

Civil Action No. 10cv00416

---

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT**

---

QUINTON RICHARDSON,

Appellant

v.

CITY OF WINTHROP, MASSACHUSETTS,

Respondent

---

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

---

Brief for Appellant

Respectfully submitted,

Team 16  
Counsel for Appellant, Quinton Richardson

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....i

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....iii

STATEMENT OF ISSUES PRESENTED.....1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....1

SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....2

STANDARD OF REVIEW.....3

ARGUMENT.....4

I. The Winthrop Ordinance is unconstitutionally vague both on its face and as applied to Richardson pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.....4

    a. An ordinance must give the ordinary person reasonable notice of the prohibited behavior to be constitutionally valid.....4

    b. The Winthrop Ordinance is facially vague because it fails to articulate breed standards for pet owners.....5

    c. An ordinance that permits arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement by the state and gives unclear notice of what is prohibited is unconstitutionally vague.....6

    d. The Winthrop Ordinance is vague as applied to Richardson because he could not know that his conduct was prohibited and the City exercised arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement.....7

II. The Winthrop Ordinance violates the overbreadth doctrine by targeting a wider population of dogs than necessary.....8

    a. An ordinance that proscribes more conduct than necessary violates the overbreadth doctrine.....9

    b. The Ordinance condemns a greater number of pit bulls than required to achieve its supposed legislative purpose.....9

    c. The Ordinance permits the removal and destruction of more than just pit bulls by targeting mixed breed animals.....10

III. Substantive due process is violated when an ordinance lacks a rational relationship to a legitimate government purpose.....11

    a. Pit bull bans bear no rational relationship to a legitimate government interest because pit bulls are not inherently dangerous.....11

|     |  |    |
|-----|--|----|
| b.  | Kennel Club publications assert the true nature of pit bulls as affectionate and intelligent.....  | 12 |
| c.  | The Winthrop Ordinance is not rationally related to a legitimate government objective because pit bulls as a breed are not a danger to its citizens.....                                     | 13 |
| d.  | The majority of courts only uphold ordinances deeming pit bulls dangerous when the city can show a special threat exists.....  | 14 |
| e.  | The Winthrop Ordinance bears no rational relationship to a legitimate government interest because the town is not experiencing a special threat from pit bulls.....                          | 15 |
| IV. | Breed-specific ordinances that have been upheld provided less severe consequences or were less under- and overinclusive.....   | 16 |
| a.  | Winthrop’s Ordinance bears no rational relation to a legitimate government interest because it is fatally underinclusive and therefore ultimately ineffective.....                           | 17 |
| b.  | Winthrop’s Ordinance is overinclusive because it prescribes the same severe penalty for dogs which have shown vicious propensities and dogs which have never shown aggression to anyone..... | 17 |
| c.  | Winthrop’s Ordinance violates substantive due process because it is sweepingly overinclusive of good-natured dogs.....   | 18 |
|     | <u>CONCLUSION</u> .....  | 19 |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

#### United States Supreme Court Cases

|   |      |
|---|------|
| <i>Grayned v. City of Rockford</i> , 408 U.S. 104 (1972)..... | 4    |
| <i>Kolender v. Lawson</i> , 461 U.S. 352 (1983).....          | 1, 2 |
| <i>Lanzetta v. N.J.</i> , 306 U.S. 451 (1939) .....           | 7, 8 |
| <i>Reno v. Flores</i> , 507 U.S. 292 (1993) .....             | 11   |

#### United States Court of Appeals Cases

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <i>Dias v. City and County of Denver</i> , 567 F.3d 1169 (10th Cir. 2009) .....                    | 3, 11, 15 |
| <i>Fla. Businessmen for Free Enter. v. City of Hollywood</i> , 673 F.2d 1213 (11th Cir. 1982)..... | 4         |
| <i>Kennedy v. Tangipahoa Parish Library Bd. of Control</i> , 224 F.3d 359 (5th Cir. 2000) .....    | 6         |

#### United States District Court Cases

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| <i>Am. Dog Owners Ass’n v. Dade County Fla.</i> , 728 F. Supp. 1533 (S.D. Fla. 1989).....                           | 4, 5, 6 |
| <i>Am. Canine Found. v. City of Aurora</i> , No. 06-cv-01510-WYD-BNB, 2008 WL 2229943 (D. Colo. May 28, 2008) ..... | 14, 15  |
| <i>Starkey v. Chester Township</i> , 628 F. Supp. 196 (E.D. Pa. 1986) .....   | 16, 17  |
| <i>U.S. v. Johnson</i> , 738 F. Supp. 594 (D. Mass. 1990) .....   | 8       |
| <i>Vanater v. Vill. of S. Point</i> , 717 F. Supp. 1236 (S.D. Ohio 1989).....                                       | 8, 15   |

#### State Court Cases

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <i>Am. Dog Owners Ass’n v. City of Des Moines</i> , 469 N.W.2d 416 (Iowa 1991) .....         | 6, 7       |
| <i>Am. Dog Owners Ass’n. v. City of Lynn</i> , 404 Mass. 73, 78, 533 N.E.2d 642 (1989) ..... | 4, 5, 6, 9 |
| <i>Carter v. Metro N. Assoc.</i> , 255 A.D.2d 251, 252, 680 N.Y.S.2d 239 (1998) .....        | 11, 12     |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <i>Emolo v. Dep't of Animal Care and Regulation</i> , No. C037620, 2002 WL 1376081<br>(Cal. Ct. App., June 25, 2002) ..... | 16, 17, 19 |
| <i>Garcia v. Vill. of Tijeras</i> , 108 N.M. 116, 767 P.2d 355 (1988).....   | 14, 15     |
| <i>Singer v. City of Cincinnati</i> , 57 Ohio App. 3d 1, 566 N.E.2d 190 (1990) .....                                       | 15         |
| <i>Toledo v. Tellings</i> , 114 Ohio St.3d 278, 871 N.E.2d 1152 (2007).....  | 12, 16, 17 |
| <i>Zuniga v. County of San Mateo Dept. of Health Serv.</i> , 218 Cal. App. 3d 1521, 267 Cal.<br>Rptr. 755 (1990) .....     | 16         |

**CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS**

|                                   |       |
|-----------------------------------|-------|
| U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1 ..... | 4, 11 |
|-----------------------------------|-------|

**STATUTES**

State

|   |      |
|---|------|
| WINTHROP, MASS., MUN. CODE § 6.04.090 ..... | 4, 6 |
|---|------|

**SECONDARY SOURCES**

Articles

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Larry Cunningham, <i>The Case Against Dog Breed Discrimination by Homeowners' Insurance Companies</i> , 11 CONN. INS. L.J. 1, 36 (2004) ..... | 12, 17 |
|---|--------|

Electronic Media

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <i>American Pit Bull Terrier</i> , UNITED KENNEL CLUB,<br><a href="http://www.ukcdogs.com/WebSite.nsf/Breeds/AmericanPitBullTerrierRevisedNovember12008">http://www.ukcdogs.com/WebSite.nsf/Breeds/AmericanPitBullTerrierRevisedNovember12008</a><br>(last updated Nov. 1, 2008) ..... | 9, 10, 13 |
|--|-----------|

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Diane Laratta, <i>American Pit Bull Terrier? Friend or foe?</i> , LIMA OHIO.COM, (Feb. 17, 2008, 12:00 AM), <a href="http://www.limaohio.com/articles/pit-3803-dog-bull.html?cb=1295760232">http://www.limaohio.com/articles/pit-3803-dog-bull.html?cb=1295760232</a> (last visited Jan. 22, 2011) ..... | 12 |
|--|----|

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <i>AKC Meet the Breeds: Staffordshire Bull Terrier</i> , AMERICAN KENNEL CLUB,<br><a href="http://www.akc.org/breeds/staffordshire_bull_terrier/">http://www.akc.org/breeds/staffordshire_bull_terrier/</a> (last visited January 12, 2011) ..... | 13 |
|---|----|