

Voices and Vetoes: Navigating First Amendment Rights in *Meinecke v. City of Seattle*

Description

Today, we analyze a recent Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decision that examines law enforcement's authority to manage public spaces while addressing the dynamics of public expression and safeguarding citizens' constitutional freedoms. This case centers on "time, place, and manner" restrictions and the application of obstruction ordinances in response to public hostility toward protected speech.

The case, *Meinecke v. City of Seattle*, arose after two public events in Seattle where Matthew Meinecke, a devout Christian, was arrested by the Seattle Police for refusing to relocate while reading Bible passages. These actions raised critical questions about the application of Seattle's obstruction ordinance and the protection of First Amendment rights.

Case Background

In June 2022, Meinecke attended two public events in Seattle to publicly read Bible passages and "convey his faith." His efforts were met with hostility from onlookers.

1. June 24, 2022 – Dobbs Decision Protest:

Following the Supreme Court's *Dobbs* decision overturning *Roe v. Wade*, protesters gathered outside the federal building on Second Avenue in Seattle. Meinecke stood on a public walkway, displaying a sign, reading from the Bible, and distributing Christian literature. Protesters reacted aggressively, tearing pages from his Bible and physically assaulting him. Despite the hostility, Meinecke resumed his activities. Seattle police intervened, acknowledging the assaults but directing Meinecke to relocate. While the city claimed the officers suggested he move across the street to continue exercising his First Amendment rights, Meinecke alleged that the relocation would have made him inaudible. Refusing to move, he was arrested for obstruction under a Seattle Municipal Code ordinance.

2. June 26, 2022 – Seattle PrideFest:

Two days later, Meinecke attended Seattle's PrideFest at a public park, where he again read Bible passages. Attendees responded with interruptions, including loud noises and pouring water on his Bible. Police officers asked Meinecke to move outside the park, citing a "time, place, and manner" restriction for public safety. He refused, asserting he was not in danger, and was arrested again for obstruction.

Legal Proceedings

Meinecke sued the City of Seattle and its police officers under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging violations of his First, Fourth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights. He sought a preliminary injunction to prevent the enforcement of the restrictions and challenged the application of the obstruction ordinance.

The district court denied his motion, concluding that there was no evidence the officers' actions were influenced by the content of his speech. Meinecke appealed to the Ninth Circuit.

Ninth Circuit Ruling

The Ninth Circuit applied a three-step framework to evaluate the First Amendment claims:

1. Determine whether the speech is protected (religious speech is protected under the First Amendment).
2. Identify the nature of the forum (a public sidewalk and park are traditional public fora).
3. Assess whether the restrictions satisfy the requisite standard.

The court focused on the third step—whether the restrictions met constitutional scrutiny. The Ninth Circuit reversed the district court's decision, agreeing with Meinecke that the restrictions constituted impermissible, content-based heckler's vetoes.

Key Findings

1. Content-Based Restrictions:

The court held that the officers' actions were content-based because they were motivated by the audience's reaction to Meinecke's speech. Under strict scrutiny, such restrictions are presumed invalid unless the government demonstrates they are narrowly tailored to serve a compelling interest.

2. Less Restrictive Alternatives:

The court noted several less speech-restrictive measures the police could have employed, such as increasing officer presence, managing hostile individuals, or arresting those who assaulted Meinecke.

Implications for Law Enforcement

This case underscores the importance of upholding First Amendment protections while maintaining public order. Content-based restrictions are subject to strict scrutiny and are typically impermissible. Law enforcement officers must ensure that:

- Restrictions are content-neutral, narrowly tailored, and leave open ample alternative channels for communication.
- Interventions focus on de-escalation and public safety without suppressing lawful expression.

By managing environments to allow for safe public expression, officers respect constitutional rights and maintain public trust in law enforcement's commitment to these principles.

Meinecke v. City of Seattle, No. 23-35481 (9th Cir. 2024)

Date Created

01/16/2025