

EXHIBIT 1

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

BAY AREA UNITARIAN)
UNIVERSALIST CHURCH; DRINK)
HOUSTON BETTER, LLC d/b/a)
ANTIDOTE COFFEE; PERK YOU)
LATER, LLC,)

Plaintiffs,

v.

KIM OGG, District Attorney for Harris)
County, in her official capacity; ED)
GONZALEZ, County Sheriff for Harris)
County, in his official capacity; PETE)
BACON, Chief of Police for the Webster)
Police Department, in his official capacity;)
TROY FINNER, Chief of the Houston)
Police Department, in his official capacity.)

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:20-cv-3081

**REDACTED VERSION
PUBLICLY FILED**

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

I. INTRODUCTION

The First Amendment safeguards the right to express differing viewpoints. “[N]o official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein.” *W. Va. State Bd. of Educ. v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 642 (1943). But Texas has ignored the First Amendment and enacted legislation that singles out a group with which it disagrees—those who prefer to keep guns off of their property—and selectively burdens their speech. Specifically, Texas property owners who espouse this viewpoint must post multiple large, text-heavy signs containing language specified by the State in order to exercise the longest established and most fundamental of their

property rights: the right to exclude. If these property owners use other means of indicating that firearms are not welcome on the premises—even if entirely reasonable and understandable—they cannot avail themselves of Texas’s criminal trespass laws. By contrast, property owners who wish to exclude others for *any other reason at all* do not face these same burdens. This viewpoint-based discrimination was entirely intentional; the Texas state land commissioner who drafted these requirements admits that he “intentionally made the sign’s language cumbersome” to discourage businesses from prohibiting entry to customers carrying guns.¹

Under Texas criminal trespass law, property owners can provide notice to potential trespassers that entry is unwelcome through a variety of means, including signs “reasonably likely to come to the attention of” the trespasser. Tex. Penal Code § 30.05(a), (b) (“General Trespass Law”). In an effort to discourage property owners from excluding individuals carrying guns, however, Texas imposes heightened and onerous speech requirements on property owners who object to handguns being on their property. Under Texas Penal Code §§ 30.06 and 30.07, property owners are required to post several square feet of government-scripted signage on their property to communicate that they object to handguns on their property. Tex. Penal Code § 30.06 (“Concealed Carry Trespass Law”); Tex. Penal Code § 30.07 (“Open Carry Trespass Law”) (together, the “Acts”). These signage requirements effectively prevent property owners from communicating a “no guns” message on their own terms and interfere with property owners’ efforts to relay other, non-gun-related messages as well.

The Texas legislature has not identified any reason why these enhanced signage requirements are necessary to provide adequate notice to gun-carrying individuals, where such

¹ See Laylan Copeline, *Limiting guns at Texas business? It’s a legal – and legalese – fight*, STATESMAN, <https://www.statesman.com/story/business/2014/12/27/limiting-guns-at-texas-businesses/6722360007/> (last updated Dec. 11, 2018, 11:28 AM).

enhanced notice is not required for any other type of would-be trespasser. Indeed, simpler, pictographic signs (like those commonly used in other states) would be both less burdensome and more effective at providing notice. Quite simply, the purpose and intent of the law is to disfavor a particular viewpoint. The Constitution does not permit this.

Plaintiffs are a Unitarian Universalist Church and a coffee shop, both located in Harris County, Texas. Plaintiffs bring this civil rights action under the U.S. Constitution to challenge the constitutionality of the heightened speech requirements imposed by the Acts on their face and as applied to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief in order to stop the State's ongoing violation of Plaintiffs' constitutional rights. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2201.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has jurisdiction by operation of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343(a)(3).

2. This Court has authority to grant the requested declaratory and prospective injunctive relief under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 and 42 U.S.C. § 1983, by Rules 57 and 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and by the general legal and equitable powers of this Court. *See Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123 (1908).

3. Venue is appropriate under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because several Defendants reside in this district and the events giving rise to the claims occurred and occur in this district.

III. PARTIES

A. Plaintiffs

4. Plaintiff Bay Area Unitarian Universalist Church is a Unitarian Universalist Church (the "Church") located in Harris County, Texas. Its building is located at the border between the City of Houston and the City of Webster. Its religious mission centers on compassion, peace, and non-violence.

5. Plaintiff Drink Houston Better, LLC d/b/a Antidote Coffee (“Antidote Coffee”) is a small shop that serves coffee, wine, and ice cream in Houston. Plaintiff Perk You Later, LLC (“Perk You Later”) owns the building where Antidote Coffee has operated for twelve years. Antidote Coffee and Perk You Later share the same ownership.

B. Defendants

6. Defendant Kim Ogg is the District Attorney for Harris County. She is responsible for prosecuting violations of the Texas Penal Code—including violations of the Acts—occurring in Harris County. She is sued by each of the Plaintiffs in her official capacity.

7. Defendant Ed Gonzalez is the County Sheriff for Harris County. He is responsible for enforcing the Texas Penal Code in Harris County, including by making arrests for criminal violations of the Acts. He is sued by each of the Plaintiffs in his official capacity.

8. Defendant Pete Bacon is the Chief of Police for the Webster Police Department. He is responsible for enforcing the Texas Penal Code in the City of Webster, including by making arrests for criminal violations of the Acts. The Webster Police Department responds to calls for police assistance made by the Bay Area Unitarian Universalist Church. He is sued by the Church in his official capacity.

9. Defendant Troy Finner is the Chief of the Houston Police Department. He is responsible for enforcing the Texas Penal Code in the City of Houston, including by making arrests for criminal violations of the Acts. He is sued by Antidote Coffee and Perk You Later in his official capacity.

IV. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

A. Notice Requirements Under General Texas Criminal Trespass Law

10. Under Texas's General Trespass Law, codified at Texas Penal Code § 30.05(a), (b), a person commits an offense of criminal trespass if the person “enters or remains on or in property of another” without “effective consent” and the person “(1) had notice that the entry was forbidden;” or “(2) received notice to depart but failed to do so.” Tex. Penal Code § 30.05(a).

11. Under the General Trespass Law, a property owner can provide “notice” that entry is forbidden in a variety of ways:

- (A) “oral or written communication,” with no particular language specified;
- (B) “fencing or other enclosure obviously designed to exclude intruders or to contain livestock;”
- (C) “a sign or signs posted on the property or at the entrance to the building, reasonably likely to come to the attention of intruders, indicating that entry is forbidden;”
- (D) “the placement of identifying purple paint marks on trees or posts on the property, provided that the marks” have certain features;
- (E) “the visible presence on the property of a crop grown for human consumption that is under cultivation, in the process of being harvested, or marketable if harvested at the time of entry.”

Tex. Penal Code § 30.05(b)(2).

12. The General Trespass Law does not impose upon property owners any size, wording, or language requirements relating to the written communications or signs necessary to exclude others from their property.

13. An offense under the General Trespass Law is generally a Class B or C misdemeanor, but it is a Class A misdemeanor if the individual “carries a deadly weapon during the commission of the offense.” Tex. Penal Code § 30.05(d)(3)(C).

B. Notice Requirements for Gun-License Holders Under Texas Criminal Trespass Law

14. However, in 2003, the Texas legislature amended the General Trespass Law to create a defense to prosecution under the statute if: (i) the basis on which entry was prohibited is that

entry with a handgun was forbidden; and (ii) the person was carrying a permit and a concealed handgun. Tex. Penal Code § 30.05(f). In 2015, this exemption was broadened to apply also to handguns carried openly in a holster. *Id.*

15. Though there are several other enumerated defenses, the only ones concerning the “basis on which entry . . . was forbidden” relate to when property owners seek to exclude a person because the person is carrying a handgun, firearm, or ammunition. Tex. Penal Code § 30.05(f)–(f-3), (i).

16. Sections 30.06 and 30.07 of the Texas Penal Code now create trespass crimes for those individuals exempted by § 30.05(f). The Concealed Carry Trespass Law (§ 30.06) covers concealed handgun license holders, whereas the Open Carry Trespass Law (§ 30.07) covers open-carry handgun license holders. Tex. Penal Code §§ 30.06, 30.07.

17. For a gun-license holder to be guilty of trespass, the license holder must carry the open or concealed handgun on to the property of another without “effective consent” and have received “notice” that entry on to the property with an open or concealed handgun was forbidden. Tex. Penal Code §§ 30.06(a), 30.07(a). Unlike the General Trespass Law, property owners can provide “notice” under the Acts only “by oral or written communication.” Tex. Penal Code §§ 30.06(b), 30.07(b).

18. Also unlike the General Trespass Law, the Concealed Carry Trespass Law defines “written communication” extremely narrowly:

(A) a card or other document on which is written language identical to the following: “Pursuant to Section 30.06, Penal Code (trespass by license holder with a concealed handgun), a person licensed under Subchapter H, Chapter 411, Government Code (handgun licensing law), may not enter this property with a concealed handgun”; or

(B) a sign posted on the property that:


- (i) includes the language described by Paragraph (A) in both English and Spanish;
- (ii) appears in contrasting colors with block letters at least one inch in height; and

(iii) is displayed in a conspicuous manner clearly visible to the public.

Tex. Penal Code § 30.06(c)(3).

19. The Open Carry Trespass Law uses the same definition of “written communication” except that the required language refers to § 30.07 of the code and to openly carried handguns. In addition, under the Open Carry Trespass Law, signs are required to be posted “at *each entrance* to the property,” regardless of whether the entrance is open to the public. Tex. Penal Code § 30.07(c)(3)(B)(iii) (emphasis added).

20. Although the two signs must contain wording “identical” to the statutory language, in both English and Spanish, they cannot be combined into one sign that covers both open and concealed weapons. Instead, the property owner must post *both* of the following signs:



21. Given these requirements, if a property owner seeks to exclude both concealed and openly carried handguns by licensees, he or she must devote several square feet of space at each entrance to text-heavy signage. For example, the statutorily compliant signs obtained and posted by the Church Plaintiff in this case measure 18 by 24 inches each. On one website that advertises

that its signs are “[f]ully compliant with the Texas penal code, including mandatory bilingual messaging and 1” character height,” the minimum-sized sign available is 30 by 30 inches.²

22. On September 1, 2021, Texas House Bill 1927 became effective, which allows people who are over 21 years old—and not otherwise prohibited by state and federal law from possessing a firearm—to carry firearms without a license. House Bill 1927 also amended the notice provisions applicable to property owners who wish to exclude unlicensed gun carriers.

23. Specifically, House Bill 1927 added a new provision to Texas Penal Code § 30.05(c), stating that “[a] person may provide notice that firearms are prohibited on the property by posting a sign at each entrance to the property that ... includes language that is identical to or substantially similar to the following: ‘Pursuant to Section 30.05, Penal Code (criminal trespass), a person may not enter this property with a firearm.’” Section 30.05 further provides that such signs must be “in both English and Spanish” and “in contrasting colors with block letters at least one inch in height” and be “displayed in a conspicuous manner clearly visible to the public.” *Id.* Like the 30.07 signs, these new signs must be posted at “each entrance to the property.” *Id.*³

24. It is a “defense to prosecution” under § 30.05 if “the basis on which entry on the property or land or in the building was forbidden is that entry with a handgun was forbidden” and the gun carrier is licensed. Texas Penal Code § 30.05(f). Accordingly, notwithstanding the provisions of House Bill 1927, a property owner who wishes to exclude licensed firearm carriers must still post signs under the Concealed Carry License Trespass Law and the Open Carry License Trespass Law.

² See *Texas Gun Signs - No Concealed Carry & No Open Carry*, MYSECURITYSIGN.COM, <https://www.mysecuritysign.com/texas-concealed-carry-signs-3006-3007> (last visited Oct. 30, 2022).

³ In the interest of judicial economy and to avoid prejudice to Defendants, Plaintiffs do not challenge the new Section 30.05(c) in this First Amended Complaint. The complaint instead remains focused on Sections 30.06 and 30.07. The new Section 30.05(c), however, is relevant to understanding some of the prosecutor and police training materials discussed *infra*.

25. By comparison, other states' signage requirements are far less burdensome. Many states have no specific requirements for giving notice excluding firearms. Those that do have specific requirements generally allow property owners to give notice that firearms are prohibited on the premises with a simple pictogram or only a few words. *See, e.g.*, Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 4-229 (providing that retailers can exclude persons carrying concealed firearms with a sign containing a pictogram and the words "no firearms allowed pursuant to A.R.S. § 4-229"); Ark. Code § 5-73-306 (requiring only "a written notice clearly readable at a distance of not less than ten feet . . . that 'carrying a handgun is prohibited'"); Ga. Code Ann. §§ 16-11-127(c), 16-7-21 (providing that "private property owners or persons in legal control of private property . . . shall have the right to exclude or eject a person who is in possession of a weapon or long gun on their private property" by giving "notice").

26. Signs under the Acts and the General Trespass Law are not provided by any governmental agency. Instead, property owners must purchase these signs, and they can cost as much as \$100. *See infra* ¶¶ 90, 105. Given that other states have less burdensome signage requirements, no-guns signs in other states are less expensive than in Texas. For example, a property owner just across the border in New Mexico would have to pay only \$7.88 for a compliant sign.⁴

27. Even though, as noted above, trespass with a deadly weapon is *generally* a Class A misdemeanor, offenses under the Acts are classified as *Class C* misdemeanors punishable by a fine not to exceed \$200. The only exception is for trespassers who, after entering the property,

⁴ *See New Mexico Gun Law Sign: Carrying Of Weapons Prohibited Sign – 10.8.2.16 NMAC (S2-0646-NM)*, MYSECURITYSIGN.COM, <https://www.mysecuritysign.com/new-mexico-gun-control-law-sign/sku-s2-0646-nm> (last visited Oct. 30, 2022).

are personally given oral notice as defined under subsection (b) and do not depart, in which case the offense is enhanced to a Class A misdemeanor. Tex. Penal Code §§ 30.06(d); 30.07(d).

28. As of September 1, 2019, the Texas legislature amended the Acts to provide a defense to prosecution if the offender promptly departs the property after receiving oral notice. Tex. Penal Code §§ 30.06(g); 30.07(h) (“It is a defense to prosecution under this section that the license holder was personally given notice by oral communication described by Subsection (b) and promptly departed from the property.”). The amended version of the Concealed Carry Trespass Law does not clarify how a property owner is to provide such oral notice if the firearm is concealed.


29. These notice requirements apply only to those wishing to exclude individuals on the basis of whether they are carrying firearms. For example, if a business wanted to exclude people not wearing a shirt and shoes, they would not have to follow the Acts’ stringent requirements.

C. Signage Requirements for Alcoholic Beverage Retailers

30. There are separate laws governing retailers who sell alcohol, and these requirements establish the internal incoherence of Texas’s signage requirements.

31. Under Texas Government Code § 411.204, businesses with alcohol permits or licenses that derive 51% or more of their income from the sale of alcoholic beverages for on-premises consumption must post a sign in both English and Spanish stating that it is unlawful for a licensed holder to carry a handgun on the premises. These are called the “Red Signs.” The Red Signs must be “displayed in a conspicuous manner clearly visible to the public” and contain block letters at least one inch tall and in contrasting colors. Tex. Gov’t Code § 411.204(c). The businesses also have to post the number “51” in solid red and at least five inches in height. *Id.* Unlike the signs imposed by the Acts, there is no exact language requirement for the Red Signs.

32. The Texas Alcoholic Beverage Code (“TABC”) currently provides to business owners compliant signs in English and Spanish that are 14 by 8.5 inches each:



V. ENFORCEMENT OF THE ACTS

A. The Acts are Enforced by the Law-Enforcement Defendants.

33. The Harris County Sheriff’s Office through Defendant Gonzalez, the Webster Police Department through Defendant Bacon, and the Houston Police Department through Defendant Finner (collectively, the “Law Enforcement Defendants”) are responsible for enforcing the laws of the State of Texas within their various jurisdictions.

34. As part of those enforcement duties, the Law Enforcement Defendants are responsible for arresting individuals who have violated the Texas Penal Code, including individuals who have violated the Acts.

35. Officers employed by the Law Enforcement Defendants will not arrest an individual for an offense if there is not probable cause as to all elements of the offense. The Law Enforcement Defendants train their officers that such an arrest would violate the law, including the individual’s constitutional rights.

36. One element of the crime of trespass is notice that the entry is forbidden. *See* Texas Penal Code § 30.05(a). Under Sections 30.06 and 30.07, a sign is inadequate to provide notice unless it contains the statutorily mandated text.

37. For this reason, officers employed by the Law Enforcement Defendants are trained on the specific elements of the Acts, including the notice element. Officers are trained that in order for notice by sign to be sufficient under the Acts, the sign in question: must include the specific language set out at § 30.06(c)(3)(A) and § 30.07(c)(3)(A); must include the statutory language in both English and Spanish; must depict this statutory language in contrasting colors; must be written in block letters at least one inch in height; and must be displayed in a conspicuous manner clearly visible to the public. Officers employed by the Law Enforcement Defendants are trained that if any one of these statutory requirements is not satisfied, notice by sign under the Acts is not sufficient and probable cause to support an arrest under the Acts is lacking.

38. Officers employed by the Law Enforcement Defendants are further trained, pursuant to the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement’s training materials, that property owners “must have the applicable (i.e., separate) signage for each type of carriage they wish to prohibit. If they want to prohibit both [licensed concealed and licensed open carry] there must be two separate signs.”⁵ And following the “constitutional carry” changes implemented by House Bill 1927, property owners who wish to exclude unlicensed firearms must also post a sign compliant with § 30.05(c).⁶ The Law Enforcement Defendants and all officers employed by each of them are mandated by law to receive this training and do receive this training.

39. [REDACTED]


[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

⁵ Texas Commission on Law Enforcement 2015 – 2017 State and Federal Law Update, Commission Course 3184 (Oct. 14, 2015).

⁶ See Texas Commission on Law Enforcement 2021 – 2023 State and Federal Law Update, Commission Course 3187 (Sept. 2, 2021).



40. Similar training is provided to officers of the Harris County Sheriff's Office and Webster Police Department.

41. The Law Enforcement Defendants are trained to carefully parse the confusing statutory requirements when responding to calls for service and while on patrol because, among other reasons, individuals known as "Second Amendment Auditors" often attempt to engage the public and law enforcement.

42. Second Amendment Auditors are private citizens who openly carry firearms into private businesses and public spaces in an attempt to engage the public or law enforcement. The Acts, in addition to the passage of other recent firearm-related legislation in Texas, have encouraged Second Amendment Auditors to increasingly carry firearms on private property in order to test the response of police and of the public.

43. [Redacted]

[Redacted]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

44. Second Amendment Auditors are aided by online forums such as www.texas3006.com. The website provides “a centralized location for reporting and retrieving businesses and other facilities that deny our right to defend both ourselves and our families from criminals.”⁷ On the website, users post the addresses of various properties that display no-guns signs along with detailed descriptions of whether the signs meet the statutory requirements, such as whether the letters are less than an inch tall. If the signs do not precisely comply with the requirements, some users see that as an opportunity to bring guns into those places anyway because they face no criminal consequences for doing so.⁸ Second Amendment Auditors also view signs that do not

⁷ Russell Jones, TEXAS3006.COM, <https://www.texas3006.com/team.php> (last visited Oct. 30, 2022).

⁸ TEXAS3006.COM, <https://www.texas3006.com/view.php> (last visited Oct. 30, 2022); *see also* Blog Post by Flightmare, TEXASCHLFORUM.COM (Mar. 11, 2019, 12:32 PM), <https://www.texaschlforum.com/viewtopic.php?p=1242194#p1242194> (“I walked right past a sign yesterday that said ‘No firearms allowed’. I thought it was cute”).

strictly comply with the Acts' statutory requirements as an opportunity to test law enforcement's response.

45. When officers employed by the Law Enforcement Defendants are on patrol and when they respond to calls for service, officers put the training described above into practice. In particular, the actions of officers employed by the Law Enforcement Defendants are informed by their mandated training regarding the specific nuances of notice requirements under the Acts, and by training related to interactions with Second Amendment Auditors.

46. For example, on June 4, 2017, a local restaurant in the City of Webster called the Webster Police Department seeking law-enforcement intervention regarding a subject carrying a concealed firearm. Upon arriving on the scene, the Webster Police Department Call Record indicates that an officer assessed the restaurant's signage and determined that the restaurant displayed a sign compliant with § 30.07, prohibiting openly carried handguns, but did not display a sign compliant with § 30.06, prohibiting concealed carry. The incident was cleared without an arrest and was resolved when officers consulted with the armed subject and advised him of the need to keep his weapon concealed.

47. Unless Plaintiffs' signs expressing their intent to exclude licensed, concealed firearms conform to the specifications of Section 30.06(c)(3)(B), officers employed by the Law Enforcement Defendants, when called, will not arrest individuals with a license to carry a concealed handgun for criminal trespass where the property owner wishes to exclude the individual on the basis that he or she is carrying a licensed, concealed firearm.

48. Unless Plaintiffs' signs expressing their intent to exclude licensed, openly carried firearms conform to the specifications of Section 30.07(c)(3)(B), officers employed by the Law Enforcement Defendants, when called, will not arrest individuals with a license to openly carry a

handgun for criminal trespass where the property owner wishes to exclude the individual on the basis that he or she is openly carrying a licensed firearm.

49. Unless Plaintiffs' signs expressing their intent to exclude licensed firearms conform to the specifications of the Acts, Second Amendment Auditors and other members of the public are not deterred from carrying licensed firearms onto private property by the threat of criminal penalties under the Acts.

B. The Acts are Enforced by the Harris County District Attorney.

50. The Harris County District Attorney's Office, through Defendant Kim Ogg, is responsible for enforcing the laws of the State of Texas in Harris County. As part of those enforcement duties, Defendant Ogg is responsible for prosecuting individuals who have violated the Texas Penal Code, including individuals who have violated the Acts.

51. Before accepting criminal charges for prosecution, prosecutors employed by the Harris County District Attorney's Office must ensure that there is probable cause to believe that all elements of the charged offense are satisfied. For this reason, prosecutors employed by the Harris County District Attorney's Office are specifically trained on the elements of the Acts, including the notice element.

52. Prosecutors are trained that in order for a sign to provide sufficient notice under the Acts, the sign in question: must include the specific, government-scripted speech prescribed by §§ 30.06(c)(3)(A) and 30.07(c)(3)(A); must include the statutory language in both English and Spanish; must depict this statutory language in contrasting colors; must be written in block letters at least one inch in height; and must be displayed in a conspicuous manner clearly visible to the public. Prosecutors are trained that if any one of these statutory requirements is not satisfied, notice by sign under the Acts is not sufficient. Prosecutors are trained that accepting charges or

proceeding with a prosecution under the Acts in such circumstances would violate the law, including the individual's constitutional rights.

53. According to the Texas District and County Attorneys Association 2015–2017 Legislative Update, provided as training material to prosecutors employed by the Harris County District Attorney's Office, "property owners can ... post notices to exclude concealed carriers, open carriers, or both from their property – but they need a separate sign for each type of actor."

54. Unless a property owner provides the mandated notice under the Concealed Carry Trespass Law, prosecutors employed by the Harris County District Attorney's office will not prosecute for trespass an individual who is licensed and conceal carries a handgun onto private property on the basis that the individual is carrying a handgun, despite the owner's wish to exclude firearms from his or her property.

55. Unless a property owner provides the mandated notice under Open Carry Trespass Law, prosecutors employed by the Harris County District Attorney's office will not prosecute for trespass an individual who is licensed and open carries a handgun onto private property on the basis that the individual is carrying a handgun, despite the owner's wish to exclude firearms from his or her property.

56. The Texas District and County Attorneys Association 2019–2021 Legislative Update, provided as training material to prosecutors employed by the Harris County District Attorney's Office, states with respect to recent legislative changes to criminal trespass laws that: "the triumph of individual gun rights over private property rights in the Penal code is now almost complete,"

and predicts that “the application of trespass laws to licensed and unlicensed carry of firearms will be that much more difficult for law enforcement officers to decipher and enforce at the scene.”

VI. THE ACTS ARE UNDULY BURDENSOME

57. The Acts impose onerous size, language, and text signage requirements that are unjustified and unduly burdensome on a group of property owners who espouse a disfavored viewpoint.

58. In most cases, property owners can take advantage of Texas criminal trespass law by providing notice through the various methods outlined in the General Trespass Law, such as any type of oral or written communication, fencing, or signs “reasonably likely to come to the attention” of would-be trespassers. But property owners who wish to exclude guns from their property are subject to the heightened, more onerous notice requirements imposed by the Acts.

59. As explained above, the Acts permit notice by oral or written communication, with a written communication defined as a card or other document containing the statutory language or a sign containing the statutory language and meeting other specific size and location requirements.

60. In practice, posting signs will be the only practicable option for property owners to effectively exclude guns from their property. Giving individual notice by oral communication or card to anyone carrying a gun risks physical confrontation and, in any event, is unworkable, particularly where the individual is carrying a concealed weapon. The alternative of providing individual oral or written notice to every person who enters the property is just as impracticable and exceedingly burdensome. Indeed, the only way for an owner to realistically comply with such a requirement would be to incur an additional financial burden in hiring an employee specifically dedicated to providing oral notice to each customer who enters the property. Even

then, this person would be required to engage in potentially dangerous one-on-one confrontations with individuals carrying weapons.

61. Notice via signage is thus the safest, most feasible, and most cost-effective method of providing notice to potential trespassers.

62. In order to exclude gun-carrying individuals, however, property owners are forced to display several square feet of imposing and text-heavy signage. These requirements prevent property owners—and small business owners in particular—from effectively conveying other messages to patrons and from maintaining the desired aesthetic of the property.

63. The signage requirements impose a number of burdens:

64. First, the size requirements for the signs ensure that the signs occupy a substantial amount of space on the front of the property.

65. Additionally, the consequence of the size and language requirements is to prevent property owners from communicating the “no guns” message on their own terms. The signs must contain wording “identical” to that in the Acts. A commonly-used “no weapons” sign won’t work. Thus, property owners wishing to communicate to patrons in a more nuanced manner would have to add yet another sign to their property front—for example, a sign stating: “This is a family establishment. While we deeply respect the Second Amendment, guns are not allowed on this property.”

66. The intrusive nature of the signs also essentially serves as a “Scarlet Letter,” causing passers-by to deem the establishment to be anti-gun. For example, Antidote Coffee received a public one-star rating from a Google Review user, who commented “The coffee shop posts 30.06 and 30.07 signage.”⁹

⁹ GOOGLE.COM, https://www.google.com/maps/contrib/104086667195114418802/place/ChIJmwSF6aW4QIYR8_c0PiFpuaI/@29.78

67. On top of that, the strict signage requirements have invited people, such as the individuals who post on www.texas3006.com, to find reasons to disregard the signs if deemed noncompliant. The website even has a “Wall of Shame,” which displays the names of the companies with the most entries.¹⁰

68. The size requirements also make it difficult, if not impossible, to print the signs at home. And unlike other state-mandated signs, the signs under the Acts are not provided for free by any state agency. Property owners must therefore purchase these signs at their own expense, often incurring costs of more than \$100.

69. In addition, the Acts require that the statutorily required text be displayed in Spanish, as well as English, yet the Acts do not provide the Spanish translation. It is therefore up to the property owner to determine the proper translation of the required language.

70. Furthermore, if a property owner opts to provide a “card or other document” to each individual entering their property—as opposed to posting a sign—the “card or other document” need not display the statutory text in Spanish. Tex. Penal Code § 30.06(c)(3)(A). This indicates that the drafters were not concerned with reaching Spanish speakers but instead intended to make the signs as large and intrusive as possible.

71. Making matters worse, the affirmative defense relating to oral notice creates confusion as to whether an individual who walks into a property with a gun is violating the law up until the property owner tells him or her to leave. Although it is clear that an individual who refuses to leave once asked is violating the law, the 2019 amendments create ambiguity in the law as to the

55094,-95.3899128,16.75z/data=!4m6!1m5!8m4!1e1!2s104086667195114418802!3m1!1e1?hl=en-US (last visited Oct. 30, 2022).

¹⁰ TEXAS3006.COM, <https://www.texas3006.com/view.php> (last visited Oct. 30, 2022).

customer's status before he or she is asked to leave. The legislative history suggests that those in favor of the amendment understood that it requires the property owner to provide individual oral notice before criminal trespass applies. Specifically, the House Research Organization's analysis of HB 121, which added the affirmative defense for gun-carriers who comply with oral notice to leave a property, states that "The bill would not make it more difficult for property owners to manage their property as *it would require only a verbal reminder to license holders* who must then leave" (emphasis added).¹¹ This reading would forbid prosecution where there is a compliant sign but no oral notice is given. In the end, the statute leaves property owners guessing as to what it requires.

72. If the 2019 amendments require property owners to provide individual oral notice in all instances, then the Acts impose even more onerous burdens on property owners. In addition to posting the signs, the property owner must approach an armed individual to tell him or her to leave, putting everyone at risk of a verbal or physical altercation. Additionally, a property owner cannot be expected to give individual oral notice where the person is carrying a concealed weapon, nor is it feasible to give individual oral notice to everyone entering the premises.

73. The only effective way for property owners to exclude guns from their property is through the criminal law of trespass. That is, the individual can summon the police to remove the individual from the premises.

¹¹ Texas House Research Organization, Bill Analysis, HB 121 (April 9, 2019), *available at* <https://hro.house.texas.gov/pdf/ba86r/hb0121.pdf#navpanes=0>. The opponents of the bill noted these concerns:

HB 121 would make it more difficult for business owners to keep guns off of their property. The bill could allow license holders to ignore signs prohibiting guns on the property and bring their weapons onto property until they are told otherwise. License holders should be held responsible for noticing and following posted signs, and property owners who post the required signs should not have to take the extra steps of tracking down patrons and giving verbal notifications to keep guns off their property.

Id.

74. Property owners have a strong interest in the deterrent effect of criminal sanctions in preventing the entry of persons carrying licensed firearms onto private property. A “criminal statute,” because of its “opprobrium and stigma,” as well as the penalty of “prison,” causes an “increased deterrent effect,” above and beyond the impact of ordinary “civil regulation.” *Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844, 872 (1997); *see also, e.g., Virginia v. Hicks*, 539 U.S. 113, 119 (2003) (repeating that the risk that a law will “deter or ‘chill’” conduct is heightened when the statute “imposes criminal sanctions”).

75. The existence of Second Amendment Auditors, and of users of and contributors to www.texas3006.com, demonstrate that such deterrent effect is necessary to effectively protect a private property owner’s right to exclude. Absent the deterrent effect of possible criminal sanctions enforced by all Defendants, people can and will carry licensed firearms onto private property against a private property owner’s wishes.

76. Plaintiffs’ property rights include the right to exclude persons carrying firearms. Plaintiffs are entitled to the government benefit of police protection, including police protection to enforce and protect property rights.

77. In addition to police protection, Plaintiffs are further entitled to the deterrent effect of the criminal law, enforced by all Defendants, in excluding persons from private property.

78. If Plaintiffs failed to comply with the notice provisions of the Acts, Plaintiffs would forfeit police protection to enforce and protect their right to exclude persons from private property on the basis that the person is carrying a licensed firearm.

79. If Plaintiffs failed to comply with the notice provisions of the Acts, Plaintiffs would forfeit the strong deterrent effect of the criminal law of the State of Texas, enforced by all Defendants, as it relates to the exclusion of persons carrying licensed firearms.

80. By impermissibly burdening property owners' rights to rely on the criminal law of trespass and the deterrent effect of the criminal law of trespass, the Acts make it impossible to exclude armed entrants without engaging in needlessly burdensome, government-scripted speech.

81. As set out in paragraphs 37-55 above, officers and prosecutors employed by Defendants are trained that when a property owner seeks to exclude a person on the basis that the person is carrying a licensed, concealed firearm, the operative notice-by-sign requirements are defined by 30.06(c)(3).

82. As set out in paragraphs 37-55 above, officers and prosecutors employed by Defendants are trained that when a property owner seeks to exclude a person on the basis that the person is openly carrying a licensed firearm, the operative notice-by-sign requirements are defined by Section 30.07(c)(3).

83. If Section 30.06(c)(3) were declared unconstitutional, or if officers and prosecutors employed by Defendants were enjoined from enforcing Section 30.06(c)(3), a property owner seeking to exclude a person on the basis that the person is carrying a licensed, concealed firearm could do so by providing "oral or written communication," and the content of the "written communication" would not be prescribed by statute. *See* § 30.06(b). Property owners could thus post a sign conforming to their preferred "no-guns" messaging, and they would have the benefit of Texas' criminal law to vindicate their property rights.

84. If Section 30.07(c)(3) were declared unconstitutional, or if officers and prosecutors employed by Defendants were enjoined from enforcing Section 30.07(c)(3), a property owner seeking to exclude a person on the basis that the person is openly carrying a licensed firearm could do so by providing "oral or written communication," and the content of the "written communication" would not be prescribed by statute. *See* § 30.07(b). Property owners could thus

post a sign conforming to their preferred “no-guns” messaging, and they would have the benefit of Texas’ criminal law to vindicate their property rights.

85. If Sections 30.06(c)(3) and 30.07(c)(3) were declared unconstitutional, or if Defendants were enjoined from applying those statutory provisions, the burdensome notice requirements set forth in Sections 30.06(c)(3) and 30.07(c)(3) would no longer be applied to determine whether there is probable cause to make an arrest for trespass by an individual carrying a licensed firearm, or whether there is probable cause to bring a prosecution for trespass by an individual carrying a licensed firearm. At that point, Plaintiffs would have the right to exclude licensed firearm carriers from their property, backed by the protection of the criminal law, including its deterrent effect, without having to engage in burdensome, government-scripted speech.

Burdens on Individual Plaintiffs

Burdens on Church Plaintiff

86. The Bay Area Unitarian Universalist Church (the “Church”) is a Unitarian Universalist church located in partly in the City of Houston and partly in the City of Webster, Texas. The Church owns the property on which the church building is located.

87. The Church has around 204 members, although a number of non-members also attend the Church’s services and other events.

88. When open carry laws went into effect in Texas, there was heightened anxiety among church members and church leadership regarding individuals carrying firearms and the safety of church attendees.

89. Currently, the Church displays the signs in English and Spanish required under the Open Carry Trespass Law at front and side entrances to the church building. Each sign is 18 by 24 inches.

90. The Church paid \$111.80 for these signs.

91. The Church displays only the signs required under the Open Carry Trespass Law because displaying signs under both the Open Carry Trespass Law and the Concealed Carry Trespass Law would have taken up too much space on the doorways and would be too obtrusive. The Church also believes that displaying both signs, given their size and imposing nature, would detract from the church experience by having visitors, upon entering the building, focus on guns instead of the Church's religious message.

92. The Church also displays rainbow stickers on the doors as a way to demonstrate inclusiveness with the LGBTQ community. And the Church sometimes displays information on these doors regarding upcoming church activities and events.

93. The doors to the Church are composed of see-through glass for safety and accessibility reasons—it is important that greeters are able to see who is on the other side of the door in order to address any security concerns and/or assist individuals with disabilities in entering the church. The clear doors are also meant to convey the Church's commitment to openness and inclusion.

94. The Church has an official policy that forbids carrying firearms, whether open or concealed, onto church property. Given the size requirements for the signs under the Acts, however, the Church had decided not to post both signs, and so the signage does not match the Church's policy. The dissymmetry between the displayed signs and church policy can be confusing to congregants.

95. Because the Church does not post the signage required by § 30.06, it does not have the benefit of Texas criminal law to exclude individuals who are carrying licensed concealed firearms onto the Church's property. It would be impractical for the Church to provide individualized notice, either orally or by card, to everyone carrying a handgun. There is no way for greeters or

anyone else at the Church to know whether someone is carrying a concealed handgun, so the Church would be required to provide notice to every person who enters the Church. Given the volume and frequency of people entering the Church and the Church grounds for various reasons, this is completely impracticable. The Church is also opposed to providing individual notice to each person orally or by card because doing so would be abrasive, unwelcoming, and off-putting to worshipers, and would substantially alter the churchgoer experience.

96. One of the most fundamental religious tenets of the Church is to address conflict through conversation, non-violence, love, and compassion. The Church believes that the signs required by the Acts detract from those religious principles.

97. Additionally, the Church intends its building to be a refuge for peace and tranquility, and the Church believes that the signs detract from this purpose because they are constant and imposing reminders of guns and violence.

98. The Church leadership deems the signs ugly and intimidating, and the group debated whether to display the signs at all, as they were likely to make the congregants uncomfortable and detract from the desired religious experience.

99. Greeters at the doors of the Church are trained that if someone appears to have a firearm, to ask the person to leave the firearm outside, but only if the greeter feels comfortable doing so. However, if the greeter feels uncomfortable approaching the person, or if the conversation becomes confrontational, the greeters are instructed to immediately call 911.

100. If given a choice, the Church would prefer to display simpler signage that is smaller and more easily understandable.

Burdens on Coffee Shop Plaintiffs

101. Plaintiff Antidote Coffee Shop is located in Houston and sells coffee, wine, ice cream and other confections to the community. Plaintiff Perk You Later owns the building in which Antidote is located. Antidote's customers include adults, children, and families. Customers also frequently bring pets to the coffee shop.

102. In keeping with the owners' views of the character of a neighborhood family coffee shop, Antidote Coffee Shop and Perk You Later object to guns being on the property. They believe that the presence of guns would be unsafe because Antidote's customers regularly bring children and pets on the property and because Antidote serves alcohol in addition to other items. In prior years, Antidote displayed a 3 by 3 inch sign with a picture of a gun in a red circle underneath a diagonal red line. This sign was posted in the same front-door location as other signs displayed or previously displayed, such as a sign urging customers to "shop local." Dawn Callaway, one of the owners of Antidote, was able to obtain this no-guns sign from a friend for free.

103. Since approximately 2016, Antidote has posted both the § 30.06 and § 30.07 signs required by the Acts. Antidote has had to replace these signs on two occasions—once due to a break-in and a second time during the spring of 2020 when the shop needed to apply sealant to its windows. Demonstrating the confusing nature of the Acts, in 2020 Antidote initially posted two § 30.06 signs, even though it had intended to prohibit both concealed and open carry, as it had in the past. Antidote later purchased and posted additional § 30.07 signs. Since 2021, Antidote has posted § 30.05(c) signs in addition to § 30.06 and 30.07 signs.

104. These signs cover a large portion of the bottom of the windowpanes at Antidote's two entrances and are detrimental to the desired "neighborhood coffee shop" aesthetic. The

owners worry that the first things Antidote's customers are forced to think about when entering the shop are weapons and criminal prosecutions. They also believe that the signage requirements force Antidote to make "a bold political statement" regarding guns, given the intrusiveness and size of the signs.

105. Before 2020, Antidote paid approximately \$70 for these signs and about \$90 to have them installed on the window. In 2020, Antidote paid approximately \$40 for the § 30.06 signs and \$59.67 for the § 30.07 signs. In 2021, Antidote paid \$243.00 for its current § 30.06, § 30.07, and § 30.05(c) signs.

106. Each pair of the newest § 30.06 and § 30.07 signs measures 26.5 by 21 inches, and each of the new § 30.05(c) signs measures 11 by 17 inches, totaling approximately 10.33 square feet.

107. Less than 51 percent of Antidote's income is derived from the sale of alcohol. Specifically, from June 30, 2021, to May 31, 2022, just 4 percent of Antidote's total sales were derived from the sale of alcohol. Accordingly, Antidote does not post the red TABC signs contemplated by Texas Government Code § 411.204.

108. Antidote's staff have occasionally encountered customers who are bothered by the required signage. Neither Ms. Callaway nor her business partners recall this happening with the original, pictographic sign.

109. Additionally, a member of the www.texas3006.com website added Antidote to the website's message board on June 3, 2017 and noted, "I guess I have to go somewhere else for coffee."¹²

¹² Post by Texas12Gauge, TEXAS3006.COM (June 3, 2017), https://www.texas3006.com/view.php?postedsearch=true&Search=Search&business_name=antidote&category=+&address=&city=&restriction_type=+_

Business Name	Category	Address	City	Type	Location	Valid	Comments	Date	Username
Antidote Coffee Shop	Restaurant	729 Studewood St	Houston	30.06 & 30.07 Sign	At both entrances.	Yes	I guess I have to go somewhere else for coffee. 0 additional comments	2017-06-03	Texas12Gauge

110. Antidote’s staff does not feel comfortable providing personal oral notice to individuals who are or might be armed, as such interactions might lead to verbal or physical altercations in a family-type environment.

111. On at least two occasions, patrons entered the premises with handguns despite the signs, forcing staff to confront these patrons and ask them to leave. On these occasions, the patrons initially refused to depart despite the staff members’ requests.

112. Ms. Callaway and the other managers and owners of Antidote want to be able to call the police to remove individuals who enter the property carrying a gun despite Antidote’s no-guns signs.

113. If the current signage requirements were not in place, Antidote would post a no-guns sign similar to the pictographic sign it used to display.

VII. THE ACTS ARE CONTENT-BASED AND VIEWPOINT-BASED

114. The Acts constitute content-based regulations on speech. Property owners who wish to exclude people from their property for reasons other than that the person is carrying a handgun are free to provide notice in a variety of ways, including through any type of sign that is “reasonably likely to come to the attention” of potential trespassers Tex. Penal Code § 30.05(b)(2)(C). On the other hand, if property owners object to individuals carrying handguns on their property, they are forced to communicate that message in a way that is unduly burdensome and crowds out opportunity for nuanced messaging or speech on other topics; namely, by posting several square feet of text-heavy and expensive signage containing the exact language

prescribed by the Acts. In other words, the State dictates, down to the letter, the content to be included on the sign.

115. The Acts are also viewpoint based—they favor one side of a deeply contested political debate. If a property owner’s viewpoint leads him or her to wish to exclude any individual who is *not* carrying a handgun, he or she can do so using the more lenient notice requirements under the General Trespass Law. If, however, a property owner’s viewpoint leads him or her to wish to exclude any individual who *is* carrying a handgun, he or she can do so only by carefully following the strict and burdensome notice requirements under the Acts.

116. Indeed, the Texas state land commissioner who wrote the language for the heightened sign requirements admits that he “intentionally made the sign’s language cumbersome so as to discourage businesses from curbing the right to bear arms while shopping or eating out or buying shoes.”¹³ Thus, in constructing the heightened-notice regime, the State sought to discourage expression of a viewpoint with which it disagrees.

VIII. THE ACTS ARE UNJUSTIFIED BY ANY LEGISLATIVE PURPOSE, OVERBROAD, UNDERINCLUSIVE, AND NOT SUFFICIENTLY TAILORED

117. The Acts’ heightened requirements, which discriminate on the basis of viewpoint, are not justified by any valid legislative purpose. Rather, all the Acts do is burden the speech of property owners who wish to exercise their established right to exclude by imposing the extensive signage requirements detailed above. The Acts fail the heightened scrutiny that is triggered by their viewpoint discrimination and burdening of property owners’ right to exclude.

118. In the Texas Legislature, proponents of the Acts did not identify any actual, known deficiency in, or harm flowing from, the notice requirements already included in § 30.05(b)(2);

¹³ See Laylan Copeline, *Limiting guns at Texas business? It’s a legal – and legalese – fight*, STATESMAN, <https://www.statesman.com/story/business/2014/12/27/limiting-guns-at-texas-businesses/6722360007/> (last updated Dec. 11, 2018, 11:28 AM).

or any concrete benefit flowing from the Acts' additional signage requirements. For example, the House Research Organization's bill analysis for HB 910, which added the Open Carry Trespass Law to establish a new offense for open carry paralleling the offense in the Concealed Carry Trespass Law, does not explain why ordinary notice under § 30.05(b)(2) will not suffice.¹⁴ The bill analysis for the Concealed Carry Trespass law is similarly devoid of any such explanation.¹⁵

119. Moreover, proponents of the Acts in the Texas Legislature did not explain why it is permissible to selectively burden the speech of property owners based on their viewpoint. For example, the House Research Organization's analysis of HB 910, while it notes bill opponents' objection that "[t]he bill would make notice requirements onerous" and that "[t]his especially would impact smaller businesses," offers no substantive response. Rather, it simply asserts, in conclusory fashion, that "[t]he requirement to display more than one sign would not be overly burdensome for business owners." The analysis includes no reasoning or evidence to support this assertion.¹⁶ The House bill analysis for the Concealed Carry Trespass Law similarly lacks evidence or explanation addressing the burden the law placed on the speech and exclusion rights of property owners.¹⁷

120. Like trespass under the Acts, trespass under the General Trespass Law results in criminal penalties (a Class A, B, or C misdemeanor, depending on the circumstances). Tex. Penal Code § 30.05(d). In fact, trespass under the General Trespass Law can even give the property owner the right to use force against the trespasser. *See* Tex. Penal Code § 9.41. Yet the Texas

¹⁴ *See* Texas House Research Organization, Bill Analysis, HB 910 (Apr. 17, 2015), *available at* <https://hro.house.texas.gov/pdf/ba84R/HB0910.PDF>.

¹⁵ *See* Texas House Research Organization, Bill Analysis, HB 2909 (May 13, 1997), *available at* <https://hro.house.texas.gov/pdf/ba75R/HB2909.PDF>.

¹⁶ *See* Texas House Research Organization, Bill Analysis, HB 910 (April 17, 2015), *available at* <https://hro.house.texas.gov/pdf/ba84r/hb0910.pdf#navpanes=0>.

¹⁷ *See* Texas House Research Organization, Bill Analysis, HB 2909 (May 13, 1997), *available at* <https://hro.house.texas.gov/pdf/ba75R/HB2909.PDF>.

legislature deemed the notice under the General Trespass Law to be sufficient with respect to everyone except handgun-carrying trespassers. Even other items carried for self-protection, including other “arms” under the Second Amendment (such as long guns and knives), are not covered by the more restrictive trespass requirements.

121. Carrying a firearm onto the premises of a business deriving 51% or more of its business from alcohol sales also results in criminal liability—a third degree felony. Tex. Penal Code § 46.035(b)(1), (g). Yet the Red Signs required under § 46.035 have no specific wording requirements. Tex. Gov’t Code § 411.204(a), (c).

122. Accordingly, the Texas legislature determined that less onerous signage requirements were sufficient to provide notice to gun-carrying individuals entering establishments serving alcoholic beverages, even though an infraction could result in a felony charge.

123. Other states’ signage requirements are far less burdensome. *See supra* ¶ 25.

124. Studies and common sense indicate that shorter, simpler messaging is not only easier to read, it is also more likely to be read than the text-heavy signage Texas requires.¹⁸

125. Simple pictogram signs are also more likely to be understood by individuals who do not speak English or Spanish, or who cannot read.

126. These alternative measures would be just as effective in providing notice, if not more so. Indeed, websites like www.texas3006.com show that people *are* noticing no-guns signs, even ones that are not strictly compliant with the Acts.

127. The affirmative defense under the Acts, if interpreted to require property owners to provide oral notice *in addition* to notice by signs, further illustrates that the Acts are not

¹⁸ *See, e.g.*, Dennis R. Proffitt & Melissa M. Wade, *Creating Effective Variable Message Signs: Human Factors Issues*, VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH COUNCIL, No. 98-CR31 (Mar. 1998); Reuvan Sussman & Robert Gifford, *Please turn off the lights: the effectiveness of visual prompts*, 43 APPLIED ERGONOMICS 596 (May 2012).

sufficiently tailored to governmental interests. If Texas were truly interested in providing notice to would-be trespassers, that interest is served by either signage *or* oral notification. It makes no sense to require both forms of communication only for a small subset of potential trespassers.

128. The Acts' lack of tailoring provides further evidence that the true reason for the heightened speech requirements is to place a burden on property owners expressing a certain viewpoint on guns, not to secure better notice for potential trespassers. In other words, the State is seeking through the Acts to discourage expression of a viewpoint with which it disagrees.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I

(Freedom of Speech – First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution)

129. Plaintiffs incorporate the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

130. The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides in relevant part: “Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech.” U.S. Const. amend. I.

131. The First Amendment is applicable to state and local governments by incorporation in the Fourteenth Amendment.

132. A private property owner has the right to exclusive control over his or her own property.

133. The Acts unconstitutionally compel speech that is unduly burdensome. They force Texas property owners to deliver government-scripted speech in a manner intended to disfavor their viewpoint on guns. In order to exclude guns from their property, property owners are compelled to communicate specific words in a highly burdensome manner so as to rule out other effective ways of delivering the same message on the property owners' own terms. The burdensome notice requirements also interfere with property owners' communications of other important messages via signage on their properties.

134. The Acts impose unconstitutional conditions on property owners' ability to enforce their property rights. Property owners are required to relay a government-drafted script in a highly burdensome manner in order to avail themselves of the protection of criminal law to exclude others from their property.

135. The Acts are also vague and do not provide adequate guidance to Texas property owners concerning what speech is adequate to exercise their right to exclude others from their property. Specifically, the Acts do not provide adequate guidance as to whether an owner must provide oral notice – regardless of whether the owner had posted appropriate signs – in order to overcome the affirmative defense under Texas Penal Code §§ 30.06(g); 30.07(h).

136. The Acts are content-based, subject-matter based, and viewpoint-based. They apply only to particular speech based on the topic discussed (guns) and the message expressed (no guns allowed).

137. The Acts alter and restrict the content of property owners' speech.

138. The Acts chill speech based not only on content but also a particular viewpoint.

139. The Acts are unconstitutionally overbroad.

140. The Acts are drastically underinclusive.

141. The Acts are not sufficiently tailored to further a governmental interest and do not do so by the least restrictive means.

142. Less speech-restrictive and less burdensome alternatives exist to further the governmental interest of ensuring that gun carriers are provided notice that handguns are prohibited. In fact, these alternatives would in many instances be *more* effective in providing notice.

143. Under any applicable level of scrutiny, the Acts are unconstitutional on their face and as applied to Plaintiffs.

COUNT II
(Freedom of Association – First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution)

144. Plaintiffs incorporate the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

145. The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides in relevant part: “Congress shall make no law . . . abridging . . . the right of the people peaceably to assemble.” U.S. Const. amend. I.

146. The First Amendment is applicable to state and local governments by incorporation in the Fourteenth Amendment.

147. The Church Plaintiff is a religious organization founded on the tenets of compassion, love, and non-violence. Permitting individuals carrying guns to attend church services and other events would impact the content and nature of the Church’s mission and message.

148. Requiring the Church to admit individuals with guns onto its premises unless it follows the burdensome notice requirements imposed by the Acts infringes on the Church’s right to free association.

149. Under any applicable level of scrutiny, the Acts are unconstitutional on their face and as applied to Plaintiffs.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request that this Court enter judgment in their favor and:

a. Declare the heightened notice requirements imposed by Texas Penal Code §§ 30.06(c)(3) and 30.07(c)(3) to be unconstitutional on their face and as applied under the United States and Texas Constitutions, and that property owners seeking to exclude licensed handguns from their properties need only provide notice by “oral or written communication.”

b. Enter an injunction against enforcement of the heightened notice requirements imposed by Texas Penal Code §§ 30.06(c)(3) and 30.07(c)(3) and requiring that property owners seeking to exclude guns from their properties need only provide notice by “oral or written communication.”

c. Award Plaintiffs their litigation costs and reasonable attorneys’ fees and expenses under 42 U.S.C. § 1988; and

d. Order such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: October 31, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

Alla Lefkowitz
Admitted pro hac vice
Andrew Nellis
Admitted pro hac vice
EVERYTOWN LAW
P.O. Box 14780
Washington, DC 20044
Telephone: (202) 545-3257, ext. 1007
alefkowitz@everytown.org
anellis@everytown.org

Ryan Gerber
Admitted pro hac vice
Laura Keeley
Admitted pro hac vice
EVERYTOWN LAW
450 Lexington Avenue
P.O. Box 4184
New York, NY 10017
Telephone: (646) 324-8198
rgerber@everytown.org
lkeeley@everytown.org

/s/ William R. Taylor
William R. Taylor
Attorney-in-Charge
TX State Bar No. 24070727
wrtaylor@jonesday.com
JONES DAY
717 Texas
Suite 3300
Houston, Texas 77002
Telephone: +1.832.239.3860
Facsimile: +1.832.239.3600

Peter C. Canfield
Admitted pro hac vice
pcanfield@jonesday.com
JONES DAY
1420 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Suite 800
Atlanta, GA 30309
Telephone: +1.404.521.3939
Facsimile: +1.404.581.8330

Charlotte H. Taylor
Admitted pro hac vice
Lesley Roe
Admitted pro hac vice
ctaylor@jonesday.com
lroe@jonesday.com
JONES DAY
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: +1.202.879.3939
Facsimile: +1.202.626.1700

Calland M. Ferraro
Admitted pro hac vice
JONES DAY
901 Lakeside Ave. E
Cleveland, OH 44114
216-586-7088

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT 4

From: Azadeh, Melissa - LGL <Melissa.Azadeh@houstontx.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 10:51 AM
To: Ryan Gerber
Cc: Alla Lefkowitz; Taylor, Charlotte H.; Andrew Nellis; Roe, Lesley E.; Laura Keeley; Taylor, William R.; Jones, Shirley - LGL
Subject: Re: Bay Area Unitarian Universalist Church et al. v. Ogg. et al., Case No. 4:20-cv-3081 (S.D. Tex.)

**** External mail ****

Dear Ryan:

Plaintiffs cannot amend a complaint that has been dismissed as to Chief Finner. Even if procedurally they could, all the deadlines for amendment have expired. Plaintiffs did not seek leave to amend their complaint in response to Chief Finner's 12(c) or 12(b) motions. They can neither establish good cause nor show amendment would not be futile. If you have not, I suggest you review the Commander's deposition, which confirms plaintiffs lack standing against Chief Finner. Also review your client, Ms. Callaway's, who testified Antidote receives about 50% of its revenue from alcohol sales. They require no signs and guns are prohibited by law.

We strongly oppose both an amended complaint and scheduling order.

Thank you,

Melissa

Melissa Azadeh
Sr. Assistant City Attorney II
City of Houston Legal Department
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77002-0368
832-393-6270
832-393-6259 fax
melissa.azadeh@houstontx.gov

THIS ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL. DO NOT read, copy, or disseminate this communication unless you are the intended addressee. If you received this data in error, please notify me, destroy all copies immediately and do not copy or distribute the information.

From: Ryan Gerber <rgerber@everytown.org>
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2022 9:37:59 AM
To: Azadeh, Melissa - LGL <Melissa.Azadeh@houstontx.gov>
Cc: Alla Lefkowitz <alefkowitz@everytown.org>; Taylor, Charlotte H. <ctaylor@jonesday.com>; Andrew Nellis <anellis@everytown.org>; Roe, Lesley E. <lroe@jonesday.com>; Laura Keeley <lkeeley@everytown.org>; Taylor, William

R. <wrtaylor@jonesday.com>

Subject: Bay Area Unitarian Universalist Church et al. v. Ogg. et al., Case No. 4:20-cv-3081 (S.D. Tex.)

[This message came from outside the City of Houston email system. Please be careful while clicking links, opening attachments, or replying to this email.]

Melissa,

As you know, on September 29, 2022, the Court dismissed the complaint as to Chief Finner without prejudice. The Plaintiffs plan to amend the complaint in response to this decision. Please let us know whether the Chief will consent to the filing of an amended complaint. We are open to a streamlined schedule that would avoid the need for additional discovery or filing a new answer. Happy to jump on the phone to discuss in more detail.

Thanks,
Ryan

--

RYAN GERBER | COUNSEL

RGERBER@EVERYTOWN.ORG | (646) 324-8198

EVERYTOWN LAW

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Everytown Law which may be confidential or privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify us immediately.