PETITIONING A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT ABOUT A NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER pdf

1: Forms | United States Courts

The federal district court in San Francisco in EFF's National Security Letter (NSL) cases has unsealed its order from last month, which denies our clients' long-running First Amendment challenges to the NSL statute.

Whether federal law enforcement officers, and agents of the Drug Enforcement Administration in particular, have authority to enforce a federal criminal statute that applies to acts perpetrated against a United States official in a foreign country by arresting an indicted criminal suspect on probable cause in a foreign country. Respondent is Humberto Alvarez-Machain. The panel opinion of the court of appeals Pet. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. Camarena-Salazar was then murdered and buried in a park near Guadalajara. See United States v. Eyewitnesses placed respondent Humberto Alvarez-Machain, a Mexican citizen, at the house while Camarena-Salazar was being tortured. In , a federal grand jury indicted respondent for the torture and murder of Camarena-Salazar in violation of, among other statutes, 18 U. After those negotiations proved unsuccessful, the DEA approved the use of Mexican nationals to take custody of respondent in Mexico and to transport him to the United States. Several Mexican nationals, acting at the behest of the DEA, then seized respondent from his office in Mexico, and in less than 24 hours moved him to the United States and into the custody of United States law enforcement officials. Respondent moved for dismissal of the indictment against him, arguing that he could not be tried in the United States because his seizure from Mexico was contrary to international law and an extradition treaty between the United States and Mexico. The district court and the Ninth Circuit agreed, ordering that the charges be dismissed and that respondent be returned to Mexico. Even if the arrest violated international law, the Court further held, respondent could be tried in this country. The case was remanded for trial. In , after returning to Mexico, respondent brought this civil action asserting various claims- including false arrest and imprisonment-against the United States, several DEA officials, and seven Mexican nationals. Although respondent also brought tort claims asserting abuse and torture, the district court rejected those claims after trial, finding them "unworthy of belief," "incredible," and "completely contrived," and that respondent had repeatedly "lied during his deposition. Respondent did not appeal those findings, and those claims are therefore no longer at issue in this case. The district court substituted the United States for the individual federal defendants pursuant to 28 U. Following an interlocutory appeal, see Alvarez-Machain v. United States, F. Although the government argued that the action for false arrest and false imprisonment under the FTCA was barred by the exception for "[a]ny claim arising in a foreign country," 28 U. The court agreed that the arrest took place in Mexico. The district court nonetheless concluded that respondent had failed to establish a false arrest claim under California law. Looking to state court decisions and statutes, id. The court concluded that those provisions would "clearly" authorize government agents and private citizens alike to arrest respondent, an indicted criminal suspect. Because the arrest took place in Mexico, the district court also addressed how California law would treat extraterritorial arrests. The court noted that California law allows a foreign peace officer in fresh pursuit to exercise arrest authority in California. Similarly, the court explained, California law does not limit citizen arrest authority to California citizens-i. Because the government had probable cause to arrest, the district court concluded that the arrest was not false within the meaning of California law. Nonetheless, the court held that respondent was entitled to damages only from the time he was seized in Mexico until he was handed over to law enforcement officials in the United States. Once respondent was handed over to United States officials, the court held, the United States law enforcement authorities made an independent and lawful decision to keep respondent in custody for which Sosa could not be held liable. Respondent and Sosa appealed, and a panel of the Ninth Circuit affirmed in part and reversed in part. The panel stated that to "determine whether a federal officer had lawful authority to carry out an arrest, a California court would first ask whether the arrest was authorized under federal law. The panel agreed that the criminal statutes under which respondent was indicted expressly apply to acts occurring abroad. And it agreed that the arrest authority provided to DEA agents under 21 U. The panel,

however, refused to hold that DEA agents have statutory authority to enforce extraterritorial laws abroad, remarking that "[i]f this assertion is an accurate statement of United States law, then it reinforces the critics of American imperialism in the international community. The panel instead "suppose[d] that Congress intended for federal law enforcement officers to obtain lawful authority, which for example, here might be a Mexican warrant, from the state in which they sought to arrest someone. But the court held that the proper standard for federal officers is the law governing arrests pursuant to a warrant. Because the seizure had been planned in the United States, the court stated, the claim was actionable under the so-called "headquarters" exception. Finally, the panel affirmed the judgment in favor of respondent against Sosa under the ATS. In the alternative, the court held that the arrest violated the international law prohibition on "arbitrary detentions. A detention is "arbitrary," the court of appeals held, if it is not "pursuant to law. The court of appeals then reheard the case en banc, reaching largely the same result by a six-to-five vote. The majority thus had "no doubt that the substantive criminal statutes under which [respondent] was charged apply to acts occurring outside the United States. Instead, the court invoked the presumption against extraterritoriality and distinguished Bowman: The court stated that it was unwilling to assume that Congress had "turned a blind eye to the interests of equal sovereigns and the potential violations of international law that would inevitably ensue. Agreeing with the reasoning of the original panel opinion, the majority also rejected the claim that the seizure could be deemed a valid citizen arrest under California law. The majority stressed that it was not questioning "the powers of the political branches to override the principles of sovereignty in some circumstances, should the need arise. But the court declared that it would not "impute such an intent where it is not expressed," ibid. The claim, the en banc majority held, fell within the "headquarters doctrine" as articulated by the California courts, id. Finally, the en banc court affirmed the judgment against Sosa. Disagreeing with the panel opinion, the majority held that there is no specific, universal, and obligatory rule of international law according individuals a personal right to be free of transborder arrests. But the en banc majority held that there is an obligatory rule of international law prohibiting "arbitrary arrests. Sosa has filed a separate petition challenging the ATS judgment against him, No. Judge Fisher, while fully joining the majority opinion, concluded that the DEA agents lacked authority to conduct this arrest because "neither Congress nor the Executive has expressed an intent to allow sub-Cabinet-level law enforcement officials in the DEA to be the final arbiters of that authority. Judge Gould dissented separately. We are now in the midst of a global war on terrorism, a mission that our political branches have deemed necessary to conduct throughout the world, sometimes with tepid or even non-existent cooperation from foreign nations. With this context in mind, our court today commands that a foreign-national criminal who was apprehended abroad pursuant to a legally valid indictment is entitled to sue our government for money damages. In so doing, and despite its protestations to the contrary, the majority has left the door open for the objects of our international war on terrorism to do the same. They, unlike the courts, may be held accountable for any whirlwind that they, and the nation, may reap because of their actions. By its judicial overreaching, the majority has needlessly shackled the efforts of our political branches in dealing with complex and sensitive issues of national security. In a separate dissent, Judge Gould concluded that the case "presents a nonjusticiable political question. In reaching that result, the Ninth Circuit held that federal officers charged with enforcing laws, including laws that expressly apply to conduct in foreign nations, cannot do so outside the United States. Those holdings are not merely incorrect. The statutory law enforcement authority that Congress gave DEA agents, like the authority given to other federal law enforcement agencies such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, does not impose geographic limits. Nor does it require that arrests take place pursuant to a warrant. It thus is naturally read as granting the Executive Branch enforcement authority that extends as far as the laws it is charged with enforcing and wherever enforcement is deemed necessary and prudent. The Ninth Circuit, however, concluded that federal agents lack statutory authority to engage in law enforcement activities outside the United States with or without the "consent or assistance of the host country. It provides terrorists or other criminals who hide in countries unwilling or unable to apprehend them using their own officers including countries that are unwilling to acknowledge publicly their approval of U. S, , To

be sure, the use of transborder arrests without foreign government consent to render criminal suspects is exceedingly rare. But judgments regarding the necessity of such measures-and the choice among law enforcement methods generally-are for the Executive Branch to make. It is precisely when criminals are harbored abroad that diplomatic, foreign policy, and law enforcement concerns overlap and must be balanced, and that the need for decisionmaking by the Executive Branch becomes paramount. That is the branch the Constitution charges with "tak[ing] Care that the Laws be faithfully executed. And that is the branch that is diplomatically accountable abroad and politically accountable at home "for any whirlwind" that its actions may produce. Individuals can, for example, commit crimes inside the United States and then retreat abroad. Increasingly, moreover, attacks on United States interests may be planned and even executed abroad. Recognizing as much, Congress has enacted criminal statutes that extend to extraterritorial conduct. Here, for example, respondent was indicted for kidnapping an internationally protected United States government employee in violation of 18 U. Many similar criminal prohibitions apply extraterritorially as well. The Executive Branch thus may sometimes determine that its constitutional obligation to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed" requires the performance of law enforcement activities abroad. Consistent with that, Congress has granted federal law enforcement officials broad authority to make arrests without a warrant for any felony, cognizable under the laws of the United States, on probable cause to believe the suspect committed the felony, without imposing territorial limits on their authority. To reach the contrary result, the Ninth Circuit invoked the general presumption against extraterritorial application of United States laws identified in cases such as EEOC v. But this Court has refused to apply that presumption to criminal statutes that logically should extend to acts abroad. By expressly providing the authority to arrest "for any felony, cognizable under the laws of the United States," 21 U. In any event, Bowman suggests that the presumption has no application to a statute defining the authority to enforce federal criminal laws. Nor does it terminate merely because the suspect flees or acts from abroad. To the contrary, Congress has made the international scope of law enforcement authority clear by enacting criminal prohibitions, like the ones at issue here, that apply to conduct committed wholly abroad. To conclude that United States law enforcement agencies nonetheless have no authority to conduct arrests outside the United States is to declare that Congress has chosen to create criminal laws applicable to conduct abroad, and to authorize arrests for any felony, but implicitly to deny the Executive Branch agencies charged with enforcing those laws authority to secure arrests for any felony committed abroad. That arrest authority was intended to "provide[] the Attorney General with flexibility in the utilization of enforcement personnel wherever and whenever the need arises. And, in enacting later substantive criminal prohibitions that apply to conduct abroad, Congress contemplated their extraterritorial enforcement as well, with or without overt cooperation from foreign governments. Specter endorsing statute criminalizing the murder of U. As the dissent in this case explained, "if Congress through enactment of 21 U. To the contrary, Congress presumably understands that the Executive Branch has principal responsibility for international relations, and Congress justifiably relies on the Executive Branch to carry out its functions with the requirements of international law in mind. Department of the Navy v. Yet the Ninth Circuit construed 21 U. The more sensible reading is that Congress both granted the Executive broad authority to determine where and when to enforce federal law, and relied on the Executive Branch-the branch primarily responsible for foreign relations and primarily accountable to foreign nations-to take into account considerations such as international law. While the Ninth Circuit would bar the DEA from engaging in federal law enforcement activities such as arrests abroad, that court expressly permits the use of the armed forces to do the same. But the Ninth Circuit did not explain why the interest of preventing international strife would favor the use of military force rather than ordinary law enforcement officers.

PETITIONING A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT ABOUT A NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER pdf

2: How to Appeal Your Disability Case to Federal District Court | DisabilitySecrets

District court judge Susan Illston this week rejected the internet search giant's argument that so-called National Security Letters (NSLs) violated its constitutional rights. As such it ordered Google to hand over private information relating to US citizens to federal agents.

Department of Homeland Security to reject all initial DACA applications and associated applications for work authorization received after Sep. On May 1, , Texas and six other states filed a lawsuit in the U. On May 2, the plaintiffs asked the court to issue a preliminary injunction that would stop USCIS from adjudicating applications for deferred action under DACA while the lawsuit is pending. After an August 8, , hearing in Houston, Tex. As a result, it continues to be the case that individuals who have or have previously had DACA can apply to renew it. This issue brief summarizes the current status primarily of 1 lawsuits filed in federal court in California, collectively known as Regents of the University of California v. Nielsen and State of New York v. Trump and Trustees of Princeton University v. Regents of the University of California, et al. Department of Homeland Security, et al. District Court for the Northern District of California issued a preliminary injunction requiring the federal government to maintain the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, program on a nationwide basis by allowing individuals to submit applications to renew their enrollment in DACA, subject to a few exceptions. In this case, however, the government took the unusual step of seeking to skip review in the Ninth Circuit and instead appeal directly to the U. Therefore, the case will return to the lower courts, and appeals will be heard first by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. In other words, although the Supreme Court could hear the case eventually, the appeals process will be the normal one, beginning with the court of appeals. Government continues to accept DACA renewal applications. Therefore, the government must continue to accept DACA renewal applications in accordance with the preliminary injunction. Other orders subject to appeal. In the order issued on Jan. On August 1, , the Ninth Circuit, in an unrelated case , [14] found that there was not sufficient support in the record for the district court to have issued an injunction that applied nationwide as opposed to limiting itself to California. The Ninth Circuit vacated the injunction in that case to the extent it applied outside of California and remanded the case back to the district court to further consider the appropriate scope of the injunction. In light of this case, on August 3, , the federal government defendants in Regents wrote a letter to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, asking it to vacate the nationwide injunction requiring the government to continue processing DACA renewals, because the nationwide scope is not necessary to remedy the injuries of the plaintiffs in Regents. In a rare move, on October 17, , the U. The court of appeals did not issue a decision by that date. On November 5, , the DOJ, for the second time in this case, filed for certiorari before judgment, seeking review by the Supreme Court of the preliminary injunction issued by U. District Court Judge Alsup. On November 8, , the Ninth Circuit issued a decision affirming the lawfulness of the preliminary injunction. To date, the preliminary injunction issued in U. Batalla Vidal, et al. The court in New York held that there was a substantial likelihood that the plaintiffs would prevail on their claim that the Trump administration ended DACA in a way that was arbitrary and capricious, and therefore unlawful. The order was issued in two lawsuits currently pending before Judge Nicholas Garaufis. The State of New York case was brought by a coalition of seventeen attorneys general. The parties have now completed supplemental briefing and are tentatively scheduled for oral argument the week of January 22, On November 5, , the U. Department of Justice took the rare step of filing for certiorari before judgment with the Supreme Court, seeking review of the preliminary injunction issued in this case and of the similar injunction issued in U. CASA de Maryland, et al. However, the court did grant a nationwide preliminary injunction to DACA recipients on their claim regarding the sharing and usage of the information DACA recipients have provided to the government when applying for DACA. The court ordered the U. The plaintiffs appealed to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals the dismissal of their claim that the DACA termination was unlawful, and the parties have now completed briefing to the Fourth Circuit. Oral

argument has been scheduled for December 11, United States of America, et al. Trump and Princeton v. Trump, two cases that the court related to each other such that the order applies to both. But, critically, the court also stayed or paused its own order for 90 days to allow the government to come up with a better explanation than the one it presented to the court for why it ended DACA. However, the court in DC stayed its order for 20 days until August 23 to give the federal government the chance to appeal the decision, to request a stay of the reinstatement of the original DACA program. After the federal government submitted to the court another explanation of its reasoning for terminating DACA, the court issued an opinion upholding its prior order, again reasoning that the DACA termination was unlawful. The partial stay does not change the status quo. The government subsequently appealed this decision, and the parties are in the process of completing their briefing to the court. Briefing is expected to be completed on January 22, Department of Justice took the rare step of filing for certiorari before judgment with the Supreme Court, seeking review of the decision issued in this case and of the preliminary injunctions issued in the related lawsuits, Batalla Vidal New York and U. District Court in D. The case was eventually assigned to the same judge who presided over U. Texas in , [27] Judge Andrew Hanen. Texas, which when it was originally filed was called Texas v. In their complaint , [28] Texas and the other states argue that, over the summer of , a larger group of ten states had threatened to amend their lawsuit to also challenge the original DACA program if the government did not terminate it by September 5, â€” and, in response, the government terminated DACA on Sep. Though Texas and the other states dropped their threat to challenge DACA at that time, they now argue that the California and New York injunctions and the District of Columbia order see above have had the effect of prolonging the DACA program indefinitely. Texas and the other states say that this indefinite prolongation of a program that the government terminated is why they filed a lawsuit now against a program that has been in place for nearly six years. They seek a declaration that DACA is unlawful and a nationwide order prohibiting the government from issuing new periods of deferred action under the program. Judge Hanen ordered that an initial scheduling conference be held on July 31, Motions for preliminary injunction and to intervene. On May 2, , Texas and the other states filed a motion for preliminary injunction to halt the DACA program from operating during the pendency of this lawsuit, both for initial and renewal applications. On August 8, , the court held a hearing in Houston, Tex. During the hearing, attorneys for the parties addressed whether the plaintiff states have legal authority to bring the lawsuit, whether a conflict exists between the plaintiffs and defendants, the alleged harms that the plaintiff states claim they are suffering as a result of the continued processing of DACA applications, and the scope of any potential preliminary injunction that the court could issue, among other issues. As a result of this order, it continues to be the case that people who currently have or previously had DACA may apply to renew it. After Judge Hanen issued his latest order, the parties moved for a discovery hearing, for determining whether further discovery is needed and to set the discovery schedule. That hearing was scheduled for November 14, The court has since issued a discovery schedule that requires the parties to undertake discovery prior to any resolution of this lawsuit. Duke, Acting Secretary, U. McCament, Acting Director, U. Citizenship and Immigration Services, et al. Court Orders the Dept.

PETITIONING A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT ABOUT A NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER pdf

3: Stop the Shadow Government; Protect Our National Security | American Center for Law and Justice

About the Owner: National Apostille, Inc. is the #1 apostille service company in the United States with offices in California (Los Angeles and San Francisco), Washington, D.C., Texas, Florida, Illinois, Colorado, and New York.

History[edit] The oldest NSL provisions were created in as a little-used investigative tool in terrorism and espionage investigations to obtain financial records. A amendment removed the restriction regarding "foreign powers" and allowed the use of NSLs to request information concerning persons who are not the direct subject of the investigation. A federal judge could repeal or modify an NSL if the court found the request for information was "unreasonable, oppressive, or otherwise unlawful. The court could repeal the nondisclosure provision if it found it had been made in bad faith. Other amendments allowed the recipient of an NSL to inform their attorney about the request and the government had to rely on the courts to enforce compliance with an NSL. The act also provided the Department of Defense when conducting a law enforcement investigation, counterintelligence inquiry, or security determination. When the Director of the FBI or his designee authorizes the inclusion of a nondisclosure provision in an NSL, the recipient may face criminal prosecution if it reveals the contents of the NSL or that it was received. The purpose of a nondisclosure provision is to prevent the recipient of an NSL from compromising both the current FBI investigation involving a specific person and future investigations as well see 18 U. Under the threat of criminal prosecution, I must hide all aspects of my involvement in the case When I meet with my attorneys I cannot tell my girlfriend where I am going or where I have been. For NSLs, that is because the U. Supreme Court has held the types of information the FBI obtains with NSLs provide no constitutionally protected reasonable expectation of privacy. Because a person has already provided the information to a third party, e. According to 2, pages of documents the FBI provided to the Electronic Frontier Foundation in response to a Freedom of Information Act lawsuit, the FBI had used NSLs to obtain information about individuals who were the subject of an FBI terrorism or counterintelligence investigation and information from telecommunications companies about individuals with whom the subject of the investigation had communicated. According to a September 9, , New York Times report, In many cases, the target of a[n FBI] national security letter whose records are being sought is not necessarily the actual subject of a terrorism investigation. Ashcroft[edit] Letter in Doe v. Ashcroft case The lack of judicial oversight and the Supreme Court ruling in Smith v. Maryland was the core of Doe v. The action challenged the constitutionality of NSLs, specifically the nondisclosure provision. At the district court, Judge of the Southern District of New York held in September that NSLs violated the Fourth Amendment "it has the effect of authorizing coercive searches effectively immune from any judicial process" and First Amendment. However, Judge Marrero stayed his ruling while the case proceeded to the court of appeals. In March , the Second Circuit ruled that nondisclosure provisions were permissible only when the FBI certified that disclosure may result in certain statutorily enumerated harms see, e. Letter in the Doe v. Gonzales case Another effect of Doe v. Ashcroft was increased congressional oversight. Although the reports are classified, a nonclassified accounting of how many NSLs are issued is also required. During this period, the total number of NSL requests On November 30, , the unredacted court ruling was published in full.

PETITIONING A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT ABOUT A NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER pdf

4: Court Forms | Western District of Washington | United States District Court

Search for national federal court forms by keyword, number, or filter by category. Forms are grouped into the following categories: Attorney, Bankruptcy, Civil, Court Reporter, Criminal, Criminal Justice Act (CJA), Human Resources, Jury, and Other.

The opinion of the district court Pet. A petition for rehearing was denied on September 1, Pet. The petition for a writ of certiorari in Humanitarian Law Project v. This conditional cross-petition is being filed pursuant to Rule The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. Section of AEDPA authorizes the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General, to designate an entity as a "foreign terrorist organization" if she finds that: Designation of a group as a "foreign terrorist organization" under AEDPA has three legal consequences. First, United States financial institutions possessing or controlling any funds in which a designated foreign terrorist organization or its agent has an interest are required to block all financial transactions involving those funds. Second, representatives and specified members of a designated foreign terrorist organization are inadmissible to this country. Third, it is illegal for persons within the United States or subject to its jurisdiction to "knowingly" provide "material support or resources" to a designated foreign terrorist organization. The Act defines "material support or resources" to mean "currency or other financial securities, financial services, lodging, training, safehouses, false documentation or identification, communications equipment, facilities, weapons, lethal substances, explosives, personnel, transportation, and other physical assets, except medicine or religious materials. IV ; see also 18 U. Two United States citizens and six domestic organizations brought suit in federal district court, challenging the constitutionality of the relevant provisions of AEDPA. Those plaintiffs are the petitioners in No. The court concluded that as a general matter, the AEDPA ban on the provision of material support to designated foreign terrorist organizations is constitutional because it serves a substantial governmental interest, is not directed at the content of political expression, and leaves would-be donors free to engage in alternative forms of political advocacy and association. The court held, however, that cross-respondents had demonstrated a probability of success on their contention that the terms "personnel" and "training," which are included within the statutory definition of "material support or resources," are too vague to satisfy constitutional requirements because they do not adequately inform reasonable people as to the range of conduct forbidden by the statute. The district court entered a preliminary injunction barring the enforcement of 18 U. IV against any of the named cross-respondents or their members for providing "training" or "personnel" to the Tamil Tigers or the PKK. As the court of appeals recognized, there is no right protected by the Constitution to donate cash or goods to terrorist organizations outside the United States. If this Court does grant the petition in No. The district court found that cross-respondents had demonstrated a probability of success on their contention that those two provisions are unconstitutionally vague. The court of appeals upheld the preliminary injunction, finding that the district court had not abused its discretion. As a basic principle of due process, criminal prohibitions must give a person of ordinary intelligence "fair warning" as to the range of conduct that is prohibited, and must establish adequate guidance to govern the exercise of discretion by executive officials in order to avoid arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement. City of Rockford, U. To satisfy that requirement, the Government need not define an offense with "mathematical certainty" id. United States, U. And because some exercise of enforcement discretion is inevitable, Grayned, U. Although greater statutory precision is required when the government imposes criminal sanctions or when the statute "abut[s] upon sensitive areas of basic First Amendment freedoms" Grayned, U. IV , vagueness concerns may be mitigated, "especially with respect to the adequacy of notice. Flipside, Hoffman Estates, Inc. And if a class of offenses can be made constitutionally definite by a reasonable construction of the statute, the courts are under a "duty to give the statute that construction. Such a construction is possible here. The term "personnel" generally describes employees or others working under the direction or control of a specific entity. IV ; 18 U. IV emphasis added. That

proscription covers situations in which individuals have submitted themselves to the direction or control of a foreign terrorist organization. So construed, the term "personnel" would give constitutionally adequate notice to the public of what is prohibited and would not implicate a substantial amount of constitutionally protected activity. Rather, the primary effect of such a ban is to prevent the provision of mercenaries, terrorists, and many other actors whose activities do not even arguably implicate the First Amendment. Any independent speech in favor or on behalf of a foreign terrorist organization would not be prohibited by the statute. By contrast, speech that is conducted under the control or direction of a foreign terrorist organization is either entitled to no First Amendment protection at all e. Even assuming, arguendo, that a particular application of the ban to a person speaking under the direction or control of a foreign terrorist organization might raise significant First Amendment questions, that prospect does not warrant facial invalidation of the term "personnel" or the granting of an injunction that apparently precludes prosecution of cross-respondents or their members under Section B for the provision of mercenaries or suicide bombers to the PKK or LTTE Pet. The court of appeals did not hold that the term "personnel" would be impermissibly vague, or that it would trench unduly upon constitutionally protected activities, if the statutory ban were limited to persons acting under the direction or control of foreign terrorist organizations. In fact, however, the limiting construction is wholly reasonable and should therefore be adopted-particularly if the alternative is facial invalidation of the "personnel" prohibition. However, the term "training" is readily intelligible to the average person, and the statutory ban does not so "significantly compromise recognized First Amendment protections" as to merit facial invalidation. See Members of the City Council v. Taxpayers for Vincent, U. The verb "train" is commonly understood to mean: As a general matter, helping foreign terrorists achieve proficiency obviously is not a protected First Amendment activity. Thus, the statutory ban quite properly precludes the training of foreign terrorists on how to use weapons, build bombs, evade surveillance, or launder funds. There is simply no reasonable argument that most "training" is protected First Amendment activity. The court of appeals hypothesized two examples of training that might raise First Amendment concerns: To begin with, it is far from clear that the statutory ban on the provision of "training" would be unconstitutional even as applied to the activities identified by the court of appeals. Since "the general class of offenses to which the statute is directed is plainly within its terms," the prohibition on training should not "be struck down as vague even though marginal cases could be put where doubts might arise. If the Court denies the petition in No.

5: United States Tax Court: Help: Information for Nonattorneys: Starting a Case

San Francisco - A federal district court judge in San Francisco has ruled that National Security Letter (NSL) provisions in federal law violate the Constitution.

6: Supreme Court Denies Petition of Convicted Murderer Ronald Gray | www.enganchecubano.com

The National Security Letter provision of the Patriot Act radically expanded the FBI's authority to demand personal customer records from Internet Service Providers, financial institutions and credit companies without prior court approval.

7: National security letter - Wikipedia

A National security letter issued to the Internet Archive demanding information about a user A national security letter (NSL) is an administrative subpoena issued by the United States government to gather information for national security purposes.

8: Petition for Name Change Apostille â€“ US District Court

PETITIONING A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT ABOUT A NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER pdf

Ultra-secret national security letters that come with a gag order on the recipient are an unconstitutional impingement on free speech, a federal judge ruled Friday.

9: United States v. Alvarez-Machain - Petition | OSG | Department of Justice

Use the federal district court locator to find the court for your area. The SSA cannot help you with a complaint (or brief) for a federal appeal. You can either file the complaint yourself or hire an attorney who is experienced in appealing disability denials at the federal level to assist you.

PETITIONING A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT ABOUT A NATIONAL SECURITY LETTER pdf

Keyhole Approaches in Neurosurgery Johnny Grasshopper The tale of Squirrel Nutkin (1903) Customizing AI systems : allowing others to modify and implement the AI Srimukhalingam temple history in telugu Gunparade March, Vol. 1 Vba tutorial for beginners with examples BJP in Indian Party System: Problems Scar of Montaigne Wireless qualityof service History of American life and thought An Assessment of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Center for Neutron Research And a host of others : the popular and unpopular. The Inaugural Address of Professor Briggs Nonverbal vocal communication German expressionist prints from the Ruth and Jacob Kainen Collection Save musicnotes sheet music to The theory of moral sentiments, by A. Smith. Writings of Daniel Berrigan Atlas of the 1st World War The roles of educational technology in learning Formulating an urban passenger transport policy Case study F. Incorporating management into an undergraduate architectural design programme Michael Daws Ford Falcon Fairlane automotive repair manual The Mathematics of Finite Elements and Applications Jay l devore probability statistics 9th edition Corporate management in action Gains derived from dealings in property Successful Problem-Solving and Test-Taking for Nursing and Nclex-Pn Exams Eleanor Roosevelt: changing fictions in the life of an individual. Alesis trigger io manual Italy, in its original glory, ruine and revival Sat math level 1 test Appendix: 1. The may-fly: a study in transformation. 2. Health, a conquest. 3. Evening in spring: a medit Ethnic families in america patterns and variations 5th edition Myth, religion, and society 100 amazing facts about the negro Template benchmark advance planning sheet Paradise Family Guides Big Island of Hawaii The Politics of Deviance