No. 19-291

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

ANNE BLOCK,

Petitioner,

v.

WSBA, et al.,

Respondents.

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States District Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit

REPLY TO DEFENDANTS KING COUNTY AND OFFICER CARY COBLANTZ RESPONSE TO PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

ANNE BLOCK
115 West Main St #204
Monroe, WA 92272
(206) 326-9933

Table of Contents

Cases

REPLY ARGUMENT

A. All three judges associated in this case have pre-existing conflicts of interest which require their disqualification.

King County has only cursorily reviewed the detailed analysis provided in Block's Petition for Writ of Certiorari which addressed in detail the very cases that King County wants to consider, including the specific reference in *Riss v. Angel*, 934 P.2d 669, 131 Wash.2d 612 (Wash. 04/10/1997) to *Nolan v. McNamee*, 82 Wash. 585, 144 P. 904 (1914) in the first footnote. Since Block has already refuted King

County's argument in the petition, there is no need to repeat those argument in a reply brief.

B. The plaintiff has properly pled first amendment retaliation claims with respect to Officer Coblantz .

In response to her detailed analysis provided in Block's Petition for Writ of Certiorari which addressed in why Block easily established a prima facie case for retaliation under existing case law, the King County defendants only provided two cases, both of which had long predated *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007), and *Ashcroft v. Iqbal* 556 U.S. 662. (2009). If these two cases, *NLRB v. Pittsburgh Steel SS Co.*, 340 US 498, 503 (1951) and *United States v. Johnston*, 268 U.S. 220, 227 (1925).were applied to motions under the standards of *Iqbal* and *Twombly* it would be difficult to imagine any case that could survive a motion on the pleadings after an appeal to the United States Supreme Court. We cannot believe it was the intent of the court to dispose of First Amendment cases in this manner without even a possibility of appeal to the United States Supreme Court.

In her petition, Anne Block presented detailed, well documented and plausible allegations against Officer Coblantz that are well supported by existing case law that even the slightest first amendment violation of first amendment rights is enough to trigger a 42 USC §1983 violation:

The act v t es of the government defendants are an unlawful attempt to prevent publ cat on of controvers al top cs by shutt ng down the press (pr or restra nt). Such "pr or restra nts on speech and publ cat on are the most ser ous and the least tolerable nfr ngements on F rst Amendment r ghts." *Nebraska Press Assn' v., Stuart, 427, US 539, 559 (1976).* They come to a court bear ng a heavy presumpt on aga nst the r val d ty. *New York Times Co. v. United states, 403 U.S. at 714 (1971)*

> *In Mendocino Environmental Center v. Mendocino County* we pointed out that the proper First Amendment inquiry asks "whether an official's acts would chill or silence a person of ordinary firmness from future First Amendment activities."192 F.3d 1283, 1300 (9th Cir. 1999)(quoting *Crawfor-El v. Britton*, 93 F.3d 813, 826 (D.C. Cir. 1996), vacated on other grounds 520 US 1273, 117 S.Ct.2451, 138 L. Ed.. 2d (1997). Because "it would be unjust to allow a defendant to escape liability for a First amendment violation merely because an unusually determined plaintiff persists in his protected activity," Rhodes not not have demonstrate that his speech was "actually inhibited or suppressed." See id. Rhodes' allegations that his First Amendment rights were chilled, though not necessarily silenced is enough to perfect his claim. *Rhodes v. Robinson*, 408 f.3d 559 (9th Cir. 04/25/2005).

DOCKET ALARM

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts

Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research

With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips

Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS
Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS
Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.