



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 202-225-4382

Congressman Robert J. Whittman
1st District of Virginia
2055 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Whitman:

AMERICAN CIVIL
LIBERTIES UNION OF
VIRGINIA
701 E. FRANKLIN ST.
SUITE 1412
RICHMOND, VA 23219
T/804.523.2152
WWW.ACLUVA.ORG

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 202-225-4218

Congressman Taylor Scott
2nd District of Virginia
412 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Taylor:

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 202-225-8354

Congressman Robert C. Scott
3rd District of Virginia
1201 Longhorn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Scott:

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 202-226-1170

Congressman A. Donald McEachin
4th District of Virginia
314 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman McEachin:

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 202-225-5681

Congressman Thomas Garrett
5th District of Virginia
415 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Garrett:

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 202-225-9681

Congressman Bob Goodlatte
6th District of Virginia
2309 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Goodlatte:

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 202-225-0011

Congressman Dave Brat
7th District of Virginia
1628 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Brat:

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 202-225-0017

Congressman Don Beyer
8th District of Virginia
1119 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Beyer:

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 202-225-0076
Congressman Morgan Griffith
9th District of Virginia
2202 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Griffith:

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 202-225-0437

Congresswoman Barbara Comstock
10th District of Virginia
229 Cannon House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congresswoman Comstock:

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 571-408-4708

Congressman Gerald E. Connolly
11th District of Virginia
2238 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Congressman Connolly:

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 202-228-6363

Senator Tim Kaine
231 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Kaine:

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director



May 8, 2017

Via Facsimile: 202-224-6920

Senator Mark R. Warner
703 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Warner:

AMERICAN CIVIL
LIBERTIES UNION OF
VIRGINIA
701 E. FRANKLIN ST.
SUITE 1412
RICHMOND, VA 23219
T/804.523.2152
WWW.ACLUVA.ORG

As you prepare to take your spring and summer recesses, the ACLU of Virginia wanted to address with you the issue of sign banning at town halls – an issue about which a number of Virginians have complained to us recently. It has come to our attention that a number of the Virginia Congressional delegation members have implemented “no sign” policies at town hall meetings. I write to express concern about this policy and explain its unconstitutionality.

Freedom of speech is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Though there are limitations, restrictions on speech in limited public forums – such as town hall meetings, which are *intended* to assess and address public concern – must be “viewpoint neutral and reasonable in light of the objective purposes served by the forum.” *Warren v. Fairfax County*, 196 F.3d 186, 194 (4th Cir. 1999).

Simply put, it is unreasonable to ban *all* signs. A total sign ban does not appear to effectuate a valid governmental purpose. For example, if there is concern that a constituent might use a sign as a weapon, one may consider requiring signs to be of a certain size and composed of a certain material. If there is a concern of disruption, you may consider that those who would be content to sit quietly holding up their signs as expression of their views may be compelled to give voice to those concerns if that is the only way to be “heard.”

If you are considering a total ban on signs at your town hall meetings this spring and summer, I would strongly encourage you to reconsider. I would be happy to speak with you further about this issue.

Sincerely,

Leslie Mehta
Legal Director