

# e-commerce law reports

**FEATURED ARTICLE**  
**04/09**



cecile park publishing

Head Office UK Cecile Park Publishing Limited, 17 The Timber Yard, Drysdale Street, London N1 6ND  
tel +44 (0)20 7012 1380 fax +44 (0)20 7729 6093 info@e-comlaw.com  
[www.e-comlaw.com](http://www.e-comlaw.com)

**John Doe v Gonzales**

04 CIV. 2614 (VM) United States District Court Southern District of New York  
6 September 2007

The court rules on the constitutionality of 'gag' orders prohibiting electronic communications service providers from disclosing that they have received NSLs from US authorities.

On 6 September, a federal court in New York ruled that 'gag' orders prohibiting electronic communications service providers from disclosing that they received National Security Letters (NSLs) for customer information, violate the First Amendment. Moreover, because it found that the gag order section cannot be severed from the rest of the NSL provision, the court invalidated the entire provision. The court also found that the limitations on judicial review of non-disclosure orders violate the First Amendment and the separation of powers. The court stayed its ruling pending appeal (or for 90 days in the unlikely event that no appeal is filed), meaning that the FBI can continue to serve NSLs on telecoms and email providers. While the court's lengthy defense of judicial prerogatives and its soaring flights of rhetoric may stir the souls of civil libertarians, a narrower and more carefully calibrated opinion might have stood a better chance of withstanding appeal.

This case, *Doe v Gonzales*, has been ongoing since April 2004, when an unnamed Internet Service Provider (ISP) filed its original complaint after receiving an NSL. NSLs are essentially administrative subpoenas that the FBI can use, without having to go to a court or a grand jury, to obtain a wide variety of customer records - but not communications content - from electronic communications providers, financial institutions and credit agencies. After the district court awarded<sup>1</sup> plaintiffs a sweeping victory that invalidated both the NSL's demand for information and the gag order on Fourth and First Amendment grounds, respectively, the government appealed. But before the Second Circuit ruled on the matter, Congress passed legislation<sup>2</sup> reauthorizing and amending the

USA PATRIOT Act<sup>3</sup>. That legislation gave NSL recipients a limited right to challenge an NSL in court, as well as a right to challenge a gag order. As a result, plaintiffs decided to drop their Fourth Amendment claim, and the Second Circuit vacated<sup>4</sup> the district court's decision and remanded for reconsideration in light of the newly enacted legislation.

The amended gag order provision, 18 USC § 2709(c), prohibits a recipient of an NSL from disclosing that it received a letter if the FBI certifies that such disclosure 'may result in' any one of several enumerated harms, including: a 'danger to ... national security', 'interference with ... a[n] investigation [or] diplomatic relations', or 'danger to the life or physical safety of any person'. Meanwhile, the newly enacted 18 USC § 3511(b) allows an NSL recipient to request judicial review of a gag order, but states that the court may lift the order only if it determines 'that there is no reason to believe' disclosure 'may result in' one of the enumerated harms. Section 3511(b) also states that the court must treat the government's certification that 'disclosure may endanger the national security of the United States or interfere with diplomatic relations' as 'conclusive', unless the court finds that such certification was 'made in bad faith'.

On remand, the district court found that the amended section 2709(c) still violates the First Amendment, since it permits the government to restrain speech without 'afford[ing] adequate procedural safeguards' and was not narrowly tailored to the government's interests. The court determined that section 2709(c) fails to place the 'burden of going to court to suppress the speech and the burden of proof once in court ... on the censoring government', as

required under *Freedman v Maryland*<sup>5</sup>, 380 U.S. 51 (1965). The court reasoned that, like *Freedman*, section 2709(c) 'constitutes a form of licensing', since it allows the FBI 'broad discretion' to grant some disclosure requests while denying others. The court also found that section 2709(c) is not narrowly tailored to a compelling government interest, since the statute potentially places 'a permanent bar on disclosure' and does not require the government to lift the gag order when the threat to national security has passed or when the existence of the NSL is disclosed through other means. Perhaps most strikingly, the court also found that section 2709(c) is not severable from sections 2709(a) and (b), which govern demands for information. The court reasoned - as it had in its initial opinion - that 'Congress intended the statute to function as a secret means of gathering information from communications service providers' and therefore could not have intended the provisions governing demands for information to operate without the non-disclosure provision. 'Accordingly', the court concluded, '§§ 2709(a) and (b) must be invalidated as non-severable from § 2709(c)'.

The court also held that section 3511(b), which allows for limited judicial review of gag orders, is unconstitutional under both the First Amendment and the doctrine of separation of powers. The court concluded that section 3511(b) violates the First Amendment because it 'impermissibly ties the judiciary's hands by requiring a reviewing court to effectively end its analysis as long [as] the court finds a reason - any reason - to believe disclosure "may" lead to one of the Enumerated Harms'. Moreover, the court noted that section 3511(b) does not permit

the kind of ‘particularized,’ ‘case-by-case’ analysis required to balance the potential harm to the government against First Amendment interests, and concluded that ‘credit[ing] the government’s invocation of national security as conclusive absent evidence of bad faith eviscerates any meaningful judicial review’. The court also found that section 3511(b) violates the separation of powers by mandating ‘when and how deference [to the executive’s assertions of danger to national security] should be accorded,’ thereby barring the judiciary from applying established First Amendment standards to a challenged restriction on protected speech. In one of its purple passages, the court warned that such incursions on the role of courts ‘could serve as a precedential step toward the development of a much larger and more fearsome vehicle for legislative or executive intrusion into the business of the courts,’ and that ‘what might commence as an innocent legislative step over a blurry line in the dark could later’ morph into ‘the legislative equivalent of breaking and entering, with an ominous free pass to the hijacking of constitutional values’.

Such rhetorical flourishes might sound like choir music to the converted, but they sometimes can grate on appellate judges like fingers on a blackboard. We already saw one instance of this recently, when the Sixth Circuit in July vacated<sup>6</sup> a sweeping (but sloppily reasoned) district court order<sup>7</sup> striking down the NSA’s former warrantless wiretapping program. Moreover, the district court in Doe probably didn’t help itself when it reached out to strike down the entire NSL provision, rather than just the gag order sections. The government has already said it is considering an appeal.

**Michael Vatis** Partner  
Stephoe & Johnson LLP  
mvatis@stephoe.com

1. <http://www.stephoe.com/assets/attachments/421.pdf>.
2. USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005, public law 109-177-Mar. 9, 2006.
3. Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT Act) Act of 2001, public law 107-56-Oct. 26, 2001.
4. John Doe I, John Doe II, American Civil Liberties Union, American Civil Liberties Union Foundation, v Alberto Gonzales (in official capacity as Attorney General), Robert S. Mueller III (in official capacity as Director of the Federal Bureau OF Investigation), Marion E. Bowman (in official capacity as Senior Counsel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation), John Roe, Docket Nos. 05-0570-cv(L), 05-4896-cv(CON), November 2, 2005.
5. U.S. Supreme Court, *Freedman v Maryland*, 380 U.S. 51 (1965).
6. <http://www.ca6.uscourts.gov/opinions.pdf/07a0253p-06.pdf>
7. <http://www.stephoe.com/publications/418d.pdf>.



# cecile park publishing

Head Office UK Cecile Park Publishing Limited, 17 The Timber Yard, Drysdale Street, London N1 6ND  
tel +44 (0)20 7012 1380 fax +44 (0)20 7729 6093 info@e-comlaw.com  
[www.e-comlaw.com](http://www.e-comlaw.com)

Registered number 2676976 Registered address 141 Wardour Street, London W1F 0UT VAT registration 577806103

## e-commerce law & policy

Many leading companies, including Amazon, BT, eBay, FSA, Orange, Vodafone, Standard Life, and Microsoft have subscribed to ECLP to aid them in solving the business and legal issues they face online.

ECLP, was nominated in 2000 and again in 2004 for the British & Irish Association of Law Librarian's Legal Publication of the Year.

**A twelve month subscription is £420 (overseas £440) for twelve issues and includes single user access to our online database.**

## e-commerce law reports

You can now find in one place all the key cases, with analysis and comment, that affect online, mobile and interactive business. ECLR tracks cases and regulatory adjudications from around the world.

Leading organisations, including Clifford Chance, Herbert Smith, Baker & McKenzie, Hammonds, Coudert Brothers, Orange and Royal Mail are subscribers.

**A twelve month subscription is £420 (overseas £440) for six issues and includes single user access to our online database.**

## data protection law & policy

You can now find in one place the most practical analysis, and advice, on how to address the many problems - and some opportunities - thrown up by data protection and freedom of information legislation.

DPLP's monthly reports update an online archive, which is an invaluable research tool for all those who are involved in data protection. Data acquisition, SMS marketing, subject access, Freedom of Information, data retention, use of CCTV, data sharing and data transfer abroad are all subjects that have featured recently. Leading organisations, including the Office of the Information Commissioner, Allen & Overy, Hammonds, Lovells, BT, Orange, West Berkshire Council, McCann Fitzgerald, Devon County Council and Experian are subscribers.

**A twelve month subscription is £390 (public sector £285, overseas £410) for twelve issues and includes single user access to our online database.**

## world online gambling law report

You can now find in one place analysis of the key legal, financial and regulatory issues facing all those involved in online gambling and practical advice on how to address them. The monthly reports update an online archive, which is an invaluable research tool for all those involved in online gambling.

Poker, payment systems, white labelling, jurisdiction, betting exchanges, regulation, testing, interactive TV and mobile gaming are all subjects that have featured in WOGLR recently.

Leading organisations, including Ladbrokes, William Hill, Coral, Sportingbet, BskyB, DCMS, PMU, Orange and Clifford Chance are subscribers.

**A twelve month subscription is £520 (overseas £540) for twelve issues and includes single user access to our online database.**

## world sports law report

WSLR tracks the latest developments from insolvency rules in football, to EU Competition policy on the sale of media rights, to doping and probity. The monthly reports update an online archive, which is an invaluable research tool for all involved in sport.

Database rights, sponsorship, guerilla marketing, the Court of Arbitration in Sport, sports agents, image rights, jurisdiction, domain names, ticketing and privacy are subjects that have featured in WSLR recently.

Leading organisations, including the England & Wales Cricket Board, the British Horse Board, Hammonds, Fladgate Fielder, Clarke Willmott and Skadden Arps Meagre & Flom are subscribers.

**A twelve month subscription is £520 (overseas £540) for twelve issues and includes single user access to our online database.**

- Please enrol me as a subscriber to **e-commerce law & policy** at £420 (overseas £440)
- Please enrol me as a subscriber to **e-commerce law reports** at £320 (overseas £440)
- Please enrol me as a subscriber to **data protection law & policy** at £390 (public sector £285, overseas £410)
- Please enrol me as a subscriber to **world online gambling law report** at £520 (overseas £540)
- Please enrol me as a subscriber to **world sports law report** at £520 (overseas £540)

**All subscriptions last for one year. You will be contacted at the end of that period to renew your subscription.**

Name

Job Title

Department  Company

Address

Address

City  State

Country  Postcode

Telephone  Fax

Email

**1** Please **invoice me**  Purchase order number

Signature  Date

**2** I enclose a **cheque** for the amount of

made payable to 'Cecile Park Publishing Limited'

**3** Please debit my **credit card**  VISA  MASTERCARD

Card No.  Expiry Date

Signature  Date

VAT No. (if ordering from an EC country)

Periodically we may allow companies, whose products or services might be of interest, to send you information. Please tick here if you would like to hear from other companies about products or services that may add value to your subscription.

priority order form

FAX +44 (0)20 7729 6093

CALL +44 (0)20 7012 1380

EMAIL [dan.towse@e-comlaw.com](mailto:dan.towse@e-comlaw.com)

ONLINE [www.e-comlaw.com](http://www.e-comlaw.com)

POST Cecile Park Publishing 17 The Timber Yard, Drysdale Street, London N1 6ND