UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

Civil Action No. 10.cv00416

QUINTON RICHARDSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CITY OF WINTHROP,
MASSACHUSETTS,

Defendant - Appellee.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

BRIEF OF APPELLEE
THE CITY OF WINTHROP, MASSACHUSETTS

Team # 3
123 Red Sox Ln.
Boston, MA 13261
(888) 987-9000
Attorneys for Appellee

Oral Argument Requested

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

APPENDICES iv

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES v

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW 1

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION 1

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES 1

STANDARD OF REVIEW 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

STATEMENT OF THE FACTS 2

PROCEDURAL HISTORY 4

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT 4

ARGUMENT 6

I. THE ORDINANCE DOES NOT REGULATE CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED CONDUCT; NOR IS IT IMPERMISSIBLY VAGUE IN ALL OF ITS APPLICATIONS; NOR DOES IT FAIL TO PROVIDE NOTICE TO DOG OWNERS THAT THEY ARE SUBJECT TO THE STATUTE OR PROVIDE MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT IN ENFORCING THE ORDINANCE 6

A. The Ordinance is Not Overly Broad Because it Does Not Implicate Constitutionally Protected Conduct 8

B. The Ordinance is Not Facially Vague, As it is Not Impermissibly Vague in All Its Applications 10

C. The Ordinance is Not Vague As applied to Plaintiff, Because it Provided Sufficient Notice to Plaintiff That his Dogs Were Subject to its Prohibitions, and Provided Sufficient Minimal Standards to Law Enforcement to Prevent Arbitrary or Discriminatory Enforcement. 11

II. THE ORDINANCE DOES NOT VIOLATE THE SUBSTANTIVE DUE PROCESS CLAUSE OF THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT 17

A. The Ability to Own a "Pit Bull" is Not A Fundamental Right Protected Under the United States Constitution 18

B. The City has a Legitimate Government Interest in Protecting the Health and Safety of its Citizens from Traditionally Vicious Breeds and the Ordinance is Rationally Related to that Objective 21

1. The Ordinance is not *overinclusive* because there are several methods to determine with sufficient certainty whether a dog is a "pit bull" within the meaning of the ordinance 26

2. The Ordinance is not fatally *underinclusive* because ordinances do not have to regulate every dangerous animal at the same time in the same way to be constitutional. 23

CONCLUSION 30

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1……..…...……A-1

APPENDIX B: 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2010).…….……B-1

APPENDIX C: Winthrop Mun. Code § 6.40.090…….……C-1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

United States Supreme Court Cases

Allied Stores v. Bowers, 358 U.S. 522 (1959). 22

Bd. of Airport Comm'rs. of Los Angeles v. Jews for Jesus, Inc., 482 U.S. 569 (1987). 6, 7, 9

Broadrick v. Oklahoma, 413 U.S. 601 (1973). 10

Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317 (1986). 2

City Council v. Taxpayers for Vincent, 466 U.S. 789 (1984). 9

Cnty. of Sacramento v. Lewis, 523 U.S. 833 (1998). 17

Collins v. City of Harker Heights, 503 U.S. 115 (1992). 19

Connally v. General Constr. Co., 269 U.S. 385 (1926). 7, 10

Dandridge v. Williams, 397 U.S. 471 (1970). 26, 27

Eisenstadt v. Baird, 405 U.S. 438 (1972) 19

Hagans v. Lavine, 415 U.S. 528 (1974). 27

Kolender v. Lawson, 461 U.S. 352 (1983). 7, 11, 12, 15

Loving v. Virginia, 388 U.S. 1 (1967). 19

Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390 (1923); 19

Miller v. California, 413 U.S. 15 (1973). 12

Moore v. East Cleveland, 431 U.S. 494 (1977). 19

Parker v Levy, 417 U.S. 733 (1974). 10

Pennell v. City of San Jose, 485 U.S. 1 (1988). 21

Reno v. Flores, 507 U.S. 292 (1993). 18, 19

Rochin v. California, 342 U.S. 165 (1952). 19

Saenz v. Roe, 526 U.S. 489 (1999). 27

Sentell v. New Orleans & Carrollton R. R., 166 U.S. 698 (1897). 5, 7, 9

Skinner v. Oklahoma ex rel. Williamson, 316 U.S. 535 (1942). 19

U.S. R.R. Ret. Bd. v. Fritz, 449 U.S. 166 (1980). 22

Vill. of Hoffman Estates v. Flipside, Hoffman Estates, Inc., 455 U.S. 489 (1982). 6, 7, 8, 10

Washington v. Glucksberg, 521 U.S. 702 (1997). 17, 18, 21

Williamson v. Lee Optical, 348 U.S. 483 (1955). 22

United States Court of Appeals Cases

Alison H. v. Bayard, 163 F.3d 2 (1st Cir. 1998). 1

Brokaw v. Mercer County, 235 F.3d 1000 (7th Cir. 2000). 15

Dias v. City & Cnty. of Denver, 567 F.3d 1169 (10th Cir. 2009). 17

Seegmiller v. LaVerkin City, 528 F.3d 762 (10th Cir. 2008). 15

United States District Court Cases

Am. Canine Found. v. City of Aurora, 618 F. Supp. 2d 1271 (D. Colo. 2009). 20

Starkey v. Chester, 628 F Supp 196 (E.D. Pa. 1986). 19, 23

Vanater v. Vill. of S. Point, 717 F. Supp. 1236 (S.D. Ohio 1989). ..... passim

State Supreme Court Cases

Am. Dog Owners Ass'n v. City of Des Moines, 469 N.W.2d 416 (Iowa 1991). 6, 9, 11

Am. Dog Owners Assn' v. City of Yakima, 113 Wash. 2d 213, 777 P.2d. 1046 (1989). 10, 24

Colo. Dog Fanciers, Inc. v. City & Cnty. of Denver, 820 P.2d 644 (Colo. 1991). 20

Colo. Mun. League v. Mountain States Tel. & Tel. Co., 759 P.2d 40 (Colo. 1988). 19

Commonwealth v. Santiago, 452 Mass. 573, 896 N.E.2d 622 (2008). 5, 21

Dog Fed'n of Wis., Inc. v. City of S. Milwaukee, 178 Wis. 2d 353, 504 N.W.2d 375 (Ct. App. 1993). 10

Garcia v. Tijeras, 108 N.M. 116, 767 P.2d 355 (Ct. App. 1988). 19, 23, 25

State Appellate Court Cases

City of Pagedale v. Murphy, 142 S.W.3d 775 (Mo. Ct. App. 2004). 12

State v. Peters, 534 So. 2d 760 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1988). 10, 13

Constitutional Provisions

U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1. ..... 3, 4, 14, 17

Statutory Provisions

42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2010). 1

Winthrop Mun. Code § 6.40.090. ..... passim

Federal Rules

Fed. R. App. P. 3. 1

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c). 1

Secondary Sources

ERWIN CHEMERINSKY, CONSTITUTIONAL LAW: PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES 540 (3rd ed. 2006). .. 18