

Dear _____,

I am reaching out because Lane Myers, a news reporter for Freedom Productions, LLC, is facing criminal charges in Arizona related to an unconstitutionally overbroad injunction against harassment. Mr. Myers is currently being held in Pima County jail without bond. The bond judge found "proof evident" that Mr. Myers committed aggravated harassment by posting a YouTube video showing the publicly available, professional contact information of the alleged victim, Ms. Shannon Walker, who is a government employee at the University of Arizona.

The injunction orders that:

Defendant must have no direct or indirect contact with Plaintiff through any form of social media.

Defendant must not post or place Plaintiff's contact information, including her work information, on any social media platform.

Defendant must not through social media or otherwise directly or indirectly encourage third parties to contact Plaintiff or go to a Protected Location.

There were two prior injunctions against Mr. Myers, in favor of Ms. Walker, prohibiting similar speech. During both injunction hearings, Ms. Walker made false allegations against Mr. Myers, and the judges violated procedural safeguards intended to ensure the rights of the party not present at the hearing, which was Mr. Myers. Ms. Walker included only one contact from Mr. Myers in her petition; however, she testified to multiple contacts from Mr. Myers during the hearings. Ms. Walker also testified to contacts from individuals who were not Mr. Myers. At the second injunction hearing, the judge re-issued the injunction without hearing testimony from Ms. Walker and in violation of the rule that says an injunction cannot be dismissed and then re-issued on the same facts.

These are clear violations of the requirements for issuing an injunction against harassment.

Further, and most importantly, the injunctions restrict constitutionally protected speech. The injunctions prohibited Mr. Myers from posting social media content about Ms. Walker. An injunction is intended to prevent one individual from having direct contact with another individual. An injunction cannot be used as a prior restraint on speech about a person. Yet that is exactly what happened here. This error is even more egregious because Ms. Walker is a State of Arizona employee.

Mr. Myers made and posted videos on YouTube discussing the unconstitutionally overbroad injunction. He also posted the injunction hearings during which procedural safeguards were violated, which are public record. Mr. Myers criticized Ms. Walker, the judges who issued the injunctions, and other government actors involved in the abridgement of Mr. Myers's First Amendment rights. Mr. Myers posted the publicly available, professional contact information of these individuals in his videos. Mr. Myers has been charged with felonies for these acts.

Mr. Myers was acting within his First Amendment rights as a journalist and as a citizen redressing his government at all times during the acts alleged in the indictment. Ms. Walker was an employee of the University of Arizona when Mr. Myers contacted her. As an employee of the State of Arizona, Ms. Walker took an oath to uphold the United States and Arizona constitutions. Those constitutional rights include the rights of citizens to redress their government. Mr. Myers is being criminally charged for redressing the government.

Ms. Walker is married to a local City of Tucson prosecutor, Matthew Walker, who in July-August of 2024, prosecuted Lane Myers for booing during a Tucson City Council meeting. Those charges were dismissed after Mr. Myers fought them in court. Matthew Walker has assisted Pima County with the prosecution of Mr. Myers.

There is no evidence of true threats, incitement to violence, or any other established First Amendment exception. Mr. Myers has never posted Ms. Walker's personal or home contact information. Everything he has posted is publicly available information. All of the charges against him stem from Mr. Myers's constitutionally protected right to redress his government.

Mr. Myers's YouTube channel can be viewed

here: <https://www.youtube.com/@lanemyers2980>

Coverage of the case and court proceedings can be seen here:

<https://www.youtube.com/@ThisisaPublicService>

Mr. Myers's fundraising page is here:

<https://www.givesendgo.com/lane-myers-legal-fund>

The injunction enjoins Mr. Myers from criticizing a government employee and from speaking publicly about legal proceedings in which he is a party. These prohibitions violate Mr. Myers's constitutional right to free speech, which provides strong protection for speech criticizing, or about, government actors. They also violate Mr. Myers's constitutional rights to free press, to petition the government, and to assemble. A court should not enjoin an individual from exercising constitutional rights, yet that is exactly what is happening here. Now the State is criminalizing Mr. Myers's constitutionally protected speech about a government employee. Arizona's harassment law, as it is being applied to Mr. Myers, directly violates his First Amendment right to redress and criticize the government.

These criminal charges have Mr. Myers potentially facing years in prison, depending on how the jury verdict and Arizona's sentencing laws interact. And under the State's legal theory, which now two courts have adopted without reaching the constitutional issues, Mr. Myers could theoretically continue being charged indefinitely, even from prison, should he "indirectly contact" the victim or "directly or indirectly encourage third parties" to contact her. This is an absurd result that

cannot stand. Mr. Myers is not receiving justice through the judicial system. The judicial system is repeatedly and blatantly abridging Mr. Myers's constitutional rights to freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom to petition the government, simply because Mr. Myers criticized government actors.

The Arizona harassment laws, as they are being applied to Mr. Myers, violate both the First Amendment and the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution. As a United States citizen, I am extremely concerned about this situation. I am concerned not only because Mr. Myers is currently detained indefinitely for speaking publicly about public court proceedings involving a government employee, but also because the ability of all Americans to redress their government is being threatened. The State cannot be allowed to prosecute free speech in order to silence speech it does not like or that criticizes it. In fact, the fundamental purpose of the First Amendment is to protect speech that is critical of the government.

The right to criticize and redress the government is one of the most fundamental rights in America. Yet a man is currently jailed and facing the threat of years in prison for doing just that. The prosecution of Lane Myers is chilling my First Amendment right as a citizen to criticize and redress my government. This is unacceptable, and I ask that you immediately take action to investigate and correct this situation.

Thank you for your time and for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
