



900 S.W. Fifth Avenue, Suite 2600
Portland, Oregon 97204
main 503.224.3380
fax 503.220.2480
www.stoel.com

May 27, 2010

P.K. RUNKLES-PEARSON
Direct (503) 294-9328
pkrunkles-pearson@stoel.com

Ms. Molly Dwyer
Clerk of the Court
United States Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit
Post Office Box 193939
San Francisco, CA 94119-3939

Re: *ACLU v. Kroger, et al.*
United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Case No. 09-35154
Argument Date: June 8, 2010

Dear Ms. Dwyer:

In accordance with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(j) and Circuit Rule 28-6, this letter provides an additional citation to recent Supreme Court authority regarding one of the issues relevant to this appeal. *United States v. Stevens*, 130 S. Ct. 1577 (2010) was described by Plaintiffs-Appellants in the May 21, 2010 letter filed in a related case, No. 09-35153. A copy of that letter is attached for your convenience. The *Stevens* opinion is equally relevant to the arguments of Plaintiffs-Appellants in this case, and they respectfully request that the Court consider it.

Very truly yours,

P.K. Runkles-Pearson

PKR:smr
Enclosure
cc (w/encl.): Michael A. Casper
Michael Bamberger

Michael A. Bamberger
212.768.6756
mbamberger@sonnenschein.com

1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020-1089
212.768.6700
212.768.6800 fax
www.sonnenschein.com

May 21, 2010

Ms. Molly Dwyer
Clerk of the Court
United States Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit
Post Office Box 193939
San Francisco, CA 94119-3939

Re: *Powell's Books, Inc. v. Kroger*
United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Case No. 09-35153
Argument Date: June 8, 2010

Dear Ms. Dwyer:

In accordance with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(j) and Circuit Rule 28-6, this letter provides an additional citation to very recent U.S. Supreme Court authority relevant to one of the issues presented by Plaintiffs-Appellants on this appeal.

The Court's attention is directed to the opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court in *United States v. Stevens*, 130 S. Ct. 1577 (2010), which was issued last month after completion of briefing in this case.

Defendants argued before the district court that the state would never criminally charge under the challenged statutes the materials put forward by plaintiffs. And the court below found that, while the challenged statutes failed to meet the Supreme Court's *Miller/Ginsberg* standard, the statutes complied with that standard because they would be constitutionally applied by "prosecutors, judges and juries." Appellants contended that the constitutional standard cannot be satisfied on the basis of a prediction of the exercise of prosecutorial discretion. (Plaintiffs-Appellants' Brief, Point IC, pp. 28-29).

In *U.S. v. Stevens*, the Chief Justice, writing for the eight-judge majority, supports Plaintiffs-Appellants' contention:

Not to worry, the Government says: The Executive Branch construes § 48 to reach only "extreme" cruelty, Brief for United States 8, and it "neither has brought nor will bring a prosecution

Ms. Molly Dwyer
May 21, 2010
Page 2

for anything less,” Reply Brief 6-7. The Government hits this theme hard, invoking its prosecutorial discretion several times ... But the First Amendment protects against the Government; it does not leave us at the mercy of *noblesse oblige*. We would not uphold an unconstitutional statute merely because the Government promised to use it responsibly. Cf. *Whitman v. American Trucking Assns., Inc.*, 531 U.S. 457, 473, 121 S.Ct. 903, 149 L.Ed.2d (2001).

Rejecting the government’s defense of its prosecutorial discretion, the Court struck down the statute as facially overbroad.

We greatly appreciate the Court’s consideration of this letter and opinion.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

By: s/ Michael A. Bamberger
Michael A. Bamberger

Enclosure

cc: Michael A. Casper
John Joshua Wheeler
P.K. Runkles-Pearson