

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TALLAHASSEE DIVISION**

THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES	:	
UNION OF FLORIDA, INC., FAIR VOTE	:	
FLORIDA, OUR VOTES MATTER, and	:	
FLORIDA VOTES MATTER,	:	
	:	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>	:	
	:	Case No. 4:21-CV-190-AW-MJF
v.	:	
	:	
FLORIDA ELECTIONS COMMISSION,	:	
	:	
<i>Defendant.</i>	:	
	:	

---

**THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT**

This lawsuit challenges Florida’s new law, Senate Bill 1890, which unconstitutionally abridges First Amendment freedoms of association and speech by limiting contributions to committees sponsoring statewide ballot initiatives. Plaintiffs allege as follows:

**INTRODUCTION**

1. This is a civil rights action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for declaratory and injunctive relief based on violations of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The action concerns the constitutionality of SB 1890, a bill passed by the Florida Legislature and signed into law by Governor Ron DeSantis on May 7, 2021. Ch. 2021-16, Laws of Fla.

2. Specifically, Plaintiffs challenge the constitutionality of SB 1890's \$3,000 cap on contributions "to a political committee that is the sponsor of . . . a constitutional amendment proposed by initiative." *Id.* § 1 (amending § 106.08(1)(a), Fla. Stat. (2020)).

3. That contribution limit unconstitutionally burdens and chills Plaintiffs' free speech and association, as protected by the First Amendment.

### **PARTIES**

4. Plaintiff THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF FLORIDA, INC. (ACLU of Florida) is the Florida affiliate of the national ACLU. The ACLU of Florida is a nonpartisan, nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of Florida, and a tax-exempt social welfare organization pursuant to section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

5. The ACLU of Florida's mission is to protect, defend, strengthen, and promote the constitutional rights and liberties of all Floridians. To further its mission, the ACLU of Florida advocates for the expansion of voting rights and participation in elections, including through passage of citizen-initiated constitutional amendments.

6. Plaintiff FAIR VOTE FLORIDA is a political committee organized under the laws of Florida and the sponsor of the Voting Eligibility Restoration Amendment (VERA), a citizen initiative to amend the Florida Constitution and

prohibit the denial of the restoration of voting eligibility because of any debt, including legal financial obligations.

7. Plaintiff OUR VOTES MATTER is a political committee organized under the laws of Florida and the sponsor of A Voter Registration Method for Eligible Floridians (AVRM), a citizen initiative to amend the Florida Constitution and register eligible citizens to vote or update their existing registrations when they submit an application for a new, renewed, updated, or replacement driver's license or identification card.

8. Plaintiff FLORIDA VOTES MATTER is a political committee organized under the laws of Florida and the sponsor of the Register and Vote Amendment (RAVA), a citizen initiative to amend the Florida Constitution and allow eligible citizens to both register and vote at the same time at early voting sites during early voting and at polling places on Election Day.

9. The purpose of Fair Vote Florida, Our Votes Matter, and Florida Votes Matter (collectively, "Committee Plaintiffs") is to propose and support their respective initiatives. The Committee Plaintiffs do not plan or intend to make contributions to candidates for office, or to make expenditures persuading voters to vote for or against certain candidates.

10. Defendant FLORIDA ELECTIONS COMMISSION (FEC) is a Florida state agency with jurisdiction to investigate, determine, and assess civil penalties for

violations of the campaign finance laws. §§ 106.25(1), .26(11), .265, .27(2), Fla. Stat. The FEC must investigate such violations, but only after receiving either information reported to it from the Division of Elections, or a sworn complaint based on personal information. *Id.* § 106.25(2).

## **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

11. This case arises under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988 to redress the deprivation under color of state law of rights secured by the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, incorporated against the states by the Fourteenth Amendment.

12. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343.

13. This Court also has jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' claim for a declaratory judgment under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–02.

14. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

15. This case is properly filed in this Division under Local Rule 3.1(B).

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

### **A. The Right of Initiative and Efforts to Restrict It**

16. In 1968, the Florida voters adopted a constitutional amendment initiative procedure, giving Floridians “[t]he power to propose the revision or amendment of any portion or portions of [the] constitution by initiative.” Art. XI, § 3, Fla. Const.

17. By forming a political committee, submitting the proposed amendment to the Secretary of State, collecting the requisite signatures, obtaining a favorable advisory opinion from the Florida Supreme Court, and securing voter approval, Floridians can amend the State Constitution directly when the Legislature fails to carry out the people's will. *Id.* art. XI, §§ 3, 5; §§ 16.061, 100.371, Fla. Stat.

18. In the half-century since the right of initiative was enshrined in their Constitution, Floridians have put 42 measures on the ballot for their fellow citizens' consideration. The voters have approved 32 of those.

19. Since voters advanced the first citizen initiative in 1976—the Sunshine Amendment, *see* art. II, § 8, Fla. Const.—the Legislature has repeatedly constrained the initiative process by making it harder and costlier for Floridians to propose a constitutional amendment and get it on the ballot.

20. In 1976, the Legislature banned collecting petition signatures within 100 yards of any polling place.<sup>1</sup> Ch. 76-61, § 1, at 109, Laws of Fla. (amending § 104.36, Fla. Stat. (1975)).

21. In 1977, the Legislature required sponsors to pay a verification fee of ten cents per signature or the actual cost of verifying, whichever was less. *Candidates* who could not afford the cost of verifying their candidate petitions could

---

<sup>1</sup> Eight years later, the ban was struck down as unconstitutionally overbroad on its face. *Clean-Up '84 v. Heinrich*, 590 F. Supp. 928, 930 (M.D. Fla. 1984), *aff'd*, 759 F.2d 1511 (11th Cir. 1985).

file an “undue burden” oath to waive the fee. Indigent *initiative sponsors*, however, were barred from filing such an “undue burden” waiver.<sup>2</sup> Ch. 77-175, § 10, at 936–37, Laws of Fla. (amending § 99.097(4), Fla. Stat. (Supp. 1976)).

22. The year after the second citizen initiative made the ballot in 1978, the Legislature required initiative sponsors to register as a political committee and submit their proposed amendment’s text and ballot summary to the Secretary for approval before obtaining any signatures. Ch. 79-365, § 15, at 1857–58, Laws of Fla. (creating § 100.371(3), Fla. Stat. (1979)); *id.* § 16, at 1858 (amending § 101.161, Fla. Stat. (1977)).

23. That same year, the Legislature granted the Secretary rulemaking authority to prescribe the format of petition forms. *Id.* § 15, at 1857–58 (creating § 100.371(3), Fla. Stat. (1979)). Following the first two initiatives’ use of ruled-lined petition forms where multiple voters could sign on a single sheet of paper, the Secretary required a separate card or sheet of paper for each signature. Fla. Admin. Code R. 1C-7.09 (1979) (now R. 1S-2.009 (2020)).

24. In 1980, the Legislature limited ballot summaries to 75 words and required initiative sponsors to explain the amendment’s chief purpose within that word limit. Ch. 80-305, § 2, at 1342–43, Laws of Fla. (amending § 101.161, Fla.

---

<sup>2</sup> Failing to offer an undue burden waiver for initiatives, while providing it to candidates, was struck down as a violation of equal protection in *Clean-Up ’84*. 590 F. Supp. at 932.

Stat. (1979)).

25. In 1983, the Legislature set a four-year expiration date on initiative petition signatures. Ch. 83-251, § 12, at 1295, Laws of Fla. (amending § 100.371(2), Fla. Stat. (1981)).

26. In 1986, the year the third and fourth initiatives appeared on the ballot, the Legislature referred to the voters and the voters approved a constitutional amendment mandating automatic Supreme Court review of initiatives (but not legislatively referred amendments) for compliance with the Florida Constitution's single-subject rule and statutory ballot summary and title requirements. Fla. HJR 71 (1986), at 2281–83, Laws of Fla. (codified at art. IV, § 10, and art. V, § 3(b)(10), Fla. Const.). Supreme Court review was triggered when an initiative obtained ten percent of the total signatures needed for ballot status. Ch. 87-363, §§ 1–2, at 2236–37, Laws of Fla. (creating §§ 15.21 and 16.061, Fla. Stat. (1987)).

27. In 1990, the Legislature passed, but the Governor vetoed, a bill to require petition signatures to be witnessed and to prohibit paying petition circulators per-signature. Fla. CS for SB 870 (1990).

28. In 1991, the Legislature again passed, and the Governor again vetoed, a bill to prohibit paying petition circulators per-signature. Fla. HB 1809 (1991).

29. In 1997, the year after three Everglades conservation initiatives appeared on the ballot, the Legislature enacted a law:

- a. requiring initiative sponsors to pay the signature-verification fee in advance;
- b. requiring sponsors to file an affidavit with the Division of Elections of their intent to use paid petition circulators;
- c. requiring sponsors to provide to the Division the name and address of each individual paid to circulate petitions;
- d. requiring paid circulators to write their name and address on each petition form they circulate;
- e. revoking a sponsor's undue-burden exemption for the signature-verification fee if the sponsor uses paid circulators; and
- f. moving the signature submission deadline up from 90 days before the general election to 121 or 151 days before, depending on the signature verification method used.

Ch. 97-13, § 21, at 29, Laws of Fla. (amending § 99.097(4), Fla. Stat. (1995)); *id.* § 22, at 29–30 (amending § 100.371, Fla. Stat. (1995)).

30. In 2002, the same year voters approved initiatives requiring the State to offer universal pre-kindergarten and reduce classroom sizes, the Legislature tasked the Revenue Estimating Conference with writing a fiscal impact statement for each initiative, stating the initiative's estimated impact on state and local government's revenues and costs. The statement would appear on the ballot after the initiative's



summary. Ch. 2002-390, Laws of Fla. (amending §§ 15.21, 16.061, 100.371, 101.161, and 216.136, Fla. Stat. (2001)).

31. In 2005, the Legislature moved up by five months, to February 1, the deadline by which an initiative must attain the requisite petitions to be placed on that year's general election ballot (more than nine months later). Ch. 2005-278, § 28, at 33, Laws of Fla. (amending § 100.371(1), Fla. Stat. (2004)).

32. In 2006, less than two years after the Florida Supreme Court rejected three different initiative financial impact statements for violating the statutory requirements, the Legislature purported to make the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House “the sole judge for the interpretation, implementation, and enforcement” of the provisions regarding initiatives’ financial impact statements.<sup>3</sup> Ch. 2006-119, § 4, at 5, Laws of Fla. (amending § 100.371(c), Fla. Stat. (2005)); *see Advisory Op. to Att’y Gen. re Authorizes Miami-Dade & Broward Cty. Voters to Approve Slot Machs. in Parimutuel Facilities*, 880 So. 2d 689 (Fla. 2004); *Advisory Op. to Att’y Gen. re Pub. Prot. from Repeated Med. Malpractice*, 880 So. 2d 686 (Fla. 2004); *Advisory Op. to Att’y Gen. re Repeal of High Speed Rail Amend.*, 880 So. 2d 628 (Fla. 2004).

---

<sup>3</sup> Notwithstanding this, the Florida Supreme Court continued to review financial impact statements for compliance with the statutory requirements until 2019. *Advisory Op. to Att’y Gen. re Raising Fla.’s Minimum Wage*, 285 So. 3d 1273, 1277 (Fla. 2019).

33. In 2007, the Legislature required petitions to accurately set forth a voter's street address, county, and voter registration number or date of birth to be verified as valid; and permitted voters to revoke their signatures after signing.<sup>4</sup> Ch. 2007-30, § 25, at 20–21, Laws of Fla. (amending § 100.371, Fla. Stat. (2006)).

34. In 2008, shortly after FairDistrictsNow.org launched a campaign to place the two Fair Districts Amendments on the 2010 ballot, the Legislature prohibited a petition form from being bundled with or attached to any other petition. Ch. 2008-95, § 14, at 16, Laws of Fla. (amending § 100.371, Fla. Stat. (2007)).

35. In 2011, following the voters' approval of the Fair Districts Amendments, the Legislature cut the signature expiration date in half, from four to two years, and abolished the cheaper "random sampling" method for signature verification of initiative petitions, while keeping random sampling for verification of *candidate* petitions—making petition verification costlier for initiatives, but not for candidates. Ch. 2011-40, § 19, at 25, Laws of Fla. (amending § 99.097(1), Fla. Stat. (2010)); *id.* § 23, at 30 (amending § 100.371(3), Fla. Stat. (2010)).

36. In 2019, after voters approved the 2018 Voter Restoration Amendment, the Legislature enacted a stringent regulatory scheme for paid petition circulators, including:

---

<sup>4</sup> The signature-revocation provision was repealed in 2011. Ch. 2011-40, § 23, at 30–32, Laws of Fla. (amending § 100.371, Fla. Stat. (2010)).

- a. banning paying circulators per-signature;
- b. requiring paid circulators to register with the Secretary;
- c. requiring paid circulators to file an affidavit with each petition they collect;
- d. requiring paid circulators to use only individualized forms issued to them by the Division of Elections or supervisors of elections;
- e. establishing fines for petitions not delivered to the supervisor of elections within thirty days.

Ch. 2019-64, § 3, at 4–6, Laws of Fla. (amending § 100.371, Fla. Stat. (2018)).

The Legislature also added a bold-font statement below an initiative’s ballot summary if the initiative was estimated to increase costs, decrease revenues, have a negative impact on the state or local economy, or have an indeterminate impact for any of those.<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 8.

37. In 2020, the Legislature enacted additional strict regulations:

- a. more than doubling the signature threshold for Supreme Court review, from ten percent of the overall number of signatures required for ballot status, to twenty-five percent;
- b. requiring the Supreme Court to review initiatives for facial validity

---

<sup>5</sup> The statement regarding the impact on the state or local economy was repealed in 2020. Ch. 2020-15, § 3, at 4–5 (amending § 100.371, Fla. Stat. (2019)).

- under the U.S. Constitution;
- c. creating a private right of action to challenge a petition circulator's registration;
- d. limiting signature collection to a two-year window ending on February 1 of the general election year;
- e. doubling the amount of time supervisors have to verify signatures;
- f. requiring sponsors to pay for the actual cost of signature verification, whether or not that is more than the standard ten-cent fee still afforded to *candidate* petitions;
- g. voiding signatures collected by circulators who were not validly registered when the signature was collected; and
- h. mandating that certain financial impact statements be printed on the ballot in bolded, capital letters.

Ch. 2020-15, § 1, at 2 (amending § 15.21, Fla. Stat. (2019)); *id.* § 2, at 2 (amending § 16.061(1), Fla. Stat. (2019)); *id.* § 3, at 2–3 (amending § 100.371(3) and (11), Fla. Stat. (2019)); *id.* § 4, at 7–8 (amending § 101.161(1), Fla. Stat. (2019)).

38. In April 2020, in response to the coronavirus pandemic, the Secretary issued an emergency rule permitting electronic or remote-signed signatures for *candidate* petitions—but not for *initiative* petitions. 46 Fla. Admin. Reg. 1415, R. 1SER20-2 (Apr. 3, 2020).

39. On March 15, 2021, the Division of Elections responded to a thirty-one-month-old advisory opinion request by the ACLU of Florida, opining that a voter's "original signature" on an initiative petition must be a wet-ink signature signed directly onto the paper by the voter. Op. Fla. Div. of Elections DE 21-01 (2021) (citing § 100.371(11)(a), Fla. Stat.).

40. Finally, on April 26, 2021, the Legislature passed SB 1890.

41. Cumulatively, the above-discussed restrictions and regulations make it extremely expensive to collect the requisite signatures, defend an initiative at the Florida Supreme Court, and secure ballot status for a citizen-initiated constitutional amendment.

#### **B. Senate Bill 1890**

42. On May 7, 2021, Governor Ron DeSantis signed SB 1890 into law. Ch. 2021-16, Laws of Fla.

43. SB 1890 amends § 106.08, Florida Statutes, to impose a \$3,000 limit on the contributions that individuals may make to a committee sponsoring a state ballot initiative, effective July 1, 2021. *Id.* § 1.

44. SB 1890 imposes the same limit on contributions to committees opposing an initiative. *Id.*

45. SB 1890's limit applies until the initiative obtains the requisite 891,589 signatures for ballot placement and receives a certificate of ballot position from the

Secretary. *Id.*; *see also* art. XI, § 3, Fla. Const. (requiring an initiative petition to be signed by a number of voters equal to eight percent of the votes cast in the last presidential election); § 100.371(12), Fla. Stat.

46. Knowingly and willfully making or accepting a single contribution over SB 1890's limit is a first-degree misdemeanor, punishable by up to one year of imprisonment and a \$1,000 fine. §§ 106.08(7)(a), 775.082(4)(a), 775.083(1)(d), Fla. Stat.

47. For a natural person to knowingly and willfully make or accept more than one contribution over SB 1890's limit is a third-degree felony, punishable by up to five years of imprisonment and a \$5,000 fine. *Id.* §§ 106.08(7)(b), 775.082(3)(e), 775.083(1)(c).

48. For a corporation or political committee, the offense is punishable by a fine of at least \$10,000 and up to \$50,000, and the entity may be ordered dissolved or have its right to do business in the state forfeited. *Id.* § 106.08(7)(b).

49. Additionally, any person who knowingly and willfully makes or accepts a contribution over SB 1890's limit must pay a fine equal to twice the amount of the illegal contribution. *Id.* § 106.08(8).

50. Furthermore, a political committee's officer, agent, or employee who accepts a contribution over SB 1890's limit is subject to a civil penalty equal to three times the amount of the illegal contribution, whether or not they do so knowingly

and willfully. *Id.* § 106.19(2).

**C. The ACLU of Florida’s Support for Ballot Initiatives**

51. The ACLU of Florida advocates for the expansion of voting rights and participation of elections through passage of citizen-initiated constitutional amendments.

52. In furtherance of that goal, the ACLU of Florida supported 2018 Amendment 4, the Voter Restoration Amendment, which restored voting rights to returning citizens after they served their felony sentences.

53. Between October 31, 2014—when the Voter Restoration Amendment was approved for petition circulation—and December 31, 2017, the ACLU of Florida donated more than \$3,000 to the sponsoring committee, Floridians for a Fair Democracy, in the form of staff time and supplies devoted to signature petition collection to put Amendment 4 on the ballot.

54. Under SB 1890, those in-kind contributions to Floridians for a Fair Democracy would have been illegal. *See* § 106.011(5)(a), Fla. Stat. (defining “contribution” as a “distribution of money or anything of value, including contributions in kind having attributable monetary value in any form, made for the purposes of influencing the results of an election or making an electioneering communication”).

55. Floridians for a Fair Democracy, the ACLU of Florida, and the voter

restoration coalition's efforts were successful; Amendment 4 was certified for the ballot on January 23, 2018 and approved by 64.5% of the voters in the November 2018 election.

56. Since 2018, the ACLU of Florida has developed plans for other ballot initiatives to expand voter participation in Florida.

57. The ACLU of Florida supports the Committee Plaintiffs' initiatives and plans to help them circulate petitions, engage with voters, and discuss their ideas for improving democracy through in-kind and monetary contributions to the Committee Plaintiffs over SB 1890's limit.

58. Each initiative the ACLU of Florida supports will need to collect 891,589 valid signatures from registered voters to attain ballot status. *See* art. XI, § 3, Fla. Const.; § 100.371(12), Fla. Stat.

59. Because of the immense expense of engaging with over 800,000 voters, convincing them to support VERA, AVRMA, and RAVA, collecting those voters' signatures, and defending the initiatives at the Florida Supreme Court, SB 1890's contribution limit has chilled the ACLU of Florida's efforts to support the Committee Plaintiffs' initiatives for the 2022 cycle.

60. Moreover, SB 1890 has chilled the ACLU of Florida's plans to support initiatives for future cycles.

61. If SB 1890 stands, the ACLU of Florida will not be able to propose and



support future initiatives, because such initiatives will not be viable under SB 1890's contribution limit.

**D. The Committee Plaintiffs and the Fair Elections Amendments**

62. The ACLU of Florida, the People Over Profits Florida, Inc., and other groups launched the Fair Elections Campaign on June 2, 2021 to place three citizen initiatives on the 2022 ballot: the Voting Eligibility Restoration Amendment (VERA); A Voter Registration Method for Eligible Floridians (AVRM); and the Register and Vote Amendment (RAVA) (collectively, "Fair Elections Amendments").

63. VERA, sponsored by Fair Vote Florida, is an initiative to prohibit the denial of the restoration of voting eligibility because of any debt, including legal financial obligations.

64. AVRM, sponsored by Our Votes Matter, is an initiative to register eligible citizens to vote or update their existing registration when they apply for, update, renew, or replace a driver's license or state identification card.

65. RAVA, sponsored by Florida Votes Matter, is an initiative to allow eligible citizens to register to vote and vote at the same time at early voting sites during early voting and at polling places on Election Day.

66. The Secretary approved the Fair Elections Amendments petition forms for circulation on May 28, 2021.

67. To meet the enormous cost of collecting more than 800,000 valid signatures and defending their initiatives at the Florida Supreme Court, the Committee Plaintiffs planned to solicit and accept both in-kind and monetary contributions in excess of SB 1890's limit, after SB 1890's effective date, and still desire to do so. If it were lawful, the Committee Plaintiffs would solicit and accept such contributions.

68. The Committee Plaintiffs have identified supporters who plan to give contributions over SB 1890's limit, but for various reasons, those supporters are unable or unwilling to give until after SB 1890's effective date.

69. The Committee Plaintiffs have also identified supporters who want to contribute *before SB 1890's effective date*, but who are unwilling to donate *at all* because they fear that the Fair Elections Campaign will not be viable once SB 1890 goes into effect.

70. The ACLU of Florida planned to make contributions to the Committee Plaintiffs in excess of SB 1890's limit, after SB 1890's effective date, and still desires to do so. If it were lawful, the ACLU of Florida would make such contributions.

71. SB 1890 not only prohibits the ACLU of Florida from contributing directly to the Committee Plaintiffs in excess of SB 1890's limit. Under Florida's campaign finance laws, the ACLU of Florida is also prohibited from making its own expenditures to advocate for the approval of the Fair Elections Amendments, in

excess of SB 1890's limit, because the ACLU of Florida is coordinating and consulting with the Committee Plaintiffs on the Fair Elections Campaign. *See* § 106.011(12), Fla. Stat. (providing that an independent expenditure is one that "is not controlled by, coordinated with, or made upon consultation with, any . . . political committee").

72. Because they and their officers and employees would be subject to civil and criminal penalties, including potential corporate dissolution, Plaintiffs will not solicit, accept, or make contributions over SB 1890's limit unless SB 1890 is struck down, even though they have a First Amendment right to do so.

73. Because of Plaintiffs' fear of criminal prosecution and civil enforcement, SB 1890 has chilled Plaintiffs' First Amendment-protected expression and association, impeding Plaintiffs' planned efforts to circulate petitions and impairing Plaintiffs' ability to disseminate their ideas to improve Florida's democracy.

74. SB 1890 gravely diminishes Plaintiffs' ability to campaign effectively and circulate petitions—activities that involve discussion on matters of public concern and efforts to persuade voters to support Plaintiffs' views on democracy, voting, and Florida's future—which cost money and require resources.

75. If SB 1890 stands, the Committee Plaintiffs will be unable to afford the enormous cost of engaging with voters, convincing them to support their initiatives,

and collecting the 891,589 signatures for each petition. Accordingly, the Committee Plaintiffs will be unable to put the Fair Elections Amendments on the ballot if SB 1890's contribution limit goes into effect and is not quickly struck down.

## **CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

### **COUNT ONE**

#### **First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, as Enforced by 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Undue Burden on Free Speech and Associational Rights**

76. Plaintiffs re-allege and incorporate by reference each allegation in the preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

77. Plaintiffs have First Amendment rights to speak, associate, make political contributions, and act collectively with others to advance political ideas, advocate for proposed ballot measures, and circulate initiative petitions. *Randall v. Sorrell*, 548 U.S. 230, 246 (2006); *Citizens Against Rent Control v. City of Berkeley*, 454 U.S. 290, 295–96 (1981); *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1, 15, 23, 65–66 (1976); *Let's Help Fla. v. McCrary*, 621 F.2d 195, 199 (5th Cir. 1980), *aff'd sub nom. Firestone v. Let's Help Fla.*, 454 U.S. 1130 (1982).

78. The State has “no significant state or public interest in curtailing debate and discussion of a ballot measure,” including by limiting contributions to ballot initiative sponsors. *Citizens Against Rent Control*, 454 U.S. at 299; *see also*

*McCrary*, 621 F.2d at 199.

79. SB 1890's contribution limit unduly burdens free speech and association, operating as a denial of Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and causing Plaintiffs irreparable harm. *Citizens Against Rent Control*, 454 U.S. at 299–300; *McCrary*, 621 F.2d at 200.

80. By limiting Plaintiffs' ability to pool resources and band together with others to advance citizen initiatives by engaging with voters, convincing voters to support initiatives, and collecting signatures, SB 1890 unduly burdens Plaintiffs' First Amendment right to associate with others.

81. By limiting Plaintiffs' ability to give monetary and in-kind contributions to advance issues and circulate ideas relating to state ballot initiatives, SB 1890 unduly burdens Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights to free speech.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court:

- A. Declare that the limit in § 106.08(1), Florida Statutes, as amended by SB 1890, on contributions to an initiative sponsor is unconstitutional in derogation of the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution;
- B. Preliminarily and permanently enjoin the State of Florida from enforcing § 106.08(1)'s limit on contributions to an initiative sponsor;
- C. Award Plaintiffs' attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988(b)

and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d);

D. Grant any such other relief the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: September 9, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Nicholas Warren

Nicholas Warren (Fla. Bar No. 1019018)

Daniel B. Tilley (Fla. Bar No. 102882)

Max H. Gaston (admitted *pro hac vice*)

**ACLU FOUNDATION OF FLORIDA, INC.**

4343 West Flagler Street, Suite 400

Miami, FL 33134

(786) 363-1769

Email: nwarren@aclufl.org

dtalley@aclufl.org

mgaston@aclufl.org

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*