

1 AARON S. DYER (State Bar No. 161798)
aaron.dyer@pillsburylaw.com
2 LAUREN M. LEAHY (State Bar No. 260651)
lauren.leahy@pillsburylaw.com
3 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
4 Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
5 Facsimile: (213) 629-1033

6 CINDY A. COHN (State Bar No. 145997)
cindy@eff.org
7 LEE TIEN (State Bar No. 148216)
tien@eff.org
8 MATT ZIMMERMAN (State Bar No. 212423)
mattz@eff.org
9 MARCIA HOFMANN (State Bar No. 250087)
marcia@eff.org
10 ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
454 Shotwell Street
11 San Francisco, CA 94110
Telephone: (415) 436-9333 x108
12 Facsimile: (415) 436-9993

13 Attorneys for Petitioner

14

15

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16

17

18 IN RE MATTER OF NATIONAL
SECURITY LETTER ISSUED TO

No. _____

19

PETITION OF PLAINTIFF _____

20

_____ TO SET ASIDE

21

NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER
AND NONDISCLOSURE
REQUIREMENT IMPOSED IN
CONNECTION THEREWITH;
22)
23) MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
24) AUTHORITIES

22

23

24

25

DOCUMENT SUBMITTED UNDER
SEAL

26

27

28

Case No. _____ PETITION TO SET ASIDE NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER
AND NONDISCLOSURE REQUIRMENT

702975909v1

1 PETITION

2 Petitioner [REDACTED] or
3 "Petitioner") has received a National Security Letter ("NSL") issued by the Federal Bureau of
4 Investigation ("FBI") demanding certain [REDACTED] records in the Petitioner's possession pursuant
5 to 18 U.S.C. § 2709, and prohibiting Petitioner from disclosing the existence of the demand to its
6 [REDACTED] or the public pursuant to sections 2709(c)(1) and (c)(2).

7 Petitioner hereby petitions the Court under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3511(a) and (b) for an order
8 setting aside both the NSL and the nondisclosure requirement imposed in connection with the
9 NSL on the following legal grounds, as explained further in the accompanying Memorandum of
10 Points and Authorities, which is incorporated herein by this reference:

11 1. The nondisclosure provisions of the NSL statute constitute unconstitutional prior
12 restraints in at least three ways:

13 (a) The statute fails the *Pentagon Papers* test for national security prior
14 restraints, which requires that disclosure of information will "surely result in direct, immediate
15 and irreparable harm to our nation or its people."

16 (b) The statute fails the procedural requirements for prior restraints first
17 articulated in *Freedman v. Maryland* by allowing restraints in the absence of court approval and
18 by failing to limit the time of the restraints.

19 (c) The nondisclosure provision of the statute fails the requirement of
20 "narrow, objective and definite standards" cabining executive discretion as required by cases
21 such as *Shuttlesworth v. City of Birmingham*.

22 2. The nondisclosure provisions of the NSL statute violate separation of powers by
23 preventing reviewing courts from applying the appropriate level of review mandated by the First
24 Amendment and by binding a court to treat an FBI certification of harm as "conclusive."

25 3. The statute as a whole, both substantively and in its non-disclosure provision, is a
26 content-based restriction on speech that fails strict scrutiny in at least three ways:
27
28

1 (a) The substantive standards for issuing NSLs fail strict scrutiny both as to
2 [redacted] itself and as to its [redacted] because it is not narrowly tailored.
3 (b) The non-disclosure provision fails strict scrutiny because it is not narrowly
4 tailored and because it authorizes overly long prior restraints.
5 (c) The judicial review provision of the statute fails strict scrutiny because it
6 limits judicial review and excludes [redacted] from meaningful participation in judicial review,
7 unconstitutionally seeking to insulate the NSL from legitimate judicial challenge in violation of
8 *Legal Services Corp. v. Velasquez*.

9 4. The NSL statute violates the anonymous speech and associational rights of
10 Americans by requiring identification of [redacted] without meeting the
11 First Amendment tests. on its face violates the associational rights of Americans.

12 5. Even if the statute survives constitutional scrutiny, the government must meet its
13 heavy burden to demonstrate, rather than simply assert, that its request is relevant to an
14 authorized investigation of the type listed, that disclosure would risk an enumerated harm and
15 that the investigation is not solely based on activities protected by the First Amendment.

16 DATED: May 2, 2011
17 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
18 AARON S. DYER
19 LAUREN M. LEAHY

20 By Aaron S. Dyer by Krista Fenderson Falk
21 Aaron S. Dyer Bar No. 179814

22 Cindy A. Cohn
23 Lee Tien
24 Matthew Zimmerman
25 Marcia Hofmann
26 ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION
27 454 Shotwell Street
28 San Francisco, CA 94110
Telephone: 415-436-9333 x108
Facsimile: 415-436-9993

Attorneys for Plaintiff
[redacted]