	Case 2:11-cv-02587-NVW Document 1	Filed 12/29/11 Page 1 of 20			
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Nathan W. Kellum nkellum@telladf.org Jonathan Scruggs jscruggs@telladf.org ALLIANCE DEFENSE FUND 699 Oakleaf Office Lane, Suite 107 Memphis, TN 38117 (901) 684-5485 telephone (901) 684-5499 – Fax Christopher R. Stovall crs@jhc-law.com Jennings, Haug & Cunningham, LLP 2800 N. Central Ave., Suite 1800 Phoenix, AZ 85004 (602) 234-7800 telephone (602) 277-5595				
10 11	Local Counsel Attorneys for Plaintiff Ryan Arneson				
12	Auomeys jor T tunnijj Kyan Ameson				
13	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA				
14	FOR THE DISTR	ICT OF ARIZONA			
14 15					
	FOR THE DISTR Ryan Arneson, Plaintiff,	ICT OF ARIZONA Case No. Judge			
15	Ryan Arneson,	Case No.			
15 16	Ryan Arneson,	Case No. Judge VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR			
15 16 17	Ryan Arneson, Plaintiff,	Case No. Judge VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND			
15 16 17 18	Ryan Arneson, Plaintiff, vs. Maricopa County Community College	Case No. Judge VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR			
15 16 17 18 19	Ryan Arneson, Plaintiff, vs.	Case No. Judge VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND			
15 16 17 18 19 20	Ryan Arneson, Plaintiff, vs. Maricopa County Community College District; South Mountain Community College; Rufus Glasper, in his official capacity as Chancellor of the Maricopa	Case No. Judge VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND			
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 	Ryan Arneson, Plaintiff, vs. Maricopa County Community College District; South Mountain Community College; Rufus Glasper, in his official	Case No. Judge VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND			
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	Ryan Arneson, Plaintiff, vs. Maricopa County Community College District; South Mountain Community College; Rufus Glasper, in his official capacity as Chancellor of the Maricopa County Community Colleges; Dr. Shari Olson, in her official capacity as President of South Mountain	Case No. Judge VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND			
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 	Ryan Arneson, Plaintiff, vs. Maricopa County Community College District; South Mountain Community College; Rufus Glasper, in his official capacity as Chancellor of the Maricopa County Community Colleges; Dr. Shari Olson, in her official capacity as President of South Mountain Community College; Buddy Cheeks, individually and in his official capacity	Case No. Judge VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND			
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 	Ryan Arneson, Plaintiff, VS. Maricopa County Community College District; South Mountain Community College; Rufus Glasper, in his official capacity as Chancellor of the Maricopa County Community Colleges; Dr. Shari Olson, in her official capacity as President of South Mountain Community College; Buddy Cheeks, individually and in his official capacity as Director of Student Life & Leadership at South Mountain	Case No. Judge VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND			
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 	Ryan Arneson, Plaintiff, vs. Maricopa County Community College District; South Mountain Community College; Rufus Glasper, in his official capacity as Chancellor of the Maricopa County Community Colleges; Dr. Shari Olson, in her official capacity as President of South Mountain Community College; Buddy Cheeks, individually and in his official capacity as Director of Student Life &	Case No. Judge VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND			

This is a civil rights action challenging the policies of Maricopa County
 Community College District and South Mountain Community College that improperly
 restrict all expressive activities, including dialogue and literature distribution, on public
 accessible areas on SMCC's campus.

~

2. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, Plaintiff Ryan Arneson seeks
injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and nominal damages against Defendants Maricopa
County Community College District; South Mountain Community College; Rufus
Glasper, in his official capacity as Chancellor of the Maricopa County Community
College District; Dr. Shari Olson, in her official capacity as President of South Mountain
Community College; and Buddy Cheeks, individually and in his official capacity as
Director of Student Life & Leadership at South Mountain Community College.

12 3. This action is premised on the United States Constitution and concerns the
13 deprivation of Plaintiff's fundamental right to free speech and expression.

4. Defendants' actions have deprived and will continue to deprive Plaintiff of
his fundamental right to free speech and expression as provided in the First and
Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

17 5. Each and every act of Defendants alleged herein was committed by
18 Defendants named herein, and each and every act was committed under the color of state
19 law and authority.

20

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343, this Court has jurisdiction over
Plaintiff's claims. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, this Court has jurisdiction
over Plaintiff's request for declaratory relief.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), venue is proper in the District of Arizona
because all claims arise out of this district and Defendants reside in this district.

26

27 28 8. Plaintiff Ryan Arneson (Arneson) resides in Mesa, Arizona.

PLAINTIFF

DEFENDANTS

9. Defendant Maricopa County Community College District (MCCCD) is the entity that is responsible for establishing general policies and plans for the operation of all colleges in the MCCCD system.

10. Defendant South Mountain Community College (SMCC) is a college in the MCCCD system and has established its own policies and regulations.

7 11. Defendant Rufus Glasper (Glasper) is Chancellor of the MCCCD system. 8 In his official capacity, Glasper oversees all aspects of every college in the MCCCD 9 system. This includes oversight of and responsibility for policies that regulate and 10 control expression at colleges in the MCCCD college system. This Defendant is sued in 11 his official capacity.

12 12. Defendant Dr. Shari Olson (Olsen) is President of SMCC. In her official 13 capacity, Olsen oversees all aspects of SMCC. This includes oversight of policies that 14 regulate and control expression and other activities taking place on SMCC's campus. 15 This Defendant is sued in his official capacity.

16 13. Defendant Buddy Cheeks (Cheeks) is Director of Student Life & 17 Leadership at SMCC. In his official capacity, Cheeks is responsible for administrating 18 and interpreting regulations that pertain to expressive activities on SMCC's campus. 19 This Defendant is sued in his individual and official capacities.

20

21

STATEMENT OF FACTS

<u>Character and History of SMCC Campus</u>

22 14. MCCCD is located in Maricopa County, Arizona and is one of the largest 23 community college districts in the United States. MCCCD contains 10 colleges and 2 24 skill centers that serve the greater Phoenix Area and the State of Arizona.

25 15. One of the public colleges in the MCCCD system is SMCC, located in 26 Phoenix, Arizona. SMCC was established by the MCCCD on April 18, 1978.

27 16. SMCC has an annual enrollment of approximately 10,000 students, along 28 with approximately 350 faculty members. SMCC has four separate locations in Phoenix:

1 the Main Campus located at 7050 S. 24th Street, the Ahwatukee Foothills Center located 2 at 10429 South 51st Street, the Guadalupe Center located at 9233 S. Avenida del Yaqui, 3 and the Laveen Center located at 5001 W. Dobbins Road. The Main Campus covers 4 approximately 104 acres.

5

7

17. The SMCC Main Campus blends in with the City of Phoenix. Various 6 streets run around and though the Main Campus. The campus is bounded by East Vineyard Road to the north, a subdivision to the west, South 28th Street to the south, and 8 South 24th Street to the east.

9 18. At SMCC's Main Campus in Phoenix, there are no fences or barricades on 10 the perimeter of the campus to prevent members of the general public from having 11 access to the campus.

12 19. The Main Campus is open to the public at large and SMCC allows 13 individuals not affiliated with the college to have free access onto the grounds.

14 20. The Main Campus contains many open accessible areas on the grounds, 15 consisting of sidewalks, park-like areas, pedestrian malls, and other public ways, 16 including the amphitheatre near the Performing Arts Center, the pedestrian malls near 17 the Student Union and Learning Resource Center, the patios near the Student Services 18 buildings, the park behind the Learning Resource Center, the sidewalks on the interior of 19 campus, and the sidewalks along East Vineyard Road, South 28th Street, and South 24th 20 Street. These outside areas are physically indistinguishable from public parks, public 21 sidewalks, and public pedestrian malls found in the City of Phoenix.

22

21. The open, accessible spaces on the grounds of the SMCC Main Campus 23 are particularly suitable for expression and the free exchange of ideas. Individuals not 24 affiliated with SMCC frequent the grounds for various reasons, including picnicking, 25 walking, and jogging. Non-affiliated individuals regularly cut through the campus to 26 move about the City of Phoenix. And students commonly use these public areas to 27 congregate and converse. One-on-one conversation and literature distribution in these 28 areas do not disrupt or hinder SMCC's educational goals.

Desired Speech of Arneson

2 22. Arneson is an evangelical Christian who works full time as a minister for 3 his faith. As a tenet of his faith, and as part of his job, Arneson conveys his religious 4 beliefs to others in public.

5 23. To carry out this duty, Arneson often visits public universities and colleges 6 and expresses his religious views with those found on campus. Arneson wants to reach 7 the next generation with his message, and the open, accessible areas of college campus 8 environment offer Arneson excellent venues for his purpose.

9 24. Because he lives in close proximity, Arneson wants to share his beliefs on 10 SMCC's Main Campus in Phoenix.

11 25. Arneson expresses his religious beliefs through conversation and religious 12 literature. He typically engages in these expressive activities as an individual, but he 13 occasionally does so with a small group of friends.

14 26. Arneson relies on conversation and literature distribution because he finds 15 these particular means effective and inexpensive.

16 27. Arneson's message focuses on the benefits of a relationship with Jesus 17 Christ. Specifically, Arneson communicates that God has begun to establish his 18 Kingdom and redeem the world through Jesus' life, death, and resurrection. Arneson 19 encourages people to enter into and align themselves with this Kingdom and receive 20 salvific benefits by placing their trust in Jesus. Arneson also addresses how his religious 21 beliefs relate to current moral and social issues.

22

1

28. Arneson's standard practice is to address people in a conversational tone 23 as they walk by, and ask whether they would like to know about Jesus or receive a 24 pamphlet about Jesus. If that person declines, Arneson moves on to someone else.

25 29. When doing this, Arneson does not harass anyone. He always conducts 26 himself in a peaceful manner. He makes no attempt to solicit funds or membership to 27 any organization. He does not attempt to gather any signatures. He does not force

28

anyone to listen to him or to accept literature from him. Nor does Arneson litter or create
 congestion. He seeks out consensual one-on-one communications.

3

Arneson's Expression at SMCC's Main Campus

30. In April of 2009, Arneson spoke with Mike Lewis, a gentleman who
worked at SMCC. Arneson mentioned that he would like to express his religious beliefs
to students at SMCC. Lewis responded that Arneson could probably come and express
his beliefs, but indicated that he would have to confirm his assumption and let Arneson
know.

9 31. Approximately one week later, Lewis forwarded an email to Arneson from
10 the Director of Student Life & Leadership (Cheeks) in which Cheeks confirmed that
11 Arneson could come and speak on SMCC's campus.

32. Following this email, on May 6, 2009, Arneson went to SMCC's campus
to share his beliefs. He went directly to the Student Life Office and found Cheeks there.
Cheeks then escorted Arneson to a designated table in the patio area in front of what was
then the SMCC Library (and is now the Learning Resource Center). This patio area was
underneath a canopy and resembled a pedestrian mall. Students and non-students
gathered in this busy area as they mingled and talked. The area was relatively noisy and
compatible with expression.

33. After Cheeks and Arneson chatted for awhile, Cheeks left to let Arneson
engage in his desired expression. Though Arneson did not wish to be confined to this
specific spot, he still wanted to share his message to students in some conceivable way.
Hence, Arneson stayed near his assigned table and engaged students in conversation
about Christianity as they passed by. Arneson participated in this activity for
approximately four hours without incident.

34. Later that summer, on July 28, 2009, Arneson contacted Cheeks again and
requested dates when he could return to SMCC campus during the upcoming fall 2009
semester to express his beliefs. On August 3, 2009, Cheeks forwarded Arneson an email
stating that Arneson could return to SMCC on particular dates during the fall 2009

semester and express his beliefs. Arneson went to SMCC on these specified dates that
 fall and shared his views in the same location and in the same manner as he did before.

3 35. In the next year, Arneson followed the same procedure as he had followed
before. He contacted Cheeks during the summer of 2010 and obtained dates on which he
could express his beliefs at SMCC during the fall 2010 semester. And, just as he had
done previously, Arneson engaged in consensual one-on-one conversations and
distributed literature during that fall 2010 semester without triggering any disturbance.

8

SMCC's Censorship of Arneson's Expression

9 36. Despite Arneson's history and willingness to continue non-disruptive
10 expressive activities, SMCC abruptly changed its stance toward Arneson's expression in
11 2011.

37. On January 4, 2011, Arneson went to SMCC's campus to secure dates for
sharing his message during the upcoming spring 2011 semester. Like he had done in the
past, Arneson notified Cheeks of his intentions.

38. During this conversation, Cheeks provided Arneson available dates upon
which he could come and express his beliefs during the spring 2011 semester. But
Cheeks informed Arneson that he would not be able to engage in expression for free at
SMCC following the spring 2011 semester. If Arneson wanted to engage in any form of
expression at SMCC after that semester, he would have to start paying fees.

39. Arneson was shocked to learn about this new requirement forcing him to
pay fees since he never had to pay any fee in the past to express his beliefs on campus.
Arneson left the meeting with Cheeks fearful of – and frustrated by – SMCC's newlyestablished fee requirement.

40. Confirming the regulation on expression, Cheeks sent an email to Arneson
on January 26, 2011, reiterating that Arneson would have to pay fees after the 2011
spring semester to engage in his expression at SMCC. Cheeks specified: "If you request
to visit after the spring you will be required to follow the solicitation policy which
requires you to pay for your visits."

41. For the balance of the 2011 spring semester Arneson went to SMCC and
 expressed his beliefs without incident. But Arneson has not attempted to engage in any
 expression at SMCC since the 2011 spring semester due to the solicitation policy. If not
 for the solicitation policy, and the actions of college officials in enforcing this policy,
 Arneson would have engaged (and would presently be engaging) in expression at SMCC
 during this fall 2011 semester.

7

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

MCCCD and SMCC Policies

8 42. Cheeks' January 26 email cited a "solicitation policy" as the basis for 9 requiring Arneson to pay fees following the 2011 spring semester. SMCC has a 10 solicitation policy which works in conjunction with MCCCD's solicitation policy to 11 regulate expression at SMCC. Both policies require speakers to pay fees prior to 12 engaging in expression at SMCC. These two policies also contain additional 13 requirements that hinder Arneson's speech in open accessible areas on the SMCC 14 campus.

15 43. MCCCD's solicitation policy is entitled "Solicitation." It appears in §2.4.9
16 of MCCCD's Policy Manual and reads as follows:

1. Definitions

A "solicitor" is any non-MCCCD-affiliated entity that would, on the premises of any Maricopa Community College or Center, purport to sell or promote any product, service, or idea, but does not include such an entity that would enter the premises for the purposes of promoting, opposing, or soliciting petition signatures in connection with any political candidate or initiative, or referendum ballot.

A "special event" is a college-sponsored event conducted on college premises for the benefit of students that is based on a particular theme, and for which the college has deemed it essential to invite the participation of solicitors whose products, services or ideas are pertinent to the special event's theme.

2. Requirements

A. A solicitor must obtain prior approval for solicitation from the designated official at each college or center. A solicitor who would purport

Case 2:11-cv-02587-NVW Document 1 Filed 12/29/11 Page 9 of 20

to sell any product or service is responsible for obtaining any necessary tax licenses and must submit to the designated official a certificate of commercial liability insurance and pay to the college or center, in consideration for the opportunity for solicitation, a fee in the amount of \$50 per day or \$125 per week (a week is defined as Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday).

B. Campus restrictions regarding location, time, date, and use of amplification may apply. All requests for space shall be granted on a first-come, first-served basis only upon completion of the requirements contained in this regulation.

C. All solicitation must take place at tables in designated areas. Standard space will be one or two tables and chairs. Solicitors may be limited to no more than fifty (50) hours of solicitation activity per semester at each college or center.

D. By requesting the opportunity for solicitation on the premises of a college or center, a solicitor warrants that it may lawfully sell or promote its product, service or idea and that such activity does not violate any law, and does not violate any trademark, copyright, or similar proprietary interest. The activity of any solicitor may not violate any existing Maricopa contract.

E. The president of every college or center shall establish for such location restrictions governing the activities of solicitors. Such restrictions shall supplement, but shall not replace or waive, this regulation.

F. A college may waive the fee prescribed in this regulation for any solicitor's participation in a special event if the college determines that such participation will be of particular educational benefit to the interests of that college's students (i.e., non-profits/501(c)3, the Armed Forces, and educational institutions offering transfer information); the participation is sponsored by a club, organization, or academic division; and the participation is approved by the college's Student Life and Leadership department. A college may waive both the fee and the insurance certificate requirements prescribed in this regulation for a student purporting to sell or promote a product or service at a special event, provided that:

i. Such product or service presents low risk of harm to a potential user;

ii. The product or service is not food or food-related and;

iii. The student is soliciting solely on his or her own behalf and not pursuant to any sales agreement, commission agreement, or similar affiliation or contractual relationship with another entity.

G. Any solicitor who violates this regulation may be deemed a trespasser on college or center premises, and therefore subject to appropriate prosecution within the discretion of the College Safety department and other responsible officials at the college or center. The Maricopa County Community College District, its colleges and centers, assume no responsibility - financial or otherwise - for the acts or omissions of any vendor whose presence on college premises pursuant to this regulation is approved by any college official.

9 44. Pursuant to the MCCCD's solicitation policy, SMCC issued its own
10 solicitation policy that regulates expression at SMCC. This policy is entitled "South
11 Mountain Community College Procedure for Solicitation" and reads as follows:

General Information

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Solicitor: A "solicitor" is any non-MCCCD-affiliated entity that would, on the premises of any Maricopa Community College or Center, purport to sell or promote any product, service, or idea, but does not include such an entity that would enter the premises for the purposes of promoting, opposing, or soliciting petition signatures in connection with any political candidate or initiative, or referendum ballot.

Special Event: A "special event" is a college-sponsored event conducted on college premises for the benefit of students that is based on a particular theme, and for which the college has deemed it essential to invite the participation of solicitors whose products, services or ideas are pertinent to the special event's theme. (*Excerpt from MCCCD Administrative Regulation 2.4.9*)

Logistics

Days & Times: Solicitors are welcome on campus Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday from 10:00 AM to 6:00 PM so long as time on campus does not exceed fifty (50) hours per term. Additional time may be requested and will be granted by the Director of Student Life & Leadership, or other appropriate college designee, as space is available. Set-up can begin no earlier than 9:45 AM and vendors must be off campus by 6:15 PM. Requests are granted on a first-come, first-served basis, once all required documentation has been submitted and approved. Location: Solicitors will be directed to a college-designated area and be provided a table and chairs, unless otherwise specified by the college for a special event (see Planning, below). Due to space limitations, no more than three (3) solicitor(s) will be permitted on campus at any one time. No more than two (2) people may occupy any one space. Solicitors must remain within a five (5) foot radius of the above designated location. Solicitors will not in any way stop the flow of traffic, approach students or employees or disrupt the college environment. Students and employees may approach the solicitor of their own accord.

Cost: \$50 per day or \$125 per week (a week is defined as Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday), non-refundable, and made payable to the college. This amount is due in the Office of Student Life & Leadership, or other college designated area, on a company or bank-issued cashier's check or money order at least five (5) business days prior to the scheduled campus visit. Some colleges also accept payment in the form of a corporate credit card.

Parking: A decal is not needed for the lots. *Driving is permitted on campus with specific permission*.

14Required Documents

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- The following documents must be approved and on file with the Office of Student Life & Leadership, or other college designated area.
- 17 At least 14 days in advance of your visit:

1. Facility Reservation OR SOLICITATION Request Form. Additional documents may be required or document names may vary, depending on the college location. Copies of the appropriate form(s) can be requested from the Office of Student Life & Leadership.

2. Proof of Insurance: A certificate of insurance displaying appropriate insurance coverage (\$1M General Liability, \$1M Auto Liability*, \$500K Workers Comp*), naming Maricopa County Community College District (MCCCD), 2411 W. 14th Street, Tempe, AZ 85281, as additional insured. (*where applicable)

At least five (5) days in advance of your visit:

Campus Visit Fee: Make \$50 per day or \$125 per week non-refundable payment on a company or bank-issued cashier's check or money order, made payable to the college, or via corporate credit card.

Planning

1	Planning		
2	Remember, the following steps need to be taken before your campus visit can take place.		
3 4	1. Contact the Office of Student Life & Leadership, or other college designated area, to request a reservation.		
5			
6	2. Obtain and complete a Facility Reservation OR SOLICITATION Request Form and submit it to the Office of Student Life & Leadership.		
7 8	3. Supply Proof of Insurance certificate to the Office of Student Life & Leadership or Public Relations Office.		
9			
10	4. Pay your Campus Visit Fee of \$50/day or \$125/week at the Office of Student Life & Leadership, or other college designated area.		
11	One table and two chairs may be provided to each solicitor. Solicitors may		
12	place banners or signs on the table to encourage interest. Banners and signs		
13	may not be adhered to any surface. Note that availability of college provided table and chairs may vary by location/scheduled events.		
14	Special Requests and Considerations		
15	The availability of electricity, canopies and amplification varies among		
16 17			
18	Failure to comply with MCCCD policies and administrative regulations		
19	could result in the termination of solicitor privileges on any or all college campuses.		
20	cumpuses.		
21	45. Given MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies, Arneson cannot		
22	express his religious message on the SMCC Main Campus as an individual or as part of		
23	a small group without first submitting an application 14 days before speaking, securing		
24	adequate insurance, paying \$50 per day or \$125 per week, and limiting his expression to		
25	certain designated areas. Moreover, these solicitation policies allow college officials to		
26	determine the location for expression without any criteria. While these policies exempt		
27	political expression from the harsh requirements, Arneson's expression is regulated.		
28			

1 46. Because MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies explicitly exempt 2 various forms of political expression, these forms of political expression are covered by another policy --- MCCCD's Policy entitled "Petition Signature Solicitation." This 3 4 policy appears in §2.4.8 of MCCCD's Policy Manual and reads as follows: 5 1. This regulation shall govern access to college premises by representatives who wish to solicit signatures on petitions for the purpose 6 of submission of a ballot proposition to voters, or nomination of a candidate for elective office, in a city-, county-, or state-wide election. 7 2. Each college president shall designate general hours of accessibility 8 for solicitation and a location on college premises where all representatives on behalf of any candidate or ballot proposition may solicit signatures. The 9 location shall be in a common area where the solicitation will not serve as an obstruction to student activities or otherwise disrupt the college 10 environment. 11 3. All solicitation must take place in designated areas. Standard space 12 may include one or two tables and chairs. Campus restrictions regarding amplification will apply. Representatives may not distribute or make 13 available to students, employees, or college visitors any tangible item, except for informational literature about the proposed candidate or ballot 14 initiative. 15 4. Representatives shall notify the designated official at each college or center for their intent to be present on college premises no fewer than three 16 working days prior to soliciting signatures. Upon obtaining authorization, representatives shall be provided a written version of this regulation. 17 18 47. As the policy makes clear, persons may solicit signatures for political 19 purposes and distribute political information without having to comply with the 20 burdensome requirements found in MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies. 21 Specifically, a person seeking to solicit signatures for political purposes and distribute 22 political information does not have to submit an application 14 days before speaking, 23 agree to insure SMCC, or pay \$50 per day/\$125 per week to access SMCC. Arneson's 24 speech does not fall under the conditions of MCCCD's petition policy because Arneson 25 wishes to express a religious message, not a political one. 26 **Impact of SMCC and MCCCD Policies** 27 48. MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies impose severe restrictions on 28 expression that have no bearing on academic programs or administrative processes.

1

49. These policies serve to chill and deter Arneson's expression. These policies adversely affect his speech in numerous ways.

2 3

50. The policies require any individual speaker to provide 14 days advance 4 notice of their expression, even if engaging in literature distribution or one-on-one 5 conversations. This requirement affects Arneson's expression because he does not necessarily know where he will be 14 days in advance. Circumstances could dictate a 6 7 change in plans or schedule. Also, the desire to speak to students often comes upon 8 Arneson spontaneously. Therefore, Arneson often feels compelled to speak 9 spontaneously to students. But MCCCD's and SMCC's policies preclude all 10 spontaneous speech.

11 51. MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies also ban all expressive 12 activities conducted by outside speakers anywhere on campus except for designated 13 areas. SMCC previously allowed Arneson to engage in expression at a table in front of 14 the SMCC Library. Arneson would like to engage in expression (one-on-one 15 conversation, distribute literature and display signs) in many other open areas on the 16 SMCC campus. He basically wants to conduct these activities in any open area where 17 students can be found, such as the amphitheatre near the Performing Arts Center, the 18 pedestrian malls near the Student Union and Learning Resource Center, the patios near 19 the Student Services buildings, the park-like area behind the Learning Resource Center, 20 the sidewalks on the interior of campus, and the sidewalks along East Vineyard Road, 21 South 28th Street, and South 24th Street. Arneson is prevented from engaging in his 22 desired activities in these areas because of MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies.

23 24

52. There is nothing in SMCC's solicitation policy that limits the discretion of officials in choosing where Arneson or other speakers may speak. As a result, SMCC 25 officials can choose the location for a potential speaker based on disagreement with that 26 speaker's message. This discretion is problematic for Arneson because it allows SMCC officials to effectively eliminate his message by placing him in an area with no audience.

28

27

1 Arneson fears that SMCC officials will threaten to place him in an obscure location if 2 Arneson refuses to alter his message to their liking.

3

4

5

7

53. MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies also contain provisions requiring speakers to pay \$50 per day or \$125 per week for use of SMCC facilities. There is no exception for indigents in any of these provisions. Arneson cannot avoid 6 these fees because they apply anywhere on campus. And these fees prevent Arneson from speaking on SMCC's campus as often as he would like.

8 54. MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies further require speakers to 9 obtain insurance before they can speak on campus. And, the cost to obtain insurance 10 varies on the content of a speaker's message. Arneson is thus held liable for the actions 11 of third parties whom he cannot control and who may react in opposition to his message.

12 55. MCCCD's solicitation policy allows officials to possibly waive the fee 13 requirement and insurance requirement if Arneson qualifies as a "special event" as 14 defined under the policy, but there is no guarantee that Arneson will qualify as a "special 15 event," since he wants to engage in one-on-one religious expression. And even if 16 Arneson did qualify as a "special event," there is no guarantee that officials would 17 always waive the fee and insurance requirement. MCCCD's solicitation policy gives 18 officials unbounded discretion to waive or not waive these requirements for any reason. 19 Arneson fears that college officials will use this discretion to discriminate against his 20 message or force him to alter his message under the threat of having to pay fees and 21 obtain insurance.

22 56. MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies explicitly exclude political 23 expression and do not require political expression to comply with the burdensome 24 requirements found in MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies. Political expression, 25 unlike Arneson's religious expression, need only comply with the minimal requirements 26 found in MCCCD's Petition Policy. In light of the differential treatment of expression 27 based solely on the content of that expression, MCCCD and SMCC effectively 28 discriminate against – and censor – religious messages and viewpoints like Arneson's.

1	57. For fear of arrest, Arneson has not returned to the SMCC Main Campus				
2	for the purpose of expressing his viewpoints since SMCC officials started to enforce				
3	MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies after the 2011 spring semester. If not for				
4	MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies, and the actions of Defendants, Arneson				
5	would immediately return to the SMCC Main Campus to share his message via				
6	conversation and literature distribution. He would do so as an individual and also in				
7	small groups of three to four people.				
8	58. The fear of arrest limits Arneson's constitutionally-protected expression on				

9 || the open accessible public grounds on the SMCC Main Campus.

10 59. The impact of chilling and deterring Arneson from exercising his
11 constitutional rights on the SMCC Main Campus constitutes irreparable harm to
12 Arneson.

60. Arneson does not have an adequate remedy at law for the loss of hisconstitutional rights.

15 16

21

22

23

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of Freedom of Speech

17 61. Arneson's religious speech is protected speech under the First18 Amendment.

19 62. Defendants' policies and practices, and enforcement thereof, including, but
20 not limited to MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies:

a. are vague and overbroad;

b. discriminate against speech because of its content;

c. discriminate against speech on the basis of the speaker's viewpoint;

d. restrain constitutionally-protected speech in advance of its
expression, without appropriate guidelines or standards to guide the discretion of
officials charged with enforcing the policy;

e. chill the free speech and free exercise of religion of Arneson and of
other third-party citizens;

	Case 2:11-cv-02587-NVW Document 1 Filed 12/29/11 Page 17 of 20		
1	f. allow the exercise of unbridled discretion;		
2	g. fail to contain an exception allowing for indigent's free expression;		
3	h. create a content-based heckler's veto that allows Arneson to be		
4	silenced because of hostile audiences;		
5	i. lack narrow tailoring, fail to achieve any legitimate government		
6	purpose, and fail to leave open alternative avenues for expression; and		
7	j. are unreasonable.		
8	63. Defendants have no legitimate reason that can justify the restrictions on		
9	Arneson's expression.		
10	64. Defendants' policies and practices, and the enforcement thereof, thus		
11	violate the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment to the United States		
12	Constitution, made applicable to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment.		
13	WHEREFORE, Arneson respectfully prays the Court grant the equitable and		
14	legal relief set forth in the prayer for relief.		
15	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION		
16	Violation of the Due Process Clause		
17	65. Defendants' policies and practices are vague and lack sufficient objective		
18	standards to curtail the discretion of officials. This allows Defendants ample opportunity		
19	to enforce the policies in an <i>ad hoc</i> , arbitrary, and discriminatory manner.		
20	66. Defendants have no compelling or legitimate reason that can justify their		
21	vague policies.		
22	67. The policies and practices, and Defendants' enforcement thereof, violate		
23	the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.		
24	WHEREFORE, Arneson respectfully prays the Court grant the equitable and		
25	legal relief set forth hereinafter in the prayer for relief.		
26	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION		
27	Violation of Equal Protection		
28	68. Under their policies and practices, Defendants single out and impose		

harsher restrictions and barriers on those expressing religious messages than those
 expressing political messages.

3 69. In so doing, Defendants allow similarly-situated speakers to easily access
4 SMCC's campus and speak on campus, but, through their policies and practices, impose
5 harsh restrictions on Arneson and prevent him from accessing SMCC's campus to
6 express his religious message.

7 70. Defendants' enforcement of their policies and practices intentionally treats
8 Arneson differently than other similarly-situated speakers based on the viewpoint and
9 content of their expression.

10 71. Defendants have no compelling or legitimate reason that would justify11 their disparate treatment of Arneson.

12 72. The policies and practices, and defendants' enforcement thereof, therefore
13 violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States
14 Constitution.

WHEREFORE, Arneson respectfully prays the Court grant the equitable andlegal relief set forth in the prayer for relief.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Arneson respectfully prays for relief in that this Court:

19

17

18

A. Assume jurisdiction over this action;

B. Enter a judgment and decree declaring that MCCCD's and SMCC's
solicitation policies are each unconstitutional on their face and as-applied to Arneson's
desired speech (conversation and literature distribution) because they violate Arneson's
rights and the rights of third parties not before the Court, as guaranteed under the First
and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;

C. Enter a preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, their agents, officials, servants, employees, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, or any of them, from applying MCCCD's and SMCC's solicitation policies so as to restrict constitutionally-protected speech of non-college speakers, including

1	Arneson, on open public areas on the SMCC Main Campus;				
2	D. Adjudge, decree, and declare the rights and other legal relations with the				
3	subject matter here in controversy, in order that such declaration shall have the force and				
4	effect of final judgment;				
5	E. Award Arneson nominal damages arising from the acts of the Defendants				
6	as an important vindication of the constitutional rights;				
7	F. Award Arneson his costs and expenses of this action, including reasonable				
8	attorneys' fees, in accordance with 42 U.S.C. § 1988 and other applicable law; and				
9	G.	Grant such other and further r	elief as appears to this Court to be equitable		
10	and just.				
11	Respectfully submitted this 29^{th} day of December, 2011.				
12	By:				
13	Nathan W.		s/ Christopher R. Stovall		
14	TN BAR #1 Jonathan Sc	13482; MS BAR # 8813 ruggs*	AZ BAR # 025127 Jennings, Haug & Cunningham, LLP		
15	TN Bar # 02	25679	2800 N. Central Ave., Suite 1800		
16		E DEFENSE FUND f Office Lane, Suite 107	Phoenix, AZ 85004 (602) 234-7800 telephone		
17	Memphis, 7	TN 38117	(602) 277-5595 - Fax		
18	(901) 684-5	485 telephone 499 – Fax	Local Counsel		
19	A the means f	an Disintiff Deven American	Attorney for Plaintiff Ryan Arneson		
20	Attorneys Id	or Plaintiff Ryan Arneson			
21	*Motion for ad	Imission pro hac vice forthcoming			
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
	19				

VERIFICATION I, the undersigned, a citizen of the United States and resident of the State of Arizona, have read the foregoing Verified Complaint and declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of Arizona, that the foregoing is true and correct. Dated this $\underline{\partial \P^{*}}$ day of December, 2011. RYAN ARNESON