## JONES DAY

3161 MICHELSON DRIVE • SUITE 800 • IRVINE, CA 92612 TELEPHONE: (949) 851-3939 • FACSIMILE: (949) 553-7539

December 26, 2013

## VIA CM / ECF FILING

Ms. Molly C. Dwyer, Clerk of the Court United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit The James R. Browning Courthouse 95 7th Street San Francisco, California 94103

Re: Courthouse News Service v. Planet

Case No. 11-57187 Argued May 8, 2013

Circuit Judges Noonan, Wardlaw and Murguia

Dear Ms. Dwyer:

Appellee Michael Planet provides notice of the following additional authorities pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(j).

1. Access To Court Records Is An Important State Interest. Appellees' Answering Brief explains that *Pullman*'s "sensitive social policy" prong protects state sovereignty over matters of local concern, including administration of California's judicial system, and access to court documents.

The California Supreme Court's opinion in *Sander v. State Bar of California*, 2013 Cal. LEXIS 10183 (Dec. 19, 2013) confirms this approach. *Sander* explains that California's Legislature has been regulating access to public records since 1872, *id.* at \*25-39, and that the right of access to judicial records is an important state interest, *id.* at \*39-40. *Sander* also explains that state access laws must be interpreted "in light of article I section 3 subdivision (b) of the California Constitution," *id.* at \*24-25; and that state courts must balance competing interests in ruling on certain public record access claims, *id.* at \*53-60.

2. The "Mirror Image" Rule Does Not Apply. Appellant argues that Pullman abstention is unnecessary in part because a "mirror image" rule requires that Article I, section 3(b) of the California Constitution and California Rules of Court 2.500 and 2.503 be interpreted consistently with the First Amendment.

Ms. Molly C. Dwyer December 26, 2013 Page 2

However, California's rules regarding access to judicial documents must also be interpreted consistently with free speech rights contained in Article I section 2(a) of California's Constitution. In *Beeman v. Anthem Prescription Management, LLC*, 2013 Cal. LEXIS 10182 (Dec. 19, 2013), the California Supreme Court confirmed that state law does *not* mirror federal law. It explained that "[t]he state Constitution's free speech provision is at least as broad as and in some ways is broader than" its federal counterpart, and that "federal decisions interpreting the First Amendment are not controlling" in California, *id.* at \*19 (citations and internal quotations omitted).

ery truly yours,

Robert A. Naeve

9th Circuit Case Number(s)	11-57187
<b>NOTE:</b> To secure your input, yo	ou should print the filled-in form to PDF (File > Print > PDF Printer/Creator).
*********	***************************************
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
When All Case Partici	pants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System
2 2	ls for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system
Dec 26, 2013	
I certify that all participants i accomplished by the appellat	n the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be e CM/ECF system.
Signature (use "s/" format)	s/ Robert A. Naeve
********	*******************
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
When Not All Case Parti	cipants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System
	nically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the als for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system.
Participants in the case who a CM/ECF system.	are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the appellate
have mailed the foregoing do	the participants in the case are not registered CM/ECF users. I cument by First-Class Mail, postage prepaid, or have dispatched it arrier for delivery within 3 calendar days to the following
Signature (use "s/" format)	