

**NO JUDGE IN THIS STATE HAS THE AUTHORITY TO  
ISSUE A PRIOR RESTRAINT ON YOUR FIRST  
AMENDMENT RIGHT TO THE FREEDOM OF SPEECH  
AND TELL YOU THAT YOU CANNOT TALK ABOUT  
YOUR CPS KIDNAPING CASE TO YOUR CHILDREN!**

The only instance in which may be subject to a prior restraint, is speech involving . . . “**a threat to national security.**” Near v. Minnesota, 282 U.S. 697, 51 S.Ct. 625, 75 L.Ed. 1357 (1931), however, the United States Supreme Court has never upheld a prior restraint, and, since the decision in Nebraska Press Association v. Stuart, 427 U.S. 539, 489 L.Ed.2d 683, 96 S.Ct. 2791 (1976), which held that “**obscenity**” and “**fighting words**” do not constitute speech subject to First Amendment protection, there are no reported decisions from any appellate court in any jurisdiction in the United States upholding a prior restraint.

Judicial restrictions on First Amendment Protected Speech constitutes unlawful prior restraint. Suggs v. Hamilton, 152 Wn.2d 74, 93 P.3d 161 (July 8, 2004); Fine Arts Guild v. Seattle, 74 Wn.2d 503, 445 P.2d 602 (1968); Adams v. Hinkle, 51 Wn.2d 763, 322 P.2d 763, 322 P.2d 844 (1958); Alexander v. United States, 509 U.S. 544, 550 (1993); Vance v. Universal Amusement Co., 445 U.S. 308, 316 n. 13 (1980); Organization for a Better Austin v. Keefe, 402 U.S. 415 (1971); Carroll v. City of Princess Anne, 393 U.S. 175 (1968); Spokane Arcades, Inc. v. Brockett, 631 F.2d 135 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1980), affirmed 454 U.S. 1165, 70 L.Ed.2d 468, 102 S.Ct. 557 (1982); Oklahoma Publishing Company v. District Court, 430 U.S. 308, 51 L.Ed.2d 355, 92 S.Ct. 1045 (1977).

The right of free expression includes both the right to communicate and the right to receive information. Stanley v. Georgia, 394 U.S. 557, 564, 89 S.Ct. 1243, 1247, 22 L.Ed.2d 542 (1969) and Red Lion Broadcasting v. F.C.C., 395 U.S. 367, 390, 89 S.Ct. 1794, 1806, 23 L.Ed.2d 371 (1969). See also, Freedom to Hear: Political Justification of the First Amendment, 46 Wash. L.Rev. 311 (1971).

“Minors like adults, have a fundamental right to freedom of expression. Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Sch. Dist., 393 U.S. 503, 511, 89 S.Ct. 733, 739, 21 L.Ed.2d 731 (1969). Expression includes speech and expressive conduct.” Nunez v. City of San Diego, 114 F.3d 935, at 950 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1977). “The protection afforded [by the First Amendment] is to the communication, to its source and to its recipients both. In Lamont v. Postmaster General, 381 U.S. 301 (1965); Kleindienst v. Mandel, 408 U.S. 753, 762-63 (1972), we acknowledged that this Court has referred to a First Amendment right to “receive information and ideas,” and that freedom of speech “necessarily protects the right to receive.” Virginia State Pharmacy Board v. Virginia Consumer Council, 425 U.S. 748, 756-57 (1976). And;

The State has no authority to interfere with the “liberty” of the parents to “control the education of their children.” Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390 (1923); Pierce v. Society of Sisters, 268 U.S. 510 (1925); Wisconsin v. Yoder, 406 U.S. 205 (May 15, 1972); Lehr v. Robertson et al., 463 U.S. 248 (June 27, 1983); Hodson v. Minnesota, 497 U.S. 417 (June 25, 1990); Prince v. Massachusetts, 321 U.S. 158 (January 31, 1944); West Virginia Board of Education v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624 (1943). If any judge cuts off your visitation or limits your visitation to SKYPE visits, you can sue him for First Amendment Retaliation under Hartman v. Moore, 547 U.S. 250, at 256 (April 26, 2006) and Keenan v. Tejada, 290 F.3d 252 (April 23, 2002).

If you want to Sue your CPS Social Worker, Guardian Ad Litem, Assistant Attorney General and Judge, call me Luis Ewing at 1 - (360) 335-1322 or go to <http://www.CPSExposed.com>