

Twenty-First Edition

# MASS MEDIA LAW



**Mc  
Graw  
Hill**

Clay Calvert | Dan V. Kozlowski | Derigan Silver

# mass media law

# Mass Media Law

21st Edition

Clay Calvert

University of Florida

Dan V. Kozlowski

Saint Louis University

Derigan Silver

University of Denver





MASS MEDIA LAW, TWENTY FIRST EDITION

Published by McGraw-Hill Education, 2 Penn Plaza, New York, NY 10121. Copyright © 2020 by McGraw-Hill Education. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. Previous editions © 2018, 2015, and 2013. No part of this publication may be reproduced or distributed in any form or by any means, or stored in a database or retrieval system, without the prior written consent of McGraw-Hill Education, including, but not limited to, in any network or other electronic storage or transmission, or broadcast for distance learning.

Some ancillaries, including electronic and print components, may not be available to customers outside the United States.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 LCR 24 23 22 21 20 19

ISBN: 978-1-260-51451-3 (bound edition)

MHID: 1-260-51451-X (bound edition)

ISBN: 978-1-260-83861-9 (loose-leaf edition)

MHID: 1-260-83861-7 (loose-leaf edition)

Portfolio Manager: *Alexander Preiss*

Product Developer: *Melanie Stafford*

Marketing Manager: *Nancy Baudean*

Content Project Managers: *Lisa Bruflo, Danielle Clement*

Buyer: *Sandy Ludovissy*

Designer: *Beth Blech*

Content Licensing Specialist: *Carrie Burger*

Cover Image: *Maxx-Studio/Shutterstock*

Compositor: *Lumina Datamatics Inc.*

All credits appearing on page or at the end of the book are considered to be an extension of the copyright page.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Cataloging-in-Publication Data has been requested from the Library of Congress.

The Internet addresses listed in the text were accurate at the time of publication. The inclusion of a website does not indicate an endorsement by the authors or McGraw-Hill Education, and McGraw-Hill Education does not guarantee the accuracy of the information presented at these sites.

[mheducation.com/highered](http://mheducation.com/highered)

# CONTENTS

Preface	xi
---------	----

## 1 The American Legal System 1

<b>Sources of the Law</b>	2	<b>The Judicial System</b>	18
Common Law	2	Facts versus the Law	19
<i>The Role of Precedent</i>	3	The Federal Court System	21
<i>Finding Common-Law Cases</i>	6	<i>The Supreme Court</i>	22
Equity Law	8	<i>Other Federal Courts</i>	28
Statutory Law	10	<i>Federal Judges</i>	30
Constitutional Law	12	The State Court System	31
Executive Orders and		Judicial Review	32
Administrative Rules	16	SUMMARY	33
SUMMARY	17	Lawsuits	34
		SUMMARY	37
		<b>Bibliography</b>	37

## 2 The First Amendment: The Meaning of Freedom 39

<b>Historical Development</b>	40	The Smith Act	64
Freedom of the Press in England	40	Defining the Limits of Freedom of	
Freedom of the Press in Colonial		Expression	66
America	41	<i>Media Liability for Real-Life Violence</i>	71
<i>Community Censorship, Then</i>		<i>The Gitlow Ruling and the</i>	
<i>and Now</i>	44	<i>Incorporation Doctrine</i>	73
SUMMARY	47	<i>Levels of First Amendment Scrutiny</i>	
<b>The First Amendment</b>	48	<i>and Distinctions Between</i>	
The New Constitution	48	<i>Content-Based and Content-</i>	
Freedom of Expression in the		<i>Neutral Regulations</i>	74
18th Century	50	SUMMARY	77
Freedom of Expression Today	52	<b>Prior Restraint</b>	78
SUMMARY	58	<i>Near v. Minnesota</i>	81
<b>The Meaning of Freedom</b>	59	Pentagon Papers Case	82
Seditious Libel and the Right to		<i>Progressive Magazine Case</i>	84
Criticize the Government	59	<i>United States v. Bell</i>	84
Alien and Sedition Acts	61	SUMMARY	85
Sedition in World War I	62	<b>Bibliography</b>	86

## 3 The First Amendment: Contemporary Problems 87

<b>The First Amendment in</b>		<i>The Hazelwood Case</i>	93
<b>Schools</b>	88	<i>The Bethel Case</i>	99
Censorship of Expression in		<i>The Morse Case</i>	100
Public High Schools	88	Censorship of College Newspapers	102

<i>Problems for College Journalists</i>	105	<b>Hate Speech/Fighting Words</b>	127
Book Banning	110	SUMMARY	137
SUMMARY	113	<b>The First Amendment and Election Campaigns</b>	137
<b>Time, Place and Manner Restrictions</b>	113	SUMMARY	141
Forum Analysis	118	<b>The First Amendment and the Information Superhighway</b>	141
SUMMARY	125	Net Neutrality	143
<b>Other Prior Restraints</b>	125	<b>Bibliography</b>	146
Prior Restraint and Protests	125		
SUMMARY	127		
<b>4 Defamation: Establishing a Case</b>	<b>147</b>		
<b>The Law of Defamation</b>	148	<i>Crime</i>	172
SUMMARY	153	<i>Sexual References</i>	172
<b>Elements of Defamation</b>	153	<i>Personal Habits</i>	174
Publication	155	<i>Ridicule</i>	174
<i>Libel on the Internet</i>	157	<i>Business Reputation</i>	174
Identification	163	<i>Criticism of a Product</i>	175
<i>Group Identification</i>	165	Falsity	176
Defamation	166	SUMMARY	179
		<b>Bibliography</b>	180
<b>5 Defamation: Proof of Fault</b>	<b>181</b>		
<i>New York Times Co. v. Sullivan</i>	182	Public Persons Over Time	199
The Rationale for the Ruling	183	Involuntary Public Figures	200
<b>Public Persons Versus Private Persons</b>	185	Private Persons	201
Who Is a Public Official?	185	SUMMARY	201
<i>Job Description</i>	185	<b>The Meaning of Fault</b>	202
SUMMARY	188	Negligence	202
<i>The Nature of the Story</i>	188	Actual Malice	204
All-Purpose Public Figures	189	<i>Knowledge of Falsity</i>	204
Limited-Purpose Public Figures	191	<i>Reckless Disregard for the Truth</i>	206
Lower-Court Rulings	193	<i>Applying the Actual Malice Standard</i>	209
<i>The Nature of the Controversy</i>	195	SUMMARY	212
<i>The Plaintiff's Role</i>	196	<b>Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress</b>	213
Businesses as Public Figures	197	SUMMARY	217
		<b>Bibliography</b>	217
<b>6 Defamation: Defenses and Damages</b>	<b>219</b>		
<b>Summary Judgment</b>	220	<b>Truth</b>	226
<b>Statute of Limitations</b>	221	<b>Privileged Communications</b>	227
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	223	Absolute Privilege	227
<i>Jurisdiction and the Internet</i>	224	Qualified Privilege	228
SUMMARY	226	Neutral Reportage	233

Abuse of Privilege	233	<i>Compensatory Damages</i>	246
SUMMARY	235	<i>General or Actual Damages</i>	246
<b>Protection of Opinion</b>	236	<i>Special Damages</i>	247
Rhetorical Hyperbole	236	<i>Presumed Damages</i>	247
The First Amendment	238	<i>Punitive Damages</i>	247
<i>The Ollman Test</i>	239	Retraction Statutes	249
Fair Comment and Criticism	243	SUMMARY	250
<b>Defenses and Damages</b>	244	<b>Criminal Libel</b>	250
Right of Reply/Self-Defense	245	<b>Bibliography</b>	252
Damages	246		

## 7 Invasion of Privacy: Appropriation and Intrusion \_\_\_\_\_ 253

<b>Conceptions and Sources of Privacy in the United States</b>	254	<i>When Consent Might Not Work</i>	281
Invasion of Privacy	256	Life After Death: Post-Mortem	
The Growth of Privacy Laws	256	Publicity Rights	282
<b>Appropriation</b>	260	SUMMARY	284
Right of Publicity	261	<b>Intrusion</b>	285
Use of Name or Likeness	263	Intrusion and the Press	285
Advertising and Trade Purposes	272	No Privacy in Public	287
News and Public Interest		The Use of Hidden Recording	
Exception	274	Devices	291
Other Exceptions	276	Intrusion by Drones	294
Booth <i>Rule</i>	277	Intrusion and the Publication of	
Consent as a Defense	279	Information Obtained Illegally	296
		SUMMARY	297
		<b>Bibliography</b>	298

## 8 Invasion of Privacy: Publication of Private Information and False Light \_\_\_\_\_ 299

<b>Public Disclosure of Private Facts</b>	299	Recounting the Past	316
Publicity	301	SUMMARY	317
Private Facts	302	<b>False-Light Invasion of Privacy</b>	317
<i>Naming Rape Victims</i>	304	Fictionalization	320
Highly Offensive Publicity	305	Other Falsehoods	322
Legitimate Public Concern and		Highly Offensive Material	324
Newsworthiness	308	The Fault Requirement	325
Ethics and Privacy	315	SUMMARY	327
		<b>Bibliography</b>	327

## 9 Gathering Information: Records and Meetings \_\_\_\_\_ 329

<b>News Gathering and the Law</b>	330	<i>The First Amendment Protection of News</i>	
The Constitution and News		<i>Gathering</i>	338
Gathering	331	SUMMARY	350
<i>Access to Government Officials: A Right to Interview?</i>	335	<b>The Freedom of Information Act</b>	351
		Recent FOIA Reforms	355



Agency Records	356	<b>State Laws on Meetings and Records</b>	378
<i>What Is an Agency?</i>	357	State Open-Meetings Laws	379
<i>What Is a Record?</i>	358	State Open-Records Laws	381
<i>What Is an Agency Record?</i>	358	The Privatization of Public Government	386
FOIA Exemptions	359	SUMMARY	387
<i>National Security</i>	360	<b>Laws That Restrict Access to Information</b>	387
<i>Housekeeping Practices</i>	362	School Records	388
<i>Statutory Exemption</i>	362	Health and Medical Records	390
<i>Trade Secrets</i>	364	The Federal Privacy Law	391
<i>Working Papers/Discovery</i>	365	Criminal History Privacy Laws	392
<i>Personal Privacy</i>	367	State Statutes That Limit Access to Information	393
<i>Law Enforcement</i>	368	SUMMARY	394
<i>Financial Records</i>	373	<b>Bibliography</b>	395
<i>Geological Data</i>	373		
Handling FOIA Requests	373		
Federal Open-Meetings Law	376		
SUMMARY	377		

**10 Protection of News Sources/Contempt Power \_\_\_\_\_ 397**

<b>Journalists, Jail and Confidential Sources</b>	398	<b>Legislative and Executive Protection of News Sources</b>	423
<b>News and News Sources</b>	400	Shield Laws	424
The Failure to Keep a Promise	404	Federal Guidelines	429
<b>Constitutional Protection of News Sources</b>	405	Newsroom Searches	431
Lower-Court Rulings	407	How to Respond to a Subpoena	434
<i>Civil Cases</i>	410	SUMMARY	437
<i>Criminal Cases</i>	414	<b>The Contempt Power</b>	437
<i>Grand Jury Proceedings</i>	415	Kinds of Contempt	438
Nonconfidential Information and Waiver of the Privilege	417	<i>Contempt and the Press</i>	439
Who Is a Journalist?	419	Collateral Bar Rule	439
Telephone Records	421	SUMMARY	441
SUMMARY	423	<b>Bibliography</b>	441

**11 Free Press–Fair Trial: Trial-Level Remedies and Restrictive Orders \_\_\_\_\_ 443**

<b>Prejudicial Crime Reporting</b>	444	Continuance	452
Impact on Jurors	446	Admonition to the Jury	453
When Is a Juror Disqualified?	448	Sequestration of the Jury	454
SUMMARY	449	SUMMARY	455
<b>Traditional Judicial Remedies</b>	449	<b>Restrictive Orders to Control Publicity</b>	456
Voir Dire	450		
Change of Venue	451		

Restrictive Orders Aimed at the Press	457	<b>Contact with Jurors</b>	465
Restrictive Orders Aimed at Trial Participants	461	SUMMARY	467
<b>12 Free Press–Fair Trial: Closed Judicial Proceedings</b>	<b>469</b>	<b>Bibliography</b>	468
<b>Closed Proceedings and Sealed Documents</b>	469	Access and Video Journalism	490
Open Courts and the Constitution	470	<i>Access to Evidence</i>	490
Open and Closed Trials	473	Recording and Televising Judicial Proceedings	492
SUMMARY	478	SUMMARY	497
<b>Closure of Other Hearings</b>	478	<b>Bench-Bar-Press Guidelines</b>	498
Accessible and Inaccessible Documents	480	SUMMARY	498
		<b>Bibliography</b>	499
<b>13 Regulation of Obscene and Other Erotic Material</b>	<b>501</b>		
<b>The Law of Obscenity</b>	503	<b>Regulation of Nonobscene Erotic Material</b>	517
Early Obscenity Law	505	Sexually Oriented Businesses	518
Defining Obscenity	506	Attacks on the Arts and Popular Culture	522
SUMMARY	506	Erotic Materials Online	524
<b>Contemporary Obscenity Law</b>	507	<i>The Communications Decency Act</i>	524
The Miller Test	507	<i>The Child Online Protection Act</i>	525
<i>An Average Person</i>	508	<i>The Children's Internet Protection Act</i>	526
<i>Community Standards</i>	508	<i>The Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act</i>	527
<i>Patent Offensiveness</i>	510	<i>Online Speech Rights of Sex Offenders: The Packingham Case</i>	528
<i>Serious Value</i>	510	SUMMARY	529
Other Standards	511	<b>Bibliography</b>	529
<i>Variable Obscenity</i>	512		
<i>Child Pornography</i>	513		
<i>Children as Child Pornographers and Sexting</i>	515		
<i>Obscenity and Women</i>	516		
SUMMARY	517		
<b>14 Copyright and Trademark</b>	<b>531</b>		
<b>Intellectual Property Law</b>	532	Misappropriation	552
Patents	533	Duration of Copyright Protection	554
Trademarks	534	SUMMARY	556
<b>Copyright</b>	543	<b>Fair Use</b>	556
What May Be Copyrighted	544	Purpose and Character of Use	558
Copyright and Facts	549	Nature of the Copyrighted Work	562
<i>Telephone Books and Databases</i>	549	The Portion or Percentage of a Work Used	564
<i>News Events</i>	550	Effect of Use on Market	567
<i>Research Findings and History</i>	551		



Application of the Criteria	568	Copyright and the Internet	577
SUMMARY	570	<i>Digital Millennium Copyright Act</i>	578
<b>Copyright Protection and Infringement</b>	570	<i>File Sharing</i>	581
Copyright Notice	571	Film and Television	582
Registration	572	Copyright and Music	583
Infringement	573	SUMMARY	586
<i>Originality of the Plaintiff's Work</i>	573	<b>Freelancing and Copyright</b>	586
<i>Access</i>	574	<b>Damages</b>	587
<i>Copying and Substantial Similarity</i>	575	<b>Bibliography</b>	588
<b>15 Regulation of Advertising</b>	<b>591</b>		
<b>Advertising and the First Amendment</b>	592	<i>Voluntary Compliance</i>	627
Commercial Speech Doctrine	594	<i>Consent Agreement</i>	627
Compelled Advertising Subsidies and Government Speech	600	<i>Litigated Order</i>	628
SUMMARY	601	<i>Substantiation</i>	629
<b>The Regulation of Advertising</b>	602	<i>Corrective Advertising</i>	630
Self-Regulation	602	<i>Injunctions</i>	630
Lawsuits by Competitors and Consumers	603	<i>Trade Regulation Rules</i>	632
State and Local Laws	607	SUMMARY	633
Federal Regulation	608	<b>The Regulatory Process</b>	634
<i>Telemarketing</i>	612	Procedures	634
Regulating Junk E-Mail and Spam	615	<b>Special Cases of Deceptive Advertising</b>	635
SUMMARY	618	<i>Testimonials</i>	635
<b>Federal Trade Commission</b>	619	<i>Native Advertising</i>	638
False Advertising Defined	620	<i>Bait-and-Switch Advertising</i>	639
Means to Police Deceptive Advertising	624	<b>Defenses</b>	639
<i>Guides and the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act</i>	625	<b>Advertising Agency/ Publisher Liability</b>	640
		SUMMARY	641
		<b>Bibliography</b>	641
<b>16 Telecommunications Regulation</b>	<b>643</b>		
<b>A Prologue to the Present</b>	644	Licensing	653
History of Regulation	644	<i>Multiple Ownership Rules</i>	654
<b>The Changing Philosophy of Broadcast Regulation</b>	645	<i>License Renewal</i>	657
SUMMARY	649	<i>The Public's Role and Online Public Inspection Files</i>	658
<b>Basic Broadcast Regulation</b>	649	SUMMARY	659
Federal Communications Commission	649	<b>Regulation of Program Content</b>	659
<i>Powers</i>	651	Sanctions	659
<i>Censorship Powers</i>	652	Regulation of Children's Programming	661

Obscene, Indecent and Profane		
Material	662	
Violence on Television	675	
SUMMARY	676	
<b>Regulation of Political</b>		
<b>Programming</b>	676	
Candidate Access Rule	677	
Equal Opportunity/Equal Time Rule	677	
<i>Use of the Airwaves</i>	678	
<i>Legally Qualified Candidates</i>	680	
SUMMARY	682	
<b>News and Public Affairs</b>	683	
Video News Releases,		
Sponsorship Identification and		
the FCC	684	
The First Amendment	687	
SUMMARY	688	
<b>Beyond Broadcasting:</b>		
<b>Regulating Cable, Satellite</b>		688
<b>and the Internet</b>		
Cable Television	689	
Federal Legislation		
Regulating Cable Television	689	
<i>Purpose of the Law</i>	690	
<i>Jurisdiction and Franchises</i>	690	
<i>Must-Carry Rules</i>	691	
<i>Programming and Freedom</i>		
<i>of Expression</i>	694	
Satellite Radio	696	
Internet and Broadband	697	
SUMMARY	698	
<b>Bibliography</b>	699	
Glossary		701
Index		707



## PREFACE

It remains vital for college students in the United States to understand the principles of media law and the First Amendment freedoms of speech, press and assembly. The previous few years have seen media companies settle libel lawsuits for millions of dollars, musicians file high-profile copyright lawsuits and the U.S. Supreme Court hear numerous cases involving freedom of expression and media law.

The fun, but challenging, aspect of keeping a media law textbook up-to-date is that new cases, controversies and statutes affecting media law arise on an almost daily basis. The authors have again done their best to make the 21st edition of *Mass Media Law* timely, relevant and helpful to undergraduates across the communication fields of advertising, journalism, media studies, public relations and telecommunications. We've added more examples from all areas of media law to make the book appealing to a wide range of professors and students.

All 16 chapters have been updated with new information and examples. Particular highlights include a new section in Chapter 2 on levels of First Amendment scrutiny and distinctions between content-based and content-neutral regulations; two new sections in Chapter 14, one on copyright issues in music and one on lawsuits involving embedding videos and tweets on webpages; and discussion of recent Supreme Court cases in Chapters 1, 2, 3, 9, 10 and 14.



The 21st edition of *Mass Media Law* is now available online with Connect, McGraw-Hill Education's integrated assignment and assessment platform. Connect also offers Smart-Book for the new edition, which is the first adaptive reading experience proven to improve grades and help students study more effectively. All of the title's Web site and ancillary content is also available through Connect, including the following:

- A full Test Bank of multiple-choice questions that test students on central concepts and ideas in each chapter.
- An Instructor's Manual for each chapter with full chapter outlines, sample test questions and discussion topics.
- Lecture Slides for instructor use in class and downloadable RAP forms.



# connect®

## FOR INSTRUCTORS

### You're in the driver's seat.

Want to build your own course? No problem. Prefer to use our turnkey, prebuilt course? Easy. Want to make changes throughout the semester? Sure. And you'll save time with Connect's auto-grading too.

# 65%

Less Time  
Grading



Laptop: McGraw-Hill; Woman/dog: George Doyle/Getty Images

### They'll thank you for it.

Adaptive study resources like SmartBook® 2.0 help your students be better prepared in less time. You can transform your class time from dull definitions to dynamic debates. Find out more about the powerful personalized learning experience available in SmartBook 2.0 at [www.mheducation.com/highered/connect/smartbook](http://www.mheducation.com/highered/connect/smartbook)

### Make it simple, make it affordable.



Connect makes it easy with seamless integration using any of the major Learning Management Systems—Blackboard®, Canvas, and D2L, among others—to let you organize your course in one convenient location. Give your students access to digital materials at a discount with our inclusive access program. Ask your McGraw-Hill representative for more information.

Padlock: Jobalou/Getty Images

### Solutions for your challenges.



A product isn't a solution. Real solutions are affordable, reliable, and come with training and ongoing support when you need it and how you want it. Our Customer Experience Group can also help you troubleshoot tech problems—although Connect's 99% uptime means you might not need to call them. See for yourself at **status.mheducation.com**

Checkmark: Jobalou/Getty Images



## FOR STUDENTS

### Effective, efficient studying.

Connect helps you be more productive with your study time and get better grades using tools like SmartBook 2.0, which highlights key concepts and creates a personalized study plan. Connect sets you up for success, so you walk into class with confidence and walk out with better grades.

### Study anytime, anywhere.

Download the free ReadAnywhere app and access your online eBook or SmartBook 2.0 assignments when it's convenient, even if you're offline. And since the app automatically syncs with your eBook and SmartBook 2.0 assignments in Connect, all of your work is available every time you open it. Find out more at [www.mheducation.com/readanywhere](http://www.mheducation.com/readanywhere)

***"I really liked this app—it made it easy to study when you don't have your textbook in front of you."***

- Jordan Cunningham,  
Eastern Washington University



Calendar: owattaphotos/Getty Images

### No surprises.

The Connect Calendar and Reports tools keep you on track with the work you need to get done and your assignment scores. Life gets busy; Connect tools help you keep learning through it all.

### Learning for everyone.

McGraw-Hill works directly with Accessibility Services Departments and faculty to meet the learning needs of all students. Please contact your Accessibility Services office and ask them to email [accessibility@mheducation.com](mailto:accessibility@mheducation.com), or visit [www.mheducation.com/about/accessibility](http://www.mheducation.com/about/accessibility) for more information.

Top: Jenner Images/Getty Images, Left: Hero Images/Getty Images, Right: Hero Images/Getty Images





## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Clay Calvert thanks his co-authors for continuing to improve the quality of the textbook. This edition is anything but stale. Their dedication and hard work in adding new and updated material and examples is amazing, especially given the rapidly and constantly evolving (and expanding) landscape of media law. From a new section on standards of scrutiny and content neutrality (Chapter 2) to a timely new unit on musical copyright issues (Chapter 14), the content they have added expands both the breadth and depth of the book. Clay also thanks his undergraduates at the University of Florida for their enthusiasm in his Law of Mass Communications course. Finally, Clay thanks Berl Brechner for his continued support of both Clay's work and that of the Marion B. Brechner First Amendment Project.

Dan Kozlowski is grateful for the guidance Clay Calvert provided throughout the writing of this edition. Clay's expertise in the media law field and his experience as an author on this textbook for years are instrumental in this book's success. Working with Clay and Derigan Silver—both talented scholars and good teachers—on the book is fun and rewarding. Dan also thanks his wife and two daughters for being awesome and for helping to keep him level-headed.

Derigan Silver thanks Dan and Clay for their keen eyes and attention to details as well as their thoughtful approach to updating the book. With so much new material that could be added to the book with every edition, Dan and Clay were invaluable in deciding what to add, what to edit out and what to update. Derigan also thanks his wife, Alison, and his four children.

Finally, all three authors greatly appreciate the support of McGraw-Hill and the multiple individuals there who assisted with the publication of this book.

## SELECTED EXAMPLES OF NEW, EXPANDED OR UPDATED MATERIAL

### Chapter 1

- New content on the U.S. Supreme Court's 2018 *Janus v. American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees* decision as an example of a case overturning precedent
- New case illustrating the overbreadth doctrine
- New examples of equity law, including a temporary restraining order issued against the *Los Angeles Times*

### Chapter 2

- New examples of self-censorship or community censorship, including ABC canceling the hit show "Roseanne" and Disney firing, and then re-hiring, director James Gunn
- New discussion of a federal court ruling that President Donald Trump's utterance of the phrase "Get 'em out of here" during a campaign rally did not constitute an unlawful incitement to violence

- New section on levels of First Amendment scrutiny and distinctions between content-based and content-neutral regulations, using the U.S. Supreme Court's 2018 *National Institute of Family and Life Advocates v. Becerra* decision as an example of a content-based regulation of speech

### Chapter 3

- New cases regarding the true threats doctrine
- New content regarding controversial speakers, including Richard Spencer, on college campuses
- Revised and new material on net neutrality and the FCC's Restore Internet Freedom Order

### Chapter 4

- Discussions of recent defamation cases, including adult film actress Stormy Daniels' defamation lawsuit against President Donald Trump, fitness guru Richard Simmons' lawsuit for articles alleging that Simmons had undergone sex reassignment surgery and several others
- New examples of defamation lawsuits arising from advertising campaigns and social media posts

### Chapter 5

- New examples of what makes an individual a limited purpose public figure
- New section on defamation lawsuits involving the use of anonymous sources
- New examples of suits involving intentional infliction of emotional distress

### Chapter 6

- Rewritten and reorganized introduction and sections on jurisdiction and statute of limitations
- New examples of media defendants successfully using the fair report privilege and the opinion defense
- New discussion and two examples of tweets protected as "rhetorical hyperbole"

### Chapter 7

- New discussion of appropriation lawsuits arising from press releases and other public relations material
- New examples of appropriation lawsuits arising from fictional stories based on factual events
- Update on so-called Ag Gag laws

### Chapter 8

- Update on what qualifies as "newsworthy," with new examples
- A new section on corporations' "right to privacy" and the U.S. Supreme Court case *Federal Communications Commission v. AT&T Inc.*

### Chapter 9

- New content regarding the legal clash that occurred when the Trump administration revoked CNN White House correspondent Jim Acosta's credentials
- New discussion of a federal court ruling that rejected an attempt to obtain President Donald Trump's tax records from the Internal Revenue Service through a FOIA request

- New discussion of the U.S. Supreme Court's 2019 decision in *Food Marketing Institute v. Argus Leader Media*

#### Chapter 10

- New content on the U.S. Supreme Court's 2018 decision in *Carpenter v. United States*, a Fourth Amendment case with press freedom implications
- New discussion of a federal magistrate judge ruling that Florida's shield law protected the online news outlet BuzzFeed
- New discussion about the Department of Justice seizing roughly three years of a reporter's phone and e-mail records

#### Chapter 11

- New examples of gag orders and appeals of those orders
- New example of a judicial order restricting access of the press to jurors

#### Chapter 12

- New examples of court closures and lawsuits involving access to judicial documents
- New section on a recent Colorado Supreme Court case that held there is no First Amendment right or common law right of access to judicial documents
- New discussion of the ability to close court-martial proceedings and a recent example

#### Chapter 13

- New examples of convictions for distributing and possessing child pornography via the Internet and smartphones
- New discussion of a 2018 federal court ruling involving sexually oriented businesses
- New section examining the Allow States and Victims to Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act (FOSTA)

#### Chapter 14

- New section on copyright law and music
- Discussion of two recent Supreme Court cases involving disparaging and scandalous trademarks
- New section on the so-called server test for embedded tweets and videos

#### Chapter 15

- New discussion of a 2018 federal court ruling that struck down a California ban on handgun advertisements at gun stores
- Multiple new examples of FTC enforcement actions against deceptive advertising
- New discussion of how the FTC's Endorsement Guides apply to social media influencers and marketers

#### Chapter 16

- New content on the FCC's deregulatory push under Chairman Ajit Pai
- Updated discussion of the FCC's regulation of broadcast indecency
- New discussion of the FCC's efforts to close the divide between those who have access to broadband Internet service and those who do not



# CHAPTER 1

## The American Legal System

©McGraw-Hill Education/Jill Braaten

<b>Sources of the Law</b>	<b>2</b>	Facts versus the Law	19
Common Law	2	The Federal Court System	21
<i>The Role of Precedent</i>	3	<i>The Supreme Court</i>	22
<i>Finding Common-Law Cases</i>	6	<i>Other Federal Courts</i>	28
Equity Law	8	<i>Federal Judges</i>	30
Statutory Law	10	The State Court System	31
Constitutional Law	12	Judicial Review	32
Executive Orders and		Summary	33
Administrative Rules	16	Lawsuits	34
Summary	17	Summary	37
<b>The Judicial System</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>37</b>

**B**efore studying media law, one needs a general background in law and the judicial system. In the United States, as in most societies, law is a basic part of existence, as necessary for the survival of civilization as are economic and political systems, the mass media, cultural achievement and the family.

This chapter has two purposes: to acquaint you with the law and to outline the legal system in the United States. While not designed to be a comprehensive course in law and the judicial system, it provides a sufficient introduction to understand the next 15 chapters.

The chapter opens with a discussion of the law, considering the most important sources of the law in the United States, and it moves on to the judicial system, including both the federal and state court systems. A summary of judicial review and a brief outline of how both criminal and civil lawsuits start and proceed through the courts are included in the discussion of the judicial system.

### FIVE SOURCES OF LAW

1. Common law
2. Equity law
3. Statutory law
4. Constitutional law (federal and state)
5. Executive orders and administrative rules

## SOURCES OF THE LAW

There are many definitions of law. Some say law is any social norm or any organized method of settling disputes. Most writers insist it is more complex, that some system of sanctions and remedies is required for a genuine legal system. John Austin, a 19th-century English jurist, defined law as definite rules of human conduct with appropriate sanctions for their enforcement. He added that both the rules and the sanctions must be prescribed by duly constituted human authority.<sup>1</sup> Roscoe Pound, an American legal scholar, suggested that law is social engineering—the attempt to order the way people behave. For the purposes of this book, it is helpful to consider law to be a set of rules that attempt to guide human conduct and a set of formal, governmental sanctions that are applied when those rules are violated.

What is the source of American law? There are several major sources of the law in the United States: the U.S. Constitution and state constitutions; common law; the law of equity; statutory law; and the rulings of various executives, such as the president and mayors and governors, and administrative bodies and agencies. Historically, we trace American law to Great Britain. As colonizers of much of the North American continent, the British supplied Americans with an outline for both a legal system and a judicial system. In fact, because of the many similarities between British and American law, many people consider the Anglo-American legal system to be a single entity. Today, our federal Constitution is the supreme law of the land. Yet when each of these sources of law is considered separately, it is more useful to begin with the earliest source of Anglo-American law, the common law.

## COMMON LAW

**Common law**,\* which developed in England during the 200 years after the Norman Conquest in the 11th century, is one of the great legacies of the British people to colonial America. During those two centuries, the crude mosaic of Anglo-Saxon customs was replaced by a single system of law worked out by jurists and judges. The system of law became common throughout England; it became common law. It was also called common law to distinguish it from the ecclesiastical (church) law prevalent at the time.

\* Terms in boldfaced type are defined in the glossary.

1. Abraham, *Judicial Process*.

Initially, the customs of the people were used by the king's courts as the foundation of the law, disputes were resolved according to community custom, and governmental sanction was applied to enforce the resolution. As such, common law was, and still is, considered "discovered law."

As legal problems became more complex and as the law began to be professionally administered (the first lawyers appeared during this era, and eventually professional judges), it became clear that common law reflected not so much the custom of the land as the custom of the court—or more properly, the custom of judges. While judges continued to look to the past to discover how other courts decided a case when given similar facts (precedent is discussed in a moment), many times judges were forced to create the law themselves. Common law thus sometimes is known as judge-made law.

*Common law thus sometimes is known as judge-made law.*

Common law is an inductive system in which a legal rule and legal standards are arrived at after consideration of many cases involving similar facts. In contrast, in a deductive system of law, which is common in many other nations, the rules are expounded first and then the court decides the legal situation under the existing rule. The ability of common law to adapt to change is directly responsible for its longevity.

Fundamental to common law is the concept that judges should look to the past and follow court precedents.\* The Latin expression for the concept is this: "Stare decisis et non quieta movere" (to stand by past decisions and not disturb things at rest). **Stare decisis** is the key phrase: Let the decision stand. A judge should resolve current problems in the same manner as similar problems were resolved in the past. Put differently, a judge will look to a prior case opinion to guide his or her analysis and decision in a current case. Following precedent is beneficial as it builds predictability and consistency into the law—which in turn fosters judicial legitimacy. Courts may be perceived as more legitimate in the public's eye if they are predictable and consistent in their decision-making process.

*Stare decisis is the key phrase: Let the decision stand.*

## *The Role of Precedent*

At first glance one would think that the law never changes in a system that continually looks to the past. Suppose that the first few rulings in a line of cases were bad decisions. Are courts saddled with bad law forever? The answer is no. While following **precedent** is desired (many people say that certainty in the law is more important than justice), it is not always the proper way to proceed. To protect the integrity of common law, judges developed means of coping with bad law and new situations in which the application of old law would result in injustice.

Imagine that the newspaper in your hometown publishes a picture and story about a 12-year-old girl who gave birth to a 7-pound son in a local hospital. The mother and father do not like the publicity and sue the newspaper for invasion of privacy. The attorney for the parents finds a precedent, *Barber v. Time*,<sup>2</sup> in which a Missouri court ruled that to photograph a patient in a hospital room against her will and then to publish that picture in a news magazine is an **invasion of privacy**.

\*Appellate courts (see page 19) often render decisions that decide only the particular case and do not establish binding precedent. Courts refer to these as "unpublished decisions." In some jurisdictions, it is unlawful for a lawyer to cite these rulings in legal papers submitted in later cases.  
2. 159 S.W. 2d 291 (1942).



#### FOUR OPTIONS FOR HANDLING PRECEDENT

1. Accept/Follow
2. Modify/Update
3. Distinguish
4. Overrule

Does the existence of this precedent mean that the young couple will automatically win this lawsuit? Must the court follow and adopt the *Barber* decision? The answer to both questions is no. For one thing, there may be other cases in which courts have ruled that publishing such a picture is not an invasion of privacy. In fact, in 1956 in the case of *Meetze v. AP*,<sup>3</sup> a South Carolina court made such a ruling. But for the moment assume that *Barber v. Time* is the only precedent. Is the court bound by this precedent? No. The court has several options concerning the 1942 decision.

First, it can *accept* the precedent as law and rule that the newspaper has invaded the privacy of the couple by publishing the picture and story about the birth of their child. When a court accepts a prior court ruling as precedent, it is adopting it and following it for guidance. Second, the court can *modify*, or change, the 1942 precedent by arguing that *Barber v. Time* was decided more than 75 years ago when people were more sensitive about going to a hospital, since a stay there was often considered to reflect badly on a patient. Today hospitalization is no longer a sensitive matter to most people. Therefore, a rule of law restricting the publication of a picture of a hospital patient is unrealistic, unless the picture is in bad taste or needlessly embarrasses the patient. Then the publication may be an invasion of privacy. In our imaginary case, then, the decision turns on what kind of picture and story the newspaper published: a pleasant picture that flattered the couple or one that mocked and embarrassed them? If the court rules in this manner, it *modifies* the 1942 precedent, making it correspond to what the judge perceives to be contemporary sensibilities and circumstances.

As a third option the court can decide that *Barber v. Time* provides an important precedent for a plaintiff hospitalized because of an unusual disease—as Dorothy Barber’s was—but that in the case before the court, the plaintiff was hospitalized to give birth to a baby, a different situation: Giving birth is a voluntary status; catching a disease is not. Because the two cases present different problems, they are really different cases. Hence, the *Barber v. Time* precedent does not apply. This practice is called *distinguishing the precedent from the current case*, a very common action. In brief, a court can distinguish a prior case (and therefore choose not to accept it and not to follow it) because it involves either different facts or different issues from the current case.

Finally, the court can *overrule* the precedent. When a court overrules precedent, it declares the prior decision wrong and thus no longer the law. Courts generally overrule prior opinions as bad law only when there are changes in:

3. 95 S.E. 2d 606 (1956).

1. factual knowledge and circumstances;
2. social mores and values; and/or
3. judges/justices on the court.

For instance, in 2003 the U.S. Supreme Court in *Lawrence v. Texas*<sup>4</sup> overruled its 1986 opinion called *Bowers v. Hardwick*<sup>5</sup> that had upheld a Georgia anti-sodomy statute prohibiting certain sexual acts between consenting gay adults. By 2003, American society increasingly accepted homosexuality (evidenced then by both the dwindling number of states that prohibited the conduct referenced in *Bowers* and by at least two Supreme Court rulings subsequent to *Bowers* but before *Lawrence* that were favorable to gay rights and thus eroded *Bowers*' strength). There also was growing recognition that consenting adults, regardless of sexual orientation, should possess the constitutional, personal liberty to engage in private sexual conduct of their choosing. Furthermore, six of the nine justices on the Supreme Court had changed from 1986 to 2003. Thus, 17 years after *Bowers* was decided, there were changes in social values, legal sentiment and the court's composition. The Supreme Court in *Lawrence* therefore struck down a Texas anti-sodomy statute similar to the Georgia one it had upheld in *Bowers*. It thus overruled *Bowers*. Justice Anthony Kennedy noted that although "the doctrine of stare decisis is essential to the respect accorded to the judgments of the court and to the stability of the law," it "is not, however, an inexorable command." In the hypothetical case involving the 12-year-old girl who gave birth, the only courts that can overrule the Missouri Supreme Court's opinion in *Barber v. Time* are the Missouri Supreme Court and the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 2018, a closely divided Supreme Court in *Janus v. American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees*<sup>6</sup> overruled a 1977 opinion called *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*.<sup>7</sup> The Court in *Abood* had upheld a Michigan law authorizing a system for union representation of government employees. Under the system, a union and a local government employer could agree to an "agency shop" arrangement "whereby every employee represented by a union—even though not a union member—must pay to the union . . . a service fee equal in amount to union dues." It was constitutional, the Court said in *Abood*, to require nonmembers to help pay for a union's collective bargaining efforts in order to ensure "labor peace."

But in *Janus*, the five conservative-leaning justices on the Court at the time (Kennedy, John Roberts, Samuel Alito, Clarence Thomas and Neil Gorsuch) ruled that a similar arrangement in Illinois was unconstitutional. In the case, Mark Janus, who worked as a child support specialist for the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services, refused to join the union that represented the public employees in his unit. He did not agree with the union's positions, and he said that, if he had the choice, he would not pay any fees or subsidize the union in any way. Under a collective-bargaining agreement, though, he was nevertheless required to pay an agency fee of \$44.58 per month.

4. 539 U.S. 558 (2003).

5. 478 U.S. 186 (1986).

6. 138 S. Ct. 2448 (2018).

7. 431 U.S. 209 (1977).

Writing for the majority in *Janus*, Justice Alito ruled, “Under Illinois law, public employees are forced to subsidize a union, even if they choose not to join and strongly object to the positions the union takes in collective bargaining and related activities. We conclude that this arrangement violates the free speech rights of nonmembers by compelling them to subsidize private speech on matters of substantial public concern.” Justice Alito noted that, in general, *stare decisis* is the preferred course and that the Court “will not overturn a past decision unless there are strong grounds for doing so.” But in this case, he wrote, “*Abood* was poorly reasoned. It has led to practical problems and abuse. It is inconsistent with other First Amendment cases and has been undermined by more recent decisions.”

Obviously, the preceding discussion oversimplifies the judicial process. Rarely is a court confronted with only a single precedent. Indeed, as attorneys would put it, there may be several prior cases that are “on point” or may apply as precedent. And whether or not precedent is binding on a court is often an issue. For example, decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States regarding the U.S. Constitution and federal laws are binding on all federal and state courts. Decisions by the U.S. Court of Appeals on federal matters are binding only on other lower federal and state courts in that circuit or region. (See pages 29–30 for a discussion of the circuits.) The supreme court of any state is the final authority on the meaning of the constitution and laws of that state, and its rulings on these matters are binding on all state and federal courts in that state. Matters are more complicated when federal courts interpret state laws. State courts can accept or reject these interpretations in most instances. Because mass media law is so heavily affected by the First Amendment, state judges frequently look outside their borders to precedents developed by the federal courts. A state court ruling on a question involving the First Amendment guarantees of free speech and press will be substantially guided by federal court precedents on the same subject.

Lawyers and law professors often debate how important precedent really is when a court makes a decision. Some have suggested a “hunch theory” of jurisprudence: A judge decides a case based on a gut feeling of what is right and wrong and then seeks out precedents to support the decision.

### *Finding Common-Law Cases*

Common law is not specifically written down someplace for all to see and use. It is instead contained in hundreds of thousands of decisions handed down by courts over the centuries. Many attempts have been made to summarize the law. Sir Edward Coke compiled and analyzed the precedents of common law in the early 17th century. Sir William Blackstone later expanded Coke’s work in the monumental *Commentaries on the Law of England*. More recently, in such works as the massive *Restatement of the Law, Second, of Torts*, the task was again undertaken, but on a narrower scale.

Courts began to record their decisions centuries ago. These decisions are called “opinions” in legal parlance. The modern concept of fully reporting written decisions of all courts probably began in 1785 with the publication of the first British Term Reports.




FIGURE 1.1

Reading a case citation.

While scholars and lawyers still uncover common law using the case-by-case method, it is fairly easy today to locate the appropriate cases through a simple system of citation. The cases of a single court (such as the U.S. Supreme Court or the federal district courts) are collected in a single **case reporter** (such as the “United States Reports” or the “Federal Supplement”). The cases are collected chronologically and fill many volumes. Each case collected has its individual **citation**, or identification number, which reflects the name of the reporter in which the case can be found, the volume of that reporter, and the page on which the case begins (Figure 1.1). For example, the citation for the decision in *Adderly v. Florida* (a freedom-of-speech case) is 385 U.S. 39 (1966). The letters in the middle (U.S.) indicate that the case is in the “United States Reports,” the official government reporter for cases decided by the Supreme Court of the United States. The number 385 refers to the specific volume of the “United States Reports” in which the case is found. The second number (39) gives the page on which the case appears. Finally, 1966 provides the year in which the case was decided. So, *Adderly v. Florida* can be found on page 39 of volume 385 of the “United States Reports.”

Computers affected the legal community in many ways. Court opinions are now available via a variety of online services. For instance, two legal databases attorneys often use and that frequently are available free to students at colleges and universities are LexisNexis and Westlaw. These databases provide access to court opinions, statutory law (see pages 10–12) and law journal articles. In most jurisdictions, lawyers may file documents electronically with the court.

If you have the correct citation, you can easily find any case you seek. Locating all citations of the cases apropos to a particular problem—such as a libel suit—is a different matter and is a technique taught in law schools. A great many legal encyclopedias, digests, compilations of common law, books and articles are used by lawyers to track down the names and citations of the appropriate cases.

### TYPICAL REMEDIES IN EQUITY LAW

1. Temporary restraining order (TRO)
2. Preliminary injunction
3. Permanent injunction

## EQUITY LAW

**Equity** is another kind of judge-made law. The distinction today between common law and equity law has blurred. The cases are heard by the same judges in the same courtrooms. Differences in procedures and remedies are all that is left to distinguish these two categories of the law. Separate consideration of common law and equity leads to a better understanding of both, however. Equity was originally a supplement to the common law and developed side by side with common law.

The rules and procedures under equity are far more flexible than those under common law. Equity really begins where common law leaves off. Equity suits are never tried before a jury. Rulings come in the form of **judicial decrees**, not in judgments of yes or no. Decisions in equity are (and were) discretionary on the part of judges. And despite the fact that precedents are also relied upon in the law of equity, judges are free to do what they think is right and fair in a specific case.

Equity provides another advantage for troubled litigants—the restraining order. While the typical remedy in a civil lawsuit in common law is **damages** (money), equity allows a judge to issue orders that can either be preventive (prohibiting a party from engaging in a potential behavior it is considering) or remedial (compelling a party to stop doing something it currently is doing). Individuals who can demonstrate that they are in peril or are about to suffer a serious irremediable wrong can usually gain a legal writ such as an injunction or a restraining order to stop someone from doing something. Generally, a court issues a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction until it can hear arguments from both parties in the dispute and decide whether an injunction should be made permanent.

For instance, in July 2018 a federal judge in California issued a temporary restraining order (TRO) requiring the *Los Angeles Times* to alter part of an online article about a plea deal made between an ex-police detective and federal prosecutors. The detective, who admitted he had lied to federal investigators about his link to an organized crime syndicate, entered a plea agreement that was supposed to be under seal. Because of a clerical error, though, the agreement was posted to an online court database called the Public Access to Court Electronic Records (PACER). A reporter for the *Los Angeles Times* found the plea agreement in the database and wrote a story about it. The detective’s lawyer sought the TRO, which was granted by the judge within hours of the story’s publication. Such injunctions—even TROs, which are brief in time, as the word “temporary” suggests—stopping the dissemination of truthful speech about a newsworthy matter presumptively violate the First Amendment (see Chapter 2 regarding prior restraints). The newspaper complied and removed details of the plea deal from its online story, but the

*Los Angeles Times* also challenged the judge's order. The newspaper filed an emergency motion with the 9th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals, seeking a stay of the order. Nearly 60 news media organizations signed a letter that they submitted to the 9th Circuit in support of the *Los Angeles Times*, arguing that "once information is made public, nearly 90 years of constitutional law stand in the way of using prior restraints to prevent a newspaper from communicating the information to its readers." Three days later, the judge, John F. Walter of the U.S. District Court of the Central District of California vacated, or threw out, his original order.

### **YOU CAN'T SAY THAT AGAIN!: ENJOINING DEFAMATION**

As discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 6, when a speaker publishes something defamatory about another person—a false statement of fact that damages that person's reputation—the traditional legal recourse in the United States is a lawsuit for defamation, with the defamed party receiving monetary damages from the defendant. But as Professor David Ardia has argued, the Internet has brought increased attention to the adequacy of monetary damages as the only remedy for defamation. Today, defamation cases are increasingly arising from online speech, with plaintiffs claiming speech published by bloggers or users of social media defames them. Rather than seek monetary damages to compensate themselves or to punish the defendants, some of the plaintiffs in these cases have instead sought to have the speech stopped altogether using injunctions. Alarming, some courts have been increasingly willing to grant injunctions that bar—or forbid—speakers from repeating their defamatory comments.

For instance, a district court in Indiana issued a permanent injunction that would have prevented an Indiana man and a former religious sister from repeating blog comments they had made in what amounted to an online smear campaign. The blog comments came in the midst of a dispute over who was entitled to the documents and artifacts of a religious sister who had experienced a series of apparitions of the Virgin Mary. The particulars of the case were messy, but, ultimately, the district court permanently enjoined the defendants from repeating several specific comments—even though the jury had not ruled that those specific comments were defamatory—as well as "any similar statements that contain the same sort of allegations or inferences, in any manner or forum."

On appeal, the 7th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals struck down the injunction as unconstitutional in December 2015. In *McCarthy v. Fuller*, the 7th Circuit said the injunction was a "patent violation of the First Amendment" because it was "so broad and vague" that it threatened to silence the defendants completely. Although this particular injunction was poorly crafted and thus problematic, the court left open the question of whether defamation could *ever* be enjoined. In a July 2018 decision, the 1st Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals also struck down an injunction on defamation. In that case, *Sindi v. El-Moslimany*, the 1st Circuit pointed out that what makes bans on repeating particular statements problematic is that "defamation is an inherently contextual tort," meaning that a statement that is libelous in one context might not be libelous in another.



On the other hand, equitable remedies in the form of injunctions are more likely to be granted in copyright cases where the plaintiff can demonstrate the defendant is selling copyrighted material owned by the plaintiff (see Chapter 14 regarding copyright). Universal Studios, which owns the movie rights to the “Fifty Shades of Grey” book series, sought an injunction in 2013 against an adult-movie company called Smash Pictures to stop the distribution of a movie called “Fifty Shades of Grey: A XXX Adaptation.” While parodies that make fun of or comment on the original work often are protected against copyright claims, this porn parody copied many lines from the book nearly verbatim and simply claimed to be a hard-core version of the book. The case ultimately settled, with Smash Pictures consenting to a permanent injunction prohibiting the distribution of its parody.

Ultimately, a party seeks an equitable remedy (a restraining order or injunction) if there is a real threat of a direct, immediate and irreparable injury for which monetary damages won’t provide sufficient compensation.

## STATUTORY LAW

While common law sometimes is referred to as discovered or judge-made law, the third great source of laws in the United States today is created by elected legislative bodies at the local, state and federal levels and is known as statutory law.

Several important characteristics of statutory law are best understood by contrasting them with common law. First, **statutes** tend to deal with problems affecting society or large groups of people, in contrast to common law, which usually deals with smaller, individual problems. (Some common-law rulings affect large groups of people, but this occurrence is rare.) It should also be noted in this connection the importance of not confusing common law with constitutional law. Certainly, when judges interpret a constitution, they make policy that affects us all. However, it should be kept in mind that a constitution is a legislative document voted on by the people and is not discovered law or judge-made law.

Second, statutory law can anticipate problems, and common law cannot. For example, a state legislature can pass a statute that prohibits publication of the school records of a student without prior consent of the student. Under common law the problem cannot be resolved until a student’s record has been published in a newspaper or transmitted over the Internet and the student brings action against the publisher to recover damages for the injury incurred.

Third, the criminal laws in the United States are all statutory laws—common-law crimes no longer exist in this country and have not since 1812. Common-law rules are not precise enough to provide the kind of notice needed to protect a criminal defendant’s right to due process of law.

Fourth, statutory law is collected in codes and law books, instead of in reports as is common law. When a bill is adopted by the legislative branch and approved by the executive branch, it becomes law and is integrated into the proper section of a municipal code, a state code or whatever. However, this does not mean that some very important statutory law cannot be found in the case reporters.

*The criminal laws in the United States are all statutory laws.*

Passage of a law is rarely the final word. Courts become involved in determining what that law means. Although a properly constructed statute sometimes needs little interpretation by the courts, judges are frequently called upon to rule on the exact meaning of ambiguous phrases and words. The resulting process of judicial interpretation is called **statutory construction** and is very important. Even the simplest kind of statement often needs interpretation. For example, a statute that declares “*it is illegal to distribute a violent video game to minors*” is fraught with ambiguities that a court must construe and resolve in order to determine if it violates the First Amendment speech rights of video game creators and players (see page 76 regarding regulation of video games). What type of content, for instance, falls within the meaning of the word “violent” as it is used in this statute? How young must a person be in order to be considered a “minor” under the law? Does the term “distribute” mean to sell a video game, to rent a video game or to give it away for free? Finally, because games are played in arcades, on computers and via consoles, just what precisely is a “video” game under the statute?

### ATTACKING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF STATUTES: FACIAL CHALLENGES VERSUS AS-APPLIED CHALLENGES

There are two primary ways to argue that a statute violates the First Amendment right of free speech: (1) by attacking problems with its wording, terms and language (known as a facial attack); or (2) by attacking problems with its actual application to a particular factual scenario (known as an as-applied attack). A facial attack tests a law’s constitutionality based on its text (its words and language), but does not consider the facts or circumstances of a particular case. For instance, a challenge to a statute based on the ground that it is either overbroad or unduly vague in its use of language (both the overbreadth doctrine and the void for vagueness doctrine are described in the next few pages of this chapter) are examples of facial challenges. In contrast, an as-applied attack does not contend that a law is unconstitutional because of how it is written, but because of how it actually applies to a particular person or particular group of people under specific factual circumstances that allegedly deprive the person of a First Amendment right. In general, as-applied challenges are the preferred method for attacking a statute. As Justice Samuel Alito wrote in 2010 in *United States v. Stevens*,<sup>8</sup> “the ‘strong medicine’ of overbreadth invalidation need not and generally should not be administered when the statute under attack is unconstitutional as applied to the challenger before the court.” Ultimately, however, as Justice Anthony Kennedy wrote in 2010 in *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission*<sup>9</sup> (see pages 139–141 describing this case in the unit “The First Amendment and Election Campaigns”), “the distinction between facial and as-applied challenges is not so well defined that it has some automatic effect or that it must always control the pleadings and disposition in every case involving a constitutional challenge.”

8. 559 U.S. 460 (2010).

9. 558 U.S. 310 (2010).

Usually a legislature leaves a trail to help a judge find out what the law means. When judges rule on the meaning of a statute, they are supposed to determine what the legislature meant when it passed the law (the legislative intent), not what they think the law should mean. Minutes of committee hearings in which the law was discussed, legislative staff reports and reports of debate on the floor can all be used to determine legislative intent. Therefore, when lawyers deal with statutes, they frequently search the case reporters to find out how the courts interpreted a law in which they are interested.

## CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

Great Britain lacks a written **constitution**. The United States, in contrast, has a written constitution, and it is an important source of our law. In fact, there are many constitutions in this country: the federal Constitution, state constitutions, city charters and so forth. All these documents accomplish the same ends. First, they provide the plan for the establishment and organization of the government. Next, they outline the duties, responsibilities and powers of the various elements of government. Finally, they usually guarantee certain basic rights to the people, such as freedom of speech and freedom to peaceably assemble.

Legislative bodies may enact statutes rather easily by a majority vote. It is far more difficult to adopt or change a constitution. State constitutions are approved or changed by a direct vote of the people. It is even more difficult to change the federal Constitution. An amendment may be proposed by a vote of two-thirds of the members of both the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate. Alternatively, two-thirds of the state legislatures can call for a constitutional convention for proposing amendments. Once proposed, amendments must be approved either by three-fourths of the state legislatures or by three-fourths of the constitutional conventions called in all the states. Congress decides which method of ratification or approval is to be used. Because the people have an unusually direct voice in the approval and change of a constitution, constitutions are considered the most important source of U.S. law.

One Supreme Court justice described a constitution as a kind of yardstick against which all the other actions of government must be measured to determine whether the actions are permissible. The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land. Any law or other constitution that conflicts with the U.S. Constitution is unenforceable. A state constitution plays the same role for a state: A statute passed by the Michigan legislature and signed by the governor of that state is clearly unenforceable if it conflicts with the Michigan Constitution. And so it goes for all levels of constitutions.

Constitutions tend to be short and, at the federal level and in most states, infrequently amended. Consequently, changes in the language of a constitution are uncommon. But a considerable amount of constitutional law is nevertheless developed by the courts, which are asked to determine the meaning of provisions in the documents and to decide whether other laws or government actions violate constitutional provisions.

*The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land.*

Hence, the case reporters are repositories for the constitutional law that governs the nation.

Twenty-seven amendments are appended to the U.S. Constitution. The first 10 are known as the Bill of Rights and guarantee certain basic human rights to all citizens. Included in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution are freedom of speech and press, rights you will understand more fully in future chapters.

The federal Constitution and the 50 state constitutions are very important when considering media law problems. All 51 of these charters contain provisions, in one form or another, that guarantee freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

Importantly, state constitutions can give more and greater rights to their citizens than are provided under the U.S. Constitution; they cannot, however, reduce or roll back rights given by the federal Constitution. The scope of protection for speech and press afforded by any given state constitution thus may be broader than that bestowed by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. For instance, whereas obscene speech is not protected by the First Amendment (see Chapter 13), the Oregon Supreme Court held in 1987 that obscene expression is protected in that state under Article I, Section 8 of the Oregon Constitution.<sup>10</sup> A lawyer challenging a state statute that allegedly restricts any form of speech therefore is wise to argue before a court that the statute in question violates either or both the First Amendment and the relevant state's constitutional provision protecting expression. Consequently, any government action that affects in any way the freedom of individuals or mass media to speak or publish or broadcast must be measured against the constitutional guarantees of freedom of expression.

*The scope of protection for speech and press afforded by any given state constitution thus may be broader than that bestowed by the First Amendment.*

There are several reasons why a law limiting speaking or publishing might be declared unconstitutional. The law might be a direct restriction on speech or press that is protected by the First Amendment. For example, an order by a Nebraska judge that prohibited the press from publishing certain information about a pending murder trial was considered a direct restriction on freedom of the press (see *Nebraska Press Association v. Stuart*,<sup>11</sup> Chapter 11).

A criminal obscenity statute or another kind of criminal law might be declared unconstitutional because it is too vague. Under the **void for vagueness doctrine**, a law will be declared unconstitutional and struck down if a person of reasonable and ordinary intelligence would not be able to tell, from looking at its terms, what speech is allowed and what speech is prohibited. Put differently, people of ordinary intelligence should not have to guess at a statute's meaning. As the U.S. Supreme Court wrote in 2012 in a broadcast indecency case called *FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.*<sup>12</sup> (see Chapter 16 for more on both broadcast indecency and this case), "a fundamental

10. *Oregon v. Henry*, 302 Ore. 510 (1987). Article I, Section 8 of the Oregon Constitution provides that "no law shall be passed restraining the free expression of opinion, or restricting the right to speak, write, or print freely on any subject whatever; but every person shall be responsible for the abuse of this right." A 1996 ballot measure, drafted in part in response to the *Henry* opinion and that would have amended Article I, Section 8 so as not to protect obscenity, narrowly failed when put before Oregon voters.

11. 427 U.S. 539 (1976).

12. 567 U.S. 239 (2012).

principle in our legal system is that laws which regulate persons or entities must give fair notice of conduct that is forbidden or required.” The Court added that “this requirement of clarity in regulation . . . requires the invalidation of laws that are impermissibly vague.” In 2018 in the U.S. Supreme Court case *Sessions v. Dimaya*, Justice Neil Gorsuch observed in his concurring opinion that vague laws “can invite the exercise of arbitrary power all the same—by leaving the people in the dark about what the law demands and allowing prosecutors and courts to make it up.” Vague laws are thus problematic because they

- don’t provide fair notice of what speech is permitted; and
- can be enforced unfairly and discriminatorily because they give too much discretion (due to the vague terms) to those who enforce them (police and judges).

For instance, in March 2018, a Texas judge dismissed charges against a social media personality in Laredo, Texas, known as La Gordiloca, which roughly translates as the Crazy Fat Lady, because the part of the law the police used to arrest her was unconstitutionally vague. The woman arrested, whose real name is Priscilla Villarreal, is a Facebook crime blogger who was charged with misuse of official information after she published the names of a suicide victim and a car accident fatality before police had released the information to the public. She was charged under a state law that made it a crime if a person “with intent to obtain a benefit or with intent to harm or defraud another . . . solicits or receives from a public servant information that . . . has not been made public.” The judge in the case ruled that, because the law was vague, it was unclear whether Villarreal had derived any “benefit.” The judge also said there had been no prior prohibition on publishing the information.

A statute might also be declared unconstitutional because it violates what is known as the **overbreadth doctrine**. A law is overbroad if it does not aim only at problems within the allowable area of legitimate government control but also sweeps within its ambit or scope other activities that constitute an exercise of protected expression. For instance, in 2010 the U.S. Supreme Court in *United States v. Stevens*<sup>13</sup> declared as unconstitutionally overbroad a federal statute that criminalized the commercial creation, sale or possession of certain depictions of animal cruelty. The statute defined a depiction of animal cruelty as one “in which a living animal is intentionally maimed, mutilated, tortured, wounded or killed,” provided that such conduct is illegal under a federal or state law where the creation, sale or possession of the depiction occurs. In holding the law overbroad, Chief Justice John Roberts wrote that it “create[s] a criminal prohibition of alarming breadth. To begin with, the text of the statute’s ban on a ‘depiction of animal cruelty’ nowhere requires that the depicted conduct be cruel. That text applies to ‘any . . . depiction’ in which ‘a living animal is intentionally maimed, mutilated, tortured, wounded, or killed.’ . . . [M]aimed, mutilated, [and] tortured’ convey cruelty, but ‘wounded’ or ‘killed’ do not suggest any such limitation.”

13. 559 U.S. 460 (2010).

The overbreadth doctrine was used in 2018 by the 5th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals to declare unconstitutional a Louisiana law that criminalized “public intimidation,” defined as “the use of violence, force, or threats” on any public officer or employee with the intent to influence the officer’s conduct in relation to his or her position. Why was the law overbroad? The 5th Circuit in *Seals v. McBee* said the “meaning of ‘threat’ is broad enough to sweep in threats to take lawful, peaceful actions,” such as threatening to sue a police officer or to challenge an incumbent officeholder or to boycott communities. The law could even “encompass an innocuous threat to complain to a [Department of Motor Vehicles] manager for slow service or a serious threat to organize lawsuits and demonstrations unless the police lower their weapons.” Because the law swept “so broadly, encompassing any number of constitutionally protected threats,” the court said it was unconstitutionally overbroad.

### **HONK IF YOU LOVE FREE SPEECH AND HATE OVERBROAD LAWS**

In 2011, the Supreme Court of Washington state declared unconstitutionally overbroad a Snohomish County ordinance that prohibited honking a car horn for a purpose other than public safety or originating from an officially sanctioned parade or public event. The case of *Washington v. Immelt* involved Helen Immelt, who intentionally sounded a car horn at length in front of a neighbor’s house in the early morning hours because she was mad at the neighbor. Does honking a horn constitute speech? The Supreme Court of Washington invoked the symbolic speech doctrine (see page 51) and found that “conduct such as horn honking may rise to the level of speech when the actor intends to communicate a message and the message can be understood in context.” Examples of horn honking as speech, the court wrote, include “a driver of a carpool vehicle who toots a horn to let a coworker know it is time to go, a driver who enthusiastically responds to a sign that says ‘honk if you support our troops,’ wedding guests who celebrate nuptials by sounding their horns, and a motorist who honks a horn in support of an individual picketing on a street corner.”

In striking down the ordinance, the court wrote that “a law is overbroad if it ‘sweeps within its prohibitions’ a substantial amount of constitutionally protected conduct.” Although emphasizing that “local governments maintain a legitimate interest in protecting residents from excessive and unwelcome noise,” the Snohomish ordinance simply went too far because it “prohibits a wide swath of expressive conduct in order to protect against a narrow category of public disturbances,” such as all of the examples noted earlier. The court suggested that a better and more narrowly written ordinance—one confined, perhaps, to horn honking intended to annoy or harass—might be constitutional.



## EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND ADMINISTRATIVE RULES

The final source of American law has two streams. First are orders issued by elected officers of government, often called executive orders. Second are rules generated by the administrative agencies of government, at the federal, state and local levels.

Government executives—the U.S. president, governors, mayors, county executives, village presidents—all have more or less power to issue rules of law, sometimes referred to as executive orders or declarations. This power is normally defined by the constitution or the charter that establishes the office, and it varies widely from city to city or state to state. In some instances the individual has fairly broad powers; in others the power is sharply confined. For instance, in 2018 President Donald Trump issued an executive order establishing a task force on market integrity and consumer fraud within the Department of Justice. The task force, among other things, provides “guidance for the investigation and prosecution of cases involving fraud on the government, the financial markets, and consumers, including cyber-fraud and other fraud targeting the elderly, service members and veterans, and other members of the public.” Such declarations are possible so long as they are properly within the delegated powers held by the executive. An order from an executive who exceeds his or her power can be overturned by the legislature (the mayor’s order can be changed or vacated by the city council, for example) or by a court. Such overstepping by a president would violate the separation of powers among the legislative, judicial and executive branches of government.

A more substantial part of U.S. law is generated by myriad administrative agencies that exist in the nation today, agencies that first began to develop in the latter part of the 19th century. By that time in the country’s history, Congress was being asked to resolve questions going far beyond such matters as budgets, wars, treaties and the like. Technology created new kinds of problems for Congress to resolve. Many such issues were complex and required specialized knowledge and expertise that the representatives and senators lacked and could not easily acquire, had they wanted to. Specialized federal administrative agencies were therefore created to deal with these problems.

Hundreds of such agencies now exist at both federal and state levels. Each agency undertakes to deal with a specific set of problems too technical or too large for the legislative branch to handle. Perhaps the most relevant **administrative agency** for purposes of media law, along with the Federal Trade Commission (FTC; see Chapter 15), is the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), created by Congress in 1934. It regulates broadcasting and other telecommunication in the United States, a job that Congress has attempted only sporadically. Its members must be citizens of the United States and are appointed by the president. The single stipulation is that at any one time no more than three of the five individuals on the commission can be from the same political party. The Senate must confirm the appointments.

Congress has sketched the framework for the regulation of broadcasting in the Federal Communications Act of 1934 and subsequent amendments to this statute. This legislation is used by the FCC as its basic regulatory guidelines. But the agency generates much law on its own as it interprets the congressional mandates, and uses its considerable authority to generate rules and regulations. Today, the FCC is involved

with issues ranging from net neutrality (see Chapter 3) to indecency on broadcast television (see Chapter 16).

People dissatisfied with an action by an agency can attempt to have it modified by asking the legislative body that created and funds the agency—Congress, for example, when considering the FCC—to change or overturn the action. In the 1980s when the FTC made several aggressive pro-consumer rulings, Congress voided these actions because members disagreed with the extent of the rulings. More commonly, the actions of an agency will be challenged in the courts. But courts have limited power to review decisions made by administrative agencies and can overturn such a ruling in only these limited circumstances:

*But courts have limited power to review decisions made by administrative agencies.*

1. If the original act that established the commission or agency is unconstitutional.
2. If the commission or agency exceeds its authority.
3. If the commission or agency violates its own rules.
4. If there is no evidentiary basis whatsoever to support the ruling.

The reason for these limitations is simple: These agencies were created to bring expert knowledge to bear on complex problems, and the entire purpose for their creation would be defeated if judges with no special expertise in a given area could reverse an agency ruling merely because they had a different solution to a problem.

The case reporters contain some law created by the administrative agencies, but the reports that these agencies themselves publish contain much more such law. Today, you can look up recent opinions and rulings of both the FCC and FTC at their respective Web sites, located at <https://www.fcc.gov> and <https://www.ftc.gov>.

There are other sources of American law, but the sources just discussed—common law, law of equity, statutory law, constitutional law, executive orders and rules and regulations by administrative agencies—are the most important and are of most concern in this book. First Amendment problems fall under the purview of constitutional law. Libel and invasion of privacy are matters generally dealt with by common law and equity law. Obscenity laws in this country are statutory provisions (although this fact is frequently obscured by the hundreds of court cases in which judges attempt to define the meaning of obscenity). And of course the regulation of broadcasting and advertising falls primarily under the jurisdiction of administrative agencies.

There are several important sources of American law. Common law is the oldest source of our law, having developed in England more than 700 years ago. Fundamental to common law is the concept that judges should look to the past and follow earlier court rulings, called precedents. Stare decisis (let the decision stand) is a key concept. But judges have developed the means to change or adapt common law by modifying, distinguishing or overruling precedent case law. Common law, a type of judge-made law, is not written in a law book but is collected in volumes of case reporters that

## SUMMARY

contain the decisions, known as opinions, handed down by courts. Each case is given its own legal identity through a system of numbered citations.

Equity law is the second source of American law. The rules and procedures of equity are far more flexible than those of common law and permit a judge (equity cases are never heard before a jury) to fashion a solution to unique or unusual problems. A court is permitted under equity law to restrain an individual or a corporation or even a government from taking an action by issuing a judicial decree such as an injunction. Under common law a court can attempt to compensate the injured party only for the damage that results from the action.

A great volume of law is generated by legislative bodies. This legislation, called statutory law, is the third important source of American law. All criminal laws are statutes. Statutes usually deal with problems that affect great numbers of people, and statutes can anticipate problems, whereas common law cannot. Statutes are collected in codes or statute books. Courts become involved when they are called on to interpret the meaning of the words and phrases contained in a statute, a process known as statutory construction.

Constitutions, the fourth source of law, take precedence over all other American law. The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land. A state constitution actually can provide more rights to citizens of a state than the U.S. Constitution, but it cannot reduce or limit U.S. constitutional rights. Other laws, whether they spring from common law, equity, legislative bodies or administrative agencies, cannot conflict with the provisions of the Constitution. Courts interpret the meaning of the provisions of our constitutions (one federal and 50 state constitutions) and through this process often make these seemingly rigid legal prescriptions adaptable to contemporary problems.

Executives (presidents and governors) can issue orders that carry the force of law. And there are thousands of administrative agencies, boards and commissions in the nation that produce rules and regulations. This administrative law usually deals with technical and complicated matters requiring levels of expertise that members of traditional legislative bodies do not normally possess. Members of these agencies and commissions are usually appointed by presidents or by governors or mayors, and the agencies are supervised and funded by legislative bodies. Their tasks are narrowly defined, and their rulings, while they carry the force of law, can always be appealed.

## THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM

This section introduces the court system in the United States. Since the judicial branch of our three-part government is the field on which most of the battles involving communications law are fought, an understanding of the judicial system is essential.

It is technically improper to talk about the American judicial system. There are 52 different judicial systems in the United States, one for the federal government and one for each of the 50 states, plus the District of Columbia. While each system is somewhat different from the others, the similarities among the 52 systems are much more

important than the differences. Each of the systems is divided into two distinct sets of courts—trial courts and appellate courts. Each judicial system is established by a constitution, federal or state. In each system the courts act as the third branch of a triumvirate of government: a legislative branch, which makes the law; an executive branch, which enforces the law; and a judicial branch, which interprets the law.

## FACTS VERSUS THE LAW

Common to all judicial systems is the distinction between trial courts and appellate courts. Each level of court has its own function: Basically, **trial courts** are fact-finding courts and **appellate courts** are law-reviewing courts. Trial courts are the courts of first instance, the place where nearly all cases begin. Juries sometimes sit in trial courts (a trial held before a judge and without a jury is known as a bench trial) but never in appellate courts. Trial courts are empowered to consider both the facts and the law in a case. Appellate courts normally consider only the law. The difference between facts and law is significant. The facts are what happened. The law is what should be done because of the facts.

*The facts are what happened. The law is what should be done because of the facts.*

The difference between facts and law can be emphasized by looking at an imaginary libel suit that might result if the *River City Sentinel* published a story about costs at the Sandridge Hospital, a privately owned medical facility.

### *Ineffective Medications Given to Ill, Injured* **SANDRIDGE HOSPITAL OVERCHARGING PATIENTS ON PHARMACY COSTS**

Scores of patients at the Sandridge Hospital have been given ineffective medications, a three-week investigation at the hospital has revealed. In addition, many of those patients were overcharged for the medicine they received.

The *Sentinel* has learned that many of the prescription drugs sold to patients at the hospital had been kept beyond the manufacturer's recommended storage period.

Many drugs stored in the pharmacy (as late as Friday) had expiration dates as old as six months ago. Drug manufacturers have told the *Sentinel* that medication used beyond the expiration date, which is stamped clearly on most packages, may not have the potency or curative effects that fresher pharmaceuticals have.

Hospital representatives deny giving patients any of the expired drugs, but sources at the hospital say it is impossible for administrators to guarantee that none of the dated drugs were sold to patients.

In addition, the investigation by the *Sentinel* revealed that patients who were sold medications manufactured by Chaos Pharmaceuticals were charged on the basis of 2019 price lists despite the fact that the company lowered prices significantly in 2020.

The Sandridge Hospital sues the newspaper for libel. When the case gets to court, the first thing that must be done is to establish what the facts are—what happened. The hospital and the newspaper each will present evidence, witnesses and arguments to support its version of the facts. Several issues have to be resolved. In addition to the general questions of whether the story has been published and whether the hospital has been identified in the story, the hospital will have to supply evidence that its reputation has been injured, that the story is false and that the newspaper staff has been extremely careless or negligent in the publication of the report. The newspaper will seek to defend itself by attempting to document the story or raise the defense that the report was privileged in some way. Or the newspaper may argue that even if the story is mistaken, it was the result of an innocent error; the newspaper staff was not negligent when it wrote and published the story.

All this testimony and evidence establishes the factual record—what actually took place at the hospital and in preparation of the story. When there is conflicting evidence, the jury decides whom to believe (in the absence of a jury, the judge makes the decision). Suppose the hospital is able to prove by documents that pharmacists in fact had removed the dated medicine from their shelves and stored it to return to the manufacturers. Further, the hospital can show that while it did accidentally overcharge some patients for Chaos products, it quickly refunded the excess charge to these patients. Finally, attorneys for the hospital demonstrate that the story was prepared by an untrained stringer for the newspaper who used but a single source—a pharmacist who had been fired by Sandridge for using drugs while on the job—to prepare the story and failed to relate to readers the substance of the evidence (which the reporter had when the story was published) presented by the hospital in court. In such a case, a court would likely rule that the hospital had carried its burden of proof and that no legitimate defense exists for the newspaper. Therefore, the hospital wins the suit. If the newspaper is unhappy with the verdict, it can appeal.

*The appellate court does not establish a new factual record. No more testimony is taken.*

In an appeal, the appellate court does not establish a new factual record. No more testimony is taken. No more witnesses are called. The factual record established by the jury or judge at the trial stands. The appellate court has the power in some kinds of cases (libel suits that involve constitutional issues, for example) to examine whether the trial court properly considered the facts in the case. But normally it is the task of the appellate court to determine whether the law has been applied properly in light of the facts established at the trial. Perhaps the appellate court might rule that even with the documentary evidence the hospital presented in court, this evidence failed to prove that the news story was false. Perhaps the judge erred in allowing certain testimony into evidence or refused to allow a certain witness to testify. Or maybe the trial court judge gave the jury the wrong set of instructions for libel. That would be a clear error of law. Nevertheless, in reaching an opinion the appellate court considers only the law; the factual record established at the trial stands.

What if new evidence is found or a previously unknown witness comes forth to testify? If the appellate court believes that the new evidence is important, it can order a new trial. However, the court itself does not hear the evidence. These facts are developed at a new trial.

There are other differences between the roles and procedures of trial and appellate courts. Juries are never used by appellate courts; a jury may be used in a trial court proceeding. The judge normally sits alone at a trial; appeals are heard by a panel of judges, usually three or more. Cases always begin at the trial level and then proceed to the appellate level. Although the appellate courts appear to have the last word in a legal dispute, that is not always the case. Usually cases are returned to the trial court for resolution with instructions from the appeals court to the trial judge to decide the case, keeping this or that factor in mind. This is called remanding the case to the trial court. In such a case the trial judge can often do what he or she wants.

In the discussion that follows, the federal court system and its methods of operating are considered first, and then some general observations about state court systems are given, based on the discussion of the federal system.

## THE FEDERAL COURT SYSTEM

Congress has the authority to abolish every federal court in the land, save the Supreme Court of the United States. The U.S. Constitution calls for but a single federal court, the Supreme Court. Article III, Section 1 states: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court." The Constitution also gives Congress the right to establish inferior courts if it deems these courts to be necessary. And Congress has, of course, established a fairly complex system of courts to complement the Supreme Court.

The jurisdiction of the federal courts is also outlined in Article III of the Constitution. The jurisdiction of a court is its legal right to exercise its authority. Briefly, federal courts can hear the following cases:

1. Cases that arise under the U.S. Constitution, U.S. law and U.S. treaties
2. Cases that involve ambassadors and ministers, duly accredited, of foreign countries
3. Cases that involve admiralty and maritime law
4. Cases that involve controversies when the United States is a party to the suit
5. Cases that involve controversies between two or more states
6. Cases that involve controversies between a state and a citizen of another state (the 11th Amendment to the Constitution requires that a state give its permission before it can be sued)
7. Cases that involve controversies between citizens of different states

While special federal courts have jurisdiction that goes beyond this broad outline, these are the circumstances in which a federal court may normally exercise its authority. Of the seven categories, Categories 1 (known as federal question jurisdiction) and 7 (known as diversity jurisdiction) account for most of the cases tried in federal court. For example, disputes that involve violations of the myriad federal laws and disputes that involve constitutional rights such as the First Amendment are heard in federal courts under federal question jurisdiction. Disputes between citizens of different states—a diversity of citizenship matter—are heard in federal courts provided that the amount at stake is more than \$75,000. It is very common, for example, for libel suits



and invasion-of-privacy suits against publishing companies to start in federal courts rather than in state courts. If a citizen of Arizona is libeled by the *Los Angeles Times*, the case will very likely be tried in a federal court in the state of Arizona rather than in a state court in either Arizona or California. Arizona law will be applied. The case will most often be heard where the legal wrong, in this case the injury to reputation by libel, occurs.

## *The Supreme Court*

*Since 1869, the Supreme Court has comprised the chief justice of the United States and eight associate justices.*

The Supreme Court of the United States is the oldest federal court, having operated since 1789. The Constitution does not establish the number of justices who sit on the high court. That task is left to Congress. Since 1869 the Supreme Court has comprised the chief justice of the United States and eight associate justices. (Note the title: not chief justice of the Supreme Court, but chief justice of the United States.) In 2020, the chief justice was John Roberts, who was nominated by former President George W. Bush and became just the 17th chief justice in the court's history in 2005. The first Hispanic to take the oath of office as an associate justice was Sonia Sotomayor in 2009; it also marked the first time that an oath-taking ceremony at the Supreme Court was open to broadcast coverage.

In June 2018, Justice Anthony Kennedy announced his retirement from the Supreme Court. Kennedy at the time was seen as the pivotal swing vote on the high court whom parties arguing before it hoped to capture. In other words, although Kennedy was generally conservative, he voted with the so-called liberal wing of the Court on some issues that typically divided the left and the right. President Donald Trump nominated Brett Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court to fill the position vacated by Kennedy's retirement. This put the nomination in the hands of the U.S. Senate, which must give its "advice and consent" on any Supreme Court nominee. Kavanaugh had been serving as a federal judge on the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. In one of the most politically polarized and contentious battles over a nominee in recent memory, the Republican-controlled Senate ultimately confirmed Kavanaugh's nomination by a vote of 50-48 that closely divided along party lines. Along with Justice Neil Gorsuch (who joined the Court in 2017), Kavanaugh was the second Trump appointee to the Court. Kavanaugh's confirmation created the distinct possibility that a conservative majority will dominate the nation's highest court for years to come. Many predicted that Chief Justice Roberts would become the new swing justice, in part because his legacy as the chief justice depends upon the public's perception of the Court being viewed as impartial.

The Supreme Court exercises both original and appellate jurisdictions. Under its **original jurisdiction**, which is established in the Constitution, the Supreme Court is the first court to hear a case and acts much like a trial court. The Supreme Court has original jurisdiction in disputes between two or more states, with these scenarios typically involving battles over land or water rights. In brief, original jurisdiction is for the resolution of claims between and among the states, not claims by private entities within states. Sometimes the justices will hold a hearing to ascertain the facts; more commonly they will appoint what is called a special master to discern the facts and make recommendations. For example, in 2018 the Supreme Court exercised its original jurisdiction in a case concerning an interstate river basin involving the Flint and Chattahoochee



Rivers, which begin near Atlanta and flow south and meet the Apalachicola River in Florida. In 2013, Florida had sued Georgia, asking the Court to issue a decree, or order, that would equitably apportion the basin's waters. The special master of the Court appointed to hear the case recommended dismissing Florida's complaint, but in its June 2018 decision, the Supreme Court concluded that the special master applied too strict a standard in ruling against Florida. The Court remanded the case in order for the special master to address several evidentiary questions.

The primary task of the Supreme Court is as an appellate tribunal, hearing cases already decided by lower federal and state courts of last resort. The appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is established by Congress, not by the Constitution. A case will come before the Supreme Court of the United States for review in one of two principal ways: on a direct appeal or by way of a writ of certiorari. The certification process is a third way for a case to get to the high court, but this process is rarely used today.

In some instances a litigant has an apparent right, guaranteed by federal statute, to appeal a case to the Supreme Court. This is called **direct appeal**. For example, if a federal appeals court declares that a state statute violates the U.S. Constitution or conflicts with a federal law, the state has a right to appeal this decision to the Supreme Court. But this is only an apparent right, because since 1928 the Supreme Court has had the right to reject such an appeal "for want of a substantial federal question." This is another way of the court saying, "We think this is a trivial matter." Almost 90 percent of all appeals that come to the Supreme Court via the direct appeal process are rejected.

The much more common way for a case to reach the nation's high court is via a **writ of certiorari**. No one has the right to such a writ. It is a discretionary order issued by the court when it feels that an important legal question has been raised. Litigants using both the federal court system and the various state court systems can seek a writ of certiorari. The most important requirement that must be met before the court will even consider issuing a writ is that a petitioner first exhaust all other legal remedies. Although there are a few exceptions, this generally means that if a case begins in a federal district court (the trial-level court), the **petitioner** must first seek a review by a U.S. Court of Appeals before bidding for a writ of certiorari. The writ can be sought if the Court of Appeals refuses to hear the case or sustains the verdict against the petitioner. All other legal remedies have then been exhausted. In state court systems every legal appeal possible must be made within the state before seeking a review by the U.S. Supreme Court. This usually means going through a trial court, an intermediate appeals court and finally the state supreme court.

When the Supreme Court grants a writ of certiorari, it is ordering the lower court to send the records to the high court for review. Any litigant can petition the court to grant a writ, and the high court receives more than 7,500 petitions each year (a year for the Supreme Court is known as a term, with a new term starting on the first Monday in October and lasting usually through late June of the following year). Each request is considered by the entire nine-member court. If four justices think the petition has merit, the writ will be granted. This is called the **rule of four**. But the court rejects the vast majority of petitions it receives. Recently only 75–80 cases a year are accepted. Workload is the key factor. Certain important issues must be decided each term, and the justices do not have the time to consider thoroughly most cases for which an appeal is sought.

The Supreme Court is more likely to hear a case if there is a **split of authority** (a disagreement among the lower courts) on a particular issue. In other words, if one federal appellate court concludes that Law A is not constitutional, but a different federal appellate court finds that Law A is constitutional, then that would be a split of authority, and the high court might take the case so as to provide uniformity across the nation on Law A.

One final point: The Supreme Court of the United States is not as interested in making certain that justice has been served as it is in making certain that the law is developing properly. A petitioner seeking redress through the high court may have a completely valid argument that a lower court has ignored an important precedent in ruling against him or her. But if the law on this point has been established, the Supreme Court is very likely to reject the petition and instead use this time to examine and decide a new or emerging legal issue.

### LEARNING MORE ABOUT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

To find out more about the U.S. Supreme Court, ranging from its history to biographies of the nine current justices to its docket and recent opinions, you can visit the high court's official Web site at <https://www.supremecourt.gov> and peruse its many links. In addition, the Legal Information Institute at Cornell University Law School has an excellent online database at <https://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/supremes.htm> that features a wealth of information about the high court, its justices and its decisions.

**Hearing a Case** The operation of the Supreme Court is unique in many ways, but by gaining an understanding of how the high court does its business, a reader will also gain an understanding of how most appellate courts function.

Once the Supreme Court agrees to hear a case, the heaviest burden falls upon the attorneys for the competing parties. The oral argument—the presentation made by the attorneys to the members of the court—will be scheduled. The parties (their attorneys) are expected to submit what are called **legal briefs**—their written legal arguments—for the members of the court to study before the oral hearing. The party that has taken the appeal to the Supreme Court—the **appellant**—must provide the high court with a complete record of the lower-court proceedings: the transcripts from the trial, the rulings by the lower courts and other relevant material.

Arguing a matter all the way to the Supreme Court takes a long time, often as long as five years (sometimes longer) from initiation of the suit until the court gives its ruling. James Hill brought suit in New York in 1953 against Time, Inc., for invasion of privacy. The U.S. Supreme Court made the final ruling in the case in 1967 (*Time, Inc. v. Hill*).<sup>14</sup> Even at that the matter would not have ended had Hill decided to go back to trial, which the Supreme Court said he must do if he wanted to collect damages. He chose not to.

14. 385 U.S. 374 (1967).

After the nine justices study the briefs (or at least summaries provided by their law clerks), the **oral argument** is held. Attorneys are strictly limited as to how much they may say. Each side is given a brief amount of time, usually no more than 30 minutes to an hour, to present its arguments. The attorneys often are interrupted by the justices, who ask them questions and pose hypothetical situations. One current justice, Clarence Thomas, is known for not asking questions, but most of the justices verbally spar in collegial fashion with attorneys to test and challenge their arguments. In contrast to Justice Thomas' usual silence during oral argument, Justices Stephen Breyer and Sonia Sotomayor are known in recent years for frequently talking the most. There are no witnesses who testify before the Supreme Court—only the attorneys who argue the case. You can listen to oral arguments in many recent Supreme Court cases online at The Oyez Project Web site at <https://www.oyez.org>. In important cases, “friends of the court” (**amici curiae**) are allowed to present briefs and to participate for 30 minutes in the oral arguments. For example, the American Civil Liberties Union often seeks the friend status in important civil rights cases. Likewise, the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press (<https://www.rcfp.org>) may file a friend-of-the-court brief in cases affecting journalists' rights, even though it is not a party in the cases. In a nutshell, a friend-of-the-court is not a party to the case but holds a vested interest or concern with its outcome.

**Deciding a Case** After oral argument (which occurs in open court with visitors welcome), the members of the high court move behind closed doors to undertake their deliberations. No one is allowed in the discussion room except members of the court itself—no clerks, no bailiffs, no secretaries. The discussion, which often is held several days after the arguments are completed, is opened by the chief justice. Discussion time is limited, and by being the first speaker the chief justice is in a position to set the agenda, so to speak, for each case—to raise what he or she thinks are the key issues. Next to speak is the justice with the most seniority, and after him or her, the next most senior justice. The court will have many items or cases to dispose of during one conference or discussion day; consequently, brevity is valued. Each justice has just a few moments to state his or her thoughts on the matter. After discussion, a tentative vote is taken and recorded by each justice in a small, hinged, lockable docket book. In the voting procedure the junior justice votes first; the chief justice, last.

#### TYPES OF SUPREME COURT OPINIONS

1. Opinion of the court (majority opinion)
2. Concurring opinion
3. Dissenting opinion (minority opinion)
4. Plurality opinion
5. Per curiam opinion (unsigned opinion)
6. Memorandum order

Under the U.S. legal system, which is based so heavily on the concept of court participation in developing and interpreting the law, a simple yes-or-no answer to any legal question is hardly sufficient. More important than the vote, for the law if not for the **litigant**, are the reasons for the decision. Therefore, the Supreme Court and all courts that deal with questions of law prepare what are called **opinions**, in which the reasons, or rationale, for the decision are given. One of the justices voting in the majority is asked to write what is called the **court's opinion**. If the chief justice is in the majority, he or she selects the author of the opinion. If not, the senior associate justice in the majority makes the assignment. Self-selection is always an option.

Opinion writing is difficult. Getting five or six or seven justices to agree to yes or no is one thing; getting them to agree on why they say yes or no is something else. The opinion must therefore be carefully constructed. After it is drafted, it is circulated among all court members, who make suggestions or even draft their own opinions. The opinion writer may incorporate as many of these ideas as possible into the opinion to retain its majority backing. Although all this is done in secret, historians have learned that rarely do court opinions reflect solely the work of the writer. They are more often a brokered conglomeration of paragraphs, pages and sentences from the opinions of several justices.

A justice in agreement with the majority who cannot be convinced to join in backing the court's opinion has the option of writing what is called a **concurring opinion**. A justice who writes a concurring opinion may agree with the outcome of the decision, but does so for reasons different from those expressed in the majority opinion. Or the concurring justice may want to emphasize a specific point not addressed in the majority opinion.

Justices who disagree with the majority can also write an opinion, either individually or as a group, called a **dissenting opinion**. Dissenting opinions are very important. Sometimes, after the court has made a decision, it becomes clear that the decision was not proper. The issue thus may be litigated again by other parties who use the arguments in the dissenting opinion as the basis for a legal claim. If enough time passes, if the composition of the court changes sufficiently or if the court members change their minds, the high court can swing to the views of the original dissenters. Decisions in which the Supreme Court fractures 5–4 are fairly common as of 2019. During the Court's 2018 term, which ran from October 2018 through June 2019, there were 25 unanimous opinions in which all of the justices agreed but also 18 opinions in which the justices split 5–4 (five justices in the majority, four justices dissenting).

An opinion in which five justices cannot agree on a single majority opinion—there is no opinion of the court—but that is joined by more justices than any other opinion in the case is known as a **plurality opinion**. For instance, imagine that four justices agree with a particular outcome in a case for reason A. Two other justices may also agree with that same outcome, but for reason B, while three other justices do not agree with the outcome at all. In this split of 4–2–3 among the justices, the four-justice opinion constitutes the plurality. This was precisely the result in a 2012 U.S. Supreme Court decision called *United States v. Alvarez* in which the Court declared unconstitutional, in violation of the First Amendment right of free speech, the Stolen Valor Act. The Stolen Valor Act made it a crime to falsely claim to have won a Congressional Medal of Honor

*A justice who writes a concurring opinion may agree with the outcome of the decision, but does so for reasons different from those expressed in the majority opinion.*

(see pages 69–70 discussing the Stolen Valor Act in more detail). Four of the nine justices concluded that the Stolen Valor Act violated the freedom of speech because it did not pass constitutional muster under the **strict scrutiny** standard of review (see page 74 discussing strict scrutiny), while two justices declared the law violated the freedom of speech because it did not pass the **intermediate scrutiny** standard of review (see pages 74–75 discussing intermediate scrutiny). In other words, six total justices found the law was unconstitutional, but four did so for one reason and two did so for a different reason. Finally, three justices in *Alvarez* dissented because they found the Stolen Valor Act was perfectly acceptable and they would have upheld it.

Finally, it is possible for a justice to concur with the majority in part and to dissent in part as well. That is, the justice may agree with some of the things the majority says but disagree with other aspects of the ruling. Such splits thwart the orderly development of the law. They often leave lawyers and other interested parties at a loss when trying to predict how the court might respond in the next similar case that comes along.

The Supreme Court can dispose of a case in two other ways. A **per curiam** (by the court) **opinion** can be prepared. This is an unsigned opinion drafted by one or more members of the majority and published as the court's opinion. Per curiam opinions are not common, but neither are they rare. For instance, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a two-paragraph per curiam opinion—such brevity is another common characteristic of per curiam opinions—in a 2012 case called *American Tradition Partnership, Inc. v. Bullock*.<sup>15</sup> In *Bullock*, the Court reversed a decision by the Montana Supreme Court that had upheld a state statute restricting corporate expenditures supporting or opposing candidates and political parties. The per curiam opinion found the Montana law violated the court's 2010 precedent on this issue from *Citizens United v. Federal Elections Commission* (see pages 139–141 for more on *Citizens United*). Four justices filed a similarly short dissent. The names of the four dissenting justices (all members of the Court's so-called liberal wing) appeared on the case, however, thus indicating that the unsigned or anonymous per curiam opinion must have been written by one of the five other justices from the Court's so-called conservative wing. This is another important aspect of per curiam opinions—while per curiam decisions themselves are not attributed to any specific justice, concurring and dissenting opinions are signed by identified justices.

Finally, the high court can dispose of a case with a **memorandum order**—that is, it just announces the vote without giving an opinion. Or the order cites an earlier Supreme Court decision as the reason for affirming or reversing a lower-court ruling. In cases with little legal importance and in cases in which the issues were really resolved earlier, the court saves a good deal of time by just announcing its decision.

One final matter in regard to voting remains for consideration: What happens in case of a tie vote? When all nine members of the court are present, a tie vote is technically impossible. However, if there is a vacancy on the court, only eight justices hear a case. Even when the court is full, a particular justice may disqualify himself or herself from hearing a case. When a vote ends in a tie, the decision of the lower court is affirmed. No opinion is written. It is as if the Supreme Court had never heard the case.

15. 567 U.S. 516 (2012).



During the circulation of an opinion, justices have the opportunity to change their vote. The number and membership in the majority may shift. It is not impossible for the majority to become the minority if one of the dissenters writes a particularly powerful dissent that attracts support from members originally opposed to his or her opinion. This event is probably very rare. Nevertheless, a vote of the court is not final until it is announced on decision day, or opinion day. The authors of the various opinions—court opinions, concurrences and dissents—publicly read or summarize their views. Printed copies of these documents are handed out to the parties involved and to the press, and are quickly available online.

Courts have no real way to enforce decisions and must depend on other government agencies for enforcement of their rulings. The job normally falls to the executive branch. If perchance the president decides not to enforce a Supreme Court ruling, no legal force exists to compel the president to do so.

At the same time, there is one force that usually works to see that court decisions are carried out: It is that vague force called public opinion or what political scientists call “legitimacy.” Most people believe in the judicial process; they have faith that what the courts do is probably right. This does not mean that they always agree with court decisions, but they do agree that the proper way to settle disputes is through the judicial process. Jurists help engender this spirit or philosophy by acting in a temperate manner. The Supreme Court, for example, has developed means that permit it to avoid having to answer highly controversial questions in which an unpopular decision could weaken its perceived legitimacy. The justices might call the dispute a political question, a **nonjusticiable matter**, or they may refuse to hear a case on other grounds. When the members of the court sense that the public is ready to accept a ruling, they may take on a controversial issue. School desegregation is a good example. In 1954, the Supreme Court ruled in *Brown v. Board of Education*<sup>16</sup> that segregated public schools violated the U.S. Constitution. The foundation for this ruling had been laid by a decade of less momentous desegregation decisions and executive actions. By 1954 the nation was prepared for the ruling, and it was generally accepted, even in many parts of the South. The legitimacy of a court’s decisions, then, often rests upon prudent use of the judicial power.

*People believe in the judicial process; they have faith that what the courts do is probably right.*

### ***Other Federal Courts***

The Supreme Court of the United States is the most visible, perhaps the most glamorous (if that word is appropriate), of the federal courts. But it is not the only federal court nor even the busiest. There are two lower echelons of federal courts, plus various special courts, within the federal system. These special courts, such as the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, U.S. Tax Court and so forth, were created by Congress to handle special kinds of problems.

Most federal cases begin and end in one of the 94 U.S. District Courts located across the nation, in Puerto Rico and in various U.S. territories. In 2019, the district courts were staffed with 677 authorized judgeships, a figure that Congress can vote to increase or decrease. In addition to these authorized U.S. District Court judges (known

16. 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

as “Article III” judges), by 2019 there were more than 530 federal magistrate judges. Federal magistrate judges are appointed for eight-year terms by a federal district court to handle some matters (initial proceedings in criminal cases, for instance) and certain cases delegated to them by the district court judges or with the consent of the parties (magistrate judges cannot, however, preside over felony criminal trials).

District courts are the trial courts of the federal court system, hearing both civil and criminal matters. Each state has at least one federal district court, with more populous states divided into two or more districts, leading to the total of 94 U.S. judicial districts. Pennsylvania, for instance, has three districts (western, middle and eastern), as does Florida (northern, middle and southern).

At the intermediate appellate level in the federal judiciary, there are 13 circuits of the U.S. Court of Appeals, with 179 authorized judgeships in 2019. These courts were created by the Federal Judiciary Act of 1789. Until 1948 these courts were called circuit courts of appeal, a reflection of the early years of the republic when the justices of the Supreme Court “rode the circuit” and presided at the courts-of-appeal hearings. While the title circuit courts of appeal is officially gone, the nation is still divided into 11 numbered circuits, each of which is served by one court (see Figure 1.2).




FIGURE 1.2

*Circuits 1 through 11 comprise the 50 states and the multiple U.S. territories.*



The 12th and 13th circuits are unnumbered. One is the court of appeals for the District of Columbia. This is a very busy court because it hears most of the appeals from decisions made by federal administrative agencies. The 13th is the court of appeals for the Federal Circuit, a court created by Congress in 1982 to handle special kinds of appeals. This court is specially empowered to hear appeals from patent and trademark decisions of U.S. District Courts and other federal agencies such as the Board of Patent Appeals. It also hears appeals from rulings by the U.S. Claims Court, the U.S. Court of International Trade, the U.S. International Trade Commission, the Merit Systems Protection Board and from a handful of other special kinds of rulings. Congress established this court to try to develop a uniform, reliable and predictable body of law in each of these very special fields.

The 12 regional federal courts of appeal (the 11 numbered circuits, plus the District of Columbia circuit) hear appeals from the federal district courts located within them, as well as appeals from decisions of federal administrative agencies. The courts are the last stop for 95 percent of all cases in the federal system. The number of appellate judges in each circuit varies, depending upon geographic size and caseload. The 9th Circuit, which sweeps up nine western states as well as the Territory of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, is the largest and busiest circuit. There occasionally are moves to break up the 9th Circuit, which is perceived as too large (and too liberal by some conservatives). Typically, a panel of three judges will hear a case. In unusual cases, a larger panel of judges, usually 11, will hear the appeal. When this happens, the court is said to be sitting **en banc**. A litigant who loses an appeal heard by a three-judge panel can ask for a rehearing by the entire court. This request is not often granted.

Among the federal courts of appeal, the 9th Circuit's opinions are generally the most likely to be reviewed and reversed by the Supreme Court. For instance, during the Court's 2018 term, from October 2018 through June 2019, the Supreme Court considered 14 decisions issued by the 9th Circuit and overruled 12 of them. In brief, more than 80 percent of 9th Circuit cases considered by the Supreme Court were overruled that term. The 9th Circuit is often considered one of the most liberal-leaning appellate courts, which might partly explain why its decisions are both reviewed and reversed so often.

### *Federal Judges*

All federal judges, other than magistrate judges, are appointed for life terms under Article III of the U.S. Constitution by the president, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The only way a federal judge can be removed is by **impeachment**. Eleven federal judges have been impeached: Seven were found guilty by the Senate, and the other four were acquitted. Impeachment and trial is a long process and one rarely undertaken.

Political affiliation plays a distinct part in the appointment of federal judges. Democratic presidents usually appoint Democratic judges, and Republican presidents appoint Republican judges. Nevertheless, it is expected that nominees to the federal bench be competent jurists. This is especially true for appointees to the U.S. Court of

Appeals and to the Supreme Court. The Senate must confirm all appointments to the federal courts, a normally perfunctory act in the case of lower-court judges. More careful scrutiny is given nominees to the appellate courts.

The appointment process now is of great public interest, as the current justices appear in many people's eyes to be narrowly divided along ideological and political lines. The president appoints the members of the high court with the "advice and consent" of the U.S. Senate. When the White House and the Senate are both in the hands of the same party, Republicans or Democrats, this appointment process will usually proceed smoothly. But when the White House and Senate are not controlled by the same party, bitter fights over future justices can occur, with a president sometimes struggling or even failing to gain the advice and consent of the Senate over a given appointee.

Presidents and senators alike have discovered that the individual who is nominated is not always the one who spends the remainder of his or her lifetime on the court. Justices and judges appointed to the bench for life sometimes change. Perhaps they are affected by their colleagues. Or maybe it is because they are largely removed from the political and social pressures faced by others in public life. For whatever reasons, men and women appointed to the bench sometimes modify their philosophy. For instance, now-retired Justice Anthony Kennedy was appointed by Republican President Ronald Reagan in 1988, but he alienated cultural conservatives during his time on the Court by writing decisions that legalized same-sex marriage and that declared unconstitutional a law against virtual child pornography (see Chapter 13).

## THE STATE COURT SYSTEM

The constitution of each of the 50 states either establishes a court system in that state or authorizes the legislature to do so. The court system in each of the 50 states is somewhat different from the court system in all the other states. There are, however, more similarities than differences among the 50 states.

Trial courts are the base of each judicial system. At the lowest level are usually what are called courts of limited jurisdiction. Some of these courts have special functions, such as a traffic court, which is set up to hear cases involving violations of the motor-vehicle code. Some of these courts are limited to hearing cases of relative unimportance, such as trials of persons charged with misdemeanors, or minor crimes, or civil suits in which the damages sought fall below a small amount of money (a so-called small claims court). The court may be a municipal court set up to hear cases involving violations of the city code. Whatever the court, the judges in these courts have limited jurisdiction and deal with a limited category of problems.

Above the lower-level courts normally exist trial courts of general jurisdiction similar to the federal district courts. These courts are sometimes county courts and sometimes state courts, but whichever they are, they handle nearly all criminal and civil matters. They are primarily courts of original jurisdiction; that is, they are the first courts to hear a case. However, on occasion they act as a kind of appellate court when the decisions of the courts of limited jurisdiction are challenged. When that happens, the case is retried in the trial court—the court does not simply review the law. This proceeding is called hearing a case **de novo**.

A **jury** is most likely to be found in the trial court of general jurisdiction. It is also the court in which most civil suits for libel and invasion of privacy are commenced (provided the state court has jurisdiction), in which prosecution for violating state obscenity laws starts and in which many other media-related matters begin.

Above this court may be one or two levels of appellate courts. Every state has a supreme court, although some states do not call it that. In New York, for example, it is called the Court of Appeals, but it is the high court in the state, the court of last resort.\* Formerly, a supreme court was the only appellate court in most states. As legal business increased and the number of appeals mounted, the need for an intermediate appellate court became evident. Therefore, in nearly all states there is an intermediate court, usually called the court of appeals. This is the court where most appeals end. In some states it is a single court with three or more judges. More often, numerous divisions within the appellate court serve various geographic regions, each division having three or more judges. Since every litigant is normally guaranteed at least one appeal, this intermediate court takes much of the pressure off the high court of the state. Rarely do individuals appeal beyond the intermediate level.

State courts of appeals tend to operate in much the same fashion as the U.S. Court of Appeals, with cases being heard by small groups of judges, usually three at a time.

Cases not involving federal questions go no further than the high court in a state, usually called the supreme court. This court—usually a seven- or nine-member body—is the final authority regarding the construction of state laws and interpretation of the state constitution. Not even the Supreme Court of the United States can tell a state supreme court what that state's constitution means.

State court judges are frequently elected. Normally the process is nonpartisan, but because they are elected and must stand for re-election periodically, state court judges are generally a bit more politically active than their federal counterparts. Nearly half the states in the nation use a kind of compromise system that includes both appointment and election. The compromise is designed to minimize political influence and initially select qualified candidates but still retain an element of popular control. The plans are named after the states that pioneered them, the **California Plan** and the **Missouri Plan**.

*Not even the Supreme Court of the United States can tell a state supreme court what that state's constitution means.*

## JUDICIAL REVIEW

One of the most important powers of courts (and at one time one of the most controversial) is the power of **judicial review**—that is, the right of any court to declare any law or official governmental action invalid because it violates a constitutional provision. We usually think of this right in terms of the U.S. Constitution. However, a state court can declare an act of its legislature to be invalid because the act conflicts with a provision of the state constitution. Theoretically, any court can exercise this power. The Circuit Court of Lapeer County, Mich., can rule that the Environmental Protection Act of 1972 is unconstitutional because it deprives citizens of their property without due process of law, something guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment to the federal Constitution. But

\* To further confuse matters, the trial court of general jurisdiction in New York is called the Supreme Court. This is a fact with which avid "Law & Order" fans should already be familiar.

this action isn't likely to happen, because a higher court would quickly overturn such a ruling. In fact, it is rather unusual for any court—even the U.S. Supreme Court—to invalidate a state or federal law on grounds that it violates the Constitution. Judicial review is therefore not a power that the courts use excessively. A judicial maxim states: When a court has a choice of two or more ways in which to interpret a statute, the court should always interpret the statute in such a way that it is constitutional.

Judicial review is extremely important when matters concerning regulations of mass media are considered. Because the First Amendment prohibits laws that abridge freedom of press and speech, each new measure passed by Congress, by state legislatures and even by city councils and township boards must be measured by the yardstick of the First Amendment. Courts have the right, in fact have the duty, to nullify laws and executive actions and administrative rulings that do not meet the standards of the First Amendment. While many lawyers and legal scholars rarely consider constitutional principles in their work and rarely seek judicial review of a statute, attorneys who represent newspapers, magazines, broadcasting stations and movie theaters constantly deal with constitutional issues, primarily those of the First Amendment. The remainder of this book will illustrate the obvious fact that judicial review, a concept at the very heart of American democracy, plays an important role in maintaining the freedom of the American press, even though the power is not explicitly included in the Constitution.

There are 52 different judicial systems in the nation: one federal system, one for the District of Columbia and one for each of the 50 states. Courts within each of these systems are divided into two general classes—trial courts and appellate courts. In any lawsuit both the facts and the law must be considered. The facts or the factual record is an account of what happened to prompt the dispute. The law is what should be done to resolve the dispute. Trial courts determine the facts in the case; then the judge applies the law. Appellate courts, using the factual record established by the trial court, determine whether the law was properly applied by the lower court and whether proper judicial procedures were followed. Trial courts exercise original jurisdiction almost exclusively; that is, they are the first courts to hear a case. Trial courts have very little discretion over which cases they will and will not hear. Appellate courts exercise appellate jurisdiction almost exclusively; that is, they review the work done by the lower courts when decisions are appealed. Whereas the intermediate appellate courts (i.e., courts of appeals; the appellate division) have limited discretion in the selection of cases, the high courts (supreme courts) in the states and the nation generally have the power to select the cases they wish to review.

Federal courts include the Supreme Court of the United States, the U.S. Courts of Appeals, the U.S. District Courts and several specialized tribunals. These courts have jurisdiction in all cases that involve the U.S. Constitution, U.S. law and U.S. treaties; in disputes between citizens of different states; and in several less important instances. In each state there are trial-level courts and a court of last resort, usually called the supreme court. In about half the states there are intermediate appellate courts as well.

## SUMMARY

State courts generally have jurisdiction in all disputes between citizens of their state that involve the state constitution or state law.

Judicial review is the power of a court to declare a statute, regulation or executive action to be a violation of the Constitution and thus invalid. Because the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees the rights of freedom of speech and press, all government actions that relate to the communication of ideas and information face potential scrutiny by courts to determine their validity.

## LAWSUITS

The final topic is lawsuits. To the layperson, the United States appears to be awash in lawsuits. This notion can probably be blamed on the increased attention the press has given legal matters. Courts are fairly easy to cover, and stories about lawsuits are commonly published and broadcast.

This is not to say that we are not a highly litigious people. Backlogs in the courts are evidence of this. Going to court today is no longer a novelty but a common business or personal practice for a growing number of Americans. And too many of these lawsuits involve silly or trivial legal claims. In the end, the public pays a substantial price for all this litigation, through higher federal and state taxes to build and maintain courthouses and money to pay the salaries of those who work in the judiciary, and through higher insurance costs on everything from automobiles to protection from libel suits.

The material that follows is a simplified description of how a lawsuit proceeds. The picture is stripped of a great deal of the procedural activity that so often lengthens the lawsuit and keeps attorneys busy.

The party that commences or brings a civil lawsuit is called the **plaintiff**. The party against whom the suit is brought is called the **defendant**. In a libel suit the person who has been libeled is the plaintiff and is the one who starts the suit against the defendant—the newspaper, television station or Web site. A civil suit is usually a dispute between two private parties. The government offers its good offices—the courts—to settle the matter. A government can bring a civil suit such as an antitrust action against someone, and an individual can bring a civil action against the government. But normally a civil suit is between private parties. (In a criminal action, the government always initiates the action.)

To start a civil suit the plaintiff first picks the proper court, one that has jurisdiction in the case. Then the plaintiff typically files a **civil complaint** with the court clerk. This complaint, or **pleading**, is a statement of the allegations against the defendant and the remedy that is sought, typically money damages. The complaint will also include:

1. A statement of the relevant facts upon which the plaintiff is suing
2. The legal theory or theories (known as causes of action) upon which the plaintiff is suing (libel, for instance, is a cause of action or legal theory)
3. A request for a remedy or relief (typically, the plaintiff requests monetary damages in a civil lawsuit, although equitable relief also can be sought in some instances)

The plaintiff then serves the defendant with the complaint to answer these allegations. The plaintiff may later amend his or her pleadings in the case. After the complaint is filed, a hearing is scheduled by the court.

If the defendant fails to answer the allegations, he or she normally loses the suit by default. Usually, however, the defendant will respond and prepare his or her own set of pleadings, which constitute an answer to the plaintiff's allegations. If there is little disagreement at this point about the facts—what happened—and that a wrong has been committed, the plaintiff and the defendant might settle their differences out of court. The defendant might say, "I guess I did libel you in this article, and I really don't have a very good defense. You asked for \$100,000 in damages; would you settle for \$50,000 and keep this out of court?" The plaintiff might very well answer yes, because a court trial is costly and takes a long time, and the plaintiff can also end up losing the case. Smart lawyers try to keep their clients out of court and settle matters in somebody's office. The overwhelming majority of cases, in fact, never go to trial.

*Smart lawyers try to keep their clients out of court and settle matters in somebody's office.*

If there is disagreement, the case is likely to continue. One common response to a complaint is for the defendant to file in court and to serve the plaintiff with an **answer**. An answer typically denies most of the facts and all of the allegations in the complaint; it may also assert various defenses to the plaintiff's complaint. Another typical move for the defendant to make at this point is to file a motion to dismiss, or a **demurrer**. In such a motion the defendant says this to the court: "I admit that I did everything the plaintiff says I did. On June 5, 2019, I did publish an article in which she was called a socialist. But, Your Honor, it is not libelous to call someone a socialist." The plea made then is that even if everything the plaintiff asserts is true, the defendant did nothing that was legally wrong. The law cannot help the plaintiff. The court might grant the motion, in which case the plaintiff can appeal. Or the court might refuse to grant the motion, in which case the defendant can appeal. If the motion to dismiss is ultimately rejected by all the courts up and down the line, a trial is then held. It is fair play for the defendant at that time to dispute the plaintiff's statement of the facts; in other words, to deny, for example, that his newspaper published the article containing the alleged libel.

Before the trial is held, the judge may schedule a conference between both parties in an effort to settle the matter or to narrow the issues so that the trial can be shorter and less costly. If the effort to settle the dispute fails, the lawsuit goes forward. Either party could ask for a **summary judgment**, which is a way of ending a case before trial. The party moving for summary judgment is trying to avoid the cost and time of a trial by asserting that both parties agree to the facts of the case, and, based on those facts, the outcome of the trial is obvious. With no factual issues to be sorted out at trial, this makes it possible for the judge to decide the case on the basis of the law. The judge can then rule that the law dictates that one party must win and the other must lose. If the facts are disputed, though, the case can proceed and be tried before either a jury or only a judge. Note that both sides must waive the right to a jury trial. In this event, the judge becomes both the fact finder and the lawgiver, a situation known as a bench trial. Now, suppose that the case is heard by a jury. After all the testimony is given, all the evidence is presented and all the arguments are made, the judge instructs the jury in the law. Instructions are often long and complex, despite attempts by judges to simplify them. **Judicial instructions** guide the jury in determining guilt or innocence if



certain facts are found to be true. The judge will say that if the jury finds that *X* is true and *Y* is true and *Z* is true, then it must find for the plaintiff, but if the jury finds that *X* is not true, but that *R* is true, then it must find for the defendant.

In a civil lawsuit, the burden is on the plaintiff to prove her case by a preponderance of the evidence. This simply means that it is more likely than not that the defendant should be held liable (greater than 50 percent chance that the plaintiff's argument is true). Notice here the use of the term "liable." A defendant who loses a civil case is found liable (the term "guilty" applies only in criminal cases).

After deliberation, the jury presents its **verdict**, the action by the jury. The judge then announces the **judgment of the court**. This is the decision of the court. The judge is not always bound by the jury verdict. If he or she feels that the jury verdict is unfair or unreasonable, the judge can reverse it and rule for the other party. This rarely happens.

If either party is unhappy with the decision, an appeal can be taken. At that time the legal designations may change. The person seeking the appeal becomes the *appellant*, or petitioner. The other party becomes the **appellee**, or **respondent**. The name of the party initiating the action is usually listed first in the name of the case. For example, Smith sues Jones for libel. The case name is *Smith v. Jones*. Jones loses and takes an appeal. At that point in most jurisdictions Jones becomes the party initiating the action and the case becomes *Jones v. Smith*. This change in designations often confuses novices in their attempt to trace a case from trial to final appeal. If Jones wins the appeal and Smith decides to appeal to a higher court, the case again becomes *Smith v. Jones*. In more and more jurisdictions today, however, the case name remains the same throughout the appeal process. This is an effort by the judiciary to relieve some of the confusion wrought by this constant shifting of party names within the case name. In California, for example, the case of *Smith v. Jones* remains *Smith v. Jones* through the entire life of that case.

The end result of a successful civil suit is usually the awarding of money damages. Sometimes the amount of damages is guided by the law, as in a suit for infringement of copyright in which the law provides that a losing defendant pay the plaintiff the amount of money he or she might have made if the infringement had not occurred, or at least a set number of dollars. But most of the time the damages are determined by how much the plaintiff seeks, how much the plaintiff can prove he or she lost and how much the jury thinks the plaintiff deserves. It is not a very scientific means of determining the dollar amount.

A **criminal prosecution**, or **criminal action**, is like a civil suit in many ways. The procedures are more formal, elaborate and involve the machinery of the state to a greater extent. The state brings the charges, usually through the county or state prosecutor. The defendant can be apprehended either before or after the charges are brought. In the federal system people must be **indicted** by a **grand jury**, a panel of 16 to 23 citizens, before they can be charged with a serious crime. But most states do not use grand juries in that fashion, and the law provides that it is sufficient that the prosecutor issue an **information**, a formal accusation. After being charged, the defendant is arraigned. An **arraignment** is the formal reading of the charge. It is at the arraignment that the defendant makes a formal plea of guilty or not guilty. If the plea is guilty, the judge gives the verdict of the court and passes sentence, but usually not immediately, for presentencing reports and other procedures must be undertaken. If the plea is not guilty, a trial is scheduled.



Some state judicial systems have an intermediate step called a preliminary hearing or preliminary examination. The preliminary hearing is held in a court below the trial court, such as a municipal court, and the state has the responsibility of presenting enough evidence to convince the court—only a judge—that a crime has been committed and that there is sufficient evidence to believe that the defendant might possibly be involved. Today it is also not uncommon that **pretrial hearings** on a variety of matters precede the trial.

If a criminal case does go to trial, the burden is on the prosecution (the government) to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. This is a much higher burden of proof than the civil case standard of a preponderance of the evidence.

In both a civil suit and a criminal case, the result of the trial is not enforced until the final appeal is exhausted. That is, a money judgment is not paid in civil suits until defendants exhaust all their appeals. The same is true in a criminal case. Imprisonment or payment of a fine is not always required until the final appeal. If the defendant is dangerous or if there is some question that the defendant might not surrender when the final appeal is completed, bail can be required. Bail is money given to the court to ensure appearance in court.

There are two basic kinds of lawsuits—civil suits and criminal prosecutions or actions. A civil suit is normally a dispute between two private parties in which the government offers its courts to resolve the dispute. The person who initiates the civil suit is the plaintiff; the person at whom the suit is aimed is the defendant. A plaintiff who wins a civil suit is normally awarded money damages.

## SUMMARY

A criminal case is normally an action in which the state brings charges against a private individual, who is called the defendant. A defendant who loses a criminal case can be assessed a fine, jailed or, in extreme cases, executed. A jury can be used in both civil and criminal cases. The jury becomes the fact finder and renders a verdict in a case. But the judge issues the judgment in the case. In a civil suit, a judge can reject any jury verdict and rule in exactly the opposite fashion, finding for either plaintiff or defendant if the judge feels the jury has made a serious error in judgment. Either side can appeal the judgment of the court. In a criminal case the judge can take the case away from the jury and order a dismissal, but nothing can be done about an acquittal, even an incredible acquittal. While a guilty defendant may appeal the judgment, the state is prohibited from appealing an acquittal.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, Henry J. *The Judicial Process*. 7th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Ardia, David S. "Freedom of Speech, Defamation, and Injunctions." *William & Mary Law Review* 55 (2013): 1.
- Pound, Roscoe. *The Development of the Constitutional Guarantees of Liberty*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1957.

