

No. 23-30445

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

STATE OF MISSOURI, EX REL. ERIC S. SCHMITT, Attorney General,

**STATE OF LOUISIANA, EX REL. JEFFREY M. LANDRY, Attorney
General, ET. AL.**

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

v.

**JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., in his official capacity as President of the United
States, ET. AL.**

Defendants-Appellants

***AMICI CURIAE* BRIEF OF AMERICA'S FRONTLINE DOCTORS AND
DR. SIMONE GOLD, M.D., J.D. IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS-APPELLEES FOR AFFIRMANCE**

Respectfully Submitted,

David A. Dalia

Attorney at Law

830 Union Street, Suite 302

New Orleans, LA 70112

T: 504-524-5541

davidadalia@gmail.com

Counsel for *Amici Curiae*,

America's Frontline Doctors and Dr.

Simone Gold, M.D., J.D.

**CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT,
CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS**

Proposed *Amici Curiae* are the Free Speech Foundation, d/b/a America's Frontline Doctors ("AFLDS") and Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D., a non-partisan, not-for-profit organization of hundreds of member physicians, and the founder and physician member, who come from all across the nation, representing a range of medical disciplines and practical experience on the front lines of medicine. AFLDS' programs focus on a number of critical issues discussed below. No publicly held company has a ten percent or greater ownership interest in America's Frontline Doctors.

The consent of all parties to this filing was courteously obtained in writing on August 3rd, 2023.

Pursuant to FRAP 26.1-1, counsel for proposed *Amici Curiae* certifies that, to the best of their knowledge, the Certificate of Interested Persons filed by the parties herein contain a correct complete list of the people and entities that have an interest in the outcome of this appeal, other than the following additions from AFLDS:

Sheriff Richard Mack and Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Corporate Disclosure Statement, Certificate of Interested Persons.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
Table of Authorities.....	iv
A Matter of the Greatest Public Importance.....	1
Interests of <i>Amici Curiae</i>	2
A. General Interests.....	2
B. Specific Interests.....	3
Summary of Argument.....	6
Argument.....	9
A. Plaintiffs-Appellees have presented overwhelming evidence of egregious constitutional violations and <i>ultra vires</i> conduct which cause significant dangers and which must be halted immediately.....	9
B. Basic First Amendment jurisprudence shows that the conduct of Defendants-Appellants in their establishment of a government censorship enterprise is clearly illegal and dangerous, violates citizen free speech rights on a massive scale, and shocks the conscience....	13
C. So-called “misinformation, disinformation, and malinformation” are all generally protected categories of free speech, subject only to the well known limited exceptions to free speech. In contrast, so-called “content moderation” is a species of censorship which is prohibited to government actors, subject only to the well known limited exceptions	

to free speech.....15

D. These egregious constitutional violations and *ultra vires* conduct heroically uncovered by Plaintiffs-Appellants may also give rise to criminal liability under such statutes as 18 U.S.C. § 241 and 42 U.S.C. §1985, in addition to civil liability20

E. Government funding of artificial intelligence viewpoint censorship programs, so that unconstitutional and illegal suppression of disfavored viewpoints can be made automatic, and driven by artificial intelligence and machine learning technologies, cries out to revisit the class action ruling in order to protect the class of social media users20

Conclusion.....21

Certificate of Compliance.....23

Certificate of Service.....23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission, 130 S. Ct. 876, 891 (2010)15

Griffin v. Breckenridge, 403 U.S. 88 (1971).....20

Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co., 457 U.S. 922 (1982).....15

Manhattan Community Access Corporation v. Halleck, 139 S. Ct. 1921, 1928 (2019).....13

Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. OSHA, 595 U.S. ___, 142 S. Ct. 661 (2022).....1

National Institute of Family and Life Advocates, dba NIFLA, et. al. v.

Becerra, Attorney General of California, et. al., 585 U.S. ____, 138 S. Ct. 2361, 201 L. Ed. 2d 835 (2018)..... 14

National Rifle Association of America v. Cuomo, 350 F. Supp. 3d 94, 112 (N.D. N.Y. 2018)..... 14

Police Department of Chicago v. Moseley, 408 U.S. 92, 96 (1972)..... 15

Public Health and Medical Professionals for Transparency v Food and Drug Administration, 21-cv-01058-P, NDTX.....7

Red Lion Broadcasting Co., v. F.C.C., 89 S. Ct. 1794, 1806 (1969).....8

Rosenberger v. Rectors and Visitors of University of Virginia, 515 U.S. 819, 829 (1995).....14

Simon & Schuster, Inc. v. Members of the New York State Crime Victim’s Board, 505 U.S. 105 (1991).....15

Schwarzer v. Wainwright, No. 19-41011 (5th Cir. 2021).....20

Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. F.C.C., 512 U.S. 622, 641 (1994).....13

United States v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745 (1966).....20

United States v. Price, 383 U.S. 787 (1966).....20

Statutes and Regulations

18 U.S.C. §241.....8

42 U.S.C. §1985.....8.

Internet Authorities

The CDC’s own Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) data shows that as of July 21, 2023, there have been 35,646 deaths in America alone which medical

professionals have attributed to a fatal adverse reaction to the experimental mRNA injections, aka “vaccines”. This is not “safe”. <https://www.openvaers.com/covid-data...7>

In July 2021 an outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 infections in Barnstable County, Massachusetts involved 469 people, 79 percent of whom were symptomatic, and 74 percent of those who were symptomatic were fully vaccinated. This incident made it clear that the “vaccines” do not prevent infection or transmission of COVID-19. “Vaccinated” people can become infected and can also spread the SARS-CoV-2 virus to other people. This is not “effective”. <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7031e2.htm.....7>

FDA notoriously asked for 75 years in which to release the Pfizer safety data in response to a Freedom of Information Act request filed by Public Health and Medical Professionals for Transparency (PHMPT). PHMPT sued the FDA on September 16, 2021, in the case of *Public Health and Medical Professionals for Transparency v Food and Drug Administration*, 21-cv-01058-P, Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, NDTX. The federal judge ordered Pfizer to release all of the documents. One particularly incriminating document entitled “Cumulative Analysis of Post-Authorization Averse Event Reports of PF-07302048 (BN 162B2) Received Through February 28, 2021,” includes a shocking 9-page list of 1,291 adverse side-effects to the Pfizer injection, including reactions affecting the nervous system, musculoskeletal, gastrointestinal, respiratory, skin, and procedural complications; infections, cardiac, vascular, psychiatric, blood and lymphatic, eye, immune, and ear complications. Perhaps the most dangerous adverse side effect listed on the 9-page list of adverse side effects is “1P36 Gene Deletion Syndrome”. Symptoms include changes in facial structures, severe learning disabilities, severe oral communication problems, heart, muscle, breathing, eye and other problems.” Source: April 30, 2021 “Cumulative Analysis of Post-Authorization Adverse Event Reports of PF-07302048 (BNT162B2) Received Through 28-Feb-2021” submitted by Pfizer to the FDA. That document can be found at: <https://phmpt.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/5.3.6-postmarketing-experience.pdf.....7>

The U.S. Government Is Building A Vast Surveillance And Speech Suppression Web Around Every American: “While the “Twitter Files” offer a glimpse into the government’s efforts to censor disfavored viewpoints, what we have seen is nothing compared to what is planned, as the details of hundreds of federal awards lay bare. Research by The Federalist reveals our tax dollars are funding the development of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine-learning (ML) technology that will allow the government to easily discover “problematic” speech and track Americans reading or partaking in such conversations. Then, in partnership with Big Tech, Big Business, and media outlets, the government will ensure the speech is censored, under the guise of combatting “misinformation” and “disinformation.” <https://thefederalist.com/2023/03/21/grants-reveal-federal-governments-horrific-plans-to-censorall-americans-speech/.....8,21>

As of July 24, 2023, a global, real-time meta-analysis includes 499 Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) COVID-19 studies, from 8,467 scientists and 522,536 patients in 58 countries, 406 studies are peer reviewed, with 402 comparing treatment and control groups. The studies indicate indicate a statistically significant improvement for mortality, hospitalization, recovery, cases, and viral clearance, and there is 72% less death in 16 early treatment trials. Source: <https://c19hcq.org/>.....17

A white paper is to draw the reader’s attention to the indisputable safety of hydroxychloroquine (HCQ), an analog of the same quinine found in tree barks that George Washington used to protect his troops. A “White Paper on Hydroxychloroquine” by Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D., is the culmination of months-long research from all sources. It explains how Americans have come to be in the grip of fear. All the myths and all the misconceptions about a safe, generic drug that has been FDA approved for 65 years, given to pregnant women, breastfeeding women, children, the elderly, and the immune-compromised for years and decades without complication, are finally put to rest. Source: [6076fe1361cd5d631ecb0a32_White-Paper-on-HCQ-2020.2%20\(3\).pdf](https://americasfrontlinedoctors.org/index/covid/hydroxychloroquine/science-of-hcq/) <https://americasfrontlinedoctors.org/index/covid/hydroxychloroquine/science-of-hcq/> ..17

As of July 25, 2023, a global, real-time meta-analysis includes 214 ivermectin COVID-19 studies; 165 that are peer reviewed, with 99 comparing treatment and control groups. The studies indicate ivermectin reduces risk for COVID-19 with very high confidence for mortality, ventilation, ICU admission, hospitalization, recovery, cases, and viral clearance. No treatment, vaccine, or intervention is 100% effective and available. Thus all practical, effective, and safe means should be used based on risk/benefit analysis. Over 20 countries adopted ivermectin for COVID-19. Ivermectin may be purchased over the counter in the state of Tennessee. Source: <https://c19ivm.org/>18

Masks – Civil Liberties, Simone Gold, MD, JD, FABEM
“The pore size of cloth face coverings range from ~ 20-100 microns. The Covid virus is 200-1000x smaller than that, at 0.1 microns. Putting up a chain link fence will not keep out a mosquito.”
https://res.cloudinary.com/afls/image/upload/v1660703803/afls/6076df5ce86247e10f68ae5b_Masks_Civil_Liberties_0b7d2bef88.pdf.....18

Masks: The Science and Myths, Dr. Lee Merritt
<https://afls.org/videos/post/masks-the-science-myths>19

Do physical measures such as hand-washing or wearing masks stop or slow down the spread of respiratory viruses? [meta-mask analysis]
“Wearing masks in the community probably makes little or no difference to the outcome of influenza-like illness (ILI)/COVID-19 like illness compared to not wearing masks (risk ratio (RR) 0.95, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.84 to 1.09; 9 trials, 276,917 participants;

moderate-certainty evidence.”

https://www.cochrane.org/CD006207/ARI_do-physical-measures-such-hand-washing-or-wearing-masks-stop-or-slow-down-spread-respiratory-viruses.....19

A MATTER OF THE GREATEST PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

The Free Speech Foundation, d/b/a America's Frontline Doctors, and Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D., the founder and physician member (“*Amici*” or “AFLDS”) respectfully move for leave to file the incorporated *amici curiae* brief as *amici curiae* in support of the Plaintiffs-Appellees request for declaratory and injunctive relief in *Missouri and Louisiana, et al v Joseph R. Biden, Jr. In his capacity as President of the United States, et al.*, 22-cv-01213, WDLA, 23-30445, CA5, filed on June 2nd, 2022. The United States Supreme Court accepted the filing of an *amicus curiae* brief from AFLDS as well in *Nat'l Fed'n of Indep. Bus. v. OSHA*, 595 U.S. ___, 142 S. Ct. 661 (2022), which position prevailed in that case. Consent for the filing of this motion and brief was sought and courteously obtained in writing from all parties on August 3rd, 2023.

Permitting the filing of the proposed *amici curiae* brief would offer an important perspective to this Court on a matter of great public importance. This *amici curiae* brief conclusively demonstrates that the Defendants-Appellants engaged in unconstitutional, illegal, and possibly criminal activity by suppressing the free speech of dozens of speakers and millions of listeners. Further, the Defendants-Appellants have not yet ceased this illegal government overreach,

thus compromising the free speech rights of millions of Americans, as well as continuing to compromise patient safety and medical care.

INTERESTS OF *AMICI CURIAE*

A. GENERAL INTERESTS OF *AMICI CURIAE*

Proposed *Amici Curiae* are Free Speech Foundation, d/b/a America's Frontline Doctors ("AFLDS"), a non-partisan, not-for-profit organization of hundreds of member physicians who come from across the country, representing a range of medical disciplines and practical experience on the front lines of medicine, and its' founder and physician member, Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D..

AFLDS' programs focus on a number of critical issues including:

- Providing Americans with science-based facts about COVID-19;
- Protecting physician independence from government overreach;
- Combating COVID-19 with evidence-based approaches without compromising constitutional freedoms;
- Fighting medical cancel culture and media censorship;
- Advancing healthcare policies that protect the physician-patient relationship;
- Expanding COVID-19 treatment options for all Americans who need them; and

- Strengthening the voices of frontline doctors in the national healthcare conversation.

Each of AFLDS' member physicians is deeply committed to the guiding principle of medicine: "FIRST, DO NO HARM." They gravely take their ethical obligations to their patients. It is axiomatic that a physician's duty is to his or her patient. AFLDS holds sacrosanct the relationship between doctor and patient where informed decisions are to be made, taking into consideration all of the factors relating to the patients' health, risks, co-morbidities and circumstances. For AFLDS member physicians, the practice of medicine is not simply a job. Neither is it merely a career. Rather, it is a sacred trust. It is a high calling that often requires a decade or more of highly focused sacrificial dedication to achieve. America's Frontline Doctors is committed to preserving the voluntary and fully informed doctor/patient relationship, and opposes any sort of illegal interference with the doctor/patient relationship and illegal government overreach, as is presented by this case.

B. SPECIFIC INTERESTS OF *AMICI CURIAE*

AFLDS and Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D., were specifically mentioned in the trial court injunction opinion in this case as being some of the "Disinformation Dozen", major American voices who were unconstitutionally suppressed by the

long list of government Defendant-Appellants. The list of the other suppressed victims including Dr. Gold at ROA.26539-26540 is shocking. Major American voices were silenced:

- i. Jill Hines and Health Freedom of Louisiana;587
- ii. One America News;588
- iii. Breitbart News;589
- iv. Alex Berenson;
- v. Tucker Carlson;591
- vi. Fox News;592
- vii. Candace Owens;593
- viii. The Daily Wire;594
- ix. Robert F. Kennedy, Jr.;595
- x. Dr. Simone Gold and America's Frontline Doctors; 596, and
- xi. Dr. Joyce Mercola.597.

Judge Doughty specifically discussed AFLDS and the controversies surrounding the various covid treatments in detail, and even discussed the first famous AFLDS press conference, which was the first White Coat Summit held by the AFLDS medical freedom doctors in front of the United States Supreme Court in 2021, in this passage at ROA.26507:

"When America's Frontline Doctors held a press conference criticizing the Government's response to the COVID-19 pandemic and spouting the benefits of hydroxychloroquine in treating the coronavirus,³²⁶ Dr. Fauci made statements on Good Morning America³²⁷ and on Andrea Mitchell Reports³²⁸ that hydroxychloroquine is not effective in treating the coronavirus. Social-media platforms censored the America's Frontline Doctors videos. Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube removed the video.³²⁹ Dr. Fauci does not deny that he or his staff at NIAID may have communicated with social-media platforms, but he does not specifically recall it.³³⁰" ROA.26507.

Unfortunately, this egregious violation of the constitutional rights of Dr. Gold and of AFLDS's truthful and accurate medical free speech by government bureaucrats is medically very dangerous. As mentioned previously, the guiding principle of medicine is to DO NO HARM. As will be shown herein, this censorship of truthful and accurate medical information, in the midst of a public health crises, causes much harm, and can be fatal to thousands of Americans.

The speeches of the America's Frontline Doctor group were widely broadcast and the video went viral. Within hours, it captivated an estimated 20 million viewers who were obviously clearly hungry for truth and objective medical information. Then, without warning, the video was illegally removed by media tech giants including Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter.

It should be noted that even false information is protected free speech, excluding only the well recognized exceptions to free speech. But here, illegal

ensorship by government bureaucrats of protected free speech, consisting of life saving, truthful and accurate medical information, deprived millions of listeners of information which they could have used in formulating informed consent. This illegal and dangerous censorship cries out for injunctive relief for the crucial reason of preventing more unnecessary deaths, among the other reasons cited by Plaintiffs-Appellees. “**Informed consent**” cannot be formulated if it is not fully **informed**. Informed consent can never be coerced.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The evidence and First Amendment jurisprudence is clear that the Defendants-Appellants have illegally, brazenly and repeatedly violated the First Amendment. The Plaintiffs-Appellees have heroically uncovered massive wrongdoing on the part of the Defendants-Appellants, which is very dangerous to the health of the people of Missouri, of Louisiana, and indeed of the entire nation, and threatens the rule of law in America. The Defendants-Appellants do not attempt to dispute the facts uncovered by the Plaintiffs-Appellees and by the lower court. They only appear to be concerned about their own rights of free speech, and of the jeopardization of their ability to continue their suppression of the nation’s free speech through their various “content moderation” policies.

The Defendants-Appellants viewpoint discrimination is blatant and obvious.

This unconstitutional censorship is particularly dangerous, harmful and life threatening in the medical freedom arena, where dangerous and experimental mRNA injections were falsely and relentlessly promoted as being “safe and effective”, [they were neither^{1, 2}], and when information regarding numerous other

¹ The CDC’s own Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) data shows that as of July 21, 2023, there have been 35,646 deaths in America alone which medical professionals have attributed to a fatal adverse reaction to the experimental mRNA injections, aka “vaccines”. This is not “safe”. <https://www.openvaers.com/covid-data>

In July 2021 an outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 infections in Barnstable County, Massachusetts involved 469 people, 79 percent of whom were symptomatic, and 74 percent of those who were symptomatic were fully vaccinated. This incident made it clear that the “vaccines” do not prevent infection or transmission of COVID-19. “Vaccinated” people can become infected and can also spread the SARS-CoV-2 virus to other people. This is not “effective”. <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7031e2.htm>

²FDA notoriously asked for 75 years in which to release the Pfizer safety data in response to a Freedom of Information Act request filed by Public Health and Medical Professionals for Transparency (PHMPT). PHMPT sued the FDA on September 16, 2021, in the case of *Public Health and Medical Professionals for Transparency v Food and Drug Administration*, 21-cv-01058-P, Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, NDTX. The federal judge ordered Pfizer to release all of the documents. One particularly incriminating document entitled “Cumulative Analysis of Post-Authorization Averse Event Reports of PF-07302048 (BN 162B2) Received Through February 28, 2021,” includes a shocking 9-page list of 1,291 adverse side-effects to the Pfizer injection, including reactions affecting the nervous system, musculoskeletal, gastrointestinal, respiratory, skin, and procedural complications; infections, cardiac, vascular, psychiatric, blood and lymphatic, eye, immune, and ear complications. Perhaps the most dangerous adverse side effect listed on the 9-page list of adverse side effects is “1P36 Gene Deletion Syndrome”. Symptoms include changes in facial structures, severe learning disabilities, severe oral communication problems, heart, muscle, breathing, eye and other problems.”

Source:

April 30, 2021 “Cumulative Analysis of Post-Authorization Adverse Event Reports of PF-07302048 (BNT162B2) Received Through 28-Feb-2021” submitted by Pfizer to the FDA. That document can be found at <https://phmpt.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/5.3.6-postmarketing-experience.pdf>

completely safe, well-known and reliably effective early treatments was demonized, denounced, and deleted. Why was truthful and accurate medical information censored, and false medical “narratives” promoted instead?

The government Defendants-Appellants do not appear to be stopping their massive government censorship campaign at all. Indeed, the very fact that they took this appeal indicates that they intend to continue their censorship policies, and merely seek permission from this Honorable Court to continue their illegal actions.

The breathtaking scope of the illegal government censorship enterprise which has been uncovered is also arguably a criminal enterprise designed to violate the First Amendment free speech rights of Americans under statutes such as 18 U.S.C. §241 and 42 U.S.C. §1985.

Alarming, new information is emerging that this government is now funding artificial intelligence viewpoint censorship programs, so that the unconstitutional and illegal suppression of disfavored viewpoints can be made automated, and driven by artificial intelligence and machine learning technologies³. This development cries out for this distinguished Court to revisit

³ The U.S. Government Is Building A Vast Surveillance And Speech Suppression Web Around Every American: “While the “Twitter Files” offer a glimpse into the government’s efforts to censor disfavored viewpoints, what we have seen is nothing compared to what is

the class action ruling as well, to protect the class of social media users.

ARGUMENT

A. **Plaintiffs-Appellees have presented overwhelming evidence of egregious constitutional violations and *ultra vires* conduct which cause significant dangers and which must be halted immediately**

“If the allegations made by Plaintiffs are true, the present case arguably involves the most massive attack against free speech in United States’ history.”...

“Although the censorship alleged in this case almost exclusively targeted conservative speech, the issues raised herein go beyond party lines. The right to free speech is not a member of any political party and does not hold any political ideology. It is the purpose of the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment to preserve an uninhibited marketplace of ideas in which truth will ultimately prevail, rather than to countenance monopolization of the market, whether it be by government itself or private licensee.”
Red Lion Broadcasting Co., v. F.C.C., 89 S. Ct. 1794, 1806 (1969).

Memorandum Ruling on Request for Preliminary Injunction, ROA.26456.

“The question does not concern whether speech is conservative, moderate, liberal, progressive, or somewhere in between. **What matters is that Americans, despite their views, will not be censored or suppressed by the Government. Other than well-known exceptions to the Free Speech Clause, all political views and content are protected free speech.**”
[Emphasis added]

planned, as the details of hundreds of federal awards lay bare. Research by The Federalist reveals our tax dollars are funding the development of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine-learning (ML) technology that will allow the government to easily discover “problematic” speech and track Americans reading or partaking in such conversations. Then, in partnership with Big Tech, Big Business, and media outlets, the government will ensure the speech is censored, under the guise of combatting “misinformation” and “disinformation.”
<https://thefederalist.com/2023/03/21/grants-reveal-federal-governments-horrific-plans-to-censor-ll-americans-speech/>

Memorandum Ruling on Request for Preliminary Injunction, ROA.26457-26458

Subject to the well-known exceptions, even false statements are protected free speech.

It is astonishing that the Defendants-Appellants appeared to be unaware of the illegality of their coercive activities.

The range and extent of the government censorship as uncovered by the Plaintiffs-Appellees is breathtaking. Contrary viewpoints on virtually all of the major issues of our time were suppressed by Defendants-Appellants. These issues included: (1) suppressing the Hunter Biden laptop story prior to the 2020 Presidential election; (2) suppressing speech about the lab-leak theory of COVID-19's origin; (3) suppressing speech about the efficiency of masks and COVID-19 lockdowns; (4) suppressing speech about the efficiency of COVID-19 vaccines; (5) suppressing speech about election integrity in the 2020 presidential election; (6) suppressing speech about the security of voting by mail; (7) suppressing parody content about Defendants; (8) suppressing negative posts about the economy; and (9) suppressing negative posts about President Biden. ROA.26458.

Examples of this illegal censorship are egregious, and abound. A few

examples:

Plaintiffs-Appellees Drs. Kulldorff and Bhattacharya were censored for advocating against vaccine and mask mandates, including mask mandates for young children, and for pointing out that natural immunity was stronger than vaccine immunity.

Plaintiff-Appellee Jill Hines was censored for advocating against mask mandates for young children, for sharing Pfizer's pre-clinical trial data, and for posting the CDC's own Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) data. ROA.26459.

Plaintiff-Appellee Jim Hoft, the owner and operator of the Gateway Pundit, was censored and deleted because of his reporting on COVID-19 and on election fraud. ROA.26460-26461.

AFLDS and Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D., were targeted by Defendants-Appellants as being some of the so-called "Disinformation Dozen", major American voices who were unconstitutionally suppressed by the long list of government defendants. These major American voices were illegally silenced. ROA.26539-26540.

The "Disinformation Dozen" were relentlessly targeted and suppressed by various Defendants-Appellants. See ROA.26471, ROA.26473, ROA.26475-

26478, ROA.26484, ROA.26490, ROA.26550, ROA.26553, and ROA.26583.

Judge Doughty noted at ROA.26507 that after the first famous White Coat Summit held by the AFLDS medical freedom doctors in front of the United States Supreme Court in 2021, Dr. Fauci made statements on Good Morning America and on Andrea Mitchell Reports that hydroxychloroquine was not effective in treating the coronavirus. Social-media platforms then censored the America's Frontline Doctors videos. Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube suddenly removed the video after having garnered over 20 million views.

Unfortunately, this egregious violation of the constitutional rights of Dr. Gold, of AFLDS's truthful and accurate medical free speech, and the free speech of all of the other Plaintiffs-Appellees is very dangerous from a medical and legal standpoint. As will be shown, this censorship of truthful and accurate medical information in the midst of a public health crises causes much harm and can be fatal to thousands of Americans.

The sovereign interests of the states of Missouri and Louisiana were violated, inasmuch as their citizens' rights to speak freely, and their citizens' right to listen to free speech, were violated by Defendants-Appellees.

Plaintiffs-Appellees uncovered and exposed numerous examples of the Defendants-Appellants' use of "strong-arm tactics", through their use of emails,

public and private messages, public and private meetings, and other means, to significantly encourage and coerce social-media platforms to suppress protected free speech posted on social-media platforms.

Judge Doughty cites countless examples of these unconstitutional and illegal free speech suppression tactics by the various government Defendants-Appellants, which fill in excess of seventy six pages of the trial court opinion. See ROA.26463-26540.

The evidence of government overreach is indeed overwhelming in this case.

B. Basic First Amendment jurisprudence shows that the conduct of Defendants-Appellants in their establishment of a government censorship enterprise is clearly illegal and dangerous, violates citizen free speech rights on a massive scale, and shocks the conscience

The trial court relied on black letter First Amendment jurisprudence in concluding that the Defendants-Appellants actions were unconstitutional and illegal in this case:

‘The Free Speech Clause prohibits only governmental abridgment of speech. It does not prohibit private abridgment of speech. *Manhattan Community Access Corporation v. Halleck*, 139 S. Ct. 1921, 1928 (2019). The First Amendment, subject only to narrow and well-understood exceptions, does not countenance governmental control over the content of messages expressed by private individuals. *Turner Broadcasting System, Inc. v. F.C.C.*, 512 U.S. 622, 641 (1994). At the heart of the First Amendment lies the principle that each person should decide for himself or herself the ideas and beliefs deserving of expression, consideration, and adherence. *Id.*

Government action, aimed at the suppression of particular views on a subject that discriminates on the basis of viewpoint, is presumptively unconstitutional. The First Amendment guards against government action “targeted at specific subject matter,” a form of speech suppression known as “content-based discrimination.” *National Rifle Association of America v. Cuomo*, 350 F. Supp. 3d 94, 112 (N.D. N.Y. 2018).

Memorandum Ruling on Request for Preliminary Injunction, ROA.26542.

Also see *National Institute of Family and Life Advocates, dba NIFLA, et. al. v. Becerra, Attorney General of California, et. al.*, 585 U.S. ___, 138 S. Ct. 2361, 201 L. Ed. 2d 835 (2018). The California Reproductive Freedom, Accountability, Comprehensive Care, and Transparency Act (“FACT Act”) analogously attempted to impose “content moderation” (i.e., mandatory medical speech) upon health care providers. The FACT Act required pro-life health care clinics to inform patients that free or low-cost abortions were available in California and required the clinics to give the patients a telephone number to call for those services. The United States Supreme Court held that this law was likely an unconstitutional violation of the First Amendment. The *NIFLA* Court noted that content-based laws targeting speech based on its communicative content, which compel speakers to speak a particular message, are presumptively unconstitutional.

“Viewpoint discrimination is an especially egregious form of content discrimination. The government must abstain from regulating speech when the specific motivating ideology or the perspective of the speaker is the rationale for the restriction. *Rosenberger v. Rectors and Visitors of University of Virginia*, 515 U.S. 819, 829 (1995). Strict scrutiny is applied

to viewpoint discrimination. *Simon & Schuster, Inc. v. Members of the New York State Crime Victim's Board*, 505 U.S. 105 (1991). The government may not grant the use of a forum to people whose views it finds acceptable, but deny use to those wishing to express less favored or more controversial views.” *Police Department of Chicago v. Moseley*, 408 U.S. 92, 96 (1972).

“The benefit of any doubt must go to protecting rather than stifling speech.” *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 130 S. Ct. 876, 891 (2010) “This is a standard that requires the private action to be “fairly attributable to the state.”” *Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.*, 457 U.S. 922 (1982).

Memorandum Ruling on Request for Preliminary Injunction, ROA.26542-26543.

The trial court carefully analyzed the voluminous evidence uncovered by Plaintiffs-Appellees and, after applying applicable law, correctly concluded that constitutional violations had occurred.

C. So-called “misinformation, disinformation, and malinformation” are all generally protected categories of free speech, subject only to the well known limited exceptions to free speech. In contrast, so-called “content moderation” is a species of censorship which is prohibited to government actors, subject only to the well known limited exceptions to free speech

The government actor Defendants-Appellants constantly used as the rationale for their actions the mantra that they were combating “misinformation, disinformation, and malinformation”. However, subject to the well-known exceptions, “misinformation, disinformation, and malinformation” are all protected categories of free speech. Defendants-Appellants knew or should have known this.

Defendants-Appellants also repeatedly pressured their social media partners to strengthen their “content-moderation” policies. The trial court found that there was substantial encouragement, coercion, and public and private demands to censor and strengthen “content-moderation” by their social media partners. See ROA.26497-26498, ROA.26514-26515, ROA.26520, ROA.26530, ROA.26559, ROA.26564, and ROA.26584.

The viewpoint discrimination was quite blatant. In the medical freedom arena, free speech which supported early COVID-19 treatments with safe drugs such as hydroxychloroquine, ivermectin and others were targeted. Ivermectin may be purchased over the counter in the state of Tennessee. Also targeted was speech questioning the efficacy of masks, and speech questioning the safety and efficacy of the experimental mRNA injections, aka “vaccines”. Free speech which was viewed as contributing to so-called “vaccine hesitancy” was also targeted. But, targeting “vaccine hesitancy” by the suppression of truthful information undermines “informed consent”, interferes with the doctor/patient relationship, and violates physician free speech rights. For example, the CDC’s own Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) data show that as of July 21, 2023, there have been **35,646 deaths in America alone** which medical professionals have attributed to fatal adverse reactions to the experimental mRNA injections,

aka “vaccines”. See footnote 1. This cannot reasonably be considered “safe”, and can form a reasonable basis for a patient to avoid such an experimental injection in favor of safer alternatives. It is dangerous to suppress such truthful and accurate medical information, in a government censorship effort to promote a contrary “narrative”. Further, we now know that these experimental mRNA injections, aka “vaccines”, do not prevent acquisition or transmission of COVID-19. See footnotes 1 and 2. Thus, they cannot reasonably be considered “effective” either.

For the record, it is the position of *amici curiae*, supported by enormous amounts of scientific research, that early COVID-19 treatments with hydroxychloroquine and ivermectin are in fact quite safe and effective, contrary to the government “narrative”^{4, 5, 6}.

⁴As of July 24, 2023, a global, real-time meta-analysis includes 499 Hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) COVID-19 studies, from 8,467 scientists and 522,536 patients in 58 countries, 406 studies are peer reviewed, with 402 comparing treatment and control groups. The studies indicate a statistically significant improvement for mortality, hospitalization, recovery, cases, and viral clearance, and there is 72% less death in 16 early treatment trials. Source: <https://c19hcq.org/>

⁵ A white paper is to draw the reader’s attention to the indisputable safety of hydroxychloroquine (HCQ), an analog of the same quinine found in tree barks that George Washington used to protect his troops. A “White Paper on Hydroxychloroquine” by Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D., is the culmination of months-long research from all sources. It explains how Americans have come to be in the grip of fear. All the myths and all the misconceptions about a safe, generic drug that has been FDA approved for 65 years, given to pregnant women, breastfeeding women, children, the elderly, and the immune-compromised for years and decades without complication, are finally put to rest. Source:

For the record, it is the position of *amici curiae*, supported by enormous amounts of scientific research, that the experimental mRNA injections are neither “safe” nor “effective”. See footnotes 1 and 2.

For the record, it is the position of *amici curiae*, supported by enormous amounts of scientific research, that masks lack efficacy. Ineffective masks have been found to have measurably harmful effects such as increased incidents of life-threatening bacterial pneumonia, decreased oxygen levels in the brains of mask-wearers, and speech deficits in children. Masks are also unsanitary, and function as bacteria-collectors. “The pore size of cloth face coverings range from ~ 20-100 microns. The Covid virus is 200-1000x smaller than that, at 0.1 microns. Putting up a chain link fence will not keep out a mosquito,”^{7, 8, 9}.

6076fe1361cd5d631ecb0a32_White-Paper-on-HCQ-2020.2%20(3).pdf

<https://americasfrontlinedoctors.org/index/covid/hydroxychloroquine/science-of-hcq/>

⁶As of July 25, 2023, a global, real-time meta-analysis includes 214 ivermectin COVID-19 studies; 165 that are peer reviewed, with 99 comparing treatment and control groups. The studies indicate ivermectin reduces risk for COVID-19 with very high confidence for mortality, ventilation, ICU admission, hospitalization, recovery, cases, and viral clearance. No treatment, vaccine, or intervention is 100% effective and available. Thus all practical, effective, and safe means should be used based on risk/benefit analysis. Over 20 countries adopted ivermectin for COVID-19. Ivermectin may be purchased over the counter in the state of Tennessee. Source: <https://c19ivm.org/>

⁷ Masks – Civil Liberties, Simone Gold, MD, JD, FABEM

“The pore size of cloth face coverings range from ~ 20-100 microns. The Covid virus is 200-1000x smaller than that, at 0.1 microns. Putting up a chain link fence will not keep out a mosquito.” Source:

https://res.cloudinary.com/afllds/image/upload/v1660703803/afllds/6076df5ce86247e10f68ae5b_Masks_Civil_Liberties_0b7d2bef88.pdf

Amici curiae AFLDS' member physicians are deeply committed to the guiding principle of medicine: "FIRST, DO NO HARM." They gravely take their ethical obligations to their patients with the utmost seriousness. It is axiomatic that a physician's duty is to his or her patient.

However, the illegal actions of the Defendants-Appellants exposed by this brilliant lawsuit pose great dangers to patient health, to the doctor/patient relationship, and to informed consent.

While it can be said that even false speech, misrepresentations and lies can be protected as free speech, *amici curiae* are left with a burning question:

Why was truthful and accurate medical information ruthlessly censored, exposing patients to great risks, while inaccurate and false information was often promoted instead of the truth, as an "approved government narrative"?

⁸ Masks: The Science and Myths, Dr. Lee Merritt
<https://afls.org/videos/post/masks-the-science-myths>

⁹ Do physical measures such as hand-washing or wearing masks stop or slow down the spread of respiratory viruses? [meta-mask analysis].
"Wearing masks in the community probably makes little or no difference to the outcome of influenza-like illness (ILI)/COVID-19 like illness compared to not wearing masks (risk ratio (RR) 0.95, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.84 to 1.09; 9 trials, 276,917 participants; moderate-certainty evidence." Source:
https://www.cochrane.org/CD006207/ARI_do-physical-measures-such-hand-washing-or-wearing-masks-stop-or-slow-down-spread-respiratory-viruses

D. These egregious constitutional violations and *ultra vires* conduct heroically uncovered by Plaintiffs-Appellees may also give rise to criminal liability under statutes such as 18 U.S.C. §241 and 42 U.S.C. §1985, in addition to civil liability

The suppression of important medical information during a pandemic, which put patient's lives at risk, is sufficiently serious so as to warrant the possible applicability of criminal statutes such as 18 U.S.C. §241 and 42 U.S.C. §1985.

This is on account of the high level of internal collusion, coordination and cooperation between and among the various government Defendants-Appellants herein. See for example *Schwarzer v. Wainwright*, No. 19-41011 (5th Cir. 2021), *United States v. Guest*, 383 U.S. 745 (1966), *Griffin v. Breckenridge*, 403 U.S. 88 (1971), and *United States v. Price*, 383 U.S. 787 (1966).

E. Government funding of artificial intelligence viewpoint censorship programs, so that unconstitutional and illegal suppression of disfavored viewpoints can be made automatic, and driven by artificial intelligence and machine learning technologies, cries out to revisit the class action ruling, in order to protect the class of socia media users.

Unfortunately, new information is emerging that this government is now funding artificial intelligence viewpoint censorship programs, so that the unconstitutional and illegal suppression of disfavored viewpoints can be made automated, and driven by artificial intelligence and machine learning

technologies¹⁰. This development cries out for this distinguished Court to revisit the class action ruling as well, to protect the class of social media users.

CONCLUSION

As the District Court eloquently observed:

“For if men are to be precluded from offering their sentiments on a matter, which may involve the most serious and alarming consequences, that can invite the consideration of mankind, reason is of no use to us; the freedom of speech may be taken away, and dumb and silent we may be led, like sheep, to the slaughter.”
[Emphasis added]

George Washington, March 15, 1783.

And

“Whoever would overthrow the liberty of a nation must begin by subduing the free acts of speech.”

Benjamin Franklin, *Letters of Silence Dogwood*.

Memorandum Ruling on Request for Preliminary Injunction, ROA.26457.

The unconstitutional and illegal actions exposed by the Plaintiffs-

¹⁰ The U.S. Government Is Building A Vast Surveillance And Speech Suppression Web Around Every American: “While the “Twitter Files” offer a glimpse into the government’s efforts to censor disfavored viewpoints, what we have seen is nothing compared to what is planned, as the details of hundreds of federal awards lay bare. Research by The Federalist reveals our tax dollars are funding the development of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine-learning (ML) technology that will allow the government to easily discover “problematic” speech and track Americans reading or partaking in such conversations. Then, in partnership with Big Tech, Big Business, and media outlets, the government will ensure the speech is censored, under the guise of combatting “misinformation” and “disinformation.” <https://thefederalist.com/2023/03/21/grants-reveal-federal-governments-horrific-plans-to-censor-ll-americans-speech/>

Appellants herein which violated the fundamental rights of millions of Americans are of sufficient gravity and importance so as to amply justify the injunction issued. The temporary administrative stay should also be immediately dissolved.

Respectfully Submitted,

s/ David A. Dalia

David A. Dalia

Attorney at Law, La. Bar No. 01320

830 Union Street, Suite 302

New Orleans, LA 70112

T: 504-524-5541

davidadalia@gmail.com

Counsel for *Amici Curiae*,

America's Frontline Doctors and

Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 32(g)

I hereby certify that the foregoing brief complies with Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(7)(B) and Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(5) because it contains 5,256 words, including the parts of the brief exempted by Fed. R. App. P. 32(f) and 5th Cir. R. 32-4. I further certify that this brief complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced font in Microsoft Word using 14-point Times New Roman.

s/ David A. Dalia
David A. Dalia

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 7th, 2023, I electronically filed the foregoing *Amici Curiae* Brief with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit via the Court's CM/ECF system, which will automatically serve all counsel of record via CM/ECF notice.

s/ David A. Dalia
David A. Dalia