STATE OF VERMONT
SUPERIOR COURT
CIVIL DIVISION

Plaintiff,

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

Defendants

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page(s)

Nieves

!

! ''''

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

State v. McDermott

State v. St. Martin

State v. Tracy

Swartz v. Insogna

Velazquez v. Legal Servs. Corp.

Zullo v. State

STATUTES

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Swartz v. Insogna

in general

1

see infra

Swartz v. Insogna

th

! ' !

Zullo v. State

Id

privacy and security of individuals against arbitrary

invasions Delaware v. Prouse

Id always

! *

before effecting the stop   Marcello

St. Martin

!   +

II. Bombard Is Entitled to Summary Judgment on His Retaliatory Stop Claim (Count II) Because No Rational Factfinder Would View the Unlawful Stop as Substantially Motivated by Anything Other Than Bombard's Protected Speech.

SeeSalter v. Douglas MacArthur State Tech. Coll.

Kelly v. o 0.1 (-0.e.2 14 11

! , !

Salter

See Pointdujour v. Mount Sinai Hosp.

Heil v. Santoro

cf. Richardson v. Bonds

genuine

See

Id.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Id. Id.

only

Seeid.

! $%

4

Id.

5

! $)

See

mens rea

State v. Albarelli

Id .

id.

id.

id

Kelly v. Town of Barnard

mens rea

IV. Bombard Is Entitled to Summary Judgment on His Viewpoint Discrimination Claim (Count V).

See

see also

See Matal v. Tam

Velazquez v. Legal Servs. Corp.

! $,

See State v. McDermott

7

See

! %·

OUNDATION FOR NDIVIDUAL IGHTS
AND XPRESSION

/s/ Gary Sarachan*