

FIRST CASE TO SHOW HOW GOVERNMENT MAKES TWITTER SILENCE POLITICAL SPEECH

Federal Judge Mark Wolf Orders Twitter to Testify at Landmark Hearing. Public Can Zoom In.
Judge's Additional Order Seeks Experts to Weigh in on Historic First Amendment Case

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Cambridge, MA (May 13, 2021) – On October 30, 2020, Federal Judge Mark Wolf declared that Dr. Shiva Ayyadurai would likely prevail on his claim in case 20-CV-11889 that the Government of Massachusetts made Twitter silence him in the middle of his election campaign. This historic case is proceeding forward and a hearing is set for May 20, 2021.

The Judge has ordered Twitter to present their position.

This case is the first in the United States that presents powerful evidence that Government and Twitter are hand in glove. The case has garnered multiple victories including surviving motions to dismiss, as well as winning the terms of its Preliminary Injunction whereby the Judge ordered the Government to stop silencing Dr. Shiva on Twitter. On February 1, 2021, the Government violated that Order.

On May 10, 2021 Judge Wolf issued an order for Twitter to appear in court on May 20, 2021 to explain why it should not be made a co-Defendant, and whether the Government was responsible for the February 1, 2021 de-platforming of Dr. Shiva.

On May 13, 2021, Judge Wolf issued a new order seeking Amicus Briefs from supporters of the First Amendment. This case goes to the heart what this country was founded to protect: Freedom of Speech, and especially Political Speech. Here is an excerpt from Judge Wolf's latest order:

This case raises substantial constitutional questions concerning whether Twitter's conduct should be deemed to be state action subject to the limitations of the Free Speech Clause of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. See, e.g. Manhattan Cmty. Access Corp. v. Halleck, 139 S. Ct. 1921, 1928 (2019) ("a private entity can qualify as a state actor in a few limited circumstances—including, for example, . . . when the government compels the private entity to take a particular action); Blum v. Yaretsky, 457 U.S. 991, 1004 (1982) ("a State normally can be held responsible for a private decision only when it has exercised coercive power or has provided such significant encouragement, either overt or covert, that the choice must in law be deemed to be that of the State").

Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se, is not a lawyer. This may be an unusual case in which the court would benefit from the participation of qualified amici curiae. See Strasser v. Doorley,

To register for Zoom hearing, visit <https://forms.mad.uscourts.gov/courtlist.html> and then select the date Thursday May 20, 2021, and Judge Wolf. To contact Dr. Shiva Ayyadurai, email: vashiva@vashiva.com.

###