

PUBLIC INSPECTION COPY

EXTENDED TO MAY 15, 2020

Form **990**Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service**Return of Organization Exempt From Income Tax**

Under section 501(c), 527, or 4947(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code (except private foundations)

▶ Do not enter social security numbers on this form as it may be made public.

▶ Go to www.irs.gov/Form990 for instructions and the latest information.

OMB No. 1545-0047

2018Open to Public
Inspection**A** For the 2018 calendar year, or tax year beginning **JUL 1, 2018** and ending **JUN 30, 2019****B** Check if applicable:

- ☐ Address change
☐ Name change
☐ Initial return
☐ Final return/terminated
☐ Amended return
☐ Application pending

C Name of organization**INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE**

Doing business as

Number and street (or P.O. box if mail is not delivered to street address) Room/suite

901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, STE 900

City or town, state or province, country, and ZIP or foreign postal code

ARLINGTON, VA 22203**F** Name and address of principal officer: **SCOTT G. BULLOCK**
SAME AS C ABOVE**D** Employer identification number**52-1744337****E** Telephone number**(703) 682-9320****G** Gross receipts \$ **39,144,449.****H(a)** Is this a group returnfor subordinates? ☐ Yes ☒ No**H(b)** Are all subordinates included? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If "No," attach a list. (see instructions)

H(c) Group exemption number ▶**I** Tax-exempt status: ☒ 501(c)(3) ☐ 501(c)() (insert no.) ☐ 4947(a)(1) or ☐ 527**J** Website: **WWW.IJ.ORG****K** Form of organization: ☒ Corporation ☐ Trust ☐ Association ☐ Other ▶**L** Year of formation: **1991** **M** State of legal domicile: **DC****Part I Summary**

Activities & Governance	1 Briefly describe the organization's mission or most significant activities: TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF AMERICANS.		
	2 Check this box <input type="checkbox"/> if the organization discontinued its operations or disposed of more than 25% of its net assets.		
	3 Number of voting members of the governing body (Part VI, line 1a)	3	10
	4 Number of independent voting members of the governing body (Part VI, line 1b)	4	8
	5 Total number of individuals employed in calendar year 2018 (Part V, line 2a)	5	142
	6 Total number of volunteers (estimate if necessary)	6	30
	7a Total unrelated business revenue from Part VIII, column (C), line 12	7a	0.
7b Net unrelated business taxable income from Form 990-T, line 38	7b	0.	
Revenue	8 Contributions and grants (Part VIII, line 1h)	Prior Year	Current Year
	9 Program service revenue (Part VIII, line 2g)	23,793,166.	21,267,811.
	10 Investment income (Part VIII, column (A), lines 3, 4, and 7d)	596,756.	1,059,927.
	11 Other revenue (Part VIII, column (A), lines 5, 6d, 8c, 9c, 10c, and 11e)	1,407,268.	1,784,859.
	12 Total revenue - add lines 8 through 11 (must equal Part VIII, column (A), line 12)	47,462.	51,980.
Expenses	13 Grants and similar amounts paid (Part IX, column (A), lines 1-3)	25,844,652.	24,164,577.
	14 Benefits paid to or for members (Part IX, column (A), line 4)	49,219.	134,695.
	15 Salaries, other compensation, employee benefits (Part IX, column (A), lines 5-10)	0.	0.
	16a Professional fundraising fees (Part IX, column (A), line 11e)	17,471,792.	16,495,714.
	b Total fundraising expenses (Part IX, column (D), line 25) ▶ 1,702,348.	0.	0.
	17 Other expenses (Part IX, column (A), lines 11a-11d, 11f-24e)	6,343,225.	6,841,942.
	18 Total expenses. Add lines 13-17 (must equal Part IX, column (A), line 25)	23,864,236.	23,472,351.
	19 Revenue less expenses. Subtract line 18 from line 12	1,980,416.	692,226.
Net Assets or Fund Balances	20 Total assets (Part X, line 16)	Beginning of Current Year	End of Year
	21 Total liabilities (Part X, line 26)	92,958,992.	96,341,010.
	22 Net assets or fund balances. Subtract line 21 from line 20	4,387,576.	5,468,203.

Part II Signature Block

Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have examined this return, including accompanying schedules and statements, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, it is true, correct, and complete. Declaration of preparer (other than officer) is based on all information of which preparer has any knowledge.

Sign Here ▶ Signature of officer **SCOTT G. BULLOCK, PRESIDENT** Date **2/24/2020**

Type or print name and title

Paid Preparer Use Only

Print/Type preparer's name **DANIEL O'SHEA** Preparer's signature **DANIEL O'SHEA** Date **02/18/20** Check if self-employed ☐ PTIN **P00957510**

Firm's name ▶ **COHNREZNICK LLP** Firm's EIN ▶ **22-1478099**

Firm's address ▶ **7501 WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 400E** Phone no. **301-652-9100**
BETHESDA, MD 20814

May the IRS discuss this return with the preparer shown above? (see instructions) ☒ Yes ☐ No

**Application for Automatic Extension of Time To File an
Exempt Organization Return**

OMB No. 1545-1709

▶ **File a separate application for each return.**▶ **Go to www.irs.gov/Form8868 for the latest information.**

Electronic filing (e-file). You can electronically file Form 8868 to request a 6-month automatic extension of time to file any of the forms listed below with the exception of Form 8870, Information Return for Transfers Associated With Certain Personal Benefit Contracts, for which an extension request must be sent to the IRS in paper format (see instructions). For more details on the electronic filing of this form, visit www.irs.gov/e-file-providers/e-file-for-charities-and-non-profits.

Automatic 6-Month Extension of Time. Only submit original (no copies needed).

All corporations required to file an income tax return other than Form 990-T (including 1120-C filers), partnerships, REMICs, and trusts must use Form 7004 to request an extension of time to file income tax returns.

Type or print	Enter filer's identifying number	
	Name of exempt organization or other filer, see instructions. INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE	Employer identification number (EIN) or 52-1744337
File by the due date for filing your return. See instructions.	Number, street, and room or suite no. If a P.O. box, see instructions. 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, STE 900	Social security number (SSN)
	City, town or post office, state, and ZIP code. For a foreign address, see instructions. ARLINGTON, VA 22203	

Enter the Return Code for the return that this application is for (file a separate application for each return) **0 1**

Application Is For	Return Code	Application Is For	Return Code
Form 990 or Form 990-EZ	01	Form 990-T (corporation)	07
Form 990-BL	02	Form 1041-A	08
Form 4720 (individual)	03	Form 4720 (other than individual)	09
Form 990-PF	04	Form 5227	10
Form 990-T (sec. 401(a) or 408(a) trust)	05	Form 6069	11
Form 990-T (trust other than above)	06	Form 8870	12

DANIEL KNEPPER

- The books are in the care of ▶ **901 NORTH GLEBE RD, STE 900 - ARLINGTON, VA 22203**
Telephone No. ▶ **703-682-9320** Fax No. ▶ _____

- If the organization does not have an office or place of business in the United States, check this box ☐ ▶ ☐
- If this is for a Group Return, enter the organization's four digit Group Exemption Number (GEN) _____. If this is for the whole group, check this box ☐. If it is for part of the group, check this box ☐ and attach a list with the names and EINs of all members the extension is for.

- 1 I request an automatic 6-month extension of time until **MAY 15, 2020**, to file the exempt organization return for the organization named above. The extension is for the organization's return for:

▶ ☐ calendar year _____ or
▶ ☒ tax year beginning **JUL 1, 2018**, and ending **JUN 30, 2019**.

- 2 If the tax year entered in line 1 is for less than 12 months, check reason: ☐ Initial return ☐ Final return
☐ Change in accounting period

3a If this application is for Forms 990-BL, 990-PF, 990-T, 4720, or 6069, enter the tentative tax, less any nonrefundable credits. See instructions.	3a	\$	0.
b If this application is for Forms 990-PF, 990-T, 4720, or 6069, enter any refundable credits and estimated tax payments made. Include any prior year overpayment allowed as a credit.	3b	\$	0.
c Balance due. Subtract line 3b from line 3a. Include your payment with this form, if required, by using EFTPS (Electronic Federal Tax Payment System). See instructions.	3c	\$	0.

Caution: If you are going to make an electronic funds withdrawal (direct debit) with this Form 8868, see Form 8453-EO and Form 8879-EO for payment instructions.

Part III Statement of Program Service AccomplishmentsCheck if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part III ☒ **X**

- 1**
- Briefly describe the organization's mission:

SEE SCHEDULE O

- 2**
- Did the organization undertake any significant program services during the year which were not listed on the prior Form 990 or 990-EZ?
- ☐
- Yes
- ☒
- No

If "Yes," describe these new services on Schedule O.

- 3**
- Did the organization cease conducting, or make significant changes in how it conducts, any program services?
- ☐
- Yes
- ☒
- No

If "Yes," describe these changes on Schedule O.

- 4**
- Describe the organization's program service accomplishments for each of its three largest program services, as measured by expenses. Section 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations are required to report the amount of grants and allocations to others, the total expenses, and revenue, if any, for each program service reported.

4a (Code:) (Expenses \$ 19,046,143. including grants of \$ 134,695.) (Revenue \$ 1,059,927.)

TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF AMERICANS THROUGH LITIGATION, TO EDUCATE THE PUBLIC ABOUT ISSUES VITAL TO LIBERTY THROUGH MEDIA, ACTIVISM, AND OUTREACH, TO APPLY SOCIAL SCIENCE AND POLICY RESEARCH METHODS TO THOSE ISSUES THAT THE ORGANIZATION LITIGATES, AND TO TRAIN LAWYERS AND LAW STUDENTS.

4b (Code:) (Expenses \$ including grants of \$) (Revenue \$)**4c** (Code:) (Expenses \$ including grants of \$) (Revenue \$)

- 4d**
- Other program services (Describe in Schedule O.)

(Expenses \$ including grants of \$) (Revenue \$)

4e Total program service expenses **19,046,143.**

Part IV Checklist of Required Schedules

	Yes	No
1 Is the organization described in section 501(c)(3) or 4947(a)(1) (other than a private foundation)? If "Yes," complete Schedule A	X	
2 Is the organization required to complete Schedule B, Schedule of Contributors?	X	
3 Did the organization engage in direct or indirect political campaign activities on behalf of or in opposition to candidates for public office? If "Yes," complete Schedule C, Part I		X
4 Section 501(c)(3) organizations. Did the organization engage in lobbying activities, or have a section 501(h) election in effect during the tax year? If "Yes," complete Schedule C, Part II	X	
5 Is the organization a section 501(c)(4), 501(c)(5), or 501(c)(6) organization that receives membership dues, assessments, or similar amounts as defined in Revenue Procedure 98-19? If "Yes," complete Schedule C, Part III		X
6 Did the organization maintain any donor advised funds or any similar funds or accounts for which donors have the right to provide advice on the distribution or investment of amounts in such funds or accounts? If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part I		X
7 Did the organization receive or hold a conservation easement, including easements to preserve open space, the environment, historic land areas, or historic structures? If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part II		X
8 Did the organization maintain collections of works of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets? If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part III		X
9 Did the organization report an amount in Part X, line 21, for escrow or custodial account liability, serve as a custodian for amounts not listed in Part X; or provide credit counseling, debt management, credit repair, or debt negotiation services? If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part IV		X
10 Did the organization, directly or through a related organization, hold assets in temporarily restricted endowments, permanent endowments, or quasi-endowments? If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part V	X	
11 If the organization's answer to any of the following questions is "Yes," then complete Schedule D, Parts VI, VII, VIII, IX, or X as applicable.		
a Did the organization report an amount for land, buildings, and equipment in Part X, line 10? If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part VI	X	
b Did the organization report an amount for investments - other securities in Part X, line 12 that is 5% or more of its total assets reported in Part X, line 16? If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part VII	X	
c Did the organization report an amount for investments - program related in Part X, line 13 that is 5% or more of its total assets reported in Part X, line 16? If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part VIII		X
d Did the organization report an amount for other assets in Part X, line 15 that is 5% or more of its total assets reported in Part X, line 16? If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part IX		X
e Did the organization report an amount for other liabilities in Part X, line 25? If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part X	X	
f Did the organization's separate or consolidated financial statements for the tax year include a footnote that addresses the organization's liability for uncertain tax positions under FIN 48 (ASC 740)? If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part X	X	
12a Did the organization obtain separate, independent audited financial statements for the tax year? If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Parts XI and XII	X	
b Was the organization included in consolidated, independent audited financial statements for the tax year? If "Yes," and if the organization answered "No" to line 12a, then completing Schedule D, Parts XI and XII is optional		X
13 Is the organization a school described in section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii)? If "Yes," complete Schedule E		X
14a Did the organization maintain an office, employees, or agents outside of the United States?		X
b Did the organization have aggregate revenues or expenses of more than \$10,000 from grantmaking, fundraising, business, investment, and program service activities outside the United States, or aggregate foreign investments valued at \$100,000 or more? If "Yes," complete Schedule F, Parts I and IV	X	
15 Did the organization report on Part IX, column (A), line 3, more than \$5,000 of grants or other assistance to or for any foreign organization? If "Yes," complete Schedule F, Parts II and IV		X
16 Did the organization report on Part IX, column (A), line 3, more than \$5,000 of aggregate grants or other assistance to or for foreign individuals? If "Yes," complete Schedule F, Parts III and IV		X
17 Did the organization report a total of more than \$15,000 of expenses for professional fundraising services on Part IX, column (A), lines 6 and 11e? If "Yes," complete Schedule G, Part I		X
18 Did the organization report more than \$15,000 total of fundraising event gross income and contributions on Part VIII, lines 1c and 8a? If "Yes," complete Schedule G, Part II		X
19 Did the organization report more than \$15,000 of gross income from gaming activities on Part VIII, line 9a? If "Yes," complete Schedule G, Part III		X
20a Did the organization operate one or more hospital facilities? If "Yes," complete Schedule H		X
b If "Yes" to line 20a, did the organization attach a copy of its audited financial statements to this return?		
21 Did the organization report more than \$5,000 of grants or other assistance to any domestic organization or domestic government on Part IX, column (A), line 1? If "Yes," complete Schedule I, Parts I and II	X	

Part IV Checklist of Required Schedules (continued)

	Yes	No
22 Did the organization report more than \$5,000 of grants or other assistance to or for domestic individuals on Part IX, column (A), line 2? If "Yes," complete Schedule I, Parts I and III		X
23 Did the organization answer "Yes" to Part VII, Section A, line 3, 4, or 5 about compensation of the organization's current and former officers, directors, trustees, key employees, and highest compensated employees? If "Yes," complete Schedule J	X	
24a Did the organization have a tax-exempt bond issue with an outstanding principal amount of more than \$100,000 as of the last day of the year, that was issued after December 31, 2002? If "Yes," answer lines 24b through 24d and complete Schedule K. If "No," go to line 25a		X
b Did the organization invest any proceeds of tax-exempt bonds beyond a temporary period exception?		
c Did the organization maintain an escrow account other than a refunding escrow at any time during the year to defease any tax-exempt bonds?		
d Did the organization act as an "on behalf of" issuer for bonds outstanding at any time during the year?		
25a Section 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), and 501(c)(29) organizations. Did the organization engage in an excess benefit transaction with a disqualified person during the year? If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part I		X
b Is the organization aware that it engaged in an excess benefit transaction with a disqualified person in a prior year, and that the transaction has not been reported on any of the organization's prior Forms 990 or 990-EZ? If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part I		X
26 Did the organization report any amount on Part X, line 5, 6, or 22 for receivables from or payables to any current or former officers, directors, trustees, key employees, highest compensated employees, or disqualified persons? If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part II		X
27 Did the organization provide a grant or other assistance to an officer, director, trustee, key employee, substantial contributor or employee thereof, a grant selection committee member, or to a 35% controlled entity or family member of any of these persons? If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part III		X
28 Was the organization a party to a business transaction with one of the following parties (see Schedule L, Part IV instructions for applicable filing thresholds, conditions, and exceptions):		
a A current or former officer, director, trustee, or key employee? If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part IV		X
b A family member of a current or former officer, director, trustee, or key employee? If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part IV		X
c An entity of which a current or former officer, director, trustee, or key employee (or a family member thereof) was an officer, director, trustee, or direct or indirect owner? If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part IV		X
29 Did the organization receive more than \$25,000 in non-cash contributions? If "Yes," complete Schedule M	X	
30 Did the organization receive contributions of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets, or qualified conservation contributions? If "Yes," complete Schedule M		X
31 Did the organization liquidate, terminate, or dissolve and cease operations? If "Yes," complete Schedule N, Part I		X
32 Did the organization sell, exchange, dispose of, or transfer more than 25% of its net assets? If "Yes," complete Schedule N, Part II		X
33 Did the organization own 100% of an entity disregarded as separate from the organization under Regulations sections 301.7701-2 and 301.7701-3? If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Part I		X
34 Was the organization related to any tax-exempt or taxable entity? If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Part II, III, or IV, and Part V, line 1		X
35a Did the organization have a controlled entity within the meaning of section 512(b)(13)?		X
b If "Yes" to line 35a, did the organization receive any payment from or engage in any transaction with a controlled entity within the meaning of section 512(b)(13)? If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Part V, line 2		
36 Section 501(c)(3) organizations. Did the organization make any transfers to an exempt non-charitable related organization? If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Part V, line 2		X
37 Did the organization conduct more than 5% of its activities through an entity that is not a related organization and that is treated as a partnership for federal income tax purposes? If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Part VI		X
38 Did the organization complete Schedule O and provide explanations in Schedule O for Part VI, lines 11b and 19? Note. All Form 990 filers are required to complete Schedule O	X	

Part V Statements Regarding Other IRS Filings and Tax ComplianceCheck if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part V ☐

	Yes	No
1a Enter the number reported in Box 3 of Form 1096. Enter -0- if not applicable		
b Enter the number of Forms W-2G included in line 1a. Enter -0- if not applicable		
c Did the organization comply with backup withholding rules for reportable payments to vendors and reportable gaming (gambling) winnings to prize winners?	X	

Part V Statements Regarding Other IRS Filings and Tax Compliance (continued)

		Yes	No
2a Enter the number of employees reported on Form W-3, Transmittal of Wage and Tax Statements, filed for the calendar year ending with or within the year covered by this return	2a 142		
b If at least one is reported on line 2a, did the organization file all required federal employment tax returns?	2b	X	
Note. If the sum of lines 1a and 2a is greater than 250, you may be required to e-file (see instructions)			
3a Did the organization have unrelated business gross income of \$1,000 or more during the year?	3a		X
b If "Yes," has it filed a Form 990-T for this year? If "No" to line 3b, provide an explanation in Schedule O	3b		
4a At any time during the calendar year, did the organization have an interest in, or a signature or other authority over, a financial account in a foreign country (such as a bank account, securities account, or other financial account)?	4a	X	
b If "Yes," enter the name of the foreign country: CAYMAN ISLANDS See instructions for filing requirements for FinCEN Form 114, Report of Foreign Bank and Financial Accounts (FBAR).			
5a Was the organization a party to a prohibited tax shelter transaction at any time during the tax year?	5a		X
b Did any taxable party notify the organization that it was or is a party to a prohibited tax shelter transaction?	5b		X
c If "Yes" to line 5a or 5b, did the organization file Form 8886-T?	5c		
6a Does the organization have annual gross receipts that are normally greater than \$100,000, and did the organization solicit any contributions that were not tax deductible as charitable contributions?	6a		X
b If "Yes," did the organization include with every solicitation an express statement that such contributions or gifts were not tax deductible?	6b		
7 Organizations that may receive deductible contributions under section 170(c).			
a Did the organization receive a payment in excess of \$75 made partly as a contribution and partly for goods and services provided to the payor?	7a		X
b If "Yes," did the organization notify the donor of the value of the goods or services provided?	7b		
c Did the organization sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of tangible personal property for which it was required to file Form 8282?	7c		X
d If "Yes," indicate the number of Forms 8282 filed during the year	7d		
e Did the organization receive any funds, directly or indirectly, to pay premiums on a personal benefit contract?	7e		X
f Did the organization, during the year, pay premiums, directly or indirectly, on a personal benefit contract?	7f		X
g If the organization received a contribution of qualified intellectual property, did the organization file Form 8899 as required?	7g		
h If the organization received a contribution of cars, boats, airplanes, or other vehicles, did the organization file a Form 1098-C?	7h		
8 Sponsoring organizations maintaining donor advised funds. Did a donor advised fund maintained by the sponsoring organization have excess business holdings at any time during the year?	8		
9 Sponsoring organizations maintaining donor advised funds.			
a Did the sponsoring organization make any taxable distributions under section 4966?	9a		
b Did the sponsoring organization make a distribution to a donor, donor advisor, or related person?	9b		
10 Section 501(c)(7) organizations. Enter:			
a Initiation fees and capital contributions included on Part VIII, line 12	10a		
b Gross receipts, included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 12, for public use of club facilities	10b		
11 Section 501(c)(12) organizations. Enter:			
a Gross income from members or shareholders	11a		
b Gross income from other sources (Do not net amounts due or paid to other sources against amounts due or received from them.)	11b		
12a Section 4947(a)(1) non-exempt charitable trusts. Is the organization filing Form 990 in lieu of Form 1041?	12a		
b If "Yes," enter the amount of tax-exempt interest received or accrued during the year	12b		
13 Section 501(c)(29) qualified nonprofit health insurance issuers.			
a Is the organization licensed to issue qualified health plans in more than one state?	13a		
Note. See the instructions for additional information the organization must report on Schedule O.			
b Enter the amount of reserves the organization is required to maintain by the states in which the organization is licensed to issue qualified health plans	13b		
c Enter the amount of reserves on hand	13c		
14a Did the organization receive any payments for indoor tanning services during the tax year?	14a		X
b If "Yes," has it filed a Form 720 to report these payments? If "No," provide an explanation in Schedule O	14b		
15 Is the organization subject to the section 4960 tax on payment(s) of more than \$1,000,000 in remuneration or excess parachute payment(s) during the year?	15		X
If "Yes," see instructions and file Form 4720, Schedule N.			
16 Is the organization an educational institution subject to the section 4968 excise tax on net investment income?	16		X
If "Yes," complete Form 4720, Schedule O.			

Form 990 (2018)

Part VI Governance, Management, and Disclosure For each "Yes" response to lines 2 through 7b below, and for a "No" response to line 8a, 8b, or 10b below, describe the circumstances, processes, or changes in Schedule O. See instructions.

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part VI

☒ X

Section A. Governing Body and Management

	1a	1b	10	8	2	3	4	5	6	7a	7b	8a	8b	9	Yes	No
1a Enter the number of voting members of the governing body at the end of the tax year			10													
If there are material differences in voting rights among members of the governing body, or if the governing body delegated broad authority to an executive committee or similar committee, explain in Schedule O.																
b Enter the number of voting members included in line 1a, above, who are independent				8												
2 Did any officer, director, trustee, or key employee have a family relationship or a business relationship with any other officer, director, trustee, or key employee?					2											X
3 Did the organization delegate control over management duties customarily performed by or under the direct supervision of officers, directors, or trustees, or key employees to a management company or other person?						3										X
4 Did the organization make any significant changes to its governing documents since the prior Form 990 was filed?							4									X
5 Did the organization become aware during the year of a significant diversion of the organization's assets?								5								X
6 Did the organization have members or stockholders?									6							X
7a Did the organization have members, stockholders, or other persons who had the power to elect or appoint one or more members of the governing body?										7a						X
b Are any governance decisions of the organization reserved to (or subject to approval by) members, stockholders, or persons other than the governing body?											7b					X
8 Did the organization contemporaneously document the meetings held or written actions undertaken during the year by the following:																
a The governing body?												8a			X	
b Each committee with authority to act on behalf of the governing body?													8b		X	
9 Is there any officer, director, trustee, or key employee listed in Part VII, Section A, who cannot be reached at the organization's mailing address? If "Yes," provide the names and addresses in Schedule O														9		X

Section B. Policies (This Section B requests information about policies not required by the Internal Revenue Code.)

	10a	10b	11a	12a	12b	12c	13	14	15a	15b	16a	16b	Yes	No
10a Did the organization have local chapters, branches, or affiliates?													X	
b If "Yes," did the organization have written policies and procedures governing the activities of such chapters, affiliates, and branches to ensure their operations are consistent with the organization's exempt purposes?													X	
11a Has the organization provided a complete copy of this Form 990 to all members of its governing body before filing the form?													X	
b Describe in Schedule O the process, if any, used by the organization to review this Form 990.														
12a Did the organization have a written conflict of interest policy? If "No," go to line 13													X	
b Were officers, directors, or trustees, and key employees required to disclose annually interests that could give rise to conflicts?													X	
c Did the organization regularly and consistently monitor and enforce compliance with the policy? If "Yes," describe in Schedule O how this was done													X	
13 Did the organization have a written whistleblower policy?													X	
14 Did the organization have a written document retention and destruction policy?													X	
15 Did the process for determining compensation of the following persons include a review and approval by independent persons, comparability data, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision?														
a The organization's CEO, Executive Director, or top management official													X	
b Other officers or key employees of the organization													X	
If "Yes" to line 15a or 15b, describe the process in Schedule O (see instructions).														
16a Did the organization invest in, contribute assets to, or participate in a joint venture or similar arrangement with a taxable entity during the year?														X
b If "Yes," did the organization follow a written policy or procedure requiring the organization to evaluate its participation in joint venture arrangements under applicable federal tax law, and take steps to safeguard the organization's exempt status with respect to such arrangements?														

Section C. Disclosure

17 List the states with which a copy of this Form 990 is required to be filed **SEE SCHEDULE O**

18 Section 6104 requires an organization to make its Forms 1023 (1024 or 1024-A if applicable), 990, and 990-T (Section 501(c)(3)s only) available for public inspection. Indicate how you made these available. Check all that apply.
☒ Own website ☐ Another's website ☒ Upon request ☐ Other (explain in Schedule O)

19 Describe in Schedule O whether (and if so, how) the organization made its governing documents, conflict of interest policy, and financial statements available to the public during the tax year.

20 State the name, address, and telephone number of the person who possesses the organization's books and records **DANIEL KNEPPER - 703-682-9320**
901 NORTH GLEBE RD, STE 900, ARLINGTON, VA 22203

Part VII Compensation of Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, Highest Compensated Employees, and Independent ContractorsCheck if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part VII ☐

Compensation includes deferred compensation and one-time bonuses. Please see page 43 for more information.

Section A. Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, and Highest Compensated Employees**1a** Complete this table for all persons required to be listed. Report compensation for the calendar year ending 12/31/2018.

- List all of the organization's **current** officers, directors, trustees (whether individuals or organizations). Enter -0- in columns (D), (E), and (F) if no compensation was paid.
- List all of the organization's **current** key employees, if any. See instructions for definition of "key employee."
- List the organization's five **current** highest compensated employees (other than an officer, director, trustee, or key employee) who received more than \$100,000 of reportable compensation (Box 5 of Form W-2 and/or Box 7 of Form 1099-MISC) of more than \$100,000 from the organization or any related organization.
- List all of the organization's **former** officers, key employees, and highest compensated employees who received more than \$100,000 of reportable compensation from the organization and any related organizations.
- List all of the organization's **former directors or trustees** that received, in the capacity as a former director or trustee of the organization, more than \$10,000 of reportable compensation from the organization and any related organizations.

- List all of the organization's **former** officers, key employees, and highest compensated employees who received more than \$100,000 of reportable compensation from the organization and any related organizations.
- List all of the organization's **former directors or trustees** that received, in the capacity as a former director or trustee of the organization, more than \$10,000 of reportable compensation from the organization and any related organizations.

- List all of the organization's **former** officers, key employees, and highest compensated employees who received more than \$100,000 of reportable compensation from the organization and any related organizations.
- List all of the organization's **former directors or trustees** that received, in the capacity as a former director or trustee of the organization, more than \$10,000 of reportable compensation from the organization and any related organizations.

- List all of the organization's **former** officers, key employees, and highest compensated employees who received more than \$100,000 of reportable compensation from the organization and any related organizations.
- List all of the organization's **former directors or trustees** that received, in the capacity as a former director or trustee of the organization, more than \$10,000 of reportable compensation from the organization and any related organizations.

List persons in the following order: individual trustees or directors; institutional trustees; officers; key employees; highest compensated employees; and former such persons.

☐ Check this box if neither the organization nor any related organization compensated any current officer, director, or trustee.

(A) Name and Title	(B) Average hours per week (list any hours for related organizations below line)	(C) Position (do not check more than one box, unless person is both an officer and a director/trustee)						(D) Reportable compensation from the organization (W-2/1099-MISC)	(E) Reportable compensation from related organizations (W-2/1099-MISC)	(F) Estimated amount of other compensation from the organization and related organizations
		Individual trustee or director	Institutional trustee	Officer	Key employee	Highest compensated employee	Former			
(1) ARTHUR DANTCHIK DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0.	0.	0.
(2) ROBERT GELFOND DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0.	0.	0.
(3) KENNETH N. LEVY DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0.	0.	0.
(4) ROBERT A. LEVY DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0.	0.	0.
(5) JIM LINTOTT DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0.	0.	0.
(6) STEPHEN MODZELEWSKI DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0.	0.	0.
(7) MARY E. STIEFEL DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0.	0.	0.
(8) ABIGAIL THERNSTROM DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0.	0.	0.
(9) SCOTT G. BULLOCK PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL	40.00	X		X				631,341.	0.	45,733.
(10) WILLIAM MELLOR CHAIRMAN & FOUNDING GENERAL COUNSEL	40.00	X		X				1,537,845.	0.	45,501.
(11) DANIEL KNEPPER MANAGING VP-CFO/SECRETARY & TREAS.	40.00			X				297,297.	0.	44,132.
(12) DANA BERLINER SENIOR VP AND LITIGATION DIRECTOR	40.00				X			564,843.	0.	49,489.
(13) ROBERT GALL MANAGING VP AND SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00				X			381,054.	0.	60,612.
(14) JOHN KRAMER VP FOR COMMUNICATIONS	40.00				X			557,223.	0.	66,218.
(15) DEBORAH SIMPSON CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER	40.00				X			426,312.	0.	55,955.
(16) BETH STEVENS VP FOR DEVELOPMENT	40.00				X			403,546.	0.	48,233.
(17) ROBERT MCNAMARA SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		438,244.	0.	49,894.

Part VII Section A. Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, and Highest Compensated Employees (continued)

(A) Name and title	(B) Average hours per week (list any hours for related organizations below line)	(C) Position (do not check more than one box, unless person is both an officer and a director/trustee)						(D) Reportable compensation from the organization (W-2/1099-MISC)	(E) Reportable compensation from related organizations (W-2/1099-MISC)	(F) Estimated amount of other compensation from the organization and related organizations
		Individual trustee or director	Institutional trustee	Officer	Key employee	Highest compensated employee	Former			
(18) JEFFREY ROWES SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		384,640.	0.	60,769.
(19) PAUL SHERMAN SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		323,644.	0.	61,746.
(20) MELANIE HILDRETH VP FOR EXTERNAL RELATIONS	40.00					X		323,338.	0.	54,883.
(21) DONALD WILSON CREATIVE DIRECTOR	40.00					X		294,201.	0.	53,875.
1b Sub-total								6,563,528.	0.	697,040.
c Total from continuation sheets to Part VII, Section A								0.	0.	0.
d Total (add lines 1b and 1c)								6,563,528.	0.	697,040.

2 Total number of individuals (including but not limited to those listed above) who received more than \$100,000 of reportable compensation from the organization

50

- 3** Did the organization list any **former** officer, director, or trustee, key employee, or highest compensated employee on line 1a? If "Yes," complete Schedule J for such individual
- 4** For any individual listed on line 1a, is the sum of reportable compensation and other compensation from the organization and related organizations greater than \$150,000? If "Yes," complete Schedule J for such individual
- 5** Did any person listed on line 1a receive or accrue compensation from any unrelated organization or individual for services rendered to the organization? If "Yes," complete Schedule J for such person

	Yes	No
3		X
4	X	
5		X

Section B. Independent Contractors

1 Complete this table for your five highest compensated independent contractors that received more than \$100,000 of compensation from the organization. Report compensation for the calendar year ending with or within the organization's tax year.

(A) Name and business address	(B) Description of services	(C) Compensation
ANSWERWARE, 200 N. GLEBE RD, SUITE 1050, ARLINGTON, VA 22203	IT CONTRACTORS	237,214.
ALVAREZ & MARSHAL GLOBAL FORENSIC AND DISPU 600 MADISON AVENUE, 8TH FLOOR, NEW YORK, NY	EXPERT WITNESS	202,078.
TECHNOMETRICA INC 70 HILLTOP RD, SUITE 1001, RAMSEY, NJ 07446	RESEARCH	177,054.
COMMUNITY WEALTH PARTNER, 1825 K STREET, NW, SUITE 1000, WASHINGTON, DC 20006	PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	138,000.
ENDGAME STRATEGIES, 1717 K ST., NW, SUITE 900, WASHINGTON, DC 20006	POLICY CONSULTANT	120,000.
2 Total number of independent contractors (including but not limited to those listed above) who received more than \$100,000 of compensation from the organization		6

Form 990 (2018)

Part VIII Statement of RevenueCheck if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part VIII ☐

				(A) Total revenue	(B) Related or exempt function revenue	(C) Unrelated business revenue	(D) Revenue excluded from tax under sections 512-514
Contributions, Gifts, Grants and Other Similar Amounts	1 a Federated campaigns	1a					
	b Membership dues	1b					
	c Fundraising events	1c					
	d Related organizations	1d					
	e Government grants (contributions)	1e					
	f All other contributions, gifts, grants, and similar amounts not included above	1f	21,267,811.				
	g Noncash contributions included in lines 1a-1f: \$		1,635,191.				
	h Total. Add lines 1a-1f			21,267,811.			
Program Service Revenue	2 a ATTORNEY FEES	Business Code	541100	1,048,280.	1,048,280.		
	b HONORARIA		900099	11,647.	11,647.		
	c						
	d						
	e						
	f All other program service revenue						
	g Total. Add lines 2a-2f			1,059,927.			
	3 Investment income (including dividends, interest, and other similar amounts)			1,577,636.			1,577,636.
4 Income from investment of tax-exempt bond proceeds							
5 Royalties							
Other Revenue	6 a Gross rents	(i) Real	(ii) Personal				
	b Less: rental expenses						
	c Rental income or (loss)						
	d Net rental income or (loss)						
	7 a Gross amount from sales of assets other than inventory	(i) Securities	(ii) Other				
	b Less: cost or other basis and sales expenses			15,187,095.			
	c Gain or (loss)			14,977,235.	2,637.		
	d Net gain or (loss)			209,860.	-2,637.		
	8 a Gross income from fundraising events (not including \$ _____ of contributions reported on line 1c). See Part IV, line 18						
	b Less: direct expenses						
	c Net income or (loss) from fundraising events						
	9 a Gross income from gaming activities. See Part IV, line 19						
	b Less: direct expenses						
	c Net income or (loss) from gaming activities						
	10 a Gross sales of inventory, less returns and allowances						
	b Less: cost of goods sold						
	c Net income or (loss) from sales of inventory						
	Miscellaneous Revenue			Business Code			
11 a OTHER INCOME			541110	51,980.		51,980.	
b							
c							
d All other revenue							
e Total. Add lines 11a-11d				51,980.			
12 Total revenue. See instructions				24,164,577.	1,059,927.	0.	1,836,839.

Part IX Statement of Functional Expenses

Section 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations must complete all columns. All other organizations must complete column (A).

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part IX ☐

Do not include amounts reported on lines 6b, 7b, 8b, 9b, and 10b of Part VIII.	(A) Total expenses	(B) Program service expenses	(C) Management and general expenses	(D) Fundraising expenses
1 Grants and other assistance to domestic organizations and domestic governments. See Part IV, line 21	134,695.	134,695.		
2 Grants and other assistance to domestic individuals. See Part IV, line 22				
3 Grants and other assistance to foreign organizations, foreign governments, and foreign individuals. See Part IV, lines 15 and 16				
4 Benefits paid to or for members				
5 Compensation of current officers, directors, trustees, and key employees	2,735,638.	2,269,462.	261,667.	204,509.
6 Compensation not included above, to disqualified persons (as defined under section 4958(f)(1)) and persons described in section 4958(c)(3)(B)				
7 Other salaries and wages	11,040,651.	9,159,230.	1,056,053.	825,368.
8 Pension plan accruals and contributions (include section 401(k) and 403(b) employer contributions)	895,022.	742,503.	85,610.	66,909.
9 Other employee benefits	1,016,391.	843,189.	97,219.	75,983.
10 Payroll taxes	808,012.	670,320.	77,287.	60,405.
11 Fees for services (non-employees):				
a Management				
b Legal	88,423.	73,622.	12,831.	1,970.
c Accounting	44,994.		44,994.	
d Lobbying	139,763.	139,763.		
e Professional fundraising services. See Part IV, line 17				
f Investment management fees	6,994.			6,994.
g Other. (If line 11g amount exceeds 10% of line 25, column (A) amount, list line 11g expenses on Sch O.)	1,110,538.	1,042,823.	31,374.	36,341.
12 Advertising and promotion	64,589.	62,408.	619.	1,562.
13 Office expenses	696,506.	426,740.	75,164.	194,602.
14 Information technology	546,196.	87,583.	435,414.	23,199.
15 Royalties				
16 Occupancy	1,836,595.	1,529,351.	173,050.	134,194.
17 Travel	871,125.	841,911.	20,274.	8,940.
18 Payments of travel or entertainment expenses for any federal, state, or local public officials				
19 Conferences, conventions, and meetings	245,865.	232,625.	13,150.	90.
20 Interest	3,643.		3,643.	
21 Payments to affiliates				
22 Depreciation, depletion, and amortization	389,139.	322,826.	37,222.	29,091.
23 Insurance	119,905.	60,103.	59,802.	
24 Other expenses. Itemize expenses not covered above. (List miscellaneous expenses in line 24e. If line 24e amount exceeds 10% of line 25, column (A) amount, list line 24e expenses on Schedule O.)				
a RESEARCH TOOLS	304,366.	272,160.	8,450.	23,756.
b FILING AND COURT FEES	49,164.	49,164.		
c				
d				
e All other expenses	324,137.	85,665.	230,037.	8,435.
25 Total functional expenses. Add lines 1 through 24e	23,472,351.	19,046,143.	2,723,860.	1,702,348.
26 Joint costs. Complete this line only if the organization reported in column (B) joint costs from a combined educational campaign and fundraising solicitation.				

Check here ☐ if following SOP 98-2 (ASC 958-720)

Part X Balance SheetCheck if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part X ☐

		(A) Beginning of year		(B) End of year
Assets	1 Cash - non-interest-bearing	5,701,794.	1	4,699,784.
	2 Savings and temporary cash investments	1,112,315.	2	1,027,429.
	3 Pledges and grants receivable, net	2,518,689.	3	990,119.
	4 Accounts receivable, net	10,361.	4	65,100.
	5 Loans and other receivables from current and former officers, directors, trustees, key employees, and highest compensated employees. Complete Part II of Schedule L		5	
	6 Loans and other receivables from other disqualified persons (as defined under section 4958(f)(1)), persons described in section 4958(c)(3)(B), and contributing employers and sponsoring organizations of section 501(c)(9) voluntary employees' beneficiary organizations (see instr). Complete Part II of Sch L		6	
	7 Notes and loans receivable, net		7	
	8 Inventories for sale or use		8	
	9 Prepaid expenses and deferred charges	367,093.	9	352,256.
	10a Land, buildings, and equipment: cost or other basis. Complete Part VI of Schedule D	10a 4,779,672.		
	b Less: accumulated depreciation	10b 3,860,430.	10c	919,242.
	11 Investments - publicly traded securities	74,881,159.	11	81,118,030.
	12 Investments - other securities. See Part IV, line 11	7,100,839.	12	7,011,229.
	13 Investments - program-related. See Part IV, line 11		13	
	14 Intangible assets		14	
	15 Other assets. See Part IV, line 11	139,612.	15	157,821.
16 Total assets. Add lines 1 through 15 (must equal line 34)	92,958,992.	16	96,341,010.	
Liabilities	17 Accounts payable and accrued expenses	1,891,161.	17	1,925,496.
	18 Grants payable		18	
	19 Deferred revenue		19	1,112,227.
	20 Tax-exempt bond liabilities		20	
	21 Escrow or custodial account liability. Complete Part IV of Schedule D		21	
	22 Loans and other payables to current and former officers, directors, trustees, key employees, highest compensated employees, and disqualified persons. Complete Part II of Schedule L		22	
	23 Secured mortgages and notes payable to unrelated third parties		23	
	24 Unsecured notes and loans payable to unrelated third parties		24	
	25 Other liabilities (including federal income tax, payables to related third parties, and other liabilities not included on lines 17-24). Complete Part X of Schedule D	2,496,415.	25	2,430,480.
	26 Total liabilities. Add lines 17 through 25	4,387,576.	26	5,468,203.
Net Assets or Fund Balances	Organizations that follow SFAS 117 (ASC 958), check here <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> and complete lines 27 through 29, and lines 33 and 34.			
	27 Unrestricted net assets	83,191,831.	27	87,530,816.
	28 Temporarily restricted net assets	5,279,585.	28	3,241,991.
	29 Permanently restricted net assets	100,000.	29	100,000.
	Organizations that do not follow SFAS 117 (ASC 958), check here <input type="checkbox"/> and complete lines 30 through 34.			
	30 Capital stock or trust principal, or current funds		30	
	31 Paid-in or capital surplus, or land, building, or equipment fund		31	
	32 Retained earnings, endowment, accumulated income, or other funds		32	
	33 Total net assets or fund balances	88,571,416.	33	90,872,807.
	34 Total liabilities and net assets/fund balances	92,958,992.	34	96,341,010.

Form 990 (2018)

Part XI Reconciliation of Net AssetsCheck if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part XI ☐

1	Total revenue (must equal Part VIII, column (A), line 12)	1	24,164,577.
2	Total expenses (must equal Part IX, column (A), line 25)	2	23,472,351.
3	Revenue less expenses. Subtract line 2 from line 1	3	692,226.
4	Net assets or fund balances at beginning of year (must equal Part X, line 33, column (A))	4	88,571,416.
5	Net unrealized gains (losses) on investments	5	1,609,165.
6	Donated services and use of facilities	6	
7	Investment expenses	7	
8	Prior period adjustments	8	
9	Other changes in net assets or fund balances (explain in Schedule O)	9	0.
10	Net assets or fund balances at end of year. Combine lines 3 through 9 (must equal Part X, line 33, column (B))	10	90,872,807.

Part XII Financial Statements and ReportingCheck if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part XII ☒

- 1 Accounting method used to prepare the Form 990: ☐ Cash ☒ Accrual ☐ Other _____
If the organization changed its method of accounting from a prior year or checked "Other," explain in Schedule O.
- 2a Were the organization's financial statements compiled or reviewed by an independent accountant? _____
If "Yes," check a box below to indicate whether the financial statements for the year were compiled or reviewed on a separate basis, consolidated basis, or both:
☐ Separate basis ☐ Consolidated basis ☐ Both consolidated and separate basis
- b Were the organization's financial statements audited by an independent accountant? _____
If "Yes," check a box below to indicate whether the financial statements for the year were audited on a separate basis, consolidated basis, or both:
☒ Separate basis ☐ Consolidated basis ☐ Both consolidated and separate basis
- c If "Yes" to line 2a or 2b, does the organization have a committee that assumes responsibility for oversight of the audit, review, or compilation of its financial statements and selection of an independent accountant? _____
If the organization changed either its oversight process or selection process during the tax year, explain in Schedule O.
- 3a As a result of a federal award, was the organization required to undergo an audit or audits as set forth in the Single Audit Act and OMB Circular A-133? _____
- b If "Yes," did the organization undergo the required audit or audits? If the organization did not undergo the required audit or audits, explain why in Schedule O and describe any steps taken to undergo such audits _____

	Yes	No
2a		X
2b	X	
2c	X	
3a		X
3b		

Form 990 (2018)

SCHEDULE A
(Form 990 or 990-EZ)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Public Charity Status and Public Support

Complete if the organization is a section 501(c)(3) organization or a section 4947(a)(1) nonexempt charitable trust.
▶ Attach to Form 990 or Form 990-EZ.
▶ Go to www.irs.gov/Form990 for instructions and the latest information.

OMB No. 1545-0047

2018

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

Part I Reason for Public Charity Status (All organizations must complete this part.) See instructions.

The organization is not a private foundation because it is: (For lines 1 through 12, check only one box.)

- 1 ☐ A church, convention of churches, or association of churches described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(i).**
- 2 ☐ A school described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii).** (Attach Schedule E (Form 990 or 990-EZ).)
- 3 ☐ A hospital or a cooperative hospital service organization described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(iii).**
- 4 ☐ A medical research organization operated in conjunction with a hospital described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(iii).** Enter the hospital's name, city, and state: _____
- 5 ☐ An organization operated for the benefit of a college or university owned or operated by a governmental unit described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(iv).** (Complete Part II.)
- 6 ☐ A federal, state, or local government or governmental unit described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(v).**
- 7 ☒ An organization that normally receives a substantial part of its support from a governmental unit or from the general public described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(vi).** (Complete Part II.)
- 8 ☐ A community trust described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(vi).** (Complete Part II.)
- 9 ☐ An agricultural research organization described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(ix)** operated in conjunction with a land-grant college or university or a non-land-grant college of agriculture (see instructions). Enter the name, city, and state of the college or university: _____
- 10 ☐ An organization that normally receives: (1) more than 33 1/3% of its support from contributions, membership fees, and gross receipts from activities related to its exempt functions - subject to certain exceptions, and (2) no more than 33 1/3% of its support from gross investment income and unrelated business taxable income (less section 511 tax) from businesses acquired by the organization after June 30, 1975. See **section 509(a)(2).** (Complete Part III.)
- 11 ☐ An organization organized and operated exclusively to test for public safety. See **section 509(a)(4).**
- 12 ☐ An organization organized and operated exclusively for the benefit of, to perform the functions of, or to carry out the purposes of one or more publicly supported organizations described in **section 509(a)(1)** or **section 509(a)(2).** See **section 509(a)(3).** Check the box in lines 12a through 12d that describes the type of supporting organization and complete lines 12e, 12f, and 12g.
- a ☐ **Type I.** A supporting organization operated, supervised, or controlled by its supported organization(s), typically by giving the supported organization(s) the power to regularly appoint or elect a majority of the directors or trustees of the supporting organization. **You must complete Part IV, Sections A and B.**
- b ☐ **Type II.** A supporting organization supervised or controlled in connection with its supported organization(s), by having control or management of the supporting organization vested in the same persons that control or manage the supported organization(s). **You must complete Part IV, Sections A and C.**
- c ☐ **Type III functionally integrated.** A supporting organization operated in connection with, and functionally integrated with, its supported organization(s) (see instructions). **You must complete Part IV, Sections A, D, and E.**
- d ☐ **Type III non-functionally integrated.** A supporting organization operated in connection with its supported organization(s) that is not functionally integrated. The organization generally must satisfy a distribution requirement and an attentiveness requirement (see instructions). **You must complete Part IV, Sections A and D, and Part V.**
- e ☐ Check this box if the organization received a written determination from the IRS that it is a Type I, Type II, Type III functionally integrated, or Type III non-functionally integrated supporting organization.

f Enter the number of supported organizations

g Provide the following information about the supported organization(s).

(i) Name of supported organization	(ii) EIN	(iii) Type of organization (described on lines 1-10 above (see instructions))	(iv) Is the organization listed in your governing document?		(v) Amount of monetary support (see instructions)	(vi) Amount of other support (see instructions)
			Yes	No		
Total						

Part II Support Schedule for Organizations Described in Sections 170(b)(1)(A)(iv) and 170(b)(1)(A)(vi)

(Complete only if you checked the box on line 5, 7, or 8 of Part I or if the organization failed to qualify under Part III. If the organization fails to qualify under the tests listed below, please complete Part III.)

Section A. Public Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in) ►	(a) 2014	(b) 2015	(c) 2016	(d) 2017	(e) 2018	(f) Total
1 Gifts, grants, contributions, and membership fees received. (Do not include any "unusual grants.")	30397072.	26553699.	23931523.	23793166.	21267811.	125943271
2 Tax revenues levied for the organization's benefit and either paid to or expended on its behalf						
3 The value of services or facilities furnished by a governmental unit to the organization without charge						
4 Total. Add lines 1 through 3	30397072.	26553699.	23931523.	23793166.	21267811.	125943271
5 The portion of total contributions by each person (other than a governmental unit or publicly supported organization) included on line 1 that exceeds 2% of the amount shown on line 11, column (f)						15952150.
6 Public support. Subtract line 5 from line 4.						109991121

Section B. Total Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in) ►	(a) 2014	(b) 2015	(c) 2016	(d) 2017	(e) 2018	(f) Total
7 Amounts from line 4	30397072.	26553699.	23931523.	23793166.	21267811.	125943271
8 Gross income from interest, dividends, payments received on securities loans, rents, royalties, and income from similar sources	330,583.	626,413.	823,607.	1103004.	1577636.	4461243.
9 Net income from unrelated business activities, whether or not the business is regularly carried on						
10 Other income. Do not include gain or loss from the sale of capital assets (Explain in Part VI.)						
11 Total support. Add lines 7 through 10						130404514
12 Gross receipts from related activities, etc. (see instructions)					12	6,505,037.
13 First five years. If the Form 990 is for the organization's first, second, third, fourth, or fifth tax year as a section 501(c)(3) organization, check this box and stop here ► <input type="checkbox"/>						

Section C. Computation of Public Support Percentage

14 Public support percentage for 2018 (line 6, column (f) divided by line 11, column (f))	14	84.35 %
15 Public support percentage from 2017 Schedule A, Part II, line 14	15	83.62 %
16a 33 1/3% support test - 2018. If the organization did not check the box on line 13, and line 14 is 33 1/3% or more, check this box and stop here. The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization ► <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
b 33 1/3% support test - 2017. If the organization did not check a box on line 13 or 16a, and line 15 is 33 1/3% or more, check this box and stop here. The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization ► <input type="checkbox"/>		
17a 10% -facts-and-circumstances test - 2018. If the organization did not check a box on line 13, 16a, or 16b, and line 14 is 10% or more, and if the organization meets the "facts-and-circumstances" test, check this box and stop here. Explain in Part VI how the organization meets the "facts-and-circumstances" test. The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization ► <input type="checkbox"/>		
b 10% -facts-and-circumstances test - 2017. If the organization did not check a box on line 13, 16a, 16b, or 17a, and line 15 is 10% or more, and if the organization meets the "facts-and-circumstances" test, check this box and stop here. Explain in Part VI how the organization meets the "facts-and-circumstances" test. The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization ► <input type="checkbox"/>		
18 Private foundation. If the organization did not check a box on line 13, 16a, 16b, 17a, or 17b, check this box and see instructions ► <input type="checkbox"/>		

Schedule A (Form 990 or 990-EZ) 2018

Part III Support Schedule for Organizations Described in Section 509(a)(2)

(Complete only if you checked the box on line 10 of Part I or if the organization failed to qualify under Part II. If the organization fails to qualify under the tests listed below, please complete Part II.)

Section A. Public Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in) ►	(a) 2014	(b) 2015	(c) 2016	(d) 2017	(e) 2018	(f) Total
1 Gifts, grants, contributions, and membership fees received. (Do not include any "unusual grants.")						
2 Gross receipts from admissions, merchandise sold or services performed, or facilities furnished in any activity that is related to the organization's tax-exempt purpose						
3 Gross receipts from activities that are not an unrelated trade or business under section 513						
4 Tax revenues levied for the organization's benefit and either paid to or expended on its behalf						
5 The value of services or facilities furnished by a governmental unit to the organization without charge						
6 Total. Add lines 1 through 5						
7a Amounts included on lines 1, 2, and 3 received from disqualified persons						
b Amounts included on lines 2 and 3 received from other than disqualified persons that exceed the greater of \$5,000 or 1% of the amount on line 13 for the year						
c Add lines 7a and 7b						
8 Public support. (Subtract line 7c from line 6.)						

Section B. Total Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in) ►	(a) 2014	(b) 2015	(c) 2016	(d) 2017	(e) 2018	(f) Total
9 Amounts from line 6						
10a Gross income from interest, dividends, payments received on securities loans, rents, royalties, and income from similar sources						
b Unrelated business taxable income (less section 511 taxes) from businesses acquired after June 30, 1975						
c Add lines 10a and 10b						
11 Net income from unrelated business activities not included in line 10b, whether or not the business is regularly carried on						
12 Other income. Do not include gain or loss from the sale of capital assets (Explain in Part VI.)						
13 Total support. (Add lines 9, 10c, 11, and 12.)						

14 First five years. If the Form 990 is for the organization's first, second, third, fourth, or fifth tax year as a section 501(c)(3) organization, check this box and **stop here** ☐

Section C. Computation of Public Support Percentage

15 Public support percentage for 2018 (line 8, column (f), divided by line 13, column (f))	15	%
16 Public support percentage from 2017 Schedule A, Part III, line 15	16	%

Section D. Computation of Investment Income Percentage

17 Investment income percentage for 2018 (line 10c, column (f), divided by line 13, column (f))	17	%
18 Investment income percentage from 2017 Schedule A, Part III, line 17	18	%

19a 33 1/3% support tests - 2018. If the organization did not check the box on line 14, and line 15 is more than 33 1/3%, and line 17 is not more than 33 1/3%, check this box and **stop here**. The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization ☐

b 33 1/3% support tests - 2017. If the organization did not check a box on line 14 or line 19a, and line 16 is more than 33 1/3%, and line 18 is not more than 33 1/3%, check this box and **stop here**. The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization ☐

20 Private foundation. If the organization did not check a box on line 14, 19a, or 19b, check this box and see instructions ☐

Part IV Supporting Organizations

(Complete only if you checked a box in line 12 on Part I. If you checked 12a of Part I, complete Sections A and B. If you checked 12b of Part I, complete Sections A and C. If you checked 12c of Part I, complete Sections A, D, and E. If you checked 12d of Part I, complete Sections A and D, and complete Part V.)

Section A. All Supporting Organizations

	Yes	No
1 Are all of the organization's supported organizations listed by name in the organization's governing documents? If "No," describe in Part VI how the supported organizations are designated. If designated by class or purpose, describe the designation. If historic and continuing relationship, explain.		
2 Did the organization have any supported organization that does not have an IRS determination of status under section 509(a)(1) or (2)? If "Yes," explain in Part VI how the organization determined that the supported organization was described in section 509(a)(1) or (2).		
3a Did the organization have a supported organization described in section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6)? If "Yes," answer (b) and (c) below.		
b Did the organization confirm that each supported organization qualified under section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6) and satisfied the public support tests under section 509(a)(2)? If "Yes," describe in Part VI when and how the organization made the determination.		
c Did the organization ensure that all support to such organizations was used exclusively for section 170(c)(2)(B) purposes? If "Yes," explain in Part VI what controls the organization put in place to ensure such use.		
4a Was any supported organization not organized in the United States ("foreign supported organization")? If "Yes," and if you checked 12a or 12b in Part I, answer (b) and (c) below.		
b Did the organization have ultimate control and discretion in deciding whether to make grants to the foreign supported organization? If "Yes," describe in Part VI how the organization had such control and discretion despite being controlled or supervised by or in connection with its supported organizations.		
c Did the organization support any foreign supported organization that does not have an IRS determination under sections 501(c)(3) and 509(a)(1) or (2)? If "Yes," explain in Part VI what controls the organization used to ensure that all support to the foreign supported organization was used exclusively for section 170(c)(2)(B) purposes.		
5a Did the organization add, substitute, or remove any supported organizations during the tax year? If "Yes," answer (b) and (c) below (if applicable). Also, provide detail in Part VI , including (i) the names and EIN numbers of the supported organizations added, substituted, or removed; (ii) the reasons for each such action; (iii) the authority under the organization's organizing document authorizing such action; and (iv) how the action was accomplished (such as by amendment to the organizing document).		
b Type I or Type II only. Was any added or substituted supported organization part of a class already designated in the organization's organizing document?		
c Substitutions only. Was the substitution the result of an event beyond the organization's control?		
6 Did the organization provide support (whether in the form of grants or the provision of services or facilities) to anyone other than (i) its supported organizations, (ii) individuals that are part of the charitable class benefited by one or more of its supported organizations, or (iii) other supporting organizations that also support or benefit one or more of the filing organization's supported organizations? If "Yes," provide detail in Part VI .		
7 Did the organization provide a grant, loan, compensation, or other similar payment to a substantial contributor (as defined in section 4958(c)(3)(C)), a family member of a substantial contributor, or a 35% controlled entity with regard to a substantial contributor? If "Yes," complete Part I of Schedule L (Form 990 or 990-EZ).		
8 Did the organization make a loan to a disqualified person (as defined in section 4958) not described in line 7? If "Yes," complete Part I of Schedule L (Form 990 or 990-EZ).		
9a Was the organization controlled directly or indirectly at any time during the tax year by one or more disqualified persons as defined in section 4946 (other than foundation managers and organizations described in section 509(a)(1) or (2))? If "Yes," provide detail in Part VI .		
b Did one or more disqualified persons (as defined in line 9a) hold a controlling interest in any entity in which the supporting organization had an interest? If "Yes," provide detail in Part VI .		
c Did a disqualified person (as defined in line 9a) have an ownership interest in, or derive any personal benefit from, assets in which the supporting organization also had an interest? If "Yes," provide detail in Part VI .		
10a Was the organization subject to the excess business holdings rules of section 4943 because of section 4943(f) (regarding certain Type II supporting organizations, and all Type III non-functionally integrated supporting organizations)? If "Yes," answer 10b below.		
b Did the organization have any excess business holdings in the tax year? (Use Schedule C, Form 4720, to determine whether the organization had excess business holdings.)		

Part IV Supporting Organizations (continued)

	Yes	No
11 Has the organization accepted a gift or contribution from any of the following persons?		
a A person who directly or indirectly controls, either alone or together with persons described in (b) and (c) below, the governing body of a supported organization?		
b A family member of a person described in (a) above?		
c A 35% controlled entity of a person described in (a) or (b) above? If "Yes" to a, b, or c, provide detail in Part VI .		

Section B. Type I Supporting Organizations

	Yes	No
1 Did the directors, trustees, or membership of one or more supported organizations have the power to regularly appoint or elect at least a majority of the organization's directors or trustees at all times during the tax year? If "No," describe in Part VI how the supported organization(s) effectively operated, supervised, or controlled the organization's activities. If the organization had more than one supported organization, describe how the powers to appoint and/or remove directors or trustees were allocated among the supported organizations and what conditions or restrictions, if any, applied to such powers during the tax year.		
2 Did the organization operate for the benefit of any supported organization other than the supported organization(s) that operated, supervised, or controlled the supporting organization? If "Yes," explain in Part VI how providing such benefit carried out the purposes of the supported organization(s) that operated, supervised, or controlled the supporting organization.		

Section C. Type II Supporting Organizations

	Yes	No
1 Were a majority of the organization's directors or trustees during the tax year also a majority of the directors or trustees of each of the organization's supported organization(s)? If "No," describe in Part VI how control or management of the supporting organization was vested in the same persons that controlled or managed the supported organization(s).		

Section D. All Type III Supporting Organizations

	Yes	No
1 Did the organization provide to each of its supported organizations, by the last day of the fifth month of the organization's tax year, (i) a written notice describing the type and amount of support provided during the prior tax year, (ii) a copy of the Form 990 that was most recently filed as of the date of notification, and (iii) copies of the organization's governing documents in effect on the date of notification, to the extent not previously provided?		
2 Were any of the organization's officers, directors, or trustees either (i) appointed or elected by the supported organization(s) or (ii) serving on the governing body of a supported organization? If "No," explain in Part VI how the organization maintained a close and continuous working relationship with the supported organization(s).		
3 By reason of the relationship described in (2), did the organization's supported organizations have a significant voice in the organization's investment policies and in directing the use of the organization's income or assets at all times during the tax year? If "Yes," describe in Part VI the role the organization's supported organizations played in this regard.		

Section E. Type III Functionally Integrated Supporting Organizations

1 Check the box next to the method that the organization used to satisfy the Integral Part Test during the year (see instructions).		
<input type="checkbox"/>	a The organization satisfied the Activities Test. Complete line 2 below.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	b The organization is the parent of each of its supported organizations. Complete line 3 below.	
<input type="checkbox"/>	c The organization supported a governmental entity. Describe in Part VI how you supported a government entity (see instructions).	
2 Activities Test. Answer (a) and (b) below.		
a	Yes	No
Did substantially all of the organization's activities during the tax year directly further the exempt purposes of the supported organization(s) to which the organization was responsive? If "Yes," then in Part VI identify those supported organizations and explain how these activities directly furthered their exempt purposes, how the organization was responsive to those supported organizations, and how the organization determined that these activities constituted substantially all of its activities.		
b	Yes	No
Did the activities described in (a) constitute activities that, but for the organization's involvement, one or more of the organization's supported organization(s) would have been engaged in? If "Yes," explain in Part VI the reasons for the organization's position that its supported organization(s) would have engaged in these activities but for the organization's involvement.		
3 Parent of Supported Organizations. Answer (a) and (b) below.		
a	Yes	No
Did the organization have the power to regularly appoint or elect a majority of the officers, directors, or trustees of each of the supported organizations? Provide details in Part VI .		
b	Yes	No
Did the organization exercise a substantial degree of direction over the policies, programs, and activities of each of its supported organizations? If "Yes," describe in Part VI the role played by the organization in this regard.		

Part V Type III Non-Functionally Integrated 509(a)(3) Supporting Organizations

- 1 ☐ Check here if the organization satisfied the Integral Part Test as a qualifying trust on Nov. 20, 1970 (explain in Part VI.) **See instructions.** All other Type III non-functionally integrated supporting organizations must complete Sections A through E.

Section A - Adjusted Net Income		(A) Prior Year	(B) Current Year (optional)
1	Net short-term capital gain	1	
2	Recoveries of prior-year distributions	2	
3	Other gross income (see instructions)	3	
4	Add lines 1 through 3	4	
5	Depreciation and depletion	5	
6	Portion of operating expenses paid or incurred for production or collection of gross income or for management, conservation, or maintenance of property held for production of income (see instructions)	6	
7	Other expenses (see instructions)	7	
8	Adjusted Net Income (subtract lines 5, 6, and 7 from line 4)	8	

Section B - Minimum Asset Amount		(A) Prior Year	(B) Current Year (optional)
1	Aggregate fair market value of all non-exempt-use assets (see instructions for short tax year or assets held for part of year):		
a	Average monthly value of securities	1a	
b	Average monthly cash balances	1b	
c	Fair market value of other non-exempt-use assets	1c	
d	Total (add lines 1a, 1b, and 1c)	1d	
e	Discount claimed for blockage or other factors (explain in detail in Part VI):		
2	Acquisition indebtedness applicable to non-exempt-use assets	2	
3	Subtract line 2 from line 1d	3	
4	Cash deemed held for exempt use. Enter 1-1/2% of line 3 (for greater amount, see instructions)	4	
5	Net value of non-exempt-use assets (subtract line 4 from line 3)	5	
6	Multiply line 5 by .035	6	
7	Recoveries of prior-year distributions	7	
8	Minimum Asset Amount (add line 7 to line 6)	8	

Section C - Distributable Amount			Current Year
1	Adjusted net income for prior year (from Section A, line 8, Column A)	1	
2	Enter 85% of line 1	2	
3	Minimum asset amount for prior year (from Section B, line 8, Column A)	3	
4	Enter greater of line 2 or line 3	4	
5	Income tax imposed in prior year	5	
6	Distributable Amount. Subtract line 5 from line 4, unless subject to emergency temporary reduction (see instructions)	6	
7	<input type="checkbox"/> Check here if the current year is the organization's first as a non-functionally integrated Type III supporting organization (see instructions).		

Schedule A (Form 990 or 990-EZ) 2018

Part V Type III Non-Functionally Integrated 509(a)(3) Supporting Organizations (continued)

Section D - Distributions		Current Year
1	Amounts paid to supported organizations to accomplish exempt purposes	
2	Amounts paid to perform activity that directly furthers exempt purposes of supported organizations, in excess of income from activity	
3	Administrative expenses paid to accomplish exempt purposes of supported organizations	
4	Amounts paid to acquire exempt-use assets	
5	Qualified set-aside amounts (prior IRS approval required)	
6	Other distributions (describe in Part VI). See instructions.	
7	Total annual distributions. Add lines 1 through 6.	
8	Distributions to attentive supported organizations to which the organization is responsive (provide details in Part VI). See instructions.	
9	Distributable amount for 2018 from Section C, line 6	
10	Line 8 amount divided by line 9 amount	

Section E - Distribution Allocations (see instructions)	(i) Excess Distributions	(ii) Underdistributions Pre-2018	(iii) Distributable Amount for 2018
1 Distributable amount for 2018 from Section C, line 6			
2 Underdistributions, if any, for years prior to 2018 (reasonable cause required- explain in Part VI). See instructions.			
3 Excess distributions carryover, if any, to 2018			
a From 2013			
b From 2014			
c From 2015			
d From 2016			
e From 2017			
f Total of lines 3a through e			
g Applied to underdistributions of prior years			
h Applied to 2018 distributable amount			
i Carryover from 2013 not applied (see instructions)			
j Remainder. Subtract lines 3g, 3h, and 3i from 3f.			
4 Distributions for 2018 from Section D, line 7: \$			
a Applied to underdistributions of prior years			
b Applied to 2018 distributable amount			
c Remainder. Subtract lines 4a and 4b from 4.			
5 Remaining underdistributions for years prior to 2018, if any. Subtract lines 3g and 4a from line 2. For result greater than zero, explain in Part VI . See instructions.			
6 Remaining underdistributions for 2018. Subtract lines 3h and 4b from line 1. For result greater than zero, explain in Part VI . See instructions.			
7 Excess distributions carryover to 2019. Add lines 3j and 4c.			
8 Breakdown of line 7:			
a Excess from 2014			
b Excess from 2015			
c Excess from 2016			
d Excess from 2017			
e Excess from 2018			

Schedule A (Form 990 or 990-EZ) 2018

Part VI

Supplemental Information. Provide the explanations required by Part II, line 10; Part II, line 17a or 17b; Part III, line 12; Part IV, Section A, lines 1, 2, 3b, 3c, 4b, 4c, 5a, 6, 9a, 9b, 9c, 11a, 11b, and 11c; Part IV, Section B, lines 1 and 2; Part IV, Section C, line 1; Part IV, Section D, lines 2 and 3; Part IV, Section E, lines 1c, 2a, 2b, 3a, and 3b; Part V, line 1; Part V, Section B, line 1e; Part V, Section D, lines 5, 6, and 8; and Part V, Section E, lines 2, 5, and 6. Also complete this part for any additional information. (See instructions.)

SCHEDULE C
(Form 990 or 990-EZ)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Political Campaign and Lobbying Activities

For Organizations Exempt From Income Tax Under section 501(c) and section 527
▶ **Complete if the organization is described below.** ▶ **Attach to Form 990 or Form 990-EZ.**
▶ **Go to www.irs.gov/Form990 for instructions and the latest information.**

OMB No. 1545-0047

2018

**Open to Public
Inspection**

If the organization answered "Yes," on Form 990, Part IV, line 3, or Form 990-EZ, Part V, line 46 (Political Campaign Activities), then

- Section 501(c)(3) organizations: Complete Parts I-A and B. Do not complete Part I-C.
- Section 501(c) (other than section 501(c)(3)) organizations: Complete Parts I-A and C below. Do not complete Part I-B.
- Section 527 organizations: Complete Part I-A only.

If the organization answered "Yes," on Form 990, Part IV, line 4, or Form 990-EZ, Part VI, line 47 (Lobbying Activities), then

- Section 501(c)(3) organizations that have filed Form 5768 (election under section 501(h)): Complete Part II-A. Do not complete Part II-B.
- Section 501(c)(3) organizations that have NOT filed Form 5768 (election under section 501(h)): Complete Part II-B. Do not complete Part II-A.

If the organization answered "Yes," on Form 990, Part IV, line 5 (Proxy Tax) (see separate instructions) or Form 990-EZ, Part V, line 35c (Proxy Tax) (see separate instructions), then

- Section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6) organizations: Complete Part III.

Name of organization INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE	Employer identification number 52-1744337
--	---

Part I-A Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c) or is a section 527 organization.

- 1 Provide a description of the organization's direct and indirect political campaign activities in Part IV.
- 2 Political campaign activity expenditures ▶ \$ _____
- 3 Volunteer hours for political campaign activities _____

Part I-B Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c)(3).

- 1 Enter the amount of any excise tax incurred by the organization under section 4955 ▶ \$ _____
- 2 Enter the amount of any excise tax incurred by organization managers under section 4955 ▶ \$ _____
- 3 If the organization incurred a section 4955 tax, did it file Form 4720 for this year? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- 4a Was a correction made? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- b If "Yes," describe in Part IV.

Part I-C Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c), except section 501(c)(3).

- 1 Enter the amount directly expended by the filing organization for section 527 exempt function activities ▶ \$ _____
- 2 Enter the amount of the filing organization's funds contributed to other organizations for section 527 exempt function activities ▶ \$ _____
- 3 Total exempt function expenditures. Add lines 1 and 2. Enter here and on Form 1120-POL, line 17b ▶ \$ _____
- 4 Did the filing organization file **Form 1120-POL** for this year? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- 5 Enter the names, addresses and employer identification number (EIN) of all section 527 political organizations to which the filing organization made payments. For each organization listed, enter the amount paid from the filing organization's funds. Also enter the amount of political contributions received that were promptly and directly delivered to a separate political organization, such as a separate segregated fund or a political action committee (PAC). If additional space is needed, provide information in Part IV.

(a) Name	(b) Address	(c) EIN	(d) Amount paid from filing organization's funds. If none, enter -0-.	(e) Amount of political contributions received and promptly and directly delivered to a separate political organization. If none, enter -0-.

For Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see the Instructions for Form 990 or 990-EZ.

Schedule C (Form 990 or 990-EZ) 2018

LHA

832041 11-08-18

Part II-A Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c)(3) and filed Form 5768 (election under section 501(h)).

- A** Check ☐ if the filing organization belongs to an affiliated group (and list in Part IV each affiliated group member's name, address, EIN, expenses, and share of excess lobbying expenditures).
- B** Check ☐ if the filing organization checked box A and "limited control" provisions apply.

Limits on Lobbying Expenditures (The term "expenditures" means amounts paid or incurred.)		(a) Filing organization's totals	(b) Affiliated group totals												
1a Total lobbying expenditures to influence public opinion (grass roots lobbying)		33,382.													
b Total lobbying expenditures to influence a legislative body (direct lobbying)		289,667.													
c Total lobbying expenditures (add lines 1a and 1b)		323,049.													
d Other exempt purpose expenditures		23,149,302.													
e Total exempt purpose expenditures (add lines 1c and 1d)		23,472,351.													
f Lobbying nontaxable amount. Enter the amount from the following table in both columns.		1,000,000.													
<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>If the amount on line 1e, column (a) or (b) is:</th> <th>The lobbying nontaxable amount is:</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Not over \$500,000</td> <td>20% of the amount on line 1e.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over \$500,000 but not over \$1,000,000</td> <td>\$100,000 plus 15% of the excess over \$500,000.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over \$1,000,000 but not over \$1,500,000</td> <td>\$175,000 plus 10% of the excess over \$1,000,000.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over \$1,500,000 but not over \$17,000,000</td> <td>\$225,000 plus 5% of the excess over \$1,500,000.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Over \$17,000,000</td> <td>\$1,000,000.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		If the amount on line 1e, column (a) or (b) is:	The lobbying nontaxable amount is:	Not over \$500,000	20% of the amount on line 1e.	Over \$500,000 but not over \$1,000,000	\$100,000 plus 15% of the excess over \$500,000.	Over \$1,000,000 but not over \$1,500,000	\$175,000 plus 10% of the excess over \$1,000,000.	Over \$1,500,000 but not over \$17,000,000	\$225,000 plus 5% of the excess over \$1,500,000.	Over \$17,000,000	\$1,000,000.		
If the amount on line 1e, column (a) or (b) is:	The lobbying nontaxable amount is:														
Not over \$500,000	20% of the amount on line 1e.														
Over \$500,000 but not over \$1,000,000	\$100,000 plus 15% of the excess over \$500,000.														
Over \$1,000,000 but not over \$1,500,000	\$175,000 plus 10% of the excess over \$1,000,000.														
Over \$1,500,000 but not over \$17,000,000	\$225,000 plus 5% of the excess over \$1,500,000.														
Over \$17,000,000	\$1,000,000.														
g Grassroots nontaxable amount (enter 25% of line 1f)		250,000.													
h Subtract line 1g from line 1a. If zero or less, enter -0-		0.													
i Subtract line 1f from line 1c. If zero or less, enter -0-		0.													
j If there is an amount other than zero on either line 1h or line 1i, did the organization file Form 4720 reporting section 4911 tax for this year?			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No												

4-Year Averaging Period Under Section 501(h)

(Some organizations that made a section 501(h) election do not have to complete all of the five columns below.

See the separate instructions for lines 2a through 2f.)

Lobbying Expenditures During 4-Year Averaging Period					
Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in)	(a) 2015	(b) 2016	(c) 2017	(d) 2018	(e) Total
2a Lobbying nontaxable amount	1,000,000.	1,000,000.	1,000,000.	1,000,000.	4,000,000.
b Lobbying ceiling amount (150% of line 2a, column(e))					6,000,000.
c Total lobbying expenditures	87,462.	221,964.	306,469.	323,049.	938,944.
d Grassroots nontaxable amount	250,000.	250,000.	250,000.	250,000.	1,000,000.
e Grassroots ceiling amount (150% of line 2d, column (e))					1,500,000.
f Grassroots lobbying expenditures	12,523.	47,395.	35,565.	33,382.	128,865.

Schedule C (Form 990 or 990-EZ) 2018

10060218 147227 0208459-0208459.0990 2018.05050 INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE 02084591

SCHEDULE D
(Form 990)Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service**Supplemental Financial Statements**▶ Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990,
Part IV, line 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11a, 11b, 11c, 11d, 11e, 11f, 12a, or 12b.
▶ Attach to Form 990.▶ Go to www.irs.gov/Form990 for instructions and the latest information.

OMB No. 1545-0047

2018
Open to Public
Inspection

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

Part I Organizations Maintaining Donor Advised Funds or Other Similar Funds or Accounts. Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 6.

	(a) Donor advised funds	(b) Funds and other accounts
1 Total number at end of year		
2 Aggregate value of contributions to (during year)		
3 Aggregate value of grants from (during year)		
4 Aggregate value at end of year		
5 Did the organization inform all donors and donor advisors in writing that the assets held in donor advised funds are the organization's property, subject to the organization's exclusive legal control?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
6 Did the organization inform all grantees, donors, and donor advisors in writing that grant funds can be used only for charitable purposes and not for the benefit of the donor or donor advisor, or for any other purpose conferring impermissible private benefit?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

Part II Conservation Easements. Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 7.

1 Purpose(s) of conservation easements held by the organization (check all that apply).

<input type="checkbox"/> Preservation of land for public use (e.g., recreation or education)	<input type="checkbox"/> Preservation of a historically important land area
<input type="checkbox"/> Protection of natural habitat	<input type="checkbox"/> Preservation of a certified historic structure
<input type="checkbox"/> Preservation of open space	

2 Complete lines 2a through 2d if the organization held a qualified conservation contribution in the form of a conservation easement on the last day of the tax year.

	Held at the End of the Tax Year
a Total number of conservation easements	2a
b Total acreage restricted by conservation easements	2b
c Number of conservation easements on a certified historic structure included in (a)	2c
d Number of conservation easements included in (c) acquired after 7/25/06, and not on a historic structure listed in the National Register	2d

3 Number of conservation easements modified, transferred, released, extinguished, or terminated by the organization during the tax year ▶

4 Number of states where property subject to conservation easement is located ▶

5 Does the organization have a written policy regarding the periodic monitoring, inspection, handling of violations, and enforcement of the conservation easements it holds? ☐ Yes ☐ No

6 Staff and volunteer hours devoted to monitoring, inspecting, handling of violations, and enforcing conservation easements during the year ▶

7 Amount of expenses incurred in monitoring, inspecting, handling of violations, and enforcing conservation easements during the year ▶ \$

8 Does each conservation easement reported on line 2(d) above satisfy the requirements of section 170(h)(4)(B)(i) and section 170(h)(4)(B)(ii)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

9 In Part XIII, describe how the organization reports conservation easements in its revenue and expense statement, and balance sheet, and include, if applicable, the text of the footnote to the organization's financial statements that describes the organization's accounting for conservation easements.

Part III Organizations Maintaining Collections of Art, Historical Treasures, or Other Similar Assets.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 8.

1a If the organization elected, as permitted under SFAS 116 (ASC 958), not to report in its revenue statement and balance sheet works of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets held for public exhibition, education, or research in furtherance of public service, provide, in Part XIII, the text of the footnote to its financial statements that describes these items.

b If the organization elected, as permitted under SFAS 116 (ASC 958), to report in its revenue statement and balance sheet works of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets held for public exhibition, education, or research in furtherance of public service, provide the following amounts relating to these items:

(i) Revenue included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 1 ▶ \$

(ii) Assets included in Form 990, Part X ▶ \$

2 If the organization received or held works of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets for financial gain, provide the following amounts required to be reported under SFAS 116 (ASC 958) relating to these items:

a Revenue included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 1 ▶ \$

b Assets included in Form 990, Part X ▶ \$

LHA For Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see the Instructions for Form 990.

Schedule D (Form 990) 2018

832051 10-29-18

Part III Organizations Maintaining Collections of Art, Historical Treasures, or Other Similar Assets (continued)

3 Using the organization's acquisition, accession, and other records, check any of the following that are a significant use of its collection items (check all that apply):

- a ☐ Public exhibition
 b ☐ Scholarly research
 c ☐ Preservation for future generations

- d ☐ Loan or exchange programs
 e ☐ Other _____

4 Provide a description of the organization's collections and explain how they further the organization's exempt purpose in Part XIII.

5 During the year, did the organization solicit or receive donations of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets to be sold to raise funds rather than to be maintained as part of the organization's collection? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Part IV Escrow and Custodial Arrangements. Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 9, or reported an amount on Form 990, Part X, line 21.

1a Is the organization an agent, trustee, custodian or other intermediary for contributions or other assets not included on Form 990, Part X? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b If "Yes," explain the arrangement in Part XIII and complete the following table:

c Beginning balance

d Additions during the year

e Distributions during the year

f Ending balance

	Amount
1c	
1d	
1e	
1f	

2a Did the organization include an amount on Form 990, Part X, line 21, for escrow or custodial account liability? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b If "Yes," explain the arrangement in Part XIII. Check here if the explanation has been provided on Part XIII ☐

Part V Endowment Funds. Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 10.

	(a) Current year	(b) Prior year	(c) Two years back	(d) Three years back	(e) Four years back
1a Beginning of year balance	111,025.	105,874.	99,259.	99,417.	
b Contributions					100,000.
c Net investment earnings, gains, and losses	7,282.	7,496.	6,615.	-158.	-583.
d Grants or scholarships					
e Other expenditures for facilities and programs	2,627.	2,345.			
f Administrative expenses					
g End of year balance	115,680.	111,025.	105,874.	99,259.	99,417.

2 Provide the estimated percentage of the current year end balance (line 1g, column (a)) held as:

a Board designated or quasi-endowment ☐ .00 %

b Permanent endowment ☐ 86.45 %

c Temporarily restricted endowment ☐ 13.55 %

The percentages on lines 2a, 2b, and 2c should equal 100%.

3a Are there endowment funds not in the possession of the organization that are held and administered for the organization by:

(i) unrelated organizations

(ii) related organizations

	Yes	No
3a(i)	X	
3a(ii)		X
3b		

b If "Yes" on line 3a(ii), are the related organizations listed as required on Schedule R? ☐

4 Describe in Part XIII the intended uses of the organization's endowment funds.

Part VI Land, Buildings, and Equipment.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 11a. See Form 990, Part X, line 10.

Description of property	(a) Cost or other basis (investment)	(b) Cost or other basis (other)	(c) Accumulated depreciation	(d) Book value
1a Land				
b Buildings				
c Leasehold improvements		2,372,124.	1,786,916.	585,208.
d Equipment		2,407,548.	2,073,514.	334,034.
e Other				
Total. Add lines 1a through 1e. (Column (d) must equal Form 990, Part X, column (B), line 10c.)				919,242.

Schedule D (Form 990) 2018

Part VII Investments - Other Securities.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 11b. See Form 990, Part X, line 12.

(a) Description of security or category (including name of security)	(b) Book value	(c) Method of valuation: Cost or end-of-year market value
(1) Financial derivatives		
(2) Closely-held equity interests		
(3) Other		
(A) HEDGE FUND	7,011,229.	END-OF-YEAR MARKET VALUE
(B)		
(C)		
(D)		
(E)		
(F)		
(G)		
(H)		
Total. (Col. (b) must equal Form 990, Part X, col. (B) line 12.)	7,011,229.	

Part VIII Investments - Program Related.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 11c. See Form 990, Part X, line 13.

(a) Description of investment	(b) Book value	(c) Method of valuation: Cost or end-of-year market value
(1)		
(2)		
(3)		
(4)		
(5)		
(6)		
(7)		
(8)		
(9)		
Total. (Col. (b) must equal Form 990, Part X, col. (B) line 13.)		

Part IX Other Assets.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 11d. See Form 990, Part X, line 15.

(a) Description	(b) Book value
(1)	
(2)	
(3)	
(4)	
(5)	
(6)	
(7)	
(8)	
(9)	
Total. (Column (b) must equal Form 990, Part X, col. (B) line 15.)	

Part X Other Liabilities.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 11e or 11f. See Form 990, Part X, line 25.

1. (a) Description of liability	(b) Book value
(1) Federal income taxes	
(2) DEFERRED RENT	2,107,991.
(3) CAPITAL LEASE LIABILITY	62,507.
(4) GIFT ANNUITY	259,982.
(5)	
(6)	
(7)	
(8)	
(9)	
Total. (Column (b) must equal Form 990, Part X, col. (B) line 25.)	2,430,480.

2. Liability for uncertain tax positions. In Part XIII, provide the text of the footnote to the organization's financial statements that reports the organization's liability for uncertain tax positions under FIN 48 (ASC 740). Check here if the text of the footnote has been provided in Part XIII ☒

Schedule D (Form 990) 2018

Part XI Reconciliation of Revenue per Audited Financial Statements With Revenue per Return.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 12a.

1	Total revenue, gains, and other support per audited financial statements	1	25,814,297.
2	Amounts included on line 1 but not on Form 990, Part VIII, line 12:		
a	Net unrealized gains (losses) on investments	2a	1,609,165.
b	Donated services and use of facilities	2b	37,918.
c	Recoveries of prior year grants	2c	
d	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	2d	
e	Add lines 2a through 2d	2e	1,647,083.
3	Subtract line 2e from line 1	3	24,167,214.
4	Amounts included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 12, but not on line 1:		
a	Investment expenses not included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 7b	4a	
b	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	4b	-2,637.
c	Add lines 4a and 4b	4c	-2,637.
5	Total revenue. Add lines 3 and 4c. (This must equal Form 990, Part I, line 12.)	5	24,164,577.

Part XII Reconciliation of Expenses per Audited Financial Statements With Expenses per Return.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 12a.

1	Total expenses and losses per audited financial statements	1	23,512,906.
2	Amounts included on line 1 but not on Form 990, Part IX, line 25:		
a	Donated services and use of facilities	2a	37,918.
b	Prior year adjustments	2b	
c	Other losses	2c	
d	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	2d	2,637.
e	Add lines 2a through 2d	2e	40,555.
3	Subtract line 2e from line 1	3	23,472,351.
4	Amounts included on Form 990, Part IX, line 25, but not on line 1:		
a	Investment expenses not included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 7b	4a	
b	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	4b	
c	Add lines 4a and 4b	4c	0.
5	Total expenses. Add lines 3 and 4c. (This must equal Form 990, Part I, line 18.)	5	23,472,351.

Part XIII Supplemental Information.

Provide the descriptions required for Part II, lines 3, 5, and 9; Part III, lines 1a and 4; Part IV, lines 1b and 2b; Part V, line 4; Part X, line 2; Part XI, lines 2d and 4b; and Part XII, lines 2d and 4b. Also complete this part to provide any additional information.

PART V, LINE 4:

ENDOWMENT FUNDS ARE MAINTAINED TO PROVIDE A PERMANENT SOURCE OF INCOME TO SUPPORT THE INSTITUTE'S OVERALL MISSION. ENDOWMENT ASSETS ARE HELD IN PERPETUITY AS DONOR-RESTRICTED GIFTS, WHILE INCOME GENERATED BY THE ENDOWMENTS IS UTILIZED BY THE INSTITUTE FOR ITS GENERAL CHARITABLE PURPOSE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TERMS OF THE GIFT INSTRUMENT.

PART X, LINE 2:

MANAGEMENT HAS DETERMINED THERE ARE NO UNCERTAIN TAX POSITIONS THAT ARE MATERIAL TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2019 AND 2018. THE INSTITUTE RECOGNIZES INTEREST EXPENSE AND PENALTIES ON INCOME TAXES RELATED TO UNCERTAIN TAX POSITIONS IN MANAGEMENT EXPENSES IN THE

Part XIII Supplemental Information *(continued)*

STATEMENTS OF ACTIVITIES AND CHANGE IN NET ASSETS. THERE IS NO PROVISION
IN THESE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR PENALTIES AND INTEREST RELATED TO INCOME
TAXES ON UNCERTAIN TAX POSITIONS FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2019 AND
2018. TAX YEARS PRIOR TO 2015 ARE NO LONGER SUBJECT TO EXAMINATION BY THE
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE ("IRS") OR THE TAX JURISDICTION OF THE DISTRICT
OF COLUMBIA.

PART XI, LINE 4B - OTHER ADJUSTMENTS:

LOSS ON DISPOSAL OF FIXED ASSETS -2,637.

PART XII, LINE 2D - OTHER ADJUSTMENTS:

LOSS ON DISPOSAL OF FIXED ASSETS 2,637.

SCHEDULE F
(Form 990)Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service**Statement of Activities Outside the United States**

▶ Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 14b, 15, or 16.

▶ Attach to Form 990.

▶ Go to www.irs.gov/Form990 for instructions and the latest information.

OMB No. 1545-0047

2018**Open to Public
Inspection**

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337**Part I** **General Information on Activities Outside the United States.** Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 14b.

1 For grantmakers. Does the organization maintain records to substantiate the amount of its grants and other assistance, the grantees' eligibility for the grants or assistance, and the selection criteria used to award the grants or assistance? ☐ Yes ☐ No

2 For grantmakers. Describe in Part V the organization's procedures for monitoring the use of its grants and other assistance outside the United States.

3 Activities per Region. (The following Part I, line 3 table can be duplicated if additional space is needed.)

(a) Region	(b) Number of offices in the region	(c) Number of employees, agents, and independent contractors in the region	(d) Activities conducted in the region (by type) (such as, fundraising, program services, investments, grants to recipients located in the region)	(e) If activity listed in (d) is a program service, describe specific type of service(s) in the region	(f) Total expenditures for and investments in the region
CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	0	0	INVESTMENTS		7,011,229.
3 a Subtotal	0	0			7,011,229.
b Total from continuation sheets to Part I	0	0			0.
c Totals (add lines 3a and 3b)	0	0			7,011,229.

LHA For Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see the Instructions for Form 990.

Schedule F (Form 990) 2018

Part IV Foreign Forms

- 1 Was the organization a U.S. transferor of property to a foreign corporation during the tax year? *If "Yes," the organization may be required to file Form 926, Return by a U.S. Transferor of Property to a Foreign Corporation (see Instructions for Form 926)* ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 2 Did the organization have an interest in a foreign trust during the tax year? *If "Yes," the organization may be required to separately file Form 3520, Annual Return To Report Transactions With Foreign Trusts and Receipt of Certain Foreign Gifts, and/or Form 3520-A, Annual Information Return of Foreign Trust With a U.S. Owner (see Instructions for Forms 3520 and 3520-A; don't file with Form 990)* ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 3 Did the organization have an ownership interest in a foreign corporation during the tax year? *If "Yes," the organization may be required to file Form 5471, Information Return of U.S. Persons With Respect To Certain Foreign Corporations (see Instructions for Form 5471)* ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 4 Was the organization a direct or indirect shareholder of a passive foreign investment company or a qualified electing fund during the tax year? *If "Yes," the organization may be required to file Form 8621, Information Return by a Shareholder of a Passive Foreign Investment Company or Qualified Electing Fund (see Instructions for Form 8621)* ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 5 Did the organization have an ownership interest in a foreign partnership during the tax year? *If "Yes," the organization may be required to file Form 8865, Return of U.S. Persons With Respect to Certain Foreign Partnerships (see Instructions for Form 8865)* ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 6 Did the organization have any operations in or related to any boycotting countries during the tax year? *If "Yes," the organization may be required to separately file Form 5713, International Boycott Report (see Instructions for Form 5713; don't file with Form 990)* ☐ Yes ☒ No

Schedule F (Form 990) 2018

Part V	Supplemental Information
---------------	---------------------------------

Provide the information required by Part I, line 2 (monitoring of funds); Part I, line 3, column (f) (accounting method; amounts of investments vs. expenditures per region); Part II, line 1 (accounting method); Part III (accounting method); and Part III, column (c) (estimated number of recipients), as applicable. Also complete this part to provide any additional information. See instructions.

[illegible]

**SCHEDULE I
(Form 990)**

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

**Grants and Other Assistance to Organizations,
Governments, and Individuals in the United States**

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 21 or 22.

► Attach to Form 990.

► Go to www.irs.gov/Form990 for the latest information.

OMB No. 1545-0047

2018

Open to Public
Inspection

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I General information on Grants and Assistance

1 Does the organization maintain records to substantiate the amount of the grants or assistance, the grantees' eligibility for the grants or assistance, and the selection criteria used to award the grants or assistance? ☒ Yes ☐ No

2 Describe in Part IV the organization's procedures for monitoring the use of grant funds in the United States.

Part II Grants and Other Assistance to Domestic Organizations and Domestic Governments. Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 21, for any recipient that received more than \$5,000. Part II can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

1 (a) Name and address of organization or government	(b) EIN	(c) IRC section (if applicable)	(d) Amount of cash grant	(e) Amount of non-cash assistance	(f) Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)	(g) Description of non-cash assistance	(h) Purpose of grant or assistance
STATE POLICY NETWORK 1655 NORTH FORT MYER DRIVE, #360 ARLINGTON, VA 22209	57-0952531	501(C)(3)	20,000.	0.			2019 SPN CONFERENCE SPONSORSHIP
SERVING OUR CHILDREN INC 1615 L STREET NW, SUITE 750, WASHINGTON, DC 20036	20-8874570	501(C)(3)	80,000.	0.			GRANT TO ASSIST PARENTS APPLYING TO DC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL (ALEC) - 2900 CRYSTAL DRIVE, 6TH FLOOR - ARLINGTON, VA 22202	52-0140979	501(C)(3)	12,000.	0.			2018 MEMBERSHIP CONTRIBUTION

2 Enter total number of section 501(c)(3) and government organizations listed in the line 1 table

3 Enter total number of other organizations listed in the line 1 table

LHA For Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see the Instructions for Form 990.

Schedule I (Form 990) (2018)

Part III

Grants and Other Assistance to Domestic Individuals. Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 22.
Part III can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

(a) Type of grant or assistance	(b) Number of recipients	(c) Amount of cash grant	(d) Amount of non-cash assistance	(e) Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)	(f) Description of noncash assistance

Part IV

Supplemental Information. Provide the information required in Part I, line 2; Part III, column (b); and any other additional information.

PART I, LINE 2:

PURSUANT TO A GRANT AGREEMENT, GRANTEE DELIVERS REGULAR STATUS REPORTS TO IJ DURING THE TERM OF THE GRANT. IJ REVIEWS THESE GRANT REPORTS AND MONITORS PERFORMANCE AND COMPLIANCE WITH THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT.

**SCHEDULE J
(Form 990)**

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Compensation Information

For certain Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, and Highest
Compensated Employees

▶ Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 23.

▶ Attach to Form 990.

▶ Go to www.irs.gov/Form990 for instructions and the latest information.

OMB No. 1545-0047

2018

**Open to Public
Inspection**

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

Part I Questions Regarding Compensation

1a Check the appropriate box(es) if the organization provided any of the following to or for a person listed on Form 990,

Part VII, Section A, line 1a. Complete Part III to provide any relevant information regarding these items.

☐ First-class or charter travel

☐ Travel for companions

☐ Tax indemnification and gross-up payments

☐ Discretionary spending account

☐ Housing allowance or residence for personal use

☐ Payments for business use of personal residence

☐ Health or social club dues or initiation fees

☐ Personal services (such as maid, chauffeur, chef)

b If any of the boxes on line 1a are checked, did the organization follow a written policy regarding payment or reimbursement or provision of all of the expenses described above? If "No," complete Part III to explain

2 Did the organization require substantiation prior to reimbursing or allowing expenses incurred by all directors, trustees, and officers, including the CEO/Executive Director, regarding the items checked on line 1a?

3 Indicate which, if any, of the following the filing organization used to establish the compensation of the organization's CEO/Executive Director. Check all that apply. Do not check any boxes for methods used by a related organization to establish compensation of the CEO/Executive Director, but explain in Part III.

☒ Compensation committee

☒ Independent compensation consultant

☒ Form 990 of other organizations

☐ Written employment contract

☒ Compensation survey or study

☒ Approval by the board or compensation committee

4 During the year, did any person listed on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, with respect to the filing organization or a related organization:

a Receive a severance payment or change-of-control payment?

b Participate in, or receive payment from, a supplemental nonqualified retirement plan?

c Participate in, or receive payment from, an equity-based compensation arrangement?

If "Yes" to any of lines 4a-c, list the persons and provide the applicable amounts for each item in Part III.

Only section 501(c)(3), 501(c)(4), and 501(c)(29) organizations must complete lines 5-9.

5 For persons listed on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, did the organization pay or accrue any compensation contingent on the revenues of:

a The organization?

b Any related organization?

If "Yes" on line 5a or 5b, describe in Part III.

6 For persons listed on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, did the organization pay or accrue any compensation contingent on the net earnings of:

a The organization?

b Any related organization?

If "Yes" on line 6a or 6b, describe in Part III.

7 For persons listed on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, did the organization provide any nonfixed payments not described on lines 5 and 6? If "Yes," describe in Part III

8 Were any amounts reported on Form 990, Part VII, paid or accrued pursuant to a contract that was subject to the initial contract exception described in Regulations section 53.4958-4(a)(3)? If "Yes," describe in Part III

9 If "Yes" on line 8, did the organization also follow the rebuttable presumption procedure described in Regulations section 53.4958-6(c)?

	Yes	No
1b		
2		
4a		X
4b	X	
4c		X
5a		X
5b		X
6a		X
6b		X
7	X	
8		X
9		

LHA For Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see the Instructions for Form 990.

Schedule J (Form 990) 2018

Part II

Part II	Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, and Highest Compensated Employees. Use duplicate copies if additional space is needed.
----------------	---

For each individual whose compensation must be reported on Schedule J, report compensation from the organization on row (i) and from related organizations, described on row (j), on row (k). Do not list any individuals that aren't listed on Form 990, Part VII.

Note: The sum of columns (B)-(iii) for each listed individual must equal the total amount of Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, applicable column (D) and (E) amount.

Compensation includes deferred compensation and one-time bonuses. Please see page 43 for more information.

(A) Name and Title	(B) Breakdown of W-2 and/or 1099-MISC compensation			(C) Retirement and other deferred compensation	(D) Nontaxable benefits	(E) more information.		
	(i) Base compensation	(ii) Bonus & incentive compensation	(iii) Other reportable compensation					
(1) SCOTT G. BULLOCK PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL	(i)	382,516.	248,750.	75.	37,800.	7,933.	677,074.	0.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
(2) WILLIAM MELLOR CHAIRMAN & FOUNDING GENERAL COUNSEL	(i)	37,464.	0.	1,500,381.	24,135.	21,366.	1,583,346.	1,500,000.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
(3) DANIEL KNEPPER MANAGING VP-CFO/SECRETARY & TREAS.	(i)	297,267.	0.	30.	34,626.	9,506.	341,429.	0.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
(4) DANA BERLINER SENIOR VP AND LITIGATION DIRECTOR	(i)	362,271.	202,500.	72.	37,800.	11,689.	614,332.	0.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
(5) ROBERT GALL MANAGING VP AND SENIOR ATTORNEY	(i)	221,063.	159,942.	49.	36,331.	24,281.	441,666.	0.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
(6) JOHN KRAMER VP FOR COMMUNICATIONS	(i)	335,427.	221,721.	75.	37,800.	28,418.	623,441.	0.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
(7) DEBORAH SIMPSON CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER	(i)	282,117.	144,123.	72.	36,600.	19,355.	482,267.	0.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
(8) BETH STEVENS VP FOR DEVELOPMENT	(i)	255,202.	148,269.	75.	37,800.	10,433.	451,779.	0.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
(9) ROBERT MCNAMARA SENIOR ATTORNEY	(i)	272,465.	165,750.	29.	36,750.	13,144.	488,138.	0.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
(10) JEFFREY ROWES SENIOR ATTORNEY	(i)	216,969.	167,622.	49.	36,500.	24,269.	445,409.	0.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
(11) PAUL SHERMAN SENIOR ATTORNEY	(i)	198,115.	125,500.	29.	37,120.	24,626.	385,390.	0.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
(12) MELANIE HILDRETH VP FOR EXTERNAL RELATIONS	(i)	192,996.	130,313.	29.	37,800.	17,083.	378,221.	0.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
(13) DONALD WILSON CREATIVE DIRECTOR	(i)	180,419.	113,729.	53.	37,500.	16,375.	348,076.	0.
	(ii)	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
	(i)							
	(ii)							
	(i)							
	(ii)							
	(i)							
	(ii)							

Part II Supplemental Information

Provide the information, explanation, or descriptions required for Part I, lines 1a, 1b, 3, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b, 7, and 8, and for Part II. Also complete this part for any additional information.

PART I, LINE 4B:

FOUNDING GENERAL COUNSEL WILLIAM MELLOR PARTICIPATES IN A SECTION 457(F)
PLAN. THERE WERE NO CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PLAN FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30,
2019. \$1.5 MM OF DEFERRED COMPENSATION WAS PAID IN JANUARY 2018 UNDER THE
PLAN.

PART I, LINE 7:

THE COMPENSATION COMMITTEE DETERMINES, ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, THE BONUSES TO
BE AWARDED TO SIX SENIOR IJ EMPLOYEES: (I) PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL, (II)
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR LITIGATION, (III) CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER, (IV)
MANAGING VP AND SENIOR ATTORNEY, (V) VICE PRESIDENT FOR COMMUNICATIONS, AND
(VI) THE MANAGING VP-CFO/SECRETARY AND TREASURER. FOR ALL OTHERS, BONUSES
ARE DETERMINED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE INSTITUTE ON AN ANNUAL BASIS. ALL
BONUSES ARE BASED ON A BOARD APPROVED BUDGET. IN ADDITION, IN 2017, THE
INSTITUTE APPROVED ONE-TIME BONUSES THAT WERE PAID IN JANUARY 2018 TO
FOURTEEN IJ EMPLOYEES. IN 2015 AND IN ANTICIPATION OF A TRANSITION IN
MANAGEMENT FROM ITS FOUNDER TO A NEW PRESIDENT, THE BOARD CONSULTED WITH AN
INDEPENDENT COMPENSATION CONSULTANT AND CONDITIONALLY AUTHORIZED THESE
BONUSES FOR IJ EMPLOYEES WHOSE CONTINUED SERVICE WAS CONSIDERED TO BE

Part III Supplemental Information

Provide the information, explanation, or descriptions required for Part I, lines 1a, 1b, 3, 4a, 4b, 4c, 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b, 7, and 8, and for Part II. Also complete this part for any additional information.

CRITICAL TO A SUCCESSFUL MANAGEMENT TRANSITION. IN NOVEMBER 2017, THE BOARD
CONCLUDED THAT THE WORK OF THOSE EMPLOYEES HAD EFFECTED BOTH A SMOOTH
TRANSITION AND POSITIONED THE INSTITUTE FOR CONTINUED SUCCESS IN
ACCOMPLISHING ITS CHARITABLE AND EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES AND APPROVED PAYMENT
OF THE BONUSES.

SCHEDULE M
(Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Noncash Contributions

OMB No. 1545-0047

2018

**Open to Public
Inspection**

- ▶ **Complete if the organizations answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, lines 29 or 30.**
▶ **Attach to Form 990.**
▶ **Go to www.irs.gov/Form990 for instructions and the latest information.**

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

Part I **Types of Property**

	(a) Check if applicable	(b) Number of contributions or items contributed	(c) Noncash contribution amounts reported on Form 990, Part VIII, line 1g	(d) Method of determining noncash contribution amounts
1 Art - Works of art				
2 Art - Historical treasures				
3 Art - Fractional interests				
4 Books and publications				
5 Clothing and household goods				
6 Cars and other vehicles	X	3	253.	FMV
7 Boats and planes				
8 Intellectual property				
9 Securities - Publicly traded	X	41	1,634,827.	FMV
10 Securities - Closely held stock				
11 Securities - Partnership, LLC, or trust interests				
12 Securities - Miscellaneous				
13 Qualified conservation contribution - Historic structures				
14 Qualified conservation contribution - Other				
15 Real estate - Residential				
16 Real estate - Commercial				
17 Real estate - Other				
18 Collectibles				
19 Food inventory				
20 Drugs and medical supplies				
21 Taxidermy				
22 Historical artifacts				
23 Scientific specimens				
24 Archeological artifacts				
25 Other ▶ (<u>BITCOIN</u>)	X	3	111.	FMV
26 Other ▶ (_____)				
27 Other ▶ (_____)				
28 Other ▶ (_____)				

29 Number of Forms 8283 received by the organization during the tax year for contributions
for which the organization completed Form 8283, Part IV, Donee Acknowledgement

29

30a During the year, did the organization receive by contribution any property reported in Part I, lines 1 through 28, that it
must hold for at least three years from the date of the initial contribution, and which isn't required to be used for
exempt purposes for the entire holding period?

b If "Yes," describe the arrangement in Part II.

31 Does the organization have a gift acceptance policy that requires the review of any nonstandard contributions?

32a Does the organization hire or use third parties or related organizations to solicit, process, or sell noncash
contributions?

b If "Yes," describe in Part II.

33 If the organization didn't report an amount in column (c) for a type of property for which column (a) is checked,
describe in Part II.

	Yes	No
30a		X
31	X	
32a	X	
33		

LHA For Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see the Instructions for Form 990.

Schedule M (Form 990) 2018

Part II **Supplemental Information.** Provide the information required by Part I, lines 30b, 32b, and 33, and whether the organization is reporting in Part I, column (b), the number of contributions, the number of items received, or a combination of both. Also complete this part for any additional information.

SCHEDULE M, LINE 32B:

THE INSTITUTE UTILIZES A BROKERAGE FIRM TO SELL DONATED SECURITIES AND
OTHER INVESTMENT VEHICLES.

SCHEDULE M, LINE 9:

THE CONTRIBUTIONS REPORTED IN COLUMN B OF PART I ABOVE REPRESENT THE
NUMBER OF CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED.

SCHEDULE O
(Form 990 or 990-EZ)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Supplemental Information to Form 990 or 990-EZ

Complete to provide information for responses to specific questions on
Form 990 or 990-EZ or to provide any additional information.

▶ Attach to Form 990 or 990-EZ.

▶ Go to www.irs.gov/Form990 for the latest information.

OMB No. 1545-0047

2018

**Open to Public
Inspection**

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

FORM 990, PART III, LINE 1, DESCRIPTION OF ORGANIZATION MISSION:

THROUGH STRATEGIC LITIGATION, TRAINING, COMMUNICATION, ACTIVISM AND
RESEARCH, THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE (IJ) ADVANCES A RULE OF LAW UNDER
WHICH INDIVIDUALS CAN CONTROL THEIR DESTINIES AS FREE AND RESPONSIBLE
MEMBERS OF SOCIETY. IJ LITIGATES TO SECURE ECONOMIC LIBERTY,
EDUCATIONAL CHOICE, PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS, FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND
OTHER VITAL INDIVIDUAL LIBERTIES, AND TO RESTORE CONSTITUTIONAL LIMITS
ON THE POWER OF GOVERNMENT. IN ADDITION, IJ TRAINS LAW STUDENTS,
LAWYERS AND POLICY ACTIVISTS IN THE TACTICS OF PUBLIC INTEREST
LITIGATION. THROUGH THESE ACTIVITIES, IJ CHALLENGES THE IDEOLOGY OF THE
WELFARE STATE AND ILLUSTRATES AND EXTENDS THE BENEFITS OF FREEDOM TO
THOSE WHOSE FULL ENJOYMENT OF LIBERTY IS DENIED BY GOVERNMENT.

FORM 990, PART VI, SECTION B, LINE 11B:

THE FORM 990 WAS REVIEWED BY THE INSTITUTE'S AUDIT COMMITTEE IN
CONSULTATION WITH THE INSTITUTE'S INDEPENDENT AUDITORS, AS NECESSARY. AFTER
REVIEW BY THE AUDIT COMMITTEE, THE FORM 990 WAS DISTRIBUTED TO THE FULL
BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

FORM 990, PART VI, SECTION B, LINE 12C:

ON AN ANNUAL BASIS BOTH THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND EVERY EMPLOYEE REVIEW
THE CONFLICT OF INTEREST POLICY AND MUST DISCLOSE ANY CONFLICTS WITH THE
INSTITUTE. THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS REVIEWS THE POLICY AT OR AROUND ITS FINAL
MEETING OF THE FISCAL YEAR AND EACH MEMBER PROVIDES WRITTEN
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. EVERY EMPLOYEE RECEIVES AN ELECTRONIC COPY OF THE POLICY.

LHA For Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see the Instructions for Form 990 or 990-EZ.

Schedule O (Form 990 or 990-EZ) (2018)

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

ANY CONFLICTS OR POTENTIAL CONFLICTS ARE RESOLVED BY THE PRESIDENT OR OTHERWISE REPORTED BY THE PRESIDENT AND REVIEWED AND RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, LESS ANY MEMBER THAT MAY HAVE A CONFLICT OR POTENTIAL CONFLICT.

FORM 990, PART VI, SECTION B, LINE 15:

AT THE FALL BOARD MEETING, THE BOARD DETERMINES THE COMPENSATION OF SIX EMPLOYEES: THE PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL, THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR LITIGATION, THE CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER, THE MANAGING VICE PRESIDENT AND SENIOR ATTORNEY, THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR COMMUNICATIONS, AND THE MANAGING VICE PRESIDENT-CFO/SECRETARY AND TREASURER. IJ PROVIDES THE BOARD'S COMPENSATION COMMITTEE WITH PRESENT AND PAST COMPENSATION AMOUNTS FOR THESE POSITIONS, AS WELL AS COMPARABLE DATA FROM THE MOST RECENTLY AVAILABLE FORM 990 FOR SIMILARLY SITUATED NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. IJ ALSO ANNUALLY ENGAGES AN OUTSIDE VENDOR TO PROVIDE AN INDEPENDENT COMPENSATION SURVEY. THE COMPENSATION COMMITTEE MAKES A RECOMMENDATION ON COMPENSATION TO THE FULL BOARD (EXCEPT FOR THE PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL, WHO IS RECUSED), AND THE FULL BOARD THEN VOTES TO DETERMINE COMPENSATION, WHICH DECISION IS CONTEMPORANEOUSLY RECORDED AND COMMUNICATED TO THE CFO BY THE CHAIRMAN AND PLACED IN THE APPLICABLE CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYMENT FILES. DURING THE SUMMER BOARD MEETING, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZES FORECASTED COMPENSATION INCREASES FOR OTHER OFFICERS AND KEY EMPLOYEES THROUGH ITS APPROVAL OF THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR'S BUDGET.

FORM 990, PART VI, LINE 17, LIST OF STATES RECEIVING COPY OF FORM 990:

AL, AK, AZ, AR, CA, CO, CT, DC, FL, GA, HI, IL, KS, KY, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, NH, NJ, NM, NY, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, SC, TN, UT, VA, WA, WV, WI

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

FORM 990, PART VI, SECTION C, LINE 19:

IJ'S 990 AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS ARE AVAILABLE ON ITS AND OTHER WEBSITES.

IJ'S 990, FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, AND OTHER IRS DOCUMENTATION, GOVERNING
DOCUMENTS AND CERTAIN OTHER POLICIES ARE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC UPON
REQUEST.

FORM 990, PART XII, LINE 2C:

IJ HAS AN AUDIT COMMITTEE THAT ASSUMES RESPONSIBILITY FOR OVERSIGHT OF
THE AUDIT OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND SELECTION OF AN INDEPENDENT
AUDITOR. THE PROCESS HAS NOT CHANGED SINCE THE PRIOR YEAR.

CASES IN LITIGATION

TIMBS V. STATE OF INDIANA

IJ MADE HISTORY AT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT THIS TERM WHEN THE COURT
UNANIMOUSLY SIDED WITH IJ AND OUR CLIENT TYSON TIMBS, RULING THAT THE
U.S. CONSTITUTION PROHIBITS STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FROM IMPOSING
EXCESSIVE FINES AND FEES, JUST AS IT PREVENTS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
FROM DOING SO. TYSON'S ROAD TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT BEGAN WHEN LAW
ENFORCEMENT USED FORFEITURE TO SEIZE HIS VEHICLE AFTER HE WAS CONVICTED
OF SELLING \$225 WORTH OF DRUGS. EVEN AFTER TURNING HIS LIFE AROUND,
SERVING OUT HIS SENTENCE, AND PAYING \$1,200 IN FEES, THE GOVERNMENT
REFUSED TO RETURN TYSON'S VEHICLE - AN AFFRONT THE TRIAL COURT RULED AS
"GROSSLY DISPROPORTIONAL" TO THE OFFENSE. AFTER THE INDIANA SUPREME
COURT RULED THAT THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT PROVIDES NO PROTECTION AGAINST
FINES AND FORFEITURES IMPOSED BY THE STATES, IJ CHALLENGED THIS
DECISION AT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT - AND RESOUNDINGLY WON. THIS VICTORY

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

PROTECTS AMERICANS FROM ABUSE AT ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT - FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL - AND PROVIDES IJ WITH AMMUNITION TO TAKE ON OTHER ABUSIVE PROPERTY RIGHTS SCHEMES NATIONWIDE.

SOUROVELIS V. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA

IN SEPTEMBER 2018, IJ SUCCESSFULLY DISMANTLED THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA'S DRACONIAN FORFEITURE PROGRAM, USHERING IN LONG-AWAITED JUSTICE TO THE 35,000 PHILADELPHIANS WHO WERE STRIPPED OF THEIR PROPERTY AND THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. UNTIL IJ BROUGHT SUIT, PHILADELPHIA ROUTINELY SEIZED HOMES, CARS, AND CASH WITHOUT NOTICE. THE CITY FORCED OWNERS TO NAVIGATE THE NOTORIOUS "COURTROOM 478," WHERE SO-CALLED "HEARINGS" WERE RUN ENTIRELY BY PROSECUTORS, WITHOUT ANY JUDGES OR COURT-APPOINTED LAWYERS TO DEFEND PROPERTY OWNERS. MISSING EVEN A SINGLE "HEARING" MEANT THAT PROSECUTORS COULD PERMANENTLY TAKE AN OWNER'S PROPERTY, SELL IT, AND USE THE PROCEEDS FOR ANY LAW-ENFORCEMENT PURPOSE THEY WISHED, CREATING A PERVERSE INCENTIVE TO SEIZE PROPERTY FOR FORFEITURE. IJ PUT ALL THIS TO AN END BY SECURING TWO SWEEPING CONSENT DECREES - WHICH RECEIVED PRELIMINARY APPROVAL IN MAY 2019 - THAT CURB THE FINANCIAL INCENTIVES UNDER WHICH LAW ENFORCEMENT KEEPS AND USES FORFEITURE REVENUE, FUNDAMENTALLY REFORM PROCEDURES FOR SEIZING AND FORFEITING PROPERTY, AND ESTABLISH A \$3 MILLION FUND TO COMPENSATE THOSE WHOSE PROPERTY WAS WRONGLY CONFISCATED.

PUERTO RICO TEACHERS' ASSOC. V. DEP'T OF EDUCATION

IN AUGUST 2018, THE PUERTO RICO SUPREME COURT REJECTED A TEACHERS'

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

UNION'S CHALLENGE TO THE FREE SCHOOL SELECTION PROGRAM AND DECLARED THE PROGRAM CONSTITUTIONAL. AS A RESULT, UP TO 10,000 PUERTO RICAN STUDENTS WERE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR GOVERNMENT SCHOLARSHIPS TO ATTEND THE PRIVATE OR PUBLIC SCHOOL THAT BEST MET THEIR EDUCATIONAL NEEDS. THIS VICTORY CAME AS A WELCOME RELIEF TO THE FAMILIES IJ REPRESENTED - AND SO MANY OTHERS LIKE THEM - WHO FACE AN EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM ON THE VERGE OF COLLAPSE. IJ WILL KEEP FILING AND WINNING CASES ON BEHALF OF PARENTS AND CHILDREN UNTIL EVERY FAMILY HAS THE FREEDOM TO CHOOSE THE BEST SCHOOL FOR ITS CHILDREN, REGARDLESS OF INCOME OR ZIP CODE.

CITIZENS FOR STRONG SCHOOLS V. FLORIDA

IN ANOTHER DECISIVE VICTORY FOR EDUCATIONAL CHOICE, THE FLORIDA SUPREME COURT, AFFIRMING THE APPELLATE COURT'S DECEMBER 2017 DECISION, RULED THAT TWO OF THE NATION'S LARGEST EDUCATIONAL CHOICE PROGRAMS, FLORIDA'S TAX-CREDIT SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AND THE MCKAY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES, ARE SAFE FROM CONSTITUTIONAL ATTACK. A GROUP OF CHOICE OPPONENTS HAD CHALLENGED THESE PROGRAMS, CLAIMING THAT THEY DIVERT MONEY FROM FLORIDA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS. THIS HARD-FOUGHT RULING CONCLUDES NEARLY A DECADE OF LITIGATION AND ENSURES THAT THE 130,000 STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE PROGRAMS WILL CONTINUE OBTAINING A QUALITY EDUCATION AT THE SCHOOLS OF THEIR CHOICE.

TN WINE AND SPIRITS RETAILERS ASSOC. V. ZACHARY BLAIR, ET AL.

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, IN THE SECOND IJ VICTORY IN THE 2018-2019 TERM, STRUCK DOWN TENNESSEE'S "DURATIONAL RESIDENCY" LAW IN A 7-2 DECISION HANDED DOWN IN JUNE. THE PROTECTIONIST LAW REQUIRED ANYONE SEEKING A

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

RETAIL LIQUOR LICENSE TO FIRST RESIDE IN THE STATE FOR TWO YEARS - AND 10 YEARS BEFORE THEY COULD RENEW THE LICENSE. IJ'S CLIENTS, DOUG AND MARY KETCHUM, HAD MOVED FROM UTAH TO TENNESSEE TO BETTER CARE FOR THEIR DISABLED DAUGHTER AND TO OPERATE A MOM-AND-POP LIQUOR STORE. BUT THE TENNESSEE WINE & SPIRITS RETAILERS ASSOCIATION, A SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP THAT SEEKS TO SHIELD IN-STATE LIQUOR STORES FROM COMPETITION, WAS DETERMINED TO PREVENT THEM FROM OPENING THEIR DOORS. AFTER LOSING IN COURT - TWICE - THE ASSOCIATION PETITIONED THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO PRESERVE TENNESSEE'S DISCRIMINATORY LICENSING LAW. THIS RULING NOT ONLY VINDICATES DOUG AND MARY'S RIGHT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING IN WHICHEVER STATE THEY CALL HOME, IT SETS AN IMPORTANT PRECEDENT THAT IJ AND OTHERS WILL BUILD ON TO CHALLENGE PROTECTIONIST LAWS IN OTHER CONTEXTS.

BILLUPS V. CITY OF CHARLESTON; FREENOR V. MAYOR AND ALDERMEN OF THE CITY OF SAVANNAH

IJ SUCCESSFULLY FREED TOUR GUIDES FROM BURDENSOME LICENSING REQUIREMENTS IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND SAVANNAH, GEORGIA. BOTH CITIES REQUIRED TOUR GUIDES TO PASS EXTENSIVE EXAMS TO OBTAIN A SPECIAL LICENSE BEFORE BEING ALLOWED TO SHARE THE RICH HISTORY OF THEIR CITIES. FAILURE TO COMPLY RESULTED IN STEEP FINES - AND EVEN JAIL TIME. IJ CHALLENGED THESE LAWS TO PROTECT THE RIGHT OF AMERICANS TO SPEAK FOR A LIVING WITHOUT GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE. AFTER A WEEKLONG BENCH TRIAL IN AUGUST 2018, A JUDGE FOR THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA HELD THAT CHARLESTON'S LICENSING REQUIREMENT VIOLATED THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND STRUCK IT DOWN. A FEDERAL COURT IN SAVANNAH FOLLOWED SUIT THIS MAY, DECLARING THE CITY'S LICENSING REQUIREMENT UNCONSTITUTIONAL. BOTH VICTORIES BUILD ON IJ'S LONG-TERM LITIGATION

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

CAMPAIGN TO ENSURE THAT OCCUPATIONAL SPEECH IS ENTITLED TO THE SAME PROTECTIONS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION AS ALL OTHER FORMS OF SPEECH.

HARJO V. CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE

IN A VICTORY FOR DUE PROCESS AND PROPERTY OWNERS EVERYWHERE, IN JULY 2018, A FEDERAL JUDGE RULED THE CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE'S CIVIL FORFEITURE PROGRAM TO BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE IT VIOLATED THE BASIC RULE THAT CITIZENS ARE PRESUMED INNOCENT UNTIL PROVEN GUILTY, AND BECAUSE THE FUNDS RAISED BY THE PROGRAM WERE USED TO FUND THE PROGRAM'S BUDGET - GIVING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS AN INCENTIVE TO POLICE FOR PROFIT, RATHER THAN JUSTICE. THIS WAS A VICTORY NOT ONLY FOR IJ'S CLIENT ARLENE HARJO - WHO HAD HER 2014 NISSAN VERSA SEIZED AFTER HER SON TOOK THE CAR UNDER FALSE PRETENSES AND WAS ARRESTED FOR DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED - BUT FOR COUNTLESS OTHERS WHO FACED SIMILAR ABUSIVE SEIZURES. IJ WILL USE THIS PRECEDENT TO CALL INTO QUESTION COUNTLESS OTHER CIVIL FORFEITURE PROGRAMS ACROSS THE COUNTRY. IN FY19, IJ RECEIVED \$365,000 FROM THE GOVERNMENT IN FEES FOR THIS CASE.

HORNER, ET AL. V. CURRY, ET AL.

THE INDIANA CONSTITUTION STATES THAT ALL FORFEITURE PROCEEDS SHOULD GO TO THE STATE'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS, BUT INDIANAPOLIS POLICE AND PROSECUTORS HAVE BEEN KEEPING THIS CASH FOR THEMSELVES, UNDER THE GUISE OF IT BEING REIMBURSEMENT FOR THEIR EXPENSES. TWO INDIANA RESIDENTS WHO WERE UNJUSTLY TARGETED IN A FORFEITURE SCHEME JOINED WITH IJ TO COMPEL POLICE AND PROSECUTORS TO FOLLOW THE LAW AND STOP PROFITING FROM THE FORFEITURE PROGRAM. IN JUNE 2019, THE INDIANA SUPREME COURT RULED THAT

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

LAW ENFORCEMENT CAN KEEP AND USE THE MONEY IT SEIZES, RATHER THAN TRANSFERRING THE MONEY TO THE STATE'S COMMON SCHOOL FUND - A BLATANT CONTRADICTION OF THE STATE'S CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT. IJ WILL PUSH FORWARD, HOWEVER, AND ASK THE INDIANA GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO PASS MEANINGFUL REFORMS THAT NOT ONLY PROTECT INDIANANS' PROPERTY RIGHTS, BUT ALSO REMOVE THE FINANCIAL INCENTIVE TO POLICE FOR PROFIT, RATHER THAN PROTECT THE PUBLIC.

JAMEELAH EL-SHABAZZ V. CITY OF NEW YORK

IN A FEDERAL CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT, IJ IS REPRESENTING THREE RENTERS TO CHALLENGE NEW YORK CITY'S "NO-FAULT" EVICTION LAW, WHICH ALLOWS POLICE TO SHUTTER A PROPERTY AND EVICT THE TENANT SIMPLY BECAUSE A CRIME OCCURRED ON THE PREMISES - EVEN IF THE TENANT HAD NO KNOWLEDGE OF THE CRIME. IJ CLIENT SUNG CHO OPERATES A LAUNDROMAT IN A RENTAL SPACE IN MANHATTAN AND FELL PREY TO THE SCHEME IN 2013, WHEN UNDERCOVER POLICE WENT TO THE LAUNDROMAT ASKING CUSTOMERS IF THEY WANTED TO PURCHASE STOLEN ELECTRONICS. NEITHER SUNG NOR ANY OF HIS EMPLOYEES WERE INVOLVED IN THE STING, BUT BECAUSE TWO CUSTOMERS TOOK THE BAIT, SUNG WAS THREATENED WITH EVICTION. THE CITY OFFERED TO DROP THE ACTION IF SUNG AGREED TO WAIVE HIS FOURTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO REFUSE WARRANTLESS SEARCHES, GIVE POLICE UNLIMITED ACCESS TO HIS SECURITY CAMERAS, AND CONSENT TO FINES AND SANCTIONS FOR ALLEGED CRIMINAL OFFENSES AT THE BUSINESS WITHOUT THE OPPORTUNITY TO GO BEFORE A JUDGE. THE DISTRICT COURT DISMISSED THE CASE ON JURISDICTIONAL GROUNDS IN JANUARY 2018, HOLDING THAT SUCH A CLAIM CAN ONLY BE BROUGHT IN STATE COURT. THE 2ND CIRCUIT U.S. COURT OF APPEALS REVERSED THIS RULING IN DECEMBER 2018, AND THE CASE IS NOW MOVING FORWARD IN THE DISTRICT COURT.

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

KAZAZI V. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

IN OCTOBER OF 2017, RUSTEM KAZAZI, A FORMER POLICE OFFICER FROM ALBANIA, WAS STOPPED IN SECURITY AT THE CLEVELAND AIRPORT AND HAD \$58,100 IN CASH SEIZED BY U.S CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTIONS (CBP) EVEN THOUGH HE HAD DONE NOTHING ILLEGAL. RUSTEM WAS FLYING TO NEW JERSEY AND THEN RETURNING TO HIS NATIVE COUNTRY WITH 12 YEARS' WORTH OF FAMILY SAVINGS TO FIND A PROPERTY HE AND HIS WIFE COULD ENJOY IN RETIREMENT. ADDING INSULT TO INJURY, CBP CLAIMED LATER THAT THEY ONLY TOOK \$57,330 - \$770 LESS THAN HE WAS ACTUALLY CARRYING. SOON AFTER IJ GOT INVOLVED, THE GOVERNMENT AGREED TO RETURN \$57,115. AND IN MARCH, THE COURT ORDERED THE GOVERNMENT TO PAY \$43,280.13 IN ATTORNEY'S FEES.

NWAORIE V. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

ANTHONIA NWAORIE IS A REGISTERED NURSE AND AN AMERICAN CITIZEN WHO WAS EN ROUTE TO NIGERIA IN OCTOBER 2017 WITH \$41,377 SHE HAD SAVED TO OPEN A MEDICAL CLINIC. BUT AT HOUSTON'S GEORGE BUSH INTERCONTINENTAL AIRPORT, CBP AGENTS DISCOVERED HER MONEY AND TOOK EVERY PENNY - EVEN THOUGH SHE OBTAINED THE MONEY LEGALLY AND PLANNED TO USE IT LEGALLY. CBP STATED IT WOULD RETURN HER MONEY ONLY IF SHE SIGNED AN AGREEMENT WAIVING HER RIGHT TO INTEREST ON THE SEIZED PROPERTY AND HER RIGHTS TO SUE CBP OVER ANYTHING RELATED TO THE CONFISCATION OF HER MONEY. ANTHONIA TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FILE A FEDERAL CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT AGAINST CBP, AND WITHIN JUST ONE MONTH, SHE RECEIVED HER MONEY BACK. YET, IJ WILL FORGE AHEAD WITH THE LAWSUIT UNTIL CBP'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND UNLAWFUL BEHAVIOR IS PUT TO AN END IN COURT.

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

PLATT V. MOORE

ARIZONA RESIDENTS TERRY AND RIA PLATT LOANED THEIR CAR TO THEIR SON WHO WAS PULLED OVER BY POLICE FOR A WINDOW TINT VIOLATION. THE POLICE FOUND CASH AND A SMALL AMOUNT OF PERSONAL-USE MARIJUANA, BOTH OF WHICH THE SON ACKNOWLEDGED WERE HIS. EVEN THOUGH ARIZONA LAW DOES NOT ALLOW FORFEITURE OF A CAR UNDER SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES, THE POLICE AND PROSECUTOR STILL SEIZED AND HELD THE PLATTS' CAR. NAVAJO COUNTY PROSECUTORS THEN USED A TROUBLING PROCEDURE THAT TURNS PROSECUTORS INTO JUDGES TO KEEP THE PLATTS FROM HAVING THEIR DAY IN COURT. A MONTH AFTER IJ GOT INVOLVED, THE GOVERNMENT RELENITED AND RETURNED THE CAR TO TERRY AND RIA. IN RESPONSE TO CASES LIKE THE PLATTS', THE ARIZONA LEGISLATURE ENACTED IMPORTANT REFORMS TO THE STATE'S FORFEITURE SYSTEM. BUT ARIZONA STILL ALLOWS "UNCONTESTED FORFEITURE" FROM THOSE WHO HAVE NEVER BEEN CHARGED WITH, MUCH LESS CONVICTED OF, ANY CRIME. SO, THE PLATTS AND IJ ARE CONTINUING TO FIGHT IN COURT TO ENSURE THE VIOLATION OF TERRY AND RIA'S RIGHTS IS RECOGNIZED AND TO PREVENT THIS FROM HAPPENING TO THEM OR OTHERS IN THE FUTURE.

SERRANO V. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

WHILE GERARDO SERRANO WAS CROSSING THE BORDER INTO MEXICO AT EAGLE PASS, TEXAS, CBP USED CIVIL FORFEITURE TO SEIZE HIS TRUCK. AGENTS HAD FOUND FIVE LOW-CALIBER BULLETS IN HIS CENTER CONSOLE WHICH, ACCORDING TO CBP, CONSTITUTED TRANSPORTING "MUNITIONS OF WAR," MAKING THE TRUCK SUBJECT TO CIVIL FORFEITURE. FOR OVER TWO YEARS, THE AGENCY HELD GERARDO'S TRUCK WITHOUT EVER TAKING ITS CASE BEFORE A JUDGE - ALL WHILE

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

GERARDO CONTINUED TO MAKE HIS MONTHLY CAR PAYMENTS. DONE WAITING, GERARDO JOINED WITH IJ TO SUE TO GET HIS PROPERTY BACK, AND IN OCTOBER 2017, THE GOVERNMENT FINALLY RETURNED GERARDO'S TRUCK. WHILE GERARDO HAS RECOVERED HIS OWN TRUCK, THE CASE IS STILL ONGOING, AS WE FILED SUIT ON BEHALF OF A CLASS OF OTHER PEOPLE WHO HAVE HAD THEIR VEHICLES SEIZED BY CBP AND ARE BEING HELD WITHOUT A HEARING. THE LAWSUIT IS CURRENTLY ON APPEAL BEFORE THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 5TH CIRCUIT, WHICH WILL HEAR ARGUMENT IN WINTER 2019-2020.

LANCASTER COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE V. CARTER WALKER, ET AL.;
BERKS COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE V. CARTER WALKER, ET AL.

EVERY YEAR, THE LANCASTER COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE USES FORFEITURE TO TAKE HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN CASH AND OTHER PROPERTY FROM PENNSYLVANIA CITIZENS. UNDER PENNSYLVANIA LAW, THE DA'S OFFICE IS ABLE TO SPEND THE PROCEEDS WITH FEW RESTRICTIONS AND ALMOST NO PUBLIC OVERSIGHT. CARTER WALKER, A YOUNG REPORTER FOR LNP MEDIA GROUP IN LANCASTER, IS WORKING HARD TO CHANGE THAT. AS PART OF HIS INVESTIGATIVE REPORTING, CARTER FILED A PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST UNDER PENNSYLVANIA'S "RIGHT-TO-KNOW" LAW ASKING FOR INFORMATION ABOUT WHAT KIND OF PROPERTY THE DA IS TAKING THROUGH FORFEITURE AND HOW THE OFFICE IS SPENDING THE PROCEEDS. WHEN THE PENNSYLVANIA OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS ORDERED THE DA TO MAKE THIS INFORMATION AVAILABLE, HE OPTED TO FIGHT CARTER'S REQUEST FOR INFORMATION IN COURT. IJ TEAMED UP WITH CARTER IN APRIL TO ENSURE THAT DISTRICT ATTORNEYS ACROSS PENNSYLVANIA MUST MAKE INFORMATION ABOUT THEIR FORFEITURE PRACTICES - AND THE PROPERTY THEY CONFISCATE UNDER THEM - AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC. BY JOINING FORCES WITH CARTER AND LNP, IJ WILL HELP SHED LIGHT ON FORFEITURE IN PENNSYLVANIA

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

AND ADVOCATE FOR THE RIGHT OF ALL PENNSYLVANIANS TO KNOW HOW THEIR
GOVERNMENT IS TAKING PROPERTY AND HOW IT SPENDS THE PROCEEDS.

CASINO REINVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY V. CHARLES AND LUCINDA
BIRNBAUM, ET AL.

IN FEBRUARY, IJ WON A DECISIVE VICTORY ON BEHALF OF PIANO TUNER CHARLIE
BIRNBAUM, SAVING HIS LONGTIME FAMILY HOME FROM AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL
EMINENT DOMAIN ATTEMPT. THE SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY, APPELLATE
DIVISION, AFFIRMED IJ'S LOWER-COURT VICTORY FROM 2016, WHICH CALLED THE
STATE'S ATTEMPT TO TAKE CHARLIE'S HISTORIC ATLANTIC CITY HOME "A
MANIFEST ABUSE OF EMINENT DOMAIN POWER." THE LONG-RUNNING COURT BATTLE
PIT BIRNBAUM'S FAMILY HISTORY AGAINST THE STATE CASINO REINVESTMENT AND
DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, WHICH SOUGHT TO TAKE THE HOME IN SERVICE OF A
"DEVELOPMENT" PROJECT THAT IT COULD NEITHER EXPLAIN NOR IDENTIFY.
THANKS TO THIS VICTORY, CHARLIE CAN FINALLY REST EASY KNOWING THAT THE
HOME HE INHERITED FROM HIS PARENTS - HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS WHO IMMIGRATED
TO AMERICA NEARLY 70 YEARS AGO - IS SAFE FROM THE STATE'S WRECKING
BALL. IT ALSO SENDS A STRONG MESSAGE TO OTHER LAND-HUNGRY AGENCIES THAT
IJ IS READY TO CHALLENGE ABUSIVE TAKINGS AND PROTECT THE SWEEPING
REFORMS TO EMINENT DOMAIN LAWS WE HAVE WORKED SO HARD TO SECURE.

CHARLESTOWN PLEASANT RIDGE NEIGHBORHOOD ASS'N CORP., ET AL. V. CITY OF
CHARLESTOWN, INDIANA

INDIANA HAS STRONG PROPERTY PROTECTION LAWS TO PREVENT THE GOVERNMENT
FROM SEIZING PEOPLE'S HOMES THROUGH EMINENT DOMAIN FOR PRIVATE
PROJECTS. BUT THE MAYOR OF CHARLESTOWN CAME UP WITH ANOTHER

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

UNCONSTITUTIONAL PLAN TO GET HOMES IN THE WORKING-CLASS NEIGHBORHOOD OF PLEASANT RIDGE INTO THE HANDS OF HIS PREFERRED DEVELOPER. CITY INSPECTORS ISSUED CRIPPLING FINES FOR TRIVIAL PROPERTY-CODE VIOLATIONS, INCLUDING TORN SCREENS AND CHIPPED PAINT. ONCE HOMEOWNERS AMASSED INSURMOUNTABLE FINES, THE DEVELOPER WOULD OFFER TO BUY THE PROPERTY FOR \$10,000 - SIGNIFICANTLY BELOW THE MARKET VALUE. IJ TEAMED UP WITH PLEASANT RIDGE RESIDENTS TO PUT AN END TO THE MAYOR'S MISSION TO DESTROY THEIR COMMUNITY, AND IN DECEMBER 2017, THE COURT ORDERED THAT CITY OFFICIALS IMMEDIATELY STOP THE CITY'S USE OF EXCESSIVE HOUSING-CODE FINES. THE CITY APPEALED THE DECISION, BUT THE INDIANA COURT OF APPEALS RULED IN SEPTEMBER 2018 THAT THE CITY MUST FOLLOW THE STATE'S STATUTE THAT GIVES PROPERTY OWNERS PROCEDURAL PROTECTIONS FROM OVERZEALOUS CODE ENFORCEMENT. THE APPELLATE COURT DID NOT ADDRESS THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THE CITY VIOLATED THE STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS, SO THE DECISION GOES BACK TO THE TRIAL COURT TO RULE ON HOW THE STATUTE APPLIES IN THIS CASE. IN THE MEANTIME, THE RESIDENTS OF PLEASANT RIDGE REMAIN IN THEIR HOMES AND LOOK FORWARD TO A FINAL JUDGMENT THAT WILL PERMANENTLY PROTECT THEM FROM CITY ABUSE AND SEND A POWERFUL MESSAGE TO OTHER CITIES CONSIDERING SUCH ACTIONS.

LYNDA LIKE, ET AL. V. TRANSCONTINENTAL GAS PIPELINE CO.

SHOULD PRIVATE PIPELINE COMPANIES BE ABLE TO USE THE GOVERNMENT'S POWER OF EMINENT DOMAIN TO TAKE LAND IMMEDIATELY WHILE DENYING THE LANDOWNERS ANY COMPENSATION FOR MONTHS OR EVEN YEARS? THAT WAS THE QUESTION RAISED BY A PETITION IJ FILED IN MARCH 2019 WITH THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ON BEHALF OF PROPERTY OWNERS IN RURAL LANCASTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA.

POWERFUL PIPELINE COMPANIES HAVE CONVINCED THE COURTS TO IGNORE THE LAW

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

AND GIVE THESE PRIVATE COMPANIES IMMEDIATE POSSESSION OF OTHER PEOPLE'S LAND WITHOUT FIRST PAYING THE OWNERS ANY COMPENSATION, AS REQUIRED UNDER FEDERAL LAW. ALTHOUGH THE HIGH COURT REGRETTABLY DECLINED TO REVIEW THE CASE, IJ WILL AGGRESSIVELY SEEK OUT ALTERNATIVE AVENUES FOR DISMANTLING THIS INHERENTLY ABUSIVE PROCESS. ULTIMATE SUCCESS WILL ESTABLISH IMPORTANT PRECEDENT ABOUT LIMITING PRIVATE DELEGATIONS OF THE EMINENT-DOMAIN POWER, ENSURING THAT NO ONE IMMEDIATELY LOSES THEIR PROPERTY OR IS FORCED TO GIVE UP THEIR RIGHT TO FULL JUDICIAL REVIEW.

CITY OF DALLAS V. HINGA MBOGO, HINGA AUTOMOTIVE CO., D/B/A HINGA AUTO REPAIR, AND 3516 ROSS AVENUE, DALLAS, TEXAS

FOR 30 YEARS, KENYAN IMMIGRANT HINGA MBOGO HAS OWNED AND OPERATED HIS AUTO GARAGE ON ROSS AVENUE IN DALLAS. BUT NOW THE CITY WANTS HINGA TO CLOSE UP SHOP AND LEAVE BECAUSE HIS POPULAR GARAGE DOES NOT FIT THE CITY COUNCIL'S VISION FOR THE NEIGHBORHOOD. SEVERAL YEARS AGO, THE CITY PASSED RETROACTIVE ZONING LAWS - A PROCESS OFFICIALLY KNOWN AS "AMORTIZATION" - AND SPECIFICALLY DISALLOWED ANY AUTOMOTIVE-RELATED BUSINESS IN THE ROSS STREET NEIGHBORHOOD. IN ADDITION, THE CITY SLAPPED HINGA WITH MORE THAN \$300,000 IN FINES, EVEN THOUGH THE CITY REGULATIONS EXPLICITLY LIMIT FINES TO \$2,000. HINGA AND IJ ARE SEEKING THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT'S REVIEW OF A LOWER COURT'S JULY 2017 DECISION THAT DISMISSED THE CASE. HINGA HAS VOWED TO CONTINUE THIS BATTLE, NOT JUST SO THAT HE CAN CONTINUE TO OPERATE HIS BUSINESS ON LAND HE HAS OWNED FOR DECADES, BUT ALSO TO SET PRECEDENT THAT PROTECTS THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS.

THE HOMELESS CHARITY, ET AL. V. AKRON BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS; THE

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

HOMELESS CHARITY, ET AL. V. CITY OF AKRON

AKRON, OHIO, HAS A SOARING HOMELESS POPULATION, AND GOVERNMENT POLICY IS AT LEAST PARTLY TO BLAME FOR THIS CRISIS, DRIVING UP EXISTING HOUSING PRICES AND MAKING IT DIFFICULT TO BUILD LOW-COST ALTERNATIVES. SAGE LEWIS STEPPED UP TO PROVIDE REAL SUPPORT TO THOSE IN NEED BY ALLOWING A FEW HOMELESS MEN AND WOMEN TO PITCH THEIR TENTS IN THE BACK LOT OF HIS BUILDING AND KEEP WARM IN THE BASEMENT WHEN NEEDED. THIS INFORMAL ARRANGEMENT EVOLVED INTO A COMMUNITY DESIGNED TO HELP HOMELESS MEN AND WOMEN TRANSITION BACK TO INDEPENDENCE. BUT WHILE AKRON OFFICIALS DO NOT OFFER ADEQUATE SOLUTIONS TO THE CITY'S HOMELESS PROBLEM, THEY ARE ALL TOO QUICK TO USE ZONING LAWS TO SHUT DOWN SECOND CHANCE VILLAGE. IJ JOINED WITH SAGE IN OCTOBER TO VINDICATE THE RIGHT TO CARRY ON THIS NOBLE WORK BY KEEPING VULNERABLE PEOPLE OFF THE STREETS. OUR VICTORY IN THIS CASE WOULD ALSO SET IMPORTANT PRECEDENT IN FIGHTING OPPRESSIVE ZONING REGULATIONS AND SPEARHEAD A MODEL THAT CAN BE REPLICATED ACROSS THE NATION BY OTHERS WHO SEEK TO USE PRIVATE PROPERTY TO HELP THOSE WHO NEED IT MOST.

BRUCKER V. CITY OF DORAVILLE

EACH YEAR, THE CITY OF DORAVILLE, GEORGIA, BUDGETS BETWEEN 17 AND 30% OF ITS OVERALL ANTICIPATED REVENUE TO COME FROM FINES AND FEES ISSUED BY ITS POLICE OFFICERS AND CODE INSPECTORS. BY PUTTING FINE REVENUE INTO ITS ANNUAL BUDGET, DORAVILLE CREATES A PERVERSE INCENTIVE FOR POLICE, PROSECUTORS, AND EVEN ITS MUNICIPAL COURT TO POLICE FOR PROFIT, RATHER THAN SEEK JUSTICE AND PROTECT THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE CITY. DORAVILLE HOMEOWNER HILDA BRUCKER WAS FINED AND SENTENCED TO SIX MONTHS

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

OF PROBATION FOR THE "CRIME" OF HAVING CRACKS IN HER DRIVEWAY. HILDA'S NEIGHBOR JEFF THORNTON WAS FINED \$1,000 FOR THE CRIME OF HAVING A STACK OF FIREWOOD IN HIS BACKYARD. THAT IS WHY IN MAY 2018, HILDA, JEFF, AND TWO OTHERS PARTNERED WITH IJ TO STOP DORAVILLE'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL RELIANCE ON FINES AND FEES INCOME, AND TO FORCE THE CITY TO NOT USE THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM TO BALANCE ITS BUDGET. AFTER A FIRST-ROUND VICTORY THIS APRIL, THE NEXT STEP IS A HEARING EXAMINING HOW COURTS HAVE INTERPRETED PROFIT-DRIVEN JUSTICE SYSTEMS IN THE PAST.

CITY OF NORCO V. MUGAR

TWO YEARS AGO, NORCO, CALIFORNIA, RESIDENT RON MUGAR RECEIVED A NOTICE INDICATING THAT HE HAD VIOLATED THE CITY'S HOUSING CODE. HE ADMITTEDLY ALLOWED HIS HOME AND BACKYARD TO BECOME CLUTTERED WITH HOBBY MACHINERY. BUT INSTEAD OF FINING HIM OR ASKING HIM TO BRING HIS PROPERTY UP TO CODE, THE CITY'S PRIVATE, FOR-PROFIT PROSECUTORS DECLARED THEY WERE GOING TO TAKE OVER OWNERSHIP OF HIS HOUSE USING A LEGAL PROCESS KNOWN AS "RECEIVERSHIP." TRADITIONALLY, RECEIVERSHIPS ALLOW A CITY TO TAKE TEMPORARY OWNERSHIP OF A PROPERTY TO FIX AN IMMINENT DANGER TO A COMMUNITY, SUCH AS A STRUCTURALLY UNSOUND BUILDING. UNFORTUNATELY, RECEIVERSHIPS ARE NOW BEING USED IN CALIFORNIA TO ADDRESS EVEN MINOR CODE VIOLATIONS. RON BROUGHT HIS HOME AND YARD UP TO CODE AND FOUGHT THE RECEIVERSHIP IN COURT - AND WON. BUT JUST WHEN RON THOUGHT HE COULD RELAX, HE RECEIVED A BILL FROM THE CITY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE FOR THE \$60,798.94 IT SPENT LOSING RON'S CASE. RON IS EFFECTIVELY BEING PUNISHED FOR SUCCESSFULLY DEFENDING HIS PROPERTY RIGHTS AGAINST GOVERNMENT OVERREACH. UNDER BOTH THE U.S. AND CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTIONS, PROSECUTORS CANNOT HAVE A DIRECT FINANCIAL INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME OF

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

THEIR CASES. IJ JOINED RON IN APRIL TO VINDICATE HIS RIGHT TO DUE
PROCESS AND TO PROTECT ALL CALIFORNIA PROPERTY OWNERS FROM FALLING
VICTIM TO ABUSIVE CODE ENFORCEMENT SCHEMES.

FICKEN V. CITY OF DUNEDIN, FLORIDA, ET AL.

IJ JOINED WITH JIM FICKEN OF DUNEDIN, FLORIDA, TO CHALLENGE THE CITY'S
ATTEMPT TO FORECLOSE HIS HOME SIMPLY BECAUSE HIS GRASS WAS TOO LONG.
WHILE JIM WAS OUT OF TOWN TENDING TO HIS LATE MOTHER'S ESTATE, CITY
CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS BEGAN FINING HIM FOR HIS LONG GRASS, TO THE
TUNE OF \$500 PER DAY. BY THE TIME HE GOT BACK AND BECAME AWARE THAT HE
WAS BEING FINED, FINES HAD ALREADY ACCRUED TO NEARLY \$30,000. THE CITY
TOLD JIM HE HAD 15 DAYS TO PAY, OR THEY WOULD GET THEIR MONEY BY
FORECLOSING ON HIS HOME. AND THAT IS JUST WHAT THE CITY VOTED TO DO.
THIS CASE IS ABOUT MORE THAN JUST SAVING JIM'S HOME; IT IS ABOUT
ENSURING - FOR EVERYONE - THAT ABUSIVE GOVERNMENTS CANNOT TRUMP THE
CONSTITUTION.

MORALES V. CITY OF INDIO, ET AL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN INDIO, CALIFORNIA, TEAMED UP WITH A
PRIVATE LAW FIRM TO CHARGE PROPERTY OWNERS TO COVER THE COSTS OF THEIR
OWN PROSECUTIONS. UNDER THIS OUTRAGEOUS SCHEME, THE LAW FIRM PROVIDED
INDIO AND SEVERAL OTHER CALIFORNIA CITIES WITH "COST-NEUTRAL" CODE
ENFORCEMENT SERVICES. THIS MEANS THAT EVERY TICKET THE CITY ISSUED FOR
VIOLATIONS SUCH AS UNMOWED GRASS OR "SUN-DAMAGED" ADDRESS NUMBERS WAS
MONEY IN THE BANK FOR THE CITY AND FOR THE LAW FIRM, WHICH THEN BILLED
PROPERTY OWNERS THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS FOR "PROSECUTION FEES." IF OWNERS

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

DARED TO CONTEST THE FEES, THEIR LEGAL BILLS SIMPLY GREW LARGER. IJ FILED A CLASS ACTION SUIT AGAINST THE CITY IN FEBRUARY 2018 TO PUT A STOP TO THIS EGREGIOUS FORM OF POLICING FOR PROFIT. AND IN DECEMBER, WE WON A RESOUNDING VICTORY WHEN THE CITY OF INDIO AGREED TO RETURN THE MONEY OF EVERYONE WHO WAS VICTIMIZED BY THE CITY'S SCHEME. IT WAS A WELCOME RELIEF FOR OUR CLIENT RAMONA MORALES AND COUNTLESS OTHERS LIKE HER.

JEROME DAVIS, ET AL. V. CITY OF CHICAGO

IN APRIL, IJ FILED A CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT CHALLENGING CHICAGO'S MASSIVE AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL VEHICLE IMPOUND PROGRAM. IN A CITY THAT RUNS A CHRONIC BUDGET DEFICIT OF MORE THAN \$100 MILLION, IMPOUNDING VEHICLES HAS BECOME AN EASY - AND SIGNIFICANT - SOURCE OF CASH. THE LEAD PLAINTIFFS IN OUR CLASS ACTION ARE INNOCENT OWNERS JEROME DAVIS AND VERONICA WALKER-DAVIS. THE CITY IMPOUNDED THEIR CAR AFTER AN AUTO-SHOP EMPLOYEE TOOK IT FOR A JOY RIDE WHILE IT WAS IN THE SHOP FOR REPAIRS. AFTER FIGHTING THE CITY FOR NEARLY A YEAR AND BEING CHARGED THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN FINES AND FEES, THE DAVISES ARRIVED TO PICK UP THEIR VEHICLE - ONLY TO FIND THAT CITY HAD ALREADY DESTROYED IT. A VICTORY IN THIS CASE HAS THE POTENTIAL TO CREATE BROAD, SYSTEMIC CHANGE IN AN AREA WHERE ABUSE IS RAMPANT.

BEAN, ET AL. V. SEATTLE, ET AL.

WHEN IT COMES TO RESPECTING THE PROPERTY AND PRIVACY RIGHTS OF ITS RESIDENTS, THE CITY OF SEATTLE TREATS ITS RENTAL TENANTS AS SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS BY FORCING THEM TO ALLOW GOVERNMENT-MANDATED

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

INSPECTORS INTO THEIR HOMES WITHOUT FIRST GETTING A WARRANT. RENTERS MATTHEW BENTLEY, WESLEY WILLIAMS, AND JOSEPH BRIERE FOUND THAT OUT FIRSTHAND WHEN THE CITY INFORMED THEIR LANDLORD THAT THEIR HOME NEEDED TO BE INSPECTED BY A GOVERNMENT-MANDATED HOUSING INSPECTOR. BENTLEY, WILLIAMS, AND BRIERE, ALONG WITH THEIR THREE OTHER ROOMMATES, ALL VALUE THEIR PRIVACY AND INFORMED THE CITY THAT THEY DID NOT WANT THEIR HOME INSPECTED. THEIR LANDLORDS AGREED, AND TOLD THE CITY THEIR TENANTS REFUSED TO ALLOW AN INSPECTOR IN. THE CITY RESPONDED BY THREATENING FINES UPWARDS OF \$500 PER DAY IF THE LANDLORDS DID NOT SOMEHOW COERCE THEIR TENANTS TO ALLOW THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL INSPECTION. THIS IS WHY BENTLEY, WILLIAMS, AND BRIERE, ALONG WITH THEIR LANDLORDS AND A GROUP OF OTHER RENTERS, PARTNERED TOGETHER WITH IJ IN DECEMBER TO FILE A CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT AGAINST SEATTLE ASKING THE COURTS TO UPHOLD RENTERS' PRIVACY RIGHTS BY SHUTTING DOWN SEATTLE'S WARRANTLESS INSPECTIONS PROGRAM. IN MARCH 2019, THE JUDGE REJECTED THE CITY'S ATTEMPT TO DISMISS THE CASE.

DOROTHY RIVERA, EDDY OMAR RIVERA, AND STEVEN CAMBURN V. BOROUGH OF POTTSTOWN AND KEITH A. PLACE

MUCH LIKE SEATTLE, POTTSTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA, HAS A RENTAL INSPECTION LAW THAT FORCES LANDLORDS AND TENANTS TO OPEN THEIR PROPERTIES AND HOMES TO SUBMIT TO INTRUSIVE INSPECTIONS. ORDINARILY, WHEN A PERSON DOES NOT WANT THE GOVERNMENT TO ENTER THEIR HOME, THEY CAN REQUEST A WARRANT SUPPORTED BY SOME EVIDENCE THAT A VIOLATION OF THE LAW HAS OCCURRED. BUT IN POTTSTOWN, IF A LANDLORD AND TENANT REQUEST A WARRANT, THE GOVERNMENT CAN GO TO COURT AND READILY OBTAIN AN "ADMINISTRATIVE" WARRANT - A WARRANT THAT DOES NOT REQUIRE ANY EVIDENCE THAT ANYTHING IS

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

WRONG WITH THE HOME. IJ HAS TEAMED UP WITH A LANDLORD AND HIS TENANTS TO FILE A LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE GOVERNMENT'S USE OF ADMINISTRATIVE WARRANTS TO SEARCH THE HOMES OF ORDINARY PEOPLE WHO DO NOT WANT INSPECTORS INSIDE. IN MAY, THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS DISMISSED THE CASE, BUT THE COALITION OF TENANTS AND LANDLORDS WILL CONTINUE THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL FIGHT IN PENNSYLVANIA'S APPELLATE COURTS.

LIVE OAK BREWING, ET AL. V. TEXAS ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE COMMISSION

CAN TEXAS SEIZE VALUABLE PROPERTY FROM CRAFT BREWERIES AND SIMPLY GIVE IT TO BEER DISTRIBUTORS, EVEN THOUGH THOSE DISTRIBUTORS NEVER EARNED IT? THREE CRAFT BREWERIES STOOD WITH IJ TO SAY "NO" IN A CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE TO A 2013 LAW THAT STRIPS BREWERIES OF THEIR TRADITIONAL RIGHT TO SELL THEIR DISTRIBUTION RIGHTS, AND INSTEAD FORCES THEM TO SURRENDER THOSE RIGHTS TO DISTRIBUTORS WITHOUT COMPENSATION. AMAZINGLY, THE LAW FORCES BREWERIES TO GIVE UP THEIR DISTRIBUTION RIGHTS FOR NOTHING, BUT DISTRIBUTORS CAN TURN AROUND AND RESELL THOSE SAME RIGHTS FOR WHATEVER PRICE THE MARKET WILL BEAR. AFTER THE CASE MADE ITS WAY UP TO THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT ON APPEAL, THE COURT UNFORTUNATELY DECLINED TO HEAR THE CASE IN JUNE, PERPETUATING THE ABUSE AGAINST CONSUMERS AND BREWERIES - AND THEIR PROPERTY RIGHTS - ACROSS TEXAS.

VALANCOURT BOOKS, LLC V. CLAGGETT, ET AL.

VALANCOURT IS A SMALL PUBLISHING COMPANY OPERATED OUT OF THE RICHMOND, VIRGINIA, HOME OF JAMES JENKINS, A FORMER LAWYER WHO FOUND HIS LIFE'S CALLING REVIVING AND POPULARIZING RARE, NEGLECTED, AND OUT-OF-PRINT FICTION. VALANCOURT HAS PUBLISHED MORE THAN 300 BOOKS, ALL OF WHICH

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

THEY HAVE PERMISSION TO REPRINT. BUT IN JUNE 2018, JAMES RECEIVED AN EMAIL FROM THE U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE DEMANDING THAT HE PROVIDE IT WITH COPIES OF EVERY SINGLE BOOK IN VALANCOURT'S CATALOG, AND THREATENING HIM WITH FINES THAT COULD REACH HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IF HE FAILED TO COMPLY. A LITTLE-KNOWN PROVISION OF FEDERAL LAW MAKES IT ILLEGAL TO PUBLISH A NEW BOOK IN THE UNITED STATES WITHOUT PROVIDING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WITH TWO FREE COPIES. VALANCOURT BOOKS JOINED WITH IJ IN AUGUST TO FILE A FEDERAL LAWSUIT AGAINST THE COPYRIGHT OFFICE AND THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, CLAIMING THAT THE BOOK-DEPOSIT MANDATE IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE IT VIOLATES THE TAKINGS CLAUSE OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT AND OPERATES AS A PENALTY ON PEOPLE WHO PUBLISH PHYSICAL BOOKS WITHOUT TURNING OVER A COPY. BUT THE GOVERNMENT CAN'T PUNISH PEOPLE SIMPLY FOR PUBLISHING A BOOK, AND THE NOTION THAT A PRIVATE CITIZEN OWES THE GOVERNMENT A DEBT SIMPLY FOR ENGAGING IN A CERTAIN KIND OF SPEECH IS ANTITHETICAL TO THE CONSTITUTION.

USHABEN CHUDASAMA, ET AL. V. LOUISIANA BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY, ET AL.

IJ FILED A SUCCESSFUL LAWSUIT ON BEHALF OF THREADERS LATA JAGTIANI, USHABEN CHUDASMA, AND PANNA SHAH, CHALLENGING THE LOUISIANA BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY'S REQUIREMENT TO OBTAIN AN ESTHETICIAN'S LICENSE TO PRACTICE EYEBROW THREADING. THIS BURDENSOME PROCESS INVOLVES SPENDING THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS AND COMPLETING 750 HOURS OF INSTRUCTION IN COSMETOLOGY SCHOOL - WHICH OFFERS NO TRAINING IN THREADING. IN JULY 2018, THE LOUISIANA STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY, FACING THE PROSPECT OF A LONG AND LOSING LEGAL BATTLE, PASSED A REGULATION EXEMPTING EYEBROW THREADERS FROM HAVING TO OBTAIN A COSTLY AND BURDENSOME ESTHETICIAN'S

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

LICENSE. NOW, EYEBROW THREADERS ACROSS THE STATE NO LONGER HAVE TO JUMP THROUGH SEVERAL UNNECESSARY REGULATORY HOOPS TO MAKE A LIVING DOING WHAT THEY LOVE.

ROCK, ET AL. V. TOWN OF CAROLINA BEACH

IN ONE OF OUR FASTEST VICTORIES YET, CAROLINA BEACH, NORTH CAROLINA, REPEALED ITS UNNECESSARY BARRIER TO EARNING AN HONEST LIVING, JUST ONE WEEK AFTER IJ FILED SUIT. IN AUGUST 2018, IJ JOINED WITH FOOD TRUCK OWNERS TO CHALLENGE AN ORDINANCE MAKING IT ILLEGAL TO OPERATE A FOOD TRUCK IN THE TOWN UNLESS THE OWNER ALSO OWNS A BRICK-AND-MORTAR RESTAURANT IN TOWN. IN ADDITION TO REMOVING THE BRICK-AND-MORTAR REQUIREMENT, CAROLINA BEACH SCALED BACK OTHER FOOD TRUCK REGULATIONS TOO. WHAT'S MORE, IT BEGAN DESIGNING A PLAN TO FURTHER DEREGULATE FOOD TRUCKS AND TRANSFORM THE TOWN INTO A "FOOD TRUCK LEADER." NOT ONLY IS THIS VICTORY GREAT NEWS FOR FOOD TRUCK OWNERS AND OTHER ASPIRING ENTREPRENEURS, IT ALSO PROVIDES A MODEL FOR FUTURE LITIGATION IN NORTH CAROLINA AND BEYOND.

BURKE V. CITY OF CHICAGO

IN A BLOW TO FOOD FREEDOM THIS MAY, THE ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT UPHELD TWO PROVISIONS OF CHICAGO'S LAW THAT BLOCK FOOD TRUCKS FROM PARKING WITHIN 200 FEET OF RESTAURANTS AND REQUIRE THEY INSTALL GPS DEVICES SO CITY OFFICIALS MAY TRACK THEIR EVERY MOVE. IJ CHALLENGED THESE TWO PROVISIONS IN 2012 ON BEHALF OF LAURA PEKARIK, OWNER OF THE CUPCAKES FOR COURAGE FOOD TRUCK. WITH THE COURT'S RULING, THE WINDY CITY'S FOOD TRUCK INDUSTRY, WHICH HAS SHRUNK BY OVER 40% IN THE PAST SIX YEARS,

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

WILL CONTINUE TO SPUTTER OUT. NOT ONLY DOES CHICAGO'S RULE STYMIE A
COMMON, LOW-COST PATH INTO THE RESTAURANT INDUSTRY FOR THE CITY'S
ENTREPRENEURS, IT FORCES EVERYDAY CHICAGOANS TO CONTINUE TO SUFFER FROM
FEWER CHOICES AND HIGHER PRICES.

PIZZA DI JOEY, LLC V. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE

IN MAY 2016, TWO BALTIMORE-AREA FOOD TRUCKS - PIZZA DI JOEY AND
MINDGRUB CAFE - JOINED WITH IJ TO FILE A LAWSUIT AGAINST THE CITY
CHALLENGING ITS BAN ON MOBILE VENDORS OPERATING WITHIN 300 FEET OF ANY
BRICK-AND- MORTAR ESTABLISHMENT SELLING SIMILAR FOOD. AND ON DECEMBER
20, 2017, A CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE RULED THAT THE 300-FOOT BAN WAS TOO
VAGUE, GIVING BALTIMORE 60 DAYS TO STOP ENFORCING IT. UNFORTUNATELY, IN
MAY 2019, AN APPEALS COURT OVERTURNED THAT DECISION AND REINSTATED THE
RULE. IJ AND THE FOOD TRUCK OWNERS WILL KEEP FIGHTING AGAINST THIS
PROTECTIONSIST LAW AND APPEAL TO THE MARYLAND COURT OF APPEALS, THE
STATE'S HIGHEST COURT.

WHITE COTTAGE RED DOOR, LLC V. TOWN OF GIBRALTAR

LISA AND KEVIN HOWARD, ALONG WITH JESSICA AND CHRIS HADRABA, OPENED A
FOOD TRUCK OUTSIDE THEIR FAMILY BUSINESS IN FISH CREEK, WISCONSIN.
DESPITE OBTAINING THE PROPER STATE AND COUNTY PERMITS FOR THEIR TRUCK,
THE TOWN'S CONSTABLE TOLD THE QUARTET TO STOP VENDING AND HAD THE
COUNTY REVOKE THE TRUCK'S ZONING PERMIT. WHEN THE COUNTY REFUSED, THE
TOWN BOARD PASSED A TOTAL BAN ON VENDING GOODS FROM MOBILE VEHICLES,
INCLUDING FOOD TRUCKS. AT THE ROOT OF THE BAN IS THE TOWN BOARD'S
SCHEME TO PROTECT ESTABLISHED RESTAURANTS FROM HEALTHY COMPETITION.

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

WITH IJ'S HELP, LISA, KEVIN, JESSICA, AND CHRIS ARE CHALLENGING THIS
UNCONSTITUTIONAL VENDING BAN TO SAVE THEIR BUSINESS AND ESTABLISH THAT
VENDORS' RIGHT TO EARN A LIVING DOES NOT DEPEND ON WHETHER THEIR
BUSINESSES HAVE WHEELS OR NOT.

DIAZ, ET AL. V. CITY OF FORT PIERCE, FLORIDA, ET AL.

IN FEBRUARY, A FLORIDA CIRCUIT COURT ISSUED A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
STATING THAT THE CITY OF FORT PIERCE CANNOT ENFORCE ITS
UNCONSTITUTIONAL BAN ON FOOD TRUCKS OPERATING WITHIN 500 FEET OF
ANOTHER ESTABLISHMENT THAT SELLS FOOD. FORT PIERCE'S LAW WAS CREATED IN
2014 FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF PROTECTING RESTAURANT OWNERS FROM
COMPETITION. FOOD TRUCK OWNERS BENNY DIAZ AND BRIAN PEFFER JOINED WITH
IJ LAST DECEMBER TO CHALLENGE THE BAN AND, THANKS TO THIS RULING, THEY
AND OTHER FOOD TRUCK OWNERS CAN OPERATE THEIR FOOD TRUCKS WHILE
LITIGATION CONTINUES, UNTIL THE BAN IS STRUCK DOWN FOR GOOD.

SURFVIVE, ET AL. V. CITY OF SOUTH PADRE ISLAND

THE LATEST CASE IN OUR NATIONAL STREET VENDING INITIATIVE TAKES US TO
SOUTH PADRE ISLAND, TEXAS, WHERE WE ARE CHALLENGING THE
CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE CITY'S REQUIREMENT THAT ALL FOOD TRUCKS OBTAIN
PERMISSION FROM A BRICK-AND-MORTAR RESTAURANT BEFORE OPENING FOR
BUSINESS, AS WELL AS ITS ARBITRARY CAP ON FOOD TRUCK PERMITS THAT
PROHIBITS MORE THAN 12 FOOD TRUCKS FROM OPERATING ON THE ISLAND. AMONG
THE VENDORS CAUGHT IN THE CITY'S CROSSHAIRS ARE LOCAL NONPROFIT
SURFVIVE AND ITS FOOD TRUCK, ALONG WITH BROTHERS ANUBIS AND RAMSES
AVALOS AND THEIR CHILE DE ARBOL FOOD TRUCK. THE CITY'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

LAWS PROHIBIT BOTH FROM OPENING FOR BUSINESS ON SOUTH PADRE ISLAND, AND THEY WILL FIGHT WITH IJ UNTIL THE CITY PUTS AN END TO ITS ILLEGAL ECONOMIC PROTECTIONISM.

NIANG V. CARROLL

IN OCTOBER 2018, THE U.S. SUPREME COURT EFFECTIVELY BROUGHT TO AN END A FOUR-YEAR CHALLENGE TO MISSOURI'S LICENSING OF AFRICAN-STYLE HAIR BRAIDERS. THE BRAIDERS, WORKING WITH IJ, CHALLENGED THE STATE'S REQUIREMENT THAT THEY SPEND THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS ON 1,500 HOURS OF COSMETOLOGY TRAINING EVEN THOUGH THE TRAINING DID NOT COVER BRAIDING. IN JUNE 2018, THE MISSOURI GENERAL ASSEMBLY EXEMPTED BRAIDERS FROM THE COSMETOLOGY LICENSE AND ESTABLISHED A NEW SPECIALTY BRAIDING LICENSE INSTEAD. BECAUSE IJ'S LAWSUIT CHALLENGED THE PREVIOUS REQUIREMENT THAT BRAIDERS OBTAIN A COSMETOLOGY OR BARBER LICENSE IN ORDER TO BRAID HAIR FOR A LIVING, THE NEW LAW MADE THE DISPUTE HYPOTHETICAL, OR, IN LEGAL TERMS, MOOT. AFTER THE LAW TOOK EFFECT LAST AUGUST, BOTH IJ AND THE STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL FILED A JOINT SUGGESTION OF MOOTNESS AND MOTION FOR VACATUR WITH THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. AND THE HIGH COURT BROUGHT THE CASE TO AN END BY VACATING THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 8TH CIRCUIT'S UNFAVORABLE RULING AND SENDING THE CASE BACK TO THE LOWER COURT TO BE DISMISSED AS MOOT.

N'DAKPRI V. LOUISIANA STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY

IJ IS PURSUING A SIMILAR CHALLENGE ON BEHALF OF THREE BRAIDERS IN LOUISIANA, WHERE THE STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY REQUIRES HAIR BRAIDERS TO ACQUIRE A BRAIDING LICENSE, WHICH ENTAILS COMPLETING 500 HOURS OF

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

UNNECESSARY AND IRRELEVANT TRAINING, PASSING AN EXAM, AND PAYING ANNUAL LICENSING FEES. BUT EVEN THOSE WHO WANT TO COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FIND IT NEARLY IMPOSSIBLE TO DO SO SINCE THE ONLY COSMETOLOGY SCHOOL THAT OFFERS THE COURSE IS FOUR HOURS AWAY FROM NEW ORLEANS. LOUISIANA'S SPECIALTY BRAIDING LICENSE IS THE MOST ONEROUS IN THE COUNTRY, BUT THE BOARD KEEPS IT THAT WAY BECAUSE THE LICENSE REQUIREMENT IS NOT MEANT TO BENEFIT THE PUBLIC. INSTEAD, THE LICENSE BENEFITS COSMETOLOGY SCHOOLS THAT WANT TO PROFIT FROM BRAIDERS AND EXISTING COSMETOLOGISTS WHO DO NOT WANT TO COMPETE WITH BRAIDERS. THIS CASE CONTINUES IJ'S NATIONAL BRAIDING FREEDOM INITIATIVE, WHICH SEEKS TO PROTECT BRAIDERS' RIGHT TO PURSUE THEIR LIVELIHOODS FREE FROM UNNECESSARY LICENSING LAWS.

HIGHT V. US DEP'T OF HOMELAND SECURITY

CAPTAIN HIGHT HAS BEEN A MERCHANT MARINER FOR MORE THAN 20 YEARS, WITH EIGHT OF THOSE YEARS SPENT COMMANDING SHIPS ALL OVER THE WORLD. BUT HE DECIDED TO RETURN TO THE UNITED STATES AND SEEK EMPLOYMENT CLOSER TO HIS FAMILY, WORKING TOWARD GETTING HIS LICENSE TO PILOT COMMERCIAL VESSELS ON THE SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND LAKE ONTARIO. PILOTING ON THE GREAT LAKES IS HIGHLY REGULATED, AND CAPTAIN HIGHT WAS REQUIRED BY THE COAST GUARD TO TRAIN WITH THE SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY PILOTS' ASSOCIATION, A FOR-PROFIT BUSINESS. AFTER DISAGREEMENTS OVER THE FINANCIAL PRACTICES OF THE ASSOCIATION'S LEADERSHIP, THEY SUDDENLY INFORMED THE COAST GUARD THAT THEY RECOMMENDED AGAINST GRANTING CAPTAIN HIGHT A LICENSE. WITH NO MEANINGFUL WAY TO CONTEST THE RECOMMENDATION WITH THE COAST GUARD, HIGHT TEAMED UP WITH IJ IN MARCH TO DEFEND HIS RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS AND ASK THE COAST GUARD TO STOP THE PRACTICE OF DELEGATING ITS POWER TO THE SELF-INTERESTED PRIVATE ORGANIZATION. A

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

VICTORY IN THIS CASE WOULD BOTH VINDICATE CAPTAIN HIGHT AND CURB
UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAWMAKING AUTHORITY AMONG SIMILAR ASSOCIATIONS
NATIONWIDE.

COURTNEY V. GOLTZ

FOR YEARS, BROTHERS JIM AND CLIFF COURTNEY HAVE WANTED TO PROVIDE
CONVENIENT FERRY SERVICE ACROSS LAKE CHELAN IN WASHINGTON STATE TO
ENHANCE ECONOMIC PROSPERITY IN THEIR SMALL COMMUNITY LOCATED AT THE
NORTHERN END OF THE LAKE. BUT THE STATE REQUIRES JIM AND CLIFF TO
EITHER OBTAIN THE EXISTING FERRY COMPANY'S PERMISSION TO COMPETE, OR
PROVE IN A TRIAL-LIKE HEARING THAT THE EXISTING COMPANY IS NOT
PROVIDING "REASONABLE AND ADEQUATE SERVICE" AND THAT A NEW SERVICE IS
NECESSARY. REALIZING THAT THE STATE IS MORE CONCERNED WITH PROTECTING
ESTABLISHED INTERESTS THAN FOSTERING ECONOMIC FREEDOM AND OPPORTUNITY,
JIM AND CLIFF HAVE JOINED WITH IJ TO PROTECT THEIR RIGHT - AND THE
RIGHT OF EVERY AMERICAN - TO PURSUE AN HONEST LIVING FREE FROM
PROTECTIONIST INTERFERENCE BY THE GOVERNMENT. THE CASE REMAINS ON
APPEAL AT THE 9TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.

SANCHEZ V. OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION

IJ JOINED WITH ALTAGRACIA YLUMINADA "ILUMI" SANCHEZ IN APRIL 2018 TO
FIGHT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF
EDUCATION'S (OSSE) REGULATIONS REQUIRING MANY OF THE CITY'S DAY CARE
PROVIDERS TO GO TO COLLEGE OR LOSE THEIR JOBS. THESE DISASTROUS
REGULATIONS WOULD HAVE CAREER-ENDING CONSEQUENCES FOR ILUMI, WHO RUNS A
DAY CARE IN HER HOME IN NORTHEAST D.C. AND HAS WORKED WITH CHILDREN FOR

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

OVER 20 YEARS SINCE COMING TO THE U.S. FROM HER NATIVE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC. TO COMPLY WITH THE NEW REGULATIONS AND RETURN TO SCHOOL FOR A DEGREE IRRELEVANT TO CHILDCARE IS TOO MUCH OF A STRAIN ON ILUMI'S TIME AND MONEY. A WIN IN THIS CASE WILL ENSURE THAT ILUMI AND HUNDREDS OF D.C. DAY CARE PROVIDERS IN HOMES AND IN CENTERS MAY CONTINUE TO DO WHAT THEY LOVE WITHOUT UNWARRANTED GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE.

JACKSON V. KEMP

MARY JACKSON, A CERTIFIED LACTATION COUNSELOR, AND REACHING OUR SISTERS EVERYWHERE (ROSE) - A NONPROFIT DEDICATED TO PROVIDING BREASTFEEDING SUPPORT TO MINORITY COMMUNITIES - JOINED WITH IJ IN JUNE 2018 TO CHALLENGE GEORGIA'S MANDATE THAT LACTATION CONSULTANTS BE CERTIFIED BY THE INTERNATIONAL BOARD OF LACTATION CONSULTANT EXAMINERS (IBCLC). DOING SO REQUIRES ROUGHLY TWO YEARS OF COLLEGE COURSES AND MORE THAN 300 HOURS OF SUPERVISED CLINICAL WORK. THOSE WHO FAIL TO COMPLY ARE CHARGED WITH FINES OF UP TO \$500 PER DAY. THESE CONSULTANTS HAVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE UNDER THEIR BELTS, AND THERE IS ABSOLUTELY NO PROOF THAT BEING IBCLC-CERTIFIED IMPROVES THE QUALITY OF CARE. THIS CASE SERVES TO PROTECT THEIR RIGHTS, AND THE RIGHTS OF NON-IBCLC LACTATION CONSULTANTS ACROSS THE STATE, TO EARN A LIVING PROVIDING MOTHERS AND BABIES WITH THE CARE THEY NEED. THE TRIAL COURT DISMISSED OUR CASE, AND WE ARE NOW UP ON APPEAL AT THE GEORGIA SUPREME COURT.

VISIBLY, INC. V. THE MEDICAL LICENSING BOARD OF INDIANA, ET AL.;
OPTERNATIVE, INC. V. SOUTH CAROLINA BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

TECHNOLOGY ALLOWS CONSUMERS TO TAKE A ROUTINE VISION TEST IN THE

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

COMFORT OF THEIR OWN HOME USING THEIR PERSONAL COMPUTER AND SMARTPHONE.

AN OPHTHALMOLOGIST REVIEWS THE RESULTS AND WRITES A PRESCRIPTION.

DEVELOPED BY HEALTHCARE STARTUP VISIBLY, THESE TESTS ARE INEXPENSIVE

AND ENABLE MORE PEOPLE TO GET EYEGLOSS PRESCRIPTIONS MORE QUICKLY AND

EASILY THAN EVER BEFORE. OPTOMETRISTS HAVE GONE TO EXTRAORDINARY

LENGTHS TO PROTECT THEMSELVES FROM ONLINE COMPETITORS LIKE VISIBLY. FOR

EXAMPLE, THE INDIANA AND SOUTH CAROLINA OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATIONS

AGGRESSIVELY LOBBIED TO CONVINCE LEGISLATORS TO BAN THE USE OF

TECHNOLOGY IN THE EYE CARE SPACE. IN APRIL, IJ FILED SUIT IN INDIANA TO

STAMP OUT THIS BLATANT ECONOMIC PROTECTIONISM AND PROTECT BOTH THE

RIGHTS OF ENTREPRENEURS TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING, AND THE RIGHTS OF

DOCTORS AND PATIENTS TO BENEFIT FROM MODERN TECHNOLOGY. THIS SUIT

BUILDS ON IJ'S ONGOING LITIGATION IN SOUTH CAROLINA AND WILL SET VITAL

LEGAL PRECEDENT PROTECTING INNOVATION IN HEALTH CARE AND OTHER

INDUSTRIES FOR DECADES TO COME.

BIRCHANSKY, ET AL. V. CLABAUGH, ET AL.

CERTIFICATE OF NEED (CON) LAWS REQUIRE MEDICAL PROVIDERS TO PROVE TO

THE GOVERNMENT THAT THERE IS A "NEED" FOR NEW MEDICAL SERVICES BEFORE

THEY ARE ALLOWED TO OFFER THEM. IJ CLIENT OPHTHALMOLOGIST LEE

BIRCHANSKY IS JUST ONE CASUALTY OF THIS SYSTEM. FOR MORE THAN 20 YEARS,

DR. BIRCHANSKY HAS TRIED TO OPEN HIS OWN OUTPATIENT SURGERY CENTER NEXT

TO HIS OFFICE IN CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA. THOUGH HE IS RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF

THE TOP OPHTHALMOLOGISTS IN THE COUNTRY, DR. BIRCHANSKY WAS DENIED A

CERTIFICATE OF NEED TO OPEN HIS CENTER ON FOUR SEPARATE OCCASIONS -

EACH TIME AFTER TWO EXISTING OPERATING FACILITIES INTERVENED TO PROTECT

THEIR BUSINESSES FROM COMPETITION. THE CASE REMAINS ON APPEAL AT THE

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 8TH CIRCUIT.

SINGH, ET AL. V. NC DEPT. OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL.

ANOTHER CHALLENGE TO A CON LAW TAKES US TO WINSTON-SALEM, NORTH CAROLINA, WHERE WE HAVE TEAMED UP WITH DR. GAJENDRA SINGH. FOR YEARS, DR. SINGH WATCHED HIS PATIENTS STRUGGLE TO AFFORD THE SOARING COSTS OF IMAGING SERVICES LIKE MRI SCANS - WHICH IN NORTH CAROLINA AVERAGE NEARLY \$2,000 PER SCAN. HE KNEW THERE HAD TO BE A BETTER WAY, SO HE OPENED FORSYTH IMAGING CENTER IN 2017 TO PROVIDE X-RAYS, ULTRASOUNDS, ECHOCARDIOGRAMS, CT SCANS, AND MRI SCANS AT TRANSPARENT, AFFORDABLE PRICES. BUT THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA PROHIBITS DOCTORS FROM OFFERING NEW SERVICES OR BUYING NEW EQUIPMENT WITHOUT FIRST OBTAINING A "CERTIFICATE OF NEED." IN DR. SINGH'S CASE, A BOARD MADE UP OF HEALTH INDUSTRY INSIDERS DECIDED THERE WAS NO NEED FOR ANOTHER MRI SCANNER IN HIS REGION AND PREVENTED HIM FROM EVEN APPLYING TO PURCHASE THIS ESSENTIAL PIECE OF EQUIPMENT. BY STIFLING COMPETITION, CON LAWS DIRECTLY HARM THOUSANDS OF PATIENTS, WHO MUST SEEK EXPENSIVE TREATMENT FROM EXISTING PROVIDERS. A VICTORY IN THIS CASE WILL TRANSFORM THE LEGAL LANDSCAPE, VINDICATING THE RIGHT OF DR. SINGH - AND OTHER MEDICAL ENTREPRENEURS - TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING BRINGING INNOVATION TO AN INDUSTRY THAT DESPERATELY NEEDS IT.

ALEXIS BAILLY VINEYARD, INC. V. DOHMAN

UNDER AN ONEROUS STATE LAW, WINERIES IN MINNESOTA CANNOT LEGALLY MAKE WINE UNLESS MOST OF THE WINERY'S GRAPES ARE GROWN IN MINNESOTA. IT IS POSSIBLE TO GET A GOVERNMENT WAIVER IF THE GRAPE-CULTIVATION WEATHER

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

HAS BEEN BAD THAT YEAR, BUT THIS RELIEF IS FAR TOO UNCERTAIN TO RELY ON. THE OUT-OF-STATE GRAPE CAP MAKES IT MORE EXPENSIVE FOR CONSUMERS TO BUY THEIR FAVORITE WINES IN MINNESOTA, AND REDUCES THEIR CHOICES, IN ORDER TO PROTECT THE STATE'S GRAPE INDUSTRY FROM HEALTHY ECONOMIC COMPETITION. TWO FARM WINERIES, ALEXIS BAILLY VINEYARD AND NEXT CHAPTER WINERY, TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO CHALLENGE THE LAW. THOUGH A MINNESOTA FEDERAL JUDGE DISMISSED THE LAWSUIT IN APRIL 2018, IJ WILL PUSH FORWARD TO CHALLENGE THESE DISCRIMINATORY REGULATIONS ON APPEAL. A VICTORY IN THIS LAWSUIT WILL ENHANCE INTERSTATE COMMERCE THAT BINDS THE COUNTRY TOGETHER AND COULD ROLL BACK SIMILAR HARMFUL REGULATIONS ACROSS THE UNITED STATES.

SHAW, ET AL. V. METRO. GOV'T OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, IS THE CENTER OF COUNTRY MUSIC. YET, INCREDIBLY, THE CITY BANS MUSICIANS FROM MAKING MUSIC IN THEIR OWN HOMES. NASHVILLE HAS OUTLAWED HOME-BASED BUSINESSES, PREVENTING LOCAL MUSICIANS, HAIR STYLISTS, AND OTHER BUDDING ENTREPRENEURS FROM BUILDING THEIR OWN AMERICAN DREAM. NASHVILLE RESIDENTS LIKE IJ CLIENTS LIJ SHAW AND PAT RAYNOR FACE STEEP FINES IF ANY CUSTOMERS PHYSICALLY COME TO THEIR HOMES TO DO BUSINESS. BUT IJ AND THE BEACON CENTER OF TENNESSEE HAVE TEAMED UP TO VINDICATE THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO USE THEIR HOME TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING.

RUSSINKO, ET AL. V. NJ DEP'T OF HEALTH, ET AL

HOME BAKERS HEATHER RUSSINKO, LIZ CIBOTARIU, AND MARTHA RABELLO HAVE TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO CONTEST THE NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH'S

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

REQUIREMENT THAT THEY BE LICENSED AS A "RETAIL FOOD ESTABLISHMENT" TO SELL THEIR HOMEMADE GOODS. THIS ENTAILS USING A COMMERCIAL-GRADE KITCHEN THAT IS SEPARATE FROM ONE'S PERSONAL HOME KITCHEN, PAYING FEES, AND ABIDING BY HUNDREDS OF PAGES OF REGULATIONS. BANNING THE SALE OF HOME-BAKED GOODS DIRECTLY TO CONSUMERS SERVES NO OTHER PURPOSE THAN TO GIVE COMMERCIAL BAKERS UNDUE PROTECTION FROM COMPETITION. THE COURT SERVED IJ AND THE HOMEBAKERS A FIRST-ROUND VICTORY IN APRIL 2018, WHEN IT DENIED THE NEW JERSEY HEALTH DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST TO DISMISS THE LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE STATE'S BAN. THE CASE WILL CONTINUE UNTIL HOME BAKERS ARE ALLOWED TO SELL THEIR GOODS DIRECTLY TO CONSUMERS - WHETHER OUT OF THEIR HOMES, AT FARMERS' MARKETS, OR AT COMMUNITY EVENTS - WITHOUT SECURING EITHER A BURDENSOME COMMERCIAL LICENSE OR A COMMERCIAL KITCHEN.

HAVEMAN, ET AL. V. BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS, ET AL.

IJ IS TAKING ON A PENNSYLVANIA LAW THAT NOT ONLY VIOLATES DUE PROCESS AND THE RIGHT TO EQUAL PROTECTION; IT ALSO GIVES EVEN MORE POWER TO ALREADY UNACCOUNTABLE GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS. THE COMMONWEALTH'S COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCE LAW, WHICH REQUIRES INDIVIDUALS TO HAVE "GOOD MORAL CHARACTER" IN ORDER TO GET A LICENSE, DENIES EX-OFFENDERS LIKE OUR CLIENTS COURTNEY HAVEMAN AND AMANDA SPILLANE FROM CONTRIBUTING TO SOCIETY AND HAVING A SECOND CHANCE AT LIFE. AFTER SPENDING MONTHS AND THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS ATTENDING COSMETOLOGY SCHOOL, COURTNEY AND AMANDA WERE DENIED A LICENSE DESPITE BOTH HAVING TURNED THEIR LIVES AROUND AND THE FACT THAT THEIR PRIOR CONVICTIONS HAVE NO RELATIONSHIP TO BEAUTY AND FACIAL CARE. REFUSING TO GIVE UP, THEY JOINED WITH IJ TO BRING AN

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

END TO THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT IN DECEMBER 2018. A VICTORY IN THIS CASE WOULD EMPOWER COURTNEY, AMANDA, AND THOSE WHO HAVE ALSO GROWN FROM THEIR PAST MISTAKES TO CONTINUE KEEPING THEIR LIVES ON TRACK. THIS CASE PRESENTS IJ WITH ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY TO STRIKE A MAJOR BLOW TO UNREASONABLE LAWS THAT MAKE IT HARDER FOR AMERICANS TO WORK IN THE FIELD OF THEIR CHOOSING.

LADD, ET AL. V. REAL ESTATE COMM'N OF PA

SALLY LADD IS AN ENTREPRENEUR WHO MANAGED VARIOUS VACATION PROPERTIES IN PENNSYLVANIA'S POCONO MOUNTAINS. THOUGH SHE IS NOT A REAL ESTATE BROKER, SALLY RECEIVED A CALL FROM THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE INFORMING HER THAT SHE WAS UNDER INVESTIGATION FOR THE UNLICENSED PRACTICE OF REAL ESTATE. TO CONTINUE TO OPERATE LEGALLY, SHE WOULD HAVE TO SPEND THREE YEARS WORKING FOR AN ESTABLISHED BROKER, PASS TWO EXAMS, AND SET UP HER OWN BRICK-AND-MORTAR OFFICE IN PENNSYLVANIA. FORCED TO SHUT DOWN HER BUSINESS, SALLY TEAMED UP WITH IJ IN JULY 2017 TO CHALLENGE THIS HEAVY-HANDED LICENSING SCHEME AND VINDICATE THE RIGHTS OF ENTREPRENEURS THROUGHOUT PENNSYLVANIA. IN JUNE 2018, THE PENNSYLVANIA COMMONWEALTH COURT DISMISSED THE LAWSUIT, BUT IJ AND SALLY WILL PRESS THE CASE FORWARD ON APPEAL TO THE PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT.

GARRETT V. STATE BOARD PHARMACY

FORTY-FIVE STATES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALLOW PATIENTS TO PURCHASE MEDICATION DIRECTLY FROM THE DOCTOR PRESCRIBING IT. THIS PRACTICE, KNOWN AS "DOCTOR DISPENSING," IS A SAFE AND EFFECTIVE WAY FOR

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

DOCTORS TO INCREASE PATIENTS' ACCESS TO THE MEDICATION THEY NEED, AND IS OFFERED BY A MAJORITY OF DOCTORS NATIONWIDE. IN TEXAS, HOWEVER, DOCTORS ARE BANNED FROM DISPENSING UNLESS THEY PRACTICE IN CERTAIN "RURAL" AREAS MORE THAN 15 MILES FROM A PHARMACY - A CONDITION THAT PREVENTS THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF TEXAS DOCTORS FROM PROVIDING THIS BENEFICIAL SERVICE. BUT THE TEXAS CONSTITUTION FORBIDS GOVERNMENT FROM IMPOSING UNREASONABLE AND PROTECTIONIST RESTRICTIONS ON THE RIGHT TO PURSUE A CHOSEN BUSINESS, AND THESE PROTECTIONS ARE NO LESS APPLICABLE TO LICENSED DOCTORS THAN ANYONE ELSE. THAT IS WHY DR. GARRETT AND DR. HELD HAVE TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FILE A LAWSUIT CHALLENGING TEXAS'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL BAN ON DOCTOR DISPENSING. THIS CASE CONTINUES IJ'S DECADES-LONG FIGHT TO ESTABLISH ECONOMIC LIBERTY AS A FOUNDATIONAL RIGHT WORTHY OF GENUINE JUDICIAL PROTECTION.

AUGUST KERSTEN, ET AL. V. CITY OF MANDAN

THE FIRST AMENDMENT DOES NOT ALLOW GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS TO PICK AND CHOOSE WHO GETS TO SPEAK AND WHAT THOSE SPEAKERS CAN AND CANNOT SAY. YET THAT IS EXACTLY WHAT OFFICIALS IN MANDAN, NORTH DAKOTA, HAVE BEEN DOING BY AGGRESSIVELY ENFORCING THE CITY'S SIGN CODE. ONE VICTIM OF THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL SPEECH POLICING IS AUGUST "AUGIE" KERSTEN, OWNER OF THE LONESOME DOVE SALOON AND DANCE HALL. AUGIE INCURRED THE WRATH OF MANDAN OFFICIALS WHEN HE DECIDED TO SPRUCE UP ONE SIDE OF HIS AGING SALOON BY COVERING UP AN OLD BEER LOGO WITH A MURAL. BECAUSE AUGIE HAD PAINTED THE NAME OF HIS BUSINESS ON HIS OWN BUILDING, THE CITY OF MANDAN LABELED THE MURAL "ILLEGAL ADVERTISING" AND THREATENED HIM WITH THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN FINES UNLESS HE REMOVED IT. AUGIE'S WAS JUST ONE OF SEVERAL LOCAL BUSINESSES SUBJECTED TO SUCH HARASSMENT. IN MAY

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

2019, IJ SUED THE CITY IN FEDERAL COURT FOR VIOLATING THE FIRST AMENDMENT, AND WITHIN 48 HOURS, WON A FIRST-ROUND VICTORY. IN A 10-PAGE OPINION RECOGNIZING THAT "COMMERCIAL SPEECH IS VALUABLE AND SERVES AN IMPORTANT PUBLIC FUNCTION," THE COURT ISSUED A RARE TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER (TRO) COMPELLING THE CITY TO STOP ENFORCING ITS SIGN CODE AGAINST AUGIE AND OTHER BUSINESSES WHILE IJ'S CASE PROCEEDS.

CASTILLO V. PHILIP

IN 2014, HEATHER CASTILLO LEFT AN UNFULFILLING CAREER TO FOUND CONSTITUTION NUTRITION, A BUSINESS THAT SPECIALIZES IN HEALTH COACHING. AS A PRIVATELY CERTIFIED HEALTH COACH, HEATHER OPERATED SUCCESSFULLY AND WITHOUT COMPLAINT - FIRST IN CALIFORNIA AND THEN IN FLORIDA - FOR NEARLY FOUR YEARS. BUT IN MAY 2017, HEATHER WAS FORCED TO SHUT DOWN COMPLETELY AFTER A LICENSED DIETITIAN FILED A COMPLAINT WITH THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ALLEGING THAT HEATHER WAS ENGAGING IN THE UNLICENSED PRACTICE OF NUTRITION/DIETETICS. ACCORDING TO FLORIDA LAW, INDIVIDUALS OFFERING DIETARY ADVICE MUST EARN A BACHELOR'S DEGREE IN NUTRITION OR AN EQUIVALENT FIELD, PRACTICE 900 SUPERVISED HOURS, PASS AN EXAM, AND PAY FEES UP TO \$290. FAILING TO COMPLY IS A FIRST-DEGREE MISDEMEANOR PUNISHABLE BY UP TO ONE YEAR IN JAIL. HEATHER JOINED WITH IJ IN OCTOBER 2017 TO VINDICATE HER FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND SET PRECEDENT THAT GOVERNMENT DOES NOT HAVE THE POWER TO GIVE ANY GROUP A MONOPOLY ON COMMON, EVERYDAY SPEECH.

CATO INSTITUTE V. SEC, ET AL.

IJ IS REPRESENTING THE CATO INSTITUTE, A D.C.-BASED THINK TANK THAT

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

WANTS TO PUBLISH A BOOK WRITTEN BY AN ENTREPRENEUR WHO, AS HE TELLS IT, WAS THE VICTIM OF AN OVERZEALOUS GOVERNMENT INVESTIGATION AT THE HANDS OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION (SEC). ALTHOUGH THE SEC AGREED TO SETTLE HIS CASE WITH NO ADMISSION OF WRONGDOING, HE CANNOT TELL HIS STORY - OR EVEN DISCLOSE HIS NAME - BECAUSE THE AGENCY DEMANDED THAT HE AGREE TO A GAG ORDER PROHIBITING HIM FROM SUGGESTING THAT HE WAS NOT ACTUALLY GUILTY. GAG ORDERS LIKE THESE ARE ASTONISHINGLY COMMON. FACED WITH THE RISK OF STAGGERING PENALTIES AND YEARS OF LITIGATION, MANY PEOPLE AGREE TO RESOLVE THE MATTER QUICKLY BY PROMISING IN RETURN TO NEVER TELL THEIR SIDE OF THE STORY. BUT THE CONSTITUTION DOES NOT PERMIT GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS TO WIELD THIS KIND OF POWER, AND A VICTORY IN THIS CASE WILL REAFFIRM THE BASIC FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO CRITICIZE THE GOVERNMENT.

HINES V. QUILLIVAN

FROM 2002 TO 2012, DR. RON HINES - A RETIRED AND PHYSICALLY DISABLED TEXAS-LICENSED VETERINARIAN - USED THE INTERNET TO GIVE ADVICE TO PET OWNERS ACROSS THE COUNTRY AND AROUND THE GLOBE. BUT ACCORDING TO THE STATE OF TEXAS, IT IS ILLEGAL FOR A VETERINARIAN TO GIVE ADVICE TO A PET OWNER WITHOUT FIRST EXAMINING THE ANIMAL IN PERSON. SO, THE TEXAS STATE BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS SHUT RON DOWN, SUSPENDED HIS LICENSE, AND FINED HIM. WHEN IJ FIRST LAUNCHED A COURTROOM CHALLENGE TO DEFEND RON'S RIGHT TO SPEAK IN 2013, A FEDERAL APPEALS COURT RULED THAT THE FIRST AMENDMENT DID NOT APPLY TO A PROFESSIONAL'S ADVICE. IN RESPONSE, IJ LAUNCHED A SERIES OF NEW CASES ACROSS THE COUNTRY AND FILED A PIVOTAL AMICUS BRIEF DEFENDING AMERICANS' RIGHT TO OCCUPATIONAL SPEECH THAT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT EMBRACED EMPHATICALLY.

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

WE REFILED THIS CASE IN OCTOBER 2018 IN LIGHT OF THE NEW PRECEDENT. A VICTORY IN THIS CASE WILL NOT ONLY FREE DR. HINES TO HELP PET OWNERS AROUND THE WORLD, IT WILL ESTABLISH IMPORTANT LEGAL PROTECTION FOR INNOVATION, INTERNET FREEDOM, AND FREE SPEECH FOR ALL AMERICANS.

HOLLAND V. WILLIAMS

IJ SUCCESSFULLY CHALLENGED COLORADO'S PERNICIOUS, SPEECH-SQUELCHING CAMPAIGN FINANCE REGULATIONS IN JUNE 2018, UPHOLDING THE RIGHT TO SPEAK OUT ABOUT POLITICS WITHOUT FEAR OF BEING SUED AND SILENCED. IN COLORADO, ANYONE COULD FILE A PRIVATE LAWSUIT ALLEGING A VIOLATION OF THE STATE'S CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS. AS A RESULT, COLORADO'S CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAW WAS ROUTINELY USED TO FILE LAWSUITS, NOT OUT OF GENUINE INTEREST IN ENFORCING THE LAW, BUT TO HARASS OR INTIMIDATE POLITICAL OPPONENTS. TAMMY HOLLAND KNEW THIS ALL TOO WELL. PRIOR TO A LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD ELECTION, SHE PLACED TWO ADS IN A LOCAL NEWSPAPER AND WAS SUBSEQUENTLY SUED BY SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS. SHE WAS EVENTUALLY CLEARED OF ALL WRONGDOING AND, THANKS TO IJ'S HELP, THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT OF COLORADO RECENTLY RULED THE REGULATIONS WERE UNCONSTITUTIONAL, PAVING THE WAY FOR ENSURING THAT ALL COLORADANS MAY FREELY SPEAK THEIR OPINIONS ABOUT THE ISSUES THAT MATTER TO THEM. IN FY19, IJ RECEIVED FROM THE GOVERNMENT \$390,000 IN FEES FOR THIS CASE.

JARLSTROM V. ALDRIDGE

IN 2013, OREGON RESIDENT MATS JARLSTROM'S WIFE RECEIVED A RED LIGHT CAMERA TICKET, SPARKING MATS' INTEREST IN HOW EXACTLY THE LIGHTS ARE TIMED. MATS BEGAN WRITING AND SPEAKING ABOUT HOW LOCAL RED-LIGHT

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

CAMERAS MISUSE THE STANDARD MATHEMATICAL FORMULA FOR THE TIMING OF TRAFFIC LIGHTS. LOCAL NEWS STATIONS COVERED HIS STORY, AND HE PRESENTED HIS RESEARCH AT A NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS. BUT OREGON'S ENGINEER LICENSING BOARD WAS NOT HAPPY ABOUT MATS' SPEECH AND FINED HIM \$500 FOR THE UNLICENSED PRACTICE OF ENGINEERING. ACCORDING TO THE BOARD, ONLY LICENSED ENGINEERS ARE PERMITTED TO TALK ABOUT ENGINEERING IN OREGON. MATS JOINED WITH IJ IN APRIL 2017 TO ASK THE COURTS TO PROTECT THE FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF ALL OREGONIANS TO SPEAK FREELY, REGARDLESS OF THE TOPIC. IN DECEMBER 2018, THE FEDERAL COURT RULED ALMOST ENTIRELY IN MATS'S FAVOR, HOLDING THAT MATS COULD SAFELY TALK ABOUT HIS TRAFFIC LIGHT THEORIES, AND THAT THE STATE CANNOT PUNISH MATS - OR ANYONE ELSE - FOR DESCRIBING THEMSELVES TRUTHFULLY USING THE WORD "ENGINEER." IN ADDITION, IJ RECEIVED \$250,000 IN FEES FOR THIS CASE IN FY19.

MISSISSIPPI BOARD OF LICENSURE FOR PROF. ENG. AND SURVEYORS V. BRENT MELTON

MISSISSIPPI ENTREPRENEURS BRENT MELTON AND SCOTT DOW FOUNDED THE INNOVATIVE STARTUP VIZALINE, LLC, TO PROVIDE BANKS - ESPECIALLY SMALL COMMUNITY BANKS - WITH A COST-EFFECTIVE WAY TO ASSESS SMALL PROPERTY ASSETS THAT THEY ACCEPT AS COLLATERAL FOR LOANS. IN 2017, HOWEVER, THE MISSISSIPPI BOARD OF LICENSURE FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND SURVEYORS - TO PROTECT THEMSELVES FROM COMPETITION - SUED THE COMPANY, CLAIMING IT WAS PRACTICING UNLICENSED SURVEYING, EVEN THOUGH IT WAS SIMPLY USING PUBLIC INFORMATION TO DRAW MAPS ON A COMPUTER. WITH HELP FROM IJ, BRENT, SCOTT, AND VIZALINE ARE FIGHTING BACK TO PROTECT THEIR FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO GENERATE AND DISSEMINATE INFORMATION TO ADVISE THEIR CLIENTS. A FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT DISMISSED THE CASE IN DECEMBER 2018,

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

AND IT IS NOW ON APPEAL AT THE 5TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS.

PCHS V. GRAFILO

BOB SMITH, OWNER OF THE PACIFIC COAST HORSESHOEING SCHOOL (PCHS), TEAMED UP WITH IJ IN OCTOBER 2017 TO VINDICATE HIS FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO TEACH HORSESHOEING TO ANYBODY WHO WANTS TO LEARN. THE LAWSUIT CHALLENGES A CALIFORNIA LAW REQUIRING THAT TRADE SCHOOLS LIKE BOB'S DENY ADMISSION TO ANY STUDENT WHO HAS NOT COMPLETED HIGH SCHOOL OR A STATE-APPROVED EQUIVALENT. HE IS JOINED IN THE SUIT BY ESTEBAN NAREZ, A RANCH HAND WHO WANTS TO LEARN HOW TO SHOE HORSES BUT CANNOT BE ADMITTED BECAUSE HE NEVER GRADUATED HIGH SCHOOL. NOT ONLY DOES THE LAW VIOLATE BOB AND ESTEBAN'S RIGHTS TO TEACH AND TO LEARN, IT PLACES AN UNTOWARD BURDEN ON THOSE WHO ARE AMONG SOCIETY'S MOST VULNERABLE POPULATIONS. THE CASE IS CURRENTLY ON APPEAL AT THE NINTH CIRCUIT AFTER A DISTRICT-COURT JUDGE RULED THAT THE FIRST AMENDMENT DOES NOT PROTECT BOB AND ESTEBAN'S RIGHTS TO TEACH AND LEARN. IJ STANDS COMMITTED TO THE PRINCIPLE THAT TEACHING IS PROTECTED SPEECH AND ANTICIPATES A RULING FROM THE 9TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS IN 2020.

SOUTH MOUNTAIN CREAMERY, LLC V. U.S. FDA

IN APRIL 2019, A FEDERAL JUDGE IN PENNSYLVANIA DENIED THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION'S MOTION TO DISMISS IJ'S LAWSUIT ABOUT WHETHER ADDITIVE-FREE SKIM MILK CAN BE LABELED AND SOLD AS "SKIM MILK." CURRENT FDA REGULATIONS REQUIRE FARMERS TO ADD SYNTHETIC VITAMINS INTO SKIM MILK BEFORE SALE. DAIRY FARMER RANDY SOWERS WANTS TO SELL ALL-NATURAL SKIM MILK WITHOUT ADDITIVES, BUT THE FDA FORCES HIM TO LABEL HIS

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

PRODUCT AS "IMITATION SKIM MILK." ARMED WITH THIS FIRST-ROUND VICTORY, IJ AND RANDY WILL PRESS ON TO PROTECT THE RIGHT OF ALL BUSINESSES TO COMMUNICATE TRUTHFUL INFORMATION TO THEIR CUSTOMERS.

ESPINOZA V. MT DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT ANNOUNCED IN JUNE THAT IT WILL HEAR AN APPEAL OF A CASE IN WHICH THE MONTANA SUPREME COURT RULED THE GOVERNMENT MUST EXCLUDE RELIGIOUS OPTIONS FOR PARENTS WHO WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN A TAX-CREDIT SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM. IJ FILED SUIT ON BEHALF OF THREE MONTANA FAMILIES IN 2015 TO DEFEND THE PROGRAM FROM AN ATTACK BY THE MONTANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, WHICH ATTEMPTED TO LIMIT THESE SCHOLARSHIPS TO NONRELIGIOUS PRIVATE SCHOOLS. AS MOST OF THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN THE STATE ARE RELIGIOUS, THIS RULE DENIES GENUINE CHOICE TO THE PARTICIPATING FAMILIES. THOUGH THE MONTANA SUPREME COURT UNFORTUNATELY RULED AGAINST IJ, TAKING THIS CASE TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT PROVIDES A GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY NOT ONLY TO RESTORE EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM IN MONTANA, BUT ALSO TO PERMANENTLY REMOVE BARRIERS TO EDUCATIONAL CHOICE PROGRAMS NATIONWIDE.

GILLIS, ET AL. V. HASSON, JR., ET AL.

IN MAINE, IJ AND THE FIRST LIBERTY INSTITUTE FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUIT IN AUGUST 2018 TO OVERTURN A STATE LAW THAT EXCLUDES PARENTS WHO SELECT RELIGIOUS OPTIONS FROM PARTICIPATING IN THE NATION'S SECOND-OLDEST SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAM. MAINE'S "TUITIONING" PROGRAM, WHICH ENABLES PARENTS IN TOWNS THAT DO NOT OPERATE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS TO CHOOSE THE PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SCHOOL THAT BEST SUITS THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS, HAS

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

BARRED RELIGIOUS OPTIONS FOR NEARLY FOUR DECADES. BUT BY SINGLING OUT RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS, AND ONLY RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS, FOR DISCRIMINATION, MAINE IS VIOLATING BOTH THE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND EQUAL PROTECTION GUARANTEES IN THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. TWO GROUPS AT THE FOREFRONT OF OUR OPPOSITION, THE AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION AND AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE, MOVED TO INTERVENE IN OUR CASE. IJ IMMEDIATELY MOVED TO OPPOSE THE MOTION IN OCTOBER 2018, AND JUST TWO MONTHS LATER, THE INTERVENTION WAS DENIED. THE SAME JUDGE, HOWEVER, RULED IN JUNE TO UPHOLD THE EXCLUSIVE, ANTI-CHOICE LAW. THE CASE IS NOW ON APPEAL AT THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 1ST CIRCUIT.

SUMMIT CHRISTIAN ACADEMY, ET AL. V. MEOTTI, ET AL.

WASHINGTON'S WORK-STUDY PROGRAM IS A FINANCIAL AID PROGRAM THAT PROVIDES FUNDING FOR LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME STUDENTS WHO WANT TO EARN MONEY DURING COLLEGE, OFTEN BY WORKING IN JOBS THAT RELATE TO THEIR FIELD OF STUDY. PARTICIPATING EMPLOYERS RANGE FROM NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS TO BUSINESSES AND GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, BUT ALL HAVE ONE THING IN COMMON: IN ORDER TO PARTICIPATE, THE EMPLOYER AND THE POSITION A STUDENT WOULD FILL MUST NOT HAVE ANY RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION. THE U.S. CONSTITUTION REQUIRES GOVERNMENT TO BE NEUTRAL TOWARD RELIGION, NEITHER FAVORING NOR DISFAVORING IT. THAT IS WHY IJ TEAMED UP WITH A SECTARIAN EMPLOYER - A PRIVATE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL - AND A UNIVERSITY STUDENT GROUP IN AUGUST 2018 TO CHALLENGE WASHINGTON STATE'S SECTARIAN EXCLUSION. A VICTORY IN THIS CASE WILL ENSURE THAT WASHINGTON'S STUDENTS AND RELIGIOUS EMPLOYERS WILL, FOR THE FIRST TIME EVER, HAVE FULL FREEDOM TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROGRAM.

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

FRIEND OF THE COURT BRIEFS

IN ADDITION TO LITIGATING THE ABOVE-DESCRIBED CASES, IJ FILED AMICUS
BRIEFS IN THE FOLLOWING CASES BETWEEN JULY 1, 2018 AND JUNE 30, 2019:

ADRIAN CALISTE, ET AL. V. HARRY E. CANTRELLADRIAN FOWLER, ET AL. V. JOCELYN BENSON, ET AL.ALANA CAIN ET AL. V. NEW ORLEANS CITY, ET AL.BOROUGH OF GLASSBORO V. GROSSMANCAROUSEL FARMS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT V. WOODCREST HOMES, INC.CHONG AND MARILYN YIM, ET AL. V. CITY OF SEATTLECIGAR ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, ET AL. V. FDA, ET AL.DELANO FARMS V. CALIFORNIA TABLE GRAPE COMMISSIONDOE V. WOODARDFRASIER V. DENVER POLICE OFFICERS, EVANS, ET AL.IN RE SOUTHCOAST TITLE AND ESCROW, INC.IN RE WILLIAM E. PAPLAUSKAS, JR.IN RE DANIEL S. BALKUN AND BALKUN TITLE & CLOSING, INC.JAMES THOMAS, DAVID HIXSON V. BILL HALSAM, ET AL.JESSOP, ET AL. V. CITY OF FRESNO, ET AL.LOVE TERMINAL PARTNERS, ET AL. V. UNITED STATESMOSLEY V. TEXAS HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSIONNIEVES V. BARLETTOLSON V. 1999 LEXUSRAFAELI, LLC, ET AL. V. OAKLAND COUNTY, ET AL.RAMOS V. LOUISIANASTATECRAFT PLLC, KORY LANGHOFER, AND THOMAS BASILE V. TOWN OF SNOWFLAKEAND COPPERSTATE FARMS LLC

Name of the organization

INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number

52-1744337

VIOLET DOCK PORT, INC., LLC V. ST. BERNARD PORT, HARBOR, & TERMINAL

DISTRICT

WAL-MART STORES, INC. V. TEXAS ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE COMMISSION

ZAATARI, ET AL. V. CITY OF AUSTIN