nonpartisan public policy institute that invests in new thinkers and new ideas to address the next generation of challenges facing the United States. One of its major projects is the Wireless Future Project, which develops and advocates policy proposals to promote universal, affordable and ubiquitous broadband and improve the public's access to critical wireless communication technologies.

Monroe Price, now a professor at the University of Pennsylvania's Annenberg School for Communication, was dean of Cardozo School of Law from 1982 to 1991. He is the author of several books on free speech and new media.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

This case rests on a fairly narrow question concerning the constitutionality of broadcasting regulations designed to suppress and censor indecent speech. However, parties on both sides of this case have argued that this Court, in addressing such indecency regulations, should consider a much broader set of constitutional rationales for spectrum regulation. Broadcasters explicitly suggest that the "scarcity rationale" is properly before the Court. Amici submit this brief in support of neither party to stress that this overreaching is both unnecessary and unwise.
First, this Court's decision in *FCC v. Pacifica*\(^3\) squarely addresses the constitutionality of indecency regulations and does not rely on the scarcity rationale. The Court can and should review the continuing vitality of *Pacifica* without questioning other lines of this Court's precedent wholly unrelated to indecency regulation. Simply put, the scarcity rationale associated with *Red Lion v. FCC*,\(^4\) *NBC v. United States*,\(^5\) *FCC v. Nat'l Citizens Comm. for Broad.*,\(^6\) and *CBS v. FCC*\(^7\) is wholly irrelevant to this case. The Court should follow its prudential rule of avoiding constitutional questions irrelevant to the case or controversy before this Court and merely address the indecency issue actually before the Court.

Moreover, a dispute over broadcasting indecency regulations offers an extremely ill-suited forum for revisiting the scarcity rationale and needlessly hurling into doctrinal chaos all of the spectrum policy that rationale supports. This rationale has never been invoked as a basis for indecency regulation. Indeed, Justice Brennan's dissent in *Pacifica* commends the majority, with which he disagrees, for understanding that the scarcity rationale is not relevant to indecency regulation. Nothing in the scarcity rationale underpinning *Red


\(^5\) 319 U.S. 190 (1943).


\(^7\) 453 U.S. 357 (1981).
Lion. NBC v. U.S., and other Court precedents justifies governmental decisions to engage in censorship or suppression of certain viewpoints.

Casting doubt on the scarcity rationale would inject uncertainty into a wide variety of actions that the government adopted by government in reliance on that rationale. These actions, many of which have been upheld by this Court, include imposing ownership limits and universal service obligations, promoting diverse uses of spectrum, experimenting with the limited authorization of unlicensed spectrum usage, implementing new economic models for the allocation of spectrum, providing equal time for political candidates, and so on. These laws generally attempt to broaden access to spectrum rights for more speakers, and are easily distinguishable from the suppression of speech evident in indecency regulations. It is for this reason, in fact, that this Court has clearly held that indecency regulations do not rely on the scarcity rationale implicated by these other governmental decisions.

The scarcity rationale forms the backdrop for all spectrum regulation, from television broadcasting to mobile Internet services. It suggests that because there are constraints on the availability and simultaneous usage of spectrum, the government must play a role in allocating rights to this spectrum, and the government may pursue allocations that ensure the widest availability of diverse and antagonistic sources of speech. Compared to other justifications for First Amendment scrutiny of spectrum licensing decisions, the scarcity rationale provides greater leeway for governmental decisions
to promote nondiscriminatory, universal access to diverse sources of speech.

While scarcity was a rationale in the Red Lion decision, which upheld a fairness doctrine repealed almost 25 years ago, many other decisions also rely on scarcity. For example, the government is currently seeking to auction billions of dollars of spectrum both to address debt obligations and to transfer more spectrum from older technologies like broadcast television to modern technologies including mobile Internet access. When the government seeks to auction this spectrum, it will decide among a range of auction mechanisms (possibly including two-sided auctions with broadcasters) and will impose rules ranging from nondiscrimination rules to build-out and service obligations. Such decisions enable spectrum to be used widely and effectively for a range of purposes. Without the scarcity rationale, these speech-focused government regulations might be subject to intrusive judicial second-guessing.

Even though, under this Court’s precedent, indecency regulation does not implicate the scarcity rationale at all, several parties before the Court use this appeal of an indecency order to argue that the scarcity rationale for limiting judicial scrutiny of spectrum allocations has faded in importance. But a case concerning indecency regulations presents a dangerously underdeveloped vehicle for evaluating, questioning, or updating the rationales underlying spectrum regulation. Given that scarcity currently serves as the primary justification for the government’s attempts to allocate spectrum and balance the claims of competing users, any effort by
the Court to evaluate this rationale requires more consideration than passing references in this case's briefs could ever provide.

Evaluation of this rationale should occur in the context of a proceeding that actually relies upon the scarcity rationale. Such a proceeding would offer the opportunity for greater analysis of the factual predicates for this rationale, and would give parties the chance to describe alternative rationales upon which the government might rely in allocating and structuring spectrum usage.

ARGUMENT

Amici caution the Court not to undermine the continuing vitality of the scarcity rationale underlying Red Lion v. FCC, NBC v. United States, FCC v. Nat'l Citizens Comm. for Broad., and CBS v. FCC when determining whether the Federal Communications Commission's context-based approach to determining indecency is unconstitutionally vague. The Court may wish to extend its analysis beyond vagueness in order to examine prior justifications for limiting the degree of First Amendment scrutiny applied to broadcasting indecency regulations. But in evaluating the broader constitutionality of indecency regulations, which have heretofore been justified solely by the pervasiveness of broadcasting, its intrusive nature, and its accessibility to children, the Court need not examine the rationales underlying other broadcast decisions.
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INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

Amici are scholars specializing in privacy and technology law, and scholars associated with the Information Society Project at Yale Law School (ISP), an intellectual center addressing the implications of new information technologies for law and society. They are: Danielle Citron, Lois K. Macht Research Professor of Law at the University of Maryland School of Law, an expert in information privacy law, former Chairperson for the AALS Section on Defamation and Privacy, and current Advisory Board Member for the SSRN Journal on Information Privacy Law; Susan Freiwald, Professor of Law at the University of San Francisco School of Law, an expert in cyberspace and information privacy law, and author of numerous articles and briefs about regulation of modern communications surveillance; Stephen Henderson, Professor of Law at the University of Oklahoma College of Law who writes and lectures on criminal procedure and computer crime, and serves as Reporter for the ABA Criminal Justice Standards on Law Enforcement Access to Third Party Records; Chris Hoofnagle, Director of the Berkeley Center for Law & Technology’s information privacy programs, senior fellow to the Samuelson Law, Technology & Public Policy Clinic, and Lecturer in

---

1 No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no person or entity other than amici and their counsel made any monetary contribution toward the preparation or submission of this brief. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 37.3, letters indicating the parties' consent to the filing of this amicus brief have been submitted to the Clerk.

2 The Fellows participate in this case in their personal capacity; titles are used only for purposes of identification.
Residence at UC Berkeley Law School; Renee Hutchins, Associate Professor of Law at University of Maryland School of Law, an expert in criminal procedure, who writes on the use of GPS surveillance technology, formerly served as a federal prosecutor with the U.S. Department of Justice and a Special Assistant U.S. Attorney in the District of Columbia; Helen Nissenbaum, Professor of Media, Culture, Communication & Computer Science at New York University, Senior Faculty Fellow at the Information Law Institute, and author of Privacy in Context: Technology, Policy and the Integrity of Social Life (Stan. Univ. Press 2009); Paul Ohm, Associate Professor of Law at the University of Colorado Law School who writes in the areas of information privacy, computer crime, and criminal procedure; Christopher Slobogin, Milton R. Underwood Chair in Law, Professor of Psychiatry and Director of the Criminal Justice Program at Vanderbilt Law School, author of over 100 articles, books and chapters on criminal procedure and evidence; Robert Ellis Smith, publisher of Privacy Journal since 1974 and author of "The Law of Privacy Explained" (2004); Daniel Solove, John Marshall Harlan Research Professor of Law at George Washington University Law School, an expert in privacy law and author of many books and articles on privacy, including Information Privacy Law (Aspen, 3rd edition 2009) and Understanding Privacy (Harv. Univ. Press 2008); and William Staples, Professor and Chair of Sociology at the University of Kansas, who writes on surveillance studies, privacy, law, and historical sociology.
Amici scholars associated with the ISP are Jack Balkin, Knight Professor of Constitutional Law and the First Amendment and founder and director of the ISP; Margot Kaminski, Research Scholar in Law and Executive Director of the ISP, who has written on law and technology issues; Nabiha Syed, currently First Amendment Fellow at the New York Times; David Thaw, Postdoctoral Research Associate in the Department of Computer Science at the University of Maryland, who has published on issues related to information security, privacy and spyware; and Albert Wong, ISP Fellow and Ph.D. candidate at Yale University, who has published multiple peer-reviewed articles in engineering and biology.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Advanced surveillance technologies significantly enhance law enforcement’s ability to maintain order and public safety. However, in an era of rapidly advancing technologies, from thermal imagers to automated tracking devices, it is critical to ensure that these technologies are used only “in a manner which will conserve ... the interests and rights of individual citizens,” Kyllo v. United States, 533 U.S. 27, 40 (2001) (internal citation omitted), and conform to the Fourth Amendment. In most cases, “requiring a warrant will have the salutary effect of ensuring that use of [new technology] is not abused.” See United States v. Karo, 468 U.S. 705, 717 (1984). The

---

5 Fellows of the Information Society Project at Yale Law School, Nabiha Syed, Albert Wong, and David Thaw, helped to prepare this brief under the supervision of Priscilla Smith, Senior Fellow of the ISP.
panel below correctly recognized that Global Positioning System ("GPS") surveillance technology used for prolonged surveillance of a target's activities in public should be subject to the warrant requirement.

The Fourth Amendment's warrant requirement applies to a surveillance technology used in public if the technology: 1) extends beyond human capabilities for surveillance, increasing the potential for surveillance abuse; and 2) collects information the public expects to be private in a way that is not generally used and/or accepted by the general public.

In this case, first, surveillance with GPS is conducted not by people but by advanced tracking devices communicating with satellites in orbit and computers on the ground. As a technological substitute for traditional visual tracking, it substantially expands human capabilities far beyond "naked-eye" surveillance and vastly increases the potential for law enforcement abuse of GPS technology to conduct prolonged surveillance both against individuals as well as groups of individuals.

Second, prolonged surveillance using GPS technology intrudes on reasonable expectations of privacy under this Court’s precedents and according to tests suggested by scholarship. It provides the government with detailed information about an individual’s movements, associations, contacts and activities, allowing the storage, analysis, and comparison of that data with data gathered from others, all with minimal involvement of law

---

4 See Kyllo, 533 U.S. at 33.
enforcement officers. As the panel correctly held, the type and scope of information collected enables government to monitor people’s political associations, their medical treatment, and their amorous liaisons, in a way that invades their privacy and chills expression of other fundamental rights. It allows surveillance of citizens on a scale that this country has never seen and in a way that the general public has rejected.  

United States v. Knotts, relied on by the Government, is limited to the use of beeper technology as a sense-enhancement of, not a replacement for, “naked-eye” surveillance. This Court has always required warrants for the use of privacy-invading technologies that replace human or other natural senses with technological ones. Moreover, in Knotts this Court reserved the question of twenty-four hour dragnet surveillance using powerful new technologies.

This Court should affirm the decision of the Court of Appeals, and clarify that, while law enforcement

---

5 United States v. Pineda-Moreno, 617 F.3d 1120, 1123 (9th Cir. 2010) (Kozinski, C.J., dissenting from denial of rehearing en banc) (making comparison to surveillance under totalitarian regime); United States v. Cuevas-Perez, 640 F.3d 272, 284 (1st Cir. 2011) (Woods, J., dissenting) (GPS surveillance invites “an unprecedented level of government intrusion into every person’s private life.”).
7 Compare Knotts, 460 U.S. at 282 with Karo, 468 U.S. at 714-15.
9 See United States v. Maynard, 615 F.3d 544 (D.C. Cir. 2010).
may employ GPS tracking devices in their efforts to enhance public safety, use of GPS technology in this case required a warrant to “assure preservation of that degree of privacy against government that existed when the Fourth Amendment was adopted.”

---

10 See Kyllo, 533 U.S. at 34.
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INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

Amici are scholars with the Information Society Project at Yale Law School (ISP), an intellectual center addressing the implications of new information technologies for law and society: Wendy Seltzer, a Senior Fellow at the ISP, writes on law and technology of free expression and user innovation, including digital copyright, software patent, and information privacy. She founded and leads the Chilling Effects Clearinghouse, exploring legal threats to online expression at https://www.chillingeffects.org/; Margot Kaminski, Research Scholar in Law and Executive Director of the ISP, writes on privacy, information politics and First Amendment issues; Priscilla Smith, Senior Fellow of the ISP, Jennifer Keighley, Resident Fellow of the ISP, and Genevieve Scott, Visiting Fellow of the ISP, research and write on reproductive rights, with a particular focus on information policy and new technologies.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

As this Court has explained clearly, the grant of a patent is a narrowly tailored exception to our free market system, a “carefully crafted bargain”

---

1 No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no person or entity other than amici and their counsel made any monetary contribution toward the preparation or submission of this brief. Pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 37.3, an email indicating the Respondent’s consent to the filing of this amicus brief has been submitted to the Clerk. The Petitioners filed a consent to the filing of amicus curiae briefs with the Court on December 15, 2011.

2 The Fellows participate in this case in their personal capacity; titles are used only for purposes of identification.
designed to strike a balance between the avoidance of monopolies that stifle competition and the need to encourage innovation. *Bonito Boats, Inc. v. Thunder Craft Boats*, 489 U.S. 141, 146 (1989).

In this brief, *Amici* argue, first, that the Court should grant the Petition because Myriad’s monopoly on the information contained in Breast Cancer Susceptibility Genes 1 and 2 (hereafter “BRCA 1/2”) undermines the careful balance struck by the patent rules. The evidence establishes that by limiting research on the BRCA 1/2 genes, and in the field of genetics more broadly, Myriad’s patents stifle innovation and prevent information about natural phenomenon from being used in research to improve diagnosis and treatment of deadly diseases.

Second, *Amici* argue that this Court should grant the Petition to closely examine these patents, which harm public health and undermine the exercise of fundamental rights. Myriad’s patents create significant health risks for women, limit access to life-saving information about naturally occurring aspects of their own genomes, thereby undermining

---

8 BRCA1 and BRCA2 "belong to a class of genes known as tumor suppressors. Mutation of these genes has been linked to hereditary breast and ovarian cancer." National Cancer Institute Fact Sheets, *BRCA1 and BRCA2: Cancer Risk and Genetic Testing*, (Mar. 29, 2009), http://www.cancer.gov/cancertopics/factsheet/Risk/B RCA.

their liberty rights to decisional autonomy, bodily integrity, and procreation.
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STATEMENT OF FACTS

Local Law 17 of 2011 ("the Ordinance") regulates facilities it dubs "pregnancy service centers" (hereinafter "PSCs"), that have a primary purpose of providing services to women who are or may be pregnant, and that either (1) offer obstetric ultrasounds, sonograms, or prenatal care, or (2) have "the appearance of a licensed medical facility." N.Y.C. Admin. Code § 20-815(g). The Ordinance lists six factors that courts should consider in evaluating whether a PSC has "the appearance of a licensed medical facility," the presence of any two of which constitutes prima facie evidence that it does. Id. The law exempts from its coverage any facility that is actually licensed to provide medical care, or has a licensed medical provider present to provide or supervise the provision of services. Id. Thus, the law only targets facilities that offer medical services or otherwise appear to the consumer to be a medical facility, but have no licensed medical provider on staff, thus creating a likelihood of consumer deception.

The Ordinance requires PSCs to make three factual disclosures: 1) that the PSC does not have a licensed medical provider on staff; 2) that the NYC Department of Health encourages women who are or may be pregnant

---

4 Prenatal care is defined in medical terms: "services consisting of physical examination, pelvic examination or clinical laboratory services provided to a woman during pregnancy," N.Y.C. Admin. Code § 20-815(i).
to consult with a licensed medical provider; and 3) whether the PSC provides or refers for abortions, emergency contraception, and prenatal care. N.Y.C. Admin. Code § 20-816(a)-(e). These disclosures must be made 1) on any advertisements for the PSC’s services; 2) on one sign at the PSC’s entrance, and one sign inside the PSC’s waiting area; and 3) orally, but only upon the request for prenatal care, emergency contraception, or abortion services. Id. at § 20-816(f). The Ordinance does not ban any speech or prevent the facilities from disassociating themselves from or commenting on the disclosures.

Given the evidence of the deceptive tactics used by the PSCs, see Appellants’ Brief 14-24, and the resulting harm to consumers, the City Council concluded that the Ordinance’s factual disclosure requirements were a necessary measure to curtail PSCs’ ongoing practice of defrauding and deceiving women seeking time-sensitive medical care.

**SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

The district court erred in applying strict scrutiny to strike down the Ordinance for two reasons. First, the court erred in determining that the regulated speech was not commercial. It ignored Supreme Court precedent requiring the court to evaluate the nature of regulated speech in its entirety, taking into account the point of view of the consumer and the impact of the
speech on her economic interests. *Cent. Hudson Gas & Elec. Corp. v. Pub. Serv. Comm’n*, 447 U.S. 557, 567 (1980). Facilities that offer medical services or hold themselves out as medical facilities to consumers in the marketplace – the only facilities to which the Ordinance applies – can not evade commercial speech doctrine and insulate themselves from reasonable fraud prevention efforts simply by offering services to consumers free of charge. Speech that solicits clients for the PSCs, advertises PSCs, and offers medical services qualifies as commercial speech, even if women do not have to pay to receive services, because it targets them as consumers by offering them free services for which they otherwise would pay. Just as religious speech is not commercialized by the mere solicitation of funds, *Jamison v. Texas*, 318 U.S. 413, 417 (1943) (speech “in pursuit of a clearly religious activity” not commercial, even where money solicited), the free nature of the services provided by PSCs does not automatically make their speech non-commercial. If a reasonable consumer would understand the solicitation as proposing a commercial transaction, including a free substitute for a traditionally commercial transaction, then it can be regulated as consumer speech.

Reasonable regulations of commercial speech are permissible because governments have a valid interest in preventing the deception of consumers
and ensuring the dissemination of truthful, non-misleading information. The First Amendment does not prevent New York City from imposing the Ordinance's narrow factual disclosure requirements to prevent fraud and protect the health of city residents, all without burdening any constitutionally-protected speech, merely because these facilities are able to bankroll the provision of services to unsuspecting consumers. The Ordinance, which seeks solely to inform women about the non-medical and limited nature of the services provided by PSCs, is a reasonable factual disclosure law designed to prevent consumer deception. Any ruling to the contrary would undermine the purpose of the commercial speech doctrine, which is to protect consumers from inaccurate speech in the marketplace.

Second, even if the commercial speech doctrine did not apply, this Court should nonetheless uphold the Ordinance under a lower level of scrutiny\(^5\) because these factual disclosure requirements target only fraudulent or illegal speech that is not protected by the First Amendment. The Ordinance does not interfere with protected speech of any kind. It applies only to facilities offering medical services to consumers or otherwise appearing to consumers to be medical facilities, and compels them to set the

\(^5\) We agree with Appellants that the Ordinance withstands strict scrutiny, see Appellants' Brief 70-79, but contend that a lower level of scrutiny is appropriate.
record straight by informing potential visitors they are not licensed medical facilities and do not offer a full range of reproductive medical services.
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