IN THE CIRCUIT COURT	Γ FOR THE STATE OF OREGON	
FOR THE COUNTY OF MULTNOMAH		
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION	Case No.	
OF OREGON, INC., an Oregon non-profit public benefit corporation, and PROTESTER #1, an individual,	COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	
Plaintiffs, v.	NOT SUBJECT TO MANDATORY ARBITRATION	
CITY OF PORTLAND, an Oregon municipal corporation,	ORS 21.135(2)(a), (f): \$281	
Defendant.		
INTRO	ODUCTION	
1. Oregon is not a surveillance sta	ate. With this action, Plaintiffs American Civil	
Liberties Union of Oregon, Inc. and Protester	#11 seek to eliminate a practice by the City of	
Portland — and, specifically, the Portland Pol	lice Bureau — that threatens to turn it into one.	
<u>PARTIES</u>	S AND VENUE	
2. Plaintiff American Civil Liber	ties Union of Oregon, Inc. ("ACLU") is an Oregon	
non-profit public benefit corporation.		
3. Plaintiff Protester #1 is an indi	vidual who resides in Portland, Oregon.	
4. Defendant City of Portland (th	e "City") is a municipality incorporated in Oregon.	
T1 D - 41 - 1 D - 1; D (%DDD2) ; 1	artment or division of the City.	

1	5.	Venue is proper in this Court because Plaintiffs' causes of action arose, at least in
2	part, in Multno	mah County.
3		<b>FACTS</b>
4	6.	Over the past several weeks, thousands of Oregonians have exercised their
5	constitutional r	ights by protesting in streets, parks, and other public spaces in and around
6	Portland. The p	rotesters seek fundamental changes in the way American police departments
7	interact with the	e communities they serve. In particular, they seek to eradicate the senseless and
8	recurring police	e brutality and murders of Black people like George Floyd, Breonna Taylor,
9	Michael Brown	, Quanice Hayes, Terrell Johnson, Keaton Otis, Aaron Campbell, Patrick
10	Kimmons, Darr	ris Johnson, Kendra James, and so many others.
11	7.	PPB has surveilled participants in the protests, and will continue to do so, with
12	livestreamed in	ternet videos. The videos regularly depict individual protesters who are
13	demonstrating p	peacefully and engaging in no criminal activity at all. Nevertheless, the videos
14	have focused an	nd will continue to focus on specific protesters, apparently for the purpose of
15	identifying ther	m.
16	8.	Protester #1 is one such protester. On the evening of July 13, 2020, Protester #1
17	attended a prote	est that took place at the headquarters of the Portland Police Association (the
18	"PPA") in Nort	h Portland. Protester #1 did so in order to express solidarity with other protesters,
19	and because Pro	otester #1 had been sickened and devastated by acts of violence committed by
20	PPB against oth	ner protesters over the past several weeks. At all times, Protester #1 demonstrated
21	peacefully and	engaged in no criminal conduct whatsoever. Protester #1 spent much of Protester
22	#1's time at the	protest standing in front of the line of PPB officers that had encircled PPA's
23	building, holding	ng up photos of Protester #1's child and pleading with the officers not to harm the

24

25

crowd.

9.	During the protest, a PPB camera captured Protester #1's image, which it
livestreamed	l publicly on the internet. At the time, Protester #1 was not aware that PPB was
filming the	crowd. Had Protester #1 known of PPB's filming, Protester #1 would not have
consented to	it. Protester #1 plans to continue attending protests, but is deeply disturbed by
PPB's pract	ice of using livestreamed internet videos to monitor protesters' exercise of their
constitutions	al rights.

- 10. Many of the other protesters whose likenesses and voices have appeared on PPB's videos also want not to be recorded. Several have shouted as much at PPB's cameraperson; others have shone bright lights at its camera in attempts to obscure the camera's view of the crowds; still others have used squeakers to obscure PPB's audio recording. ACLU's legal observers<sup>2</sup> and other members have been (and will continue to be) among those at the protests who object to PPB's recording.
- 11. As a technological matter, the contents of each livestreamed video are within PPB's custody and control beginning at the moment when each livestream begins. For example, YouTube which PPB has used for some of its livestreams requires a user to choose whether to delete or retain a livestreamed video when the livestream ends. Until the user makes a selection, the full contents of the video remain accessible to the user, which, in this case, is PPB itself.
- 12. PPB has offered varying rationales for livestreaming videos of protesters. Its policies say that it does so to provide "situational awareness" and to record possible criminal activity. According to section 4.3 of PPB Directive No. 0635.10, "[d]emonstrations may be broadcast to Bureau facilities by live video feed to provide situational awareness to the [PPB]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> ACLU legal observers are trained volunteers who attend protests at the invitation of the events' organizer(s). Legal observers are asked to document interactions between protesters and law enforcement. They do not intervene in the event of a violation of law; instead, they document the violation for later review.

1	Incident Commander]. * * * If a possible crime is captured on the recording, that recording will
2	be forwarded to [the] Bureau's Detective Division for investigation and the District Attorney's
3	Office, if requested." However, in a separate email, a Senior Deputy City Attorney wrote that
4	PPB had livestreamed one video not to provide "situational awareness," but rather "so the
5	community could understand what was occurring at the protest."
6	13. In August of 1988, ACLU and PPB reached a civil settlement agreement (the
7	"Agreement") regarding the latter's collection of information about participants in public
8	demonstrations. A copy of an August 3, 1988 letter from Portland's City Attorney memorializing
9	the Agreement is attached as Exhibit A. Among other things, the Agreement obligated PPB to
10	adopt the following formal policy:
11	"Portland Police Officers shall not collect or maintain
12	information about the political, religious or social views, associations or activities of any individual, group, association,
13	organization, corporation, business or partnership unless such information relates directly to an investigation of criminal
14	activities, and there are reasonable grounds to suspect the subject of the information is or may be involved in criminal conduct."
15	In exchange for that and other promises by PPB, ACLU promised that it would "not litigate over
16	the collection of information by [PPB] at demonstrations which have occurred prior to July 27,
17	1988."
18	14. The nature of the Agreement was and remains clear: PPB promised ACLU that it
19	would comply at all times with ORS 181A.250 (whose language the Agreement tracks verbatim)
20	when its officers are present at or otherwise involved in demonstrations by members of the
21	public.
22	15. PPB's practice of livestreaming videos of protesters amounts to a violation of
23	ORS 181A.250, and to a breach of the Agreement. By livestreaming videos of protesters, PPB
24	collects and maintains information about their political and social views, associations, and
25	activities in violation of ORS 181A.250.

16.	Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law for PPB's violations, which pose a
serious and i	mminent threat of irreparable harm to them and other protesters alike. Specifically,
PPB cannot	"undo" a video through which its officers identify or otherwise collect information
about a prote	ester. Nor can it force a third party to "un-learn" information about a protester that
the third part	ry obtains by watching PPB's livestream. Moreover, any damages associated with
such conduc	t by PPB would be, by their very nature, extremely difficult or impossible to
quantify.	
17.	An order prohibiting PPB from livestreaming or otherwise recording video or
audio of prot	testers except as permitted by ORS 181A.250 would subject it to no meaningful
burden. As the	he contents of the videos themselves make clear, there is no reason to believe that
such an orde	r would interfere at all with PPB's legitimate operations or responsibilities at the
protests.	
18.	Additionally, an order prohibiting PPB from livestreaming or otherwise recording
video or aud	io of protesters except as permitted by ORS 181A.250 would serve the public
interest, in th	nat it would facilitate and promote Plaintiffs' and other protesters' exercise of their
constitutiona	ll rights.
	CLAIMS FOR RELIEF
	FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Declaratory Judgment; ORS 181A.250 and ORS 28.010 et seq.) (ACLU and Protester #1)
19.	Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference each of the preceding paragraphs
as if fully set	t forth herein.
20.	By livestreaming the videos described above, the City has collected and
maintained,	and will continue to collect and maintain, information about the political and social
views, assoc	iations, and activities of Protester #1, ACLU, and others who have attended or will
attend the pr	otests. Its videos do not relate to an investigation of any criminal activities, nor are

<ul><li>22</li><li>23</li></ul>	SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF (Breach of Contract/Breach of the Duty of Good Faith and Fair Dealing) (ACLU)		
21	preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief prohibiting the City from doing so in the future.		
20	subjects of the videos are or may be involved in criminal conduct; and (ii) temporary,		
19	relates to an investigation of criminal activities and there exist reasonable grounds to suspect the		
18	video or audio of protesters demonstrating in public spaces, except where the video or audio		
17	prohibits the City (including, but not limited to, PPB) from livestreaming or otherwise recording		
16	23. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are entitled to (i) a declaration that ORS 181A.250		
15	violations of ORS 181A.250.		
14	22. As explained above, Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law for the City's		
13	City's unlawful conduct to cease.		
12	practical effect on the rights that Plaintiffs are seeking to vindicate because it will cause the		
11	circumstances permitted by the statute, and enjoining it from doing so in the future, will have a		
10	City from livestreaming or otherwise recording video or audio of protesters except in the		
9	this Court orders otherwise. Moreover, a decision declaring that ORS 181A.250 prohibits the		
8	already has engaged in conduct prohibited by ORS 181A.250 and will continue to do so unless		
7	of such conduct. Their injury is real, and not hypothetical or speculative, because the City		
6	caused a specific injury to Plaintiffs' rights under ORS 181A.250, which entitles them to be free		
5	practice of livestreaming the videos described above. The City's livestreaming of the videos has		
4	21. Plaintiffs' rights, statuses, and other legal relations are affected by the City's		
3	will continue to violate ORS 181A.250.		
2	involved in any criminal conduct. Thus, by livestreaming the videos, the City has violated and		
1	there any reasonable grounds to suspect that the specific subjects of the videos are or may be		

PAGE 6 – COMPLAINT

as if fully set forth herein.

24.

24

25

ACLU realleges and incorporates by reference each of the preceding paragraphs

1	25.	The Agreement is a binding and valid contract between ACLU and the City.	
2	ACLU has fo	ully performed all of its obligations under the Agreement, and has not breached any	
3	obligation imposed on it by the Agreement.		
4	26.	The Agreement imposes a contractual obligation on the City to comply with ORS	
5	181A.250, w	hose language the Agreement tracks verbatim. In particular, the Agreement	
6	obligates the City as a matter of contract "not [to] collect or maintain information about the		
7	political * *	* or social views, associations or activities of any individual, group, association, [or]	
8	organization	," except in the circumstances permitted by ORS 181A.250.	
9	27.	The City (and, specifically, PPB) has breached the Agreement by collecting	
10	information	about protesters in the manner described above.	
11	28.	Alternatively, if the City did not breach the terms of the Agreement by collecting	
12	information about protesters in the manner described above, it violated the duty of good faith and		
13	fair dealing by doing so.		
14	29.	As explained above, ACLU has no adequate remedy at law for the City's breaches	
15	of the Agree	ment or, alternatively, of the duty of good faith and fair dealing.	
16	30.	Accordingly, ACLU is entitled to (i) a declaration that the Agreement prohibits	
17	the City (inc	luding, but not limited to, PPB) from livestreaming or otherwise recording video or	
18	audio of protesters demonstrating in public spaces, except where the video or audio relates to an		
19	investigation of criminal activities and there exist reasonable grounds to suspect the subjects of		
20	the videos are or may be involved in criminal conduct; and (ii) temporary, preliminary, and		
21	permanent ir	njunctive relief prohibiting the City from doing so in the future.	
22		<u>PRAYER</u>	
23	WHE	EREFORE Plaintiffs pray for a judgment awarding the following relief:	
24	A.	A declaration that ORS 181A.250 and the Agreement each prohibit the City	
25	(including, b	out not limited to, PPB) from livestreaming or otherwise recording video or audio of	

PAGE 7 – COMPLAINT

1	protesters demonstrating in public spaces, except where the video or audio relates to an		
2	investigation of criminal activities and there exist reasonable grounds to suspect the subjects of		
3	the videos are or may be involved in criminal conduct;		
4	B. Temporary, preliminary, and permanent injunctive relief prohibiting the City,		
5	including its employees, agents, and all others acting in concert with it or on its behalf, from		
6	livestreaming or otherwise recording video or audio of protesters demonstrating in public spaces		
7	except where the video or audio relates to an investigation of criminal activities and there exist		
8	reasonable grounds to suspect the subjects of the videos are or may be involved in criminal		
9	conduct.		
10	C. The costs and disbursements that Plaintiffs incur in bringing this action; and		
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

PAGE 8 – COMPLAINT

1	D.	Such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
2	Dated: July 2	9, 2020.
3		s/Edward A. Piper
4		ANGELI LAW GROUP LLC EDWARD A. PIPER, OSB No. 141609
5		ed@angelilaw.com JOANNA T. PERINI-ABBOTT, OSB No. 141394
6		joanna@angelilaw.com URSULA M. LALOVIĆ, OSB No. 176289
7		ursula@angelilaw.com 121 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
8		Portland, Oregon 97204 Tel. 503.954.2232
9		Fax 503.227.0880
10		ALAN LLOYD KESSLER ALAN LLOYD KESSLER, OSB No. 150209
11		ak@alankesslerlaw.com 1001 SE Sandy Blvd # 210
12		Portland, Oregon 97214 Telephone: (503) 860-1020
13		AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION OF OREGON
14		KELLY K. SIMON, OSB No. 154213
15		ksimon@aclu-or.org P.O. Box 40585
16		Portland, Oregon 97240 Telephone: (503) 227-6928
17		Counsel for Plaintiffs
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PAGE 9 – COMPLAINT





## PORTLAND, OREGON

## OFFICE OF CITY ATTORNEY

Jeffrey L. Rogers, City Attorney 1220 S.W. 5th Avenue Portland, Oregon 97204 (503) 248-4047

RECEIVED

AUG 4 1988

E ROSENTHAL

August 3, 1988

ELDEN M ROSENTHAL ROSENTHAL & GREENE PC 1907 ORBANCO BUILDING 1001 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND OR 97204-1165

Re: Portland Police Bureau Policy on

Maintaining Information

Dear Elden:

I have met with the appropriate Police Bureau officials to discuss your partial counter-proposal in your March 2, 1988 letter. We accept the new paragraph you proposed.

Accordingly, it is our understanding that the American Civil Liberties Union and the Portland Police Bureau have agreed to the following resolution of this matter.

- 1. The American Civil Liberties Union will not litigate over the collection of information by the Portland Police Bureau at demonstrations which have occurred prior to July 27, 1988.
- 2. The Portland Police Bureau will formally adopt the following policy by amending its standard operating procedures for the criminal investigation division. The amended policy shall state:

Portland Police Officers shall not collect or maintain information about the political, religious or social views, associations or activities of any individual, group, association, organization, corporation, business or partnership unless such information directly relates to an investigation of criminal activities, and there are reasonable grounds to suspect the subject of the information is or may be involved in criminal conduct.

Any photographs or other tangible information taken or obtained at peaceful demonstrations in accordance with the above paragraph may be retained by the Portland Police Bureau for 30

Elden M. Rosenthal August 3, 1988 Page 2

> days, during which time the Bureau will be able to process police officer reports and review evidence, including any citizen complaints or charges of criminal misconduct, property damage, or other matters for which the photographs or information could constitute evidence. At the end of this 30-day period the photographs and information shall be destroyed by the Portland Police Bureau unless, at that time, there are reasonable grounds to suspect the subject of the information is or may be involved in criminal conduct and the photographs or information relate directly to a criminal investigation, in which case, the photographs may be maintained by the Portland Police Bureau as long as those conditions exist.

The Bureau shall not collect or maintain information about the political, religious or social views, associations or activities of any individual, group, association or organization, corporation, business or partnership, solely for the reason that the individual, or individual members of a group, association, organization, corporation, business or partnership have been convicted of a crime, but the Bureau may consider the relationship of the facts which supported the conviction to any current information in determining whether there are reasonable grounds to suspect the subject is or may be involved in criminal conduct.

- 3. The Portland Police Bureau has reviewed its files, and will review them again in light of the amended policy, to ensure that their contents comply with the law and the amended policy adopted pursuant to this agreement.
- 4. The Portland Police Bureau assures that they are not currently collecting or maintaining information upon the political, religious, or social views, associations or activities of Mr. John Blank, the American Field Services (AFS), or the Portland Central American Solidarity Committee (PCASC). Furthermore, the Bureau assures that it does not presently have any documents whatsoever concerning Blank, AFS or PCASC in criminal intelligence files.

Elden M. Rosenthal August 3, 1988 Page 3

I have one additional concern, although I do not propose that it be an official part of the resolution of this matter. My concern is how the ACLU portrays this agreement. Understandably, any organization wants to portray itself as a frequent "winner." Although it wouldn't be the end of the world if the ACLU portrays this agreement as a victory over the Police Bureau, I believe it would be inaccurate and might create unnecessary tension which would interfere with future cooperative approaches to problem solving. In other words, I believe that the Portland Police Bureau has responded in a constructive and responsible manner to the legitimate parts of the ACLU's concerns, and I hope that the ACLU will acknowledge that action in any public portrayal of this agreement.

The City has been making increased efforts to talk with the ACLU prior to taking actions which might raise civil liberties questions. Conversely, we appreciated your approaching us informally on this matter before commencing litigation. Although there is inevitably healthy tension between your organization and the Portland Police Bureau, I believe strongly that it is in everyone's interest to promote a non-adversarial approach to these difficult and important issues.

I will be out of town from August 4th through August 15th. I hope that before my return you will be able to confirm this agreement. When I receive your confirmation upon my return, I will advise the Police Bureau and they will amend their policy in accordance with this agreement.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Jeff Roger

Jeffrey L. Rogers City Attorney

JLR/dzl conf\rosen

c: Deputy Chief Rob Aichele
 Lt. Al Dean
 Mary Overgaard
 Steve Moskowitz