

1 James Wheaton  
Lowell Chow  
2 FIRST AMENDMENT PROJECT  
1736 Franklin Street, 9th floor  
3 Oakland, California 94612  
Phone: 510/208-7744  
4 Fax: 510/208-4562

5 Mary Lou Boelcke  
LAW OFFICES OF MARY LOUISE BOELCKE  
6 PO Box 31033  
Albuquerque, NM 87190-1033  
7 Phone: (505) 804-1632  
Fax: (505) 232-9718

8 William Simpich  
9 LAW OFFICE WILLIAM SIMPICH  
1736 Franklin Street, 10th Floor  
10 Oakland, California 94612  
Phone: 510/444-0226

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff Philip Mocek  
12  
13

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
15 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO  
16

17 PHILLIP MOCEK,,  
18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE,  
ALBUQUERQUE AVIATION POLICE  
21 DEPARTMENT, MARSHALL KATZ, in  
his official capacity as Chief of Police of the  
22 Albuquerque Aviation Police Department,  
JONATHAN BREEDON, GERALD  
23 ROMERO, ANTHONY SCHREINER,  
ROBERT F. DILLEY a/k/a BOBBY  
24 DILLEY, LANDRA WIGGINS, JULIO DE  
LA PENA, and DOES 1–25, inclusive,

25 Defendants,  
26

No. 1:11-cv-01009-BB-KBM

**[AMENDED] TABLE OF CONTENTS IN  
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S  
OPPOSITION TO FEDERAL  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS****Page:**

1		
2		
3		
4	I. DEFENDANTS CANNOT RECAST AND MISCHARACTERIZE THE FACTS AND ALLEGATIONS IN THE COMPLAINT	2
5	A. Mocek did not premeditatedly decide to film his interaction at the Albuquerque Support and did not know it was likely that his inability to provide I.D. would result in his denial of access to enter secure areas of the airport	2
6		
7	B. Mocek did not engage in disorderly or disruptive conduct	2
8		
9	II. THE COMPLAINT PROPERLY ALLEGES VIOLATIONS OF MOCEK'S WELL ESTABLISHED FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS BY THE FEDERAL DEFENDANTS	4
10		
11	III. PLAINTIFF CAN ESTABLISH ALL THE ELEMENTS TO ESTABLISH A FIRST AMENDMENT CLAIM	5
12	A. THE FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTS THE PUBLIC'S RIGHT TO GATHER INFORMATION	6
13		
14	B. DEFENDANTS' ACTIONS CAUSED MOCEK TO SUFFER AN INJURY THAT WOULD CHILL A PERSON OF ORDINARY FIRMNESS FROM CONTINUING TO ENGAGE IN THAT ACTIVITY	2
15		
16	C. THE PLEADINGS ALSO SHOW THAT THE DEFENDANTS' ADVERSE ACTION WAS SUBSTANTIALLY MOTIVATED AS A RESPONSE TO MOSEK'S EXERCISE OF CONSTITUTIONALLY PROTECTED CONDUCT	9
17		
18		
19	IV. QUALIFIED IMMUNITY IS NOT AVAILABLE, AS THIS RIGHT TO GATHER NEWS WAS CLEARLY ESTABLISHED	10
20		
21	V. THESE DEFENDANTS ALSO VIOLATED MOCEK'S FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHTS	14
22		
23	VI. THE FOURTH AMENDMENT PROTECTS THE PLAINTIFF'S RIGHT FROM WRONGFUL ARREST, AND THE FEDERAL DEFENDANTS WERE THE DIRECT CAUSE OF THE WRONGFUL ARREST WITH THEIR UNCONSTITUTIONAL DEMAND TO HALT RECORDING	16
24		
25	VII. DEFENDANTS VIOLATED A CLEARLY ESTABLISHED RIGHT, AS THE FEDERAL DEFENDANTS' AGENCY'S POLICY WAS THAT RECORDING WAS PERMITTED	20
26		
27	VIII. DECLARATORY RELIEF	21
28	CONCLUSION	22