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In 2006, Jeffrey Heffernan—a detective in the Paterson, New Jersey, police department—was seen holding a mayoral campaign lawn sign while off duty and was immediately demoted on the government’s mistaken belief that Heffernan was supporting the incumbent mayor. Heffernan filed suit against the city of Paterson for violating his First Amendment rights. Ten years, one trial, three district judges, three summary judgment motions, two dismissals, and two appeals later, Heffernan and his lawyers found themselves in the U.S. Supreme Court, in Heffernan v. City of Paterson, No. 14-1280. On April 26, we won.

The issue before the court was unique: It is well-established that nonpolitical public employees cannot be retaliated against for supporting a political candidate. But what if a public employee is demoted because his supervisor mistakenly believes he supports a candidate? A circuit split emerged, with three circuits finding that the employee’s claim was actionable, while the U.S. Court of Appeals later found it was not.

The United States—can choose to join a side in cases in which it is not a party. The office brings immense clout to the side it joins, and it also submits a brief and is provided time at oral argument. Having the solicitor general—who is unofficially considered to be “the 10th justice”—also does wonders for one’s odds at the court; in the last term, the solicitor general participated in 41 cases as amicus curiae and won 71 percent of those cases. We ended up conferencing with members of the SG’s office, including current acting solicitor general Ian Gershengorn. This call was our first real sense of the questions the justices might ask at oral argument. Ominously, we did not hear back from the SG’s office after our call.

In October and November, organizations and law schools—including Georgetown University and the University of Virginia—reached out to us regarding potential amicus briefs, and we met with them about potential issues and arguments.

The tried-and-true way of preparing for Supreme Court oral argument is through moot courts.
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for them to explore. In mid-November, we submitted our opening brief. A week later, we received four amicus briefs in our favor, including—to our surprise—from the solicitor general.

In December, the City of Patterson responded on January 23, filing its reply brief. We then prepared for oral argument. The tried-and-true way of preparing for Supreme Court oral argument is through moot courts, where a panel of experienced lawyers and professors—many of whom have themselves argued before the court—pepper you with questions for roughly an hour and thereafter critique your answers. The goal is to get beat up enough over multiple moots until you begin to anticipate the questions. Mark Frost, who would be the attorney arguing the case, argued at the moots. Ryan Lockman prepared potential questions and ideal answers from the moots for approximately 150 different questions that might be asked at the oral argument. By the time all of the moots were completed, there were not many surprise questions. The trick—which proved to be easier said than done—is to state the answers immediately and succinctly. During this time, we also learned many of the unwritten rules of Supreme Court oral argument, like how to address each justice, how to respond if you are asked multiple questions at once, and when to ask for rebuttal time.

We also attended the moot court for Ginger Anders, assistant to the solicitor general, who would be arguing on behalf of the United States. Set in the bowels of the Justice Department, with intense levels of security (we needed an escort to go anywhere, including the restroom) this moot was one of the major highlights of our Supreme Court experience. We then discussed the case with panel members from the moot, who were attorneys in the SG’s office and elsewhere in the Justice Department.

Finally, oral argument day came, Jan. 19. All of the justices (with the exception of typically silent Justice Clarence Thomas) were active in oral argument. Within seconds, questions were flying. We had anticipated that the “conservative” justices would be critical of our case based on their votes in prior cases involving political patronage, and their questions confirmed our suspicions. Justice Antonin Scalia—in what would prove to be his penultimate oral argument day—was his typical self, asking pointed questions and joking simultaneously. Then, it was time for Ginger Anders to argue. She faced similar questioning. When the city’s counsel argued, Justices Alito and Stephen G. Breyer questioned him with hypotheticals, and soon all four “liberal” justices joined. Justice Anthony M. Kennedy, like usual, seemed to be the swing vote. After argument, we were reasonably confident that we had four in our favor, three against us, and two—Chief Justice John G. Roberts and Kennedy—on the fence.

The justices informally vote on each case in highly secretive conferences that not even the justices’ clerks attend. However, the results are not divulged until the opinion is formally released. The way the Supreme Court releases its opinions is unlike other federal courts. The Supreme Court does not have PACER. It also does not announce which cases are going to be decided ahead of time. Rather, certain days are designated as opinion announcement days, opinions are posted online as they are announced, and you’d better be on the Supreme Court website at 10 a.m. on those days, lest you miss it.

On April 26, at around 10:10, our case popped up on the site. The site did not say who won; you had to actually read the opinion to find out that, which is announced in real time once the justice reads a summary of his/her opinion live at the Supreme Court. But judging by the breakdown in justices, we knew immediately that we won. 6-2, with only Justices Thomas and Samuel Alito dissenting.

Breyer’s opinion was succinct and persuasive. As stated in the opinion, First Amendment retaliation claims are predicated on the supervisor’s motive, not the employee’s intent. Thus, when an employer demotes an employee out of a desire to prevent the employee from engaging in protected activity, the First Amendment has been violated, even if the supervisor’s assumptions were incorrect.

This ruling affects free speech and association claims and will be applied in a litany of different scenarios. There are 21 million public employees, and the vast majority of them occupy nonpolitical positions—they are teachers and firefighters, nurses and letter carriers, bus drivers and police officers. Of whom, Breyer’s decision profoundly shaped the environment in which they work. Employees can be free from worry that their conduct will be misinterpreted by their employers and result in political retaliation. Further, an adverse decision would have clearly discouraged other public employees from engaging in protected activity. As Justice Breyer stated, “The discharge of one tells the others that they engage in protected activity at their peril.”

The decision also affects Third Circuit precedent. In Ambrose v. Township of Robinson Pennsylvania, 303 F.3d 488 (3d Cir. 2002), and Fogarty v. Biles, 121 F.3d 886 (3d Cir. 1997), the Third Circuit had ruled that First Amendment retaliation claims required actual protected activity, as intended by the employee. That is now no good law. Now, the employee’s conduct as perceived by the government determines whether a First Amendment retaliation claim is actionable.

Jeffernan has now been remanded to the Third Circuit for a determination as to what occurs next. Our case has changed the law for millions of public employees and has defined the meaning of the First Amendment. This case will have an impact on First Amendment jurisprudence, as well as potentially other areas like perceived race or religion discrimination claims. What more could any attorney ask for in his or her career? •

Moving on to trademarks, the effect of Brexit again varies depending upon the specific type of trademark registration involved. The biggest concern here is with regard to European Union trademark registrations. The European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO) registers almost 120,000 trademarks every year, and a European Union trademark registration protects in 28 countries of the European Union (including the U.K.). Of concern is what will happen to the enforceability of a EU trademark in the U.K. once the U.K. leaves the EU. Most European IP attorneys believe that before this happens, some mechanism will be put into place to ensure that existing EU registrations still provide trademark protection in the U.K.

In the meantime, trademark protection in the U.K. is still valid. The applicant has the option of filing a trademark registration application directly with the U.K.’s Intellectual Property Office (IPO). This is a good option for a trademark owner that desires registration in a limited number of countries. The direct filing of trademark registration involves several steps:

1. **Copyright Office**: The trademark application must be filed with the U.S. Copyright Office. The application must include a drawing of the trademark, a statement of use, and a filing fee.
2. **EUIPO**: The application is then filed with the EUIPO. The application must include a drawing of the trademark, a statement of use, and a filing fee. The application is then published for opposition.
3. **Opposition**: Any third party can file an opposition to the trademark application within three months of publication. The opposition must be filed with the EUIPO and must include evidence of prior use of the trademark in the EU.
4. **Registration**: If no opposition is filed, or if the opposition is not successful, the trademark registration is granted.

The EUIPO then issues a certificate of registration, which grants the trademark owner exclusive rights to use the trademark in the EU. The trademark registration is valid for ten years and can be renewed indefinitely. The trademark owner must file a renewal application with the EUIPO before the end of the registration term, or the trademark registration will be cancelled.