

# **Legislative Immunity in Minnesota**

Peter S. Wattson  
Senate Counsel  
State of Minnesota

October 17, 2002



Table of Authorities .....	v
Minnesota Cases .....	v
Federal Cases .....	v
Cases from Other States .....	x
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>I. Origins of the Doctrine of Legislative Immunity .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>A. Common Law .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B. Constitutions .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>C. Statutes .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Scope of Legislative Immunity .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>A. “Legislative Acts” Are Immune from Questioning .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>1. Introducing and Voting for Legislation .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. Failing or Refusing to Vote or Enact Legislation .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3. Voting on the Seating of a Member .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Voting on the Confirmation of an Executive Appointment .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5. Voting on an Impeachment .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>6. Determining Whether a Bill Requires Local Approval .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>7. Making Speeches .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>8. Enforcing Rules .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>9. Serving as a Member of a Committee .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>10. Conducting Hearings and Developing Legislation .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>11. Investigating Conduct of Executive Agencies .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>12. Gathering Information .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>13. Publishing Reports .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>14. Sending Letters .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>15. Drafting Memoranda and Documents .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>16. Lobbying for Legislation .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>17. Making Budgetary Decisions .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>18. Making Personnel Decisions .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>a. Speech or Debate Clause Immunity .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>b. Common Law Immunity .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>B. Legislative Immunity is Absolute .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>C. Legislative Immunity is Personal .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>D. Legislative Immunity Continues for Former Legislators .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>E. Legislative Immunity Extends to Non-Legislators Participating in the Legislative Process .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>III. Some Activities of Legislators are Not Immune .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>A. Actions Without Lawful Authority Are Not Immune .....</b>	<b>16</b>

1.	Unconstitutional Procedures for Enacting Legislation	16
2.	Illegal Investigative Procedures	16
3.	False Disclosures and Claims	16
B.	“Political” Acts Are Not Immune	17
1.	Solicitation of Bribes	17
2.	Communications to the Press	18
3.	Communications to Constituents	19
4.	Pressure on the Executive Branch	19
5.	Travel on Legislative Business	19
C.	Administrative Acts are Not Immune	20
1.	Personnel Decisions	20
a.	Congressional Employees	20
b.	State and Local Government Employees	20
2.	Other Administrative Acts by a Local Legislative Body	22
a.	Substantively Legislative	22
b.	Procedurally Legislative	23
D.	Executive Branch Activities are Not Immune	24
1.	Sitting on an Audit Commission	24
2.	Sitting on an Executive Branch Committee	24
IV.	Some Offers of Proof About Legislative Activity are Not Prohibited	24
A.	Proof of Status as a Member is Not Prohibited	24
B.	Proof of Legislative Acts Offered by Defendant in Criminal Action is Not “Questioning”	24
V.	A Legislator and Aide Are “Treated as One” for Purposes of Legislative Immunity	25
A.	Legislative Acts of an Aide Are Immune	25
B.	“Political” Acts of an Aide Are Not Immune	27
C.	Unconstitutional or Illegal Conduct of an Aide is Not Immune	28
VI.	Uses of Legislative Immunity	29
A.	From Ultimate Relief	29
1.	Criminal Prosecution	29
2.	Liability for Damages	29
3.	Declaratory Judgments	30
4.	Injunctions	31
5.	Writs of Quo Warranto and Mandamus	32
6.	Claims for Repayment	32
B.	From Having to Testify or Produce Documents	32
1.	In Criminal Actions	32
2.	In Civil Actions	34
a.	Legislators	34

	(1) Members of Congress .....	34
	(2) State Legislators .....	36
	(3) Local Legislators .....	38
	b. Legislative Aides .....	38
<b>VII.</b>	<b>Appropriate Relief .....</b>	<b>41</b>
	A. From Criminal Indictment .....	41
	C. From Subpoena .....	41
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>Right to Interlocutory Appeal .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>IX.</b>	<b>Waiver of Immunity .....</b>	<b>43</b>



## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Minnesota Cases

<i>Blume v. County of Ramsey</i> , 1988 WL 114606 (Minn. Tax Ct. 1988) .....	39
<i>Layton v. Legislative Audit Commission</i> , No. 429436 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Aug. 29, 1978) (Godfrey, J.) (unpublished order) .....	24
<i>Lifteau v. Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission</i> , No. 421416 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Dec. 27, 1977) (Hachey, J.) (unpublished order) .....	37, 42
<i>Lifteau v. Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission</i> , No. 421416 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Dec. 14, 1977) (Lenertz, J.) (unpublished order) .....	37, 42
<i>McGaa v. Glumack</i> , No. C9-87-2398 (Minn. App., Dec. 31, 1987) (Wozniak, C.J.) (unpublished order) .....	37, 40, 42
<i>Minnesota-Dakota Retail Hardware Association v. State</i> , No. 406422 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Sep. 14, 1976) (Godfrey, J.) (unpublished order) .....	40, 42
<i>Nieting v. Blondell</i> , 306 Minn. 122, 235 N.W.2d 597 (1975) .....	6
<i>State ex rel. Humphrey v. McLaren</i> , No. C5-85-475478 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Nov. 23, 1992) (Wilson, J.) (unpublished order) .....	37, 40
<i>State ex rel. Humphrey v. Philip Morris, Inc.</i> , No. C1-94-8565 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Mar. 13, 1997) (Fitzpatrick, J.) (unpublished order) .....	39
<i>State v. Granse</i> , No. 4133153 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Sep. 3, 1987) (Gearin, J.) (unpublished order) .....	34

### Federal Cases

<i>2BD Associates Limited Partnership v. County Commissioners for Queen Anne's County</i> , 896 F. Supp. 528 (D. Md. 1995) .....	7, 43
<i>77<sup>th</sup> District Judge v. State</i> , 175 Mich. App. 681, 438 N.W.2d 333 (1989) .....	7
<i>Abraham v. Pekarski</i> , 728 F.2d 167 (3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1984) .....	21
<i>Acevedo-Cordero v. Cordero-Santiago</i> , 958 F.2d 20 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir. 1992) .....	2, 20, 22, 29
<i>Acevedo-Garcia v. Vera-Monroig</i> , 204 F.3d 1 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir. 2000) .....	21
<i>Acierno v. Cloutier</i> , 40 F.3d 597 (3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1994) (No. 93-7456) .....	6, 23
<i>Acosta v. Agosto</i> , 590 F.Supp. 144 (D. Puerto Rico 1984) .....	10, 31
<i>Agromayor v. Colberg</i> , 738 F.2d 55 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir. 1984); <i>cert. denied</i> , 469 U.S. 1037 (1984) ...	13, 29
<i>Aitchison v. Raffiani</i> , 708 F.2d 96 (3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1983) .....	3
<i>Alexander v. Holden</i> , 66 F.3d 62 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995) .....	21, 44
<i>Baker v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore</i> , 894 F.2d 679 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990) .....	12
<i>Bastien v. Office of Campbell</i> , 209 F. Supp.2d 1095 (D. Colo. 2002) .....	13
<i>Bateson v. Geisse</i> , 857 F.2d 1300 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1988) .....	23
<i>Benford v. American Broadcasting Companies</i> , 502 F. Supp. 1148 (D. Md. 1980) ...	16, 19, 28
<i>Berkley v. Common Council of City of Charleston</i> , 63 F.3d 295 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995) ( <i>en banc</i> ) ...	12
<i>Bio/Basics International Corp. v. Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp.</i> , 545 F. Supp. 1106 (S.D.N.Y. 1982) .....	)15

<i>Bogan v. Scott-Harris</i> , 523 U.S. 44 (1998) . . . . .	2, 14, 27, 29
<i>Bostick v. Rappleyea</i> , 629 F Supp. 1328 (N.D.N.Y. 1985), <i>aff'd sub nom. Bostick v. Cochrane</i> , 907 F.2d 144 (2 <sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1990) (mem.) . . . . .	22
<i>Brown &amp; Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Williams</i> , 62 F.3d 408 (D.C. Cir. 1995) . . . . .	35
<i>Brown v. Griesenauer</i> , 970 F.2d 431 (8 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992) . . . . .	9, 22
<i>Browning v. Clerk, U. S. House of Representatives</i> , 789 F.2d 923 (D.C. Cir 1986) . . . . .	12, 20, 27, 29, 42
<i>Bruce v. Riddle</i> , 631 F.2d 272 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1980) . . . . .	3
<i>Burtnick v. McLean</i> , 76 F.3d 611 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) . . . . .	2
<i>Cable News Network v. Anderson</i> , 723 F. Supp. 835 (D.D.C. 1989) . . . . .	9
<i>Calhoun v. St. Bernard Parish</i> , 937 F.2d 172 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991) . . . . .	2, 6
<i>Cano v. Davis</i> , 193 F. Supp.2d 1177 (C.D. Cal. 2002) . . . . .	43
<i>Carlos v. Santos</i> , 123 F.3d 61 (2 <sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1997) (No. 97-7523) . . . . .	2, 13
<i>Carver v. Foerster</i> , 102 F.3d 96 (3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1996) . . . . .	21
<i>Chappell v. Robbins</i> , 73 F.3d 918 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) . . . . .	6, 29
<i>Chastain v. Sundquist</i> , 833 F.2d 311 (D.C. Cir. 1987), <i>cert. denied</i> , 487 U.S. 1420 (1988) . . . . .	19
<i>Chateaubriand v. Gaspard</i> , 97 F.3d 1218 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996) . . . . .	21
<i>Cinevision Corp. v. City of Burbank</i> , 745 F.2d 560 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984), <i>cert. denied</i> , 471 U.S. 1054 (1985) . . . . .	22, 23
<i>City of Safety Harbor v. Birchfield</i> , 529 F.2d 1251 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1976) . . . . .	6, 14
<i>Cole v. Gray</i> , 638 F.2d 804 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981), <i>cert. denied</i> , 454 U.S. 838 (1981) . . . . .	18, 19
<i>Colon Berrios v. Hernandez Agosto</i> , 716 F.2d 85 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir. 1983) . . . . .	10, 11, 31
<i>Consumers Union of United States, Inc. v. Periodical Correspondents' Association</i> , 515 F.2d 1341 (D.C. Cir. 1975) . . . . .	9, 26, 30
<i>Corporation Insular de Seguros v. Garcia</i> , 709 F. Supp. 288 (D. Puerto Rico 1989) . . . . .	40
<i>Crymes v. DeKalb County</i> , 923 F.2d 1482 (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991) . . . . .	22, 23
<i>Cutting v. Muzzey</i> , 724 F.2d 259, 261 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir. 1984) . . . . .	22, 23
<i>Davis v. Passman</i> , 544 F.2d 865 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1977), <i>rev'd on other grounds</i> , 571 F.2d 793 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1978) (en banc), <i>rev'd</i> , 442 U.S. 228 (1979) . . . . .	20
<i>Detz v. Hoover</i> , 539 F. Supp. 532 (E.D. Pa. 1982) . . . . .	21
<i>Dickey v. CBS, Inc.</i> , 387 F.Supp. 1332 (E.D. Pa. 1975) . . . . .	18
<i>Doe v. McMillan</i> , 412 U.S. 306 (1975) . . . . .	11, 14, 19, 26, 27, 29, 37
<i>Dombrowski v. Eastland</i> , 387 U.S. 82 (1967) . . . . .	14, 28, 42
<i>Dominion Cogen, Inc. v. District of Columbia</i> , 878 F. Supp. 258 (D.D.C. 1995) . . . . .	10
<i>Drayton v. Mayor and Council of Rockville</i> , 699 F. Supp. 1155 (D. Md. 1988) . . . . .	12
<i>Dusanenko v. Maloney</i> , 560 F. Supp. 822 (S.D.N.Y. 1993) . . . . .	13
<i>Eastland v. United States Servicemen's Fund</i> , 421 U.S. 491 (1975) . . . . .	11, 14, 26, 31, 34, 37, 41
<i>Eslinger v. Thomas</i> , 476 F.2d 225 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1973) . . . . .	28
<i>Espanola Way Corp. v. Meyerson</i> , 690 F.2d 827 (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982), <i>cert. denied</i> , 460 U.S. 1039 (1983) . . . . .	)3
<i>Federal Election Comm'n v. Wright</i> , 777 F. Supp. 525 (N.D. Tex. 1991) . . . . .	16
<i>Florida Ass'n of Rehabilitation Facilities, Inc. v. Fla. Dept. of Health and Rehabilitative Services</i> , 164 F.R.D. 257 (N.D. Fla. 1995) . . . . .	24



<i>Forrester v. White</i> , 484 U.S. 219 (1988) . . . . .	13, 20
<i>Fralin &amp; Waldron, Inc. v. Henrico County, Va.</i> , 474 F. Supp. 1315 (E.D. Va. 1979) . . . . .	7, 23
<i>Front Royal and Warren County Industrial Park Corp. v. Town of Front Royal, Va.</i> , 865 F.2d 77 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989) . . . . .	23
<i>Gambocz v. Sub-Committee on Claims of Joint Legislative Appropriations Committee, New Jersey Legislature</i> , 423 F.2d 674 (3rd Cir. 1970) . . . . .	8
<i>Gordon v. Katz</i> , 934 F. Supp. 79 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) . . . . .	12, 15
<i>Gorman Towers, Inc. v. Bogoslavsky</i> , 626 F.2d 607 (8th Cir. 1980) . . . . .	3
<i>Government of Virgin Islands v. Lee</i> , 775 F.2d 514 (3rd Cir. 1985) . . . . .	16, 29, 43
<i>Gravel v. United States</i> , 408 U.S. 606 (1972) . . . . .	8, 10, 14, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 41
<i>Green v. DeCamp</i> , 612 F.2d 368 (8th Cir. 1980) . . . . .	10, 11, 18, 26, 29
<i>Greenberg v. Collier</i> , 482 F. Supp. 200 (E.D. Va. 1979) . . . . .	18, 36, 43
<i>Gregg v. Barrett</i> , 594 F. Supp. 108 (D.D.C. 1984) . . . . .	11, 27, 31
<i>Gross v. Winter</i> , 692 F. Supp. 1420 (D.D.C. 1988) . . . . .	21
<i>Hahn v. City of Kenner</i> , 984 F. Supp. 436 (E.D. La. 1997) . . . . .	18
<i>Hartley v. Fine</i> , 595 F. Supp. 83 (W.D. Mo. 1984), <i>aff'd in part</i> , 780 F.2d 1383 (8th Cir. 1985) . . . . .	19
<i>Haskell v. Washington Township</i> , 864 F.2d 1266 (6th Cir. 1988) . . . . .	3, 22
<i>Healy v. Town of Pembroke Park</i> 831 F.2d 989 (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987) . . . . .	3, 13
<i>Helstoski v. Meanor</i> , 442 U.S. 500 (1979) . . . . .	42
<i>Hentoff v. Ichord</i> , 318 F. Supp. 1175 (D.D.C. 1970) . . . . .	10, 27
<i>Herbst v. Daukas</i> , 701 F. Supp. 964 (D. Conn. 1988) . . . . .	12
<i>Hernandez v. City of Lafayette</i> , 643 F.2d 1188 (5th Cir. 1981), <i>cert. denied</i> , 455 U.S. 907 (1982) . . . . .	15
<i>Hoellen v. Annunzio</i> , 468 F.2d 522 (7th Cir. 1972) . . . . .	19
<i>Hollyday v. Rainey</i> , 964 F.2d 1441 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992), <i>cert. denied</i> 506 U.S. 1014 (1992) . . . . .	12
<i>Holy Spirit Association for Unification of World Christianity v. Central Intelligence Agency</i> , 558 F. Supp. 41 (D.D.C. 1983) . . . . .	36
<i>Hudson v. Burke</i> , 617 F. Supp. 1501 (N.D. Ill. 1985) . . . . .	20
<i>Hughes v. Tarrant County, Tex.</i> , 948 F.2d 918 (5th Cir. 1991) . . . . .	22, 23
<i>Hutchinson v. Proxmire</i> , 443 U.S. 111 (1979) . . . . .	18, 27
<i>In re Grand Jury Investigation</i> , 587 F.2d 589 (3rd Cir. 1978) . . . . .	33
<i>In re Grand Jury Proceedings (Cianfrani)</i> , 563 F.2d 577 (3rd Cir. 1977) . . . . .	34
<i>In re Grand Jury Subpoena</i> , 626 F. Supp. 1319 (M.D. Pa. 1986) . . . . .	34
<i>In re Grand Jury</i> , 821 F.2d 946 (3rd Cir. 1987) . . . . .	34
<i>In re Possible Violations</i> , 491 F. Supp. 211 (D.D.C. 1980) . . . . .	33
<i>Jones v. Palmer Media, Inc.</i> , 478 F. Supp. 1124 (E.D. Tex. 1979) . . . . .	19, 25
<i>Joyner v. Mofford</i> , 539 F. Supp. 1120 (D. Ariz. 1982) . . . . .	7
<i>Kilbourn v. Thompson</i> , 103 U.S. 168 (1880) . . . . .	6, 7, 28, 29
<i>Knights of Columbus v. Town of Lexington</i> , 138 F. Supp.2d 136 (D. Mass. 2001) . . . . .	38, 42
<i>Kurtz v. Baker</i> , 630 F. Supp. 850 (D.D.C. 1986) . . . . .	27
<i>Kuzinich v. County of Santa Clara</i> , 689 F.2d 1345 (9th Cir. 1982) . . . . .	3, 23
<i>Lake County Estates, Inc. v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency</i> , 440 U.S. 391 (1979) . . . . .	2

<i>Larsen v. Early</i> , 842 F. Supp. 1310 (D. Colo. 1994) . . . . .	14
<i>Larsen v. Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania</i> , 152 F.3d 240 (3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir.1998) . . .	9, 29-31
<i>Lasa v. Colberg</i> , 622 F. Supp. 557 (D. Puerto Rico 1985) . . . . .	13, 29, 31
<i>Latino Political Action Committee v. City of Boston</i> , 581 F.Supp. 478 (D. Mass. 1984) . . . . .	7
<i>Manzi v. DiCarlo</i> , 982 F. Supp. 125 (E.D.N.Y. 1997) . . . . .	22, 38
<i>Marylanders for Fair Representation v. Schaefer</i> , 144 F.R.D. 292 (D. Md. 1992) . . . . .	2, 8, 14, 43
<i>May v. Cooperman</i> , 578 F. Supp. 1308 (D. N.J. 1984) . . . . .	44
<i>McSurely v. McClellan</i> , 553 F.2d 1277 (D.C. Cir. 1976) . . . . .	10, 16, 19, 28, 29
<i>Miles-Un-Ltd., Inc. v. Town of New Shoreham, R.I.</i> , 917 F. Supp. 91 (D.N.H. 1996) . . . . .	23, 38
<i>Miller v. Transamerican Press, Inc.</i> , 709 F.2d 524 (9th Cir. 1983) . . . . .	10, 11, 14, 18, 35, 36, 39
<i>MINPECO, S.A. v. Conticommodity Services, Inc.</i> , 844 F.2d 856 (D.C. Cir. 1988) . . . . .	14, 38
<i>National Ass’n of Social Workers v. Harwood</i> , 69 F.3d 622 (1st Cir. 1995) . . . . .	9
<i>Negron-Gaztambide v. Hernandez-Torres</i> , 35 F.3d 25 (1st Cir. 1994) . . . . .	21
<i>Niedermeier v. Office of Baucus</i> , 153 F. Supp.2d 23 (D.D.C. 2001) . . . . .	13
<i>Orange Lake Associates, Inc. v. Kirkpatrick</i> , 21 F.3d 1214 (2 <sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1994) . . . . .	6
<i>Orange v. County of Suffolk</i> , 830 F. Supp. 701 (E.D.N.Y. 1993) . . . . .	12, 15
<i>Orange v. County of Suffolk</i> , 855 F. Supp. 620 (E.D.N.Y. 1994) . . . . .	38
<i>Pentagen Technologies Int’l, Ltd. v. Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. House of Representatives</i> , 20 F. Supp.2d 41 (D.D.C. 1998) . . . . .	11, 35
<i>Peroff v. Manuel</i> , 421 F. Supp. 570 (D. D.C. 1976) . . . . .	26
<i>Porter v. Bainbridge</i> , 405 F. Supp. 83 (S.D. Ind. 1975) . . . . .	8
<i>Powell v. McCormack</i> , 395 U.S. 486 (1969) . . . . .	14, 28, 30, 31
<i>Powell v. Ridge</i> , 247 F.3d 520 (3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir. 2001) . . . . .	43
<i>Quillan v. U. S. Government</i> , 589 F. Supp. 830 (N.D. Iowa 1984) . . . . .	8
<i>Rateree v. Rockett</i> , 630 F. Supp. 763 (N.D. Ill. 1986) . . . . .	7, 12, 20
<i>Ray v. Proxmire</i> , 581 F.2d 998 (D.C. Cir. 1978), <i>cert. denied</i> , 439 U.S. 933 (1978) . . . . .	11, 29
<i>Reed v. Village of Shorewood</i> , 704 F.2d 943 (7th Cir. 1983) . . . . .	3, 6, 7
<i>Rheuark v. Shaw</i> , 477 F. Supp. 897 (N.D. Tex. 1979) <i>aff’d in part, rev’d in part</i> , 628 F.2d 297 (5th Cir. 1980), <i>cert. denied</i> , 101 S. Ct. 1392 (1981) . . . . .	3
<i>Rini v. Zwirn</i> , 886 F. Supp. 270 (E.D.N.Y. 1995) . . . . .	12, 27
<i>Roberson v. Mullins</i> , 29 F.3d 132 (4th Cir. 1994) . . . . .	21, 22
<i>Romero-Barcelo v. Hernandez-Agosto</i> , 75 F.3d 23 (1st Cir. 1996) . . . . .	10, 11
<i>Rusack v. Harsha</i> , 470 F. Supp. 285 (M.D. Pa. 1978) . . . . .	12, 29
<i>Ryan v. Burlington County, New Jersey</i> , 889 F.2d 1286 (3 <sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1989) . . . . .	22, 23
<i>Schiaffo v. Helstoski</i> , 492 F.2d 413 (3rd Cir. 1974) . . . . .	19
<i>Schlitz v. Commonwealth of Virginia</i> , 854 F.2d 43 (4th Cir. 1988) . . . . .	8
<i>Schultz v. Sundberg</i> , 759 F.2d 714 (9th Cir. 1985) . . . . .	9, 29
<i>Scott v. Greenville County</i> , 716 F.2d 1409 (4 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983) . . . . .	23
<i>Searingtown Corp. v. Incorporated Village of North Hills</i> , 575 F. Supp. 1295 (E.D. N.Y. 1981) . . . . .	3, 7, 29
<i>Shape of Things to Come, Inc. v. Kane County</i> , 588 F. Supp. 1192 (N.D. Ill. 1984) . . . . .	35
<i>Shelton v. City of College Station</i> , 780 F.2d 475 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986) . . . . .	6
<i>Small v. Hunt</i> , 152 F.R.D. 513 (D.S.C. 1994) . . . . .	24

<i>Smith v. Eagleton</i> , 455 F. Supp. 403 (W.D. Mo. 1978) .....	10, 29
<i>Smith v. Lomax</i> , 45 F.3d 402 (11 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995) .....	21, 42
<i>Stamler v. Willis</i> , 287 F. Supp. 734 (N.D. Ill. 1968), <i>appeal dismissed</i> , 393 U.S. 217 (1968), <i>vacated on other grounds</i> , 393 U.S. 407 (1969) .....	10, 14, 31
<i>Star Distributors, Ltd. v. Marino</i> , 613 F.2d 4 (2nd Cir. 1980) .....	32
<i>Stone's Auto Mart, Inc. v. City of St. Paul, Minn.</i> , 721 F. Supp. 206 (D. Minn. 1989) .....	23
<i>Suhre v. Board of Commissioners</i> , 894 F. Supp. 927 (W.D.N.C. 1995) .....	8
<i>Supreme Court of Virginia v. Consumers Union of the United States</i> , 446 U.S. 719 (1980) ....	2
<i>Tavoulaareas v. Piro</i> , 527 F.Supp. 676 (D.D.C. 1981) .....	10
<i>Tenney v. Brandhove</i> , 341 U.S. 367, 372 (1951) .....	1-3, 14, 29
<i>Thillens, Inc. v. Community Currency Exchange Assn. of Illinois, Inc.</i> , 729 F.2d 1128 (7th Cir. 1974) .....	12, 14
<i>Thompson v. Ramirez</i> , 597 F. Supp. 730 (D. Puerto Rico 1984) .....	16
<i>Trevino ex rel. Cruz v. Gates</i> , 23 F.3d 1480 (9th Cir. 1994), <i>cert. denied sub nom. Wachs v. Trevino</i> , 513 U.S. 932 (1994) .....	23
<i>United States ex rel. Hollander v. Clay</i> , 420 F. Supp. 853 (D.D.C. 1976) .....	16
<i>United States Football League v. National Football League</i> , 842 F.2d 1335 (2 <sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1988) ...	43
<i>United States v. American Telephone &amp; Telegraph Co.</i> , 567 F.2d 121 (D.C. Cir. 1977) .....	31
<i>United States v. Biaggi</i> , 853 F.2d 89 (2nd Cir. 1988), <i>cert. denied</i> , 489 U.S. 1052 (1989) ....	19
<i>United States v. Brewster</i> , 408 U.S. 501 (1972) .....	14, 17-19, 24
<i>United States v. Craig</i> , 528 F.2d 773 (7 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1979) .....	43
<i>United States v. DiCarlo</i> , 565 F.2d 802 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir. 1977) .....	18
<i>United States v. Doe</i> , 332 F. Supp., 930 (D. Mass. 1972) .....	25, 33
<i>United States v. Dowdy</i> , 479 F.2d 213 (4th Cir. 1973), <i>cert. denied</i> , 414 U.S. 823 (1973) ....	17
<i>United States v. Durenberger</i> , 48 F.3d 1239 (D.C. Cir. 1995) .....	42
<i>United States v. Durenberger</i> , Crim. No. 3-93-65, 1993 WL 738477 at *3-4 (D. Minn. 1993) .....	41
<i>United States v. Ehrlichman</i> , 389 F. Supp. 95 (D.D.C. 1974) .....	33
<i>United States v. Eilberg</i> , 465 F. Supp. 1080 (E.D. Pa. 1979) .....	10, 27
<i>United States v. Garmatz</i> , 445 F. Supp. 54 (D. Md. 1977) .....	17
<i>United States v. Gillock</i> , 445 U.S. 360 (1980) .....	29
<i>United States v. Gonzalez de Modesti</i> , 145 F.Supp.2d 171 (D. Puerto Rico 2001) .....	29
<i>United States v. Hanson</i> , 566 F. Supp. 162 (D.D.C. 1983), <i>aff'd</i> No. 83-1689 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 1, 1983) (unpublished order), <i>cert. denied</i> , 464 U.S. 1042 (1984) .....	16
<i>United States v. Helstoski</i> , 442 U.S. 477 (1979) .....	6, 8, 24, 29, 43
<i>United States v. Johnson</i> , 383 U.S. 169 (1966) .....	9, 14, 19, 26, 29
<i>United States v. Kolter</i> , 71 F.3d 425 (D.C. Cir. 1995) .....	24
<i>United States v. McDade</i> , 28 F.3d 283 (3rd Cir. 1994) (No. 93-1487) .....	11, 19, 24, 42
<i>United States v. Myers</i> , 635 F.2d 932 (2nd Cir. 1980) .....	17, 18
<i>United States v. Myers</i> , 692 F.2d 861 (2nd Cir. 1982) .....	16, 18
<i>United States v. Peoples Temple of the Disciples of Christ</i> , 515 F. Supp. 246 (D.D.C. 1981) .	35, 38, 41
<i>United States v. Rose</i> , 28 F.3d 181 (D.C. Cir. 1994) .....	16, 42

<i>United States v. Rostenkowski</i> , 59 F.3d 1291 (D.C. Cir. 1995) .....	20, 24, 42
<i>United States v. Seeger</i> , 180 F. Supp. 467 (S.D.N.Y. 1960) .....	43
<i>United States v. Swindall</i> , 971 F.2d 1531 (11th Cir. 1992), <i>cert. denied</i> , 510 U.S. 1040 (1994) .....	10, 41
<i>United States v. Williams</i> , 644 F.2d 950 (2nd Cir. 1981) .....	18
<i>United Transportation Union v. Springfield Terminal Ry.</i> , 132 F.R.D. 4 (D. Me. 1990) .....	12
<i>Vacca v. Barletta</i> , 933 F.2d 31 (1 <sup>st</sup> Cir. 1991) .....	21
<i>Walker v. Jones</i> , 733 F.2d 923 (D.C. Cir. 1984) .....	20, 27
<i>Washington Legal Foundation v. Texas Equal Access to Justice Foundation</i> , 86 F. Supp.2d 617 (W.D. Tex. 2000) .....	2
<i>Webster v. Sun Company, Inc.</i> , 731 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir. 1984) .....	15
<i>Williams v. Brooks</i> , 945 F.2d 1322 (5th Cir. 1991), <i>cert. denied</i> , 504 U.S. 931 (1992) .....	18
<i>X-Men Security, Inc. v. Pataki</i> , 196 F.3d 56 (2 <sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1999) .....	14
<i>Yeldell v. Cooper Green Hospital, Inc.</i> , 956 F.2d 1056 (11th Cir. 1992) .....	21

### Cases from Other States

<i>Abercrombie v. McClung</i> , 55 Haw. 595, 525 P.2d 594 (1974) .....	5, 18
<i>Associated Press v. Cook</i> , 17 S.W.3d 447 (Tex. App. 2000) .....	21
<i>Attorney General ex rel. Bashford v. Barstow</i> , 4 Wis. 567 [757] (1855) .....	5
<i>Bardoff v. United States</i> , 628 A.2d 86 (D.C. App. 1993) .....	10
<i>Bartlett v. Cinemark USA, Inc</i> .....	23
<i>Bassett v. Newton</i> , 658 So.2d 398 (Ala. 1995) .....	44
<i>Bigelow v. Brumley</i> , 138 Ohio. St. 574, 37 N.E.2d 584 (1941) .....	15
<i>Blondes v. State</i> , 16 Md.App. 165, 294 A.2d 661 (1972) .....	4, 17, 29
<i>Brock v. Thompson</i> , 1997 OK 127, 948 P.2d 279 (Okla. 1997) .....	15, 41
<i>Campaign for Fiscal Equity v. State</i> , 179 Misc.2d 907, 687 N.Y.S.2d 227, <i>aff'd</i> 265 A.D.2d 277, 697 N.Y.S.2d 40 (1999) .....	15, 27, 41-43
<i>City of Dublin v. State</i> , 138 Ohio App.3d 753, 742 N.E.2d 232 (2000) .....	4, 36
<i>Coffin v. Coffin</i> , 4 Mass. 1 (1808) .....	7, 17, 18
<i>Consumer Party of Pennsylvania v. Commonwealth</i> , 510 Pa. 158, 507 A.2d 323 (Pa. 1986) ..	5, 32
<i>Consumers Education &amp; Protective Association v. Nolan</i> , 368 A.2d 675 (Pa. 1977) .....	30, 31
<i>Copsey v. Baer</i> , 593 So.2d 685 (La. App. 1 Cir. 1991) .....	4, 37
<i>Ethics Comm'n of the State of Oklahoma v. Cullison</i> , 850 P.2d 1069 (Okl. 1993) .....	31
<i>Hamilton v. Hennessey</i> , 783 A.2d 852 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2001) .....	19
<i>Harristown Development Corp. v. Commonwealth</i> , 135 Pa. Commw. Ct. 177, 580 A.2d 1174 (1990) ..... )11, 31	
<i>Holmes v. Farmer</i> , 475 A.2d 976 (R.I. 1984) .....	5, 11, 14, 36, 38, 43
<i>Humane Society of New York v. City of New York</i> , 188 Misc.2d 735, 729 N.Y.S.2d 360 (2001) .....	7, 38
<i>In re Deposition of Prange</i> , 542 N.W.2d 354 (Mich. App. 1995) .....	12, 40
<i>Jennings v. Cronin</i> , 256 Pa. Super. Ct. 398, 389 A.2d 1183 (1978) .....	15

<i>Jubelirer v. Singel</i> , 638 A.2d 352 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1994) .....	8
<i>Keefe v. Roberts</i> , 116 N.H. 195, 355 A.2d 824 (1976) .....	9
<i>Kertulla v. Abood</i> , 686 P.2d 1197 (Alaska 1984) .....	3
<i>Kraus v. Kentucky State Senate</i> , 872 S.W.2d 433 (Ky. 1994) .....	8
<i>Lincoln Party v. General Assembly</i> , 682 A.2d 1326 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1996) .....	7, 31
<i>Lopez v. Trevino</i> , 2 S.W.3d 472 (Tex. App. 1999) .....	21
<i>Lucchesi v. State</i> , 807 P.2d 1185 (Colo. App. 1990) .....	7
<i>Marra v. O’Leary</i> , 652 A.2d 974 (R.I. 1995) .....	8, 26
<i>Mayhew v. Wilder</i> , 46 S.W.3d 760 (Tenn. App. 2001) (No. M2000-01948-COA-R10-CV), <i>appeal denied</i> (Mar 19, 2001), <i>rehearing of denial of appeal denied</i> (Apr 30, 2001) .....	5, 10
<i>Melvin v. Doe</i> , 2000 WL 33252882 (Pa.Com.Pl.), 48 Pa. D. & C.4th 566 .....	36, 41
<i>Oates v. Marino</i> , 482 N.Y.S.2d 738 (A.D. 1 Dept. 1984) .....	10
<i>Oklahoma State Senate ex. rel. Roberts v. Hetherington</i> , 1994 OK 16, 868 P.2d 708 (Okl. 1994) .....	5, 14
<i>Pataki v. New York State Assembly</i> , 190 Misc.2d 716, 738 N.Y.S.2d 512 (2002) .....	14
<i>People v. Ohrenstein</i> , 77 N.Y.2d 38, 563 N.Y.S.2d 744, 565 N.E.2d 493 (1990) .....	20
<i>Prelesnik v. Esquina</i> , 347 N.W.2d 226 (Mich. App. 1984) .....	4, 13, 27
<i>Riddle v. Perry</i> , 439 Utah Adv. Rep. 29, 2002 UT 10, 40 P.3d 1128 (2002) .....	5, 15
<i>Romer v. Colorado General Assembly</i> , 810 P.2d 215 (Colo. 1991) .....	4, 6, 16
<i>Sherrard v. Hull</i> , 53 Md.App. 553, 456 A.2d 59 (1983) .....	15
<i>Silva v. Hernandex Agosto</i> , 118 P.R.Offic.Trans. 55 (1986) .....	5
<i>Simpson v. Cenarrusa</i> , 130 Idaho 609, 944 P.2d 1372 (1997) .....	8
<i>State ex rel. Judge v. Legislative Finance Committee</i> , 168 Mont. 470, 543 P.2d 1317 (1975) ..	31
<i>State ex rel. Stephan v. Kansas House of Representatives</i> , 687 P.2d 622 (Kan. 1984) .....	4, 32
<i>State v. Beno</i> , 341 N.W.2d 668 (Wis. 1984) .....	5, 25, 38, 39, 41
<i>State v. Dankworth</i> , 672 P.2d 148 (Alaska App. 1983) .....	12, 29
<i>State v. Gregorio</i> , 451 A.2d 980 (N.J. Super.L. 1982) .....	4
<i>State v. Haley</i> , 687 P.2d 305 (Alaska 1984) .....	27
<i>State v. Township of Lyndhurst</i> , 650 A.2d 840 (N.J. Super. Ch. 1994) .....	8, 43
<i>Straniere v. Silver</i> , 281 A.D.2d 80, 637 N.Y.S.2d 982 (A.D. 3 Dept. 1996), <i>aff’d</i> 89 N.Y.2d 825, 653 N.Y.S.2d 270, N.E.2d 1222 (mem.) (1996) .....	4, 9
<i>Sweeney v. Tucker</i> , 473 Pa. 493, 375 A.2d 698 (1977) .....	28
<i>Thompson v. Legislative Audit Comm’n</i> , 79 N.M. 693, 448 P.2d 799 (1968) .....	31
<i>Uniontown Newspapers, Inc. v. Roberts</i> , 777 A.2d 1225 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2001) .....	36
<i>Urbach v. Farrell</i> , 229 A.D.2d 275, 656 N.Y.S.2d 448 (1997) .....	10
<i>Village of North Atlanta v. Cook</i> , 219 Ga. 316, 133 S.E.2d 585 (1963) .....	7
<i>Wiggins v. Stuart</i> , 671 S.W.2d 262 (Ky. App. 1984) .....	4, 7, 30
<i>Wilkins v. Gagliardi</i> , 219 Mich. App. 260, 556 N.W.2d 171 (Mich. App. 1996) (No. 174456) .....	10
<i>Williams v. State Legislature of Idaho</i> , 111 Idaho 156, 722 P.2d 465 (1986) .....	31



## INTRODUCTION

This paper is a compilation and explanation of federal and state cases on legislative immunity. I have used major parts of it in memoranda in support of a motion to quash a subpoena or to dismiss the complaint in a civil action, and have also found it useful as a quick source of points and authorities when trying to convince opposing counsel not to waste his or her time trying to subpoena my client who does not wish to testify concerning legislative intent. I have tried to include enough cases, and enough about the facts of each case, to be able to find a case that is on all fours with the facts of almost any situation with which I may be presented.

While the common law of legislative immunity arose out of the sixteenth and seventeenth century struggles between the English Crown and Parliament, most of the cases in the United States have arisen since the passage of the Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Act as an amendment to 42 U.S.C. § 1988 in 1976. *See* Pub. L. 94-559, §2, Oct. 19, 1976, 90 Stat. 2641; and the annotations to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Most of these cases are cited and described in this paper. There are some older cases, especially state cases, that I have not bothered to mention. Additional state cases can be found under the West keynote "States 28(2)." Federal cases can be found under West keynotes "Civil Rights 13.8(2)" and "United States 12," and under 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983, annotations 2977-88.

A hypertext version of this paper, with hyperlinks to the U.S. Supreme Court cases and other cases that are in the public domain, is available on the Internet at:

<http://www.senate.leg.state.mn.us/departments/scr/treatise/immunity/legimm-02.htm>





## I. Origins of the Doctrine of Legislative Immunity

### A. Common Law

The doctrine of legislative immunity had its origins in the struggles between the English Crown and Parliament that began more than 500 years ago. For some, it was a matter of life and death. In the reign of Richard II (1396-1397), a member of Parliament, Thomas Haxey, was condemned to death as a traitor for having introduced a bill to reduce the expenditures of the royal household. Richard II was deposed by Parliament before the sentence was carried out and Henry IV annulled the judgment. See Yankwich, *The Immunity of Congressional Speech --- Its Origin, Meaning and Scope*, 99 U. of Pa. L. Rev. 960, 962 (1951); 1 G.M. Trevelyan, *History of England* 335 (3rd ed. reissue 1952). In 1512, Henry VIII prosecuted a member of Parliament, Richard Strode, and had him thrown into prison for having proposed bills to regulate the tin industry. Parliament passed an act annulling the judgment against him and declared void all suits and proceedings against Strode and every other member of Parliament. Yankwich, *supra*, at 963. Later kings granted the members of Parliament the right to speak with impunity, *id.*, until Charles I, in 1632, prosecuted Sir John Eliot and his friends Valentine and William Strode and kept them in prison for what they had done in the House of Commons. Eliot died in the Tower. Valentine and Strode were not freed until 1643, after Parliament had raised an army and begun the Civil War. The struggle was not ended until the army of Parliament had won the war and Charles I was beheaded, January 30, 1649. See 2 G.M. Trevelyan, *History of England* 165, 179-203 (3rd ed. reissue 1952); *Tenney v. Brandhove*, 341 U.S. 367, 372 (1951).

We usually think of the common law as judge-made law. Legislative immunity is one part of the common law that was written in blood with quills of iron.

In 1689, following the “Glorious Revolution” that brought William and Mary to the throne of England, the legislative immunity that the members of Parliament had fought so hard to achieve was codified in the English Bill of Rights as:

That the Freedom of Speech, and Debates or proceedings in Parliament, ought not to be impeached or questioned in any Court or Place out of Parliament. (Quoted in *Tenney v. Brandhove*, 341 U.S. 367, 372 (1951)).

It was “taken as a matter of course” by our Founding Fathers and included in the Articles of Confederation as:

Freedom of speech and debate in Congress shall not be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Congress.

*Id.*

and included in the United States Constitution, Article I, Section 6, as:

[F]or any speech or debate in either house [the members] shall not be questioned in any other place.

As the court said in *Tenney*

The reason for the privilege is clear. It was well summarized by James Wilson, an influential member of the Committee of Detail which was responsible for the provision in the Federal Constitution. “In order to enable and encourage a representative of the public to discharge his public trust with firmness and success, it is indispensably necessary, that he should enjoy the fullest liberty of speech, and that he should be protected from the resentment of every one, however powerful, to whom the exercise of that liberty may occasion offense.”

II Works of James Wilson (Andrews ed. 1896) 38. Quoted in 341 U.S. at 373.

Legislators are immune from deterrents to the uninhibited discharge of their legislative duty, not for their private indulgence but for the public good. One must not expect uncommon courage even in legislators. The privilege would be of little value if they could be subjected to the cost and inconvenience and distractions of a trial upon the conclusion of the pleader, or to the hazard of a judgment against them based upon a jury’s speculation as to motives. The holding of this Court in *Fletcher v. Peck*, 6 Cranch 87, 130, that it was not consonant with our scheme of government for a court to inquire into the motives of legislators, has remained unquestioned.

*Id.* at 377.

Due to its common law origins, legislative immunity under federal common law is afforded to state legislators even where not specifically provided for in a state’s constitution. *Tenney v. Brandhove*, 341 U.S. 367, 372 (1951). It is afforded to nonlegislators when performing a quasi-legislative function. *Supreme Court of Virginia v. Consumers Union of the United States*, 446 U.S. 719, 732 (1980) (members of Virginia Supreme Court promulgating *Code of Professional Responsibility*); *Washington Legal Foundation v. Texas Equal Access to Justice Foundation*, 86 F. Supp.2d 617 (W.D. Tex. 2000) (members of the Texas Supreme Court promulgating rule relating to Interest on Lawyers’ Trust Account (IOLTA) program); *Marylanders for Fair Representation v. Schaefer*, 144 F.R.D. 292 (D. Md. 1992) (governor drawing redistricting plan for presentation to the legislature).

Common law legislative immunity has also been recognized for members of local legislative bodies. *Bogan v. Scott-Harris*, 523 U.S. 44 (1998) (members of city council); *Lake County Estates, Inc. v. Tahoe Regional Planning Agency*, 440 U.S. 391 (1979) (members of regional planning body created by interstate compact). See also, *Carlos v. Santos*, 123 F.3d 61, 66 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1997) (No. 97-7523); *Burnnick v. McLean*, No. 95-1345, 76 F.3d 611 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996); *Acevedo-Cordero v. Cordero-Santiago*, 958 F.2d 20 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1992); *Calhoun v. St. Bernard Parish*, 937 F.2d 172 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991)

(parish police jury); *Haskell v. Washington Township*, 864 F.2d 1266, 1276-78 (6th Cir. 1988) (town board of trustees); *Healy v. Town of Pembroke Park*, 831 F.2d 989, 993 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987) (town commissioners); *Aitchison v. Raffiani*, 708 F.2d 96, 98-100 (3rd Cir. 1983) (members of borough council); *Reed v. Village of Shorewood*, 704 F.2d 943, 952-53 (7th Cir. 1983) (village board of trustees); *Espanola Way Corp. v. Meyerson*, 690 F.2d 827, 829 (11th Cir. 1982), *cert. denied*, 460 U.S. 1039 (1983); *Kuzinich v. County of Santa Clara*, 689 F.2d 1345, 1349-50 (9th Cir. 1982) (county supervisors); *Bruce v. Riddle*, 631 F.2d 272, 274-80 (4th Cir. 1980) (county council members); *Gorman Towers, Inc. v. Bogoslavsky*, 626 F.2d 607, 611-14 (8th Cir. 1980) (city directors); *Searingtown Corp. v. Incorporated Village of North Hills*, 575 F. Supp. 1295 (E.D. N.Y. 1981) (village board of trustees); *Rheuark v. Shaw*, 477 F. Supp. 897, 921-22 (N.D. Tex. 1979) *aff'd in part, rev'd in part*, 628 F.2d 297 (5th Cir. 1980), *cert. denied*, 101 S. Ct. 1392 (1981) (county commissioners).

*Tenney* involved a suit by a witness against the chairman and members of a committee of the California State Senate for misusing the subpoena power of the committee to “intimidate and silence Plaintiff and deter and prevent him from effectively exercising his constitutional rights of free speech and to petition the legislature for redress of grievances, and also to deprive him of the equal protection of the laws, due process of law, and of the enjoyment of equal privileges and immunities as a citizen of the United States under the law . . . .” 341 U.S. at 371. The central question in the case was whether Congress by the passage of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, had intended to “overturn the tradition of legislative freedom achieved in England by Civil War and carefully preserved in the formation of State and National governments here.” 341 U.S. at 376. The Court found that Congress, “itself a staunch advocate of legislative freedom,” had not intended to “impinge on a tradition so well grounded in history and reason” and that § 1983 did not subject legislators to civil liability for acts done within “the traditional legislative sphere” or “the sphere of legitimate legislative activity.” 341 U.S. at 376. The Court found *Tenney* and the other members of the committee immune from suit under § 1983 for their conduct of the committee hearings and compelling *Brandhove* to appear before the committee as a witness. It reversed the judgment of the Court of Appeals and affirmed the judgment of the District Court dismissing the Complaint. 341 U.S. at 379.

## **B. Constitutions**

The constitution of almost every state has a speech or debate clause, and most are similar to the federal clause. *See Tenney v. Brandhove*, 341 U.S. 367, 375-76 n. 5 (1951). As a result of the common law origins of legislative immunity, where state courts have been called upon to interpret a speech or debate clause in their own constitution, they have chosen to follow the guidance given them by the decisions of federal courts interpreting the United States Speech or Debate Clause.

Alaska            *Kertulla v. Abood*, 686 P.2d 1197 (Alaska 1984) (Alaska Const. art. II, § 6, “Legislators may not be held to answer before any other tribunal for any statement made in the exercise of their legislative duties while the legislature is in session.”)

Colorado	<i>Romer v. Colorado General Assembly</i> , 810 P.2d 215, 220-25 (Colo. 1991) (Colo. Const. art. V, § 16, “for any speech or debate in either house, or any committees thereof, they shall not be questioned in any other place.”)
Kansas	<i>State ex rel. Stephan v. Kansas House of Representatives</i> , 687 P.2d 622, 631-34 (Kan. 1984) (Kan. Const. art. 2, § 22, “For any speech, written document or debate in either house, the members shall not be questioned elsewhere.”)
Kentucky	<i>Wiggins v. Stuart</i> , 671 S.W.2d 262, 264 (Ky. App. 1984) (Ky. Const. § 43, “for any speech or debate in either House they shall not be questioned in any other place.”)
Louisiana	<i>Copsey v. Baer</i> , 593 So.2d 685, 688 (La. App. 1 Cir. 1991) (La. Const. art. III, § 8, “No member shall be questioned elsewhere for any speech in either house.”)
Maryland	<i>Blondes v. State</i> , 16 Md.App. 165, 294 A.2d 661 (1972) (Md. Const. Dec. of Rights, art. 10, “That freedom of speech and debate, or proceedings in the Legislature, ought not to be impeached in any Court of Judicature.” Md. Const. art. 3, § 18, “No Senator or Delegate shall be liable in any civil action, or criminal prosecution, whatever, for words spoken in debate.”)
Michigan	<i>Prelesnik v. Esquina</i> , 347 N.W.2d 226 (Mich. App. 1984) (Mich. Const. 1963, art. 4, § 11, “They shall not be questioned in any other place for any speech in either house.”)
New Hampshire	<i>Keefe v. Roberts</i> , 116 N.H. 195, 355 A.2d 824 (1976) (N.H. Const. Part I, art. 30, “The freedom of deliberation, speech, and debate, in either house of the legislature, is so essential to the rights of the people, that it cannot be the foundation of any action, complaint, or prosecution, in any other court or place whatsoever.”)
New Jersey	<i>State v. Gregorio</i> , 451 A.2d 980 (N.J. Super.L. 1982) (N.J. Const. art. IV, § 4, ¶ 9, “for any statement, speech or debate in either house or at any meeting of a legislative committee, they shall not be questioned in any other place.”)
New York	<i>Straniere v. Silver</i> , 281 A.D.2d 80, 83, 637 N.Y.S.2d 982, 985, <i>aff’d</i> 89 N.Y.2d 825, 653 N.Y.S.2d 270, 675 N.E.2d 1222 (mem.) (1996) (N.Y. Const. art. III, § 11, “For any speech or debate in either house of the legislature, the members shall not be questioned in any other place.”)
Ohio	<i>City of Dublin v. State</i> , 138 Ohio App.3d 753, 742 N.E.2d 232 (2000) (Ohio Const. art. II, § 12, “for any speech, or debate, in either house, they shall not be questioned elsewhere.”)

- Oklahoma *Oklahoma State Senate ex. rel. Roberts v. Hetherington*, 1994 OK 16, 868 P.2d 708 (Okl. 1994) (Okl. Const. art. 5, § 22, “for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place.)
- Pennsylvania *Consumer Party of Pennsylvania v. Commonwealth*, 510 Pa. 158, 507 A.2d 323, 330-31 (1986) (Pa. Const. art. II, § 15, “for any speech or debate in either House they shall not be questioned in any other place.”)
- Rhode Island *Holmes v. Farmer*, 475 A.2d 976 (R.I. 1984) (R.I. Const. art. VI, § 5, “For any speech in debate in either house, no member shall be questioned in any other place.”)
- Tennessee *Mayhew v. Wilder*, 46 S.W.3d 760 (Tenn. App. 2001) (No. M2000-01948-COA-R10-CV, concur), *appeal denied* (Mar 19, 2001), *rehearing of denial of appeal denied* (Apr 30, 2001) (Tenn. Const. art. II, § 13, “for any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place.”)
- Utah *Riddle v. Perry*, 439 Utah Adv. Rep. 29, 2002 UT 10, 40 P.3d 1128 (2002) (Utah Const. art. VI, § 8, “for words used in any speech or debate in either house, they shall not be questioned in any other place.”)

The same has been true in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. *Silva v. Hernandex Agosto*, 118 P.R.Offic.Trans. 55, 70 (1986) (P.R. Const. art. III, § 14, “The members of the Legislative Assembly shall not be questioned in any other place for any speech, debate or vote in either house or in any committee.”)

*But see State v. Beno*, 341 N.W.2d 668 (Wis. 1984) (“The people of other states made for themselves respectively, constitutions which are construed by their own appropriate functionaries. Let them construe theirs--let us construe, and stand by ours.” Quoting *Attorney General ex rel. Bashford v. Barstow*, 4 Wis. 567, 785 [757, 758] (1855)).

Legislative immunity under the Speech or Debate Clause of the Constitution of Hawaii was intended to be broader than under the U.S. Constitution. *Abercrombie v. McClung*, 55 Haw. 595, 525 P.2d 594 (1974) (“No member of the legislature shall be held to answer before any other tribunal for any statement made or action taken in the exercise of his legislative function.”)

The Minnesota Constitution has a speech or debate clause, article IV, § 10, that is identical to the Speech or Debate Clause in the United States Constitution.

For any speech or debate in either house they shall not be questioned in any other place.

The Minnesota Supreme Court has never had occasion to construe this clause, but its recognition of

the doctrine of legislative immunity can be inferred from its opinion in *Nieting v. Blondell*, 306 Minn. 122, 235 N.W.2d 597 (1975), prospectively abolishing the doctrine of state sovereign immunity in the tort area but retaining sovereign immunity for legislative functions.

We wish to make clear, however, that we are only indicating our disfavor of the immunity rule in the tort area, and our decision should not be interpreted as imposing liability on any governmental body in the exercise of discretionary functions or legislative, judicial, quasi-legislative, and quasi-judicial functions.

306 Minn. at 131.

### C. Statutes

In Minnesota, and presumably in other states, legislative immunity has been provided for by statute. Minn. Stat. § 540.13 (1996), a recodification of the Act of March 31, 1893, ch. 53, 1893 Minn. Gen. Laws 164, provides:

#### 540.13 EXEMPTIONS OF LEGISLATIVE MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES.

No member, officer, or employee of either branch of the legislature shall be liable in a civil action on account of any act done by him in pursuance of his duty as such legislator.

There have been no reported Minnesota cases construing this section.

## II. Scope of Legislative Immunity

### A. “Legislative Acts” Are Immune from Questioning

#### 1. Introducing and Voting for Legislation

Legislative immunity extends to all of a legislator’s “legislative acts,” *United States v. Helstoski*, 442 U.S. 477 (1979). “Legislative acts” include introducing a bill, *Helstoski, supra*; writing headnotes and footnotes into a bill, *Romer v. Colorado General Assembly*, 810 P.2d 215 (Colo. 1991) (omnibus appropriations bill); and voting for a bill or resolution. *Kilbourn v. Thompson*, 103 U.S. 168 (1880); *Chappell v. Robbins*, No. 93-17063, 73 F.3d 918 (9th Cir. 1996); *Acierno v. Cloutier*, 40 F.3d 597 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1994) (No. 93-7456) (county council voting to rezone a single parcel of property); *Orange Lake Associates, Inc. v. Kirkpatrick*, 21 F.3d 1214, 1221-24 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1994); *Calhoun v. St. Bernard Parish*, 937 F.2d 172 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991) (local zoning board adopting construction moratorium); *Shelton v. City of College Station*, 780 F.2d 475 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1986) (denial of request for zoning variance); *Reed v. Village of Shorewood*, 704 F.2d 943, 952-53 (7th Cir. 1983) (municipal legislators voting to reduce number of liquor licenses); *City of Safety Harbor v. Birchfield*, 529 F.2d 1251 (5th Cir. 1976) (voting for committee report and urging passage of bill on

the floor); *2BD Associates Limited Partnership v. County Commissioners for Queen Anne's County*, 896 F. Supp. 528 (D. Md. 1995) (municipal legislators drafting and passing amendment to zoning ordinance); *Rateree v. Rockett*, 630 F. Supp. 763, 769-72 (N.D. Ill. 1986) (municipal legislators voting to reduce budget and eliminate positions); *Latino Political Action Committee v. City of Boston*, 581 F. Supp. 478 (D. Mass. 1984) (municipal legislators voting to pass redistricting plan that allegedly discriminated against minorities); *Joyner v. Mofford*, 539 F. Supp. 1120 (D. Ariz. 1982) (passing an allegedly unconstitutional law; *dicta*, legislators not named as defendants); *Searingtown Corp. v. Incorporated Village of North Hills*, 575 F. Supp. 1295 (E.D. N.Y. 1981) (village board of trustees enacting zoning ordinances); *Fralin & Waldron, Inc. v. County of Henrico, Va.*, 474 F. Supp. 1315, 1320-21 (E.D. Va. 1979) (members of county planning board voting to rezone a single parcel of property); *Humane Society of New York v. City of New York*, 188 Misc.2d 735, 729 N.Y.S.2d 360 (2001) (members of city board of health voting to adopt list of prohibited wild animals); *Lincoln Party v. General Assembly*, 682 A.2d 1326 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1996) (state legislature passing a proposed constitutional amendment); *Lucchesi v. State*, 807 P.2d 1185 (Colo. App. 1990) (voting for allegedly unconstitutional tax bill); *77<sup>th</sup> District Judge v. State*, 175 Mich. App. 681, 438 N.W.2d 333 (1989) (enacting unconstitutional system of compensating district judges); *Wiggins v. Stuart*, 671 S.W.2d 262, 264 (Ky. App. 1984) (voting for allegedly unconstitutional bills relating to compensation and pensions for legislators); *Village of North Atlanta v. Cook*, 219 Ga. 316, 133 S.E.2d 585 (1963) (voting for allegedly unconstitutional bill relating to county).

*Kilbourn v. Thompson* was the first Speech or Debate Clause case decided by the United States Supreme Court. It was a civil suit by a private citizen who had been jailed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives after he had been voted in contempt of the House for failing to answer questions as a witness before a committee. The Court found that the Speaker of the House, who had signed the order for the witness' imprisonment, and the members of the committee who had reported to the House that the witness had refused to testify and should be found in contempt, and who had introduced a resolution to that effect and voted for it, were immune from having to defend themselves in court. The Court refused to limit the privilege only to words spoken in debate, but rather extended it to the written report presented to the House by the committee, the resolution offered by committee members finding the witness in contempt and the act of voting for the resolution, "In short, to things generally done in a session of the House by one of its members in relation to the business before it." 103 U.S. at 204. The court quoted approvingly from an 1808 decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Court, *Coffin v. Coffin*, 4 Mass. 1, which said in regard to a similar clause in the Massachusetts Constitution:

I would define the article as securing to every member exemption from prosecution for everything said or done by him as a representative, in the exercise of the functions of that office, without inquiring whether the exercise was regular . . . or irregular . . . I do not confine the member to his place in the House; and I am satisfied that there are cases in which he is entitled to the privilege when not within the walls of the representatives' chamber.

103 U.S. at 204.

More recently, the court has described a legislative act as any act that is: (1) “an integral part of the deliberative and communicative processes by which Members participate in committee and House proceedings,” and (2) relates “to the consideration and passage or rejection of proposed legislation or with respect to other matters which the Constitution places within the jurisdiction of either House.” *Gravel v. United States*, 408 U.S. 606, 625 (1972).

*United States v. Helstoski*, 442 U.S. 477 (1979) was a criminal prosecution of a former congressman who was alleged to have solicited and obtained bribes from resident aliens in return for introducing private bills on their behalf to suspend the application of the immigration laws so as to allow them to remain in the United States. The court held that evidence of Helstoski’s actions to introduce the bills could not be admitted at trial, since the legislative acts of a member were not a proper subject of judicial scrutiny.

## **2. Failing or Refusing to Vote or Enact Legislation**

Failing or refusing to vote or enact legislation is also conduct entitled to legislative immunity. *Schlitz v. Commonwealth of Virginia*, 854 F.2d 43 (4th Cir. 1988) (not voting to reelect state circuit court judge); *Gambocz v. Sub-Committee on Claims of Joint Legislative Appropriations Committee, New Jersey Legislature*, 423 F.2d 674 (3rd Cir. 1970) (voting to deny a claim); *Suhre v. Board of Commissioners*, 894 F. Supp. 927 (W.D.N.C. 1995) (refusing to remove Ten Commandments from wall of courtroom); *Marylanders for Fair Representation v. Schaefer*, 144 F.R.D. 292 (D. Md. 1992) (failing to adopt alternative to redistricting plan presented by governor); *Quillan v. U. S. Government*, 589 F. Supp. 830 (N.D. Iowa 1984) (failing to enact private claims bill); *Simpson v. Cenarrusa*, 130 Idaho 609, 611-12, 944 P.2d 1372, 1374-75 (1997) (failure to support calling constitutional convention to consider term limits); *State v. Township of Lyndhurst*, 650 A.2d 840 (N.J. Super. Ch. 1994) (approving a transfer of money by an executive agency by failing within a certain time to object to it); *Marra v. O’Leary*, 652 A.2d 974 (R.I. 1995) (preventing private claims bill from being passed out of committee).

## **3. Voting on the Seating of a Member**

Voting to seat or unseat a member is a legislative act. *Jubelirer v. Singel*, 638 A.2d 352 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1994) (voting to seat a member); *Porter v. Bainbridge*, 405 F. Supp. 83 (S.D. Ind. 1975) (voting to unseat member).

## **4. Voting on the Confirmation of an Executive Appointment**

Voting on the confirmation of an executive appointment is a legislative act. *Kraus v. Kentucky State Senate*, 872 S.W.2d 433 (Ky. 1994).

## **5. Voting on an Impeachment**

State legislators participating in impeachment proceedings are entitled to absolute immunity



for their actions. *Larsen v. Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, No. 97-7153, 152 F.3d 240 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir.1998). *Larsen* was an action by a judge of the state supreme court against numerous state officials who had participated in various disciplinary proceedings against him, including 49 members of the Pennsylvania Senate who had voted on articles of impeachment presented by the House of Representatives. In addition to money damages against the senators, the judge sought declaratory and injunctive relief voiding the Senate verdict of guilty on Article II. The trial court dismissed the claim against the senators for money damages but not the claim for declaratory and injunctive relief. The Court of Appeals observed that both the federal and state constitutions had placed the impeachment power in the legislative branch primarily as a function of the separation of powers. It therefore held that impeachment proceedings were a legislative activity and remanded the case to the trial court with instructions to dismiss all the claims against the senators.

Members of a city council participating in impeachment proceedings have been held entitled to absolute judicial immunity, rather than absolute legislative immunity. *Brown v. Griesenauer*, 970 F.2d 431 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992).

## **6. Determining Whether a Bill Requires Local Approval**

Determining whether a bill requires a “home rule message” from a local government is a legislative act for which legislators are immune from suit. *Straniere v. Silver*, 637 N.Y.S.2d 982 (A.D. 3 Dept. 1996).

## **7. Making Speeches**

Under the Speech or Debate Clause, a member of Congress is immune from inquiry into his or her motives for giving a speech on the House floor, even when the speech is alleged to be part of a criminal conspiracy. *United States v. Johnson*, 383 U.S. 169 (1966). Representative Johnson was tried and convicted of conflict of interest and conspiracy to defraud the United States. Part of the conspiracy to defraud included a speech made by Representative Johnson on the House floor, favorable to savings and loan institutions. The Government claimed Johnson was paid a bribe to make the speech. The Supreme Court held that the Government was precluded by the Speech or Debate Clause from inquiring into Johnson’s motives for giving the speech, and thus could not use the speech as evidence of the conspiracy, even without questioning the representative directly.

## **8. Enforcing Rules**

“Legislative acts” include compelling attendance at a legislative session in order to secure a quorum, *Schultz v. Sundberg*, 759 F.2d 714 (9th Cir. 1985); *Keefe v. Roberts*, 116 N.H. 195, 355 A.2d 824 (1976); excluding private lobbyists from the house floor while admitting governmental lobbyists, *National Ass’n of Social Workers v. Harwood*, 69 F.3d 622 (1st Cir. 1995); allowing a witness before a congressional committee to demand that his testimony not be televised, *Cable News Network v. Anderson*, 723 F. Supp. 835 (D.D.C. 1989); denying press credentials for admission to the Senate and House galleries, *Consumers Union of United States, Inc. v. Periodical*

*Correspondents' Association*, 515 F.2d 1341 (D.C. Cir. 1975); and refusing permission to videotape committee proceedings for failure to seek advance permission, *Wilkins v. Gagliardi*, 219 Mich. App. 260, 556 N.W.2d 171 (Mich. App. 1996) (No. 174456).

## 9. Serving as a Member of a Committee

Serving as a member of a standing committee that considers legislation is a legislative act, and proof that a member served on two committees that considered a bill imposing criminal penalties for certain conduct may not be used to prove the member knew when he engaged in that type of conduct that it was illegal. *United States v. Swindall*, 971 F.2d 1531 (11th Cir. 1992), *cert. denied*, 510 U.S. 1040 (1994).

## 10. Conducting Hearings and Developing Legislation

“Legislative acts” include conducting committee hearings, *Gravel v. United States*, 408 U.S. 606, 624 (1972); *Colon Berrios v. Hernandez Agosto*, 716 F.2d 85 (1st Cir. 1983); *Dominion Cogen, Inc. v. District of Columbia*, 878 F. Supp. 258 (D.D.C. 1995); *United States v. Eilberg*, 465 F. Supp. 1080 (E.D. Pa. 1979); *Stamler v. Willis*, 287 F. Supp. 734 (N.D. Ill. 1968), *appeal dismissed*, 393 U.S. 217 (1968), *vacated on other grounds*, 393 U.S. 407 (1969); *Bardoff v. United States*, 628 A.2d 86 (D.C. App. 1993); *Oates v. Marino*, 482 N.Y.S.2d 738 (A.D. 1 Dept. 1984); compelling attendance of witnesses at a committee hearing, *Colon Berrios v. Hernandez Agosto*, 716 F.2d 85 (1st Cir. 1983); *Acosta v. Agosto*, 590 F. Supp. 144 (D. Puerto Rico 1984); issuing subpoenas for documents, *McSurely v. McClellan*, 553 F.2d 1277 (D.C. Cir. 1976); *Urbach v. Farrell*, 229 A.D.2d 275, 656 N.Y.S.2d 448 (1997); procuring contempt of Congress citations against persons who refuse to produce the documents, *McSurely v. McClellan*, 553 F.2d 1277 (D.C. Cir. 1976); receiving information from a confidential source, *Miller v. Transamerican Press, Inc.*, 709 F.2d 524 (9th Cir. 1983), *contra*, *Tavoulaareas v. Piro*, 527 F. Supp. 676 (D.D.C. 1981); and voting by legislators and the preparation of committee reports, *Gravel*, 408 U.S. at 624; *Green v. DeCamp*, 612 F.2d 368 (8th Cir. 1980); *Smith v. Eagleton*, 455 F. Supp. 403 (W.D. Mo. 1978); *Hentoff v. Ichord*, 318 F. Supp. 1175 (D.D.C. 1970).

Legislative immunity, both under a state Speech or Debate Clause and at common law, “prevents the courts from making the Legislature justify its decision to hold closed sessions” to adopt budget and revenue bills. *Mayhew v. Wilder*, 46 S.W.3d 760, 776 (Tenn. App. 2001) (No. M2000-01948-COA-R10-CV, slip op. at 14), *appeal denied* (Mar 19, 2001), *rehearing of denial of appeal denied* (Apr 30, 2001).

Where investigative hearings by a legislative committee have been duly authorized, the members of the committee are immune from suit for damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, even when they are alleged to have illegally issued subpoenas, examined witnesses, and gathered evidence. *Romero-Barcelo v. Hernandez-Agosto*, No. 95-1235, 75 F.3d 23 (1st Cir. 1996).

“Legislative acts” include developing a legislative redistricting plan, even when some

meetings take place outside the State House and are not formal committee meetings. *Holmes v. Farmer*, 475 A.2d 976, 984 (R.I. 1984).

### **11. Investigating Conduct of Executive Agencies**

“The power to investigate and to do so through compulsory process plainly falls within [the legitimate legislative sphere].” *Eastland v. United States Servicemen’s Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 504 (1975) (quoted in *United States v. McDade*, 28 F.3d 283, 304 (3rd Cir. 1994) (No. 93-1487, slip op. at 49) (Scirica, J., concurring and dissenting in part); *Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Williams*, 62 F.3d 408 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *Pentagen Technologies Int’l, Ltd. v. Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. House of Representatives*, 20 F. Supp.2d 41 (D.D.C. 1998) (confidential reports prepared by investigative staff of House subcommittee were protected from compulsory disclosure).

### **12. Gathering Information**

Gathering information about the expenditure of public money is within the legitimate legislative sphere, even when done by an individual legislator. *Harristown Development Corp. v. Commonwealth*, 135 Pa. Commw. Ct. 177, 580 A.2d 1174 (1990) (chair of state Senate Appropriations Committee).

### **13. Publishing Reports**

“Legislative acts” also include distributing published reports for legislative purposes to “Members of Congress, congressional committees, and institutional or individual legislative functionaries,” *Doe v. McMillan*, 412 U.S. 306, 312 (1975); publishing a transcript of witnesses’ testimony at a hearing, *Colon Berrios v. Hernandez Agosto*, 716 F.2d 85 (1st Cir 1983); releasing the official report of committee hearings to news reporting and publishing agencies, *Green v. DeCamp*, 612 F.2d 368 (8th Cir. 1980); and inserting material into the Congressional Record, *Miller v. Transamerican Press, Inc.*, 709 F.2d 524 (9th Cir. 1983), even when the material contains revisions and extensions of the remarks actually made on the Floor. *Gregg v. Barrett*, 594 F. Supp. 108 (D.D.C. 1984).

Authorizing live television coverage of open hearings is a legislative decision entitled to absolute legislative immunity, even against an allegation that the broadcast went beyond the reasonable requirements of the legislative function. *Romero-Barcelo v. Hernandez-Agosto*, No. 95-1235, 75 F.3d 23, 30-31 (1st Cir. 1996).

### **14. Sending Letters**

“Legislative acts” include sending a letter containing defamatory material from one Senator to another in response to the second Senator’s inquiry into the first Senator’s exercise of his official powers, *Ray v. Proxmire*, 581 F.2d 998 (D.C. Cir. 1978), *cert. denied*, 439 U.S. 933 (1978); and

composing and sending a letter containing defamatory material concerning alleged dishonest and illegal conduct by a naval contract supervisor to his commanding officer. *Rusack v. Harsha*, 470 F. Supp. 285 (M.D. Pa. 1978).

## **15. Drafting Memoranda and Documents**

“Legislative acts” include drafting memoranda and other documents for discussion between a legislator and legislative staff, even when the documents discuss proposed actions outside the sphere of legitimate legislative activity. *United Transportation Union v. Springfield Terminal Ry.*, 132 F.R.D. 4 (D. Me. 1990) ( documents discussing efforts to influence an executive branch agency on behalf of a constituent). In Michigan, however, legislative immunity does not extend to discussion between a senator and his aide about an investigation being conducted by an executive agency. *In re Deposition of Prange*, 542 N.W.2d 354 (Mich. App. 1995).

## **16. Lobbying for Legislation**

“Legislative acts” include successfully lobbying other state legislators to enact legislation regulating plaintiff’s business, *Thillens, Inc. v. Community Currency Exchange Assn. of Illinois, Inc.*, 729 F.2d 1128 (7th Cir. 1974); and working as chairman of the state senate finance committee to get the executive branch to include in the governor’s proposed budget money to purchase real property owned by the senator. *State v. Dankworth*, 672 P.2d 148 (Alaska App. 1983).

## **17. Making Budgetary Decisions**

Enacting a budget that denied appellants a salary increase is a legislative act. *Berkley v. Common Council of City of Charleston*, 63 F.3d 295, 302-03 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995) (*en banc*). Abolishing a position is a legislative act. *Hollyday v. Rainey*, 964 F.2d 1441 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992), *cert. denied* 506 U.S. 1014 (1992). Abolishing personnel positions through budget cuts is a legislative act. *Baker v. Mayor and City Council of Baltimore*, 894 F.2d 679 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990); *Rateree v. Rocket*, 852 F.2d 946, 950 (7th Cir. 1988); *Gordon v. Katz*, 934 F. Supp. 79 (S.D.N.Y. 1996); *Rini v. Zwirn*, 886 F. Supp. 270, 283 (E.D.N.Y. 1995); *Orange v. County of Suffolk*, 830 F. Supp. 701 (E.D.N.Y. 1993); *Herbst v. Daukas*, 701 F. Supp. 964 (D. Conn. 1988); *Drayton v. Mayor and Council of Rockville*, 699 F. Supp. 1155 (D. Md. 1988).

## **18. Making Personnel Decisions**

### **a. Speech or Debate Clause Immunity**

The Speech or Debate Clause of the U.S. Constitution provides legislative immunity for personnel decisions made by members of Congress regarding employees whose “duties were directly related to the due functioning of the legislative process.” *Browning v. Clerk, U. S. House of Representatives*, 789 F.2d 923, 928-29 (D.C. Cir 1986), *cert. denied* 479 U.S. 966 (1986). *Browning* involved firing an official reporter of committee and subcommittee hearings, whose duties were

found to be an integral part of the legislative process. Other congressional employees whose duties have been found to be directly related to the due functioning of the legislative process include a chief of staff, *Niedermeier v. Office of Baucus*, 153 F. Supp.2d 23, 31 n.5 (D.D.C. 2001), and an employee in a senator's district office whose main duties were to work with the senator's constituents. *Bastien v. Office of Campbell*, 209 F. Supp.2d 1095 (D. Colo. 2002).

The Speech or Debate Clauses in state constitutions likewise provide legislative immunity for personnel decisions regarding certain employees of the Legislature. See, e.g., *Prelesnik v. Esquina*, 347 N.W.2d 226, 227-28 (Mich. App. 1984) (employing a legislative corrections ombudsman who issues a defamatory report).

#### **b. Common Law Immunity**

Federal common law legislative immunity, which applies to legislative bodies where there is no Speech or Debate Clause, does not provide as broad protection for personnel decisions as does a Speech or Debate Clause. Whether a given personnel decision is entitled to legislative immunity at common law depends on the nature of the decision rather than on the title of the official making it. *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 224 (1988). In *Forrester*, the Supreme Court found that a state court judge was not immune from suit for firing a probation officer because the action was an administrative function rather than a judicial function.

Where the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico refused to hire a journalist as a legislative press officer after the journalist published an article attacking him, the court found that a press officer had "enough opportunity for 'meaningful input' into the legislative process such that the employment decision should be immunized." *Agromayor v. Colberg*, 738 F.2d 55, 60 (1st Cir. 1984); *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1037 (1984). Where the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico fired the superintendent of the state capitol building, who held office at their discretion, the court found that the employee was "a political creature" whose firing was protected by legislative immunity. *Lasa v. Colberg*, 622 F. Supp. 557, 560 (D. Puerto Rico 1985).

Where a town board voted to hire a consultant to review the police force as part of an investigation of the police department, it was protected by legislative immunity. *Carlos v. Santos*, 123 F.3d 61, 66 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1997) (No. 97-7523). Where town police officers were discharged as a consequence of the town board having voted to contract with the county sheriff for police services, the court found the town board entitled to legislative immunity for both the vote and the discharge. *Healy v. Town of Pembroke Park* 831 F.2d 989, 993 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1987). Where the town board voted to reduce the salaries of the town supervisor and his confidential secretary, and failed to reappoint the deputy town attorney, the members of the town board were protected by legislative immunity. *Dusanenko v. Maloney*, 560 F. Supp. 822 (S.D.N.Y. 1993).

For a discussion of personnel decisions that have been held not immune because they were "administrative" rather than "legislative," see section III.C.1.

## **B. Legislative Immunity is Absolute**

Once it is determined that the activities of a legislator fall within the “sphere of legitimate legislative activity,” the protection of the Speech or Debate Clause is absolute. *Eastland v. United States Servicemen’s Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 501 (1975); *Doe v. McMillan*, 412 U.S. at 311-312; *Gravel v. United States*, 408 U.S. at 623 n. 14; *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 502-503 (1969); *Dombrowski v. Eastland*, 387 U.S. 82, 84-85 (1967); *United States v. Johnson*, 383 U.S. at 184-185; *Oklahoma State Senate ex rel. Roberts v. Hetherington*, 1994 OK 16, 868 P.2d 708 (Okl. 1994).

The immunity of a legislator is not destroyed by a mere allegation of bad faith or an unworthy purpose. *Tenney v. Brandhove*, 341 U.S. 367, 377 (1951); *X-Men Security, Inc. v. Pataki*, 196 F.3d 56 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1999) (allegation that legislators had threatened to introduce legislation); *MINPECO, S.A. v. Conticommodity Services, Inc.*, 844 F.2d 856 (D.C. Cir. 1988); *City of Safety Harbor v. Birchfield*, 529 F.2d 1251, 1256 (5th Cir. 1976); *Larsen v. Early*, 842 F. Supp. 1310 (D. Colo. 1994) (allegation that a Colorado state senator had fraudulently misrepresented the effect of a bill to fellow legislators and had conspired to fraudulently mislead other legislators not sufficient to overcome defense of legislative immunity); *Stamler v. Willis*, 287 F. Supp. 734 (N.D. Ill. 1968), *appeal dismissed*, 393 U.S. 217 (1968), *vacated on other grounds*, 393 U.S. 407 (1969); *Holmes v. Farmer*, 475 A.2d 976, 984 (R.I. 1984).

“The issue . . . is not whether the information sought might reveal illegal acts, but whether it falls within the legislative sphere.” *MINPECO, S.A. v. Conticommodity Services, Inc.*, 844 F.2d 856, 860-61 (D.C. Cir. 1988).

## **C. Legislative Immunity is Personal**

Legislative immunity is personal and belongs to each individual member. It may be asserted or waived as each individual legislator chooses. *Marylanders for Fair Representation v. Schaefer*, 144 F.R.D. 292, 299 (D. Md. 1992). It does not belong to the body as a whole. *Pataki v. New York State Assembly*, 190 Misc.2d 716,729; 738 N.Y.S.2d 512, 523 (2002).

## **D. Legislative Immunity Continues for Former Legislators**

Immunity for “legislative acts” continues even after a legislator has ceased to hold office. *Miller v. Transamerican Press, Inc.*, 709 F.2d 524 (9th Cir. 1983). See *United States v. Brewster*, 408 U.S. 501 (1972); *Thillens, Inc. v. Community Currency Exchange Assn. of Illinois, Inc.*, 729 F.2d 1128 (7th Cir. 1984).

## **E. Legislative Immunity Extends to Non-Legislators Participating in the Legislative Process**

“Officials outside the legislative branch are entitled to legislative immunity when they perform legislative functions.” *Bogan v. Scott-Harris*, 523 U.S. 44, 55 (1998). This includes a

mayor presenting a budget to the city council, 523 U.S. 44; an executive agency employee preparing a change in an education funding formula for consideration by the legislature, *Campaign for Fiscal Equity v. State*, 179 Misc.2d 907, 687 N.Y.S.2d 227, *aff'd* 265 A.D.2d 277, 697 N.Y.S.2d 40 (1999); a judge preparing a budget proposal for presentation to the town board, *Gordon v. Katz*, 934 F. Supp. 79 (S.D.N.Y. 1996); a county executive signing a budget resolution, *Orange v. County of Suffolk*, 830 F. Supp. 701 (E.D.N.Y. 1993); and a mayor vetoing an ordinance passed by the city council. *Hernandez v. City of Lafayette*, 643 F.2d 1188, 1193-94 (5th Cir. 1981), *cert. denied*, 455 U.S. 907 (1982). “It is the nature of the work in question performed by a state employee—not the employee’s title—that determines whether the Speech or Debate Clause obtains.” *Campaign for Fiscal Equity v. State*, 687 N.Y.S.2d at 231.

A witness at a legislative hearing who makes defamatory statements related to the subject matter of the hearing has an absolute common law immunity from suit for making them. *Riddle v. Perry*, 2002 UT 10, 439 Utah Adv. Rep. 29, 40 P.3d 1128 (2002). As the court said:

We recognize there is a potential danger for abuse, but conclude that the greater good is served by ensuring that citizens who want to participate in the legislative process may do so without fear of liability for defamation.

2002 UT 10, ¶ 10, 40 P.2d at 1132. *Accord*, *Bio/Basics International Corp. v. Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp.*, 545 F. Supp. 1106 (S.D.N.Y. 1982); *DeSantis v. Employees Passaic County Welfare Assn.*, 237 N.J. Super. Ct. 550, 568 A.2d 565 (1990); *Sherrard v. Hull*, 53 Md.App. 553, 456 A.2d 59 (1983); *Jennings v. Cronin*, 256 Pa. Super. Ct. 398, 389 A.2d 1183 (1978).

An unsolicited statement made to a legislative investigative employee is not protected by legislative immunity unless the communicator shows that he would not have made the unsolicited statement but for his intention to inform the legislative body on a subject properly within its jurisdiction and the statement has some relation to the legitimate legislative business to which it is addressed. *Webster v. Sun Company, Inc.*, 731 F.2d 1 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

Circulating an initiative petition is a legislative function and the citizens who promote it are entitled to legislative immunity for their circulation-related activities. *Brock v. Thompson*, 1997 OK 127, ¶ 20, 948 P.2d 279, 290 (Okla. 1997) (*dicta*; defendants in this case had not yet begun to circulate the petition).

Where a state constitution provides for publication of official arguments for and against initiated legislation or a constitutional amendment, the officials who prepare and publish those arguments are entitled to absolute common law legislative immunity for defamatory statements in the arguments, but a private citizen who acts in concert with the officials is not entitled to immunity. *Bigelow v. Brumley*, 138 Ohio. St. 574, 37 N.E.2d 584 (1941).

### **III. Some Activities of Legislators are Not Immune**

#### **A. Actions Without Lawful Authority Are Not Immune**

##### **1. Unconstitutional Procedures for Enacting Legislation**

Legislative immunity does not prevent a court from issuing a declaratory judgment that procedures used by the legislature to enact legislation were unconstitutional. *Romer v. Colorado General Assembly*, 810 P.2d 215 (Colo. 1991). In *Romer*, the governor had used his item veto authority to veto certain headnotes and footnotes in the “long” appropriation bill. Rather than override the vetoes or bring a declaratory judgment action in district court to have them declared invalid, the General Assembly chose to publish a letter that said, in the Assembly’s opinion, the vetoes were invalid and should be ignored. The Colorado Supreme Court held that this was an improper procedure for overriding a veto and thus outside the sphere of legitimate legislative activity. It presumed the vetoes valid until properly challenged.

##### **2. Illegal Investigative Procedures**

Legislative immunity does not protect otherwise legislative acts that are taken without legislative authority, as when a special investigative committee of the Puerto Rican House of Representatives issued subpoenas after its authority to investigate had expired. *Thompson v. Ramirez*, 597 F. Supp. 730 (D. Puerto Rico 1984).

Legislative immunity does not extend to the unlawful seizure of documents by a subcommittee investigator without a subpoena, especially documents conceded to be irrelevant to the subcommittee’s inquiry, *McSurely v. McClellan*, 553 F.2d 1277 (D.C. Cir. 1976), 753 F.2d 88 (1985); nor to the surreptitious videotaping of an interview with a subcommittee investigator, *Benford v. American Broadcasting Companies*, 502 F. Supp. 1148 (D. Md. 1980).

##### **3. False Disclosures and Claims**

Legislative immunity does not extend to filing false or incomplete reports of campaign contributions or expenditures, *United States v. Rose*, 28 F.3d 181 (D.C. Cir. 1994); *United States v. Hanson*, 566 F. Supp. 162 (D. D.C. 1983), *aff’d* No. 83-1689 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 1, 1983) (unpublished order), *cert. denied*, 464 U.S. 1042 (1984); nor to the allegedly false disclosure of income from sources other than the United States, *United States v. Myers*, 692 F.2d 823 (2nd Cir. 1982); nor to allegedly receiving income in excess of Congressional limits on honoraria, *Federal Election Comm’n v. Wright*, 777 F. Supp. 525 (N.D. Tex. 1991); nor to submission by a congressman of allegedly false claims for travel expense reimbursement for trips home to his district. *United States ex rel. Hollander v. Clay*, 420 F. Supp. 853 (D.D.C. 1976).

Legislative immunity does not bar inquiry into whether a legislator’s activities and conversations were, in fact, legislative in nature. *Government of Virgin Islands v. Lee*, 775 F.2d 514



(3rd Cir. 1985). In *Lee*, a Virgin Islands legislator had requested reimbursement for the portion of his travel expenses that related to his activities as a legislator engaged in a fact-finding trip. The government alleged that his request overstated that portion, and the Court of Appeals held that legislative immunity did not bar inquiring into whether the private conversations he engaged in were, in fact, legislative in nature. 775 F.2d. at 522.

## **B. “Political” Acts Are Not Immune**

### **1. Solicitation of Bribes**

The Speech or Debate Clause does not preclude inquiry into alleged criminal conduct of a congressman apart from his actions as a member of Congress. *United States v. Brewster*, 408 U.S. 501 (1972); *United States v. Myers*, 635 F.2d 932 (2nd Cir. 1980); *United States v. Dowdy*, 479 F.2d 213 (4th Cir. 1973), *cert. denied*, 414 U.S. 823 (1973); *United States v. Garmatz*, 445 F. Supp. 54 (D. Md. 1977). Nor does a state Speech or Debate Clause preclude a similar inquiry into the conduct of a state legislator. *Blondes v. State*, 16 Md.App. 165, 294 A.2d 661 (1972). In *Brewster*, United States Senator Daniel Brewster of Maryland was accused of solicitation and acceptance of bribes in violation of law. The Supreme Court held that the Speech or Debate Clause did not protect him from prosecution, because the bribery could be proved without inquiry into his “legislative” acts or motivation. The Court said:

A legislative act has consistently been defined as an act generally done in Congress in relation to the business before it. In sum, the Speech or Debate Clause prohibits inquiry only into those things generally said or done in the House or Senate in the performance of official duties and into the motivation for those acts.

It is well known, of course, that Members of the Congress engage in many activities other than the purely legislative activities protected by the Speech or Debate Clause. These include a wide range of legitimate “errands” performed for constituents, the making of appointments with Government agencies, assistance in securing Government contracts, preparing so-called “news letters” to constituents, news releases, and speeches delivered outside the Congress. The range of these activities has grown over the years. . . . Although these are entirely legitimate activities, they are political in nature rather than legislative, in the sense that term has been used by the Court in prior cases. But it has never been seriously contended that these political matters, however appropriate, have been afforded protection by the Speech or Debate Clause.

408 U.S. at 512.

The Court referred back to the early Massachusetts case of *Coffin v. Coffin*, 4 Mass. 1 (1808), to show that while the privilege may extend beyond the legislative chamber, that is only because not all legislative business is done in the chamber.

If a member . . . be out of the chamber, sitting in committee, executing the commission of the house, it appears to me that such member is within the reason of the article, and ought to be considered within the privilege. The body of which he is a member is in session, and he, as a member of that body, is in fact discharging the duties of his office. He ought therefore to be protected from civil or criminal prosecutions for everything said or done by him in the exercise of his functions, as a representative either in debating, in assenting to, or in draughting a report. 4 Mass. at 28.

Quoted in 408 U.S. at 515.

Legislative immunity “does not extend beyond what is necessary to preserve the integrity of the legislative process.” *United States v. Brewster*, 408 U.S. 501, 517 (1972). It does not extend to discussions that involve only the possible future performance of legislative functions, as when Senator Harrison Williams discussed with an ABSCAM undercover agent disguised as an Arab sheik the possibility that the Senator would introduce a private immigration bill on the sheik’s behalf. *United States v. Williams*, 644 F.2d 950 (2nd Cir. 1981). *Accord*, *United States v. Myers*, 635 F.2d 932 (2nd Cir. 1980). Nor does it extend to a whispered solicitation on the House floor by one member to another member to accept a bribe. *United States v. Myers*, 692 F.2d 861 (2nd Cir. 1982).

Federal common law legislative immunity does not prevent the use in federal court of evidence of a state legislator’s actions in directing the course of a committee’s investigation of a contractor’s performance as a construction manager according to whether the contractor made timely payment of a series of bribes the contractor had agreed to pay to secure a favorable investigation. *United States v. DiCarlo*, 565 F.2d 802 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1977).

## **2. Communications to the Press**

Legislative immunity does not extend to the issuance of a press release that republishes a speech made on the Senate floor, *Hutchinson v. Proxmire*, 443 U.S. 111 (1979), *but cf.* *Green v. DeCamp*, 612 F.2d 368 (8th Cir. 1980) (release to press of official committee report is a legitimate legislative activity); and *Abercrombie v. McClung*, 55 Haw. 595, 525 P.2d 594 (1974) (defamatory remarks made to reporter off the Senate floor amplifying charges made in a speech on the Senate floor was in the “exercise of his legislative functions”); nor to defamatory statements made at a press conference, *Cole v. Gray*, 638 F.2d 804 (5th Cir. 1981), *cert. denied*, 454 U.S. 838 (1981) (dicta, complaint dismissed on other grounds); nor to speeches made outside the Congressional forum, *Miller v. Transamerican Press, Inc.*, 709 F.2d 524 (9th Cir. 1983); nor to allegedly defamatory remarks made during an appearance by a congressman on a television broadcast, *Williams v. Brooks*, 945 F.2d 1322 (5th Cir. 1991), *cert. denied*, 504 U.S. 931 (1992) (interview in congressman’s office); *Dickey v. CBS, Inc.*, 387 F. Supp. 1332 (E.D. Pa. 1975), *accord*, *Hahn v. City of Kenner*, 984 F. Supp. 436, 441-42 (E.D. La. 1997) (comments by state senator who called in to radio talk show); *Greenberg v. Collier*, 482 F. Supp. 200 (E.D. Va. 1979) (news releases and speeches by state legislator outside of General Assembly); nor to the release by a congressman to the press of a

defamatory letter the congressman had sent to the Attorney General, *Chastain v. Sundquist*, 833 F.2d 311 (D.C. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 487 U.S. 1420 (1988); nor to the release to the press of derogatory information in a deceased congressman's files concerning a candidate to fill his seat in a special election, *Jones v. Palmer Media, Inc.*, 478 F. Supp. 1124 (E.D. Tex. 1979); nor to the dissemination of unlawfully seized documents outside of Congress, *McSurely v. McClellan*, 553 F.2d 1277 (D.C. Cir. 1976), 753 F.2d 88 (D.C. Cir. 1985); nor to the broadcast on the ABC Nightly News of a videotape of a meeting between subcommittee investigators and a person being investigated. *Benford v. American Broadcasting Companies*, 502 F. Supp. 1148 (D. Md. 1980).

### **3. Communications to Constituents**

Legislative immunity does not extend to the use of the franking privilege to mail materials to constituents and potential constituents. *Schiaffo v. Helstoski*, 492 F.2d 413 (3rd Cir. 1974); *Hoellen v. Annunzio*, 468 F.2d 522 (7th Cir. 1972); *Hamilton v. Hennessey*, 783 A.2d 852, 855 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2001).

### **4. Pressure on the Executive Branch**

Legislative immunity does not extend to efforts by members of Congress to influence the executive branch. *Doe v. McMillan*, 412 U.S. 306, 313 (1975); *Gravel v. United States*, 408 U.S. 606, 625 (1972). It does not extend to attempts to secure government contracts for constituents, *United States v. Brewster*, 408 U.S. 501, 512 (1972); nor to attempts to influence the Department of Justice in enforcing the laws, *United States v. Johnson*, 383 U.S. 169, 172 (1966); nor to attempts to get an executive branch employee fired after an investigating committee has been dissolved, *Cole v. Gray*, 638 F.2d 804 (5th Cir. 1981), *cert. denied*, 454 U.S. 838 (1981) (dicta, complaint dismissed on other grounds); nor to the application of pressure by a state senator on the executive branch to discharge a public employee having responsibilities vested exclusively with the executive branch. *Hartley v. Fine*, 595 F. Supp. 83 (W.D. Mo. 1984), *judgment on the merits in favor of state senator aff'd*, 780 F.2d 1383 (8th Cir. 1985).

### **5. Travel on Legislative Business**

Travel by a member of Congress to or from a location where the member performs legislative acts is not itself protected by the Speech or Debate Clause. *United States v. McDade*, 28 F.3d 283, 298-99 (3rd Cir. 1994) (No. 93-1487, slip op. at 35-37); *United States v. Biaggi*, 853 F.2d 89, 104 (2nd Cir. 1988), *cert. denied*, 489 U.S. 1052 (1989).

## **C. Administrative Acts are Not Immune**

### **1. Personnel Decisions**

#### **a. Congressional Employees**

Whether a personnel decision regarding congressional employees is entitled to legislative immunity depends upon the nature of the duties of the employee about whom the decision is made. *Browning v. Clerk, U. S. House of Representatives*, 789 F.2d 923, 928 (D.C. Cir. 1986). If the employee's duties are not directly related to the functioning of the legislative process, such as the duties of the general manager of the House of Representatives restaurant system, the chairman of the subcommittee overseeing the restaurant is not immune from suit for alleged sex discrimination in firing her. *Walker v. Jones*, 733 F.2d 923 (D.C. Cir. 1984). Duties are not directly related to the functioning of the legislative process if they do not involve "work that significantly informs or influences the shaping of our nation's laws," *id.* at 931, such as when the employee does not have "meaningful input into . . . legislative decision making," 733 F.2d at 930 (quoting *Davis v. Passman*, 544 F.2d 865, 880-81 n. 25 (5th Cir. 1977), *rev'd on other grounds*, 571 F.2d 793 (5th Cir. 1978) (en banc), *rev'd*, 442 U.S. 228, 99 S.Ct. 2264, 60 L.Ed. 846 (1979)). Duties are also not directly related to the functioning of the legislative process if they are not "peculiar to a Congress member's work qua legislator," or stated differently, "'intimately cognate' . . . to the legislative process." *Walker*, 733 F.2d at 931 (quoting *Davis v. Passman*, 544 F.2d at 879). *See, also, Hudson v. Burke*, 617 F. Supp. 1501, 1511 (N.D. Ill. 1985) (factual record inadequate to show whether city council finance committee investigators had "the opportunity for meaningful input into the legislative process").

Placing individuals on a congressman's staff as a pretext for paying them out of congressional funds, where their duties did not have even a tangential relationship to the legislative process, does not entitle the member to immunity from prosecution for using public money for private services. *United States v. Rostenkowski*, No. 94-3158, 59 F.3d 1291, 1303 (D.C. Cir. 1995).

#### **b. State and Local Government Employees**

Like members of Congress, state legislators are not immune from criminal prosecution for placing on the legislative payroll certain "no show" employees who performed no services of any kind. *People v. Ohrenstein*, 77 N.Y.2d 38, 563 N.Y.S.2d 744, 565 N.E.2d 493 (1990).

Immunity for other personnel decisions made by a state or local official is not as broad under federal common law as that afforded to members of Congress under the Speech or Debate Clause. Immunity for local officials under federal common law depends on the nature of the decision rather than on the title of the official making it. *Forrester v. White*, 484 U.S. 219, 224 (1988) (state court judge not immune from suit for firing probation officer since the action was an administrative rather than a judicial function); *Acevedo-Cordero v. Cordero-Santiago*, 958 F.2d 20, 21 (1st Cir. 1992) (city assembly members adopting ordinance to abolish specified civil service positions may not have

been legislative act if ordinance was used to fire only employees who supported the opposition party).

A legislative act is one that involves establishment of general policy; an administrative act singles out individuals and affects them differently from others. *Negron-Gaztambide v. Hernandez-Torres*, 35 F.3d 25, 28 (1st Cir. 1994). Terminating a librarian employed by the legislative library because she was a member of the opposition party after the opposition party lost control of the legislature was an administrative act and not entitled to legislative immunity from damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *Id.* Laying off employees is an administrative act, even if done after adoption by ordinance of a layoff plan. *Acevedo-Garcia v. Vera-Monroig*, No. 99-1137, 204 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2000). Demoting and then discharging a state Senate caucus information officer who refused to do illegal campaign activity on state time was an administrative act. *Chateaubriand v. Gaspard*, No. 95-36086, 97 F.3d 1218 (9th Cir. 1996). Eliminating a position's salary, consolidating it with another position, and refusing to reappoint the incumbent to the new position was an administrative act. *Alexander v. Holden*, No. 94-1810, 66 F.3d 62 (4th Cir. 1995). Voting to replace the white clerk of a county board with an African American clerk was an administrative act. *Smith v. Lomax*, No. 93-8062, 45 F.2d 402 (11th Cir. 1995). A discussion on whether new positions for specific individuals could be funded was an administrative act. *Vacca v. Barletta*, 933 F.2d 31 (1st Cir. 1991). Terminating a legislative researcher for a District of Columbia council member allegedly because she took time off to observe Jewish holidays was an administrative act. *Gross v. Winter*, 692 F. Supp. 1420 (D.D.C. 1988). Refusing to rehire the Democratic clerk of a city council after Republicans gained a majority on the council at the general election was an administrative act. *Visser v. Magnarelli*, 542 F. Supp. 1331 (N.D.N.Y. 1982). Failing to rehire a police chief who had resigned is an administrative act. *Detz v. Hoover*, 539 F. Supp. 532 (E.D. Pa. 1982). Deciding not to hire an applicant for employment as a committee clerk of the Texas House of Representatives because the applicant was suing a member of the committee for defamation was an administrative act. *Associated Press v. Cook*, 17 S.W.3d 447 (Tex. App. 2000). Voting to not pay an annuity to an individual is an administrative act. *Lopez v. Trevino*, 2 S.W.3d 472 (Tex. App. 1999).

A decision by a county board to terminate the superintendent of public works is an administrative act even though made by vote of a legislative body. *Roberson v. Mullins*, 29 F.3d 132 (4th Cir. 1994); *accord, Abraham v. Pekarski*, 728 F.2d 167 (3rd Cir. 1984) (township director of roads and public property). Where a county commission has divided responsibility for administering the county's executive departments among the members of the county commission, personnel decisions by a commissioner regarding a department under the commissioner's control are administrative acts. *Yeldell v. Cooper Green Hospital, Inc.*, 956 F.2d 1056 (11th Cir. 1992).

Where the chair of the county board threatened and harassed county employees who supported a candidate for elected county office whom the chair opposed, and after the election the chair ordered their supervisors to fire the employees, the subsequent vote by the county board to eliminate their positions did not cloak the chair with legislative immunity for his actions before the vote that were independent of the vote. *Carver v. Foerster*, No. 96-3008, 102 F.3d 96 (3rd Cir. 1996).

If a decision on how much money to allocate to each member of the state Senate is made by a vote as part of a legislative budget process, it is legislative, but if the same decision is made unilaterally by the Senate Majority Leader, it is administrative. *Manzi v. DiCarlo*, 982 F. Supp. 125, 128-29 (E.D.N.Y. 1997).

Legislative immunity does not protect a member or employee of a state legislature from a suit in federal court for damages under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (equal employment opportunity) or under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967. *Bostick v. Rappleyea*, 629 F. Supp. 1328, 1332-33 (N.D.N.Y. 1985), *aff'd sub nom. Bostick v. Cochrane*, 907 F.2d 144 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1990) (mem.).

For a discussion of personnel decisions that were found to be “legislative,” see section II.A.18.

## **2. Other Administrative Acts by a Local Legislative Body**

In order for an act by a local legislative body to be considered “legislative” for purposes of absolute common law legislative immunity, the act must be both “substantively” legislative and “procedurally” legislative. *Ryan v. Burlington County, New Jersey*, 889 F.2d 1286 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1989).

### **a. Substantively Legislative**

Some courts have used a two-part test to determine whether an act is “substantively” legislative. The first part focuses on the facts considered by the decision-maker.

If the underlying facts on which the decision is based are “legislative facts”, such as “generalizations concerning a policy or state of affairs”, then the decision is legislative. If the facts used in the decision making are more specific, such as those that relate to particular individuals or situations, then the decision is administrative.

*Cutting v. Muzzey*, 724 F.2d 259, 261 (1st Cir. 1984).

The second part focuses on the impact of the decision.

If the action involves establishment of a general policy, it is legislative; if the action “single[s] out specifiable individuals and affect[s] them differently from others”, it is administrative.

*Id. Accord, Roberson v. Mullins*, 29 F.3d 132 (4th Cir. 1994); *Brown v. Griesenauer*, 970 F.2d 431, 437 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992); *Acevedo-Cordero v. Cordero-Santiago*, 958 F.2d 20, 23 (1st Cir. 1992); *Hughes v. Tarrant County, Tex.*, 948 F.2d 918, 921 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991); *Crymes v. DeKalb County*, 923 F.2d 1482, 1485 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991); *Ryan v. Burlington County, New Jersey*, 889 F.2d 1286, 1290-91 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1989); *Haskell v. Washington Township*, 864 F.2d 1266, 1278 (6th Cir. 1988); *Cinevision Corp.*

v. *City of Burbank*, 745 F.2d 560; 580 (9th Cir. 1984), *cert. denied*, 471 U.S. 1054 (1985); *Bartlett v. Cinemark USA, Inc.*, 908 S.W.2d 229 (Tex. App. 1995).

*Cutting v. Muzzey* involved a decision by a town planning board to condition approval of a subdivision plat on completion of a particular road, which the court found to be an administrative action. Other cases have found similar actions by a local legislative body, even though taken by a vote of the legislative body, to be administrative in nature. *See, e.g., Acierno v. Cloutier*, No. 93-7456, 40 F.3d 597 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1994) (vote to void approved record development plan and related subdivision plans for one parcel); *Trevino ex rel. Cruz v. Gates*, 23 F.3d 1480, 1480-82 (9th Cir. 1994), *cert. denied sub nom. Wachs v. Trevino*, 513 U.S. 932 (1994) (vote to pay punitive damage award); *Hughes v. Tarrant County, Tex.*, 948 F.2d 918 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991) (refusal to pay attorney's fees incurred by county employee); *Crymes v. DeKalb County*, 923 F.2d 1482, 1485 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991) (decision to uphold denial of development permit); *Front Royal and Warren County Industrial Park Corp. v. Town of Front Royal, Va.*, 865 F.2d 77 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989) (failure to provide sewer service after being ordered by court to do so); *Bateson v. Geisse*, 857 F.2d 1300, 1304 (9th Cir. 1988) (decision to deny building permit); *Cinevision Corp. v. City of Burbank*, 745 F.2d 560, 580 (9th Cir. 1984), *cert. denied* 471 U.S. 1054 (1985) (vote to deny rock groups access to city amphitheater); *Scott v. Greenville County*, 716 F.2d 1409 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983) (withholding a builder's permit); *Kuzinich v. County of Santa Clara*, 689 F.2d 1345, 1349 (9th Cir. 1982) (vote to institute action to abate a private business); *Miles-Un-Ltd., Inc. v. Town of New Shoreham, R.I.*, 917 F. Supp. 91 (D.N.H. 1996) (enforcement of local zoning ordinance); *Stone's Auto Mart, Inc. v. City of St. Paul, Minn.*, 721 F. Supp. 206 (D. Minn. 1989) (actions of a city planning commission imposing certain conditions upon the development of a particular subdivision); *Fralin & Waldron, Inc. v. Henrico County, Va.*, 474 F. Supp. 1315 (E.D. Va. 1979) (refusal to approve a plan of development or attempts to hinder construction of a project); *Bartlett v. Cinemark USA, Inc.*, 908 S.W.2d 229 (Tex. App. 1995) (vote to deny development permit).

#### **b. Procedurally Legislative**

Even if an act is substantively legislative, it will not be entitled to absolute legislative immunity if it has not been taken in accordance with established legislative procedures to insure that it is "a legitimate, reasoned decision representing the will of the people which the governing body has been chosen to serve." *Ryan v. Burlington County, New Jersey*, 889 F.2d 1286, 1291 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1989). Where the members of the county board administered the county jail "in an informal manner" where decisions were not always made by passage of a resolution or ordinance, they were not entitled to absolute legislative immunity from a claim that the jail's poor administration had contributed to an inmate becoming a quadriplegic. *Id.* A mere technical violation of a statutory procedure is not sufficient to convert an otherwise legislative action into an administrative one. *Acierno v. Cloutier*, 40 F.3d 597, 614-15 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1994) (No. 93-7456).

## **D. Executive Branch Activities are Not Immune**

### **1. Sitting on an Audit Commission**

While the Minnesota Supreme Court has never been called upon to construe the Speech or Debate Clause in the Minnesota Constitution, Judge Otis H. Godfrey, Jr., of Ramsey County District Court has ruled that legislative immunity “does not extend to such duties as sitting as members of an audit commission.” *Layton v. Legislative Audit Commission*, No. 429436 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Aug. 29, 1978) (unpublished order). This decision was appealed to the Minnesota Supreme Court, but the issue was made moot when the Audit Commission released the working papers to the public.

### **2. Sitting on an Executive Branch Committee**

Legislative immunity does not extend to sitting as a member of a committee in the executive branch, either for legislators, *Small v. Hunt*, 152 F.R.D. 513 (D.S.C. 1994); or for legislative staff. *Florida Ass’n of Rehabilitation Facilities, Inc. v. Fla. Dept. of Health and Rehabilitative Services*, 164 F.R.D. 257 (N.D. Fla. 1995).

## **IV. Some Offers of Proof About Legislative Activity are Not Prohibited**

### **A. Proof of Status as a Member is Not Prohibited**

Proof that the defendant was a member of Congress and thus covered by a statute prohibiting acceptance of a bribe by a public official is not barred by the Speech or Debate Clause. *United States v. Brewster*, 408 U.S. 501 (1972); *United States v. Helstoski*, 576 F.2d 511 (3rd Cir. 1978), *aff’d*, 442 U.S. 477 (1979). Likewise, proof that the defendant was a member of a congressional committee or the holder of a committee leadership position is not barred. *United States v. McDade*, 28 F.3d 283, 289-94 (3rd Cir. 1994) (No. 93-1487, slip op. at 10-23).

### **B. Proof of Legislative Acts Offered by Defendant in Criminal Action is Not “Questioning”**

The Speech or Debate Clause protects a member from being questioned about legislative acts. A member who chooses to offer evidence of legislative acts in defense of a criminal prosecution is not being “questioned,” even though he thereby subjects himself to cross-examination. *United States v. Kolter*, 71 F.3d 425, 430-31 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *United States v. Rostenkowski*, No. 94-3158, 59 F.3d 1291, 1302-04 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *United States v. McDade*, 28 F.3d 283, 294-95 (3rd Cir. 1994) (No. 93-1487, slip op. at 23-25).



## V. A Legislator and Aide Are “Treated as One” for Purposes of Legislative Immunity

### A. Legislative Acts of an Aide Are Immune

Legislative immunity extends to an aide working on behalf of a legislator to prepare for a committee meeting. *Gravel v. United States*, 408 U.S. 606 (1972); or conducting an investigation on behalf of the member, *State v. Beno*, 341 N.W.2d 668 (Wis. 1984). In *Gravel*, Senator Mike Gravel of Alaska had read extensively aloud from the hitherto secret Pentagon Papers at a meeting of the Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds of the Senate Public Works Committee, held on the night of June 29, 1971. Senator Gravel was the chairman and had called the meeting himself. A federal grand jury investigating possible criminal conduct with respect to release and publication of the Papers subpoenaed an assistant to Senator Gravel who had helped him prepare for the meeting. Senator Gravel intervened and moved to quash the subpoenas on the ground that requiring the assistant to testify would violate the Senator’s immunity under the Speech or Debate Clause. The Government contended that the meeting was “special, unauthorized, and untimely,” and that the courts had power to limit the immunity to meetings that were related to a legitimate legislative purpose. The District Court rejected the contention:

Senator Gravel has suggested that the availability of funds for the construction and improvement of buildings and grounds has been affected by the necessary costs of the war in Vietnam and that therefore the development and conduct of the war is properly within the concern of his subcommittee. The court rejects the Government’s argument without detailed consideration of the merits of the Senator’s position, on the basis of the general rule restricting judicial inquiry into matters of legislative purpose and operations. *United States v. Doe*, 332 F. Supp., 930, 935 (D. Mass. 1972).

Quoted in 408 U.S. at 610, n. 6. The Supreme Court upheld the District Court’s decision and prohibited the grand jury from inquiring further into the conduct of the Senator or his aides at the subcommittee meeting and in preparation for it.

In discussing the legislative immunity of the Senator’s aide, the Court found that “for the purpose of construing the privilege a Member and his aide are to be ‘treated as one’ . . . . [T]he ‘Speech or Debate Clause prohibits inquiry into things done . . . as the Senator’s agent or assistant which would have been legislative acts, and therefore privileged, if performed by the Senator personally.’” 408 U.S. at 616; *Jones v. Palmer Media, Inc.*, 478 F. Supp. 1124 (E.D. Tex. 1979).

[I]t is literally impossible, in view of the complexities of the modern legislative process, with Congress almost constantly in session and matters of legislative concern constantly proliferating, for Members of Congress to perform their legislative tasks without the help of aides and assistants; . . . the day-to-day work of such aides is so critical to the Members’ performance that they must be treated as the latter’s alter egos; . . . if they are not so recognized, the central role of the Speech or

Debate Clause - to prevent intimidation of legislators by the Executive and accountability before a hostile judiciary, *United States v. Johnson*, 383 U.S. 169, 181 (1966) - will inevitably be diminished and frustrated.

408 U.S. at 617.

The protection afforded a legislator and a member of his or her personal staff is also accorded to the principal employee of a committee when working on committee business. *Eastland v. United States Servicemen's Fund*, 421 U.S. 491 (1975); *Romero-Barcelo v. Hernandez-Agosto*, No. 95-1235, 75 F.3d 23, 31-32 (1st Cir. 1996); *Green v. DeCamp*, 612 F.2d 368 (8th Cir. 1980); *Marra v. O'Leary*, 652 A.2d 974 (R.I. 1995) (claims committee legal counsel and committee clerk).

In *Eastland*, the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, pursuant to its authority under a Senate resolution to make a complete study of the administration, operation, and enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, began an inquiry into the various activities of the U.S. Servicemen's Fund to determine whether they were potentially harmful to the morale of the U.S. armed forces. In connection with the inquiry, it issued a subpoena *duces tecum* to the bank where the organization had an account ordering the bank to produce all records involving the account. The organization and two of its members then brought an action against the chairman, senator members, chief counsel of the subcommittee, and the bank to enjoin implementation of the subpoena on First Amendment grounds. The Supreme Court held that the activities of the Senate Subcommittee, the individual senators, and the chief counsel fell within the "legitimate legislative sphere" and, once this appeared, were protected by the absolute prohibition of the Speech or Debate Clause of the Constitution against being "questioned in any other Place" and hence were immune from judicial interference. The Court drew no distinction between the members and the chief counsel, saying that "Since the Members are immune because the issuance of the subpoena is 'essential to legislating' their aides share that immunity." 421 U.S. at 504. *Cf. Peroff v. Manuel*, 421 F. Supp. 570 (D.D.C. 1976), where a subcommittee investigator was held immune from liability for damages due to emotional distress and other harm he allegedly caused to a witness in the process of preparing him for a subcommittee hearing.

This same protection is also afforded to committee staff in general. *Doe v. McMillan*, 412 U.S. 306 (1973). *Doe v. McMillan* was a civil suit involving publication and distribution of materials in a committee report that were damaging to private individuals. The individuals brought suit against the committee members, the committee employees, a committee investigator, and a consultant, among others, for their actions in introducing materials at committee hearings that identified particular individuals, for referring the report that included the material to the Speaker of the House, and for voting for publication of the report. All were granted legislative immunity for their actions.

Protection is also afforded to the Sergeant at Arms and other employees and agents who adopt and enforce rules on behalf of either or both Houses, *Consumers Union of United States, Inc. v. Periodical Correspondents' Association*, 515 F.2d 1341 (D.C. Cir. 1975); to the official reporters

who prepare the Senate and House versions of the Congressional Record, *Gregg v. Barrett*, 594 F. Supp. 108, 112 n. 4 (D.D.C. 1984); and to a legislative corrections ombudsman who investigates actions of the department of corrections on behalf of the legislature and publishes an allegedly defamatory report. *Prelesnik v. Esquina*, 347 N.W.2d 226 (Mich. App. 1984).

Congressional staff who *supervise* employees whose duties are directly related to the functioning of the legislative process, such as an official reporter of committee and subcommittee hearings, are immune from suit for alleged racial discrimination in firing. *Browning v. Clerk, U. S. House of Representatives*, 789 F.2d 923 (D.C. Cir. 1986). *But cf. State v. Haley*, 687 P.2d 305 (Alaska 1984). In *Haley*, the Executive Director of the Legislative Affairs Agency and the Director of its Research Division were sued for damages and reinstatement under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for discharging a researcher in violation of her right to free speech. These two defendants failed to assert legislative immunity but successfully asserted a qualified official immunity for their actions. The Legislative Affairs Agency and Legislative Council, on the other hand, were required to reinstate the researcher and pay her back pay and benefits, interest, costs, and attorney's fees. The court held that the act of firing the researcher, even though done by a vote of the Legislative Council, was "an administrative rather than a legislative act, and that it was therefore not within the scope of legislative immunity." 687 P.2d at 319.

Executive branch officials who participate in the legislative process by preparing budget proposals for consideration by a legislative body are entitled to legislative immunity for their actions. *Bogan v. Scott-Harris*, 523 U.S. 44 (1998); *Rini v. Zwirn*, 886 F. Supp. 270, 284 (E.D.N.Y. 1995); *Campaign for Fiscal Equity v. State*, 179 Misc.2d 907, 687 N.Y.S.2d 227, *aff'd* 265 A.D.2d 277, 697 N.Y.S.2d 40 (1999).

## **B. "Political" Acts of an Aide Are Not Immune**

Just as when a member himself engages in "political" acts, the courts have also held the conduct of legislative staff subject to judicial scrutiny when it has gone beyond what is "essential to the deliberations" of a legislative body, *Hutchinson v. Proxmire*, 443 U.S. 111 (1979); *Gravel v. United States*, 408 U.S. 606, 625 (1972); *United States v. Eilberg*, 465 F. Supp. 1080 (E.D. Pa. 1979); or "beyond the reasonable requirements of the legislative function," *Doe v. McMillan*, 412 U.S. at 315-16, such as when arranging for a republication, *Hutchinson v. Proxmire, supra*; *Gravel, supra*; *Doe v. McMillan, supra*; *Hentoff v. Ichord*, 318 F. Supp. 1175 (D.D.C. 1970); or contacting an executive agency to arrange for the release of grant funds, *Eilberg, supra*; or conducting prayers before the opening of a legislative session. *Kurtz v. Baker*, 630 F. Supp. 850 (D.D.C. 1986).

Congressional staff who *supervise* employees whose duties are *not* directly related to the functioning of the legislative process, such as the general manager of the House of Representatives restaurant system, are not immune from suit for alleged sex discrimination in firing. *Walker v. Jones*, 733 F.2d 923 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

### C. Unconstitutional or Illegal Conduct of an Aide is Not Immune

Although legislators are immune from liability or questioning even when their legislative acts go beyond the constitutional authority of the legislative body, their aides do not share the same absolute immunity for their conduct in executing invalid orders or policies of the legislature.

The purpose of the protection afforded legislators is not to forestall judicial review of legislative action but to insure that legislators are not distracted from or hindered in the performance of their legislative tasks by being called into court to defend their actions.

*Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 505 (1969).

When a legislative act is alleged to be unconstitutional, the proper subject of judicial power is not a legislative body or its members, but rather those officials who are charged with executing the legislative act. *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486 (1969) (dismissal of action for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief against the Speaker of the House and four other members individually and as representatives of all House members for voting to exclude Adam Clayton Powell from membership and refusing to administer to him the oath of office was affirmed, while dismissal of same action against the Chief Clerk of the House for refusing services to excluded member, Sergeant at Arms for refusing to pay salary to excluded member, and Doorkeeper for refusing to admit excluded member was reversed and remanded for further proceedings); *Kilbourn v. Thompson*, 103 U.S. 168 (1880) (Sergeant at Arms liable for damages for arresting a person found in contempt of the House); *Eslinger v. Thomas*, 476 F.2d 225 (4th Cir. 1973) (action against President and President pro tem of South Carolina Senate, members of the Senate, and Clerk of the Senate for declaratory judgment that denying a female law student employment as a page solely on the ground of gender was unconstitutional and for an injunction against continuing that denial, dismissed as to senators on the basis of legislative immunity; injunction granted as to Clerk of the Senate); *Sweeney v. Tucker*, 473 Pa. 493, 503-07, 375 A.2d 698, 703-04 (1977) (action by expelled member of Pennsylvania House of Representatives against House Comptroller for back pay not barred by state Speech or Debate Clause).

Likewise, where a legislative staff person is accused of participation in a crime, the protection of the Speech or Debate Clause is not absolute. *Gravel v. United States*, 408 U.S. 606, 622 (1972); *Dombrowski v. Eastland*, 387 U.S. 82 (1967); *McSurely v. McClellan*, 553 F.2d 1277 (D.C. Cir. 1976); *Benford v. American Broadcasting Companies*, 502 F. Supp. 1148 (D. Md. 1980). In *Dombrowski*, the chairman and the chief counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee were both accused of conspiring with Louisiana officials to seize petitioners' property and records in violation of the Fourth Amendment. The chief counsel was required to go to trial on the factual question of whether he participated in the conspiracy, even though the case against the chairman of the committee was dismissed on the basis of legislative immunity. The Court found that legislative staff was not entitled to the same absolute protection afforded members where criminal activity was alleged.

## **VI. Uses of Legislative Immunity**

### **A. From Ultimate Relief**

#### **1. Criminal Prosecution**

Legislative immunity may be invoked to shield a legislator from criminal prosecution for his legislative acts. *United States v. Helstoski*, 442 U.S. 477 (1979); *United States v. Johnson*, 383 U.S. 169 (1966); *Government of Virgin Islands v. Lee*, 775 F.2d 514 (3rd Cir. 1985); *State v. Dankworth*, 672 P.2d 148 (Alaska App. 1983); *Blondes v. State*, 16 Md.App. 165, 294 A.2d 661 (1972).

Legislative immunity does not apply, however, to shield the legislative acts of a *state* legislator from criminal prosecution in a *federal* court. *United States v. Gillock*, 445 U.S. 360 (1980); *United States v. Gonzalez de Modesti*, 145 F.Supp.2d 171 (D. Puerto Rico 2001). The federal Speech or Debate Clause does not apply to state legislators, and a state Speech or Debate Clause does not limit the federal government. The court in *Gillock* found that common law principles protecting the independence of legislators from their executive and judicial co-equals did not require state legislators to be free from prosecutions by federal officials.

The courts will not assume that Congress intended to abrogate the common law legislative immunity of a state legislator unless Congress has made a clear statement to that effect. In passing RICO, Congress did not express that clear intent, so legislative immunity is available to a state legislator as a defense to a prosecution under RICO. *Chappell v. Robbins*, No. 93-17063, 73 F.3d 918, 922-25 (9th Cir. 1996).

#### **2. Liability for Damages**

Legislative immunity may also be invoked to shield a legislator from liability for damages for his or her legislative acts. *Bogan v. Scott-Harris*, 523 U.S. 44 (1998); *Doe v. McMillan*, 412 U.S. 306 (1975); *Tenney v. Brandhove*, 341 U.S. 367 (1951); *Kilbourn v. Thompson*, 103 U.S. 168 (1880); *Larsen v. Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, No. 97-7153, 152 F.3d 240 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1998); *Acevedo-Cordero v. Cordero-Santiago*, 958 F.2d 20, 22 (1st Cir. 1992); *Browning v. Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives*, 789 F.2d 923 (D.C. Cir. 1986); *Schultz v. Sundberg*, 759 F.2d 714 (9th Cir. 1985); *Agromayor v. Colberg*, 738 F.2d 55 (1st Cir. 1984); *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 1037 (1984); *Green v. DeCamp*, 612 F.2d 368 (8th Cir. 1980); *Ray v. Proxmire*, 581 F.2d 998 (D.C. Cir. 1978), *cert. denied*, 439 U.S. 933 (1978); *McSurely v. McClellan*, 553 F.2d 1277 (D.C. Cir. 1976); *Lasa v. Colberg*, 622 F. Supp. 557 (D. Puerto Rico 1985); *Searingtown Corp. v. Incorporated Village of North Hills*, 575 F. Supp. 1295 (E.D. N.Y. 1981); *Rusack v. Harsha*, 470 F. Supp. 285 (M.D. Pa. 1978); *Smith v. Eagleton*, 455 F. Supp. 403 (W.D. Mo. 1978).

### 3. Declaratory Judgments

Legislative immunity protects legislators from declaratory judgments. *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486 (1969); *Larsen v. Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, No. 97-7153, 152 F.3d 240 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1998); *Consumers Union of United States, Inc. v. Periodical Correspondents' Association*, 515 F.2d 1341 (D.C. Cir. 1975) (action for declaratory judgment that rules of Senate and House of Representatives excluding certain correspondents from the press galleries were unconstitutional dismissed on basis of legislative immunity and non-justiciability of subject matter); *Consumers Education & Protective Association v. Nolan*, 368 A.2d 675 (Pa. 1977); *Wiggins v. Stuart*, 671 S.W.2d 262 (Ky. App. 1984) (action for declaratory judgment that various bills passed by the legislature relating to compensation and pensions for legislators were unconstitutional).

*Powell v. McCormack* was an action against the Speaker of the House and four other members individually and as representatives of all House members for a declaratory judgment that the vote whereby congressman Adam Clayton Powell was excluded from membership in the House was null and void and to enjoin the Speaker from refusing to administer to him the oath of office. The action also sought to enjoin the Chief Clerk of the House from refusing services to the excluded member, the Sergeant at Arms from refusing to pay a salary to the excluded member, and the Doorkeeper from refusing to admit the excluded member. The action was dismissed as to the Speaker and members of the House on the basis of legislative immunity.

*Larsen v. Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* was an action by a judge of the state supreme court against numerous state officials who had participated in various disciplinary proceedings against him, including 49 members of the Pennsylvania Senate who had voted on articles of impeachment presented by the House of Representatives. In addition to money damages against the senators, the judge sought declaratory and injunctive relief voiding the Senate verdict of guilty on Article II. The trial court dismissed the claim against the senators for money damages but not the claim for declaratory and injunctive relief. The Court of Appeals held that impeachment proceedings were a legislative activity and remanded with instructions to dismiss all the claims against the senators.

*Consumers Education and Protective Association v. Nolan* was an action against the chairman of a committee of the Pennsylvania Senate for a declaratory judgment that the vote whereby the committee recommended confirmation of an appointment by the Governor was void as in violation of the “sunshine” law because of inadequate public notice of the meeting, to declare the senate vote on the confirmation likewise void, to enjoin the chairman from submitting any other name to the Senate for confirmation, and to enjoin the chairman to take minutes of all meetings of his committee. The action was dismissed on the basis of legislative immunity.

Legislative immunity also protects legislative staff from declaratory judgments. *Consumers Union of United States, Inc. v. Periodical Correspondents' Association*, 515 F.2d 1341 (D.C. Cir. 1975).

In one case, however, the Supreme Court of Oklahoma refused to dismiss a declaratory judgment action brought against the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to have a law declared unconstitutional, finding that the suit was really against the state itself and that the legislators were only nominal defendants. *Ethics Comm'n of the State of Oklahoma v. Cullison*, 850 P.2d 1069 (Okl. 1993).

Where legislators have been named as defendants but legislative immunity has not been asserted as a defense, courts have issued declaratory judgments invalidating legislative actions. *Williams v. State Legislature of Idaho*, 111 Idaho 156, 722 P.2d 465 (1986) (failure of the Legislature to appropriate money to the State Auditor to conduct post-audit functions was “impermissible”); *State ex rel. Judge v. Legislative Finance Committee*, 168 Mont. 470, 543 P.2d 1317 (1975) (law granting Legislative Finance Committee power to amend enacted budget was unconstitutional); *Thompson v. Legislative Audit Comm’n*, 79 N.M. 693, 448 P.2d 799 (1968) (law removing duties implicit in office of state auditor was unconstitutional).

#### 4. Injunctions

Legislative immunity also insulates the legislative conduct from judicial interference by means of an injunction. *Eastland v. United States Servicemen’s Fund*, 421 U.S. 491 (1975); *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486 (1969); *Larsen v. Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, No. 97-7153, 152 F.3d 240 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1998); *Colon Berrios v. Hernandez Agosto*, 716 F.2d 85 (1st Cir. 1983); *Green v. DeCamp*, 612 F.2d 368 (8th Cir. 1980); *Lasa v. Colberg*, 622 F. Supp. 557 (D. Puerto Rico 1985); *Acosta v. Agosto*, 590 F. Supp. 144 (D. Puerto Rico 1984); *Gregg v. Barrett*, 594 F. Supp. 108 (D.D.C. 1984); *Stamler v. Willis*, 281 F. Supp. 734 (N.D. Ill. 1968), *appeal dismissed*, 393 U.S. 217 (1968), *vacated on other grounds*, 393 U.S. 407 (1969); *Lincoln Party v. General Assembly*, 682 A.2d 1326 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1996); *Harristown Development Corp. v. Commonwealth*, 135 Pa. Commw. Ct. 177, 580 A.2d 1174 (1990); *Consumers Educational Protective Association v. Nolan*, 368 A.2d 675 (Pa. 1977).

In *Eastland*, an action to enjoin a Senate subcommittee from implementation of a subpoena *duces tecum* was dismissed on the basis of legislative immunity. In *Stamler*, an action to enjoin the House Un-American Activities Committee from conducting a hearing and from enforcing its subpoenas was dismissed on the basis of legislative immunity.

However, if the members of a subcommittee are not named as defendants in an action to enjoin implementation of a subcommittee subpoena *duces tecum* directed against a private corporation, and the executive branch moves to quash the subpoena on the basis of a claim of executive privilege to protect national security, as with a subpoena of telephone records of warrantless wiretaps, the court may be willing to balance a claim of legislative immunity against a claim of executive privilege. *United States v. American Telephone & Telegraph Co.*, 567 F.2d 121 (D.C. Cir. 1977).

Legislative immunity from injunctive relief applies at common law to protect state legislators

from a federal injunction under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *Star Distributors, Ltd. v. Marino*, 613 F.2d 4 (2nd Cir. 1980). There a motion for a preliminary injunction to restrain the members of a New York state legislative committee from enforcing subpoenas *duces tecum* served upon printers, publishers, and distributors of sexually-oriented material as part of a legislative investigation of child pornography was denied.

## **5. Writs of Quo Warranto and Mandamus**

Legislative immunity protects a Senate and House of Representatives, as well as their members, from writs of quo warranto and mandamus seeking to determine the constitutionality of a law. *State ex rel. Stephan v. Kansas House of Representatives*, 687 P.2d 622 (Kan. 1984) (law authorizing legislature to adopt, modify, or revoke administrative rules by concurrent resolutions passed by the legislature without presentment to the governor).

## **6. Claims for Repayment**

Legislative immunity protects state legislators from having to defend a claim for repayment of amounts paid to them under a law increasing legislative expense allowances when the law is challenged as unconstitutional. *Consumer Party of Pennsylvania v. Commonwealth*, 510 Pa. 158, 507 A.2d 323 (Pa. 1986).

### **B. From Having to Testify or Produce Documents**

#### **1. In Criminal Actions**

The Speech or Debate Clause protects a legislator from having to respond to a subpoena, even one issued by a grand jury investigating possible criminal conduct, insofar as the subpoena would require him or her to testify concerning legislative activities.

[T]he Speech or Debate Clause at the very least protects [a Senator] from criminal or civil liability and from questioning elsewhere than in the Senate, with respect to the events occurring at the subcommittee hearing at which the Pentagon Papers were introduced into the public record. To us this claim is incontrovertible.

. . . We have no doubt that Senator Gravel may not be made to answer - either in terms of questions or in terms of defending himself from prosecution - for the events that occurred at the subcommittee meeting.

*Gravel v. United States*, 408 U.S. 606, 615-16 (1972).

The immunity of a legislator from having to respond to a subpoena relating to conduct “within the sphere of legitimate legislative activity” is shared by the legislator’s aides.



[F]or the purpose of construing the privilege a Member and his aide are to be ‘treated as one,’ *United States v. Doe*, 455 F.2d, at 761 . . . [T]he ‘Speech or Debate Clause prohibits inquiry into things done by [a Senator’s aide] as the Senator’s agent or assistant which would have been legislative acts, and therefore privileged, if performed by the Senator personally.’ *United States v. Doe*, 332 F. Supp. at 937-938.

*Quoted in Gravel*, 408 U.S. at 616.

Nor will the courts attempt to enforce a subpoena *duces tecum* served on the chief counsel of a House subcommittee on behalf of a defendant in a criminal trial when the subpoena is directed to the official record of testimony received by the subcommittee in executive session. *United States v. Ehrlichman*, 389 F. Supp. 95 (D.D.C. 1974).

Legislative immunity under the Speech or Debate Clause is both a use immunity to protect a legislator from liability and a testimonial immunity to protect a legislator from harassment, but it does not protect legislative documents from subpoena by a grand jury when they are not in the possession of a legislator or the legislator’s personal or committee staff.

[T]o the extent that the Speech or Debate Clause creates a testimonial privilege as well as use immunity, it does so only for the purpose of protecting the legislator and those intimately associated with him in the legislative process from the harassment of hostile questioning. It is not designed to encourage confidences by maintaining secrecy, for the legislative process in a democracy has only a limited toleration for secrecy . . . . As we have said on two other occasions, the privilege when applied to records or third-party testimony is one of nonevidentiary use, not of non-disclosure.

*In re Grand Jury Investigation*, 587 F.2d 589 (3rd Cir. 1978).

In that case, the court held that records of telephone calls, both official and unofficial, to and from Representative Eilberg and in the possession of the Chief Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, rather than in the possession of Rep. Eilberg or his aide, were subject to subpoena by a grand jury, but that calls identified by Representative Eilberg as relating to official business could not be presented to the grand jury.

Even where the records of a congressman were subpoenaed by a grand jury from his administrative assistant, the congressman’s motion to quash the subpoena was denied, but he was granted the right to assert legislative immunity as to specific documents *in camera* and his request for a protective order prohibiting testimony by his administrative assistant relating to the congressman’s legislative activities was upheld. *In re Possible Violations*, 491 F. Supp. 211 (D.D.C. 1980).

Legislative immunity under federal common law does not protect state legislators and staff from having to testify and produce records regarding legislative actions in a federal criminal proceeding. *In re Grand Jury*, 821 F.2d 946 (3rd Cir. 1987). A federal grand jury investigating alleged improprieties in procurement of granite for expansion of the Pennsylvania state capitol issued a subpoena *duces tecum* to members of a state legislative committee that had already been investigating the same allegations. The federal district court quashed the subpoena as to all documents conveying impressions and thought processes of committee members, but enforced it as to information regarding identity of witnesses interviewed by the committee and as to documents or exhibits authored by a witness or third party that could not be obtained by any other means. *In re Grand Jury Subpoena*, 626 F. Supp. 1319 (M.D. Pa. 1986). The court noted that the committee members had voluntarily supplied the grand jury with substantial information from their own investigation and that “much of the information sought is readily available from other sources.” 626 F. Supp. at 1329 n. 9. The Court of Appeals reversed, holding that Speech or Debate Clause immunity does not protect state legislators from having to produce documents for a federal grand jury. 821 F.2d 946. Their proper remedy to protect from an unreasonable or oppressive subpoena is a motion under Rule 17 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. 821 F.2d at 957.

Federal common law legislative immunity does not shield a state senator and chief clerk of the state Senate from producing legislative payroll and tax evidence before a federal grand jury that is investigating allegations of mail fraud, racketeering, and tax evasion, although records of legislative actions would be protected. *In re Grand Jury Proceedings (Cianfrani)*, 563 F.2d 577 (3rd Cir. 1977).

Legislative immunity under Minnesota’s Speech or Debate Clause has been used to protect legislators and legislative staff from having to testify about legislative intent in enacting a tax law when subpoenaed by the defendant in his criminal trial for tax evasion. *State v. Granse*, No. 4133153 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Sep. 3, 1987) (Gearin, J.) (unpublished order) (subpoenas quashed as to senator, Senate Counsel, and electronic technician).

## **2. In Civil Actions**

### **a. Legislators**

#### **(1) Members of Congress**

The Speech or Debate Clause gives legislators protection “not only from the consequences of litigation’s results but also from the burden of defending themselves” when they are made a party to a civil action. *Eastland v. United States Servicemen’s Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 503 (1975).

[A] private civil action . . . creates a distraction and forces Members to direct their time, energy, and attention from their legislative tasks to defend the litigation . . . . Moreover, whether a criminal action is instituted by the Executive Branch, or a civil action is brought by private parties, judicial power is still brought to bear on

Members of Congress and legislative independence is imperiled.

*Id.*

Legislative immunity under the United States Speech or Debate Clause protects a member of Congress from having to testify in a civil action in which the member is not a party concerning the member's "legislative acts." *Miller v. Transamerican Press, Inc.*, 709 F.2d 524, 530 (9th Cir. 1983) (congressman served with subpoena *duces tecum* for deposition regarding source of article he inserted in Congressional Record); *Shape of Things to Come, Inc. v. Kane County*, 588 F. Supp. 1192 (N.D. Ill. 1984) (congressman served with subpoena *duces tecum* for all documents in his files relating to a housing project); *United States v. Peoples Temple of the Disciples of Christ*, 515 F. Supp. 246 (D.D.C. 1981). This is true whether the testimony relates to information that was subsequently published, as in *Transamerican Press, Inc.*, or to information that was never published, as in *Peoples Temple*.

The *Peoples Temple* case was a civil action by the United States government to collect costs accrued in searching for the living and transporting the dead in the Jonestown tragedy. Defendants served subpoenas *duces tecum* to attend a deposition on the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the committee clerk seeking unpublished information gathered by the committee in its investigation of the Jonestown tragedy. The motion of the chairman and the clerk to quash the subpoenas was granted. The court held that the investigation of a congressman's assassination in Jonestown, the publication of the report, and the discretionary inclusion or omission of information was within the sphere of legitimate legislative activity protected by the Speech or Debate Clause and was absolutely immune from questioning.

Otherwise, Members of Congress conducting investigations would be forced to consider at every turn whether evidence received pursuant to the investigation would subsequently have to be produced in court. This would "imperil" the legislative independence protected by the Clause. Moreover, producing documents and testifying at a deposition would certainly disrupt the functioning of a Member of Congress.

515 F. Supp. at 249.

The United States Speech or Debate Clause protects a member of Congress from having to produce documents for inspection and copying in response to a subpoena in a private civil action brought by a third party, even if the degree of disruption to the legislative process is minimal; "any probing of legislative acts is sufficient to trigger the immunity." *Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp. v. Williams*, No. 94-5171, 62 F.3d 408, 419 (D.C. Cir. 1995).

Confidential reports prepared by the investigative staff of a House subcommittee are not subject to compulsory disclosure. *Pentagen Technologies Int'l, Ltd. v. Committee on Appropriations of the U.S. House of Representatives*, 20 F. Supp.2d 41 (D.D.C. 1998).

Legislative immunity under the United States Speech or Debate Clause does not shield congressional documents from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act when the documents have been left in the custody of the Central Intelligence Agency and Congress has not, by resolution, asserted that the documents should not be disclosed. *Holy Spirit Association for Unification of World Christianity v. Central Intelligence Agency*, 558 F. Supp. 41 (D.D.C. 1983). Nor does it bar inquiry into the identity of a congressman's aides. *Miller v. Transamerican Press, Inc.*, 709 F.2d 524 (9th Cir. 1983).

## (2) State Legislators

Legislative immunity at federal common law protects a state legislator from having to testify in a civil action in federal court in which the legislator is not a party about the legislator's motives for supporting the passage of a bill. *Greenberg v. Collier*, 482 F. Supp. 200 (E.D. Va. 1979). Where plaintiffs challenged the constitutionality of a law and subpoenaed for deposition the chairman of the subcommittee of the Virginia General Assembly that had recommended the bill to pass, the chairman's motion to quash the subpoena was denied but a protective order prohibiting inquiry into "any legislative activity or his motives for same" was granted on the basis of federal common law legislative immunity. *Id.*

In an action against a state legislator in state court alleging a violation of federal law, such as 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a court will apply federal common law, rather than a state's own Speech or Debate Clause, in determining the scope of legislative immunity. *Uniontown Newspapers, Inc. v. Roberts*, 777 A.2d 1225, 1232-34 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2001). Common law legislative immunity protects a legislator from having to disclose records of telephone calls on legislative business. *Id.*

The Speech or Debate Clause of the Rhode Island constitution protects state legislators from having to testify in an action challenging the constitutionality of a legislative redistricting plan concerning their actions and motivations in developing the plan. *Holmes v. Farmer*, 475 A.2d 976 (R.I. 1984).

A Pennsylvania legislator may not be deposed in a defamation action about private conversations concerning various candidates to fill a judicial vacancy. *Melvin v. Doe*, 2000 WL 33252882 (Pa.Com.Pl.), 48 Pa. D. & C.4th 566. This is because, even if the questioning were not barred by the Speech or Debate Clause of the Pennsylvania Constitution, it would violate a citizen's right to petition the government in confidence. *Id.* at 574-76.

The Speech or Debate Clause of the Ohio Constitution protects legislators from being questioned about their private, off-the-record meetings with corporate representatives concerning legislation, but it does not protect them from having to divulge the identity of those corporate representatives or protect the corporate representatives from being deposed about the meetings. *City of Dublin v. State*, 138 Ohio App.3d 753, 742 N.E.2d 232 (2000).

The Speech or Debate Clause of the Louisiana constitution protects legislative staff from

having to produce bill drafting files related to specific legislation authored by a member. *Copsey v. Baer*, 593 So.2d 685 (La. App. 1 Cir. 1991).

Legislative immunity from having to testify in a civil action in which the legislator was not a party has been recognized by the Minnesota Court of Appeals. *McGaa v. Glumack*, No. C9-87-2398 (Minn. App., Dec. 31, 1987) (unpublished order). *McGaa* was a defamation action brought against the former chair of the Metropolitan Airports Commission. The plaintiff alleged that defamatory statements about him had been included in a document given to a legislative committee. Plaintiff sought to question Senator Donald M. Moe, who chaired the committee, and his aide, Michael Norton, about whether they had received the document and, if so, when and where. He also sought to question them about whether they knew of anyone else who had received the document and, if so, when and where. The senator and his aide moved to quash the subpoenas served on them. The trial court refused to grant the senator and his aide absolute immunity and instead weighed the benefit to the plaintiff in being able to ask the questions against the imposition on the deponents in having to answer them. The trial court ordered the senator and his aide to answer just four questions about their receipt of the document. The Court of Appeals, in a decision for a three-judge panel written by Chief Judge D.D. Wozniak, issued a writ of prohibition reversing the trial court's order on the ground that it required the production of information that was clearly non-discoverable. The Court cited both *Eastland v. United States Servicemen's Fund* and *Doe v. McMillan* for the proposition that, "within the sphere of legitimate legislative activity," the protection of the Speech or Debate Clause is absolute.

Legislative immunity for a member from having to testify in a civil action in which a legislator was not a party has likewise been recognized in Minnesota at the district court level.

Judge Edward S. Wilson of Ramsey County District Court upheld a claim of legislative immunity made by former senator Donald M. Moe, his former committee administrator Michael Norton, and former Senate Counsel Allison Wolf when C. Michael McLaren, former Executive Director of the Public Employees Retirement Association ("PERA"), sought to question them about information they had gathered as part of a senate committee's investigation of PERA. Judge Wilson issued a protective order prohibiting McLaren from questioning them "about anything said, done, received, or learned by either of them within the sphere of legitimate legislative activity, particularly the 1984 investigation of the management of the Public Employees Retirement Association." *State ex rel. Humphrey v. McLaren*, No. C5-85-475478 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Nov. 23, 1992) (unpublished order).

Judge Lawrence L. Lenertz of the First Judicial District upheld a claim of legislative immunity made by Senator Clarence M. Purfeerst and Representative Robert E. Vanasek in the case of *Lifteau v. Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission*, No. 421416 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Dec. 14, 1977) (unpublished order). The legislators had been subpoenaed to give depositions in a case challenging the constitutionality of the act creating the Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission. They moved to quash the subpoenas or for protective orders prohibiting plaintiff from questioning them "about anything said or done by them as members of the . . . Legislature in the

exercise of the functions of that office, particularly the passage of” the act in question. Judge Lenertz granted the protective orders.

Later that same month, Judge Ronald E. Hachey of Ramsey County District Court upheld a similar claim of legislative immunity asserted by Senator Nicholas D. Coleman and Representative Martin O. Sabo in the *Lifteau* case, and signed a similar protective order. (Dec. 27, 1977) (unpublished).

Legislative immunity will not protect from disclosure by a state senator documents showing the allocation of money to pay the senator’s office expenses if the decision is made by the Senate Majority Leader as an administrative action, rather than by a vote in the budget process as a legislative action. *Manzi v. DiCarlo*, 982 F. Supp. 125, 128-29 (E.D.N.Y. 1997).

### (3) Local Legislators

Common law legislative immunity protects the members of a local governing body from having to testify concerning their motives in enacting an ordinance, *Knights of Columbus v. Town of Lexington*, 138 F. Supp.2d 136 (D. Mass. 2001); *Miles-Un-Ltd., Inc. v. Town of New Shoreham, R.I.*, 917 F. Supp. 91 (D.N.H. 1996); *Searingtown Corp. v. Incorporated Village of North Hills*, 575 F. Supp. 1295 (E.D.N.Y. 1981); or in adopting a list of prohibited wild animals. *Humane Society of New York v. City of New York*, 188 Misc.2d 735, 729 N.Y.S.2d 360 (2001). It also protects them from having to testify about their deliberations and communications related to the passage of legislation. *Orange v. County of Suffolk*, 855 F. Supp. 620 (E.D.N.Y. 1994).

Common law legislative immunity protects members of a local governing body from having to produce documents outside the official record concerning their procedures or their motives in taking legislative action. *Id.* (adopting list of protected wild animals). However, they must produce documents that are part of the official record. *Miles-Un-Ltd., Inc. v. Town of New Shoreham, R.I.*, 917 F. Supp. 91 (D.N.H. 1996).

#### b. Legislative Aides

The immunity of a legislator from having to respond to a subpoena in a civil action relating to conduct “within the sphere of legitimate legislative activity” is shared by the legislator’s aides. *MINPECO, S.A. v. Conticommodity Services, Inc.*, 844 F.2d 856 (D.C. Cir. 1988) (subpoenas *duces tecum* for oral depositions served on custodian of records and staff director of subcommittee of U.S. House of Representatives for production of documents relating to testimony presented to the subcommittee and information gathered by it; subcommittee’s motion to quash granted); *United States v. Peoples Temple of the Disciples of Christ*, 515 F. Supp. 246 (D.D.C. 1981) (committee clerk subpoenaed to testify and produce documents at deposition concerning committee’s investigation of Jonestown tragedy; chairman and clerk’s motion to quash granted); *Holmes v. Farmer*, 475 A.2d 976 (R.I. 1984) (legislative aide to General Assembly’s Reapportionment Commission not required to testify at trial concerning formation of redistricting plan); *State v. Beno*,

341 N.W.2d 668 (Wis. 1984) (administrative assistant to speaker of state assembly subpoenaed to testify at deposition about investigation into member's misconduct; speaker and aide's motion to quash granted). See, *Miller v. Transamerican Press, Inc.*, 709 F.2d 524, 530 (9th Cir. 1983) (congressman served with subpoena *duces tecum* for deposition regarding source of article he inserted in Congressional Record; dicta said that "If [his] aides are deposed, [the congressman] may have them assert his privilege. Because Congressmen must delegate responsibility, aides may invoke the privilege to the extent that the Congressman may and does claim it.")

The Wisconsin Constitution provides, in Article IV, Section 16, that:

No member of the legislature shall be liable in any civil action, or criminal prosecution whatever, for words spoken in debate.

When the administrative assistant to the Speaker of the Wisconsin Assembly, who also served as staff to the Assembly Organization Committee and Joint Committee on Legislative Organization, was served with a subpoena relating to information he had provided to the Speaker and committee members as a result of his investigation into alleged misconduct and violation of law by legislators, the administrative assistant and the Speaker moved to quash the subpoena on the basis of legislative immunity. Granting the motion was upheld on appeal. *State v. Beno*, 341 N.W.2d 668 (Wis. 1984).

In *State ex rel. Humphrey v. Philip Morris, Inc.*, No. C1-94-8565 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Minn.), defendant tobacco companies served subpoenas *duces tecum* on the Secretary of the Senate and the Chief Clerk of the House demanding that they produce any nonpublic documents in the possession of the legislature since 1946 related to the dangers of cigarette smoking to your health, public health regulations imposed by the state to reduce those dangers, taxes imposed on tobacco products, and spending of tobacco tax receipts. Judge Kenneth J. Fitzpatrick quashed the subpoenas on the ground of legislative immunity, saying:

Such information is traditionally protected, and for good reason. Such documents fall squarely into the sphere of legitimate legislative activity. The sorts of documents sought directly relate to the process of developing and considering proposed legislation. The exchange of such information is recognized as vital to the legislative process. Disclosure of such matters would chill, if not cripple, free debate, discussion, and analysis of proposed legislation.

(Mar. 13, 1997) (unpublished order).

In *Blume v. County of Ramsey*, 1988 WL 114606 (Minn. Tax Ct. 1988), the court quashed a third-party subpoena served on several tax committee staff persons and the Chief Clerk of the House, holding that the Speech or Debate protection prevented *discovery* into dates, places, and circumstances of committee meetings. The Court held that:

[T]he proposed questions about the dates, places and circumstances of committee meetings fall within the sphere of protected legislative activity. Questions regarding resolutions to suspend or alter Senate or House Rules, and questions about the availability of computer data presented to committees of the legislature likewise relate to the deliberation of the legislative body. . . . We find the recording in the Journals in this case is part of the legislative process because it is required of the legislature as part of its official action. Minn. State. § 3.17. No further inquiry is therefore allowed.

*Id.* \* 4.

Where subpoenas to testify in a civil action to which they were not a party have been served on both Minnesota legislators and legislative staff, the subpoenas have been quashed or protective orders issued for the benefit of legislative staff along with the legislators. *McGaa v. Glumack*, No. C9-87-2398 (Minn. App., Dec. 31, 1987) (unpublished order); *State ex rel. Humphrey v. McLaren*, No. C5-85-475478 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Nov. 23, 1992) (unpublished order).

In *Minnesota-Dakota Retail Hardware Association v. State*, No. 406422 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Sep. 14, 1976) (unpublished order), the hardware dealers challenged the validity of certain regulations promulgated by the Director of Consumer Services. In discovery, they served subpoenas *duces tecum* upon various legislative staff members seeking information concerning the Legislature's intent in enacting the law pursuant to which the Director of Consumer Services had promulgated the regulations. Judge Otis H. Godfrey, Jr., applied to the Minnesota Constitution the same construction given the Speech or Debate Clause of the United States Constitution by the federal courts, and in his order of September 14, 1976, quashed the subpoenas served upon legislative staff "as to any matters pertaining to memoranda, documents or actions by said offices which are or were in connection with the Legislative process." Other matters, those related to the preparation, drafting, and issuance of the *regulations*, he found to be not related to the due functioning of the legislative process and thus subject to discovery. Matters relating to the regulations may not have been within the legitimate legislative sphere because the duty of promulgating them was, by statute, placed upon the Director of Consumer Services in the executive branch.

Federal common law legislative immunity may not protect a *state* legislative staff member from having to produce documents in a civil suit in *federal* court in which he is not a party, even though the staff member would be immune from being deposed regarding the documents. *Corporation Insular de Seguros v. Garcia*, 709 F. Supp. 288 (D. Puerto Rico 1989).

In Michigan, legislative immunity does not protect a senator's aide from having to testify about private conversations he had with the senator in the senator's office about an investigation being conducted by an executive agency. *In re Deposition of Prange*, 542 N.W.2d 354 (Mich. App. 1995).

In New York, legislative immunity protects an employee of the executive branch from having



to testify or produce documents in court related to a budget proposal being prepared for consideration by the legislature. *Campaign for Fiscal Equity v. State*, 179 Misc.2d 907, 687 N.Y.S.2d 227, *aff'd* 265 A.D.2d 277, 697 N.Y.S.2d 40 (1999).

## **VII. Appropriate Relief**

### **A. From Criminal Indictment**

When a legislator has been improperly questioned before a grand jury concerning legislative acts, the counts in an indictment that are based on that testimony must be dismissed. *United States v. Swindall*, 971 F.2d 1531, 1546-50 (11th Cir. 1992), *cert. denied*, 510 U.S. 1040 (1994).

If written evidence of any legislative acts is presented to a grand jury, a grand jury's indictment that may have been based on that evidence must be dismissed. *United States v. Durenberger*, Crim. No. 3-93-65, 1993 WL 738477 at \*3-4 (D. Minn. 1993).

### **B. From Civil Complaint**

The usual relief granted when a legislator has been found to be immune from a civil complaint is to have the complaint dismissed. *See, e.g., Eastland v. United States Servicemen's Fund*, 421 U.S. 491, 512 (1975).

In one case, the state supreme court issued a writ of prohibition to stop further proceedings in the district court. *Brock v. Thompson*, 1997 OK 127, 948 P.2d 279 (Okla. 1997).

### **C. From Subpoena**

In *Gravel v. United States*, 408 U.S. 606 (1972), the U.S. Supreme Court ordered the Court of Appeals to fashion a protective order that forbade questioning the Senator's aide:

(1) concerning the Senator's conduct, or the conduct of his aides, at the June 29, 1971, meeting of the subcommittee; (2) concerning the motives and purposes behind the Senator's conduct, or that of his aides, at that meeting; (3) concerning communications between the Senator and his aides during the term of their employment and related to said meeting or any other legislative act of the Senate; (4) except as it proves relevant to investigating possible third-party crime, concerning any act, in itself not criminal, performed by the Senator, or by his aides in the course of their employment, in preparing for the subcommittee hearing.

408 U.S. at 628-29.

In *United States v. Peoples Temple of the Disciples of Christ*, 515 F. Supp. 246 (D.D.C. 1981); *State v. Beno*, 341 N.W.2d 668 (Wis. 1984); and *Melvin v. Doe*, 2000 WL 33252882

(Pa.Com.Pl.), 48 Pa. D. & C.4th 566, the court granted a motion motion to quash the subpoenas.

In *Campaign for Fiscal Equity v. State*, 179 Misc.2d 907, 687 N.Y.S.2d 227, *aff'd* 265 A.D.2d 277, 697 N.Y.S.2d 40 (1999), the court granted a protective order barring plaintiffs from “seeking disclosure concerning contacts between [an executive branch employee] and legislative and executive officials and staff concerning the creation, consideration and enactment of legislation.” 687 N.Y.S.2d at 232.

In *Knights of Columbus v. Town of Lexington*, 138 F. Supp.2d 136 (D. Mass. 2001), the plaintiffs sought to depose five members of the town’s board of selectmen about their motives for enacting regulations governing the use of the Battle Green at Lexington Common that prevented them from displaying a creche on the Battle Green. The court issued a protective order prohibiting plaintiffs from questioning the selectmen about their motives for passing the regulations and from depositing them at any time before demonstrating to the court that the selectmen had evidence of objective facts not available from any other source.

In *Minnesota-Dakota Retail Hardware Association v. State*, No. 406422 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County, Sep. 14, 1976) (unpublished order), the district court quashed the subpoenas served on legislative staff “as to any matters pertaining to memoranda, documents or actions by said offices which are or were in connection with the Legislative process.” And in *Lifteau v. Metropolitan Sports Facilities Commission*, No. 421416 (2nd Dist. Ramsey County), the Minnesota district court granted protective orders (Dec. 14, 1977, unpublished), (Dec. 27, 1977, unpublished) prohibiting plaintiffs from questioning senators “about anything said or done by them as members of the . . . Legislature in the exercise of the functions of that office, particularly the passage of [the act whose constitutionality was in question].”

### **VIII. Right to Interlocutory Appeal**

Denial of a claim of legislative immunity is immediately appealable under the collateral order doctrine because the Speech or Debate Clause is designed to protect Members of Congress “not only from the consequences of litigation’s results but also from the burden of defending themselves.” *Helstoski v. Meanor*, 442 U.S. 500, 508 (1979) (quoting *Dombrowski v. Eastland*, 387 U.S. 82, 85 (1967); *United States v. Rostenkowski*, No. 94-3158, 59 F.3d 1291, 1297-1300 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *United States v. Durenberger*, 48 F.3d 1239, 1241-42 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *Smith v. Lomax*, No. 93-8062, 45 F.3d 402 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995); *United States v. McDade*, 28 F.3d 283, 288-89 (3rd Cir. 1994) (No. 93-1487, slip op. at 8-10); *United States v. Rose*, 28 F.3d 181, 185 (D.C. Cir. 1994); *see also Browning v. Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives*, 789 F.2d 923, 926 n. 6 (D.C. Cir. 1986).

The proper method of appeal is by direct interlocutory appeal; because a direct appeal is possible, a writ of mandamus will not lie in federal court. *Helstoski v. Meanor*, 442 U.S. 500, 505-08 (1979). The Minnesota Court of Appeals, however, has issued a writ of prohibition. *McGaa v. Glumack*, No. C9-87-2398 (Minn. App., Dec. 31, 1987) (unpublished order).

There is no right to interlocutory appeal of an order compelling discovery against legislators who had intervened in a suit and intended to press their claims, but who refused to respond to discovery requests against them. *Powell v. Ridge*, 247 F.3d 520 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 2001).

## **IX. Waiver of Immunity**

The legislative immunity afforded by the Speech or Debate Clause may be waived, if that is possible, “only after explicit and unequivocal renunciation of the protection.” *United States v. Helstoski*, 442 U.S. 477, 491 (1979). *Helstoski* held that voluntary testimony to grand juries on ten occasions was not a waiver. Other cases have likewise held that a legislator may cooperate with an investigation in various ways and still be permitted to assert legislative immunity. See, e.g., *2BD Associates Limited Partnership v. County Commissioners for Queen Anne’s County*, 896 F. Supp. 528, 535 (D. Md. 1995) (county commissioners answering certain discovery questions about their legislative activities not a waiver of objections to further discovery); *Greenberg v. Collier*, 482 F. Supp. 200 (E.D. Va. 1979) (submission of affidavit not a waiver); *State v. Township of Lyndhurst*, 278 N.J. Super. 192, 650 A.2d 840 (N.J. Super. Ch. 1994) (participating in criminal investigation, submitting affidavits, and explicitly waiving immunity of legislative staff was not a waiver of immunity of members); *Holmes v. Farmer*, 475 A.2d 976, 985 (R.I. 1984) (testimony at depositions in a related case not a waiver; voluntary testimony at trial not a waiver, testimony held improperly admitted into evidence at trial).

Legislative immunity belongs to individual legislators and may be waived or asserted by each individual legislator. *Marylanders for Fair Representation v. Schaefer*, 144 F.R.D. 292, 298 (D. Md. 1992). One legislator may not waive immunity on behalf of any other legislator. *United States Football League v. National Football League*, 842 F.2d 1335, 1374-75 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 1988); *United States v. Craig*, 528 F.2d 773, 780-81 n.7 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1979); *Cano v. Davis*, 193 F. Supp.2d 1177, 1179-80 (C.D. Cal. 2002). Legislative immunity does not belong to the legislature as a whole, so legislative rules cannot waive the immunity. *Campaign for Fiscal Equity v. State*, 179 Misc.2d 907, 687 N.Y.S.2d 227, 232, *aff’d* 265 A.D.2d 277, 697 N.Y.S.2d 40 (1999). An open meeting law that “does not expressly or unequivocally waive the immunity of individual legislators under the Speech or Debate Clause” will not be construed as a waiver. *Wilkins v. Gagliardi*, No. 174456, slip op. at 6, 219 Mich. App. 260, 271, 556 N.W.2d 171, 178 (Mich. App. 1996)

To receive the protection of legislative immunity, a member must assert it. In *United States v. Seeger*, 180 F. Supp. 467 (S.D.N.Y. 1960), the chairman of a House committee was subpoenaed to testify at a third-party criminal trial while Congress was in session. The chairman moved to quash the subpoena on the ground compliance would be unreasonable and oppressive but did not advance a claim of legislative immunity. The court denied the motion to quash the subpoena, mentioning in a footnote that failure to claim legislative immunity was a waiver of it.

Testifying voluntarily is a waiver of legislative immunity. *Government of the Virgin Islands v. Lee*, 775 F.2d 514, 520 n.7 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1985) (Virgin Islands legislator voluntarily submitted to deposition by Assistant United States Attorney); *United States v. Craig*, 528 F.2d 773, 780 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir.

1979) (Illinois legislator testified to grand jury); *Alexander v. Holden*, No. 94-1810, 66 F.3d 62, 68 n.4 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995).

Intervening in an action to defend the constitutionality of a law is a waiver of legislative immunity; legislators who so intervene may be assessed attorney's fees when the law is declared unconstitutional. *May v. Cooperman*, 578 F. Supp. 1308 (D. N.J. 1984). In *May*, the New Jersey Legislature enacted, over the governor's veto, a law directing principals and teachers to "permit students of each school to observe a 1 minute period of silence." 578 F. Supp. at 1309. The attorney general and executive branch officials refused to defend the statute when its constitutionality was challenged in court. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives moved, on behalf of their respective bodies, to intervene to defend the statute. The motion was granted, and they served throughout the litigation as the only defenders of the statute. The statute was found to be unconstitutional. The court found that the legislators had waived their legislative immunity and moved outside the sphere of legitimate legislative activity by undertaking the executive's responsibility to defend the statute, and assessed attorney's fees against them under 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

In Alabama, the Constitution of 1901, article IV, § 106, as amended by Amendment 341, and § 110, as amended by Amendments 375 and 397, require that, before a local law may be introduced in the Legislature, four-weeks notice of its substance must be published in the affected counties. The Alabama Supreme Court, in *Bassett v. Newton*, 658 So.2d 398, 402 (Ala. 1995), held that "a legislator waives any confidentiality regarding proposed legislation once public notice is published."

## APPENDIX

STATE OF MINNESOTA

DISTRICT COURT

COUNTY OF RAMSEY

SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT

\_\_\_\_\_  
John Doe,

Case Type: Other Civil

Plaintiff,

File No. C1-96-\_\_\_\_\_

Judge \_\_\_\_\_

vs.

Richard Roe,

**Notice of Motion  
and  
Motion**

Defendant.  
\_\_\_\_\_

**To:** Plaintiff John Doe and his attorney \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_;

and defendant Richard Roe and his attorney \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_.

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on November 24, 1996, at 9:30 a.m. at Special Term before the Honorable \_\_\_\_\_, Judge of the District Court, Room \_\_\_\_\_, Ramsey County Courthouse, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, Senator \_\_\_\_\_ will move the Court for an order:

1. That the subpoena served on him on November 5, 1996, be quashed; or, in the alternative,

2. That plaintiffs be prohibited from questioning movant about anything said or done by him within the sphere of legitimate legislative activity as a member of the Minnesota State Senate, including, but not limited to, his actions, motives for his actions, or intent in sponsoring or voting for any bill or amendment to a bill.

This motion is made under Rule 45.02 of the Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure, and upon all the files and records in this action. The ground for this motion is that movant, a member of the Minnesota State Senate, is immune from the use of compulsory process to question him about anything said or done by him within the sphere of legitimate legislative activity.

Dated: November 6, 1996

Respectfully submitted,

**Peter S. Wattson**  
**Senate Counsel**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Atty Reg. No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Senate Counsel & Research  
17 Capitol  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155  
(612) 296-3812  
Attorney for Movant  
Senator \_\_\_\_\_

STATE OF MINNESOTA  
COUNTY OF RAMSEY

DISTRICT COURT  
SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT

\_\_\_\_\_  
John Doe,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Richard Roe,

Defendant.  
\_\_\_\_\_

Case Type: Other Civil

File No. C1-96-\_\_\_\_\_  
Judge \_\_\_\_\_

**Protective Order**

The above-entitled matter was heard by the Court, at Special Term, on \_\_\_\_\_, before the Honorable \_\_\_\_\_, on a motion to quash a subpoena or, in the alternative, for a protective order made by Senator \_\_\_\_\_. Peter S. Wattson, Senate Counsel, appeared for movant in support of the motion and \_\_\_\_\_, Esq., appeared for plaintiff in opposition to the motion.

Based on the files and records of this proceeding and the arguments and representations of counsel, and for good cause shown,

**It Is Hereby Ordered** that plaintiff not question Senator \_\_\_\_\_ about anything said or done by him as a member of the Minnesota State Senate within the sphere



of legitimate legislative activity, particularly in connection with the passage of Laws 1996,  
chapter \_\_\_\_\_.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**Judge of District Court**