

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

EMILEE CARPENTER, LLC d/b/a  
Emilee Carpenter Photography and  
Emilee Carpenter,

**21-CV-6303**

Plaintiffs,

-vs-

LETITIA JAMES, in her official capacity as  
Attorney General of the State of New York;  
JONATHAN J. SMITH, in his official capacity  
as Interim Commissioner of the New York State  
Division of Human Rights; and  
WEEDEN WETMORE, in his official capacity as  
District Attorney of Chemung County,

Defendants.

---

**NOTICE OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF AS AMICI CURIAE**

Massachusetts, California, Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawai‘i, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington hereby move this Court for an order granting leave to file a brief as amici curiae in support of the motion to dismiss filed by Defendants Letitia James, Jonathan J. Smith, and Weeden Wetmore and in opposition to the motion for a preliminary injunction filed by Plaintiffs Emilee Carpenter, LLC and Emilee Carpenter. Amici are fellow States that share Defendants’ compelling interest in combating discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community—and members of other protected groups—in public accommodations and in the marketplace. In the attached brief, amici discuss the foundations of statutory protections for members of the LGBTQ community

and demonstrate that laws forbidding discrimination in public accommodations do not infringe on Plaintiffs' rights under the First Amendment.

While “there is no governing standard, rule or statute prescribing the procedure for obtaining leave to file an amicus brief in the district court, . . . district courts have broad inherent authority” to grant interested parties leave to appear as amici curiae. *Onondaga Indian Nation v. State of New York*, 1997 WL 369389, at \*2 (N.D.N.Y. June 25, 1997) (cleaned up). The proposed memorandum's discussion of the interests of States other than that served by Defendants may assist the Court in resolving the pending motions. Accordingly, amici request that the Court grant them leave to file the proposed brief.

Dated: July 2, 2021

/s/ Adam M. Cambier

MAURA HEALEY  
*Attorney General*  
*Commonwealth of Massachusetts*  
Elizabeth N. Dewar  
*State Solicitor*  
Adam M. Cambier\*  
*Assistant Attorney General*  
One Ashburton Place  
Boston, Massachusetts 02108  
Tel.: 617-963-2278  
Email: adam.cambier@mass.gov

\* Counsel of Record, admitted *pro hac vice*

ROBERT BONTA  
*Attorney General of California*  
1300 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

KWAME RAOUL  
*Attorney General of Illinois*  
100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60601

WILLIAM TONG  
*Attorney General of Connecticut*  
165 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, CT 06106

AARON M. FREY  
*Attorney General of Maine*  
6 State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333

KATHLEEN JENNINGS  
*Attorney General of Delaware*  
820 North French Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801

BRIAN E. FROSH  
*Attorney General of Maryland*  
200 Saint Paul Place  
Baltimore, MD 21202

KARL A. RACINE  
*Attorney General for the District of Columbia*  
400 6th Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20001

DANA NESSEL  
*Attorney General of Michigan*  
P.O. Box 30212  
Lansing, MI 48909

CLARE E. CONNORS  
*Attorney General of Hawai'i*  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813

KEITH ELLISON  
*Attorney General of Minnesota*  
102 State Capitol  
75 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard  
St. Paul, MN 55155

AARON D. FORD  
*Attorney General of Nevada*  
100 North Carson Street  
Carson City, NV 89701

GURBIR S. GREWAL  
*Attorney General of New Jersey*  
25 Market Street  
Trenton, NJ 08625

HECTOR BALDERAS  
*Attorney General of New Mexico*  
P.O. Drawer 1508  
Santa Fe, NM 87504

JOSHUA H. STEIN  
*Attorney General of North Carolina*  
114 W. Edenton Street  
Raleigh, NC 27603

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM  
*Attorney General of Oregon*  
1162 Court Street N.E.  
Salem, OR 97301

JOSH SHAPIRO  
*Attorney General of Pennsylvania*  
16th Floor, Strawberry Square  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

PETER F. NERONHA  
*Attorney General of Rhode Island*  
150 South Main Street  
Providence, RI 02903

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.  
*Attorney General of Vermont*  
109 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05609

MARK R. HERRING  
*Attorney General of Virginia*  
202 North 9th Street  
Richmond, VA 23219

ROBERT W. FERGUSON  
*Attorney General of Washington*  
P.O. Box 40100  
Olympia, WA 98504

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on July 2, 2021, the foregoing motion was filed electronically using the Court's CM/ECF system, through which counsel for all parties will be served.

*/s/ Adam M. Cambier* \_\_\_\_\_

Adam M. Cambier

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

EMILEE CARPENTER, LLC d/b/a  
Emilee Carpenter Photography and  
Emilee Carpenter,

**21-CV-6303**

Plaintiffs,

-vs-

LETITIA JAMES, in her official capacity as  
Attorney General of the State of New York;  
JONATHAN J. SMITH, in his official capacity  
as Interim Commissioner of the New York State  
Division of Human Rights; and  
WEEDEN WETMORE, in his official capacity as  
District Attorney of Chemung County,

Defendants.

---

**PROPOSED BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE MASSACHUSETTS, CALIFORNIA,  
CONNECTICUT, DELAWARE, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HAWAI'I,  
ILLINOIS, MAINE, MARYLAND, MICHIGAN, MINNESOTA, NEVADA, NEW  
JERSEY, NEW MEXICO, NORTH CAROLINA, OREGON, PENNSYLVANIA, RHODE  
ISLAND, VERMONT, VIRGINIA, AND WASHINGTON IN SUPPORT OF  
DEFENDANTS**

MAURA HEALEY  
*Attorney General*  
*Commonwealth of Massachusetts*  
Elizabeth N. Dewar  
*State Solicitor*  
Adam M. Cambier\*  
*Assistant Attorney General*  
One Ashburton Place  
Boston, Massachusetts 02108  
Tel.: 617-963-2278  
Email: adam.cambier@mass.gov

\* Counsel of Record, admitted *pro hac vice*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION AND INTERESTS OF AMICI..... 1

ARGUMENT..... 2

    I. States across the country have enacted laws to combat discrimination against LGBTQ people in public accommodations. .... 2

        A. LGBTQ Americans are a historically disadvantaged group. .... 3

        B. States prohibit discrimination against LGBTQ people in public accommodations to prevent severe economic, personal, and social harms. .... 4

    II. The First Amendment does not exempt businesses open to the public from state anti-discrimination laws. .... 8

        A. State public accommodations laws do not violate the Free Speech Clause when applied to people with objections to serving LGBTQ customers. .... 9

        B. State public accommodations laws do not violate the Free Exercise Clause..... 17

    III. A First Amendment exemption to public accommodations laws of the kind sought by Plaintiffs would dramatically undermine anti-discrimination laws. .... 19

CONCLUSION..... 20

ADDENDUM..... 23

Table A: State Laws..... 23

Table B: Local Laws..... 24

Table C: Discriminatory Advertising Laws..... 30

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

*Anderson v. Treadwell*,  
294 F.3d 453 (2d Cir. 2002).....12

*Bd. of Dirs. of Rotary Int’l v. Rotary Club of Duarte*,  
481 U.S. 537 (1987)..... 14-16

*Bostock v. Clayton County, Georgia*,  
140 S. Ct. 1731 (2020).....6

*Burt v. Gates*,  
502 F.3d 183 (2d Cir. 2007).....9

*Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*,  
573 U.S. 682 (2014).....15

*Cervelli v. Aloha Bed & Breakfast*,  
415 P.3d 919 (Haw. Ct. App. 2018) .....14

*Christian Legal Soc. v. U.C. Hastings*,  
561 U.S. 661 (2010).....8, 14

*City Council of Los Angeles v. Taxpayers for Vincent*,  
466 U.S. 789 (1984)..... 6-7

*Daniel v. Paul*,  
395 U.S. 298 (1969)..... 4-5

*Elane Photography, LLC v. Willock*,  
309 P.3d 53 (N.M. 2013) .....12

*Employment Div. v. Smith*,  
494 U.S. 872 (1990).....18

*Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*,  
\_\_ U.S. \_\_, No. 19-123 (June 17, 2021) .....2

*Gay Rights Coal. of Georgetown Univ. Law Ctr. v. Georgetown Univ.*,  
536 A.2d 1 (D.C. 1987) .....14

*Giboney v. Empire Storage & Ice Co.*,  
336 U.S. 490 (1949).....11

*Gifford v. McCarthy*,  
137 A.D.3d 30 (N.Y. App. Div. 2016) .....14

*Goodpaster v. City of Indianapolis*,  
736 F.3d 1060 (7th Cir. 2013) .....12

*Goodridge v. Dep’t of Pub. Health*,  
798 N.E.2d 941 (Mass. 2003) ..... 2-3

*Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. United States*,  
379 U.S. 241 (1964).....2, 4-5, 16-17

*Holcomb v. Iona Coll.*,  
521 F.3d 130 (2d Cir. 2008).....8

*Hurley v. Irish American Gay, Lesbian & Bisexual Group of Boston*,  
515 U.S. 557 (1995).....11, 19

*Int’l Bhd. of Teamsters v. United States*,  
431 U.S. 324 (1977).....13

*Katzenbach v. McClung*,  
379 U.S. 294 (1964).....8, 17

*Lawrence v. Texas*,  
539 U.S. 558 (2003) .....8

*Lombard v. Louisiana*,  
373 U.S. 267 (1963).....5

*Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colorado Civil Rights Comm’n*,  
138 S. Ct. 1719 (2018).....2, 4-5, 14-16, 20

*N. Coast Women’s Care Med. Grp., Inc. v. San Diego Cty. Super. Ct.*,  
189 P.3d 959 (Cal. 2008) .....14

*Obergefell v. Hodges*,  
576 U.S. 644 (2015)..... 2-3, 16

*Pittsburgh Press Co. v. Human Relations Comm’n*,  
413 U.S. 376 (1973).....12

*Pruneyard Shopping Ctr. v. Robins*,  
447 U.S. 74 (1980).....11

*Ragin v. New York Times Co.*,  
923 F.2d 995 (2d Cir. 1991).....7, 13

*Roberts v. United States Jaycees*,  
468 U.S. 609 (1984).....2, 4, 6-7, 12, 14-17

*Romer v. Evans*,  
517 U.S. 620 (1996).....2, 15

*Rumsfeld v. Forum for Acad. & Inst’l Rights, Inc.*,  
547 U.S. 47 (2006)..... 9-13

*Snyder v. Phelps*,  
562 U.S. 443 (2011).....20

*Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.*,  
564 U.S. 552 (2011).....13

*Soules v. Dep’t of Hous. & Urb. Dev.*,  
967 F.2d 817 (2d Cir. 1992).....13

*State v. Arlene’s Flowers, Inc.*,  
441 P.3d 1203 (Wash. 2019).....17

*Telescope Media Grp. v. Lucero*,  
936 F.3d 740 (8th Cir. 2019) .....13

*Wooley v. Maynard*,  
430 U.S. 705 (1977).....10

*Zarda v. Altitude Express, Inc.*,  
883 F.3d 100 (2d Cir. 2018).....8

**Constitutional Provisions, Statutes, and Rules**

U.S. Const. amend. 1 ..... *passim*

42 U.S.C. § 3604.....7

42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3.....7

Act Forbidding Unjust Discrimination on Account of Color or Race,  
1865 Mass. Acts, ch. 277 (May 16, 1865).....5

Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 272, § 92A .....7

Mont. Code Ann. § 49-2-304(1)(b).....7

N.Y. Exec. Law § 296.2(a) .....7, 18

N.Y. Sexual Orientation Non-Discrimination Act of 2002, ch. 2, § 1.....6

Or. Rev. Stat. § 659A.409.....7

Va. Code § 2.2-3904 .....7

Florida Commission on Human Relations, *Notice: Sexual Discrimination*  
(2021).....6

**Miscellaneous**

Center for the Study of Inequality, Cornell University, *What Does the Scholarly  
Research Say About the Effects of Discrimination on the Health of  
LGBT People?, What We Know Project* (2019) .....4

Tim Fitzsimons, *Nearly 1 in 5 Hate Crimes Motivated by Anti-LGBTQ Bias,  
FBI Finds*, NBC News (Nov. 12, 2019) .....3

Mark L. Hatzenbuehler, *Structural Stigma: Research Evidence and Implications  
for Psychological Science*, 71 *Am. Psychologist* 742 (2016).....4

Mark L. Hatzenbuehler, *The Social Environment and Suicide Attempts in  
Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youth*, 127 *Pediatrics* 896 (2011).....4

Mark L. Hatzenbuehler et al., *State-Level Policies and Psychiatric Morbidity in  
Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Populations*, 99 *Am. J. Pub. Health* 2275  
(2009).....4

Christy Mallory & Brad Sears, *Refusing to Serve LGBT People: An Empirical  
Assessment of Complaints Filed under State Public Accommodations  
Non-Discrimination Laws*, 8 *J. Res. Gender Stud.* 106 (2018) .....3

Christy Mallory & Brad Sears, *LGBT Discrimination, Subnational Public  
Policy, and Law in the United States*, in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia  
of Politics* 1 (2020).....3

Tasseli McKay et al., *Understanding (and Acting On) 20 Years of Research on  
Violence and LGBTQ + Communities*, 20 *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 665  
(2019).....3

Julia Raifman et al., *Association of State Laws Permitting Denial of Services to Same-Sex Couples with Mental Distress in Sexual Minority Adults: A Difference-in-Difference-in-Differences Analysis*, 75 JAMA Psychiatry 671 (2018).....4

Julia Raifman et al., *Difference-in-Differences Analysis of the Association Between State Same-Sex Marriage Policies and Adolescent Suicide Attempts*, 171 JAMA Pediatrics 350 (2017) .....4

Brief for Appellees, *Katzenbach v. McClung*, No. 543, 1964 WL 81100 (U.S. Oct. 2, 1964) .....17

*Reuters/Ipsos/UVA Center for Politics Race Poll* (Sept. 11, 2017) .....20

## INTRODUCTION AND INTERESTS OF AMICI

The *Amici* States—Massachusetts, California, Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawai‘i, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington—file this brief in support of New York’s motion to dismiss and in opposition to Plaintiffs’ request for a preliminary injunction because we share sovereign and compelling interests in protecting our residents and visitors from discrimination. Like New York, we support civil rights protections for LGBTQ people, including prohibitions on discrimination in places of public accommodation: the diners, stores, and other businesses that are part of daily life in a free society. Such public accommodations laws respond to the pervasive discrimination LGBTQ people have long suffered and continue to suffer today, ensuring equal enjoyment of goods and services and combatting the severe personal, economic, and social harms caused by discrimination.

The *Amici* States also share interests in upholding the rights protected by the First Amendment. We respect and do not seek to abridge the right to hold and express views regarding the nature of marriage, including views founded in religious faith. But neither the Free Speech Clause nor the Free Exercise Clause shields businesses from content-neutral, generally applicable civil rights laws like the one Emilee Carpenter, LLC (together with its proprietor, Ms. Emilee Carpenter, “Plaintiffs”) proposes to violate.

Exempting businesses from public accommodations laws on the basis of the First Amendment would undermine the vital benefits these laws provide to residents and visitors. Many Americans would face exclusion from a host of everyday businesses or, at the very least,

the ever-present threat that any business owner could refuse to serve them when they walk in the door—simply because of their sexual orientation, or their race, religion, or gender.

The *Amici* States therefore join New York in asking this Court to deny Plaintiffs’ request for a preliminary injunction and to dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim.

## ARGUMENT

### **I. States across the country have enacted laws to combat discrimination against LGBTQ people in public accommodations.**

The States have sovereign and compelling interests in protecting their residents, and particularly members of historically disadvantaged groups, from the economic, personal, and social harms caused by invidious discrimination. *See Roberts v. United States Jaycees*, 468 U.S. 609, 624 (1984). Since the mid-nineteenth century, statutes focused on places of public accommodation have been a centerpiece of state efforts to combat discrimination. *See Romer v. Evans*, 517 U.S. 620, 627-28 (1996). These statutes have long been held constitutional as applied to a range of public accommodations, including commercial businesses. *See, e.g., Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. United States*, 379 U.S. 241, 260 (1964).

Because “[o]ur society has come to the recognition that gay persons and gay couples cannot be treated as social outcasts or as inferior in dignity and worth” and because this “interest is a weighty one,” many States and other jurisdictions throughout the country expressly protect LGBTQ people from discrimination in places of public accommodation. *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, \_\_ U.S. \_\_, No. 19-123, slip op. at 14-15 (June 17, 2021) (quoting *Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colorado Civil Rights Comm’n*, 138 S. Ct. 1719, 1727 (2018)); *see* Addendum Tables A and B, *infra* (collecting laws). These statutes recognize and work to redress the discrimination that continues to afflict LGBTQ Americans.

**A. LGBTQ Americans are a historically disadvantaged group.**

LGBTQ Americans have faced a long history of invidious discrimination—including legally sanctioned discrimination. *See Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. 644, 660-61, 673-74, 677-78 (2015); *Goodridge v. Dep’t of Pub. Health*, 798 N.E.2d 941, 967-68 (Mass. 2003). LGBTQ people have been fired from their jobs, evicted from their homes, targeted by police, and denied service by businesses across the country simply because of their “distinct identity.” *Obergefell*, 576 U.S. at 660.

Discrimination against LGBTQ people is a severe and continuing problem. LGBTQ Americans are still much more likely to be bullied, harassed, and attacked in hate crimes than their non-LGBTQ peers.<sup>1</sup> LGBTQ people also report overt discrimination, particularly in the form of denial of service by businesses, at rates comparable to, or greater than, those for other historically disadvantaged groups.<sup>2</sup>

This continuing discrimination harms the health and well-being of LGBTQ people, their families, and their communities. A large and growing body of evidence shows that discriminatory social conditions have severe negative health impacts on LGBTQ people, including increased rates of mental health disorders and suicide attempts, especially for LGBTQ

---

<sup>1</sup> See Tasseli McKay et al., *Understanding (and Acting On) 20 Years of Research on Violence and LGBTQ + Communities*, 20 *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 665, 669-70 (2019); Tim Fitzsimons, *Nearly 1 in 5 Hate Crimes Motivated by Anti-LGBTQ Bias, FBI Finds*, NBC News (Nov. 12, 2019), <https://www.nbcnews.com/feature/nbc-out/nearly-1-5-hate-crimes-motivated-anti-lgbtq-bias-fbi-n1080891>.

<sup>2</sup> See Christy Mallory & Brad Sears, *Refusing to Serve LGBT People: An Empirical Assessment of Complaints Filed under State Public Accommodations Non-Discrimination Laws*, 8 *J. Res. Gender Stud.* 106, 113-16 (2018); Christy Mallory & Brad Sears, *LGBT Discrimination, Subnational Public Policy, and Law in the United States*, in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics* 1, 2-8 (2020), <https://oxfordre.com/politics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228637-e-1200?rskey=tI5wxr&result=7>.

youth.<sup>3</sup> Notably, these outcomes are less severe and pervasive in communities that provide LGBTQ people with legal protection against discrimination.<sup>4</sup>

**B. States prohibit discrimination against LGBTQ people in public accommodations to prevent severe economic, personal, and social harms.**

Discrimination by places of public accommodation causes unique and severe economic, personal, and social harms. It denies equal access to important goods and services and, by segregating the market, has a well-established “substantial and harmful effect” on the economy. *Heart of Atlanta*, 379 U.S. at 258 (acknowledging broad impacts of seemingly local discrimination); *see also Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 625-26. Such discrimination also stigmatizes its victims, causing them intense dignitary injuries, and encourages social fragmentation and conflict. *See Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 625-26; *Daniel v. Paul*, 395 U.S. 298, 306 (1969); *Heart of Atlanta*, 379 U.S. at 250; *see also Masterpiece*, 138 S. Ct. at 1727 (allowing wedding service providers to refuse to provide goods and services to same-sex couples would create “a community-wide stigma inconsistent with the history and dynamics of civil rights laws”).

---

<sup>3</sup> Center for the Study of Inequality, Cornell University, *What Does the Scholarly Research Say About the Effects of Discrimination on the Health of LGBT People?*, What We Know Project (2019), <https://whatweknow.inequality.cornell.edu/topics/lgbt-equality/what-does-scholarly-research-say-about-the-effects-of-discrimination-on-the-health-of-lgbt-people/> (detailing findings from 300 peer-reviewed studies); *see also, e.g.*, Julia Raifman et al., *Association of State Laws Permitting Denial of Services to Same-Sex Couples with Mental Distress in Sexual Minority Adults: A Difference-in-Difference-in-Differences Analysis*, 75 JAMA Psychiatry 671, 673-75 (2018); Julia Raifman et al., *Difference-in-Differences Analysis of the Association Between State Same-Sex Marriage Policies and Adolescent Suicide Attempts*, 171 JAMA Pediatrics 350, 353-55 (2017); Mark L. Hatzenbuehler, *Structural Stigma: Research Evidence and Implications for Psychological Science*, 71 Am. Psychologist 742, 745-46 (2016); Mark L. Hatzenbuehler, *The Social Environment and Suicide Attempts in Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Youth*, 127 Pediatrics 896, 899-901 (2011); Mark L. Hatzenbuehler et al., *State-Level Policies and Psychiatric Morbidity in Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Populations*, 99 Am. J. Pub. Health 2275, 2277-78 (2009).

<sup>4</sup> *See Raifman et al. (2018), supra n.3; Raifman et al. (2017), supra n.3; Hatzenbuehler et al., supra n.3.*

As the Supreme Court has long recognized, “no action is more contrary to the spirit of our democracy and Constitution—or more rightfully resented by a . . . citizen who seeks only equal treatment”—than a denial of equal service by a business “ostensibly open to the general public.” *Daniel*, 395 U.S. at 306-08 (quotations omitted); *see also Heart of Atlanta*, 379 U.S. at 292 (Goldberg, J., concurring) (“Discrimination is not simply dollars and cents, hamburgers and movies; it is the humiliation, frustration, and embarrassment that a person must surely feel when he is told that he is unacceptable as a member of the public because of his race or color.” (quoting S. Rep. No. 88-872, at 16 (1964)). Accordingly, the Supreme Court has instructed the lower courts to resolve public accommodations cases “without subjecting gay persons to indignities when they seek goods and services in an open market.” *Masterpiece*, 138 S. Ct. at 1732.

The American legal and political system has long recognized the importance of public accommodations being open to all. Modern statutes codify and expand upon a common law doctrine, dating back at least to the sixteenth century, that generally required public accommodations to serve all customers. *See Heart of Atlanta*, 379 U.S. at 261 (recognizing that such statutes “codify the common-law innkeeper rule”); *see also, e.g., Lombard v. Louisiana*, 373 U.S. 267, 275-77 & n.6 (1963) (Douglas, J., concurring) (collecting references dating back to 1558). States began enacting public accommodations statutes in 1865 to prohibit discrimination against African Americans. *See Act Forbidding Unjust Discrimination on Account of Color or Race*, 1865 Mass. Acts, ch. 277 (May 16, 1865). Although there is some variation across the States, “public accommodations” laws generally guarantee that when customers enter a business that has opened its doors to the public, they will not be denied service

simply because of the color of their skin, their gender, their disability, or—under many state and local laws—their sexual orientation.

A majority of Americans now live in communities that “carr[y] forward [this] tradition,” *Masterpiece*, 138 S. Ct. at 1725, by prohibiting places of public accommodation from discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation. Twenty-two States and the District of Columbia have laws expressly protecting their residents against discrimination in public accommodations on the basis of sexual orientation. *See* Addendum Table A, *infra*.<sup>5</sup> These state-level protections are supplemented by local laws and ordinances enacted by hundreds of cities, towns, and counties across the country. *See* Addendum Table B, *infra* (collecting citations to roughly 100 local laws and ordinances in the States that do not have statewide laws protecting against discrimination in public accommodations based on sexual orientation). All told, according to U.S. Census Bureau data, the number of Americans living in jurisdictions that have such statewide or local protections is over 189 million (or 57.6% of the national population). *See* Addendum Tables A & B, *infra*.

These laws—including the New York statute at issue before this Court—reflect recognition of the strong evidence of discrimination against LGBTQ people. As New York’s Legislature found in extending the State’s antidiscrimination protections, prejudice on account of sexual orientation “has severely limited or actually prevented access to employment, housing and other basic necessities of life, leading to deprivation and suffering,” and “fostered a general

---

<sup>5</sup> In addition to these twenty-three jurisdictions with express statutory protections, in Florida, the State’s Commission on Human Relations has recently announced that, based on the Supreme Court’s decision in *Bostock v. Clayton County, Georgia*, 140 S. Ct. 1731 (2020), the Commission would interpret Florida’s public accommodations law’s prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sex to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. *See* Florida Commission on Human Relations, *Notice: Sexual Discrimination* (2021), <https://fchr.myflorida.com/sexual-discrimination>.

climate of hostility and distrust, leading in some instances to physical violence.” N.Y. Sexual Orientation Non-Discrimination Act of 2002, ch. 2, § 1. And such public accommodation laws ban the very “acts of . . . discrimination” that “cause [the] unique evils that government has a compelling interest to prevent,” thereby “respond[ing] precisely to the substantive problem which legitimately concerns’ the State[.]” *Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 628-29 (quoting *City Council of Los Angeles v. Taxpayers for Vincent*, 466 U.S. 789, 810 (1984)) (describing gender discrimination).

In conjunction with bans on acts of discrimination, state public accommodations laws commonly also prohibit posting notices and advertisements that indicate that services will be denied on the basis of a protected characteristic. At least twenty-three States and the District of Columbia expressly prohibit such discriminatory advertising by public accommodations. *See* Addendum Table C, *infra*. Twenty of those laws include terms similar to New York’s provisions making it unlawful for public accommodations “to publish, circulate, issue, display, post or mail any written or printed communication, notice or advertisement to the effect that any of the accommodations, advantages, facilities and privileges of such place shall be refused, withheld from or denied to any person on account of . . . sexual orientation” or “that the patronage or custom thereat of any person of or purporting to be of any particular . . . sexual orientation . . . is unwelcome, objectionable or not acceptable, desired or solicited.” N.Y. Exec. Law § 296.2(a).<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Of the list of twenty-four laws included in Table C, *infra*, only four States’ public accommodations laws do not use similar “unwelcome” terms. *See* Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 272, § 92A; Mont. Code Ann. § 49-2-304(1)(b); Or. Rev. Stat. § 659A.409; Va. Code § 2.2-3904. As argued by New York in its motion to dismiss, Dkt. 25-1 at 25, Plaintiffs’ vagueness challenge to this prohibition fails for the simple reason that their proposed conduct plainly violates the law’s terms—which in any case are of a kind long recognized as readily understandable by ordinary people. *See, e.g., Ragin v. New York Times Co.*, 923 F.2d 995, 1002 (2d Cir. 1991) (rejecting vagueness challenge to similar Fair Housing Act provision).

Prohibitions against discriminatory advertising are also commonly included in anti-discrimination measures directed at housing and employment. *See, e.g.*, 42 U.S.C. § 3604 (barring housing advertising that “indicates any preference, limitation, or discrimination based on” a protected characteristic); 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3(b) (similar prohibition for employment advertisements).

**II. The First Amendment does not exempt businesses open to the public from state anti-discrimination laws.**

There is no real dispute that Plaintiffs’ stated intent to refuse services to LGBTQ customers would violate New York’s anti-discrimination law: Plaintiffs “offer[], solicit[], and receive[] inquiries for engagement and wedding-photography services from the general public and provide[] these services to the general public,” while categorically refusing to “provide wedding photography which . . . promotes or celebrates any engagements, weddings, or marriages not between one man and one woman, such as same-sex . . . engagements or marriages.” Compl. ¶¶ 32, 117. An objection to two people of the same sex marrying cannot reasonably be divorced from the status of being LGBTQ. *See Christian Legal Soc. v. U.C. Hastings*, 561 U.S. 661, 689 (2010); *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, 583 (2003); *Zarda v. Altitude Express, Inc.*, 883 F.3d 100, 125-27 (2d Cir. 2018); *cf. Holcomb v. Iona Coll.*, 521 F.3d 130, 138-39 (2d Cir. 2008) (recognizing that “where an employee is subjected to adverse action because an employer disapproves of interracial [marriage], the employee suffers discrimination because of the employee’s own race”). Nor is it a defense to provide photography services to LGBTQ parents and planners associated with opposite-sex weddings or to LGBTQ clients of Plaintiffs’ branding photography business. *Cf.* Dkt. 3-1 (Pls.’ PI Mem.) at 13-14. Public accommodations laws exist to prevent not only outright exclusion, but also separate and unequal treatment. Otherwise, our country would be blighted by segregated businesses that serve in

perniciously unequal ways, reserving some services only for customers who are members of preferred groups. *See Katzenbach v. McClung*, 379 U.S. 294, 296-97 (1964) (discussing restaurant that served African American customers through a take-out window but refused to serve them in the dining area).

The First Amendment does not require permitting such unequal treatment by businesses that offer their services to the public. No matter the sincerity of a business owner’s religious beliefs or other deeply held views, the Free Speech Clause does not allow a business to pick and choose its customers in violation of laws that prohibit discriminatory conduct. Nor does the Free Exercise Clause excuse a business from complying with neutral and generally applicable civil rights laws based on its owner’s religious beliefs.

**A. State public accommodations laws do not violate the Free Speech Clause when applied to people with objections to serving LGBTQ customers.**

The application of New York’s content- and viewpoint-neutral public accommodations law to prevent a commercial business from denying the full and equal enjoyment of their services to LGBTQ customers does not violate the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment.

**1. Prohibiting businesses from discriminating against customers does not compel speech.**

Although the First Amendment prohibits States from “telling people what they must say” or requiring them to “speak the government’s message,” *Rumsfeld v. Forum for Acad. & Inst’l Rights, Inc.*, 547 U.S. 47, 61, 63 (2006) (“*FAIR*”), public accommodations statutes like New York’s do neither.

Indeed, New York’s public accommodations law does not regulate speech at all. In *FAIR*, the Supreme Court rejected the argument that a prohibition on law schools discriminating against military recruiters when providing campus access to outside employers regulated the law schools’ speech. *Id.* at 60. The Court concluded that the prohibition regulated “conduct, not

speech” given that “[i]t affects what law schools must *do*—afford equal access to military recruiters—not what they may or may not *say*.” *Id.*; *see also, e.g., Burt v. Gates*, 502 F.3d 183, 191-92 (2d Cir. 2007) (because Solomon Amendment regulates conduct, it does not interfere with First Amendment right to academic freedom). That reasoning applies equally to this case. State anti-discrimination laws like New York’s affect what public accommodations “must *do*”—provide equal access to LGBTQ people—“not what they may or may not *say*.” *FAIR*, 547 U.S. at 60. In other words, New York’s law does not require speaking or endorsing a government motto, pledge, or message. *See id.* at 62. Rather, the law simply prohibits refusing to “afford equal access” to the full range of a business’s services to LGBTQ couples. *Id.* at 60.

Moreover, even assuming that wedding photography is a form of speech, New York law does not “compel” wedding photography or blog posts, nor does it regulate the process of wedding photography in any particular way. Plaintiffs are under no legal obligation to offer wedding photography or blog posts as a service of their broader photography business, *see* Compl. ¶¶ 36-39 (noting that Plaintiffs also offer branding photography services), nor to take photographs or prepare blog posts in any specific manner. And New York law *certainly* does not compel Plaintiffs to “follow[] the officiant’s instructions, sing[], and engage[] with . . . prayers” or otherwise practice religion when attending the weddings themselves. Pls.’ PI Mem. 20 (claiming, in connection with Free Exercise and Establishment Clause arguments, that Plaintiffs “must also participate in same-sex weddings in the same ways she does for opposite sex weddings”); *see also* Compl. ¶ 71. New York law simply requires that businesses offering their services to the public make wedding photography for LGBTQ customers if, and to the extent that, they provide wedding photography for other customers—just as under the Solomon Amendment at issue in *FAIR*, recruiting assistance involving “elements of speech” like posting

notices of employer visits was “only ‘compelled’ if, and to the extent, the school” chose to assist “other recruiters.” 547 U.S. at 61-62. This type of non-discrimination requirement is a “far cry” from laws “dictat[ing] the content of . . . speech.” *Id.* (distinguishing cases like *Wooley v. Maynard*, 430 U.S. 705 (1977)). As the *FAIR* Court noted with an example also apposite here, “prohibit[ing] employers from discriminating in hiring on the basis of race” does not compel speech, and “it has never been deemed an abridgment of freedom of speech or press to make a course of conduct illegal merely because the conduct was in part initiated, evidenced, or carried out by means of language, either spoken, written, or printed.” *Id.* (quoting *Giboney v. Empire Storage & Ice Co.*, 336 U.S. 490, 502 (1949)).<sup>7</sup>

This doctrine also lays bare why Plaintiffs are wrong to rely on *Hurley v. Irish American Gay, Lesbian & Bisexual Group of Boston*, 515 U.S. 557 (1995), in arguing that New York’s public accommodations law unlawfully compels their speech. *See, e.g.*, Pls.’ PI Mem. 8-11, 14. Plaintiffs’ argument relies on the premise that commercial businesses’ refusal to serve customers from a historically disadvantaged group should receive the same First Amendment protection afforded to private, non-commercial organizations engaged in expressive associational activities at the core of the First Amendment’s protections. But this premise elides the fundamental distinction between a private speaker sharing its own message and a public accommodation that offers services to the general public. While *Hurley* noted that “business corporations generally” enjoy a speaker’s “autonomy to choose the content of his *own* message,” and that a private

---

<sup>7</sup> Public accommodations laws also leave businesses like Plaintiffs’ free to disclaim any message they worry may be communicated by providing non-discriminatory service. So long as businesses treat all customers equally, they may, for example, create and disseminate a disclaimer stating that the provision of a service does not constitute an endorsement or approval of any customer or conduct. *See FAIR*, 547 U.S. at 64-65; *Pruneyard Shopping Ctr. v. Robins*, 447 U.S. 74, 86-88 (1980).

parade organizer may “customar[ily] determin[e]” which expressive units it wishes to present, 515 U.S. at 573-75 (emphasis added), *Hurley* nowhere suggested that a business that offers as a service to the general public the creation of a product could refuse to provide the service to customers on the basis of their sexual orientation, nor that laws requiring such service compel any form of speech. *See FAIR*, 547 U.S. at 63 (“The expressive nature of a parade was central to our holding in *Hurley*.”). Rather, just as a commercial business has no protected expressive interest in its relationship with its customers, *see Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 638 (O’Connor, J., concurring); *Goodpaster v. City of Indianapolis*, 736 F.3d 1060, 1073 (7th Cir. 2013), a business offering services to the general public does not have the right to express a message by only offering particular services to clients of particular sexual orientations and is not unlawfully compelled to speak when it is required to offer those clients all of its services on equal footing, *see Elane Photography, LLC v. Willock*, 309 P.3d 53, 68 (N.M. 2013) (“While photography may be expressive, the operation of a photography business is not.”).

**2. The First Amendment does not protect advertisements giving notice that public accommodations will refuse service on the basis of a protected characteristic.**

Public accommodations laws’ restrictions on discriminatory advertising do not violate the free speech rights of business owners who wish to post notices of their intent to deny services on the basis of a protected characteristic—as Plaintiffs do here. *See* Compl. ¶¶ 229-232 (describing intent to add policy statement to operating agreement “bind[ing] Emilee Carpenter Photography to not photograph same-sex weddings”); *id.* ¶¶ 246-252 (describing intent to post statement to website “explaining her religious reasons for why she only promotes marriages between one man and one woman”). Such advertisements may be prohibited for at least two reasons.

First, to the extent the notices constitute commercial speech, they can be banned outright simply because they advertise unlawful, discriminatory activities. *Pittsburgh Press Co. v.*

*Human Relations Comm'n*, 413 U.S. 376, 388-89 (1973) (employment discrimination ordinance validly prohibited newspaper from publishing sex-segregated employment advertisements); *see also Anderson v. Treadwell*, 294 F.3d 453, 460 (2d Cir. 2002) (“Even a communication combining commercial and noncommercial elements, if it is an advertisement...is properly characterized as commercial speech.”).

Second, commercial speech doctrine aside, a state may prohibit such signs as part and parcel of, and incidental to, the public accommodations law’s restriction on discriminatory conduct. Such laws in essence prohibit discriminatory refusals of service that are communicated preemptively in a notice, rather than only after service is requested by the customer. *See Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.*, 564 U.S. 552, 567 (2011) (“That is why a ban on race-based hiring may require employers to remove ‘White Applicants Only’ signs.” (quoting *FAIR*, 547 U.S. at 62) (internal quotation marks omitted)); *cf. Int’l Bhd. of Teamsters v. United States*, 431 U.S. 324, 365 (1977) (“If an employer should announce his policy of discrimination by a sign reading ‘Whites Only’ on the hiring-office door, his victims would not be limited to the few who ignored the sign and subjected themselves to personal rebuffs.”). Indeed, even some of the case law Plaintiffs themselves cite, *see* Pls.’ PI Mem. 18, recognizes that, insofar as a state can constitutionally prohibit a discriminatory refusal to provide services, the state can also “forbid the [business owners] from advertising their intent to engage in discriminatory conduct.” *Telescope Media Grp. v. Lucero*, 936 F.3d 740, 757 n.5 (8th Cir. 2019) (citing *FAIR*, 547 U.S. at 62). This is why courts repeatedly hold that even in expressive contexts, discriminatory advertising is not entitled to First Amendment protection. *See, e.g., Soules v. Dep’t of Hous. & Urb. Dev.*, 967 F.2d 817, 824 (2d Cir. 1992); *Ragin v. New York Times Co.*, 923 F.2d 995, 1003 (2d Cir. 1991).

**3. Public accommodations laws like New York’s satisfy any level of constitutional scrutiny.**

For all the reasons above, New York’s neutral and generally applicable statute regulates conduct and commercial speech, and therefore is not subject to strict scrutiny.<sup>8</sup> The law would, however, survive even strict scrutiny. As the Supreme Court has found time and again, “public accommodations laws ‘plainly serv[e] compelling state interests of the highest order.’” *Bd. of Dirs. of Rotary Int’l v. Rotary Club of Duarte*, 481 U.S. 537, 549 (1987) (quoting *Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 624).

**a. States have a compelling interest in eliminating sexual orientation discrimination in public accommodations.**

States have a “compelling interest of the highest order” in eradicating invidious discrimination against historically marginalized groups, *Duarte*, 481 U.S. at 549 (quoting *Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 624)—including LGBTQ persons. *See Masterpiece*, 138 S. Ct. at 1727 (“The exercise of their freedom on terms equal to others must be given great weight and respect by the courts.”). Courts across the country, including in New York, have recognized as much. *See, e.g., Cervelli v. Aloha Bed & Breakfast*, 415 P.3d 919, 931, 935 (Haw. Ct. App. 2018); *Gifford v. McCarthy*, 137 A.D.3d 30, 40 (N.Y. App. Div. 2016); *N. Coast Women’s Care Med. Grp., Inc. v. San Diego Cty. Super. Ct.*, 189 P.3d 959, 968 (Cal. 2008); *Gay Rights Coal. of Georgetown Univ. Law Ctr. v. Georgetown Univ.*, 536 A.2d 1, 31-37 (D.C. 1987).

As discussed above, LGBTQ Americans continue to suffer severe and pervasive discrimination in employment, housing, and places of public accommodation, among other facets of their everyday lives. *See Part I, supra*, at 2-4 & nn.1-4. And research bears out the terrible

---

<sup>8</sup> Plaintiffs’ contention that New York’s statute is somehow *not* viewpoint-neutral, *see* Pls.’ PI Mem. 17-19, defies both common sense and decades of precedent. *See, e.g., Christian Legal Soc.*, 561 U.S. at 695 (“all-comers requirement” is “textbook viewpoint neutral”); *see also infra* at 18 (explaining why New York’s law is neutral for free exercise purposes).

injuries this discrimination inflicts on LGBTQ people, their families, and their communities—not only lost employment or housing, but also severe harms to their health and wellbeing. *See* Part I, *supra*, at 2-4 & nn.1-4. Plaintiffs’ assertion that refusals of service on the basis of sexual orientation are not an “actual problem” in light of the existence of other photographers who will provide services for same-sex weddings, Pls.’ PI Mem. 22, thus belies the lamentable reality that is exemplified by Plaintiffs’ own expressed intention to discriminate. And the Supreme Court has long recognized the significant harm caused by such discrimination, as well as the States’ concomitant compelling interests in preventing these harms. *See, e.g., Masterpiece*, 138 S. Ct. at 1728-29; *Duarte*, 481 U.S. at 549.

**b. Public accommodations laws are narrowly tailored to serve the States’ compelling interest in combatting discrimination.**

Just as employment discrimination laws are “precisely tailored” to advance a state interest in providing “equal opportunity to participate in the workforce,” *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682, 733 (2014), public accommodations laws like New York’s are precisely tailored to advance a state interest in ensuring equal access to the businesses that sustain our everyday life. *See Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 628. New York’s law is therefore constitutional.

Public accommodations laws directly combat the economic, personal, and social harms caused by discrimination. By guaranteeing full and equal access to the commercial marketplace, these laws ensure that LGBTQ residents are not denied—or forced to overcome artificial barriers to acquire—“tangible goods and services.” *Id.* at 625-26; *see also Romer*, 517 U.S. at 631 (“[T]hese are protections against exclusion from an almost limitless number of transactions and endeavors that constitute ordinary civic life.”). Public accommodations laws also provide protection from the “stigmatizing injury” and “deprivation of personal dignity” that necessarily

“accompanies denials of equal access to public establishments.” *Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 625 (quoting *Heart of Atlanta*, 379 U.S. at 250); see *Masterpiece*, 138 S. Ct. at 1727, 1729, 1732. By ensuring that such public establishments are indeed open to the entire public, these laws foster not only the economic, but also the social and political integration of residents. *Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 625-26. In so doing, these laws deliver many benefits, including counteracting the negative health effects caused by stigmatization and social exclusion, see *supra* nn.3-4. In short, New York’s law and its analogues across the country serve to vindicate the “equal dignity” of LGBTQ people. *Obergefell*, 576 U.S. at 681.

Given these “compelling state interests of the highest order” directly served by public accommodations laws, they are constitutional, including as applied to business owners who would prefer to discriminate based on their personal views. *Duarte*, 481 U.S. at 549 (quoting *Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 624). Plaintiffs’ assertion that LGBTQ people can simply find other wedding website designers to serve them, Pls.’ PI Mem. 22, ignores this central animating purpose of anti-discrimination laws: to ensure that people will *not* be turned away from a business on account of their race, gender, religion, or sexual orientation. Plaintiffs’ “just go elsewhere” argument would hearken back to the days when Black travelers relied on the “Negro Motorist Green Book” to find accommodations that would serve them while on the road, thus reinforcing exactly the kind of social disintegration and economic balkanization that public accommodation laws like New York’s are intended to combat.

For the same reason, the numerous examples of further tailoring that Plaintiffs propose, Pls.’ PI Mem. 23-25, fundamentally hamstring New York’s public accommodations law. Exceptions for businesses like Plaintiffs’ would not constitute better tailoring; rather, they would frustrate the laws’ very purpose. To take one example, Plaintiffs propose that New York limit its

public accommodations law to apply “only to essential, non-expressive, or non-internet businesses.” *Id.* at 24-25. But this ill-defined restriction removes from the scope of the law’s protections countless businesses that could be deemed “expressive” (to take just one of Plaintiffs’ proposed exempted categories)—including web designers, architects, sign makers, hairdressers, make-up artists, chefs, and more. Exempting businesses like these from public accommodations laws leaves LGBTQ people (and Black people, and Jews, and women, and myriad other protected groups) vulnerable to discrimination across the marketplace. Laws like New York’s effectively ensure equal access and combat discrimination’s harms only when they comprehensively cover places open to the public; States cannot both combat discrimination and, at the same time, license businesses to discriminate. *See State v. Arlene’s Flowers, Inc.*, 441 P.3d 1203, 1235 (Wash. 2019) (“carv[ing] out a patchwork of exceptions for ostensibly justified discrimination” would “fatally undermine[]” this interest).

Accordingly, for well over a century, courts have upheld the constitutionality of public accommodations laws against challenges by businesses seeking to discriminate based on personal convictions. *See, e.g., McClung*, 379 U.S. at 298 n.1 (rejecting argument that restaurant could discriminate against African Americans based on “personal convictions and...choice of associates,” as argued in the Brief for Appellees, No. 543, 1964 WL 81100, at \*32-33 (U.S. Oct. 2, 1964)). The Supreme Court has long decried discrimination in public establishments as a “unique evil” entitled to “no constitutional protection,” *Roberts*, 468 U.S. at 628-29, and has described state laws prohibiting such discrimination as “unquestionab[ly]” constitutional, *Heart of Atlanta*, 379 U.S. at 260-61. So too here.

**B. State public accommodations laws do not violate the Free Exercise Clause.**

Prohibiting a business from refusing to provide wedding photography services to LGBTQ customers also does not violate the Free Exercise Clause.

The Free Exercise Clause does not excuse businesses from complying with neutral laws of general applicability, including public accommodations laws like New York's. *Employment Div. v. Smith*, 494 U.S. 872, 879 (1990); *Masterpiece*, 138 S. Ct. at 1727 (While a person's "religious and philosophical objections are protected, it is a general rule that such objections do not allow business owners and other actors in the economy and in society to deny protected persons equal access to goods and services under a neutral and generally applicable public accommodations law."). For free exercise purposes, a law is neutral and generally applicable if it does not target religion and "prohibit[s] conduct the State is free to regulate." *Smith*, 494 U.S. at 878-79. Plaintiffs do not seriously challenge that public accommodations laws like New York's, on their face, meet this requirement.

Rather, Plaintiffs allege that the laws "are not neutral because New York interprets its law to target [Plaintiffs'] religious beliefs for adverse treatment." Pls.' PI Mem. 21. Nothing could be further from the truth. Nothing in New York's public accommodations laws targets religious belief; the laws instead prohibit businesses from refusing to serve potential customers, or denying any person the full and equal enjoyment of their services, "*because of*" certain characteristics, like their race, sex, or sexual orientation. N.Y. Exec. Law § 296.2(a) (emphasis added). Whether a person's desire to discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation is grounded in religious reasons or in secular ones, the law treats it the same: A business that refuses to provide a service for same-sex couples that it would provide to other customers violates the law. Consistent with this facial neutrality, Plaintiffs do nothing to demonstrate bias in the law's application; they are unable to point to a single instance in which discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation has been permitted for secular reasons but forbidden based on religious ones.

Because New York’s law is neutral and generally applicable, Plaintiffs’ Free Exercise claim should be rejected.

**III. A First Amendment exemption to public accommodations laws of the kind sought by Plaintiffs would dramatically undermine anti-discrimination laws.**

Although the claim here on its face relates to just one photography business, the consequences of ruling in its favor would have far broader consequences for our public accommodations laws, our residents, and our society.

As discussed above, *supra* at 16-17, Plaintiffs offer no principled basis for distinguishing a photography business from myriad other businesses that may seek to claim an exemption from public accommodations laws. An architect, sign-maker, hairdresser, make-up artist, chef: Each is engaged in a business that its operator may view as involving “expressive” activity. Indeed, there is no reason that Plaintiffs’ sweeping view of *Hurley* would be limited to their category of “expressive” businesses, as opposed to other businesses that offer services with potentially expressive aspects—like a hotel ballroom that posts signs to announce its events. Under Plaintiffs’ view of *Hurley*’s reach, LGBTQ people could be exposed to discrimination in a broad swath of the commercial marketplace, particularly when attempting to exercise their fundamental right to marry or to celebrate other important life events.

Moreover, the free-speech exemption Plaintiffs seek would not be limited to opposition to marriage between same-sex couples or to beliefs rooted in religious convictions. Under their theory, for example, a baker opposed to mixed-race relationships could refuse to bake wedding cakes for interracial couples, or a real estate agent opposed to racial integration could refuse to represent non-white couples. It remains a sad fact of American society that such views remain

disturbingly prevalent.<sup>9</sup> Although the First Amendment tolerates all manner of odious speech in the public square, *see, e.g., Snyder v. Phelps*, 562 U.S. 443 (2011), it does not require insulating from liability businesses that violate content-neutral laws by turning away customers because of their race, religion, gender, or sexual orientation.

This Court should heed the Supreme Court’s instruction to ensure that LGBTQ persons are not subjected “to indignities when they seek goods and services in an open market.” *Masterpiece*, 138 S. Ct. at 1732. The States must be permitted to preserve their residents’ social and economic well-being and protect all within their borders from the manifest harms of discrimination.

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should grant Defendants’ motion to dismiss and deny Plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction.

---

<sup>9</sup> *See, e.g., Reuters/Ipsos/UVA Center for Politics Race Poll* (Sept. 11, 2017), <http://www.centerforpolitics.org/crystalball/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/2017-Reuters-UVA-Ipsos-Race-Poll-9-11-2017.pdf> (showing 16% of U.S. adults—*i.e.*, approximately 35 million people—agree that “[m]arriage should only be allowed between people of the same race,” and 5% of adults—*i.e.*, approximately 12 million people—disagree that “[p]eople of different races should be free to live wherever they choose”).

Dated: July 2, 2021

/s/ Adam M. Cambier

MAURA HEALEY  
*Attorney General*  
*Commonwealth of Massachusetts*  
Elizabeth N. Dewar  
*State Solicitor*  
Adam M. Cambier\*  
*Assistant Attorney General*  
One Ashburton Place  
Boston, Massachusetts 02108  
Tel.: 617-963-2278  
Email: adam.cambier@mass.gov

\* Counsel of Record, admitted *pro hac vice*

ROBERT BONTA  
*Attorney General of California*  
1300 I Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

KWAME RAOUL  
*Attorney General of Illinois*  
100 West Randolph Street, 12th Floor  
Chicago, IL 60601

WILLIAM TONG  
*Attorney General of Connecticut*  
165 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, CT 06106

AARON M. FREY  
*Attorney General of Maine*  
6 State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333

KATHLEEN JENNINGS  
*Attorney General of Delaware*  
820 North French Street  
Wilmington, DE 19801

BRIAN E. FROSH  
*Attorney General of Maryland*  
200 Saint Paul Place  
Baltimore, MD 21202

KARL A. RACINE  
*Attorney General for the District of Columbia*  
400 6th Street NW  
Washington, D.C. 20001

DANA NESSEL  
*Attorney General of Michigan*  
P.O. Box 30212  
Lansing, MI 48909

CLARE E. CONNORS  
*Attorney General of Hawai'i*  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813

KEITH ELLISON  
*Attorney General of Minnesota*  
102 State Capitol  
75 Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard  
St. Paul, MN 55155

AARON D. FORD  
*Attorney General of Nevada*  
100 North Carson Street  
Carson City, NV 89701

GURBIR S. GREWAL  
*Attorney General of New Jersey*  
25 Market Street  
Trenton, NJ 08625

HECTOR BALDERAS  
*Attorney General of New Mexico*  
P.O. Drawer 1508  
Santa Fe, NM 87504

JOSHUA H. STEIN  
*Attorney General of North Carolina*  
114 W. Edenton Street  
Raleigh, NC 27603

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM  
*Attorney General of Oregon*  
1162 Court Street N.E.  
Salem, OR 97301

JOSH SHAPIRO  
*Attorney General of Pennsylvania*  
16th Floor, Strawberry Square  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

PETER F. NERONHA  
*Attorney General of Rhode Island*  
150 South Main Street  
Providence, RI 02903

THOMAS J. DONOVAN, JR.  
*Attorney General of Vermont*  
109 State Street  
Montpelier, VT 05609

MARK R. HERRING  
*Attorney General of Virginia*  
202 North 9th Street  
Richmond, VA 23219

ROBERT W. FERGUSON  
*Attorney General of Washington*  
P.O. Box 40100  
Olympia, WA 98504

## ADDENDUM

Table A: State Laws

The following States have laws expressly prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in places of public accommodation. The population data is taken from the United States Census Bureau's estimate of State populations as of July 1, 2020.<sup>10</sup>

<i>State</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>State Law</i>
California	39,368,078	Cal. Civ. Code § 51 (2018).
Colorado	5,807,719	Colo. Rev. Stat. § 24-34-601 (2014).
Connecticut	3,557,006	Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46a-64 (2019).
Delaware	986,809	Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 4504 (2013).
District of Columbia	712,816	D.C. Code § 2-1402.31 (2001).
Hawaii	1,407,006	Haw. Rev. Stat. § 489-3 (2006).
Illinois	12,587,530	775 Ill. Comp. Stat. 5/1-102, 5/5-102 (2015).
Iowa	3,163,561	Iowa Code § 216.7 (2007).
Maine	1,350,141	Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 5, § 4592 (2019).
Maryland	6,055,802	Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-304 (West 2018).
Massachusetts	6,893,574	Mass. Gen. Laws. ch. 272, § 98 (2018).
Minnesota	5,657,342	Minn. Stat. § 363A.11 (2019).
Nevada	3,138,259	Nev. Rev. Stat. § 651.070 (2011).
New Hampshire	1,366,275	N.H. Rev. Stat. § 354-A:17 (2009).
New Jersey	8,882,371	N.J. Stat. § 10:5-12(f) (West 2013).
New Mexico	2,106,319	N.M. Stat. § 28-1-7 (2008).
New York	19,336,776	N.Y. Exec. Law § 291 (McKinney 2010).
Oregon	4,241,507	Or. Rev. Stat. § 659A.403 (2019).
Rhode Island	1,057,125	R.I. Gen. Laws § 11-24-2 (2019).
Vermont	623,347	Vt. Stat. tit. 9, § 4502 (2019).
Virginia	8,590,563	Va. Code § 2.2-3904 (2020).
Washington	7,693,612	Wash. Rev. Code § 49.60.030 (2019).
Wisconsin	5,832,655	Wis. Stat. § 106.52 (2018).

<sup>10</sup> See U.S. Census Bureau, *Annual Estimates of Resident Population for the United States, Regions, States, and Puerto Rico: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2020* (Dec. 2020), <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest/technical-documentation/research/evaluation-estimates/2020-evaluation-estimates/2010s-state-total.html>

**Table B: Local Laws**

The following local jurisdictions have laws or ordinances prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in places of public accommodation and are jurisdictions *not* covered by the State-level public accommodations laws listed in Table A. The list is not exhaustive but includes the laws and ordinances that could be readily identified and reviewed through publicly available sources. The population data is taken from the U.S. Census Bureau's estimates of local populations as of July 1, 2018.<sup>11</sup> (This table omits the numerous local non-discrimination ordinances in the States listed in Table A.)

<i>Population</i>	<i>Ordinance</i>
<b>Alabama</b>	
209,403	Birmingham, Ala., Ordinance No. 17-121 (2017).
<b>Alaska</b>	
288,000	Anchorage, Alaska, Anchorage Municipal Code tit. 5, ch. 5.20, § 5.20.050 (2015).
31,974	Juneau, Alaska, Compiled Laws of the City and Borough of Juneau, Alaska tit. 41, ch. 41.05, § 41.05.020 (2019).
<b>Arizona</b>	
1,680,992	Phoenix, Ariz., Phx. City Code art 1, ch. 18, §18-4 (2013).
548,073	Tucson, Ariz., Tucson City Code ch. 17, art. 3, § 17-12 (1999).
195,805	Tempe, Ariz., Tempe City Code ch. 2, § 2-603(1) (2019).
75,038	Flagstaff, Ariz., Flagstaff City Code ch. 14-02-001-0003(A) (2013).
<b>Florida</b>	
2,716,940	Miami-Dade County, Fla., The Code of Miami-Dade County ch. 11A, art. 3, § 11A-19 (2014).
1,952,778	Broward County, Fla., Broward County, Fla., Code of Ordinances ch. 16½, §§ 16½-3(p), 16½-34 (2011).
1,471,968	Hillsborough County, Fla., Hillsborough County Code of Ordinances and Laws ch. 30, § 30-23 (2014).
1,393,452	Orange County, Fla., Orange County Code of Ordinances ch. 22, art. 3, § 22-42 (2013).
974,996	Pinellas County, Fla., Pinellas County Code of Ordinances ch. 70, art. 2, § 70-214 (2014).
553,284	Volusia County, Fla., Municipal Code of Ordinances ch. 36, art. 3, § 36-41 (2019).

<sup>11</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, *Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Incorporated Places of 50,000 or More, Ranked by July 1, 2019 Population: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019* (April 2021) (data accessible at <https://www.census.gov/data/tables/time-series/demo/popest/2010s-total-cities-and-towns.html>); U.S. Census Bureau, *Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for Minor Civil Divisions: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019* (April 2021) (accessible at same link); U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts: United States (Dec. 2019) (<https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/>).

293,582	Leon County, Fla., Leon County Code of Ordinances ch. 9, art. 3, § 9-42 (2019).
269,043	Alachua County, Fla., Alachua County Code of Ordinances ch. 111, art. 1, § 111.06 (2013).
<b>Georgia</b>	
506,811	Atlanta, Ga., Atlanta Code of Ordinances ch. 94, art. 3, § 94-68 (2000).
<b>Idaho</b>	
228,959	Boise, Idaho, Boise City Code ch. 6, § 6-02-03(B) (2012).
56,637	Pocatello, Idaho, City Code tit. 9, ch. 9.36, § 9.36.030(B) (2013).
52,414	Coeur D'Alene, Idaho, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho City Code tit. 9, ch. 9.56, § 9.56.030(B) (2019).
25,702	Moscow, Idaho, Moscow City Code tit. 10, ch. 19, § 19-23(B) (2013).
<b>Indiana</b>	
964,582	Indianapolis-Marion County, Ind., Rev. Code of the Consolidated City and County ch. 581, art. 1, § 581-101 (2008).
270,402	Fort Wayne, Ind., Fort Wayne City Code tit. 9, ch. 93, § 93.018 (2003).
195,732	Tippecanoe County, Code of Tippecanoe County tit. 3, ch. 31, §§ 31.75, 31.76 (2001).
181,451	Vanderburgh County, Ind., Vanderburgh County Code tit. 2, ch. 2.56, § 2.56.020 (2020).
148,431	Monroe County, Ind., Monroe County Code ch. 520-2 (2020).
102,026	South Bend, Ind., Municipal Code of South Bend, Ind. ch. 2, art. 9, § 2-127.1 (2012).
75,522	Hammond, Ind., City of Hammond, Ind. Code of Ordinances tit. 3, ch. 37, § 37.057 (2019).
67,999	Muncie, Ind., Code of Ordinances tit. 3, ch. 34, div. 5, § 34.87(F) (2015).
33,897	Valparaiso, Ind. Ordinance No. 16-09 (2017).
31,015	Michigan City, Ind., Michigan City Code ch. 66, div. 3, § 66-114 (2019).
28,357	Zionsville, Ind., Zionsville Town Code tit. 9, ch. 103, § 103.07 (2019).
<b>Kansas</b>	
98,193	Lawrence, Kan., City Code of Lawrence ch. 10, art. 1, § 10-110 (2019).
54,604	Manhattan, Kan., Code of Ordinances City of Manhattan, Kan. ch. 10, art. 3, § 10-17 (2019).
<b>Kentucky</b>	
617,638	Louisville-Jefferson County, Ky., Metro Code tit. 9, ch. 92, § 92.05 (2004).
323,152	Lexington-Fayette County, Ky., Charter and Code of Ordinances Lexington-Fayette Urban County Gov't ch. 2, art. 2, § 2-33 (1999).

40,341	Covington, Ky., Covington, Ky. Code of Ordinances tit. 3, ch. 37, § 37.07 (2003).
27,755	Frankfort, Ky., City of Frankfort, Ky. Code of Ordinances tit. 9, ch. 96, § 96.08 (2013).
7,562	Morehead, Ky., City of Morehead, Ky. Code of Ordinances tit. 9, ch. 96, § 96.07 (2013).
<b>Louisiana</b>	
390,144	New Orleans, La., Code of the City of New Orleans, Louisiana ch. 86, art. 6, § 86-33 (1999).
187,112	Shreveport, La., City Code of Ordinances City of Shreveport ch. 39, art. 1, § 39-2 (2013).
<b>Michigan</b>	
670,031	Detroit, Mich., Detroit City Code ch. 27, art. 6, § 27-6-1 (2008).
119,980	Ann Arbor, Mich., Code City of Ann Arbor tit. 9, ch. 112, §§ 9:150, 9:153 (2020).
118,210	Lansing, Mich., Codified Ordinances of Lansing, Mich. tit. 12, ch. 297.04 (2019).
76,200	Kalamazoo, Mich., Kalamazoo City Code ch. 18, art. 2, § 18-20 (2009).
48,145	East Lansing, Mich., Code of Ordinances City of East Lansing, Mich. ch. 22, art. 2, § 22-35 (2012).
20,033	Ferndale, Mich., Code of Ordinances City of Ferndale, Mich. ch. 28, §28-4 (2006).
15,738	Traverse City, Mich., Codified Ordinances of Traverse City, Mich. Pt. 6, ch. 605, § 605.04 (2010).
2,425	Pleasant Ridge, Mich., Code of Ordinances City of Pleasant Ridge, Mich. ch. 40, § 40-4 (2013).
<b>Mississippi</b>	
160,628	Jackson, Miss., Code of Ordinances City of Jackson, Miss. ch. 86, art. 10, § 86-302 (2019).
<b>Missouri</b>	
994,205	St. Louis County, Mo., Code of Ordinances, tit. 7, ch. 718, § 718.020 (2012).
495,327	Kansas City, Mo., Code of Ordinances of Kansas City, Mo. vol. 1, ch. 38, art. 3, § 38-113 (2013).
300,576	St. Louis, Mo., The Charter, the Scheme, and the General Ordinances of the City of St. Louis, Mo. tit. 3, ch. 3.44, § 3.44.080(E) (2003).
123,195	Columbia, Mo., Code of Ordinances ch. 12, art. 3, div. 1, §12-35 (2012).
71,028	St. Charles, Mo., Code of Ordinances of the City of St. Charles ch. 240, art. 3, § 240.090 (2019).
<b>Montana</b>	
75,516	Missoula, Mont., Missoula Municipal Code tit. 9, ch. 64, §9.64.040 (2010).

49,831	Bozeman, Mont., Municipal Code of the City of Bozeman, Mont. Ch. 24, art. 10, § 24.10.050 (2014).
34,207	Butte-Silver Bow, Mont., Butte-Silver Bow Municipal Code tit. 5, ch. 5.68, §5.68.040 (2014).
33,124	Helena, Mont., Municipal Code of the City of Helena, Mont. tit. 1, ch. 8, § 1-8-4 (2019).
8,295	Whitefish, Mont., The City Code of the City of Whitefish, Mont. tit. 1, ch. 10, § 1-10-4 (2019).
<b>Nebraska</b>	
478,192	Omaha, Neb., Omaha Municipal Code, Charter, and General Ordinances of the City vol. I, ch. 13, art. 3, div. 1, § 13-84 (2012).
<b>Ohio</b>	
898,553	Columbus, Ohio, Columbus – City Code of Ordinances tit. 23, ch. 2331, § 2331.04 (2008).
381,009	Cleveland, Ohio, Code of Ordinances § 667.01 (2019).
303,940	Cincinnati, Ohio, Municipal Code of Cincinnati, Ohio § 914-7 (2006).
272,779	Toledo, Ohio, Toledo Municipal Code § 554.05 (2019).
197,597	Akron, Ohio, Code of Ordinances tit. 3, ch. 38, § 38.04 (2019).
140,407	Dayton, Ohio, Code of Ordinances City of Dayton, Ohio tit. III, div. I, § 32.04 (2007).
65,469	Youngstown, Ohio, Codified Ordinances of the City of Youngstown, Ohio pt. 5, ch. 147, § 547.04 (2019).
49,678	Lakewood, Ohio, Codified Ordinances of Lakewood, Ohio pt. 5, § 516.04 (2019).
50,315	Newark, Ohio, City of Newark Code of Ordinances pt. 6, ch. 632, §632.03(c) (2007).
43,992	Cleveland Heights, Ohio, Codified Ordinances of the City of Cleveland Heights, Ohio pt. 7, ch. 749, § 749.15 (2019).
31,504	Bowling Green, Ohio, City of Bowling Green Code of Ordinances tit. 3, ch. 39, §§ 39.01, 39.03 (2018).
24,536	Athens, Ohio, Code of Ordinances tit. 3, ch. 3.07, §3.07.62 (2019).
23,110	Oxford, Ohio, Codified Ordinances of the City of Oxford, Ohio pt. 1, ch. 143, § 143.04 (2019).
13,770	Bexley, Ohio, Bexley City Codes ch. 637, § 637.04 (2018).
11,051	Coshocton, Ohio, Codified Ordinances of the City of Coshocton, Ohio pt. 1, tit. 5, ch. 159, § 159.03(c) (2014).
<b>Oklahoma</b>	
124,880	Norman, Okla., Norman, Oklahoma - Code of Ordinances, ch. 7, § 7-104 (2020).
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	
1,584,064	Phila., Pa., The Philadelphia Code tit. 9, § 9-1106 (2016).
1,216,045	Allegheny County, Pa., Administrative Code div. 2, ch. 215, art. 5, § 215-35 (2009).

269,728	Erie County, Pa., Erie County Code, ord. 59, art. 11 (2004).
121,442	Allentown, Pa., The Ordinances of the City of Allentown, Pa. tit. 11, art. 181, § 181.06 (2019).
88,375	Reading, Pa., Reading, Pa. Code of Ordinances pt. 5, ch. 23, § 23-509 (2019).
49,271	Harrisburg, Pa., The Harrisburg Municipal Code tit. 4, pt. 1, ch. 4-101, § 4-105.3 (2018).
42,160	State College, Pa., Borough Codification of Ordinances ch. 5, pt. E, § 505 (2018).
40,766	Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Code of Ordinances City of Wilkes-Barre, Pa. ch. 14, §§ 14-1, 14-3 (2018).
2,530	New Hope, Pa., Code of the Borough of New Hope ch. 129, art. 1, § 129-4 (2007).
<b>South Carolina</b>	
415,759	Richland County, S.C., Code of Ordinances of Richland County, S.C. ch. 16, art. 6, §16-68 (2017).
137,566	Charleston, S.C., Code of the City of Charleston, S.C. ch. 16, art. IV, § 16-29 (2019).
<b>South Dakota</b>	
24,415	Brookings, South Dakota, Brookings, South Dakota - Code of Ordinances, ch. 2, art. V, div. 2, § 2-143(5) (2019).
<b>Texas</b>	
1,547,253	San Antonio, Tex., Code City of San Antonio Tex. ch. 2, art. 10, div. 5, § 2-592 (2018).
1,343,573	Dallas, Tex., The Dallas City Code vol. II, ch. 46, art. II, § 46-6.1 (2019).
978,908	Austin, Tex., The Code of the City of Austin, Tex. Tit. 5, ch. 5-2, § 5-2- 4 (1992).
909,585	Fort Worth, Tex., City of Fort Worth Code of Ordinances pt. 2, ch. 17, art. 2, § 17-48 (2019).
681,728	El Paso, Tex., A Codification of the General Ordinances of El Paso, Tex. Tit. 10, ch. 10.16, § 10.16.010 (2003).
287,677	Plano, Tex., Code of Ordinances City of Plano, Tex. ch. 2, art. I, § 2-11(d) (2019).
<b>West Virginia</b>	
46,536	Charleston, W. Va., Code of the City of Charleston, W. Va. Ch. 62, art. 3, § 62-81(6) (2007).
45,110	Huntington, W. Va., Codified Ordinances of Huntington, W. Va. pt. 1, ch. 5, art. 147, § 147.08(f) (2018).
6,029	Charles Town, W. Va., Codified Ordinances of Charles Town pt. 1, ch. 5, art. 154, § 154.03(6) (2018).
3,807	Lewisburg, W. Va., Codified Ordinances of Lewisburg, W. Va. Pt. 1, ch. 5, art. 137, § 137.08(f) (2019).

<b>Wyoming</b>	
32,711	Laramie, Wyo., Laramie, Wyo. Municipal Code tit. 9, ch. 9.32, § 9.32.040 (2015).

**Table C: Discriminatory Advertising Laws**

The following States prohibit discriminatory advertising or notices as part of their public accommodations laws.

<i>State</i>	<i>State Law</i>
<b>Alaska</b>	Alaska Stat. § 18.80.230 (2000).
<b>Colorado</b>	Colo. Rev. Stat. §§ 24-34-601(2)(a), 701 (2021).
<b>Delaware</b>	Del. Code Ann. tit. 6, § 4504(b) (West 2019).
<b>District of Columbia</b>	D.C. Code § 2-1402.31(a)(2) (2006).
<b>Idaho</b>	Idaho Code Ann. § 67-5909(5)(b) (2005).
<b>Illinois</b>	775 Ill. Comp. Stat. § 5/5-102(B) (2007).
<b>Iowa</b>	Iowa Code § 216.7(1)(b) (2019).
<b>Kentucky</b>	KY. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 344.140 (West 1992).
<b>Maine</b>	Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 5, § 4592(2) (2019).
<b>Massachusetts</b>	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 272, § 92A (2016).
<b>Michigan</b>	Mich. Comp. Laws § 37.2302(b) (1977).
<b>Montana</b>	Mont. Code Ann. § 49-2-304(1)(b) (1993).
<b>New Hampshire</b>	N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 354-A:17 (2019).
<b>New Jersey</b>	N.J. Stat. Ann. § 10:5-12(f)(1) (West 2020).
<b>New York</b>	N.Y. Civ. Rights Law § 40 (McKinney 1945).
<b>North Dakota</b>	N.D. Cent. Code § 14-02.4-16 (1995).
<b>Oregon</b>	Or. Rev. Stat. § 659A.409 (2007).
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	43 Pa. Cons. Stat. § 955(i)(2) (2009).
<b>Rhode Island</b>	R.I. Gen. Laws § 11-24-2 (2001).
<b>South Dakota</b>	S.D. Codified Laws § 20-13-25 (1986).

<b>Tennessee</b>	Tenn. Code Ann. § 4-21-502 (West 1978).
<b>Virginia</b>	Va. Code § 2.2-3904 (2021).
<b>West Virginia</b>	W. Va. Code § 5-11-9(6)(B) (2016).
<b>Wisconsin</b>	Wis. Stat. § 106.52(3)(3)-(3m) (2016).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

EMILEE CARPENTER, LLC d/b/a  
Emilee Carpenter Photography and  
Emilee Carpenter,

**21-CV-6303**

Plaintiffs,

-vs-

LETITIA JAMES, in her official capacity as  
Attorney General of the State of New York;  
JONATHAN J. SMITH, in his official capacity  
as Interim Commissioner of the New York State  
Division of Human Rights; and  
WEEDEN WETMORE, in his official capacity as  
District Attorney of Chemung County,

Defendants.

---

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF AS AMICI  
CURIAE**

On consideration of the Motion for Leave to File Brief as Amici Curiae filed by  
Massachusetts, California, Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawai'i, Illinois,  
Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina,  
Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington, and finding good  
cause to grant the motion, it is hereby ORDERED that the Motion is GRANTED. The proposed  
brief submitted with the Motion shall be filed in this action upon entry of this Order.

SO ORDERED this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2021.

---

HON. FRANK P. GERACI, JR.  
Chief United States District Judge