

IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

MICHAEL E. MANN, Ph.D.,

Plaintiff–Appellee,

v.

NATIONAL REVIEW, INC.; MARK STEYN;
COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE;
RAND SIMBERG,


Defendants–Appellants.

Nos. 13-cv-1043,
13-cv-1044 (consolidated)

**UNOPPOSED MOTION OF THE REPORTERS COMMITTEE FOR FREEDOM OF
THE PRESS AND 18 OTHER MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS FOR LEAVE TO FILE
MEMORANDUM AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN RESPONSE TO ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

Pursuant to D.C. App. R. 29, the above-named amici move for leave to file the attached brief in response to the court’s Oct. 18, 2013, order to show cause why this interlocutory appeal should not be dismissed. All parties have consented to the filing of this brief.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregg P. Leslie (D.C. Bar # 426092)
The Reporters Committee
for Freedom of the Press
1101 Wilson Blvd., Suite 1100
Arlington, VA 22209
Telephone: (703) 807-2102
Counsel for *Amicus Curiae*


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on Nov. 13, 2013, a copy of the foregoing motion was served by electronic mail upon:

DAVID B. RIVKIN, JR.
BRUCE BROWN
MARK I. BAILEN
ANDREW M. GROSSMAN
BAKERHOSTETLER LLP
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 861-1770
agrossman@bakerlaw.com
*Attorneys for Appellants
Competitive Enterprise Institute
and Rand Simberg*

SHANNEN W. COFFEN
JAMES MOORHEAD
THOMAS CONTOIS
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 429-6255
scoffin@steptoe.com
*Attorneys for Appellants National
Review, Inc., and Mark Steyn*

JOHN B. WILLIAMS
CATHERINE ROSATO REILLY
COZEN O'CONNOR P.C.
1627 I Street, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20006
jbwilliams@cozen.com
Attorneys for Appellee Michael E. Mann



Gregg P. Leslie
The Reporters Committee
for Freedom of the Press
1101 Wilson Blvd., Suite 1100
Arlington, VA 22209
Telephone: (703) 807-2102
Counsel for *Amicus Curiae*

Nos. 13-cv-1043, 13-cv-1044 (consolidated)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

Michael E. Mann, Ph.D.,

Plaintiff–Appellee,

v.

National Review, Inc.; Mark Steyn;
Competitive Enterprise Institute; Rand Simberg,

Defendants–Appellants.

On Appeal from the Superior Court for the District of Columbia

**BRIEF *AMICI CURIAE* OF THE REPORTERS COMMITTEE FOR FREEDOM OF
THE PRESS AND 19 OTHER MEDIA ORGANIZATIONS IN SUPPORT OF
APPELLANTS, SUPPORTING A FINDING OF JURISDICTION**

Gregg P. Leslie
The Reporters Committee
for Freedom of the Press
1101 Wilson Blvd., Suite 1100
Arlington, VA 22209
Telephone: (703) 807-2100
Counsel for *Amicus Curiae*

Additional counsel listed in Appendix B

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

STATEMENT OF INTEREST..... iv

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT v

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT 1

ARGUMENT 1

I. The right to avoid litigation of meritless claims against speech on a matter of public interest, as provided by the D.C. anti-SLAPP statute, will be irreparably lost if denial of a motion is not immediately appealable. 1

 A. Three federal circuit courts have found, under the collateral order doctrine, that anti-SLAPP statutes fall within the small class of interlocutory orders that are immediately appealable. 2

 B. At least two states have found that anti-SLAPP statutes create immunity from suit, a right that is irreparably lost if denials of anti-SLAPP motions are not immediately appealable. 4

 C. Contrary decisions of other courts indicating there is no right to immediately appeal the denial of anti-SLAPP motions are distinguishable from the D.C. anti-SLAPP statute because of the issue of immunity. 6

II. The important role appellate courts play in reviewing defamation cases and the frequency with which defamation decisions are overturned justify prompt appellate review. 8

CONCLUSION..... 10

APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF AMICI..... 11

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL COUNSEL:..... 16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>A.R. v. F.C.</i> , 33 A.3d 403 (D.C. 2011).....	7
<i>Abbas v. Foreign Policy Grp., LLC</i> , No. 12–1565, 2013 WL 5410410 (D.D.C. Sept. 27, 2013)..	2
<i>Batzel v. Smith</i> , 333 F.3d 1018 (9th Cir. 2003).....	2, 6
<i>Boley v. Atlantic Monthly Grp.</i> , No. 13–89, 2013 WL 3185154 (D.D.C. June 25, 2013).....	2
<i>Bose Corp. v. Consumers Union</i> , 466 U.S. 485 (1984).....	8, 9
<i>Citizens Ass’n of Georgetown v. Zoning Comm’n of the District of Columbia</i> , 392 A.2d 1027 (D.C. 1978).....	7
<i>Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp.</i> , 337 U.S. 541 (1949).....	2
<i>DC Comics v. Pac. Pictures Corp.</i> , 706 F.3d 1009 (9th Cir. 2013)	2, 3, 4
<i>Elrod v. Burns</i> , 427 U.S. 347 (1976)	4
<i>Englert v. MacDonell</i> , 551 F.3d 1099 (9th Cir. 2009).....	6, 7
<i>Fabre v. Walton</i> , 781 N.E.2d 780 (Mass. 2002).....	4
<i>Godin v. Schencks</i> , 629 F.3d 79 (1st Cir. 2010)	2, 3, 6
<i>Grayson v. AT&T Corp.</i> , 15 A.3d 219 (D.C. 2011).....	7, 8
<i>Harte-Hanks Communications v. Connaughton</i> , 491 U.S. 657 (1989)	8
<i>Henry v. Lake Charles Am. Press, L.L.C.</i> , 566 F.3d 164 (5th Cir. 2009).....	2, 3, 4
<i>Metabolic Research, Inc. v. Ferrell</i> , 693 F.3d 795 (9th Cir. 2012).....	6, 7
<i>Morse Bros. v. Webster</i> , 772 A.2d 842 (Me. 2001).....	4, 5
<i>Peoples Drug Stores, Inc. v. District of Columbia</i> , 470 A.2d 751 (D.C. 1983)	7
<i>Schelling v. Lindell</i> , 942 A.2d 1226 (Me. 2008).....	5
<i>Stuart v. Walker</i> , 6 A.3d 1215 (D.C. 2010)	7
<i>Wendt v. Barnum</i> , 2007 Mass. App. Div. 93 (App. Div. 2007).....	4, 5

Statutes

Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 425.16 (West 1992) (amended 2011) 2

D.C. Code §§ 16-5501 *et seq.* (2011) 1, 5

La. Code Civ. Proc. Ann. art. 971 (1999) (amended 2012)..... 2

Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 231, § 59H (1994) (amended 1996) 4

Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 14, § 556 (1999) (amended 2012) 2

S.B. 286 (Nev. 2013) (amending Nev. Rev. Stat. § 41.637)..... 6

Other Authorities

MLRC 2012 Report on Trials and Damages, Media L. Resource Center, Feb. 2012 9

Report on Bill 18-893, “Anti-SLAPP Act of 2010,” Council of the District of Columbia,
Committee on Public Safety and the Judiciary (Nov. 18, 2010) 2, 6, 7, 9

Rules

D.C. App. R. 25 11

D.C. App. R. 29 i, iv

STATEMENT OF INTEREST

Pursuant to D.C. App. R. 29, the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, through undersigned counsel, respectfully submit this brief as amicus curiae in support of appellants Mark Steyn *et al.* and Competitive Enterprise Institute *et al.* Pursuant to D.C. App. R. 29 (a), this brief is filed with the consent of all parties.

Media organizations have an interest in ensuring anti-SLAPP statutes remain effective tools in protecting free speech. While all citizens who choose to speak out on public affairs benefit from anti-SLAPP statutes, which aim to deter the use of litigation to silence speech, news organizations have an even greater interest in ensuring that these statutes provide meaningful relief. It is news organizations that choose every day to venture into the thick of every public controversy they can find, to make sure citizens are fully informed about their world. This engagement with important issues makes the news media more liable to be drawn in to court, particularly when a controversial figure decides to use litigation as a weapon to counter thorough reporting.

The amicus parties are: The Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, Advance Publications, Inc., Allbritton Communications Company, American Society of News Editors, Association of Alternative Newsmedia, Dow Jones & Company, Inc., The E.W. Scripps Company, First Amendment Coalition, The McClatchy Company, The National Press Club, National Press Photographers Association, NBCUniversal Media, LLC, News Corp, Newspaper Association of America, Online News Association, POLITICO LLC, Society of Professional Journalists, Time Inc., Tribune Company, and The Washington Post. Each is described more fully in Appendix A.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Advance Publications, Inc. has no parent corporation, and no publicly held corporation owns 10% or more of its stock.

Allbritton Communications Company is an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of privately held Perpetual Corporation and is the parent company of entities operating ABC-affiliated television stations in the following markets: Washington, D.C.; Harrisburg, Pa.; Birmingham, Ala.; Little Rock, Ark.; Tulsa, Okla.; and Lynchburg, Va.

American Society of News Editors is a private, non-stock corporation that has no parent.

Association of Alternative Newsmedia has no parent corporation and does not issue any stock.

The E.W. Scripps Company is a publicly traded company with no parent company. No individual stockholder owns more than 10% of its stock.

News Corporation, a publicly held company, is the indirect parent corporation of Dow Jones. No publicly held company owns 10% or more of Dow Jones' stock.

First Amendment Coalition is a nonprofit organization with no parent company. It issues no stock and does not own any of the party's or amicus' stock.

The McClatchy Company is publicly traded on the New York Stock Exchange under the ticker symbol MNI. Contrarius Investment Management Limited owns 10% or more of the common stock of The McClatchy Company.

The National Press Club is a not-for-profit corporation that has no parent company and issues no stock.

National Press Photographers Association is a 501(c)(6) nonprofit organization with no parent company. It issues no stock and does not own any of the party's or amicus' stock.

Comcast Corporation and its consolidated subsidiaries own 100% of the common equity interests of NBCUniversal Media, LLC.

News Corporation has no parent company, and no publicly held company owns more than 10 percent of its shares.

Newspaper Association of America is a nonprofit, non-stock corporation organized under the laws of the commonwealth of Virginia. It has no parent company.

Online News Association is a not-for-profit organization. It has no parent corporation, and no publicly traded corporation owns 10% or more of its stock.

POLITICO LLC is a wholly owned subsidiary of privately held Capitol News Company, LLC.

Society of Professional Journalists is a non-stock corporation with no parent company.

Time Inc. is a wholly owned subsidiary of Time Warner Inc., a publicly traded corporation. No publicly held corporation owns 10% or more of Time Warner Inc.'s stock.

Tribune Company is a privately held company.

WP Company LLC (d/b/a The Washington Post) is a wholly-owned subsidiary of The Washington Post Company, a publicly held corporation. Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., a publicly held company, has a 10 percent or greater ownership interest in The Washington Post Company.

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT

The District of Columbia enacted the anti-SLAPP statute, D.C. Code §§ 16-5501 *et seq.* (2011), to prevent claims based on speech about matters of public interest from advancing past the initial stages of litigation unless the plaintiff can demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits. Michael Mann, a climate scientist, sued defendants for defamation regarding statements they made on blog posts about the controversy surrounding Mann's research methods and data. Defendants moved to dismiss Mann's complaint under the D.C. anti-SLAPP statute. The D.C. Superior Court denied the motions, prompting this appeal.

This brief takes no position on the merits of the case; rather, it urges this court to find that denials of anti-SLAPP motions are immediately appealable. This decision would be consistent with at least three federal circuits and two state high courts, which have found that anti-SLAPP statutes are meant to confer immunity and that the right not to be exposed to the costs and delays of litigation will be irreparably lost if not immediately appealable. Furthermore, the high rate at which defamation decisions are overturned and the important role appellate courts play in reviewing defamation cases justify prompt appellate review.

ARGUMENT

- I. **The right to avoid litigation of meritless claims against speech on a matter of public interest, as provided by the D.C. anti-SLAPP statute, will be irreparably lost if denial of a motion is not immediately appealable.**

This court has not yet issued a published opinion determining whether interlocutory orders denying anti-SLAPP motions are immediately appealable. However, other jurisdictions have found that interlocutory orders denying anti-SLAPP motions must be immediately appealable to preserve the very rights conveyed to defendants under the statute.

A. Three federal circuit courts have found, under the collateral order doctrine, that anti-SLAPP statutes fall within the small class of interlocutory orders that are immediately appealable.

Because of the lack of precedent from this court on the issue of appeals, it is appropriate to look to other jurisdictions for guidance, particularly when the law is based on similar laws in other states. Report on Bill 18-893, “Anti-SLAPP Act of 2010,” Council of the District of Columbia, Committee on Public Safety and the Judiciary (Nov. 18, 2010), at 4 (“Committee Report”) (“[This bill] follows the model set forth in a number of other jurisdictions . . .”). In fact, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia has looked to other jurisdictions for guidance when this issue has surfaced. *See, e.g., Boley v. Atlantic Monthly Grp.*, No. 13–89, 2013 WL 3185154, at *3 (D.D.C. June 25, 2013) (“Where appropriate, then, the Court will look to decisions from other jurisdictions . . . for guidance in predicting how the D.C. Court of Appeals would interpret its own anti-SLAPP law.”); *Abbas v. Foreign Policy Grp., LLC*, No. 12–1565, 2013 WL 5410410, at *3 (D.D.C. Sept. 27, 2013).

The First, Fifth, and Ninth Circuits relied on the collateral order doctrine, *see Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541 (1949), in finding that the anti-SLAPP statutes in Maine,¹ Louisiana,² and California,³ respectively, required the right of immediate appeals to preserve the purpose of the statutes. *DC Comics v. Pac. Pictures Corp.*, 706 F.3d 1009 (9th Cir. 2013) (reaffirming *Batzel v. Smith*, 333 F.3d 1018 (9th Cir. 2003)); *Godin v. Schencks*, 629 F.3d 79 (1st Cir. 2010); *Henry v. Lake Charles Am. Press, L.L.C.*, 566 F.3d 164 (5th Cir. 2009). The collateral order doctrine permits immediate appeal of interlocutory orders “that are [(1)] conclusive, [(2)] that resolve important questions separate from the merits, and [(3)] that are

¹ Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 14, § 556 (1999) (amended 2012).

² La. Code Civ. Proc. Ann. art. 971 (1999) (amended 2012).

³ Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 425.16 (West 1992) (amended 2011).

effectively unreviewable on appeal from the final judgment in the underlying action.” *DC Comics, supra*, 706 F.3d at 1013 (brackets in original).

The Ninth Circuit held that the first two criteria of the collateral order doctrine were clearly satisfied. *Id.* Analyzing the third criterion, the court held that the California anti-SLAPP statute, based on the language of the statute and the legislative history behind it, was meant to confer immunity and not merely a defense against liability. *Id.* Immunity from suit is unreviewable on appeal from final judgment; therefore, the third criterion of the collateral order doctrine was met. *Id.* The Ninth Circuit noted that the protection of the right to free speech embedded in the anti-SLAPP statute requires “particular solicitude within the framework of the collateral order doctrine.” *Id.* at 1016. The court further noted that “[t]he California legislature’s determination, through its enactment of the anti-SLAPP statute, that such constitutional rights would be imperiled absent a right of interlocutory appeal deserves respect.” *Id.*

The First Circuit also found that the first two criteria of the collateral order doctrine were met before concluding that the rights created by the Maine anti-SLAPP statute were akin to immunity and therefore unreviewable on appeal from final judgment. *Godin, supra*, 629 F.3d at 84-85. Looking at a Maine court’s decision granting interlocutory review, the court found that “lawmakers wanted to protect speakers from the trial itself rather than merely from liability.” *Id.* at 85.

The Fifth Circuit analyzed each criterion of the collateral order doctrine, ultimately finding that interlocutory orders denying an anti-SLAPP motion fall under the “small class” of orders that are immediately appealable. *Henry, supra*, 566 F.3d at 173-81. Regarding the third criterion, the court found that anti-SLAPP statutes “provide defendants the right not to bear the costs of fighting a meritless defamation claim” and are therefore unreviewable on appeal from

final judgment. *Id.* at 177-78. “[I]mmunity is not simply a right to prevail, but a right not to be tried,” and that right is lost if the case proceeds to trial. *Id.* at 177. Echoing the Ninth Circuit, which held that free speech protections should be given greater import under the collateral order doctrine, *DC Comics*, 706 F.3d at 1016, the Fifth Circuit noted that the importance of protecting First Amendment rights “weighs profoundly in favor of appealability,” *Henry, supra*, 566 F.3d at 180. “The loss of First Amendment freedoms, for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.” *Id.* (quoting *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 373 (1976)).

B. At least two states have found that anti-SLAPP statutes create immunity from suit, a right that is irreparably lost if denials of anti-SLAPP motions are not immediately appealable.

Maine and Massachusetts⁴ have likewise held that denial of anti-SLAPP motions are immediately appealable, even though each of their statutes does not explicitly provide for that right. *Morse Bros. v. Webster*, 772 A.2d 842 (Me. 2001); *Fabre v. Walton*, 781 N.E.2d 780 (Mass. 2002). Both courts focused their analyses on whether the right in question will be irreparably lost if not immediately appealable, which is essentially the third element of the collateral order doctrine. *Morse Bros., supra*, 772 A.2d at 847; *Fabre, supra*, 781 N.E.2d at 784.

The Massachusetts high court held that the right to avoid “the harassment and burdens of litigation” is similar to government immunity in that the right is lost if the defendant is forced to litigate a case beyond its initial stages. *Id.* Not only did the high court find that defendants *may* immediately appeal the denial of an anti-SLAPP motion, *id.*, but an appellate court held defendants *must* immediately appeal the interlocutory order or they lose their right to appeal after final judgment. *Wendt v. Barnum*, 2007 Mass. App. Div. 93, 96 (App. Div. 2007). In *Wendt*, a defendant fully litigated his case after his anti-SLAPP motion was denied, and then he appealed

⁴ The Massachusetts anti-SLAPP statute can be found at Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 231, § 59H (1994) (amended 1996).

the anti-SLAPP order along with other claims of error. 2007 Mass. App. Div. at 93-97. The judge dismissed the anti-SLAPP appeal as moot because the defendant failed to appeal the interlocutory order immediately after it was issued. *Id.* at 96. Therefore, in Massachusetts, it is not mere speculation that a defendant loses his right under an anti-SLAPP statute if he cannot immediately appeal the denial of his motion – it is a certainty.

Much like the Massachusetts high court and the First, Fifth, and Ninth Circuits, the Maine high court found that anti-SLAPP statutes create a right to avoid the “cost and delay of litigating [a] claim,” and forcing a defendant to continue litigation is the “precise harm that the statute seeks to prevent.” *Morse Bros.*, *supra*, 772 A.2d at 848; *see also Schelling v. Lindell*, 942 A.2d 1226 (Me. 2008). The court noted that the statute was “designed to protect certain defendants from meritless litigation,” as indicated by its provisions offering an expedited hearing on the motion and temporarily switching the burden of proof to the plaintiff. *Id.* Ultimately, the court held that not immediately hearing an appeal of the denial of an anti-SLAPP motion would result in the “loss of a substantial right.” *Id.*

Like the anti-SLAPP statutes in California, Louisiana, Maine, and Massachusetts, the D.C. anti-SLAPP statute confers a right to avoid the costs and harassment of meritless litigation – a right that will be lost if it is not immediately appealable. *See* D.C. Code §§ 16-5501 *et seq.* The D.C. anti-SLAPP statute is crafted to forestall litigation. *See id.* Much like the statute in Maine, *see Morse Bros.*, *supra*, 772 A.2d at 848, the D.C. statute requires the court to hold an expedited hearing on the special motion to dismiss and shifts the burden to the plaintiff to prove his or her likelihood of success on the merits. D.C. Code §§ 16-5502 (b), (d), -5503 (b). Furthermore, it permits the court to award the costs of litigation to a party who prevails on an anti-SLAPP motion, another deterrent to litigation. § 16-5504 (a). D.C. lawmakers recognized

that the unique problem with SLAPP lawsuits “is that the goal of the litigation is not to win the lawsuit but punish the opponent and intimidate them into silence.” Committee Report at 4. The anti-SLAPP statute, then, is a remedy to the litigation itself. This brief takes no position as to whether the underlying merits of this case fall within that class of “intimidating” SLAPP suits; rather, this brief focuses on the importance generally of immediately appealing denials of anti-SLAPP motions. Just as the court in *Godin* stated, “lawmakers wanted to protect speakers from the trial itself rather than merely from liability.” 629 F.3d at 85. As the First, Fifth, and Ninth Circuits have found, along with the high courts of Maine and Massachusetts, requiring a party to continue litigation before appealing the denial of an anti-SLAPP motion results in irreparable injury – the exact injury the statute was meant to guard against.

C. Contrary decisions of other courts indicating there is no right to immediately appeal the denial of anti-SLAPP motions are distinguishable from the D.C. anti-SLAPP statute because of the issue of immunity.

The Ninth Circuit distinguished between California’s anti-SLAPP statute, *Batzel, supra*, 333 F.3d 1018, and Oregon’s, *Englert v. MacDonell*, 551 F.3d 1099 (9th Cir. 2009), and Nevada’s, *Metabolic Research, Inc. v. Ferrell*, 693 F.3d 795 (9th Cir. 2012), finding that appeals of anti-SLAPP motions are immediately appealable under California law but not under Oregon or Nevada law. California lawmakers intended to confer immunity, whereas Nevada’s and Oregon’s lawmakers did not, the court held. *See Metabolic Research, supra*, 693 F.3d at 801. In response to *Metabolic Research*, the Nevada legislature this year amended its statute so that denials of anti-SLAPP motions are immediately appealable. S.B. 286 (Nev. 2013) (amending Nev. Rev. Stat. § 41.637).

Like California lawmakers, D.C. lawmakers intended to confer immunity from suit in the D.C. anti-SLAPP statute. The statute is silent as to whether interlocutory orders are immediately appealable, but the legislative history has much to say.

This court has long recognized the importance of interpreting a statute through the lens of its legislative history. *A.R. v. F.C.*, 33 A.3d 403, 405 (D.C. 2011) (“When interpreting a statute, the judicial task is to discern, and give effect to, the legislature’s intent.”); *Grayson v. AT&T Corp.*, 15 A.3d 219, 238 (D.C. 2011) (en banc) (“In interpreting statutes, judicial tribunals seek to discern the intent of the legislature and, as necessary, whether that intent is consistent with fundamental principles of law.”); *Peoples Drug Stores, Inc. v. District of Columbia*, 470 A.2d 751, 754 (D.C. 1983) (“This court has found it appropriate to look beyond the plain meaning of statutory language in several different situations.”). While the court must look first at the plain language of the statute, *Peoples Drug Stores, supra*, 470 A.2d at 753, “the words [of a statute] ‘cannot prevail over strong contrary indications in the legislative history’” *Grayson, supra*, 15 A.3d at 238 (quoting *Citizens Ass’n of Georgetown v. Zoning Comm’n of the District of Columbia*, 392 A.2d 1027, 1033 (D.C. 1978)).

Lawmakers originally included a provision granting a defendant the right of immediate appeal but later removed it solely because they thought the provision might exceed their authority, based this court’s decision in *Stuart v. Walker*, 6 A.3d 1215 (D.C. 2010); see Committee Report at 7. Even after lawmakers removed the provision, the report noted that the “Committee agrees with and supports the purpose of this provision.” *Id.*

There is no need here, as in past cases, for this court to interpret ambiguous language or attempt to extrapolate the lawmakers’ intent. D.C. lawmakers clearly intended the anti-SLAPP statute to include the right to immediately appeal the denial of a special motion to dismiss. The

D.C. anti-SLAPP statute is distinct from the Oregon and Nevada statutes, *see Metabolic Research, supra*, 693 F.3d at 801; *Englert, supra*, 551 F.3d at 1105-06, as the intent to ensure immediate appeal and confer immunity is clear in D.C.’s legislative history. As this court noted in *Grayson*, “the words [of a statute] ‘cannot prevail over strong contrary indications in the legislative history’” 15 A.3d at 238. Yet this court need not go so far as to seek “contrary” legislative history. The statute may be read together with the legislative history to form a coherent interpretation, absent contradiction.

The clear intention of the D.C. lawmakers to permit immediate appeals leads to a single conclusion: the statute confers immunity from litigation, and that right is irreparably lost if the denial of an anti-SLAPP motion is not immediately appealable.

II. The important role appellate courts play in reviewing defamation cases and the frequency with which defamation decisions are overturned justify prompt appellate review.

At its heart, this case is about getting an action before an appellate court promptly, so that the purpose of an anti-SLAPP motion – avoidance of litigation over non-meritorious claims about speech on issues of public interest – is not frustrated. Such appellate review has even greater import in light of the role appellate courts often play in recognizing First Amendment rights and supports the interest in allowing interlocutory appeals.

The importance of searching appellate review in defamation cases has long been established. *See Harte-Hanks Communications v. Connaughton*, 491 U.S. 657, 685-86 (1989); *Bose Corp. v. Consumers Union*, 466 U.S. 485, 505 (1984). Because of “[o]ur profound national commitment to the free exchange of ideas,” *Connaughton, supra*, 491 U.S. at 686, and the Court’s fear that “decisions by triers of fact may inhibit the expression of protected ideas,” *Bose*

Corp., supra, 466 U.S. at 505, the Supreme Court has held that appellate judges must independently review trial court findings of defamation, *Bose Corp., supra*, 466 U.S. at 505.

The question whether the evidence in the record in a defamation case is of the convincing clarity required to strip the utterance of First Amendment protection is not merely a question for the trier of fact. Judges, as expositors of the Constitution, must independently decide whether the evidence in the record is sufficient to cross the constitutional threshold

Bose Corp., supra, 466 U.S. at 511.


This heightened appellate review has had a significant impact on the number of defamation decisions overturned or modified. Between 1980 and 2011, defamation plaintiffs won 58.7 percent of their cases at trial, but defendants who appealed were able to reverse or modify nearly 70 percent of those decisions. *See MLRC 2012 Report on Trials and Damages*, Media L. Resource Center, Feb. 2012, at 36 tbl.1, 74 tbl.12A (reporting that 145 out of 215 cases that were appealed, or 67.4 percent, were reversed or modified).

The D.C. anti-SLAPP statute was enacted so that defendants in cases involving speech on issues of public interest could quickly have meritless claims dismissed before litigation costs became too burdensome, acting as a punishment in itself. Committee Report at 4. Given that nearly 70 percent of defamation decisions that defendants appeal are overturned or reversed, *see MLRC 2012 Report on Trials and Damages, supra*, it is imperative to permit immediate appellate review of denials of anti-SLAPP motions. It is not only burdensome on the parties but a waste of the court's limited time and resources to allow a defamation claim to linger in a lengthy and costly litigation that ultimately leads to an appeals process it is not likely to survive.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons given above, as well as those given in the response of the appellant, the court should accept jurisdiction to hear an appeal of the denial of appellants' anti-SLAPP motions.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Gregg P. Leslie", is written over a horizontal line.

Gregg P. Leslie
The Reporters Committee
for Freedom of the Press
1101 Wilson Blvd., Suite 1100
Arlington, VA 22209
Telephone: (703) 807-2100
Counsel for *Amicus Curiae*

APPENDIX A: DESCRIPTION OF AMICI

Advance Publications, Inc., directly and through its subsidiaries, publishes 18 magazines with nationwide circulation, newspapers in over 20 cities and weekly business journals in over 40 cities throughout the United States. It also owns many Internet sites and has interests in cable systems serving over 2.3 million subscribers.

Allbritton Communications Company is the parent company of entities operating ABC-affiliated television stations in the following markets: Washington, D.C.; Harrisburg, Pa.; Birmingham, Ala.; Little Rock, Ark.; Tulsa, Okla.; and Lynchburg, Va. In Washington, it operates broadcast station WJLA-TV, the 24-hour local news service, NewsChannel 8 and the news website WJLA.com. An affiliated company operates the ABC affiliate in Charleston, S.C.

With some 500 members, American Society of News Editors (“ASNE”) is an organization that includes directing editors of daily newspapers throughout the Americas. ASNE changed its name in April 2009 to American Society of News Editors and approved broadening its membership to editors of online news providers and academic leaders. Founded in 1922 as American Society of Newspaper Editors, ASNE is active in a number of areas of interest to top editors with priorities on improving freedom of information, diversity, readership and the credibility of newspapers.

Association of Alternative Newsmedia (“AAN”) is a not-for-profit trade association for 130 alternative newspapers in North America, including weekly papers like The Village Voice and Washington City Paper. AAN newspapers and their websites provide an editorial alternative to the mainstream press. AAN members have a total weekly circulation of seven million and a reach of over 25 million readers.

Dow Jones & Company, Inc., a global provider of news and business information, is the publisher of The Wall Street Journal, Barron's, MarketWatch, Dow Jones Newswires, and other publications. Dow Jones maintains one of the world's largest newsgathering operations, with 2,000 journalists in more than fifty countries publishing news in several different languages. Dow Jones also provides information services, including Dow Jones Factiva, Dow Jones Risk & Compliance, and Dow Jones VentureSource. Dow Jones is a News Corporation company.

The E.W. Scripps Company is a diverse, 131-year-old media enterprise with interests in television stations, newspapers, local news and information websites and licensing and syndication. The company's portfolio of locally focused media properties includes: 19 TV stations (ten ABC affiliates, three NBC affiliates, one independent and five Spanish-language stations); daily and community newspapers in 13 markets; and the Washington-based Scripps Media Center, home of the Scripps Howard News Service.

First Amendment Coalition is a nonprofit public interest organization dedicated to defending free speech, free press and open government rights in order to make government, at all levels, more accountable to the people. The Coalition's mission assumes that government transparency and an informed electorate are essential to a self-governing democracy. To that end, we resist excessive government secrecy (while recognizing the need to protect legitimate state secrets) and censorship of all kinds.

The McClatchy Company, through its affiliates, is the third-largest newspaper publisher in the United States with 30 daily newspapers and related websites as well as numerous community newspapers and niche publications.

The National Press Club is the world's leading professional organization for journalists. Founded in 1908, the Club has 3,100 members representing most major news organizations. The

Club defends a free press worldwide. Each year, the Club holds over 2,000 events, including news conferences, luncheons and panels, and more than 250,000 guests come through its doors.

The National Press Photographers Association (“NPPA”) is a 501(c)(6) non-profit organization dedicated to the advancement of visual journalism in its creation, editing and distribution. NPPA’s approximately 7,000 members include television and still photographers, editors, students and representatives of businesses that serve the visual journalism industry. Since its founding in 1946, the NPPA has vigorously promoted the constitutional rights of journalists as well as freedom of the press in all its forms, especially as it relates to visual journalism. The submission of this brief was duly authorized by Mickey H. Osterreicher, its General Counsel.

NBCUniversal Media, LLC is one of the world’s leading media and entertainment companies in the development, production and marketing of news, entertainment and information to a global audience. Among other businesses, NBCUniversal Media, LLC owns and operates the NBC television network, the Spanish-language television network Telemundo, NBC News, several news and entertainment networks, including MSNBC and CNBC, and a television-stations group consisting of owned-and-operated television stations that produce substantial amounts of local news, sports and public affairs programming. NBC News produces the “Today” show, “NBC Nightly News with Brian Williams,” “Dateline NBC” and “Meet the Press.”

News Corp is a global, diversified media and information services company focused on creating and distributing authoritative and engaging content to consumers throughout the world. The company comprises leading businesses across a range of media, including: news and information services, digital real estate services, book publishing, digital education, and sports programming and pay-TV distribution.

Newspaper Association of America (“NAA”) is a nonprofit organization representing the interests of more than 2,000 newspapers in the United States and Canada. NAA members account for nearly 90% of the daily newspaper circulation in the United States and a wide range of non-daily newspapers. The Association focuses on the major issues that affect today’s newspaper industry, including protecting the ability of the media to provide the public with news and information on matters of public concern.

Online News Association (“ONA”) is the world’s largest association of online journalists. ONA’s mission is to inspire innovation and excellence among journalists to better serve the public. ONA’s more than 2,000 members include news writers, producers, designers, editors, bloggers, technologists, photographers, academics, students and others who produce news for the Internet or other digital delivery systems. ONA hosts the annual Online News Association conference and administers the Online Journalism Awards. ONA is dedicated to advancing the interests of digital journalists and the public generally by encouraging editorial integrity and independence, journalistic excellence and freedom of expression and access.

POLITICO LLC is a nonpartisan, Washington-based political journalism organization that produces a series of websites, video programming and a newspaper covering politics and public policy.

Society of Professional Journalists (“SPJ”) is dedicated to improving and protecting journalism. It is the nation’s largest and most broad-based journalism organization, dedicated to encouraging the free practice of journalism and stimulating high standards of ethical behavior. Founded in 1909 as Sigma Delta Chi, SPJ promotes the free flow of information vital to a well-informed citizenry, works to inspire and educate the next generation of journalists and protects First Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech and press.

Time Inc. is the largest magazine publisher in the United States. It publishes over 90 titles, including Time, Fortune, Sports Illustrated, People, Entertainment Weekly, InStyle and Real Simple. Time Inc. publications reach over 100 million adults, and its websites, which attract more visitors each month than any other publisher, serve close to two billion page views each month.

Tribune Company operates broadcasting, publishing and interactive businesses, engaging in the coverage and dissemination of news and entertainment programming. On the broadcasting side, it owns 23 television stations, a radio station, a 24-hour regional cable news network and “Superstation” WGN America. On the publishing side, Tribune publishes eight daily newspapers — *Chicago Tribune*, *Hartford (Conn.) Courant*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Orlando Sentinel* (Central Florida), *The (Baltimore) Sun*, *The (Allentown, Pa.) Morning Call*, (Hampton Roads, Va.) *Daily Press* and *Sun-Sentinel* (South Florida).

WP Company LLC (d/b/a The Washington Post) publishes one of the nation’s most prominent daily newspapers, as well as a website, www.washingtonpost.com, that is read by an average of more than 20 million unique visitors per month.

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL COUNSEL:

Richard A. Bernstein
 Sabin, Bermant & Gould LLP
 4 Times Square, 23rd Floor
 New York, NY 10036
 Counsel for Advance Publications, Inc.

Jerald N. Fritz
 Senior Vice President
 Legal and Strategic Affairs
 and General Counsel
 Allbritton Communications Company
 1000 Wilson Blvd., Suite 2700
 Arlington, VA 22209

Kevin M. Goldberg
 Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, PLC
 1300 N. 17th St., 11th Floor
 Arlington, VA 22209
 Counsel for American Society of News
 Editors

Kevin M. Goldberg
 Fletcher, Heald & Hildreth, PLC
 1300 N. 17th St., 11th Floor
 Arlington, VA 22209
 Counsel for Association of Alternative
 Newsmedia

Mark H. Jackson
 Jason P. Conti
 Dow Jones & Company, Inc.
 1211 Avenue of the Americas
 7th Floor
 New York, NY 10036

David M. Giles
 Vice President/
 Deputy General Counsel
 The E.W. Scripps Company
 312 Walnut St., Suite 2800
 Cincinnati, OH 45202

Peter Scheer
 First Amendment Coalition
 534 Fourth St., Suite B
 San Rafael, CA 94901

Karole Morgan-Prager
 Juan Cornejo
 The McClatchy Company
 2100 Q Street
 Sacramento, CA 95816

Charles D. Tobin
 Holland & Knight LLP
 800 17th Street, NW
 Suite 1100
 Washington, DC 20006
 Counsel for The National Press Club

Mickey H. Osterreicher
 1100 M&T Center, 3 Fountain Plaza,
 Buffalo, NY 14203
 Counsel for National Press Photogra-
 phers Association

Beth R. Lobel, Esq.
 Vice President, Media Law
 NBCUniversal Media, LLC
 30 Rockefeller Plaza
 New York, NY 10112

Eugenie Gavenchak
 News Corp
 1211 Avenue of the Americas
 New York, NY 10036

Kurt Wimmer
 Covington & Burling LLP
 1201 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
 Washington, DC 20004
 Counsel for the Newspaper Association
 of America

Jonathan D. Hart
Dow Lohnes PLLC
1200 New Hampshire Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036
Counsel for Online News Association

Jerald N. Fritz
Vice President and General Counsel
POLITICO LLC
1000 Wilson Blvd., Suite 2700
Arlington, VA 22209

Andrew Lachow
Vice President and Deputy
General Counsel – Litigation
Time Inc.
1271 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020

Karen H. Flax
Assistant General Counsel/
Publishing & Litigation
Tribune Company
220 E. 42nd St., Suite 400
New York, NY 10017

John B. Kennedy
James A. McLaughlin
Kalea S. Clark
The Washington Post
1150 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20071


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on all counsel of record listed below in accordance with D.C. App. R. 25 via electronic mail, with all parties' written consent, on this the 13th day of November, 2013.

DAVID B. RIVKIN, JR.
BRUCE BROWN
MARK I. BAILEN
ANDREW M. GROSSMAN
BAKERHOSTETLER LLP
Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 861-1770
agrossman@bakerlaw.com
*Attorneys for Appellants
Competitive Enterprise Institute
and Rand Simberg*

SHANNEN W. COFFEN
JAMES MOORHEAD
THOMAS CONTOIS
STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 429-6255
scoffin@steptoe.com
*Attorneys for Appellants National
Review, Inc., and Mark Steyn*

JOHN B. WILLIAMS
CATHERINE ROSATO REILLY
COZEN O'CONNOR P.C.
1627 I Street, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20006
jbwilliams@cozen.com
Attorneys for Appellee Michael E. Mann



Gregg P. Leslie
The Reporters Committee
for Freedom of the Press
1101 Wilson Blvd., Suite 1100
Arlington, VA 22209
Telephone: (703) 807-2100
Counsel for Amicus Curiae