

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HUMANITARIAN LAW PROJECT,)	CASE NO.: CV 03-6107 ABC (MCx)
et al.,)	AMENDED
)	ORDER RE: PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
Plaintiffs,)	SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND DEFENDANTS'
)	MOTION TO DISMISS
vs.)	
)	
JOHN ASHCROFT, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr/>		

This action involves a challenge to the constitutionality of §805(a)(2)(B) of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act ("USA PATRIOT Act") and §§302 and 303 of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (the "AEDPA") which prohibit the provision of material support, including "expert advice or assistance," to designated foreign terrorist organizations. See §805(a)(2)(B), 18 U.S.C. §§2339A(a) and 2339B(a). Plaintiffs seek to provide support for the lawful activities of two organizations that have been designated as "foreign terrorist organizations." Plaintiffs seek summary judgment and an injunction to prohibit Defendants from enforcing the criminal prohibition on providing "expert advice or

1 assistance" to such organizations on the ground that, like the
2 prohibitions on providing "training" and "personnel," which the Court
3 previously enjoined, the prohibition is unconstitutionally vague and
4 overbroad. See Humanitarian Law Project v. Reno, 9 F.Supp. 2d 1176
5 (C.D. Cal. 1998)(granting Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary
6 injunction), aff'd, 205 F.3d 1130 (9th Cir. 2000) and Humanitarian Law
7 Project v. Reno, No CV 98-1971 ABC (BQRx), 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16729
8 (C.D. Cal. 2001)(granting in part and denying in part Plaintiffs'
9 motion for summary judgment and denying Defendants' motion to
10 dismiss), aff'd in part and rev'd in part, 352 F.3d 382 (9th Cir.
11 2003)(hereinafter referred to as HLP I).

12 Plaintiffs HUMANITARIAN LAW PROJECT, RALPH FERTIG, ILANKAI THAMIL
13 SANGAM, DR. NAGALINGAM JEYALINGAM, WORLD TAMIL COORDINATING COMMITTEE,
14 FEDERATION OF TAMIL SANGAMS OF NORTH AMERICA and TAMIL WELFARE AND
15 HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE (collectively, "Plaintiffs") now bring a Motion
16 for Summary Judgment, and Defendants JOHN ASCHROFT (in his official
17 capacity as United States Attorney General), the UNITED STATES`
18 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, COLIN POWELL (in his official capacity as
19 Secretary of the Department of State) and the UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
20 OF STATE ("collectively, "Defendants") bring a Motion to Dismiss. The
21 Court found the motions appropriate for submission without oral
22 argument. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; Local R. 7-15. Accordingly, the
23 scheduled hearing date of January 12, 2004 was VACATED. After
24 reviewing the materials submitted by the parties and the case file,
25 the Court DENIES Defendants' motion to dismiss and GRANTS IN PART and
26 DENIES IN PART Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment.

27 //

28 //

1 I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

2 A. The Regulatory Scheme

3 On October 26, 2001, Congress enacted the USA PATRIOT Act, which
4 broadened the AEDPA's definition of "material support or resources" to
5 add as a proscribed act the provision of "expert advice or
6 assistance." As discussed in detail in HLP I, the AEDPA permits the
7 Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury
8 and the Attorney General, to designate an organization as a foreign
9 terrorist organization after making certain findings as to the
10 organization's involvement in terrorist activity. See 8 U.S.C. §
11 1189(a)(1). "Terrorist activity" is defined as "an act which the
12 actor knows, or reasonably should know, affords material support to
13 any individual, organization, or government in conducting a terrorist
14 activity at any time." 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(3)(B)(iii).

15 Section 303 of the AEDPA, as modified by Section 810 of the USA
16 PATRIOT Act, provides: "Whoever, within the United States or subject
17 to the jurisdiction of the United States, knowingly provides material
18 support or resources to a foreign terrorist organization, or attempts
19 or conspires to do so, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned
20 not more than 15 years, or both, and, if the death of any person
21 results, shall be imprisoned for any term of years or for life." 18
22 U.S.C. § 2339B(a). "Material support or resources" is defined as
23 "currency or monetary instruments or financial securities, financial
24 services, lodging, training, expert advice or assistance, safehouses,
25 false documentation or identification, communications equipment,
26 facilities, weapons, lethal substances, explosives, personnel,
27 transportation, and other physical assets, except medicine or
28 religious materials." Id. §2339A(b)(emphasis added).

1 **B. The Secretary's Designation**

2 On October 8, 1997, then Secretary of State Madeline Albright
3 designated 30 organizations as "foreign terrorist organizations" under
4 the AEDPA. See 62 Fed.Reg. 52,649-51. The designated organizations
5 included the Kurdistan Workers' Party, a.k.a. Partiya Karkeran
6 Kurdistan, a.k.a. PKK ("PKK") and the Liberation Tigers of Tamil
7 Eelam, a.k.a. LTTE, a.k.a. Tamil Tigers, a.k.a. Ellalan Force
8 ("LTTE").

9 **C. The Plaintiffs**

10 Plaintiffs are five organizations and two United States citizens.
11 Plaintiffs seek to provide support to the lawful, nonviolent
12 activities of the PKK and the LTTE. Since October 8, 1997, the date
13 on which the Secretary designated the PKK and the LTTE as foreign
14 terrorist organizations, Plaintiffs, their members and individuals
15 associated with the organizational Plaintiffs have not provided such
16 support, fearing criminal investigation, prosecution and conviction.

17 1. The PKK and the Plaintiffs that Support It

18 The PKK, the leading political organization representing the
19 interests of the Kurds in Turkey, was formed approximately 25 years
20 ago with the goal of achieving self-determination for the Kurds in
21 Southeastern Turkey. It is comprised primarily of Turkish Kurds.
22 Plaintiffs allege that for more than 75 years, the Turkish government
23 has subjected the Kurds to human rights abuses and discrimination.
24 The PKK's efforts on behalf of the Kurds include political organizing
25 and advocacy both inside and outside Turkey, providing social services
26 and humanitarian aid to Kurdish refugees and engaging in military
27 combat with Turkish armed forces in accordance with the Geneva
28 Convention and Protocols.

1 Two Plaintiffs, Humanitarian Law Project ("HLP") and
2 Administrative Judge Ralph Fertig,¹ HLP's President, seek to support
3 the PKK's peaceful and non-violent activities. The HLP, a not-for-
4 profit organization headquartered in Los Angeles, is dedicated to
5 furthering international compliance with humanitarian law and human
6 rights law and the peaceful resolution of armed conflicts.²

7 The HLP has consultative status to the United Nations ("UN") as a
8 non-governmental organization and regularly participates in meetings
9 of the UN Commission on Human Rights in Geneva, Switzerland. The HLP
10 conducts fact-finding missions, writes and publishes reports, and
11 works for the peaceful resolution of armed conflicts around the world.

12 Judge Fertig has a career of over 50 years in human rights work.
13 He has been a member of the HLP's Board of Directors since 1989,
14 serving as President from 1993 to 1995 and from 1997 to the present.
15 He has participated in HLP delegations that have investigated alleged
16 human rights violations in Turkey, Mexico, and El Salvador, has
17 written reports for the HLP, and has trained others in the use of
18 international human rights law and other lawful means for the peaceful
19 resolution of disputes.

20 Since 1991, the HLP and Judge Fertig have devoted substantial
21 time and resources advocating on behalf of the Kurds living in Turkey

23 ¹Although Judge Fertig was an administrative judge for the
24 United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission until his
recent retirement, he sues solely in his personal capacity.

25 ²The HLP was absorbed by the International Educational
26 Development, Inc. ("IED") in 1989. The HLP is sometimes referred
27 to as the International Educational Development,
28 Inc.*Humanitarian Law Project ("IED*HLP"). The IED was formed in
the 1950's by a group of Jesuit Fathers to conduct non-sectarian
work to aid schools, hospitals, and impoverished third world
communities.

1 and working with and providing training, expert advice and other forms
2 of support to the PKK. Judge Fertig and other individuals associated
3 with the HLP have conducted fact-finding investigations on the Kurds
4 in Turkey and have published reports and articles presenting their
5 findings, which are supportive of the PKK and the struggle for Kurdish
6 liberation. They assert that the Turkish government has committed
7 extensive human rights violations against the Kurds, including the
8 summary execution of more than 18,000 Kurds, the widespread use of
9 arbitrary detentions and torture against persons who speak out for
10 equal rights for Kurds or are suspected of sympathizing with those who
11 do, and the wholesale destruction of some 2,400 Kurdish villages.
12 Applying international law principles, they have concluded that the
13 PKK is a party to an armed conflict governed by Geneva Conventions and
14 Protocols and, therefore, is not a terrorist organization under
15 international law.

16 To further peaceful resolutions of the armed conflict in Turkey
17 and protect the human rights of the Kurds, the HLP, Judge Fertig, and
18 other individuals associated with the HLP have worked with and
19 supported the PKK in numerous ways. They have petitioned members of
20 Congress to support Kurdish human rights and to encourage negotiations
21 between the PKK and the Turkish government. They have argued for the
22 release of Leyla Zana, Hatip Dicle, Orhan Dogan, and Selim Sadak, four
23 Kurds who were elected to the Turkish Parliament in 1991, but
24 sentenced to 15 years in prison by the Turkish courts for being
25 members or supporters of the PKK. In addition, the HLP, Judge Fertig,
26 and other individuals associated with the HLP have provided training
27 to some PKK members and other Kurds in using humanitarian law and
28 international human rights law and in seeking a peaceful resolution of

1 the conflict in Turkey. Both the HLP and Judge Fertig only support
2 the PKK in its non-violent and lawful activities.

3 Since the Secretary designated the PKK as a foreign terrorist
4 organization, the HLP and Judge Fertig have been deterred from
5 continuing to assist the PKK to improve conditions for the Kurds
6 living in Turkey. But for the AEDPA and the USA PATRIOT Act, they
7 would continue to provide the type of support which they provided in
8 the past, as well as additional support. However, they fear that
9 doing so would subject them to criminal prosecution.

10 The HLP, Judge Fertig, and individuals associated with the HLP
11 would specifically like to, but are afraid to, provide support to the
12 PKK in the following ways:

13 (1) engage in political advocacy on behalf of the PKK and
14 the Kurds before the U.N. Commission on Human Rights and the
United States Congress;

15 (2) provide the PKK and the Kurds with training and written
16 publications on how to engage in political advocacy on their
own behalf and on how to use international law to seek
17 redress for human rights violations;

18 (3) write and distribute publications supportive of the PKK
and the cause of Kurdish liberation;

19 (4) advocate for the freedom of Turkish political prisoners,
20 including Leyla Zana, Hatip Dicle, Orhan Dogan, and Selim
Sadak; and

21 (5) assist PKK members at peace conferences and other
22 meetings designed to support a peaceful resolution of the
Turkish conflict.

23 HLP and Judge Fertig are committed to providing the above-
24 mentioned support. However, they are afraid that the conduct in which
25 they have engaged and in which they wish to continue to engage may
26 come within the scope of "expert advice or assistance." Since the
27 enactment of the USA PATRIOT ACT and the amendment of the term
28 "material support" to include "expert advice or assistance," the HLP

1 and Judge Fertig have refrained from providing this advice and
2 assistance for fear that they may be subjected to criminal
3 prosecution.

4 2. The LTTE and the Plaintiffs that Support It

5 The LTTE was formed in 1976 with the goal of achieving self-
6 determination for the Tamil residents of Tamil Eelam, in the Northern
7 and Eastern provinces of Sri Lanka. Plaintiffs allege that the Tamils
8 constitute an ethnic group that has for decades been subjected to
9 human rights abuses and discriminatory treatment by the Sinhalese, who
10 have governed Sri Lanka since the nation gained its independence from
11 Great Britain in 1948. The Sinhalese constitute a numerical majority
12 of Sri Lanka's population.

13 Plaintiffs allege that the LTTE, to further its goal of self-
14 determination for the Tamils, engages in: (1) political organizing and
15 advocacy; (2) diplomatic activity; (3) the provision of social
16 services and humanitarian aid; (4) the establishment of a quasi-
17 governmental structure in Tamil Eelam; (5) economic development; (6)
18 defense of the Tamil people from human rights abuses; and (7) military
19 struggle against the government of Sri Lanka.

20 Five Plaintiffs--four membership organizations and an individual-
21 -seek to provide support to the LTTE. These Plaintiffs are committed
22 to the human rights and well-being of the Tamils in Sri Lanka. Many
23 members of these organizations and the individual Plaintiff, Dr.
24 Nagalingam Jeyalingam, are Tamils born in Sri Lanka. Although they
25 now reside in the United States and many are United States citizens,
26 they still have close friends and family members living in Sri Lanka,
27 many of whom have been the victims of alleged abuses by the Sri Lankan
28 government.

1 a. Ilankai Tamil Sangam

2 Plaintiff Ilankai Tamil Sangam ("Sangam"), a New Jersey not-for-
3 profit corporation founded in 1977 has approximately 135 members, most
4 of whom are Tamils born in Sri Lanka. The Sangam's objectives are to
5 promote the association of Tamils in the New York City metropolitan
6 area, to promote knowledge of the Tamil language, culture, and
7 heritage, and to provide humanitarian assistance to the Tamils in Sri
8 Lanka, especially those who are refugees and orphans as a result of
9 the political strife in Sri Lanka.

10 The Sangam and its members, many of whom are physicians, wish to
11 offer their expert medical advice and assistance to the LTTE by
12 consulting with the LTTE on how the health care system in Tamil Eelam
13 can be improved and by volunteering their advice and assistance to
14 hospitals and medical centers in LTTE-controlled areas, some of which
15 are run by the LTTE. Neither the Sangam nor its members seek to
16 support any military or unlawful activities of the LTTE. The Sangam
17 and its members have been deterred from providing the above-described
18 advice and assistance because of fear of criminal investigation,
19 prosecution and conviction.

20 b. Dr. Nagalingam Jeyalingam

21 Plaintiff Dr. Nagalingam Jeyalingam is a naturalized United
22 States citizen who is a Tamil from Sri Lanka. He is a surgeon with
23 specialized training in otolaryngology, was President of Sangam from
24 1995 to 1997 and is currently an active member. Members of Dr.
25 Jeyalingam's family, including his mother, brothers, and sisters, were
26 displaced from their homes and forced to flee from Sri Lanka to India
27 as refugees in 1983.

28 Dr. Jeyalingam traveled to the Tamil Eelam region in April of

1 2002, several months after the LTTE and the Sri Lankan government
2 entered into a cease fire. During his travels, he visited a hospital
3 run by the LTTE and observed first-hand the lack of trained
4 physicians. Dr. Jeyalingam would like to return to the region in
5 order to consult with and provide the LTTE his expert advice on how to
6 improve the delivery of health care, with a special focus on
7 otolaryngology, and to provide his services as an otolaryngology
8 specialist for a period of six months or longer. Dr. Jeyalingam has
9 been deterred from doing so because he fears he may be subjected to
10 criminal prosecution for providing "expert advice or assistance."

11 c. World Tamil Coordinating Committee

12 Plaintiff World Tamil Coordinating Committee (the "WTCC"), an
13 organization based in Jamaica, New York, and its members wish to
14 provide expert advice and assistance to the LTTE toward the goals of
15 achieving normalcy in war-torn Tamil Eelam and negotiating a permanent
16 peace agreement between the LTTE and the Sri Lankan government. The
17 WTCC and its members have expertise in the fields of politics, law and
18 economic development and wish to provide expert advice and assistance
19 in these fields. Since the enactment of the USA PATRIOT Act, the WTCC
20 and its members have been afraid to provide this expert advice and
21 assistance for fear of criminal prosecution.

22 d. Federation of Tamil Sangams of North America

23 Plaintiff Federation of Tamil Sangams of North America ("FETNA")
24 is a non-profit corporation founded in 1986. FETNA's membership
25 includes 30 Sangams in the United States, including Ilankai Thamil
26 Sangam. The FETNA member Sangams are comprised mainly of United
27 States citizens and legal permanent residents who are ethnic Tamils
28 from all over the world, including India and Sri Lanka. FETNA's

1 purposes are to encourage appreciation of Tamil language, literature,
2 arts, cultural heritage and history, and friendship among the Tamils
3 and the Tamil Sangams around the world.

4 FETNA, its member Sangams, and its individuals members would like
5 to provide their expert advice and assistance in the fields of Tamil
6 language, literature, arts, cultural heritage, and history to the
7 Tamils in the Tamil Eelam region, which is under the control of the
8 LTTE, by developing school curricula, teaching these subjects and
9 rebuilding Tamil Eelam's libraries and arts programs. In order for
10 the FETNA and its members to do this, they would be required to work
11 in coordination with the LTTE, which controls the infrastructure in
12 Tamil Eelam. They are afraid, however, of being criminally prosecuted
13 for doing so.

14 e. Tamil Welfare and Human Rights Committee

15 Finally, Plaintiff Tamil Welfare and Human Rights Committee
16 ("TWHRC") is a Maryland association of approximately 100 Tamils, both
17 United States citizens and non-citizens. Its primary objectives are
18 to protect the human rights of the Tamils in Sri Lanka and to promote
19 their health, social well-being, and welfare. The TWHRC and its
20 members have expertise in the fields of economic development and
21 information technology and wish to provide the LTTE with expert advice
22 and assistance in these fields towards the goal of promoting civil
23 peace and stability in the lives of the Tamils of Tamil Eelam.
24 Because of the USA PATRIOT Act, however, the TWHRC and its members
25 have been deterred from doing do for fear of criminal prosecution.
26 The TWHRC seeks only to support the LTTE's humanitarian efforts and
27 does not seek to support the LTTE's military activities.

28 //

1 **II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

2 In a related suit filed in March of 1998 by Plaintiffs
3 challenging the AEDPA's material support provision, this Court granted
4 an injunction prohibiting prosecution of Plaintiffs for providing
5 "training" and "personnel" on the grounds that the terms were
6 unconstitutionally vague. See HLP I, 9 F.Supp. 2d 1176 (C.D. Cal.
7 1998)(granting Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction), aff'd,
8 205 F.3d 1130 (9th Cir. 2000); Humanitarian Law Project v. Reno, No.
9 CV 98-1971 ABC (BQRx), 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 16729 (C.D. Cal.
10 2001)(granting in part and denying in part Plaintiffs' motion for
11 summary judgment and denying Defendants' motion to dismiss), aff'd in
12 part and rev'd in part, 352 F.3d 382 (9th Cir. 2003).

13 On August 27, 2003, Plaintiffs filed their Complaint against
14 Defendants alleging the following three causes of action:

- 15 (1) Section 805(a)(2)(B) of the USA PATRIOT ACT
16 violates the First Amendment's guarantees to
17 freedom of speech and association and to petition
18 the government for a redress of grievances insofar
19 as it criminalizes the provision of "expert advice
20 and assistance" to designated foreign terrorist
21 organizations without a specific intent to further
22 the organization's unlawful ends;
- 23 (2) Sections 302 and 303 of the AEDPA and Section
24 805(a)(2)(B) of the USA PATRIOT Act violate the
25 First and Fifth Amendments by granting the
26 Secretary of State unreviewable authority to
27 designate foreign organizations as terrorist
28 organizations and prohibit the provision of
"expert advice and assistance," which invite
impermissible viewpoint discrimination targeting
particular groups and their supporters based on
their political views; and
- (3) Section 805(a)(2)(B) of the USA PATRIOT Act
violates the First and Fifth Amendment because its
prohibition of "expert advice and assistance" is
impermissibly vague and substantially overbroad,
fails to provide adequate notice of prohibited
activity, gives government officials unfettered
discretion in enforcement, and causes individuals

1 to avoid protected First Amendment activity in
2 order to steer clear of the prohibited conduct.

3 Plaintiffs seek a preliminary and permanent injunction barring
4 enforcement against Plaintiffs of the USA PATRIOT Act's prohibition of
5 the provision of "expert advice or assistance" to a designated foreign
6 terrorist organization absent a specific intent to further the
7 organization's unlawful terrorist activities. Plaintiffs also seek an
8 order declaring the prohibition of the provision of "expert advice or
9 assistance" unconstitutional as applied to Plaintiffs' conduct because
10 it violates the First and Fifth Amendments by criminalizing the act of
11 providing expert advice or assistance to designated foreign terrorist
12 organizations without requiring a showing of specific intent to
13 further the organization's unlawful terrorist activities, and by doing
14 so in an impermissibly vague and overbroad manner.

15 On October 16, 2003, Plaintiffs filed the instant motion for
16 summary judgment, in which they seek summary judgment and a permanent
17 injunction against enforcement of the "expert advice or assistance"
18 provision of the USA PATRIOT Act, as well as summary judgment on their
19 other claims. Defendants filed their memorandum in opposition to
20 Plaintiffs' motion and in support of their motion to dismiss on
21 November 24, 2003. On December 8, 2003, Plaintiffs filed their reply
22 in support of their motion and in opposition to Defendants' motion to
23 dismiss. Defendants filed their reply on December 15, 2003.

24 **III. LEGAL STANDARDS**

25 **A. Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Justiciability**

26 Defendants move to dismiss Plaintiffs' challenge to the "expert
27 advice or assistance" provision for lack of justiciability. They
28 maintain that the case raises issues of both standing and ripeness.

1 A motion to dismiss will be denied unless it appears that the
2 plaintiff can prove no set of facts which would entitle him or her to
3 relief. See Gilligan v. Jamco Dev. Corp., 108 F.3d 246 (9th Cir.
4 1997). All material allegations in the complaint will be taken as
5 true and construed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. See
6 NL Indus., Inc. v. Kaplan, 792 F.2d 896, 898 (9th Cir. 1986).

7 1. Standing

8 Standing is a threshold requirement in every federal case. Warth
9 v. Seldin, 422 U.S. 490, 498 (1975). "As an aspect of justiciability,
10 the standing question is whether the plaintiff has alleged such a
11 personal stake in the controversy as to warrant [plaintiffs']
12 invocation of federal court jurisdiction." MAI Sys. Corp. v. UIPS,
13 856 F.Supp. 538, 540 (N.D. Cal. 1994) (citation omitted). The "three
14 separate but interrelated components" of Article III standing are: (1)
15 a distinct and palpable injury to the plaintiff; (2) a fairly
16 traceable causal connection between the injury and challenged conduct;
17 and (3) a substantial likelihood that the relief requested will
18 prevent or redress the injury. Id. (citing McMichael v. County of
19 Napa, 709 F.2d 1268, 1269 (9th Cir. 1983)).

20 2. Ripeness

21 Ripeness is "peculiarly a question of timing," Regional Rail
22 Reorg. Act Cases, 419 U.S. 102, 140 (1974), designed to "prevent the
23 courts, through avoidance of premature adjudication, from entangling
24 themselves in abstract disagreements." Abbott Labs. v. Gardner, 387
25 U.S. 136, 148 (1967). In the context of a claimed threat of
26 prosecution, courts are to consider whether the plaintiffs face "a
27 realistic danger of sustaining a direct injury as a result of the
28 statute's operation or enforcement," Babbitt v. United Farm Workers

1 Natal Union, 442 U.S. 289, 298 (1979), "look[ing] to whether the
2 plaintiffs have articulated a 'concrete plan' to violate the law in
3 question, whether the prosecuting authorities have communicated a
4 specific warning or threat to initiate proceedings, and the history of
5 past persecution or enforcement under the challenged statute."
6 Thomas, 220 F.3d at 1139 (quoting San Diego County Gun Rights Comm. v.
7 Reno, 98 F.3d 1121, 1126-27 (9th Cir. 1996)). If these requirements
8 are met, the Court is also to consider "the fitness of the issues for
9 judicial decision and the hardship to the parties of withholding court
10 consideration." Abbott Labs., 387 U.S. at 149.

11 **B. Motion for Summary Judgment**

12 Summary judgment shall be granted when there is no genuine issue
13 of material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of
14 law. See Fed. R. Civ. 56(c). The moving party bears the initial
15 burden of identifying those portions of the record that demonstrate
16 the absence of a genuine issue of material fact. The burden then
17 shifts to the nonmoving party to "go beyond the pleadings, and by
18 [its] own affidavits, or by the 'depositions, answers to
19 interrogatories, or admissions on file,' designate 'specific facts
20 showing that there is a genuine issue for trial.'" Celotex Corp. v.
21 Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 324 (1986) (citations omitted). A dispute
22 about a material fact is genuine "if the evidence is such that a
23 reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party."
24 Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986).

25 The moving party discharges its burden by showing that the
26 nonmoving party has not disclosed the existence of any "significant
27 probative evidence tending to support the complaint." First Natal
28 Bank v. Cities Serv. Co., 391 U.S. 253, 290 (1968). The Court views

1 the inferences drawn from the facts in the light most favorable to the
2 party opposing the motion. See T.W. Elec. Serv., Inc. v. Pacific
3 Elec. Contractor's Ass'n, 809 F.2d 626, 631 (9th Cir. 1987).

4 IV. DISCUSSION

5 A. Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.

6 Defendants move to dismiss Plaintiffs' challenge to the
7 provisions regarding "expert advice or assistance," arguing that
8 Plaintiffs' pre-enforcement challenge is not justiciable on the basis
9 of both standing and ripeness.³ Plaintiffs oppose the Government's
10 motion, arguing that their claims are justiciable because they face a
11 credible threat of prosecution.

12 "To satisfy the Article III case or controversy requirement, [a
13 plaintiff] must establish, among other things, that it has suffered a
14 constitutionally cognizable injury-in-fact." California Pro-Life
15 Council, Inc. v. Getman, 328 F.3d 1088, 1093 (9th Cir. 2003).

16 "[N]either the mere existence of a proscriptive statute nor a
17 generalized threat of prosecution satisfies the 'case or controversy'
18 requirement." Thomas v. Anchorage Equal Rights Commission, 220 F.3d
19 1134, 1139 (9th Cir. 2000)(*en banc*). Instead, there must be a
20 "genuine threat of imminent prosecution." Id. "In evaluating the
21 genuineness of a claimed threat of prosecution, [the Ninth Circuit
22 considers] whether the plaintiffs have articulated a 'concrete plan to

23
24
25 ³"Sorting out where standing ends and ripeness begins is not
26 an easy task [I]n 'measuring whether the litigant has
27 asserted an injury that is real and concrete rather than
28 speculative and hypothetical, the ripeness inquiry merges almost
completely with standing.'" Thomas v. Anchorage Equal Rights
Commission, 220 F.3d 1134, 1138-39 (9th Cir. 2000)(*en*
banc)(quoting Gene R. Nichol, Jr., Ripeness and the Constitution,
54 U. Chi. L. Rev. 153, 172 (1987)).

1 violate the law in question, whether the prosecuting authorities have
2 communicated a specific warning or threat to initiate proceedings, and
3 the history of past prosecution or enforcement under the challenged
4 statute." Id.

5 Defendants contend that the above-referenced factors support
6 dismissal of Plaintiffs' claims on the basis of standing and ripeness,
7 because Plaintiffs have failed to demonstrate (1) a history of
8 prosecution under the relevant provision of the USA PATRIOT Act, or
9 any threat of prosecution directed toward Plaintiffs or (2) that they
10 have a "concrete plan" to violate the law in question, or that their
11 intended conduct might arguably come within the statute's reach.
12 Defendants also argue that Plaintiffs' 18-month delay in seeking
13 relief also weighs against a finding of justiciability. Finally,
14 Defendants attempt to divide Plaintiffs into two categories.
15 Defendants argue that the Plaintiffs in the first category, which
16 comprises the majority of Plaintiffs, do not fall within the scope of
17 the statute because the advice and assistance they seek to provide is
18 not "expert." Defendants concede that the Plaintiffs in the second
19 category, comprised of Dr. Nagalingam Jeyalingam, and "to a lesser
20 extent," Ilankai Tamil Sangam, seek to provide services that at least
21 arguably fall within the statute's reach. However, Defendants claim
22 that like the other Plaintiffs, the failure of Dr. Jeyalingam and of
23 Sangam to identify a "concrete plan" to violate the law at issue is
24 fatal to their claims. Based on the foregoing, Defendants conclude
25 that Plaintiffs have failed to meet their burden in demonstrating an
26 injury-in-fact in support of Article III ripeness or standing, and
27 their claims should therefore be dismissed for lack of justiciability.

28 In their opposition, Plaintiffs contend that the threat of

1 prosecution they face is credible because (1) the government has
2 rigorously enforced the material support provision in the wake of
3 September 11, 2001, (2) the government has specifically identified the
4 LTTE and PKK as terrorist organizations, (3) prior to their
5 designation as terrorist organizations, Plaintiffs provided support to
6 the LTTE and PKK and (4) Defendants have never suggested that
7 Plaintiffs' intended support was lawful and thus not subject to
8 prosecution. In Plaintiffs' view, these facts are sufficient to
9 establish a credible threat of prosecution and their standing to bring
10 suit based upon that threat.

11 With respect to Defendants' contention that the advice and
12 assistance Plaintiffs seek to offer (with the exception of medical
13 advice and assistance) is not even arguably expert, Plaintiffs refer
14 to their supplemental affidavits, which identify their expertise in
15 the fields of (1) international human rights, peacemaking and advocacy
16 (HLP and Judge Ralph Fertig), (2) information technology and economic
17 development (TWHRC), (3) law and telecommunications (WTCC) and (4)
18 Tamil language, literature, arts, cultural heritage and history
19 (FETNA). In Plaintiffs' view, it is undisputable that Plaintiffs'
20 activities are at least "arguably covered" by the prohibitions on the
21 provision of "expert advice or assistance."

22 Plaintiffs also assert that they have sufficiently identified
23 "concrete plans" which are specific as to the groups they seek to
24 support and the type of expert advice and assistance they seek to
25 provide, and that their past activities underscore that these plans
26 are not merely abstract desires. Specifically, Plaintiffs HLP and
27 Judge Fertig would encourage the PKK and its affiliate and successor
28 groups "to pursue peace and human rights advocacy" by (1) assisting

1 members of the PKK in participating in delegations and making
2 presentations to the United Nations Human Rights Subcommittee, (2)
3 working with the UN Subcommittee on Human Rights on behalf of the
4 Kurds of Turkish-occupied Kurdistan and (3) providing training to PKK
5 members to help them bring claims before legislative bodies and the
6 United Nations. (12/7/03 Declaration of Judge Ralph Fertig ¶ 5.)
7 Plaintiffs Dr. Jeyalingam and the physician members of Sangam would
8 offer medical advice and assistance to the physicians and health care
9 professionals of the Tamil Eelam region of Sri Lanka by (1) seeking to
10 identify the health needs of the region, (2) assessing how those needs
11 can be met, (3) raising the level of education for physicians and
12 other health care professionals, (4) developing plans for modernizing
13 the delivery of health care in the region, and (5) improving services
14 provided at LTTE-run hospitals. (12/7/03 Declaration of Tharmarajah
15 Pathmakumar ¶ 3; 12/7/03 Declaration of Dr. Jeyalingam ¶ 4.)
16 Plaintiff WTCC and its members wish to provide the LTTE with expert
17 advice and assistance in the areas of law, politics and economic
18 development in order to negotiate a permanent peace agreement between
19 the LTTE and the Sri Lankan government and achieve normalcy in the
20 Tamil Eelam region. (9/8/03 Declaration of Amirthalingam Jeyakumar ¶
21 3.) Plaintiff FETNA and its members wish to use their expertise in
22 Tamil language, literature, arts, cultural heritage and history by (1)
23 developing school curricula in these subjects, (2) teaching these
24 subjects in Tamil Eelam's schools and (3) rebuilding Tamil Eelam's
25 libraries and arts programs. (9/9/03 Declaration of Karuppiah
26 Sivaraman ¶ 3.) Plaintiff TWHRC seeks to provide expert advice and
27 assistance (1) in the field of information technology by teaching
28 students in LTTE-controlled Tamil Eelam how to utilize computer

1 equipment and desktop publishing software and (2) in the field of
2 economic development, to assist in the development of sound economic
3 plans that will encourage an infusion of capital in the region.
4 (12/7/03 Declaration of Muthuthamby Sreetharan ¶¶ 3-4.) In
5 Plaintiffs' estimate, the foregoing is sufficient to satisfy the
6 "concrete plan" requirement of California Pro-Life Council and Thomas.

7 Plaintiffs also seek to discount Defendants' emphasis on the 18-
8 month delay in filing a challenge to the "expert advice or assistance"
9 provision, arguing that there is no requirement that a party challenge
10 a statute as soon as it is enacted, and citing a number of Ninth
11 Circuit cases in which pre-enforcement challenges were entertained
12 long after the enactment of the statutes.⁴

13 Having carefully considered the parties' arguments and the
14 applicable law, the Court finds that Defendants' motion to dismiss for
15 lack of justiciability must be denied. As set forth above, the
16 relevant factors to consider in determining whether Article III
17 requirements have been satisfied are (1) whether the plaintiffs have
18 articulated a "concrete plan" to violate the law in question, (2)
19 whether the prosecuting authorities have communicated a specific
20 warning or threat to initiate proceedings, and (3) the history of past
21 prosecution or enforcement under the challenged statute.

22 With respect to the articulation of a concrete plan, the Court
23
24

25 ⁴See, e.g., Bland v. Fessler, 88 F.3d 729 (9th Cir.) (pre-
26 enforcement challenge filed four years after statute's
27 enactment), cert. denied, 519 U.S. 1009 (1996); Adult Video Ass'n
28 v. Barr, 960 F.2d 781 (9th Cir. 1992) vacated sub nom., 509 U.S.
918, reinstated in relevant part, 41 F.3d 503 (9th Cir.
1994) (pre-enforcement challenge filed five years after statute's
enactment).

1 finds that Plaintiffs have satisfied their burden. While “[a] general
2 intent to violate a statute at some unknown date in the future does
3 not rise to the level of an articulated, concrete plan[,]” Thomas, 220
4 F.3d at 1139, Plaintiffs here have identified more than a
5 “hypothetical intent to violate the law.” Id. Unlike the plaintiffs
6 in Thomas, who claimed that they had violated the law in the past and
7 intended to do so in the future, but were unable to specify “when, to
8 whom, where, or under what circumstances,” ibid., the Plaintiffs in
9 the instant case have articulated that they (1) have provided services
10 in the past and would do so again if the fear of criminal prosecution
11 were removed, and have in some cases identified the duration of time
12 for which their services would be provided, (2) seek to assist the PKK
13 and the LTTE (as well as Tamils in LTTE-controlled Tamil Eelam), (3)
14 wish to provide this assistance in this country, through advocacy, as
15 well as in Sri Lanka and Turkish-controlled Kurdistan and (4) would
16 provide these services as needed, in many cases immediately. These
17 plans are markedly different from the intent of the Thomas landlords
18 to violate the law “on some uncertain day in the future.” Id. at
19 1140. The Court therefore finds that the first prong has been met.
20 Second, the Court finds that Plaintiffs have sufficiently demonstrated
21 a threat of prosecution. As the Ninth Circuit indicated in California
22 Pro-Life Council, “[p]articularly in the First Amendment-protected
23 speech context, the Supreme Court has dispensed with rigid standing
24 requirements.” 328 F.3d at 1094. “In an effort to avoid the chilling
25 effect of sweeping restrictions, the Supreme Court has endorsed what
26 might be called a ‘hold your tongue and challenge now’ approach rather
27 than requiring litigants to speak first and take their chances with
28 the consequences.” Id., citing Ariz. Right to Life Political Action

1 Comm. v. Bayless, 320 F.3d 1002, 1006 (9th Cir. 2003). While
2 recognizing that the "self-censorship door to standing" is not
3 available for every plaintiff, fear of prosecution in the free speech
4 context inures "if the plaintiff's intended speech arguably falls
5 within the statute's reach." Id. at 1095.

6 While Defendants are correct that the record does not demonstrate that
7 Plaintiffs have yet been subjected to prosecution for their
8 activities, it is clear under California Pro-Life Council that this is
9 not required in the free speech context. The PKK and the LTTE have
10 been designated as foreign terrorist organizations, thus putting
11 Plaintiffs on notice that provision of expert advice and assistance
12 may subject them to criminal prosecution. The question is thus
13 whether Plaintiffs' intended speech-related activities arguably fall
14 within the statute's reach. Defendants concede that the medical
15 expertise at least arguably falls within the reach of the statute, but
16 contend that none of the other areas of expertise identified by
17 Plaintiffs are actually "expert." The Court disagrees. Judge Fertig
18 and HLP have set forth ample support of their asserted expertise in
19 international human rights, peacemaking and advocacy, TWHRC has
20 identified at least two of its members with significant expertise and
21 training in information technology and software development, WTCC has
22 identified three members with expertise in the law and in
23 telecommunications, and FETNA has identified at least two members with
24 significant expertise in Tamil culture. For purposes of satisfying
25 the standing requirements of Article III, the Court finds that these
26 Plaintiffs have demonstrated that their speech at least arguably falls
27 within the scope of the statute.

28 Third, Plaintiffs have sufficiently demonstrated a history of

1 enforcement under the challenged statute, something which Defendants
2 do not contest in their motion or reply. Unlike the statute in
3 Thomas, for which there was not a single instance of criminal
4 prosecution in the 25 years it had been in effect, the government has
5 been active in its enforcement of the USA PATRIOT Act. The Court
6 therefore finds that this prong weighs in favor of a finding of
7 Article III standing.

8 Finally, the Court agrees with Plaintiffs that the delay in initiating
9 the instant action is not fatal to a finding of standing or ripeness.
10 Defendants have identified no legal requirement that a pre-enforcement
11 challenge be filed within a set amount of time after a statute's
12 enactment, and the Court finds, in light of Bland v. Fessler and Adult
13 Video Ass'n v. Barr that this delay is not determinative.

14 Based on the foregoing, Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for lack of
15 justiciability is hereby DENIED in its entirety.

16 **B. Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment.**

17 Plaintiffs bring their motion for summary judgment on several grounds.
18 First, they argue that the prohibition on providing expert advice and
19 assistance is both impermissibly vague and substantially overbroad.
20 Second, they contend that prohibition violates the First and Fifth
21 Amendments by criminalizing associational speech without proof of
22 intent to incite imminent violence or to support a group's illegal
23 ends. Finally, they assert that the prohibition on providing expert
24 advice and assistance violates the First and Fifth Amendments because
25 it grants the Secretary of State unreviewable authority to designate
26 groups as foreign terrorist organizations.

27 Defendants oppose Plaintiffs' motion, asserting that Plaintiffs' First
28 and Fifth Amendment claims are meritless because (1) the statute is

1 not vague under the Fifth Amendment or in relation to Plaintiffs' own
2 conduct, (2) under Virginia v. Hicks, Plaintiffs' facial First
3 Amendment overbreadth challenge must fail, and (3) the USA PATRIOT Act
4 does not regulate advocacy or association with terrorist groups.
5 Defendants also assert that the Court previously rejected Plaintiffs'
6 arguments with respect to regulation of association and the
7 unreviewable authority given to the Secretary of State in HLP I, and
8 that these arguments need not be revisited here.

9 1. Plaintiffs Have Demonstrated that the Prohibition is
10 Impermissibly Vague but Have Failed to Demonstrate that the
11 Prohibition is Substantially Overbroad.

12 Plaintiffs first argue that the term "expert advice or assistance" is
13 at least as vague as "training" and "personnel," the enforcement of
14 which has been enjoined on constitutional grounds. See HLP I.
15 Plaintiffs also contend that the prohibition is overbroad, because it
16 prohibits a substantial amount of speech activity that is clearly
17 protected by the First Amendment.

18 a. Plaintiffs Have Demonstrated that the Prohibition is
19 Impermissibly Vague.

20 A challenge to a statute based on vagueness grounds requires the Court
21 to consider whether the statute is sufficiently clear so as not to
22 cause persons "'of common intelligence . . . necessarily [to] guess at
23 its meaning and [to] differ as to its application.'" United States v.
24 Wunsch, 84 F.3d 1110, 1119 (9th Cir. 1996) (quoting Connally v.
25 General Constr. Co., 269 U.S. 385, 391 (1926)). Vague statutes are
26 void for three reasons: "(1) to avoid punishing people for behavior
27 that they could not have known was illegal; (2) to avoid subjective
28 enforcement of the laws based on 'arbitrary and discriminatory

1 enforcement' by government officers; and (3) to avoid any chilling
2 effect on the exercise of First Amendment freedoms." Foti v. City of
3 Menlo Park, 146 F.3d 629, 638 (9th Cir. 1998) (citing Grayned v. City
4 of Rockford, 408 U.S. 104, 108-09 (1972)).

5 "[P]erhaps the most important factor affecting the clarity that the
6 Constitution demands of a law is whether it threatens to inhibit the
7 exercise of constitutionally protected rights. If, for example, the
8 law interferes with the right of free speech or of association, a more
9 stringent vagueness test should apply." Village of Hoffman Estates v.
10 Flipside, Hoffman Estates, Inc., 455 U.S. 489, 499 (1982). "The
11 requirement of clarity is enhanced when criminal sanctions are at
12 issue or when the statute abuts upon sensitive areas of basic First
13 Amendment freedoms." Information Providers' Coalition for the Defense
14 of the First Amendment v. FCC, 928 F.2d 866, 874 (9th Cir. 1991)
15 (quotation omitted). Thus, under the Due Process Clause, a criminal
16 statute is void for vagueness if it "fails to give a person of
17 ordinary intelligence fair notice that his contemplated conduct is
18 forbidden by the statute." United States v Harriss, 347 U.S. 612, 618
19 (1954).

20 The determinative issue is thus whether the USA PATRIOT Act
21 sufficiently identifies the prohibited conduct. Plaintiffs contend
22 that the term "expert advice or assistance" is at least as vague as
23 the terms "training" and "personnel," which the Court previously held
24 to be vague as applied to Plaintiffs. To support this contention,
25 Plaintiffs cite the definitions of "expert," "advice" and "assistance"
26 to show that (1) "expert" fails to identify the types of activities
27 which may or may not be undertaken, (2) "advice" is virtually
28 synonymous with "training," (3) "assistance," which is potentially

1 broader than "advice," could encompass nearly any human resources
2 support, and (4) although the modifier "expert" makes the ban on
3 advice and assistance less broad than the ban on the provision of
4 "personnel," it is still similar to, and potentially broader than, the
5 ban on "training."

6 In addition to the foregoing, Plaintiffs argue that the prohibition
7 conceivably encompasses any activity that may provide counsel or aid,
8 regardless of intent, including many activities protected by the First
9 Amendment, e.g., instructing designated groups how to petition the
10 United Nations and advocating for a designated group. Plaintiffs
11 assert that certain expert advice and assistance, which they believe
12 to be protected by the First Amendment, could potentially be barred by
13 the USA PATRIOT Act. Specifically, (1) HLP seeks to assist the PKK by
14 advocating on its behalf and advising it on international law and the
15 art of peacemaking and negotiation; (2) physician members of Sangam
16 and Dr. Jeyalangim wish to provide expert medical advice and
17 assistance to improve the delivery of health care in LTTE-controlled
18 regions of Sri Lanka; (3) TWHRC members seek to provide expertise to
19 the LTTE in the fields of economic development and information
20 technology; (4) WTCC members seek to provide legal expertise to the
21 LTTE in negotiating a peace agreement with the Sri Lankan government
22 and establishing a legal and political framework that will embrace
23 democratic values and promote the rule of law in Tamil Eelam and to
24 provide telecommunications expertise to the LTTE in disseminating news
25 on the progress of the peace developments; and (5) FETNA members seek
26 to provide expert advice and assistance to the LTTE in order to
27 improve the cultural life and schools in Tamil Eelam. Plaintiffs
28 claim that they are fearful that participating in these activities

1 would constitute providing expert advice or assistance to foreign
2 terrorist organizations, for which they would be subject to criminal
3 prosecution.

4 In their opposition, Defendants argue that the definitions of
5 "expert," "advice" and "assistance" are clear, as is Congress's intent
6 to deny foreign terrorist groups expert skills, whether in the flying
7 of jet aircraft, the raising of funds or the manufacture of weapons.
8 Defendants also claim that the statute does not prohibit either (1)
9 advocacy on behalf of terrorist organizations or their causes or (2)
10 association with those organizations in furtherance of their advocacy
11 goals. With the exception of these activities, in Defendants' view,
12 the statute gives "fair warning" that it prohibits the provision of
13 any expert advice or assistance to terrorist organizations.

14 Defendants next argue that the law is not vague in relation to
15 Plaintiffs' own conduct, because it puts them on notice that the
16 provision of medical services is barred, as is the provision of expert
17 advice or assistance on economic development or human rights
18 advocacy.⁵ Thus, in Defendants' view, Plaintiffs' argument that the
19 prohibition is impermissibly vague must fail.

20 In their reply, Plaintiffs first point out that Defendants' opposition
21 entirely fails to articulate how the term "expert advice or
22 assistance" is less vague than "training" and "personnel." They also
23 note that Defendants appear to contradict themselves, by asserting
24 that the ban does not prohibit advocacy of foreign terrorist
25 organizations but does preclude the provision of any expert advice or

26
27 ⁵Defendants do not address whether this prohibition extends
28 to the provision of advice and assistance in the field of
information technology, although presumably such activity is also
barred by the statute.

1 assistance, including associational activity which might be construed
2 as expert advice or assistance, which Plaintiffs contend could
3 potentially include HLP's intended assistance to the PKK in the fields
4 of training in human rights advocacy and peacemaking. Plaintiffs
5 conclude based on this that the term "expert advice or assistance" is
6 void for vagueness for the same reasons the Court previously found the
7 terms "training" and "personnel" to be impermissibly vague.⁶
8 Having considered the parties' arguments and the relevant law,
9 including the rulings in HLP I, the Court concludes that the term
10 "expert advice or assistance," like the terms "training" and
11 "personnel," is not "sufficiently clear so as to allow persons of
12 'ordinary intelligence a reasonable opportunity to know what is
13 prohibited.'" Foti, 146 F.3d at [638](quoting Grayned, 408 U.S. at
14 108). Defendants have failed to adequately distinguish the provision
15 of "expert advice or assistance" from the provision of "training" or
16 "personnel" in a way that allows the Court to reconcile its prior
17 finding that the terms "training" and "personnel" are impermissibly
18 vague, with a finding that the term "expert advice or assistance" is
19 not.

20 Furthermore, Defendants' contradictory arguments on the scope of the
21 prohibition underscore the vagueness of the prohibition. The "expert
22 advice or assistance" Plaintiffs seek to offer includes advocacy and
23 associational activities protected by the First Amendment, which

24
25 ⁶Defendants raise additional arguments in opposition to
26 Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment in their reply in support
27 of their own motion to dismiss. To the extent that these
28 arguments constitute an improper sur-reply, the Court has
disregarded them. The Court also notes that Defendants'
arguments on this issue conflict with the Ninth Circuit's recent
decision.

1 Defendants concede are not prohibited under the USA PATRIOT Act.
2 Despite this, the USA PATRIOT Act places no limitation on the type of
3 expert advice and assistance which is prohibited, and instead bans the
4 provision of all expert advice and assistance regardless of its
5 nature. Thus, like the terms "personnel" and "training," "expert
6 advice or assistance" "could be construed to include unequivocally
7 pure speech and advocacy protected by the First Amendment" or to
8 "encompass First Amendment protected activities." 2003 U.S. App. LEXIS
9 24305 at *60-61 (9th Cir. Dec. 3, 2003).

10 Based on the foregoing, the Court finds that Plaintiffs have satisfied
11 their burden on their claim that the term "expert advice or
12 assistance" is impermissibly vague, and concludes that Plaintiffs are
13 entitled to injunctive relief.⁷

14 b. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Demonstrate that the Prohibition is
15 Substantially Overbroad.

16 "The First Amendment doctrine of overbreadth is an exception to [the]
17 normal rule regarding the standards for facial challenges." Virginia
18 v. Hicks, 123 S. Ct. 2191, 2196 (2003). Under the overbreadth
19 doctrine, a "showing that a law punishes a 'substantial' amount of
20

21 ⁷The Ninth Circuit recently construed 18 U.S.C. §2339B "to
22 require the government to prove that a person acted with
23 knowledge of an organization's designation as a 'foreign
24 terrorist organization' or knowledge of the unlawful activities
25 that caused the organization to be so designated." 2003 U.S.
26 App. LEXIS 24305 at *29-30 (9th Cir. Dec. 3, 2003). Although the
27 Ninth Circuit's ruling in HLP I clarifies the statute's scienter
28 requirement with respect to non-First Amendment protected
activities, it does not mitigate a finding of vagueness with
respect to those activities that fall within the scope of the
First Amendment. See id. at *57-59 (affirming this Court's ruling
that the terms "personnel" and "training" are impermissibly vague
"because they bring within their ambit constitutionally protected
speech and advocacy.")

1 protected free speech judged in relation to the statute's plainly
2 legitimate sweep . . . suffices to invalidate *all* enforcement of that
3 law, until and unless a limiting construction or partial invalidation
4 so narrows it as to remove the seeming threat or deterrence to
5 constitutionally protected expression." Id. (internal citations and
6 quotations omitted.)

7 Despite the foregoing, the Supreme Court has recognized that "there
8 comes a point at which the chilling effect of an overbroad law,
9 significant though it may be, cannot justify prohibiting all
10 enforcement of that law-particularly a law that reflects legitimate
11 state interests in maintaining comprehensive controls over harmful,
12 constitutionally unprotected conduct." Id. at 2197. "To ensure that
13 [the substantial social costs created by the overbreadth doctrine] do
14 not swallow the social benefits of declaring a law 'overbroad,'" the
15 Supreme Court requires that the "law's application to protected speech
16 be 'substantial,' not only in an absolute sense, but also relative to
17 the scope of the law's plainly legitimate applications before applying
18 the 'strong medicine' of the overbreadth invalidation." Id.

19 In their motion, Plaintiffs contend that the term "expert advice or
20 assistance" is substantially overbroad because it prohibits a
21 substantial amount of speech activity which is clearly protected by
22 the First Amendment, such as training in human rights advocacy, giving
23 advice on how to improve medical care and education, and distributing
24 human rights literature. Defendants oppose, arguing that Plaintiffs
25 have failed to meet their burden in showing that substantial
26 overbreadth exists, as required by Virginia v. Hicks. In Defendants'
27 view, Plaintiffs have offered no examples of core political activities
28 barred by the statute, and the examples they have provided fall short

1 of demonstrating that the statute prohibits a substantial amount of
2 speech in either an absolute sense or in relation to the law's
3 legitimate applications.

4 With respect to the physician members of Sangam and Dr. Jeyalangim,
5 Defendants contend that the prohibition on providing medical aid and
6 advice survives First Amendment scrutiny because (1) the practice of
7 medicine is subject to reasonable licensing and regulation, (2) the
8 government has the authority to restrict the dealings of United States
9 citizens with foreign entities and (3) the prohibition is not aimed at
10 interfering with the expressive component of Plaintiffs' intended
11 conduct.⁸

12 In addition, Defendants argue that Plaintiffs cannot demonstrate
13 overbreadth from the statutory text itself. In Defendants' view,
14 while the statute might at the fringes apply to protected speech, this
15 is insufficient to block its legitimate applications. To succeed,
16 Plaintiffs must demonstrate that the law's application is substantial
17 both in an absolute sense and relative to the scope of the law's
18 legitimate applications. While Defendants concede that the statute
19 could apply to international human rights advocacy and peacekeeping,
20 thus implicating First Amendment values, they argue that because the
21 statute is not aimed at interfering with expressive conduct,
22 Plaintiffs' overbreadth claim must be dismissed. Defendants argue

23
24 ⁸Defendants also argue that the record is devoid of any
25 facts showing that Plaintiffs' alleged intended conduct comes
26 within the statute's reach, asserting that with the exception of
27 the doctors' medical expertise, Plaintiffs have presented
28 insufficient evidence that the advice and assistance they seek to
offer is "expert" for purposes of the USA PATRIOT Act. The Court
already rejected this argument in its ruling on Defendants'
motion to dismiss.

1 that any potential First Amendment violation can be remedied by "as
2 applied" litigation.

3 In their reply, Plaintiffs reiterate that the ban is directed at pure
4 speech, not just at the margins, and at all expert advice and
5 assistance, regardless of whether it is intended to or could ever
6 further terrorist activity. They also argue that the examples
7 identified by Defendants as activities which may be legitimately
8 barred are the same as those used in defense of the ban on "training,"
9 despite the fact that the ban is not limited to those forms of advice
10 and assistance. Finally, Plaintiffs contend that Virginia v. Hicks
11 does not contradict their position, as the law in Virginia v. Hicks
12 had nothing to do with the plaintiffs' speech and the Court indicated
13 that the plaintiff had failed to show that the bar would be applied to
14 anyone engaging in constitutionally protected speech.

15 The Court agrees with Defendants that Plaintiffs have failed to meet
16 their burden in establishing that the prohibition on the provision of
17 "expert advice or assistance" is substantially overbroad, thereby
18 warranting an injunction of its enforcement. Although Plaintiffs have
19 provided examples of some protected speech which may be prohibited by
20 the application of the ban, this is not sufficient to meet the burden
21 imposed by Virginia v. Hicks. The USA PATRIOT Act's prohibition of
22 the provision of "expert advice or assistance" is aimed at furthering
23 a legitimate state interest: curbing support for designated foreign
24 terrorist organizations' activities, which unquestionably constitute
25 "harmful, constitutionally unprotected conduct." Virginia v. Hicks,
26 123 S. Ct. at 2197. Plaintiffs have failed to demonstrate that the
27 USA PATRIOT Act's application to protected speech is "substantial"
28 both in an absolute sense and relative to the scope of the law's

1 plainly legitimate applications. The Court therefore declines to
2 apply the "strong medicine" of the overbreadth doctrine, finding
3 instead that as-applied litigation will provide a sufficient safeguard
4 for any potential First Amendment violation.

5 2. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Demonstrate that the Prohibition on the
6 Provision of "Expert Advice or Assistance" Criminalizes
7 Associational Speech.

8 Plaintiffs argue that the prohibition on providing "expert advice or
9 assistance" punishes pure speech by penalizing moral innocents for the
10 culpable acts of the groups that they have supported through their
11 speech, without requiring a showing of intent to incite or further
12 terrorist or other illegal activity. For support, they cite
13 Brandenburg v. Ohio, 395 U.S. 444 (1969) and McCoy v. Stewart, 282
14 F.3d 626 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 537 U.S. 993 (2002). Plaintiffs
15 attempt to distinguish this argument from that made in HLP I on the
16 ground that they do not seek to provide material support in the form
17 of money or any other tangible asset, but only through associational
18 speech and assistance.

19 In their opposition, Defendants contend that this argument was
20 previously raised and rejected by the Court in HLP I, where the Court
21 found that the material support restriction (1) was content-neutral
22 and not aimed at the suppression of free speech and (2) does not
23 criminalize mere association with designated foreign terrorist
24 organizations. These rulings were affirmed by the Ninth Circuit. See
25 205 F.3d at 1135. According to Defendants, the addition of "expert
26 advice or assistance" should not alter the analysis of the issue by
27 this Court or the Ninth Circuit, and Plaintiffs' efforts to relitigate
28 HLP I should be rejected.

1 The Court agrees with Defendants that Plaintiffs' attempt to
2 relitigate this issue is improper. In addition, as discussed in Note
3 10, the Ninth Circuit recently clarified that the knowledge required
4 by the statute is of a group's designation as a terrorist
5 organization, or its participation in unlawful activities that caused
6 it to be so designated. There is thus no risk of the prosecution of
7 "moral innocents" under the law, contrary to Plaintiffs' assertion.
8 The Court therefore DENIES Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment on
9 this basis.

10 3. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Demonstrate that the Prohibition Gives
11 the Secretary of State Unreviewable Authority to Designate Groups
12 as Terrorist Organizations.

13 Plaintiffs' final argument in support of their motion for summary
14 judgment is that the prohibition on providing "expert advice or
15 assistance" found in the USA PATRIOT Act violates the First and Fifth
16 Amendments by granting the Secretary of State unreviewable authority
17 to designate groups as terrorist organizations. Plaintiffs recognize
18 that the Court previously rejected the same argument made with respect
19 to the material support provision as a whole in HLP I. 9 F. Supp. 2d
20 at 1198-1201 (finding that Plaintiffs had failed to establish a
21 probability of success on the merits of their claim that the Secretary
22 of State had unfettered discretion to target disfavored political
23 groups), aff'd, 205 F.3d at 1136-1137 (finding that the AEDPA's
24 standard is not so vague or indeterminate as to give the Secretary of
25 State unfettered discretion). Plaintiffs have not presented any
26 arguments in their motion that would require the Court to reconsider
27 its previous determination. The Court therefore DENIES Plaintiffs'
28 motion for summary judgment on this basis, concluding that Plaintiffs

1 have failed to establish that the prohibition on providing "expert
2 advice and assistance" violates the First and Fifth Amendments by
3 giving the Secretary of State virtually unreviewable authority to
4 designate groups as terrorist organizations.

5 **V. CONCLUSION**

6 For the reasons set forth above, Defendants' Motion to Dismiss is
7 DENIED.

8 Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED IN PART and DENIED
9 IN PART as follows:

10 1. Plaintiffs' motion is GRANTED to the extent the Court finds that
11 the term "expert advice or assistance" is impermissibly vague;
12 and

13 2. Plaintiffs' motion is DENIED with respect to the remaining
14 arguments raised.

15 Accordingly, Defendants, their officers, agents, employees, and
16 successors are ENJOINED from enforcing the USA PATRIOT Act's
17 prohibition on providing "expert advice or assistance" to either the
18 Kurdistan Workers' Party, a.k.a. Partiya Karkeran Kurdistan, a.k.a.
19 PKK, a.k.a. the Kurdistan Freedom and Democracy Congress, a.k.a.
20 KADEK, a.k.a. Freedom and Democracy Congress of Kurdistan, a.k.a. the
21 People's Defense Force, a.k.a. Halu Mesru Savunma Kuvveti (HSK); or

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, a.k.a. LTTE, a.k.a. Tamil

28 Tigers, a.k.a. Ellalan Force against any of the named Plaintiffs or

1 their members. The Court declines to grant a nationwide injunction.

2
3 **SO ORDERED.**

4
5 **DATED:** _____

_____ **AUDREY B. COLLINS**
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28