



Ginny LaRoe, Advocacy Director  
glaroe@firstamendmentcoalition.org  
David Loy, Legal Director  
dloy@firstamendmentcoalition.org

September 5, 2024

**VIA EMAIL**

The Honorable Gavin Newsom  
Governor, State of California  
1021 O Street, Suite 9000  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**Re: Request for veto – SB 1287**

Dear Governor Newsom:

We write on behalf of the First Amendment Coalition, a California nonprofit public interest organization dedicated to advancing free speech, a free press, and government transparency, to respectfully request a veto of SB 1287 (Glazer). Regardless of whether its purpose is commendable, it risks chilling protected speech and fomenting expensive and time-consuming litigation.

This bill would require the Trustees of the California State University (CSU) to adopt and enforce policies that purport to prohibit unlawful violence, harassment, intimidation, and discrimination. The bill would also require the adoption of time, place, and manner restrictions on speech. CSU and other colleges and universities are already required to comply with existing laws that protect students from violence, harassment, intimidation and discrimination. They have extensive rules and policies in place on those subjects. To require CSU to adopt new policies would be a waste of resources better devoted to enforcing existing rules and teaching students.

In addition, to require the development of comprehensive new policies in these sensitive areas would enhance the risk of drafting errors that could lead to extensive litigation over the constitutionality of rules that potentially impact protected speech. For example, the directive to prohibit “conduct that limits or denies a person’s ability to participate in or benefit from the free exchange of ideas or the educational mission of the California State University” is an open invitation to litigation. The meaning of “participate in or benefit from the free exchange of ideas” is inherently unclear. Any rule on this topic would likely be challenged in court as void for vagueness or unconstitutionally chilling protected speech, especially given the First Amendment’s protection for robust debate and dissent on campus.

It is no answer to suggest that the bill would require CSU to “ensure that any policy adopted or enforced pursuant to this section” is consistent with the First Amendment. CSU and other public institutions are already required to comply with the U.S. Constitution, yet they often misunderstand or ignore First Amendment principles. For these reasons, FAC asks for your veto on SB 1287. Thank you for your consideration.

FIRST AMENDMENT COALITION



Ginny LaRoe  
Advocacy Director

FIRST AMENDMENT COALITION



David Loy  
Legal Director

cc: Senator Glazer  
Nichole Murillo