IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

Competitive Enterprise Institute, et al.))
and	
National Review, Inc.)
Appellants,)
v.) Nos. 14-CV-101 & 14-CV-126
Michael E. Mann)
Appellee.)

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF

Pursuant to D.C. Court of Appeals Rule 29(b)(2), Dr. Judith A. Curry respectfully moves this Court to grant her leave to file the attached *amicus curiae* brief in support of Appellants' petitions for rehearing *en banc*.¹

I. Dr. Judith A. Curry's Interest in this Case

Dr. Curry is a prominent climate scientist and former thirteen-year chair of the Georgia Institute of Technology's School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences. Dr. Curry has been a member of the National Research Council's Climate Research Committee and the United States Department of Energy's Biological & Environmental Research Advisory Committee. She has authored three books and nearly two hundred scholarly articles on climate science.² Dr. Curry

¹ Counsels for Appellants have consented to the filing of this brief. Counsels for Appellee did not respond to movant's consent request.

² See, e.g., V.I. Khvorostyanov & Judith A. Curry, Kinetics and Thermodynamics of Clouds and Precipitation (2013); J.P. Holton, Judith A. Curry, & J. Doyle eds., Encyclopedia of Atmospheric

also maintains an active blog, Climate Etc., which provides a forum for climate researchers, academics, technical experts from other fields, citizen scientists, and the interested public to engage in a discussion on topics related to climate science and the science-policy interface. Dr. Curry has received numerous federal grants and contracts over the past ten years to study climate science. Her full curriculum vitae is available online.³

As it relates to this case, Dr. Curry has been critical of Appellee Michael Mann's methodological approach to climate science and the conclusions he has reached. Dr. Curry has experienced personal and professional attacks from Dr. Mann for her criticisms of his work. Dr. Mann has a pattern of attacking those who disagree with him and this case is another in a long line of tactics to silence debate over the science of global warming. Dr. Curry is a stalwart supporter of free speech and believes it plays a crucial role in the advancement of scientific debate and the advancement of knowledge, particularly in the controversial and politically charged field of climate science. As such, she has an acute interest in the outcome of this case because should Dr. Mann prevail, he would be emboldened to continue his pattern of attacks against Dr. Curry and others like her who seek to maintain vigorous debate over climate science.

II. Movant's *Amicus Curiae* Brief will assist this Court in assessing Appellants' Petitions for Rehearing *En Banc*.

Scientific progress and democratic governance depend upon vigorous and open debate. The use of libel law in the Courts to intimidate into silence conflicting scientific views injures both a free society and scientific advancement. Especially in a jurisdiction like the District of Columbia — where so many of the Nation's public policy debates occur — speakers and writers

Sciences (2003); Judith A. Curry and P.J. Webster, Thermodynamics of Atmospheres and Oceans (1999).

³ See Judith A. Curry, Curriculum Vitae, http://b.gatech.edu/2k4d6Pf (last visited Jan. 24, 2017).

should be confident in their ability to exercise their free speech rights over politically contentious issues, such as climate science.

Dr. Mann has transgressed scientific norms and offended First Amendment principles by bringing a defamation claim against Appellants for their pointed criticism of his scientific methodology. Dr. Mann's suit is ill-founded because of his behavior toward his critics, particularly *amicus curiae* Dr. Curry, which demonstrates both that the debate over climate science is often contentious and that Dr. Mann ought not to be indulged if scientific debate is not to be curtailed.

Additionally, in its recent transition from the *Dyas/Frye* test to the *Daubert* test for the admissibility of scientific evidence, this Court has embraced the view that generally accepted scientific viewpoints are not always more reliable than the minority opinion. In order for minority views to flourish and develop into arguments that will aid finders of fact, they must be protected from efforts that seek to silence and force them out of the marketplace of ideas.

The District of Columbia has adopted an Anti-SLAPP statute specifically to protect these interests. The panel's decision refusing to dismiss Dr. Mann's suit endangers scientific norms, First Amendment principles, and minority viewpoints. Dr. Judith A. Curry respectfully requests this Court grant her leave to file the accompanying *amicus curiae* brief in support of Appellants' petitions for rehearing *en banc*.

//

//

January 25, 2017

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ John J. Vecchione John J. Vecchione (D.C. Bar. #431764) *Counsel of Record* R. James Valvo, III CAUSE OF ACTION INSTITUTE 1875 Eye Street, N.W., Ste. 800 Washington, D.C. 20006 Telephone: (202) 499-4232 Facsimile: (202) 330-5824 john.vecchione@causeofaction.org

Counsel for Movant Dr. Judith A. Curry

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on January 25, 2017, I caused a copy of the foregoing motion to be

served by the United States Postal Service, postage prepaid, upon:

John B. Williams Williams Lopatto PLLC 1776 K Street, N.W., Suite 800 Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 296-1665 jbwilliams@williamslopatto.com

Catherine Rosato Reilly Cozen O'Connor 1627 I Street, N.W., Suite 1100 Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 912-4800 creilly@cozen.com

Peter J. Fontaine Cozen O'Connor 1900 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19103 (856) 910-5043 pfontaine@cozen.com *Counsel for Appellee Michael E. Mann*

Todd S. Kim Solicitor General for DC 441 4th Street, NW Suite 600 South Washington, DC 20001 todd.kim@dc.gov *Counsel for* amicus *District of Columbia*

Arthur B. Spitzer American Civil Liberties Union of the National Capital Area 1400 20th St., NW #119 *Counsel for* amicus *American Civil Liberties Union of the National Capital Area* Michael A. Carvin Anthony J. Dick Jones Day 51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 879-3939 macarvin@jonesday.com ajdick@jonesday.com *Counsel for Appellant National Review, Inc.*

David B. Rivkin, Jr. Mark I. Bailen Andrew M. Grossman BakerHostetler Washington Square, Suite 1100 1050 Connecticut Ave, NW Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 861-1770 drivkin@bakerlaw.com mbailen@bakerlaw.com agrossman@bakerlaw.com *Counsel for Appellants Competitive Enterprise Institute and Rand Simberg*

Gregg P. Leslie Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press 1156 15th Street NW Suite 1250 Washington DC 20005 Counsel for amici Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press and Committee for Freedom of the Press Phillip C. Chang McGuire Woods LLP 2001 K Street, NW Suite 400 Washington DC 20006 pchang@mcguirewoods.com *Counsel for* amici *Free Beacon, LLC, Newsmax Media, Inc., The Daily Caller LLC, PJ, The Electronic Frontier Foundation, and The Foundation for Cultural Review*

Ilya Shapiro Cato Institute 1000 Massachusetts Ave NW Washington, DC 20001 ishapiro@cato.org *Counsel for* amici *Cato Institute, Reason Foundation, Individual Rights Foundation, and Goldwater Institute*

Seth D. Berlin Mara J. Grassman Shaina Jones Ward Levine Sullivan Koch & Schulz, LLP 1899 L Street, NW, Ste. 200 Washington, DC 20036 *Counsel for* amicus *Reporters Comm. for Freedom of Press*

David A. Cortman Alliance Defending Freedom 15100 N. 90th Street Scottsdale, AZ 85260 *Counsel for* amicus-*App*. *Alliance Defending Freedom*

/s/ John J. Vecchione John J. Vecchione